

The tour is over! Comrade Muste reports herein on the final meetings and his impression of the whole tour.

By A. J. MUSTE

DAVENPORT and MUSCATINE, Ia.—It is when one meets a small branch such as the one at Davenport that one sees most clearly, perhaps, how thorough training in revolutionary theory can hold a group together in the face of the greatest obstacles and discouragement.

Crowded Hours in St. Louis

ST. LOUIS, Mo.—The standard, not to say classic, Stalinist mimeographed leaflet distributed at our public meeting gives "the new line" of the C. P. on us, at least for that day: the workers are warned to beware of "ultra-revolutionary parties" such as the W. P.

A conference with workers who want to discuss the details of the W. P. program, one with a group of progressive trade unionists, two meetings with middle class sympathizers, a business meeting of the branch, and a public mass meeting are crowded into 36 hours here.

ILLINOIS MINE FIELDS.—Shacks, dirt, poverty. Here one realizes again that Columbia has indeed fallen low. In one mining town P.M.A. members on strike over two years still believe in the P.M.A. which supplies them with about fifty cents worth of relief a month, and regard Allard, Pat Ansbury and Jack Battuello as union-wreckers!

"Best Political Meeting Yet" COLUMBUS, Ohio.—The best political meeting yet held in Columbus from the standpoint both of numbers and of the level of questions and discussion.

Watch the number after your name on the wrapper of your copy. When the serial number on the masthead of the paper corresponds to it, your subscription is expiring!

Business Manager

CAPITOL NEWS LETTER

Roosevelt Held up Auto Labor Report until Code Was Renewed

By JACK ELDER

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Acting on the principle of sentence first and verdict afterward, the President renewed the automobile code one week before the Henderson-Lubin report on employment and labor conditions in the automobile industry was made public.

Not one solitary advantage, large or small, has accrued to the automobile wage-slaves as the consequence of the labor provisions of their code.

Let the report speak for itself. To begin with the "speed-up", vicious and unrestrained, is the universal practice throughout the industry. "There is no set speed for a conveyor line even after production has been pushed up to what is regarded as a maximum."

BITTERLY OPPOSE PAYMENT PLAN

Pass workers are paid on a straight hourly basis or by individual piece work. The typical method of payment is the "group bonus plan", to which method the workers are "bitterly and unalterably opposed", because of "the simple but to them all conclusive fact that they do not know how much they are receiving."

Workers must come to shop "as much as an hour early to prepare work for the day". During the noon lunch interval "material must

(Continued on Page 4)

C.P.'s Attack on Mini Decried in Sacramento

SACRAMENTO, Cal., Feb. 11.—That the prosecution's immediate aim in the criminal syndicalism trial is the crushing of trade unionism in the rich valleys of the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers has become crystal clear during the fourth week of the presentation of the state's case.

During the first weeks of the trial the prosecution utilized Communist party literature as a smoke-screen. Under this cover, it now begins to sneak up on the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Union, or its successors, since the union has been smashed by the terror.

The testimony presented by stool-pigeons, sheriffs and prosperous farmers (i.e., employers of migratory workers) is that Pat Chambers and Caroline Decker, union leaders, openly advocated the use of armed force in various strikes, and provoked violence. Many of the witnesses were obviously lying and cross-examination shot their testimony full of holes.

Stool Pigeon's Testimony The testimony of M. Harris, a stool-pigeon who had been in the Communist party was also featured. This gentleman, who soon after joining the C. P. was made secretary to the section organizer, with access to all party records, is connected with the Associated Farmers (i.e., mortgage-holding banks), the Industrial Association of San Francisco and the State Criminal Identification Bureau.

Leo Gallagher, International Labor Defense attorney, has made no headway in wiping out from the juror's minds the prejudice which middle-class provincials inevitably

bring to such a trial. One of the jurors openly criticized Gallagher's method of cross-examination. The fact that the complaint was unjustified is less important than the fact that this and other jurors are full of resentment and antagonism against Gallagher.

