

FIGHTING WORKER SUPPLEMENT

VOL.1 NO.1

JAN. 1, 1946

CONTENTS

1. Shall Foremen Join Unions
 2. How to Make Strikes and How to Break Strikes
 3. Company Security Is a Union - Busting Scheme
-

Published by:

DEMOS PRESS
708 N. Clark St.
Chicago, Illinois

FOR

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS LEAGUE, U. S.

(Affiliated To the Provisional International Contact Commission
for a New Communist (4th) International)

January 1, 1946

Fellow Workers:

In order to ensure closer and more direct participation in the workers' daily struggles against the bosses, the RWL feels that speedier and more comprehensive treatment of urgent problems of workers has to be made than can be accomplished by the four-page, monthly Fighting Worker.

SUPPLEMENT to the Fighting Worker is designed to discuss in detail the strategy and tactics of the class struggle in order to help workers meet urgent problems as they arise. Much of the material in more condensed form will appear in the Fighting Worker.

After reading the SUPPLEMENT, if you think it explains your problems and helps you in your work, the editors request you:

Show the SUPPLEMENT to your brother workers;

Request more copies;

Send in letters, comments, articles, union stories and situations useful to other workers.

Financial contributions to enable us to publish both the Fighting Worker and the SUPPLEMENT more frequently and in greater volume, so that they can be used as weapons in workers' struggles, will be appreciated.

The Editors

SHALL FOREMEN JOIN UNIONS?

Shall foremen join unions?

This question arises now because foremen are already organizing. And they are organizing into trade unions.

Majority opinion of the government agency, NLRB, at present is that foremen are employees for the purposes of the Wagner Act, not part of management when they are asking for something for themselves as a group, and thus may constitute an appropriate bargaining unit. To management's claims, that organized foremen will be more loyal to the workers they supervise than to management, the NLRB has claimed that foremen have legal rights under the Wagner Act and that terms of the ultimate bargain will dispel any management fears. A Foremen's Association of America has arisen and in the case of Packard Motor Company foremen have obtained an NLRB ruling favorable to joining of a union by foremen. The dispute has been referred to the higher courts for settlement.

Behind the dispute are problems of importance to all workers and unions:

Why are foremen organizing trade unions?

Shall foremen be permitted in workers' unions?

Foremen for many years have been a buffer group between the top supervisory officialdom in industry and the workers. They were needed to absorb most of the shock of daily clashes in the struggle between labor and management in the plants so that the top supervisory officialdom could devote its attention to wider problems of production and control of labor. Foremen functioned as tools of management to direct production on the spot, spy on labor, check on its efficiency and increase its speed in production.

With the rise of large-scale mass unions and the spreading of the union shop, the function and role of some types of foremen shifted perceptibly. During the war period with production going full blast and unions growing larger in size and embracing increasing amounts of workers, the powerful unions began to make their labor arrangements not with the foremen but directly with the bigger bosses. Many foremen who formerly had had the right to hire and fire and to deal with unions and individual laborers were fast losing this right (though retaining in whole or in part the right to recommend firing).

All foremen could see what the advent of unionism in large shops meant for production workers. Caught in the midst of the incessant struggle between the two powerful class forces - workers and bosses - some foremen were being reduced rapidly to the status of slightly more highly skilled labor capable of directing a part of assembly line production, and having little or no relation to the basic function of management control over labor and the process of production.

In the larger and organized shops a good number of foremen are part and parcel of the productive process. They may be called production line foremen, head men, leaders, straw bosses. As part of the process of production such elements are really more skilled workers, who like all workers are producing values out of which the boss makes his profit. Union contracts are so written by the legal experts that the function of these types of foremen has been very care-

fully delineated and delimited to supervisory activity over the concrete productive process, and little more. All other functions normally associated with management have been eliminated, or substantially reduced. In the smaller and unorganized shops most foremen are not merely supervisors of a production line; additionally they possess management functions of hiring and firing labor and of planning production, and therefore do not have interests close to those of workers in the plant.

What is at play here is that the bourgeoisie in many borderline cases in its methods of directing production is on bad terms with its own henchmen or stooges. Basically all these elements are non-owners, do not exploit labor and are capitalist stooges because they are bribed by a higher standard of living.

It is obvious that this split in the enemy's ranks has to be taken advantage of in the workers' interests. It is clear also that foremen in selecting workers' organizations as the means of defending themselves are copying workers' proven measures.

