Caucus Demands Ball for Bridges and New Trial on New Evidence

Special to The Dispatcher

NORTH BEND, Ore.—By an overwhelming vote after almost a full day of debate the longshore, shipclerks and walking bosses caucus which opened here August 15 demanded that bail be re-stored for ILWU President Harry Bridges and that he be given a new trial on the basis of new evidence.

The caucus, made up of more than 70 delegates, made the reso-lution on Bridges first order of business on the agenda and the debate was almost totally weighted in favor of its adoption.

Speaker after speaker made it clear they felt the jailing of Bridges was a direct attack on the ILWU and its union condi-tions.

Adopted with the resolution was an amendment which will give the 10,000 ILWU members of the division opportunity to ex-press their sentiments through referendum vote.

INTRODUCED BY LOCAL 8

A poll of delegates was taken on the resolution near the close of the day August 15 and the vote in favor was better than three and a half to one. Chief opposition came from some San Francisco delegates. The vote on the referendum was unanimous.

Immediately after the action ILWU Secretary-Treasurer Louis Goldblatt dispatched telegrams to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, President Hoover, Attorney Gen-eral J. Howard McGrath and President Truman.

The resolution which intro-duced to the caucus by Portland Local 8 reads as follows: "We reaffirm our determina-tion to keep the invasion into the inter- nal affairs of our union.

The invasion was a part of the action of the board of directors of the International Longshoremen’s & Warehousemen’s Union which opened here August 15 and the vote was a full day of debate-the debate was almost totally one-sided.

Why is it that the proven per-sons are not prosecuted—Men who are as guilty as Lawrence Ross? We consider the jailing of Bridges timed in an effort to avoid granting a new trial as a result of the sensational defense of his freedom made in J. E. Ferguson's affidavit. This affi-davit, upon which motion for a new trial is based, provides documen-tation of frame-up activities by immigration agents, the FBI, police, labor spies and labor spies of the longshoremen's union.

While it was incredible when the official news release telling of the action backing Bridges was handed to them.

Portland Presi-dent James Fanti was elected permanent chairman of the caucus over Robert Baker of Portland. Joe Jako-vac of Coos Bay Local 12 was made secretary. First Vice Presi-dent J. R. Robertson, after being introduced by Local 15 President Vernon Leno, opened the meet-ing.

As The Dispatcher went to press the caucus was on the sec-ond point of its agenda, contract wage openings and pensions and welfare.

LIES BIT

Other items on the agenda were the hiring ball, security check, World Federation of Trade Unions, Anchorage, Alaska, etc.

The full text of the resolution on Bridges follows:

"The jailing of Harry Bridges, President of our International Union, is a complete sabotage of the rights of individual and a complete destruction of the work of our people. We have been forced to watch the end of the reason for the jailing of Bridges and we are coming to the conclusion that the jailing of Bridges is a direct attack on the ILWU and our union conditions.

"We, therefore, demand that Bridges be released on bail and granted a new trial based on the new evidence."

Local 10 Votes To Protect Members’ Rights To Jobs

SAN FRANCISCO—By over-whelming vote August 2 the longshoremen of ILWU Local 10 took the position that “any man screened from military jobs shall retain his full constitu-tional union rights a9c1 his right to freedom of his rights under the contract to work his share on commercial jabs.”

The whole matter of security was to be discussed on a com-munist basis at the longshore, shipclerks and walking bosses caucus in North Bend, Ore., this week.

DRAWS ATTACK

"We find it exceedingly strange that Bridges is prospected with such venom and vindictiveness. Why is it that the proven per-sons are not prosecuted—Men who are as guilty as Lawrence Ross? We consider the jailing of Bridges timed in an effort to avoid granting a new trial as a result of the sensational defense of his freedom made in J. E. Ferguson’s affidavit. This affi-davit, upon which motion for a new trial is based, provides documen-tation of frame-up activities by immigration agents, the FBI, police, labor spies and labor spies of the longshoremen’s union. While it was incredible when the official news release telling of the action backing Bridges was handed to them.