Min's Statement The prosecution introduced last

(Continued on Page 4)

Warnick Defends Mini, Raps 'Western Worker'

Ed. Note: The author of the following statement is one of the 17 workers being tried for criminal syndicalism in Sacramento. Arrested on August 13 he was hauled out by the Non-Partisan Labor Defense after the I.L.D. had let all the defendants except one rot in jail for six months.

Warnick is twenty-eight years old, the son of a blacksmith. He worked his way through the Universities of Washington and California. In 1933 he was San Jose section organizer of the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union and was active in the cherry and pear strikes in the Santa Clara Valley, the Redwood City mushroom strike and the San Joaquin cotton strike.

Warnick recently criticized the Communist party for its actions in smashing the Sacramento united front. Now he speaks out against the Communist party attack on a comrade who stands in the shadow of San Quentin. His straight-forward statement is a crushing answer to the Communist Party slander campaign against Mini.

Warnick's Statement "No brief or excuse can be held

for a class-conscious worker giving any information whatsoever to the police. That is why Norman Mini should be severely condemned for his statement given at the time of his arrest last August to Neil R. McAllister, chief prosecutor, in the Sacramento criminal syndicalism case.

"However, any attempt, such as is being made by the Western Worker, to characterize the statement of Norman Mini as a 'confession' and the act of a 'cowardly, treacherous stool-pigeon', must be equally condemned.

"I am convinced from my close acquaintance with Mini in jail and during the last months, that Mini did not give the statement with evil intent. I am certain that he neither attempted to save himself from a prison term, nor consciously gave information against his fellow-defendants. Neither do I think the information he gave is damaging to the revolutionary movement. What he said consisted of facts which we have always disdained to hide. The rest was merely his personal opinion.

"Norman Mini made a stupid mistake. But it is not a fatal mistake and he should not be crucified for it.

(signed) JACK WARNICK San Francisco Feb. 10, 1935.

SOCIALISTS VIOLATE AGREEMENT

Now Take Steps to Launch Sectarian Defense Organization

With cynical disregard for existing written agreements binding the Socialist party to united action to launch a labor defense organization, the S. P. appears now to be engaged in setting up a "Labor and Socialist" imitation of the I.L.D.

The New Leader of Feb. 2 announced that a conference to launch a permanent labor defense organization will be held March 15 in the headquarters of the I.L.G.W.U. and that a call for that conference is being sent out to "trade union, Socialist and fraternal organizations". The announcement did not state by whom the call will be issued. The impression one gets from reading the announcement is that the call will be issued by the New York Socialist Committee for Promotion of Labor Defense. It may or may not issue the call. Some other body may do that. A number of organizations—trade union or fraternal—may sign the call. All that is important but not decisive in determining the significance of the conference.

The announcement of this conference follows by a week the announcement of the formation of a Socialist Committee for Promotion of Labor Defense as a step in the direction of the formation of such committees in other cities where the Socialist party is organized and the formation of a Labor and Socialist National Defense Committee. The conference, therefore, must be considered as a part of this policy.

A "Plan for a Labor Defense Organization" was drafted about a year ago by representatives of the Non-Partisan Labor Defense, the Communist Party Opposition, the Left Poole Zion, the Il Martello Group, the Workers Party and the Socialist party. The plan specified how the organization was to be launched. A Conference Committee of representatives of organizations endorsing the plan of the Provisional Committee for Non-Partisan Labor Defense, and leading trade unionists was provided for. Its function was to "organize and carry through a conference of invited representatives of as many organizations as are interested in the plan as here set forth at which conference the defense organization is to be set up and then publicly launched." In preparation for the conference the committee was to "draw up a draft constitution and declaration of principles", "formulate resolutions upon policy", "carry on preliminary negotiations with organizations and outstanding individuals, in order to draw them into the conference", "select a name

(Continued on Page 4)

United Opposition Needed against Tighe

Lack of Preparation Brought Present Progressive Movement in Steel to Disaster

By ELMER COPE

In defiance of an explicit threat made by President Mike Tighe of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers, delegates and members from 78 locals met in Pittsburgh February 3 in a conference called to consider steps toward the organization of the steel industry. Similarly, about seventy miners from Western Pennsylvania, Ohio and West Virginia, in face of a similar threat by their officials, met in joint session to plan united action with the steel workers.

