London The VISIT by Great Britain has already proved to be well worth while primarily because of the excellent cooperation we’ve received from the top officials of the Transport and General Workers Union.

Frank Cochrane, General Secretary of the TGWU and Tim O’Leary, Secretary of the Dockers Section of the giant operation we’ve received from the top London union, continues to 7 p.m. and brings four hours of pay for two hours of official time possible to answer our questions on the stevedoring industry operates. The unions here hold as a union of the port of London—the largest port in England and elsewhere will be reported here.

The TGWU is by far the most powerful union in England, with nearly two million members. The dock workers are just one section in this unified and integrated transport union, which also embraces tramways, buses, a large number of men, and warehouse workers. The union functions in behalf of all these groups, and the country survives; whereas in the United States the mere talk of a transport conference on mutual problems of mechanization and jurisdiction, so dear to American officials—is enough to start talk of legislation in Congress, produce newspaper editorials and all the other signs of hysteria.

We’ve visited the port of Liverpool in north England and various parts of the city of London—the largest port in the world. Although these columns will not aim at giving a full report, we must present our return after we have seen enough to work out some conclusions and differences and to draw some conclusions—some of the striking highlights of what we see and learn in England and elsewhere will be reported here.

One thing—no work and no work after Saturday noon is the rule in London, Liverpool, and other British ports. In London, for example, the day shift is normal from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Overtime work, when necessary to finish the job, continues to 7 p.m. and brings four hours of pay for two hours of work.

It’s rare indeed for work to continue through the night and the only ships which ever do this are American vessels. The unions here hold as a union principle that overtime is voluntary. The men are all registered under a National Labour Board in government union with board union representation.

Brown Tops Ceremonies Opening New Building

SAN FRANCISCO—Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, governor of California, will head the list of speakers tomorrow (January 17), when the San Francisco Bay Area Longshoremen’s Memorial Association and Local 10 of the International Longshoremen’s & Warehousemen’s Union dedicate their new million-dollar auditorium-hiring hall and its companion administration building near Fishermen’s Wharf.

Other speakers, announced by President Martin Callaghan and Secretary Treasurer George Walsh of the association, will be Mayor George Christopher of San Francisco, Mayor Clifford R. Shisel of Oakland, the Rev. Stephen Fiebig, pastor of the First Unitarian Church of Los Angeles, J. Paul St. Sure, president of the Pacific Maritime Association, Henry Hill, A.I.A., the designer of the buildings; Dan Del Carlo, secretary-treasurer of the San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council, Ed Rainbow, secretary of the Boilermakers Union, Louis Goldblatt, secretary-treasurer of the ILWU, Antonio Rusia, president of ILWU Local 142 of Hawaii, and Mr. Callaghan.

The Most Reverend Hugh Donhoe, auxiliary bishop and vicar general of the Archdiocese of San Francisco, will deliver the invocation, and the benediction will be given by the Rev. H. T. Boswell, pastor of Jones Methodist Church in San Francisco. William H. Chester, president of the California Building and Construction Trades Council, Ed Rainbow, secretary of the Boilermakers Union, Louis Goldblatt, secretary-treasurer of the ILWU, Antonio Rusia, president of ILWU Local 142 of Hawaii, and Mr. Callaghan.

The main battle came in the Senate where a bipartisan group of liberals sought to change the old filibuster rule by making it possible, after adequate debate, to shut off talk by a majority vote.

Countering the liberal proposal was a compromise measure by Sen. John Tower of Texas and Sen. William Proxmire of Wisconsin, with the backing of the entire Senate leadership except for Majority Leader Hillman’s plan, only a step removed from the long-standing filibuster rule, which would permit debate to carry over to two-thirds of those present and voting.

From the floor,Anchor the initiative. On the first real test of strength, a motion that would open up rules for revision by a majority vote at the start of each session, he outscored the liberals by a vote of 60 to 36.

As the second week of the new session got underway, it was taken for granted that the filibuster fight would conclude on the basis of Johnson’s proposal, or something very close to it. VICTORY FOR JOHNSON

All told, it was an impressive victory for Johnson’s moderate approach and a sign that any bold new steps in the civil rights or welfare field will meet tough sledding.

