

The Potters Herald

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF
THE NATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF OPERATIVE POTTERS
and
EAST LIVERPOOL TRADES & LABOR COUNCIL

Published every Thursday at East Liverpool, Ohio, by the N. B. of O. P., owning and operating the Best Trades Newspaper and Job Printing Plant in the State

Entered at Post Office, East Liverpool, Ohio, April 20, 1902, as second-class matter. Accepted for mailing at Special Rate of Postage provided for in Section 1109, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized August 20, 1948.

GENERAL OFFICE, N. B. of O. P. BUILDING, W. SIXTH ST., BELL PHONE 575

HARRY L. GILL, Editor and Business Manager
One Year to Any Part of the United States or Canada \$2.00



President—James M. Duffy, P. O. Box 752, East Liverpool, Ohio
First Vice President—E. L. Whitley, Room 215, Broad Street, National Bank Building, Trenton 5, New Jersey
Second Vice President—Frank Hall, 6111 Pacific Blvd., Huntington Park, Calif.
Third Vice President—James Zimmer, Cannons Mills, East Liverpool, Ohio
Fourth Vice President—Charles Zimmer, 1645 Ohio Avenue, Trenton 5, New Jersey
Fifth Vice President—Arthur Devlin, 205 Ashmore Ave., Trenton, N. J.
Sixth Vice President—Frank Dales, 215 Alton St., East Liverpool, Ohio
Seventh Vice President—T. J. Desmond, 625 E. Lincoln Way, Minerva, Ohio
Eighth Vice President—Joshua Chadwick, Grant Street, Newell, W. Va.
Secretary-Treasurer—Chas. F. Jordan, P. O. Box 752, East Liverpool, Ohio

GENERAL WARE STANDING COMMITTEE
Manufacturers—M. J. LYNCH, W. A. BETZ, J. T. HALL
Operatives—CHAS. F. JORDAN, FREDERICK GLYNN, ERNEST TORRENCE

CHINA WARE STANDING COMMITTEE
Manufacturers—E. K. KOOS, R. M. WALKER, W. A. BETZ
Operatives—BERT CLARK, DAVID BEVAN, CHAS. JORDAN

DECORATING STANDING COMMITTEE
Manufacturers—ROBERT SUTZ, Sr., W. A. BETZ, RAY BROOKES
Operatives—JAMES SLAVEN, OSCAR SWAN, ROSE STEWART

T. J. Duffy

The National Brotherhood of Operative Potters has suffered a grievous personal loss in the passing of Thomas J. Duffy, former president of the N. B. of O. P. A native of England, Mr. Duffy came to this country at the age of 7. Like his father, brothers and sisters he became a potter.

He started to work in the pottery when 11 years old. There were many causes for his rapid ascendancy in the ranks of the N. B. of O. P. His unique position of strength and power could be attributed to his unwavering loyalty to his associates and to his advocacy of the true principles and purposes of labor unions.

At the age of 22 he was elected secretary of the N. B. of O. P. and four years later was elected president, serving eight years in this office before relinquishing the post to accept an appointment to the Ohio State Industrial Commission. He was one of the original sponsors of workmen's compensation in Ohio and participated in its functioning in its earliest days.

It is to be regretted that T. J. Duffy's great work has ended. His life was devoted to organized labor and he was always willing to lend a helping hand to any man or woman toiler.

We extend our sincere condolences to Bro. Duffy's family, and we are well aware his name will go down in Brotherhood history.

Same Old Answer

Most union members can sympathize with Harry Truman these days. Mr. Truman is on a spot that is very familiar to anyone who has ever served on a negotiating committee. You go in to Mr. Moneybags and propose that wages be raised or conditions in the shop improved and his first answer always is the same: "We can't afford it." Well, the President has taken to Congress a program for progressive legislation that would benefit the entire country and he is getting that same answer: "We can't afford it."

We remember when the companies were telling us they couldn't afford the eight-hour day. Then when it was forced on them, they found that it was more efficient than the 10 or 12 hour day. They said they couldn't afford time and one-half for overtime, or paid vacations or paid holidays, or second shift differentials or reclassifications or a score of other improvements. But since they have been forced to accept them, business has been better than ever. Working people are turning out more goods per man hour than ever before. The whole country has benefited.