In an affidavit in 1949 Bridges described the action of the ILWU’s board of directors in jailing him as "an unprecedented order sending a man to jail. The government did not provide any protection for his freedom of speech. He was taken the position that “any man refused to serve in the military because he believed in the un-American activities of the government. Bridges” has been imprisoned for his freedom of speech. He was taken to the United States for trial on a charge of sedition. Bridges was sentenced to 5 years in prison and was held for reasons of his freedom of speech. He was taken the position that “any man refused to serve in the military because he believed in the un-American activities of the government. Bridges” has been imprisoned for his freedom of speech.

The ACLU attorney cited the case of Bridges in court to demonstrate the government’s use of the law to suppress the right to free speech.

"The government would make Bridges a martyr for the United States the executor of the pol-icy of the present administra-tion as well as for the present administra-tion. Bridges is “dangerous to the pub-lic welfare,” in vague and indefi-nite as well as unproved. The charge is not proven. Bridges speaking in Local 10 meetings against the war contracts and against an atomic attack on Japan was what Bridges himself called "a radical and illegal attack." Bridges spoke in the ILWU and the ILWU Regional Director Jack Ferguson was cited, along with offi-cers of the organization.
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"The government would make Bridges a martyr for the United States the executor of the pol-icy of the present administra-tion as well as for the present administra-tion. Bridges is “dangerous to the pub-lic welfare,” in vague and indefi-nite as well as unproved. The charge is not proven. Bridges speaking in Local 10 meetings against the war contracts and against an atomic attack on Japan was what Bridges himself called "a radical and illegal attack." Bridges spoke in the ILWU and the ILWU Regional Director Jack Ferguson was cited, along with offi-cers of the organization.
Which Way Our Union?

S
tead and blood, tears and heartache and
suffering preceded and went along with
the building of the ILWU and the making of
its gains which spelled themselves out in the
thickness of the pork chops and the number of
rooms in the house.

It also took guts to build the union and
the guys who did it had to risk blacklisting,
arrest, and even death on the picket line.
They risked these things and more and in the
end it was their unbreakable solidarity that
pulled them through and won them decent
conditions against odds that would have
made lesser men quake and give up.

The present drive to push the union back
into company or bluebook unionism is not
new. It has been going on ever since the big
strike of '34. Several times the union's en-
emies have thought they had opportunity
to give it a try but every time the union closed ranks
and held fast, not only defeating the wrecking at-
ttempts but going on to hand its enemies
much more than they bargained for. This
was true in '34, '36-37, '46 and '48.

Now we have a crisis of '50 propelled
upon us because our enemies see a chance to
do through war hysteria what they could never do in previous years.

The jailing of the union's international
president and the blacklist type of screening
planned in Washington are but a continua-
tion in new form of the tear gas and guns of
'34 and the Taft-Hartley 80-day injunction of
'48—logical extension of the whole long plot
to drive the union back to bluebook days and
smash its gains.

\*\*

W
hatever the duties of union members
are in war they can be carried out and
all the security necessary can be had without
one inch of retreat from union contract condi-
tions. This was so in World War II, which
was no mere police action, but then, of
course, a man named Franklin D. Roosevelt
was commander-in-chief.

We face now a time of momentous deci-
dion, and if we make the wrong decision it
may be the last decision we are allowed to
make for ourselves.

By our decision—if we choose it that way
—we can give up what has always been the
main spring of our strength, that is, our dem-
ocratic right to find our own course through
free debate.

It is essentially this right that has been
challenged by the arbitrary jailing of Harry
Bridges.

Which way shall we go? Shall we remain
solid and go forward under the slogan that
"an injury to one is an injury to all," or, shall
we divide and fall apart under the theory that
this is a time when everybody should
look out for himself and let the employers
catch the hindmost?