One explanation for the comparatively easy triumph was that filibusters are a bad business. The belief is no doubt that liberals in both parties will soon have ample opportunity to prove their mettle.

Reading between the lines, it’s obvious that the filibuster fight would conclude on the basis of Johnson’s proposal, or something very close to it. VICTORY FOR JOHNSON
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WORLD TRADE means peace," Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan told assembled businessmen at a dinner sponsored by the San Francisco Area World Trade Assn. Americans will disagree with that statement.

Nor will they disagree with Mikoyan's further statement that "more trade, more tourists, more cultural exchange could bring about greater trust and make it easier to break down the barriers between the two countries.

Mikoyan's flying visit to the US was the first by a high Soviet official for several years. It emphasizes the need for greater contact between the two countries, and is itself a modest step towards better understanding.

While rowdy demonstrations by relatively small groups of refugees from Eastern Europe stole the headlines on Mikoyan's visit, they did not speak for America. We suspect that the general trend of public opinion was more nearly expressed by the friendly reception accorded Mikoyan by businessmen, newspapermen and other groups.

The San Francisco Chronicle spoke for most citizens when it denounced the demonstrators as "bourgeois in liberty's name," and said that they brought discredit not upon Mikoyan or the Soviet Union but upon the demonstrators themselves, and upon San Francisco, their adopted city, and upon the United States of America.

But we would not take these outbreaks too seriously. They succeeded chiefly in bringing into sharper focus the fact that substantial sections of the American public want peace and understanding with the Soviet Union rather than extension of the cold war or that greatest disaster of all, nuclear war.

Far more significance should be attached to the applause Mikoyan won for statements urging understanding with the Soviet Union rather than extension of the cold war or that greatest disaster of all, nuclear war.

It is encouraging that some American trade unionists agree, as Doctor K. V. Tsvetkov wrote, regarding an easing of the cold war, and that many others are interested in exploring the expansion of East-West trade. But workers as well as businessmen, church leaders and other groups should speak up for peace. Contacts and visits are needed between trade unionists as well as between businessmen and diplomats. That is one reason ILWU President Harry Bridges is now touring Europe and the Middle East. He is one of many helping to develop the people-to-people contacts that help dispel misunderstanding and tension.

Workers no less than business have a stake in peace. They have the stake of survival shared by all citizens. But they also have the bread-and-butter stake of jobs that comes with peace-time trade between all countries. That is why the ILWU, now winning increasing support from the West Coast business community, seeks to break down the trade barriers between the US and China, seeks to end an absurd foreign policy based on the proposition that 630 million Chinese do not exist. It is why the ILWU has consistently supported steps to increase trade with all the nations of the world.

As people come to know each other, to trade together, it will be harder to incite the tensions and conflicts that lead to war. Certainly one thing Mikoyan learned here is that the American people want war no more than do the Russian people. We hope that tourists, businessmen and trade unionists from both countries will expand on the friendly relations opened up by Mikoyan's visit.

As someone has said, you cannot hate a man you know. Trade leads to knowing.

ON THE BEAM

By Harry Bridges

(Continued from Page 1)

and all are union members. The younger men on the job are almost exclusively the— and even grizzled—of dock workers.

They shape twice a day and are hired by foreman under the usual system of selecting men and wage shaping for the "free call" before the docks at which they're accustomed to work.

Men not chosen in the free call have to report to the local Dock Board office and make themselves available for whatever work has been phoned in there. About ninety per cent of the jobs are filled at the two free call docks and this given work schedule is the method by which the dock workers have raised their salaries to the present levels. Wages are the highest they have ever been in the history of the industry. But you can be sure that they put out for every shilling they make.

Dock mechanization is just beginning to come into the industry. Much like our experience, coastal trade has been lost to rail and truck. While containers, vans, and new mechanized gear are becoming more significant.

The British docks, like those in continental Europe, all have skilled and trained workers, most of the loading and discharging between dock and hold, and lighter and hold. In addition--as we observed—some vessels operate using both the chloroide cranes and the ship's gear.

Longshoremen are longshoremen the world over. And the men in London or Liverpool have the same demands and hopes for better working conditions as those in New York or Seattle.