It's the same in Government. Big business spokesmen in Congress said we couldn't afford social security, or unemployment benefits, or rural electrification, or the wage-hour law, or public works. Somehow, all those programs got passed and it turned out we could afford them. Best evidence is the record of corporation profits over the past three years. Business never had it so good. The entire country has benefited.

The record shows that the fearful souls who have opposed every progressive step by Government always cried, "wolf." They have always predicted that grass would grow in our streets. And, they have always been wrong. If we, the people, want our government to rebuild our public school system, to continue Marshall Plan aid to Europe, to increase the pensions paid to our old folks, to raise our unemployment insurance, to reorganize farm price supports, to set up an insurance system to cover doctor and hospital bills, to help middle income families to own their own homes, certainly the strongest and richest nation in the world has the resources to do it. If it means a tax increase, then our representatives in Congress have the authority to raise taxes. After all, it was the same men who are so worried now about Government finances who cut taxes two years ago when we should have been using a surplus to pay off our national debt.

As members of President Truman's union—the United States of America—we say: "Go ahead, Harry." The first answer is never the last in any negotiating session. We know that these programs you have proposed will benefit the entire nation—including the businessmen.

AFL To Go Forward

A study of 4003 wage negotiations from January through November, 1949, shows that the American Federation of Labor was chiefly responsible for wage increases won last year. These negotiations covered at least 6,500,000 workers, including those in AFL and other unions. Wage increases were won in 2882 negotiations, of which 1934 or 67 percent were conducted by AFL unions. That is, our affiliated unions won twice as many wage increases as all unaffiliated unions together. AFL unions took part in 2361 of these negotiations, won wage increases in 82 percent, other gains in 9 percent; that is, gains were won in 91 percent of our negotiations.

This is our record for 1949; as we all know, these wage gains were won without forcing general price rises, for living costs declined during 1949. We intend to go forward in 1950 to win further wage gains, cooperating with employers to cut costs wherever they are willing to make this possible. By cooperation we mean genuine joint effort based on submission of cost records; we do not mean acquiescence in employer dominated speed-up schemes.

Whispers—And The Job Ahead

There's a whispering campaign drifting around the country. It takes the line that certain political candidates can't lose, and that certain others can't win.

Specifically, it says labor can't raise the money to beat so-and-so. Or it can't find a good candidate. Or working men and women don't care enough to register and vote for their favorites. Or trade unionists are overconfident because they won a great victory unexpectedly in 1948.

The same "experts" who grandly dismissed President Truman and other Fair Deal candidates that year as dead political pigeons didn't learn a thing. After making small, stale jokes about eating crow, they now are back predicting again—and in just as lordly a manner.

It is they and their wishful-thinking conservative brethren who now are whispering that labor's going to lose Ohio. Or it can't beat its chief enemy in Missouri. Or how can it expect to win in Pennsylvania?

Yes, if workers and their families had listened to them in '48 the 81st Congress would have made the reactionary 80th shine, in comparison, like a silver dollar in a mud hole.

What working people need to do to win at the polls this year is simple. They must stand on their program for better health, better housing, better working conditions, better education, more security for the workers, the aged and the unemployed, stable prices for the farmer, fair profits for the businessman.

They must see that they, their families and their friends are registered and qualified for voting.

They must contribute money voluntarily to Labor's League for Political Education. Political campaigns and educational programs take money.

They must make their friends and acquaintances understand the issues. They must make them understand that labor must take intelligent and energetic political action to protect the progress and achievements won after years of struggle, and to move forward further in the direction of human values.

And, of course, they must vote.

If trade unionists do these things, they needn't fear the whispers, the prophets of defeat or the wise guys.

If trade unionists do these things, they'll win.

The 64-Year Question

Repeal of burdensome and undesirable federal taxation on margarine has been demanded so often by organized labor that any additional remarks on our part may seem superfluous.

