Copy hund

P1286021

June 5, 1929.

Yera Bush, 512 West Airline Avenue, Gastonia, N. C.

Dear Comrade Bush:

Miner. In many respects I think it is a very biased report. In the first place, you do not state how bitterly you were opposed to the negro policy of ne Jim Crowism in the Union, and that you agreed with the proposition of two locals in the Union; that I had to go to Bessemer City practically alone to carry out the negro policy, that I spoke not only at one mass meeting, but at several mass meetings, that the only one I took with me was Comrade Karl Reeve, who alone showed willingness to help me. You fail to state that it was I who told you not to take a vote in the strike committee, when I anticipated that the old strike committee, made up of rotten elements like Milinax and Childers, were opposed to our policy, and we had to get rid of such elements as these, and that if they effected the strike committee, not to take a vote at the meeting.

If you remember, I had not mot regularly with the strike committee when you went down there to meet with them, in my absence, on the negre question. You failed to tell that after the first meeting with the strike committee we had a mass meeting, and after the mass meeting we had other meetings of the strike committee where the strike committee actually veted for our pelicy under my influence.

Another thing which you have desired is the proposition of a separate local for colored workers. When I was there I pointed out that the Maket Waste Hill was a separate mill, and senetimes, under our constitution, can be formed into a separate heal. However, you failed to report that I also stated first, that this would not selve the negre problem because there were other makets negroes in other mills there here were white workers, and second, in my opinion, a separate head should not be formed because they were all part of the American Spinning Company and should be in one local for that reason, as well as

2\26 M

Delos

of our negro

ted elsewhere.

for the fact that it would be a demonstration of our negro policy, so our policy could not be misinterpreted elsewhere.

I think it is particularly wrong for you to write a report which fails to give my opinion that there should be not be two locals, but one local, leaving the impression that I stood for two locals, but the fraction overruled me and decided for one local. Such a biased report certainly cannot help the comrades in the field to recognize the serious mistakes they made on the negro policy or to correct them.

I am very much astonished that after so many weeks have gone by your should still be writing this type of report.

Fraternally yours,

albert Weishard

CEC TEXTILE REPRESENTATIVE

AW:D