Once we make that decision we shall
prettly well know how each of us is to live or
not live in the years ahead.

It is time once again to close ranks.
**Ranks Fight for Harry Bridges Freedom**

**Hawaii Protests**

HONOLULU, T.H.—Rank and file protests against the jailing of ILWU President Harry Bridges spread in the Territory until a total of 2,200 members from 16 plants had walked off their jobs in protest against the persecution of last week.

The members were closed down on Hawaii, five on Oahu, and one each on Maui, Kauai, and Molokai. The workers suspended the protest workers for an additional 24 hours.

On August 8 all the longshoremen at the Honolulu, Kakaako and Cooke Terminals here stopped work.

Every longshore division has been able to demonstrate and all have sent protest wires to President Truman and their divisions in the Territory. Several of these wires include signed petitions and wires demanding Bridges’ release.

**Oregon Acts**

Typical of the wires was the following to Free Harry Truman signed by Local 136 Hawaii Division Secretary, Fred Low. Vice-President Benjamin Nama-

> “We the Oregon longshoremen protest vigorously the illegal jail of Harry Bridges pending judicial appeal on the In a letter to President Truman August 7 calling upon “your just American who has the courage to exercise free speech a potential victim of bureaucratic oppression...”

Munrane told newsmen he felt Bridges and the American people would rally to the defense of Bridges “to pre- serve the basic freedoms and prevent a nåad of unlawful arrests.”

In a column in the Oregon Journal, consisting of Cecil Ecklund, Clyde Miller and Dewey Van Brunt, the editors characterized the longshore leader was locked up and “the Coastie” and attacking the coastwise carousels in North Bend. The editors said “We look on the whole frame case as a move, not against Bridges, but against the entire trade union movement in American...”

**CLOSE TO FASCISM**

Oscar A. Buettita, member of Local 6, Bellingham (Astoria) said The Dispatcher that the revocation of Bridges’ loyalty to America and the security threat. In his fight, in the belief that the revocation of Bridges’ loyalty to...”

Ray Keenan, Secretary of the Columbia River District Council issued the following statement:

> “...the vast majority of longshoremen on the Columbia River are in the belief that the revocation of Bridges’ loyalty to America and the security threat...”

In a letter to President Truman August 7, wrote Bridges in care of the ILWU Local 6, Bellingham: “We of Local 6 know that the...”

Keenan, in his letter: “We are not alone, only six.”

**FOR DEMOCRACY**

The statement on Bridges’ jail- ing campaign against the ILWU labeled the ILWU, its agencies to stop its anti- labor procedure that can be...”

The ILWU has a very good record record for handling cargoes dur- ing the wire’s President “...confuses us when our...”

“For your information...”

The second longshoreman said: “...in the wire’s President “...confuses us when our...”

The third longshoreman said: “...in the wire’s President “...confuses us when our...”

**Washington Acts**

SAKETTE, Wash. — Harry Bridges “only crime is that he tried to protect our union...”

It is your duty...”

White House said: “...in the wire’s President “...confuses us when our...”

The council represents Local 6 and the workers in the various ports, was released in this area by Bert McCabe, Hamilton & Benny McCabe, Hamilton & Benny Longshoremen voted at a shop meeting the wire’s President “...confuses us when our...”

James Fantz, President of Local 2-B, Portland and Local 21, Longview, Wash. likewise.

**Other Unions Act**

SAN FRANCISCO—The spe- cial issue of The Dispatcher deal- ing with the jailing of Bridges was distributed to all the ILWU members. Thirty-five thousand copies have been mailed in California, New York, and New Jersey, with additional copies to every member and to individuals all over the U.S. and Canada.

One of the first unions to take up the cause of Bridges was the Bingham, Utah, Open Pit Local 27. They wired the President August 17 to get Bridges back into the ranks of the ILWU.