But now that repeal is ready for the last hurdle in the Senate and the old hobgoblins are again trying hard to befuddle the issue, a summary and final admonition are in order. Elimination of restrictions on the production and sale of the "poor man's butter" is not only long overdue and a point of elementary justice; it is a single and simple issue, not to be confused with and hamstrung by other legislative considerations, no matter how necessary and deserving of labor support.

The 64-year-old margarine controversy deserves to be taken care of on its own merits. Or as a New York contemporary rather neatly puts it: "Senators in favor of repeal now have the task of opposing every delaying tactic of the interests bent on maintaining federal discrimination. In particular, crippling amendments must be defeated; any attempts to recommit the bill to committee must be stopped; riders to the repeal bill in the form of such extraneous proposals as the repeal of other taxes must be kept out of the bill."

To all of which the working people of America fervently say Amen.

Challenge Of 1950

"Can we provide enough work for all those who failed to find work in 1949, plus a million newcomers?" is the challenge of 1950, Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin pointed out in a New Year's message.

Another way to put the challenge, Tobin said is "Can we sell all that we are able to produce? and continued, in words that meet with strong labor approval:

"The problem is one of increasing the ability of great numbers of people to buy the output of our farms and factories."

"In the American tradition, this has always been done in two ways—by cutting prices and by increasing wages. We know, from long experience, that these two methods are entirely compatible; we have been using both for generations—and the result has been the highest standard of living on earth."

"We must also take into account those who have been overlooked and bypassed. Programs such as expanded social-security programs, increased pensions for retired worker and special aid to low-income groups are necessary to assure that our general welfare is shared by all."

"I predict that the security and freedom of working people will be expanded and improved during the coming year, thereby contributing to a prosperous, productive and peaceful year."

'She'll Marry Me,' Says King Farouk

It's nice to be an American! At least you can marry any girl you can persuade to marry you.

It's different in Egypt! Zaki Hachian and Nariman Sadek who have been sweethearts since childhood, were to be married last December 4, but Egypt's King Farouk, fat and aging, got a look at the beautiful girl and decided she was just what he wanted for his harem.

So Farouk forbade the wedding and announced that he, instead of Hachian, will be the happy bridegroom. Hachian and his 16-year-old ex-fiancee are "broken-hearted," but Farouk is "absolute ruler" of his country. There's no Congress to check him and the people can't throw him out on his ear in an election.

Britain was the real ruler of Egypt for generations, and still has great power there, but never interfered with "local customs"—like a king butting into a romance.

A Wee Bit O' Scotch

A recent correspondent wrote that he noticed quite a few people crossing light controlled intersections against the green light. "Most of these offenders," he wrote "fail to think of the risks they take in doing so, as well as not fully realizing the purpose of those traffic lights; the safety and protection offered. Being Scotch, as well as a taxpayer, I always wait for the green light. My taxes help install and maintain those lights for my protection and guidance, so I make sure I get my money's worth out of them."

This Doesn't Seem Sensible

A reader asked if he sells his house at a loss, can it be "deducted" from the income on which he pays taxes to Uncle Sam. The answer is "No," if the house has been his home. If, however, he has been using it for "business purposes"—such as real estate speculation—the loss can be deducted from his tax bill.

Favoring speculators over home-owners seems silly, but Uncle Sam's tax authorities say that's the way it is.

"Guaranteed to Cut-er-er"



BEHIND THE HEADLINES

Businessmen On Truman's Side

By NATHAN ROBERTSON
For Labor Press Association

Washington (LPA)—The biggest battle in this session of Congress is between President Truman and the conservative "power" Fair Deal spending program. The biggest news in that battle is that a group of prominent and highly respected businessmen are on the President's side, rather than on the side of the Byrds in Congress.

The businessmen are those belonging to the Committee for Economic Development (CED). They are not self-serving propagandists such as the men who are running the National Association of Manufacturers. They are serious-minded and enlightened businessmen who have taken the trouble to sit down with experts and study the budget problems of the government and try to come up with honest answers.

The answers they have come up with are very close to the answers reached by the experts who helped President Truman frame his budget. They call for continued spending of the kind recommended by President Truman to build and strengthen the country so that the budget can be balanced, not by cutting necessary expenditures, but by increased revenues from improved and expanded production.