The call for the conference was previously, attended by regularly elected delegates from three district organizations of the Amalgamated Association. At this meeting six international officials also attended. Though the officials defended their policies they established the legality of the conference by promising to issue the call for the February 3 meeting.

The Leaders The initiators of this progressive movement are by and large the same militants who took over the 1934 annual convention of the A. A. and forced through a program for general strike action, over the protest of the international officials.

This original movement collapsed after a re-convened convention held two months later had—under pressure from President Roosevelt and Bill Green of the A. F. of L.—rescinded the strike action of the previous convention. Last fall the movement took a new lease on life and under the leadership of Clarence Irwin of Youngstown, and William Spang of Duquesne together with Louis Morris of Canton, Mel Moor of Weirton and others began to rally the progressives for the nation-wide organizing campaign which the officialdom had completely abandoned.

The Feb. 3 Conference

In an effort to find a way out approximately 400 steel workers came to the February 3 conference. It is not known how many were officially delegated to represent their respective lodges. The fact that the bureaucrats, after first indicating that they would tolerate the conference, launched an attack outlawing it, undoubtedly kept many delegates away.

It is significant that the bulk of those attending came from lodges where unemployment is high and working conditions most desperate. The lodges with signed contracts, mostly in the tin plate divisions, were cool toward the movement and had no significant representation at the conference.

There is no doubt that the conference, although the majority of delegates came from the Pittsburgh-Youngstown-Canton-Weirton area, expressed the dissatisfaction of the workers in the industry with the inaction of the Tighe machine. The conference illustrated that the job of building a real, national progressive movement in steel has just begun. The vitally important Chicago-Gary district had one representative, no one attended from the Portsmouth, Ohio section, and the entire Michigan area was without a spokesman.

Resolutions

"The steel workers can not depend upon labor boards and other federal agencies but must rely upon their own organized strength," read the main resolution adopted. "We reaffirm our belief in the principles of the A. A. and the A. F. of L. which are principles of struggle." The resolution provided for the establishment of a committee to seek the cooperation of the executive boards of the A. A. and of the A. F. of L. for a general organizing drive.

A detailed program of action called for mass meetings, publicity, unemployed relief committees, ladies auxiliaries and a supporting committee of liberal and professional elements. Another resolution was adopted petitioning the A. A. executive board to liberalize dues payments and provide exemptions for unemployed workers in order to meet the emergency.

Tighe Goes Into Action Hardly had the conference adjourned when the delegates were informed that Spang and his Duquesne lodge had been expelled, and that the A. A. attorney, Ogburn, had been instructed to withdraw the Duquesne case which was then

(Continued on Page 4)

A.F. of L. Helpless; Strike Action on PWA Only Course for Labor

How they would welcome the opportunity to pay \$12 per week instead of the present scale of \$12 per day.

And the A. F. of L., recognizing that the bill threatens its very existence, has hastened to make its feeble and ineffectual protests. To quote the New York Times, "The full force of the A. F. of L. as represented by William Green, president, and the executive council, was brought to bear on the Senate Appropriations Committee in an effort to have it write the prevailing wage requirement into President Roosevelt's \$4,000,000,000 work relief program."

"The Federation President decried the adoption of the relief program without the McCarran (prevailing wage) amendment would wreck the prevailing wage scale throughout the country."

The Outlook

As the matter stands at the present writing the Senate Committee, under pressure from the President, has voted 14-9 to reconsider the amendment which it passed last week. There can be little doubt that the President will finally succeed in having the amendment totally withdrawn. The ineffectual bleats from the A. F. of L. officialdom, if the past is any indication, will have less than any influence.