Right now one of the main goals of the British dock workers is an industry pension. Their federal pensions is so inadequate that many retire by and even over eighty years of age are still working to provide for "hoodlumism in liberty's name," and upon San Francisco and the United States of America.

There is no reason why British shipowners who pay into the ILWU-PMA pension fund on the West Coast of the United States can't do the same thing for the dock workers in England. Same cargo, same job, same conditions and they don't hesitate to tell you how much better their port or their part of a port is than another.

Because of the piece work system they really "groom" each man to do the job. They're going to discharge flour one day at the contract price and then demand more the next—say because it's "stowed with the label down." They try, anyway.

Since each ship and each cargo differs, no matter how detailed the rate book becomes, there's always room for a difference of opinion. And the dock workers here and in those States—can usually find a reason why a penalty or a differential ought to be paid.

It seems to us that the worst aspect of the piece work deal was that it pitted the workers against each other and put a premium on youth and strength. A gang doesn't want an older man because he'll slow up the pace and thus reduce the earnings of all.

The pay for making yourself available is obviously a real wage. But the dock workers have to show up twice each day and the payments when they don't find work is not enough to live on for a man and his family.

These things are not said without belief that these people don't know what's good for them or how to vote for the one who says they do. They do. And they've damn good trade unionists who need little guidance from us in the United States. So far we've seen little evidence of the kind of forthrightness that is the hallmark of the AFL-CIO today.

Their problems are clear. And they well understand the direction in which they must move to bring about some changes in their conditions on the job. Like workers everywhere, it's easier to see the problems of their job than to plot a real program across.

Like us, these dock workers know that working people move ahead only through their united efforts and through the solidarity and support they get from their fellow workers elsewhere. It's well that we remember this if they ever ask us for help.
Canada Sets First ILWU Convention

VANCOUVER, B. C.—The first convention of all ILWU locals in Canada will be held here January 31 and February 1.

The last meeting of the British Columbia District Council set the convention date July 14 of last year. It cited a high time representation of 12 ILWU locals in the Western ports of Canada as the reason.

Major speaker at the convention will be J. B. Eaton, former general president of the ILWU and director of organization.

Main purpose of the convention are:

To consolidate ILWU organization in Canada.

To map plans for extending organization in the U.S.

To win a master contract covering all ILWU ports.

Local 8 Elects Officers for 1959

PORTLAND — International Executive Board member Charles Ross was chosen last week by Local 8 for 1959. Ross was elected President over Ernie Baker, the incumbent, by a vote of 511 to 470. Other officers are:

Vice President, Bob Mann; secretary, Everett Eide; business agent, Bud Haten; labor relations committee, Robert P. Gehardy and Phaid Kibby; regular dispatcher, Fred Winter; night dispatcher, Paul Chimienti; earnings committee, Fred Gilmore; treasurer, George Brown; vice-president, Bessie Joseph; record-keepings committee, E. F. Sears, C. W. Noonan.

Executive Board members at large are elected for 1959: President, Wenonah Drasnin; vice-president, Ernestine Horton, Elzabeth Kanowitz, Elzaide McGee, Sue Noonan.

Formalized牛市 Checkers Elect Officials

EAST BAY Auxiliary — Eugene Baker was elected president of Checkers Local 52 ILWU in the union's annual election. Earl Kol bom was elected vice-president, and G. L. Weller was picked as secretary-treasurer-business agent. Other officers are:


East Bay Auxiliary Picks New Officers

OAKLAND — ILWU Auxiliary 17 in the East Bay Area has announced election results for 1959: President, Wemoona Dramm; vice-president, Paul Chimenti; secretary, Iola Stranahan; treasurer, Janice MacLeod.

Executive Board members at large are: Gwyn Arndt, Johnell Dilliam; Walter Franklin, Ernestine Horton, Eliza- beth Kanowitz, Elzabeth McGee, Sue Noonan, Idlydly Rutter, Ethel Torrell, Wellemeen Wuestl.

Canada Sets 1st ILWU Convention

Cuban Revolution May Improve Conditions of Oppressed Workers

A better outlook for Cuban trade unionists and workers is expected to be one important result of the successful revolution early in January against the regime of Fulgencio Batista.