The President's budget calls for expenditures of about \$42 billion. The NAM budget is set at about \$33 billion, and the Byrds in Congress are proposing a budget of about \$37 billion. The big difference between these budgets is chiefly the amount to be spent for such things as health and education, public works such as dams and power projects, and construction of schools and hospitals.

The issue between these two schools of thought is very clear. The President feels it is sound to build for the future even if it means temporary deficit at a time when 3,500,000 people are unemployed. The Byrds and the NAM propagandists believe it is more important to balance the budget than to see that people have enough to eat, enough houses, or enough medical care. The NAM has even taken the position that the budget should be balanced in times of depression.

Now the CED has stepped into the middle of this controversy with a budget that takes the ground out from under the Byrds and the NAM. Its budget calls for about the same kind of spending Truman has proposed and totals \$40 billion. That \$40 billion, however, is based on a high level of employment with no more than 2½ million unemployed.

The CED concedes that in times like these with 3½ million unemployed it may not be possible to balance President Truman's budget without too much ultimate cost to the country economically. It wants to set a level of spending and taxing that will balance the budget when the unemployed have jobs. That's just about what President Truman proposed.

Most newspaper stories about the CED report did not sound that way. That is because the CED presented a budget that showed, instead of a deficit, a surplus of \$5 billion that would permit a tax cut of more than \$2 billion, and permit paying \$3 billion on the public debt. But study of the two documents showed many close parallels between the President's and the CED's budgets, not only in figures but in language.

The CED, for instance, strongly supports many of the President's programs for such things as expanded social security, appropriations for health and education. It wants spending to continue for needed public works that will increase the productive power of the country. Its budget would not be balanced until economic conditions improve.

These are not New Deal businessmen. They are big middle-of-the-road businessmen such as Marion B. Folsom, of Eastman Kodak; J. Cameron Thomson, a Minneapolis banker; John D. Biggers, of Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co.; S. Bayard Colgate, of the soap company; Ernest Kanizer, of Universal Credit Corporation; Clarence Francis, of General Foods; and George L. Harrison of New York Life, to name only a few.

The position taken by these businessmen gives strong hope that a meeting of the minds between business and labor leaders on major economic policy is not far off. Enlightened businessmen are beginning to realize that the public policies for which labor has been standing are good not only for labor, but also for the whole country, business as well as labor.

In view of the enlightened attitude taken by the CED businessmen on spending policies, labor leaders and economists should take another look at their proposal for cutting taxes on corporations—which most labor leaders would reject as quickly as the NAM would turn down a labor plan for spending money.

What the CED has proposed, in addition to cutting the excise or sales taxes, which labor would also like to cut, is this: It proposes to withhold taxes on dividends just as employers withhold income taxes for workers from pay envelopes. This would provide a system of current collection on dividends just as the government now collects currently as you earn on your income.

The joker, if any, is that what the corporation collects and turns into the government as taxes on dividends could be subtracted from the taxes the corporation pays on its earnings. At the present rate of declaring dividends this would mean a cut of 20 per cent, or perhaps a little more, in corporation taxes.

For example, take a corporation which makes a profit of \$1,000,000 and pays dividends of \$500,000. At present it pays 38 per cent on the \$500,000, or \$190,000. Under the new plan it would continue to pay \$380,000, but \$83,000 of this would represent collections in advance on the dividends paid to stockholders. The corporation would be paying this \$83,000 for the stockholders, instead of having them pay the tax themselves as at present. In the end the stockholders would pay exactly the same as they do now. But the corporation, instead of paying taxes of \$380,000, would get credit for the \$83,000 and pay only \$297,000. This would be a cut of 22 per cent in its taxes.

This plan has been proposed by the CED as a means of curtailing the so-called double taxation of corporation earnings. At present the corporation pays 38 per cent on its earnings, and the remaining earnings when they reach stockholders are again taxed under the personal income tax—sometimes as high as 70 or 80 per cent. The result is that some stockholders realize very little on their investments.

Students of progressive taxation have long favored greater dependence on personal income taxes, which can be graduated according to ability to pay, than on corporate taxes, which cannot be so graduated. The CED proposal is a move in that direction, which the businessmen believe will provide an incentive for greater business investment without changing present personal income tax rates.