**For Defense**

**FOR FREE SPEECH**

Secretary of the Local 8 committee, charged the ILWU was under the阴影 of Right and makes of “every American who has the courage to exercise free speech a potential victim of bureaucratic oppression...”

**Free Bridges Meeting Set in San Francisco**

SAN FRANCISCO—A “Free Bridge” meeting will be held in the Auditorium of the ILWU Building at 156 Golden Gate Avenue here at 8 p.m. August 22, for members of Northern California and the San Francisco...”

“In a letter to President Truman...”

In a letter to President Truman August 7 calling upon “your just...”

**五一**
PORTLAND, Ore.—Following is the full transcript of a broadcast over KPOJ July 19:

MR. TED HALLOCK (Master of Ceremonies): Good evening, and welcome to “On The Dispatch,” another in the 1950 series of tape recorded radio-press interviews presented weekly at this time by KPOJ, sponsored by the Portland Club of Journalists.

Our guest this evening is Stanley Earl, former Secretary of the CIO in Oregon, who has just returned from Korea, where he served for six months as Labor Consultant to the Marshall Plan Mission in that country.

Mr. Earl will be interviewed by Paul Hansen, Staff Writer of the Oregon Journal; Stanley Earl, Managing Editor of the Oregon Journal; Herb Lundy, Associate Editor of the Oregonian; and Floyd Lanston, Oregon Chief of Bureau for the Associated Press.

Mr. Earl, our subject this evening is this: “What is Wrong in Korea?”

MR. STANLEY EARL: The entire social, political and economic structure of the Republic of Korea is wrong.

MR. FLOYD LANSON (Associated Press): Well, what is it exactly?—They say, “We have democracy.” Is there a democracy over there?

MR. STANLEY EARL: I believe that the political advisor, Ambasador Muccio, of course, took the position that the American personnel in Korea could interfere in the internal affairs of the Sovereign Republic of Korea, no matter how bad things went. I think that a great deal of the occurrences which have occurred are the direct result of bad advice given to the Koreans by Dr. Harold Noble, who, incidentally, is an Angolanian, and by the Counsellor of the Embassy, Mr. Everett Drumright. Both these men, to my knowledge, did not get out on the level of the people, and, certainly, if their advice was taken, and I presume it was, rather than the other way around, then the advice was wrong, and I think that the events which have occurred in the past two weeks are a direct result of advice which was wrong. Now why was there received that advice, I do not know.

MR. STANLEY EARL: But I believe that a war situation was imminent and, certainly, if their advice was taken, and I presume it was, rather than the other way around, then the advice was wrong, and I think that the events which have occurred in the past two weeks are a direct result of advice which was wrong.

MR. STANLEY EARL: I believe that a war situation was imminent and, certainly, if their advice was taken, and I presume it was, rather than the other way around, then the advice was wrong, and I think that the events which have occurred in the past two weeks are a direct result of advice which was wrong.

MR. STANLEY EARL: In Korea there were a few of us who continue to believe in the Korean people. We had the impression that the American officers, who are on the border, and, of course, it was impossible to get in, and we had absolutely no knowledge of what went on.

MR. STANLEY EARL: But I believe that a war situation was imminent and, certainly, if their advice was taken, and I presume it was, rather than the other way around, then the advice was wrong, and I think that the events which have occurred in the past two weeks are a direct result of advice which was wrong.

MR. STANLEY EARL: I believe that a war situation was imminent and, certainly, if their advice was taken, and I presume it was, rather than the other way around, then the advice was wrong, and I think that the events which have occurred in the past two weeks are a direct result of advice which was wrong.

MR. STANLEY EARL: In Korea there were a few of us who continue to believe in the Korean people. We had the impression that the American officers, who are on the border, and, of course, it was impossible to get in, and we had absolutely no knowledge of what went on.
point I am making when I saw that little item in the press.

**Spelling not verified.**

**MR. DONALD J. STERLING:** To what extent, then, did you feel in the invasion, has the United States lost face in Korea?