The problem of foremen's organization in unions is relatively new on the American class struggle scene, but it is comparable to relations workers have with other parts of the enemy class. As an example among farmers who are generally part of the enemy class there are several specifications of share-croppers. Some of them are fairly prosperous and employ labor. Others are non-owners, do not employ labor and are part of the exploited mass. Solidarity with these latter is necessary. Farmhands are allies of workers and are in reality agricultural laborers. Similarly some types of foremen may be utilized by workers and placed under workers' domination within or without workers' unions. Other types of foremen cannot be so ruled in the workers' class interests. The types of foremen vary from plant to plant, from company to company, and in many cases within the same plant foremen of different types may be present at the same time.

Where foremen have management functions of hiring and firing and planning and controlling production, unions in the industry will almost unquestionably determine that these foremen cannot be part of a workers' union. This covers the enormous majority of cases. In relations with these non-worker unions of foremen, it is necessary to come to some practical agreement over actions begun by them. When such non-worker unions have conducted strikes and had picket lines, workers' unions by and large have not crossed the picket line. Many arrangements with such foremen unions have been made whereby workers agreed not to cross the foremen union's picket line in exchange for a foremen's union agreement not to cross the workers' picket line. Some of these agreements have been in writing.

Where there are head men, leaders, strawbosses, production line foremen and other types of foremen who are closely associated with the productive process, who do not have the right to hire and fire, and therefore can be made loyal not to the boss but to the workers they supervise, it is a tactical problem for the union on the spot to determine how closely related to the workers these types of foremen are, what tactics are to be applied to moves and organization of these foremen, and whether they are to be taken into the workers' unions. In many cases where workers' unions have taken in foremen, they place them in separate locals. In National Tea or Jewel Tea food stores, managers are in the same union and in

the same local as workers.

Unions in given industries will know best how to deal with foremen who are openly enemies of workers, foremen who are openly loyal to the workers and foremen who are borderline cases. Open enemies cannot be in workers' unions. Foremen loyal to the workers can be. Borderline cases have to be decided by the workers concerned.

It is a problem in class struggle tactics and no general rule or principle is involved once the basic attitude of workers' domination of "loyal" foremen is granted. Placing of such foremen inside workers' unions is not decisive. Whether inside or outside the workers' union the decisive point is that pressure on such types of foremen has to be maintained and increased to ensure that speed of production, efficiency, grievances, and leaders or pace-setters are all under workers' union domination. At the point of production these elements have to be dominated by workers' strength. The closest workers appear to be able to come to a widespread tactic is that under given conditions, workers may strike together with foremen (for example, refuse to cross their picket line), but at all time will retain their own organizational identity and independent policy. At no time should workers subordinate their long run class interests to the foremen, and in their relations workers should subordinate foremen's interests to the interests of the workers.

Behind the furor raised by the bosses against permitting foremen to join unions and the rejection by workers of having the overwhelming majority of foremen in workers unions lies the enormous problem of control and direction of production. The bosses feel that if foremen are in unions they cannot be controlled by the boss and that by foremen's unions collaborating with workers' unions the boss will be pushed out of the control and direction of the plant.

Though able to dominate inside or outside their unions only a tiny minority of foremen, in the increasing pressure on the boss for union control of hiring and firing, of job conditions, of wages, of publication of company records of profit and executives' salaries workers are driving the economic struggle to higher and higher levels. The capitalist state, with Truman's administration (closely adhering to the policy laid down by Roosevelt) openly intervenes in the process to attempt to slow down and destroy workers action, and to ease workers pressure on the bosses. The capitalist class and its state recognizes that the workers are attempting to control the speed of the production line where possible and by mass action to press against the roots of private capitalist control at the point of production.

At a higher level of the national class struggle, increased control by the workers of borderline foremen and winning over of the white collar workers, technicians and scientists in the plants to the side of the working masses of the country will occur.

HOW TO MAKE STRIKES AND HOW TO BREAK STRIKES

JOHN L. LEWIS ON TIMING OF STRIKES

John L. Lewis, that brilliant candidate for the Academy Award of 1945 based on his splendid performance in behalf of the preservation and continuation of capitalism in the recent labor-management conference, appeared before a congressional investigating committee to toll his reaction to President Truman's proposal for strikebreaking by whipping up public opinion against unions.

Old Beetle Brow declared the arrogance of the GM corporation is exceeded only by the stupidity of the UAW leaders in calling the strike against General Motors now because the corporation lose very little money by not producing while present tax schedules take away some 80% of profits, and by waiting until January 1, 1946, when far lower tax schedules go into effect and much higher profits can be made.