—In Little Rock, Ark., the only remaining diamond field in the U.S. was closed down and 10 of the discharged workers decided they would attempt to establish a new kind of trade union on a co-operative basis. They announced that they were seeking funds to buy Geiger counters to explore for uranium, plus additional funds for jeeps and supplies. All the investors, limited to 100 at \$50 apiece, would cooperatively share the profits of any discovery equally with the 10 workers. The union gimmick was a contract that provided that the 10 men would work only 8 hours a day and six days a week.

—In Indiana, union-hating Senator Homer Capehart has been debating Rep. Andrew Jacobs, an advocate of Taft-Hartley repeal, in a series of one night stands in various cities throughout the state. Capehart, who founded the company which manufactures Capehart radio and phonograph sets, was able to pass off every question from the audience except one. That came from a man who stood up and said, "Senator, from what you've said for the past hour I judge that you Republicans have done a wonderful job in Washington. But you still haven't told me why my record-changer doesn't work."



Communists and pro-Communists like Harry Bridges howled themselves red in the face when Walter Reuther's United Auto Workers signed a contract with General Motors which tied a small fraction of negotiated pay raises to the cost-of-living index. Bridges and the Creeps mixed gallons of tears and printers' ink on how the workers had been "sold-out" and "betrayed." Last week it was disclosed that Bridges has signed a new 20-months contract covering 20,000 Hawaiian sugar workers. Not even Bridges' worst enemies could say it resembled Reuther's contract. The agreement signed by Bridges—over the protests of several Hawaiian locals—ties the wages of the 20,000 Hawaiian sugar workers to prices on the New York spot raw sugar market—a speculative market like the cotton exchange!

The attempt to dynamite the United Auto Workers headquarters in Detroit produced a new rash of newspaper and magazine articles conjecturing on who was responsible for the shootings of Walter and Victor Reuther. Some of the pieces were obviously written by men who had been dropped on their heads onto a pile of detective mysteries when they were babies. But it remained for the ultra-conservative magazine, Business Week, bible of industrial executives, to come up with the most amazing explanation of all. First, the magazine considered the possibility that the assassin was either a Communist or an employer. Mulling over the latter possibility Business Week declared with delightful frankness, "However aggressive an employer may think the UAW is, he would hardly dare the consequences of murder and arson—and in any case would hire professionals to do the job right!" And then came the payoff! Business Week's straight-faced conclusion was: "Feudists? The clues seem to be most solid here. The Reuthers came from the West Virginia hills—traditionally feuding country!"

What's going to puzzle hundreds of thousands of UAW members is why the Detroit police haven't arrested all those barefooted, bearded hill-billies that have been prowling around the city with long-barreled squirrel rifles.

Practically every reactionary newspaper in the United States drooled off a gleefully sarcastic editorial the day after New Year's because a new group of British labor leaders received titles of nobility. Five Labor Party officials were elevated to the peerage as viscounts and the editorials professed to find this very funny indeed.

A more important question, however, is where do the reactionary papers of this country get off, looking down their noses at titles for labor leaders? Newspapers and only the newspapers have bestowed such titles as "Czar" Petrillo, "King Coal" Lewis, and "Duke" Dubinsky. And the paper which throws these titles around most promiscuously is edited by a "Colonel" McCormick in Chicago.

As Congress convened it was announced that an attempt would be made this session to strengthen the Full Employment Law. However, two days later it was disclosed that Congress had already taken steps to solve the employment problem. Ninety Representatives have placed their relatives on the Congressional payroll.

One type of employment that Congress hadn't planned on spreading was revealed when the Library of Congress reported that there are now three times as many lobbyists in Washington as there are Congressmen. What's more at least 27 former Congressmen, who might otherwise be unemployed, found plushy jobs as lobbyists and the entire crew pulled down a neat \$8,952,000 last year. The only registered lobbyist who doesn't seem to be doing so well is ex-Senator Joe Ball. In newspaper advertisements which are headlined "A Message From The Principal Author of the Taft-Hartley Law," Ball is trying to peddle a weekly letter which he calls "The Joe Ball Washington Labor Letter" to executives for 50c a letter. Even at four bits there haven't been too many takers. Because, for example, how could any NAM executive trust a "labor letter" written by a man who still thinks that he, and not the NAM, was the "principal author" of the Taft-Hartley law?