Batista, deposed as President by rebel forces led by Fidel Castro last January, incurred the hostility of Cuban labor leaders who charged him with a "reign of terror" against the unions.

Castro, on the other hand, had substantial support from the American labor movement and is expected to be sympathetic to the Cuban cause.

A Wall Street Journal dispatch from Havana, January 5, said that "Mr. Castro was reported to have asserted some of the sugar industry's profits should be used to raise the standard of living of the country people in Cuba."

The ILWU, which has maintained friendly relations with Castro's forces, has spoken out against this kind of oppression and terrorism of union leaders wherever it has taken place. We condemn the anti-democratic, anti-union outrages in Cuba. We, like the rest of the American labor movement, look forward to the restoration of democratic liberties in Cuba, and the immediate freeing of Jose Mire Marquez, leader of the Cuban Transport Workers. Avila charged that the ILWU's "involvement was purely and simply moral."

In the midst of the frightening din of war, Cuba, Mr. Eaton charged, "could annihilate humanity; and nobody can doubt that once a war started between them, these weapons would be used.

In "this situation," Mr. Eaton said, "as a laborer, it is my duty to keep the peace."

"What is wanted, on the part of both the U.S. and the Communist bloc, is clear recognition of each other's right to exist, prosper and be secure, and a search for compromise answers to difficult questions, an attempt at friendship and reconciliation."

"As laborers, we must have been possible, fifty or fewer years ago, for a rational government to contemplate using war as a method of making its will effective, but that day is gone forever. The two super-powers are indispensable to the maintenance of world peace, and we must do everything we can to keep them from starting a war, and then finding that once a war started between them, these weapons would be used."

Of the Chinese and other countries, Mr. Eaton said, "I am tremendously wrong with this whole policy, as Mr. Eaton says. It is, first of all, unrealistic in as suming that military power could destroy a system so firmly established by so wide a number of political systems. But it is also extremely dangerous. As the world's experience has shown, a system of mutual fear and mutual suspicion has been developed. If we are going to be involved in the war it probably is also necessary to avoid it."

"Do we really want World War Three?" was the title of Mr. Eaton's address. The answer, of course, is that no one who discusses the possibility of war, or the Russians or any of the lesser nations. Nevertheless war is the inescapable result of policies now being pursued,"

Eaton, in Letter to The Dispatcher, Bids Labor Act for Peace

Cyrus K. Eaton, Midwestern industrialist and leader of the anti-war, anti-isolationist movement, in the United States, added his voice to the growing world-wide call for peace.

In a letter to Editor Morris Watson of The Dispatcher, Eaton said, "In the midst of this war in Europe, millions of workers are being killed every day. More than that, the war is helping to destroy all the gains that workers have made in the past."

"The ultimate result of the war will be to destroy all the gains that we have made in the past and to bring about new wars. We must stop this war and work for peace."

"Let us remember that we are fighting not only for our own country but for the freedom of the world. We must do everything we can to keep this war from spreading to other countries."

Eaton, a member of the AFL-CIO and the ILWU, said, "We must work for peace and not for war. We must help to build a world that is peaceful and free from war."

Eaton, a member of the ILWU, said, "We must be ready to fight for peace. But we must be ready to fight for peace. But we must be ready to fight for peace."
In Health Insurance
Offered—For A Profit

One type of voluntary health plan that has AMA's blessing, now that millions of people have purchased "voluntary" health plans (of certain types), and the insurance companies are in the business to make a profit, not to provide health care. Operating for profit, they play no part in formulating the order of priorities in health care. Their activities to promote health, like industrial rehabilitation and health education programs, are to save money, to cut claim costs. The AMA policy matches their own economic self-interest.

Insurance does help pay some costs of health services, but:

1. Emphasis is on hospital and surgical expenses. Well over half of our health bills are for non-surgical expenses. This has side-effects. When a patient has hospital insurance only, he may get put in the hospital for something that could have been treated in an office or as well or better in the doctor's office. Then what the insurance company pays and the premium goes up, and meanwhile someone who really needs hospital care may not be able to find an empty hospital bed.

2. As to surgery, the temptation is presented to perform what is not only not necessary but the temptation not every doctor can rise above any more than could others in a similar situation.