Lewis is not merely showing that Reuther, Thomas and Addes are foolish for pulling the auto strike at a time when GM was not producing much during the reconversion and re-tooling snarl and corporation taxes are so high. Though he may not realize it, he is pointing the finger of scorn at - of all people - John L. Lewis.

Lewis' Timing of Strikes

For many years John L. Lewis has pulled the Mine Workers out on strike AT THE WRONG TIME OF THE YEAR in the strategic sense. Lewis usually selects late spring. Knowing that the stockpile of anthracite and bituminous coal is from a 3-weeks to a 3-4 months supply, when is the best strategic time to call a strike in coal? John L. knows! That best time for a coal strike is certainly not spring, because that is when Lewis calls a strike. Lewis draws up contracts to terminate when coal is not too badly needed for heating, instead of having contracts terminate when coal is most badly needed for heating and industry. He divides miners into anthracite and bituminous coal groups which have contracts running out at different times so that no unified strike action can be taken by both groups of miners, thus destroying the basis of miner unity.

In this one little blistering remark about UAW leaders Lewis has shown that he and his entire tribe of misleaders of labor WHEN AND HOW TO MAKE STRIKES and WHEN AND HOW TO BREAK STRIKES. They know when it is correct strategy to call strikes with a better chance of victory. As Lewis' own life history shows, they know how to call strikes at the wrong time so that the peak of workers' strength is weakened, dissipated and finally washed out. The core of Truman's strikebreaking proposals is exactly this

device - of turning time against labor - by delaying timing of strikes for 30 days until all the forces of government, press and misleaders of labor have combined to weaken the workers' strike spirit. Truman, the strikbreaker, see timing of strikes in the identical light as Lewis.

The UAW leaders know about timing of strikes too. Why did they call the auto strike now? To answer this it is necessary to show class relations in the industry and the role of the UAW leaders.

Why Was Auto Strike Called Now?

From GM's standpoint - Corporation was not ready for reconversion from war to peace production: materials and parts shortage existed; production was being held up pending removal of government wartime controls. Meanwhile profits at same level as during war production years were guaranteed by government. In what amounts to a highly skilful lockout, GM sought to shift blame for non-production of autos onto the union by assuming an arrogant attitude and precipitating a strike. GM knows as much about timing of strikes as Truman and Lewis.

From Auto Workers' standpoint - Throughout the war the auto workers had fought union leaders in an effort to smash the "no strike" policy that took away the union's principal weapon; and to recall labor members from participation in the War Labor Board. Pressure for strike action was bottled up by the union leaders during the war though many small-scale stoppages occurred. After the Japanese surrender, worker pressure for strike action continued. But though workers were moving towards a strike, it does not follow that the strike should have been called when production was so low and profits guaranteed that the Corporation could not be hurt badly by strike action. However, though weakened by the UAW leaders calling out only part of the Auto workers, and at the wrong strategic time, the strike will still hurt GM some.

From UAW Leaders' standpoint - By calling the strike the leaders could pose as militants, could seem to be fulfilling the general desire of workers for strike action. But by deliberately calling the strike at the wrong time these misleaders knew the strike would be weakened and therefore any rank and file attempt to struggle for control of the UAW during a large-scale strike could be controlled and smashed. That is the meaning of calling out only one part of the industry at a time and of agreeing to permit the corporation's to fire militant workers who move for strike action.

When he declared UAW leaders were stupid, Lewis knew the situation in the industry. He obscured the longer-range economic effects of the strike which will be felt by GM not so much today as in the next period when GM will be some three months behind in automotive parts production on which the largest section of the auto industry depends for survival, and GM will be losing some profits later. Though accompanied with the same show of militancy that the UAW leaders put on, Lewis' strategy of calling strikes at the wrong strategic time, not once or twice, but as one of his lifelong, basically anti-worker devices for weakening worker pressure on him and the mine bosses, is the strategy of Truman, the strikbreaker.

COMPANY SECURITY IS UNION-BUSTING SCHEME

In its contract negotiations with the UAW the Ford Motor Co. demanded that the union give the company security against strikes by making itself liable to fines for any strikes occurring during the life of the contract.

To this new and unusual demand on the part of a Corporation the UAW leaders have agreed in principle, but with the modification that instead of fining the entire union for "sporadic" or "wildcat" strikes the individual workers concerned be fined \$3.00 for the first strike, \$5.00 for the second "offense" and be fired by the Corporation and thrown out of the Union for the third strike; proceeds of the fines to go to charity.

Thus, though they recognize and oppose fact-finding by Truman's committees as a step toward compulsory arbitration of labor disputes which would mean the liquidation of the union, the UAW leaders agree to permit the Corporation to control part of the struggles of union members thereby giving the Corporation an ideal mechanism for union busting.

