

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Capitalist Can't Represent Workers

Editor, Daily Worker:

I would like to see more readers' letters on trade union problems. After all, most of us make a living from our labor and belong to unions. White collar workers will be organized in unions in the near future. Many progressive workers can be of great help in this task of organizing the white collar workers. The labor movement is on the way to do it and without the progressive workers in that field it will be harder and take much longer.

The conception of production and non-production workers has changed in modern times. Service jobs are just as important as producing commodities. One cannot work without the other.

It is true that we have about 16 million organized workers in a united trade union organization. But we have 64 million wage earners. The field is open to organization.

The leaders of monopoly capital are well aware of this and they are doing everything they can to avoid or postpone this process. It's not only that they don't want the unorganized workers to win union conditions. But they know what a trade union organization of 30 million workers will be. What political and economic power it will have!

In their efforts to undermine the unions and prevent organization of the unorganized, especially white collar workers, the employers smear the unions with the charge of corruption. They do not tell us, of course, that corruption has its roots in the capitalist system. It comes from a dog eat dog system.

The Dave Beck issue in my opinion involves more than Dave Beck or the union he represents. It affects the whole labor movement to a larger or smaller degree. It comes from the conception of extravagant salaries for union officials. Presidents get \$50,000 a year and so down the line.

The conception is that a good man is worth such money and if the workers pay for it they get it back in higher wages. But the trouble is that when officials get such money they don't put it in stockings. They invest it in capitalist enterprises. Money makes money. They started to represent labor and become capitalists.

One would have to be an angel to be able to represent workers while having an investment and the workers improvement will cost him money. I think the Communist Party and

the Daily Worker should refute this ideology.

If this is presented in the right light the workers will understand it. A capitalist can't represent workers.

A trade union official has to make a decent living, have decent security, at least as much as we get from the capitalists. But a trade union official must not be engaged in business.

I'd like to ask other readers to write their ideas on this subject. It is timely with the Dave Beck case in the news and everybody thinks.

BELLA

Strikers Would Appreciate Aid

Editor, Daily Worker:

In reply to James Ford's letter condemning the Daily Worker editorial on American and British labor, my opinion is that the editorial was 100 percent right in urging our unions to pledge support, moral and financial, to the British workers.

Brother Ford—in so doing, we would be supporting them in their struggle against British capital and American imperialism. Ford is right, of course, that labor should be against the cold war, etc. But speaking realistically, to urge labor leaders to call for abandoning NATO, etc., now is OK, but the proposal of the DW is one the AFL-CIO would accept now, and it would help to strengthen their solidarity with British labor.

Many times, I have seen the glow in the faces of fellow workers during a strike when other unions sent moral and financial support (it also comes in handy when you are hungry). I think this expression by our unions would be in line with the help for the miners in 1950 or the donation by my local to the Montgomery, Alabama, bus boycott last year or the Kohler strike. It's all the same, Brother Ford, helping your fellow workers to fight the bosses.

"THE COOL ONE"

April 4

How to Help British Workers

Editor, Daily Worker:

Does Comrade Ford want to help the British workers? It doesn't look it by his criticism of George Morris' article on "Aid to British Labor" (March 25).

Comrade Ford proposed to eliminate the disease of imperialism as the only means of helping British labor. While we are doing that, what aid will the British working class get immediately?

This seems to be a mechanical approach. It takes for granted that the American working class

is already on the march to eliminate imperialism and to end the cold war.

The fact is that the American working class is not rousing itself to help the British working class financially. Such help must of necessity be a blow to imperialism.

By the same token, using the yardstick of Comrade Ford, let us not fight for shorter hours, civil rights, etc. because this is the "symptom of the disease—the disease is capitalism itself."

Such a position can only help capitalism and postpone the actual cure.—M. D.

APRIL 5.

A Poem On Thomas Jefferson

LOS ANGELES.

Editor, Daily Worker:

To Honor the Sage of Monticello born 214 years ago, April 13, 1743, in Virginia.

Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, also wrote a proverb bold and clear—

"The Tree of Liberty should be nourished frequently, by the blood of tyrants."

Abraham Lincoln, a Jeffersonian at heart, Proclaimed a credo, that children still read and hear:—

"Whenever the people shall grow weary of their existing government, they have the Constitutional right to amend it, or the revolutionary right to overthrow it."

Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Jefferson of our time, Broadcast his fireside chats without the slightest fear:—

"We are all immigrants, and all revolutionaries."

If today these Presidents wrote or printed such words in many American cities, they would be hailed before one of those Congressional un-American Committees, and maybe jailed. But remember, Jefferson in his time, helped nullify the un-American Acts called Alien and Sedition.

So today in this clime,

The Sage of Monticello

Would again lift voice and pen,

With logic keen and witty,

To expose every single un-American Committee.

Demanding its abolition,

Thus refreshing the American Tradition.—V.M.S.

Use of Epithets Deplored

Editor, Daily Worker:

I am very unhappy to see the type of exchange that is taking place between James Ford on the one side and George Morris and one Jacob Samuelson on the other.

The thing that disturbs me is

the harsh attitude taken towards him. Though I am not in complete agreement with him on the matter he raised, I feel that the replies given him have been overly strong, harsh, and in some part insulting.

The fact that James Ford has given long and noble service to the Negro people and to the CP (twice Vice-Presidential candidate) is too well known to go into. To characterize him as sectarian, isolated and reminiscent of a 1919 type Communist is phrase-mongering of the worst type, and similar to the tendencies Ford is accused of.

If we are to continue our discussion let us do it in a comradely fashion and not fall into the old Left Sectarian tendency of turning on one another as if the enemy is in our ranks and lose sight of our real enemy, CAPITALISM.

Fraternally,

Jack Beveridge.

April 8

Justice for The Indians

Editor, Daily Worker:

On November 11, 1794, there was signed a treaty between the United States and the tribes of Indians called the Six Nations, or more commonly, the Iroquois. Of the six nations, the most powerful was the Seneca, and article 3 of this Treaty stipulated the exact boundaries of that nation. The United States solemnly pledged that it "will never claim the same" and that the land within those boundaries "shall remain theirs until they choose to sell the same to the people of the United States."

This Treaty is the oldest continuing treaty into which our country has entered; the mutual pledge of the contracting powers remains legally binding and has remained unbroken. But now the Government of the United States is in the process of breaking that pledge, solemnly ratified in treaty form; and in breaking

the pledge, the U.S. Government threatens to drive from their ancestral lands and from their homes about one thousand Seneca Indians.

This threat arbitrarily and forcibly to create one thousand dispossessed men, women, and children does not involve some distant country in the Near East, but involves people living right now in the State of New York.

The homes of these people are to be flooded as the result of a dam-building project of the Engineers Corps of the Army, and this is to be done despite the fact that the people involved have protested against the action. It is to be done at a cost exceedingly one hundred million dollars, though civilian experts have cast grave doubts on its usefulness, and though Governor Harriman appealed to the Engineer Corps to "take a new look" at the project. Included in President Eisenhower's recent budget message was a provision for the appropriation of a million dollars to begin the plans for this dam.

There is some reason to doubt the purity of the motives behind this move to confiscate 9,000 acres of land. Meanwhile, pleading "emergency", the U.S. Government has filed condemnation proceedings against the Seneca Indian Nation in the District Court of Western New York. Thus, right now, a minimum of 250 families, enjoying property rights guaranteed by treaty, face eviction.

The Association on American Indian Affairs (48 E. 86th St., N. Y. 28, N. Y.), the Indian Rights Association, in Philadelphia, and the Friends (Quakers) Committee on National Legislation, in Washington, have all condemned this governmental action. All partisans of justice should join in this opposition, with letters to the Governor, the President, and to Senator Richard L. Neuberger, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, in Washington.

Herbert Aptheker, April 9.

To Those (Trusts) Who Have . . .

WASHINGTON.—Final report of the House Select Committee on Small Business headed by Rep. Wright Patman, says that between

1952 and 1955 the "profits of smaller corporations have declined, while those of the largest corporations have gone up." For the five and a half years from January 1951, to June 1956, the average annual profit rate (as a percentage of stockholders investment) was 12.8 percent for manufacturing corporations with assets of over \$100 million, while for those with assets of less than \$250,000 the average rate was only 6.9 percent.

In the period between 1952 and 1955 the profits of three top soft drink companies rose 109 percent; of seven top chemical companies 62 percent; three top auto companies 129 percent; five top cement companies 74 percent; three top glass companies 99 percent; seven top steel companies 118 percent; three top aluminum companies 112 percent.