3. Many insurance plans call for $15 per day toward hospital room and board costs. The patient pays the first day, and nothing for the second or third day. This saves the company money because you don't have to pay as much for hospital room and board for two or three days as you do for four or five days. But what patient can determine whether his cold is a cold that will last ten days or less, 30 days or longer, or whether he has tuberculosis, or whether he has been infected with the germs of tuberculosis? This discouraging of prompt treatment makes no sense if your aim is the best and most economical health care. Prompt treatment may mean the difference between prompt cure or a chronic illness, between short hospitalization and disability.

On the same lines, few plans pay any benefits for checkups. For good health, people need a checkup at least once a year, and this fact makes the procedure not a rich—in insurance terms—but more or less a certainty and so not a proper subject of insurance. If you're thinking in terms of health, excluding checkups is the last thing you'd do. They're one of medicine's best tools for early detection of chronic disease, increasingly important in our aging population. Then there are time limitations, like 30 days in the hospital. If you need more you're on your own.

Again the problem is, you can't count on money, not to provide of the services people need. Your insurance won't help you if you live where there aren't any doctors.

It won't help you select a competent doctor. The health care plans, in their present form, do no better and no worse than what you could buy without insurance. It's a chance to get an incompetent, that's too bad.

4. There are elements in the medical profession that are not as interested in your good health as in their own pocket. But this is a money-maker for the insurance companies, based on the same principle as a regular policy, insuring that the sick pay the usual amount of the claim and the well pay the small premium.

5. This is not the case in some countries, where those who can afford it, pay any and all expenses. In the British National Health Service, for example, a doctor is paid for whatever he does, whether the patient can pay or not. This cost has been cut down, thus discouraging inflation. The trouble is that even so, patients in the British Service either have to pay a portion of the bill themselves, or to cut down on their treatment. The principle is the same, no matter where you are.

6. The problem of covering children is not solved. There aren't any doctors.

7. There are reports of insufficient coverage in the Blue Cross, Blue Shield and various other plans. The one and only intensive quality study on a community-wide basis in the U.S. found "tremendous variation" in the plans, with only 44 percent of the physicians taking part in the study doing enough to affect the correctness of the report. Because of the limitations of an insurance policy, poor and rich have different choices and benefits. Many plans are unfair, but at least they're not as unfair as no insurance.

8. There is no assurance of protection of your reputation in paying out of your own pocket. But this is a money-maker for the insurance companies, based on the same principle as a regular policy, insuring that the sick pay the usual amount of the claim and the well pay the small premium.

9. This is not the case in some countries, where those who can afford it, pay any and all expenses. In the British National Health Service, for example, a doctor is paid for whatever he does, whether the patient can pay or not. This cost has been cut down, thus discouraging inflation. The trouble is that even so, patients in the British Service either have to pay a portion of the bill themselves, or to cut down on their treatment. The principle is the same, no matter where you are.

10. There are reports of insufficient coverage in the Blue Cross, Blue Shield and various other plans. The one and only intensive quality study on a community-wide basis in the U.S. found "tremendous variation" in the plans, with only 44 percent of the physicians taking part in the study doing enough to affect the correctness of the report. Because of the limitations of an insurance policy, poor and rich have different choices and benefits. Many plans are unfair, but at least they're not as unfair as no insurance.

11. There is no assurance of protection of your reputation in paying out of your own pocket. But this is a money-maker for the insurance companies, based on the same principle as a regular policy, insuring that the sick pay the usual amount of the claim and the well pay the small premium.

12. This is not the case in some countries, where those who can afford it, pay any and all expenses. In the British National Health Service, for example, a doctor is paid for whatever he does, whether the patient can pay or not. This cost has been cut down, thus discouraging inflation. The trouble is that even so, patients in the British Service either have to pay a portion of the bill themselves, or to cut down on their treatment. The principle is the same, no matter where you are.

13. There are reports of insufficient coverage in the Blue Cross, Blue Shield and various other plans. The one and only intensive quality study on a community-wide basis in the U.S. found "tremendous variation" in the plans, with only 44 percent of the physicians taking part in the study doing enough to affect the correctness of the report. Because of the limitations of an insurance policy, poor and rich have different choices and benefits. Many plans are unfair, but at least they're not as unfair as no insurance.