Truman's fact-finding boards are so open and raw an anti-union proposal that even the union leaders had to oppose it or be branded as open stooges of Truman's government against the union members. So viciously anti-labor is the proposal that it forced a political split between CIO leaders and Truman, with talk of a third party arising (a third capitalist party).

The company security proposal, accepted by Reuther, Thomas & Co., is not quite as obvious an anti-union proposal, however it is capable of destroying the union and placing it at the complete mercy of the employers and their government. General Motors has shown the broader meaning of company security when it raised the question of management's "right" to manage.

Continues No Strike Policy

Company security against strikes in peacetime is a continuation of the "no strike" policy in wartime. It attempts to restrain labor on the basis of class collaboration by forcing all militant workers desiring to improve job conditions to face the corporation not as a united mass in a single organization but as individuals. As such it is diametrically opposed to the very basis of all union organization: the solidarity of organized workers against the employer. This solidarity wipes out competition between individual workers and presents a powerful, united workers front in collective struggle of all kinds for improvement of wages, working conditions and organizational power of the union. Company security ties the workers to a static contract in the face of the constantly rising cost of living, a contract which favors the corporations and is directed against the workers' stomach and long-run class interests by preventing workers from conducting continuing action against the rising cost of living.

UAW leaders are not exactly the most stupid labor bureaucrats in the country. Then why do they in open collaboration with the boss favor this proposal for striking blows at militant individual members of the union? In the reply to this question lies the answer to two enormous problems being thrown up constantly by the class struggle in industry in every dispute, large or small:

Workers' pressure on the labor bureaucrats, which is undermining their control;

Workers' pressure on the boss class, aiming at solving the basic political-economic problem confronting contemporary society - who is to control production, worker or boss, under what form of government and, for what purpose, use or profits.

Under pressure of the workers, who are driven by the rising cost of living the UAW leaders found it to their interests to call the strike, though it was at the wrong time strategically. These misleaders are anxious to prove to the corporation that they do not conduct frivolous actions, that they treasure and cherish contracts, that they can control the members. In their efforts to restrain the workers and build themselves up as a responsible, reliable bargaining group these misleaders are up against a momentous fact in the capital organization of the auto industry:

It is so highly organized, so speeded up and so swiftly geared to improved production methods that each time the industrial leaders think they have stabilized class relations on the basis of class relations, they find that the workers under pressure of the higher organization of the plant internally and the rising cost of living externally have been forced to take action to raise wages.

Knowing this the union leaders have many times sought for ways to curb the continuous expression of working class rebellion against conditions in the plant and in the consumer market. In the recent past these leaders have threatened, fined, disciplined and expelled "wildcat" strikers. Today company and worker pressure on these union leaders has posed the issue of labor bureaucrat or rank and file control over the union sharply. UAW leaders see in the company security proposal a swift and sure method of ferreting out militant workers moving towards strike action and towards smashing bureaucratic control of the union. These misleaders want the company security proposal because it gives them the means for destroying rank and file opposition by throwing out all workers who favor and attempt strike action. In an immediate time sense the UAW leaders agree to collaborate with the boss to eliminate militant workers from the plant and from the union. Acceptance of this proposal means an open drive against the militant elements today and development of new militants tomorrow. It is a move to control from above any incipient strike action from below, to prevent large-scale strike action in the future, and accomplish the destruction of rank and file opposition to the UAW bureaucrats.

With this guarantee of control over actions of union members the boss is in an ideal position not only to halt strike action but also to destroy the union. As long as the boss has complete control of hiring and firing of militant workers who take strike action, union members can be kicked out at the bosses' will and the union strangled between the hoary hands of the big corporations and the union misleaders. However, there is a fly in the ointment: auto strikes arise out of the intensified production

and from pressure of the rising cost of living generated by the imperialist war for the world. Strikes are not ordered, planned and accomplished merely because of desires of individuals but because economic and political conditions drive the workers to take strike action to defend their standard of living against the boss and the boss government. Militant leaders arise constantly to head this basic struggle for workers' survival.

As the GM big shots have recognized, the basic issues in the auto strike are who is to manage and control production, who is to rule job conditions, hiring and firing and who is to control profits? In this most highly geared and organized section of American capitalism the basic issue of modern production - control by bosses and bosses' government or control by workers under a workers' government - is coming more and more to the fore.

Herein lies the broader class significance of the company security proposal not alone for auto but for all workers in all their struggles against the national capitalist class and the national capitalist state.