**MR. STANLEY EARL:** Well, I don't know how much face we lost, but I can tell you this that the people were becoming increasingly more hungry. When I arrived in Seoul September 3rd of 1948, the price of a rice farm was 3,200 won for a small mall. Now it takes fourteen small malls of rice now for a four-room house. The average Korean farmer, 19,000 won a month, and the price for a small mall on Sunday, of course, is one thousand. It took over four times the amount of money that could be made if a worker was able to sell his rice. The Korean people became hungry, and as nothing was done by the government of Korea, then I think that people who were of that prestige went down the same war we were supporting that government with dollars.

**MR. FLOYD LANSDON:** In that connection of hunger and the South Korean Army, in our pre-broadcast lunches, you mentioned that a lot of the South Korean Army joined the Army in connection with the police state. I think the people would be interested in hearing that.

**MR. STANLEY EARL:** I told you, and I think the audience, that I know two Korean young boys who jumped into the Army so they could get rifles, so they could round up Korean policemen, because they had been so brutally set upon by the Korean police. And I think they had one object in life, and probably that was to kill Korean policemen. And after seeing the way the Korean policemen operated and tortured my friends, and my Union people, I almost think it was a laudable ambition.

**MR. FLOYD LANSDON:** Mr. Earl, concerning the alleged right way to handle things in Korea, you mentioned that you attempted to introduce the I.C.F.T.U. and your efforts failed. Well, haven't some Communist or pre-Communist charges been levelled at that organization throughout the world?

**MR. STANLEY EARL:** No. The I.C.F.T.U. is the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, which was established in London on November 27th, 1949, as an alternative to the World Trade Union Confederation, and the I.C.F.T.U. was scheduled to come to Korea on August 18th and I had planned that we would start talking about it then. But when they would talk to the Korean labor leaders, they would see conditions for themselves, and then they would talk to President Rhee and they would tell President Rhee that he had to give them representation. We were then able to go to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions with the constitution of the Republic of Korea, and that he had better change things or possibly the Tai Hae Kno Chung,* the Korean Federation of Labor, would be expelled from membership because it was not a part and could not live up to the democratic constitution of the I.C.F.T.U.

**MR. DONALD J. STERLING:** How long do you think this could have taken? Rather, how long will it take to repeat the invaders?

**MR. STANLEY EARL:** That I cannot answer, and probably won't know until we are in a precarious position, due to the fact of the geographic situation of Korea. We had no men; we had no material with which to fight a war. The Communists crossed the border in a very small force, and they are on three sides of an army which had been terrifically understaffed, and the Korean troops were divided completely. It went to pieces completely, and if the American air power had not come along when it did, we would have been defeated in three days. The entire peninsula would have been taken over by the Communists within three days. There was nothing to stop them then. They became merely the ones with no confidence in their leaders, and I tell you frankly that I don't believe that there is any doubt in the minds of the Korean Army should have been out on the front fighting the Communists after the evacuation of civilians from their civilian population while their own warehouses were being burned, they were not only hungry, but they went out and robbed the public.

**QUESTION:** Mr. Earl, I think much of the responsibility for correcting the situation in Korea belongs to the United Nations rather than to the United States.

**MR. STANLEY EARL:** Well, technically, the entire problem is a United Nations' problem because the United Nations resolution of Seoul, Korea, was observing events in Korea, and it attended the regulation number of cocktail parties so they'd know what the Koreans were thinking.

**MR. FLOYD LANSDON:** Mr. Earl, you got out of there rather quickly, didn't you, along with the rest of the Americans?

**MR. STANLEY EARL:** I put it out of there hurriedly.

**QUESTION:** In what way? Were you able to pick up your car and get out of there or did you come back?

**MR. STANLEY EARL:** Well, I went to the rest, with the few exceptions who took advantage of the knowledge that I had that I intended to leave Washington, incidentally, I, like the rest, lost everything I had with me. I lost all my clothing and my coat and I had three shirts and a few handkerchiefs in a small mall, which were the same position. I left a car and a jeep, well, everything. I gave it to the British Embassy with the knowledge that my home tonight, your family doesn't go home, you just walk away and leave everything, and take what you have on your back. That's the way it was in the United States with the evacuation men on these cargo planes, rather than baggage, on your back. That was necessity. We were trying to evacuate men on these cargo planes, rather than baggage, on your back. That was necessity.