Corporation executives have frequently attacked the employment statistics released by the government, but now some of them are beginning to think that if there are inaccuracies part of the fault may lie among employers themselves. For example, the employment turnover of vice-presidents at Montgomery-Ward has now reached nearly 100%. Only last April, Sewell Avery fired every one of his eight vice-presidents and last week he started firing their successors. A good strong union of vice-president wouldn't be covered by the Taft-Hartley act but it certainly would be subject to the Sewelllective Service Law.

News and Views

. By ALEXANDER S. LIPSETT, (An ILNS Feature)

Whatever the sins of capitalism, it has made the American workman the best fed, best dressed and most amply provided with luxuries of any in the world. That at least is the conclusion drawn by "Le Populaire," leading newspaper of the French Socialist party and mouthpiece of former Premier Leon Blum, in a three-column article entitled, "How the Working Class Lives in the United States." The contents are a welcome change from the usual abuse and communist inspired vituperations heaped on America and American institutions.

But though the American worker enjoys a buying power nearly 5 times higher than his French counterpart, his life is by no means sweetness and roses, the paper maintains. His principal troubles are: A pressing housing shortage and, consequently, high rents; too much eating and waste; and the readiness to run into debt in order to appear to live in better surroundings. Whether they are automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines or other household luxuries, they can all be bought on credit.

It is the French writer's contention that no matter how undesirable and painful these surface results they are adequately balanced by other factors. As to housing, the American is surely no worse off than his colleagues in Europe, or in the so-called worker's paradise, Soviet Russia. Two-thirds of all newly wed couples in France are forced to live in hotels or furnished rooms and pay exorbitant rates. America has large housing projects in the making, something of which the workers abroad, with the exception of the Scandinavians, hardly dare to dream.

Purchase of automobiles, gadgets and other luxuries on credit is the logical result of an "extraordinarily well developed and adapted" capitalism which has but one major disadvantage, the reduction of the weekly pay to a fraction of its real worth. For while American business does not mind paying high wages, it knows well how to get its share back from the worker; it sells him, through clever advertising and other media, goods he often does not need.

Nevertheless, the paper states, "this system produces an extreme prosperity. For 80 years that prosperity has been based entirely on the cycle of high wages and intense consumption. It is a very different world from ours, where the mere idea of a decent wage throws the bourgeoisie into convulsions."

From Cincinnati comes word that workers can get legal services free or at a nominal cost under a novel program worked out by the Legal Aid Society and industrial leaders.

Employees with legal troubles can apply to the personnel departments of companies cooperating in the plan, it was announced. If the applicant is unable to pay or if the cost would work a hardship on his family and dependents, he will be given free aid. If he is able to pay but has limited means—and what worker has not?—he will be referred to the Lawyers Reference Service, whose members will serve him at a moderate cost.

Other cities might well copy this set-up. Aside from giving workers legal protection in cases the cost of which is beyond their reach, it helps to improve management-labor relations. Apparently the good business people of Cincinnati are not unaware of the likely results.

The National Foremen's Institute has sounded a sour note concerning the labor outlook of the Republican party; its Employee Relations Bulletin states that the Republicans, in addition to abolishing the party's labor research division, have "thrown in the towel on getting labor support in the next election."

The institute's complaint is justified. It is a sad truth indeed that the Republican party, once the rallying center of American labor, has in recent years neglected its duty to the workers of the nation. True, its leaders pay lip service whenever election time rolls around, but for the in-between time organized labor might as well roll over and play dead. Well, labor will not play dead, no matter what party politicians may hope. If the Republicans are needed to win the working people over to the party's standard and convincing them of the sincerity and soundness of their policies, the time is now.

—In London, Jack Hughes, a union auto mechanic, wondered whether to buy out his employer after investing exactly one penny in a football pool and collecting \$127,435. The odds were figured at 10-923,023 to one.