There is only one course for the workers, both unemployed, and employed, for both are threatened, and that is to organize militantly for strike struggle against the attacks of the Administration.

Relief Bill Will Drive Wages of All Labor to \$12 Minimum

Prevailing Wage Clause Defeated by Order of Roosevelt

In order to understand the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee in amending the Roosevelt Work Relief Bill it is necessary to understand the financial implications of the amendment.

On Thursday, Feb. 7, the Roosevelt Bill, which provided full time employment for 3,500,000 heads of families at \$50 per month (30c per hour) at a total yearly cost of four billion dollars was introduced. An amendment by Senator Adams, providing a continuation of the present home relief at a yearly cost of two billion dollars was defeated by a 10-10 tie. Senator Adams' amendment represents big business sentiment, as embodied in a resolution of the National Manufacturers Association several months ago, for cheap government and a balanced budget.

Prevailing Wage Amendment

At the same session of the Committee the "prevailing wage" amendment was introduced and passed by a 12-8 vote. This amendment provides for the payment of wages at rates prevailing in the locality where work is undertaken. This was calculated by the Budget Bureau to be 80c per hour as an average for all localities and all sorts of work to be undertaken.

Roosevelt Opposes It

How does it happen that two advocates of cheap relief and two advocates of "expensive" relief get together on the amendment? And why does President Roosevelt greet this amendment which receives support from both camps as an amendment which "defeats the whole purpose of the relief bill"?

First to take the problem of the agreement between the cheap relief and the "expensive" relief factions: The fact of the matter is that the amendment, while it provides higher wages, would not necessarily cost more than the original bill, and might even cost less!

The original bill contemplates full time employment for 3,500,000 heads of families at \$50 per month (30c per hour). On this basis total wage payments per month would be \$175,000,000. At the same time the cost of materials, according to the estimate of the Budget Bureau, would be \$160,000,000 per month, a total of \$335,000,000 per month, or approximately four billion per year.

The amendment provides "prevailing" wage payments (80c per hour) but it says nothing about full time employment. This leaves two possibilities. The first, which attracted the proponents of "expensive" relief, is for full time employment at prevailing wages. This would involve a total yearly expenditure both for wages and materials, of some six billion.

The second possibility, which attracted the proponents of cheap relief, is for part time employment at prevailing wages, part time such as to make the monthly payments total \$50 per worker. Under this plan the monthly payments for

wages would be, as under the original bill, \$175,000,000. At the same time, since the work would be part time, the cost of materials would only be \$80,000,000; the total monthly expenditure \$225,000,000, slightly more than three billion per year!

The Three Proposals

What does the unemployed worker stand to gain from each of these possibilities?

The best proposed plan is that for full time employment at prevailing wages. A plan which would cost six billion per year.

The second best is for part time (62 hours per month) employment at prevailing wages. A plan which would cost three billion per year.

The third choice is the President's proposal for full time employment at 30c per hour. A plan which would cost four billion per year.

Why does the President choose and support the last plan which is the worst so far as the workers are concerned and which is only second best so far as total government expenditure is concerned? Against the first plan, it is true, he may argue expense, as it calls for an appropriation of six billion instead of four.

But even leaving the first plan out of consideration, what argument can be advanced against the second plan, which actually will cost one billion less than the original proposal?

The Sweatshop Argument

The argument advanced by the President, through his agents, is that under the second plan, although it costs one fourth less, the government will receive in return only one half as much construction because workers will be on part time instead of full. Thus the

SCHOLARSHIP CONTEST TO NEW YORK WORKERS

To the person who sends in the largest number of subscriptions this date (February 16) and March 2 the New Militant will award a free scholarship consisting of three courses in the International Workers School. These courses may be chosen by the winner subject to the capacity of the classes. Ten yearly subscriptions or equivalent will be the minimum in order to qualify. In case of the similar scholarships will be awarded to each typing contestant.