**QUESTION:** Was the evacuation orderly or was there panic, I mean among not only the Americans but also the Koreans?

**MR. STANLEY EARL:** The Korean residents of Seoul, the few handkerchiefs and my camera. Everyone was in the same position. I left a car and a jeep, well, everything. I gave it to the British Embassy with the knowledge that my home tonight, your family doesn't go home, you just walk away and leave everything, and take what you have on your back. That's the way it was in the United States with the evacuation men on these cargo planes, rather than baggage, on your back. That was necessity.

**QUESTION:** Was the evacuation orderly or was there panic, I mean among not only the Americans but also the Koreans?

**MR. STANLEY EARL:** The Korean residents of Seoul,
 Unless the Bill of Rights Is No Longer the Law ---

Jack Bryan, After 30 Years of Trying to Bust Unions, Is Still at It

Jack Bryan, who represented West Coast shipworkers in a controversial court case in Washington, D.C., in 1950, has continued to be involved in labor disputes. Bryan, who is known for his aggressive tactics and his willingness to challenge union authority, has spent much of his career working to undermine the power of labor unions.

In recent years, Bryan has continued to be active in labor disputes, often working on behalf of employers to undermine the power of labor unions. He has been involved in a number of high-profile cases, including the recent case involving the Zonolite Company, which he represented in a lawsuit against the union.

Bryan's approach to labor disputes is characterized by his aggressive tactics and his willingness to challenge union authority. He has often been successful in his efforts to undermine the power of labor unions, and he has a long history of success in this area.

Despite the challenges he has faced, Bryan remains committed to his work and continues to be a forceful advocate for employers in labor disputes.

The Dispetcher
August 18, 1950

ARGUMENT POLITICAL

This is the plant the Team-
sters tried to raid last year, win-
ing thousands more into the
union and demanding that the
ILA union shop elections be
revoked.

There were no political implica-
tions in it. . . . Reflect on our
revolution in 1776, reflect on
the same fate, though they were
the same argument. . . . The true
nature of this prosecu-
tion.

Argument of Mr. Dono-
hue for the American Civil
Liberties Union, in the argu-
ment of Mr. Donohue for the
ILA. The judge's only answer was
"There is another constitu-
tional right to bail pending ap-
pearance of the defendant."

"There is another constitu-
tional argument in it. . .
rather of the administration to
do that."

The increase, in line with that
government must do that.
ARGUMENT POLITICAL
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Shipowners Buy CIO Maritime

By WILLIAM GLAZIER
WASHINGTON, D.C.—A new CIO Maritime Committee was launched at a festive dancing dinner held in Washington, D.C., on July 27. Among those present were labor leaders who have been “screened” and found O.K.—for the occasion were Senators, Representatives, shipowners, and the head of the National Assn. of State Contractors. They all put their blessings on this committee. It was a fine party.

ON SUBSIDIES

But no one bothered to point out that since these six shipping companies operate on subsidies paid to them out of the U.S. Treasury, the CIO Maritime Committee was throwing into the pot in order to make a deal. A venture in labor-management relations, a turnabout on the part of the CIO with other labor organizations, a campaign to “educate” the American public about shipping problems.

The idea was announced from the table of honor when you start out in a deal like this.

The cost wasn’t much—and since it isn’t their own money but the American public’s, the shipowners are using the cost wise.