BROADER MEANING OF COMPANY SECURITY

In essence all national capitalist class and state proposals for curbing labor are designed to utilize the power of the capitalist state to give company security against strikes and resulting loss in profits. Fact-finding, compulsory arbitration, legal delay mechanisms, strikebreaking by troops, jailing of union members, terror, propaganda pressure, labor-management committees are all designed to increase production and profits and to eliminate strikes. They succeed only in throttling labor. "No strike" policy in wartime gave the corporations full cooperation, though the rank and file workers fought ceaselessly to smash this treacherous pledge of the misleaders.

Against company, national boss class and boss state attempts to eliminate class struggle actions from interfering with production and private profits, workers are finding it increasingly necessary to counter their own independent demands, based on their long and bitter experiences with all kind of anti-union proposals and devices:

Against company security, workers are demanding union security - union shop, maintenance of membership, closed shop.

To smash the union-busting proposal of fining workers individually, of permitting the boss-and-UAW leaders to put the finger on militants and thereby throttle strike action, to throw out rank and file opposition, workers know it is necessary to fight against the system of fines, to reassert the basic right of workers to take strike action against a sea of troubles, to reassert the fundamental solidarity of all workers against the employer and to forbid the firing of individual workers for strike actions. Atomisation of workers and forcing them to confront the boss and the boss state not as a united mass but as individuals is the essence of the Fascist control of labor. (the infamous labor "front").

Any worker the boss desires to fire for strike action ought to be carefully treasured, guarded and retained by his fellow workers. Against

the bosses' desire to fire such workers, let us raise the demand that determination of firing shall go through the Union grievance machinery of Stewards and Shop Committeemen; and not through the union misleaders. This new type of blacklist by the UAW officialdom in collaboration with the enemy class has to be smashed.

It will be necessary to demand operation by rank and file workers of grievance machinery to settle all grievances, especially those concerned with hiring and firing of the toughest and most discerning workers. The bosses and union misleaders are as concerned about keeping militants out of factory and union initially as they are about throwing out militant workers striving to improve working conditions and have the rank and file run the union. Plant stewards, shop committeemen and local union groups on the spot should fight for the authority to defend their staunchest workers, and not to surrender them to the new blacklist system.

Since as a general policy company security is the aim of the national capitalist class and the national capitalist state, the workers' struggle against this concerted drive to prevent and crush strikes, to blacklist militants, to destroy rank and file union opposition to labor misleaders, and thereby permit Corporation intervention in the internal affairs of an eventually complete domination of unions, has to rise to the level of a national class struggle.

Truman's fact-finding boards which halt, delay, shackle and destroy strike action have to be fought. Compulsory arbitration has to be exposed as a deadly enemy of all labor organization. Use of the army in strikebreaking and of Truman's war powers to seize plants and thereby halt strikes has to be opposed bitterly.

To accelerate the entire process of showing the uselessness of the boss in production and of the growing pressure of the workers on control of hiring and firing, of speed of the production line, of regulation of wages and hours - of workers' control of production as part of workers' rule of the country - demand for publication of records of the corporation should be raised. Publish the secret records of corporations!

Profits should be printed publicly. Bookkeeping devices for concealing profits, cheating stockholders, misrepresenting capital stock, have to be laid bare.

Salaries of executives should be known to the workers.

Participation and non-participation of stockholders in direction of the company should be published. (GM has declared its stockholders do not run the corporation. Who does?)

Real financial rulers of the Company and relation of directors to large banking houses should be revealed.

Increased speedup and the degree of increase in productivity as compared to the static position of real wages (take home pay) should be exposed. Relation of static wage level to rising mass of profits can be established

by exposure of extent of profits. Demand for sliding scale of wages can be proved by publication of Corporation financial records.

Lockouts, intimidation, labor-spying and anti-labor moves of the Company should be exposed publicly and fought. Special funds for anti-labor goons and gunmen, bribing of police and judges, should be made public.

Management's Right to Manage

Company security as a policy is a national capitalist class and national capitalist state declaration of war against workers' demands for a greater share of the product of labor. Against this capitalist declaration of war, workers are taking strike action today and will find the means of taking broader, national strike and national political action tomorrow.

Workers have every right and obligation today to show that there is no democracy in industry. That the big bosses are complete economic dictators, that the so-called management "right" to manage is based not on election or control by the enormous mass of workers but on appropriation by the tiny minority of bosses of the fruits of labor of this enormous mass. Industrial dictatorship, boss terrorism against labor, use of vast production of the U.S. to further U.S. boss class economic and political domination of U.S. workers and those of many other countries are the real meaning of company security proposals.