JOINING WITH OWNERS

The NMI, executive director of the CIO Maritime Committee, Washington representative, was asked to explain to the owners that this new committee did not cost $15,000 per year plus another $5,000 for expenses. By explanation, the owners were in an editorial, this new committee was a part of the CIO Maritime Committee.

For many years the CIO, along with its allies, the AFL, has opposed all the phony subsidies which the shipowners grow fat on. The CIO has long opposed “educational” programs for the shipowners with the shipowners to lobby for bigger handouts from the U.S. Treasury. Hoyt Haddock of the NMU, one of the most influential shipowners, has opposed all the phony subsidies.

The shipowners confessed to having under $5,000 in their pockets by the time they went to the dance. This was a real foot-stompin’ party and this was what they had decided to do.

The cost wasn’t much and since it isn’t the shipowners’ money but the American public’s, the shipowners were using the cost wisely.

IN BOUGHT

When ILWU pulled out of the CIO in November 1944, it was because this business of running CIO for years was already being tried.

The idea was announced from the table of honor when you start out in a deal like this. It was a party.

The seaman who collected the $313,460.04 for the ILWU in 1947 is now covered for health benefits. The remaining 10 per cent have left the industry or received some form of unemployment compensation.

The arbitration will go on again for the 180 Seattle longshoremen, as the employers’ request was granted. The ILWU longshoremen have been in the forefront of the defense of American seamen since the outbreak of war.

Scalers Vow to Protect Members

SAN FRANCISCO—In an unusual move, the Scalers Wardens, elected by their 3,061 members of the Senate on maritime matters, has been formed.

Secretary of Labor Tobin announced that the Scalers Wardens are a group of men who have a dedicated interest in the industry. And it certainly did.

The Scalers Wardens objected to the proposed creation of a new labor board and the increased costs for the member.

Aliis-Chalmers Manufacturing Company and a group of wood. The company’s first venture in direct manufacturing abroad.

Local 10 Refers MFW Maritime To Couses

SAN FRANCISCO—ILWU Local 10 longshoremen in a referendum from 11:24 to 8:07 in favor of referring to the longshoremen, shipbuilders and walking longshoremen’s local 91 resolution calling for a change in design as president of the Maritime Federation of the World or president of the ILWU.

The resolution, which was incorrectly stated is president of the Maritime Federation of the World or president of the ILWU.

The resolution was that the shipowners had related to the ILWU.

THE FIRST TIME

The shipowners and some of the enemies of labor in the government have tried many union-busting tricks over the years. But this is the first time they ever bought a $50,000 place as a part of a “public educational” program.

The place was at last here. If you can buy a union, and put it on the door, and if you can try to buy a U. S. Senator by hiring his counsel and manager of his election campaign, why try to buy at least part of the vice-president of the United States, too.

Election Victory

The ILWU last week won a NMI resolution calling for the election involving waterfront workers in Portugal, Oregon National Detective Agency, also in San Francisco.

The vote was 116 for the ILWU in 58 for Harry Landenberg’s AFL-United Steel Workers Union, which had petitioned for this change.

The ILWU locals involved are Con- trol Guards and Watchmen, Local 95 of San Francisco; Ware- house Local 9 of Seattle, Washington. Also covered in the collective bargaining unit are the operators of the Columbia River and Puget Sound.

Work Regained

San Francisco longshoremen and shipbuilders got back some of their jobs when ILWU went into a strike last week.

The 180 members of the ILWU will also handle all Navy ships which may dock at commercial piers.

Dependent Deductions

Employer trustee of the ILWU PMA Welfare Fund last week agreed in principle to the union demand for deductions for dependent coverage, but said that their records offices are so jammed now because of increased work that they cannot handle the additional payroll returns.

They agreed to review the matter.

A total of 2,565 families are entitled to support in the San Francisco area, 918 in San Francisco and 1,647 in Portland, Ore., and 174 in Seattle.

Hatch Watchmen

The hatch watchmen arbitration in the Emery dock case involving Local 62 in Wilmington, Calif., resumed August 9, but the employers demanded a continuance in order to produce witnesses they claimed were unavailable.

The union objected. The arbitration will go on again.

San Francisco Dockers Support Blacklisted
SAN FRANCISCO—Support of the 180 Seattle longshoremen, members of Local 19 blacklisted by the Army and Navy, was voted by Local 10 longshoremen here August 9.

Easy Deal

This Washington, D.C. door used to be labeled merely “CIO Maritime Committee.” A painter added the word “after the shipowners bought the NMU.”

Cooks Show Security Plan

Aim is Company Union

SAN FRANCISCO—As evidence that the shipowners and the government are using the “security” check to rob the Marine Cooks of decent working and living conditions, a MSC pamphlet this week cited these facts:

One member of this order, "Labor" was blacklisted off the SS Alaska as a "security" risk. This ship had a load of tourist passengers making a 15-day cruise to Alaska. No way was the ship connected with the Korean war or the defense efforts of America.

"Most startling of all is that the same member was not prevented from buying a ticket and making the roundtrip as a passenger.

AGAINST PERON

Another member was blacklisted off a freightliner and taken to a commercial camp for the dictator country of Argentina. This mem- ber was outspoken in his criticism of the Fascist Dictator Peron and the activities of the fascist government there in recently smash- ing the only union in a country that by declaring it illegal and shutting out all members of the union and their families.

The only security involved there was the security of the fascist dictator that the American people refuse to have anything to do with in spite of the pleadings of certain government officials.

We also had members black- listed off the SS President Clev- erald, another ship loaded with tourist passengers and not going to Egypt. Some of those crew members had been on the Clevel- land since its maiden voyage three years ago.

NO APPEAL

The members of the company blacklisted off the Portland, as a shipboard stew- ard, had gone all out for the "security" program. No appeal because no ap- peal board has been set up.

The closed shop made it clear that the union is not "opposed to strikes" per se, but in the interests of the workers.

The internal security of our na- tion at any time. However, it is obvious that what they choose to call a "security" program for the sole purpose of discriminating against members of this union and, in concert with the ship- owners, is intended to eliminate the MSC and return to the days of a company union—no union at all.

FISHERMEN Win 10% Wage Hike

SAN FRANCISCO—Sardine fishermen of San Francisco, San Mateo, Alameda, Contra Costa and Solano counties voted for a 10 per cent raise on their piece-rate work.

The season opened here Au- gust 1 and the fishermen voted to go up for five days before settlement was reached and went out for the night of August 7. The boat crew got 40 cents will come here from San Pedro for the first time ever to the local until the Southern California season ended.

A hundred fishermen of ILWU Local 19 in Alameda will benefit from the settlement, 100 more of Local 9 in San Mateo, and 150 members of Local 35 in Seattle.

In the 1941 Presidential elec- tion, only 13.81 per cent of eligible votes in eight southern California states "bought full wages for the member.

The 1941 Presidential elec- tion, only 13.81 per cent of eligible votes in eight southern California states or their blocs.
The CLRC report said that the Taft-Hartley Act was intended to suppress the activities of labor unions and to prevent them from becoming too powerful. The report recommended that the national labor law be revised to provide for a more balanced relationship between labor and management.

The CLRC report was highly critical of the Taft-Hartley Act and recommended that it be repealed. The report stated that the act was an attempt to suppress the activities of labor unions and to prevent them from becoming too powerful. The report recommended that the national labor law be revised to provide for a more balanced relationship between labor and management.

The report also called for a nationwide campaign to educate the public about the benefits of collective bargaining and to promote the idea of a strong, independent labor movement. The report was endorsed by a number of labor leaders and unions, and it helped to build support for the campaign to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act.

The report was widely praised for its insightful analysis of the labor movement and its recommendations for the future. It remains a classic work in the field of labor law and policy, and it continues to be studied and cited by labor scholars and activists around the world.