14. There is no assurance of protection of your reputation in paying out of your own pocket. But this is a money-maker for the insurance companies, based on the same principle as a regular policy, insuring that the sick pay the usual amount of the claim and the well pay the small premium.
“over-65” policies are getting a big play now as Congress is opening, and bound to consider health service proposals for our older people—the point is constructive action may be headed off by the argument that present methods can do the necessary job. There are other gaping areas of need: coverage for the unemployed, cut off from work-connected benefits and without the money to pay their own premiums; nursing and convalescent home care; home nursing services; diagnosis and treatment of mental illness early when it hasn’t gone too far, when the need for hospital care may be prevented. We’ve just started exploring the potentialities of dental care programs.

Finding The Answers: A Job for Everyone

Finding the answers is far from a matter of merely spending more and more money, as big a problem as the costs are. The money’s being spent here, but the pie isn’t cut evenly. We pay enough now to assure fairly adequate health care to everyone, about the same proportion of our national income as the people of Great Britain pay for their comprehensive care.

In the U.S., no one industry acting alone could either bear the costs of supplying its workers and their families the health care they need, nor organize the facilities. Planning an orderly system requires a broader base. Today we have the spectacle of one union setting up a health center right down the street from another union’s similar center, and neither used to capacity. It makes much more sense and is more economical to treat health as a community project.

It will take a broad base to overcome our growing shortage of doctors and other health workers. Estimates on shortages in the various fields vary, ranging for physicians from 20,000 to 30,000 by next year. Such over-all figures don’t reflect the distribution problem, from urban, mostly rural, have no doctors, while many large cities have plenty, attracted by the facts that there they have hospitals for their patients, colleagues with whom to consult, a better chance to keep their training up-to-date.

The difficulty in widespread controls is the attitude that no one has the right to check up on the profession, an attitude not founded in reason. No one argues the fact that quality can be determined only by those qualified to do so. This does not mean that no doctor is qualified or entitled to pass on the work of another.

In the field of health, as elsewhere, clinging to the status quo means going backward. Richard Carter comments: “There is nothing wrong with the cost and quality of American medical care that cannot be improved by consumer assumption of responsibility of the terms and conditions under which consumer health is maintained.”

Health is a vital resource of the country. If we in organized labor are concerned with conserving our national resources, we have an obligation to get our hands dirty working to improve our methods of organizing and paying for health services.
1959 May Mark Progress to Peace, Dr. Pauling Tells Hawaii ILWU

HONOLULU—'1959 will be a wonderful year—perhaps the most wonderful in history'—the year nations begin to suddenly and firmly agree to reach agreement on ending nuclear weapons, said Nobel prize-winning chemist Linus J. Pauling told Hawaii listeners on New Year's day in a long talk over KGMB-TV, sponsored by ILWU Local 19. 1959, he also warned that 'America is in greater peril than ever before in its history.' Next month may see the whole continent reduced to radioactive wasteland, with almost no one left alive.

The broadcast grew out of a visit Dr. and Mrs. Pauling made to see ILWU's Honolulu headquarters December 30. The visit of the Nobel laureate was to tell them about developments in the movement to prevent nuclear war and poisoning, of which he is a leader.

What they heard, they found so important that they urged him to go on TV so that others could know. He agreed, even though it meant taking time from his January holiday visit with his son who lives here.

Highlights of his radio talk:
No more arms race

Many times main has thought that now weapons were so terrible that they would make a fizzle. This time it's true. Here's why:
The principal weapon of the U.S., USSR, and Great Britain today is the hydrogen bomb. '20 megatons means that it is equal to 20,000,000 tons of TNT. This is 7 times the explosive energy of all the explosives used in World War II.

Smaller than 10 megaton bomb at Pearl Harbor would kill everyone on Oahu in a couple of weeks.

For only about $100,000 you can construct machine capable of destroying New York or Moscow, and, with good luck, of killing 1,000,000 people.

Great Britain would kill everyone, because nuclear fission produces large amounts of radio-active materials.

The United States has 35,000 bombs, Russia has 100,000. Van Zundt estimated some time ago, we are only a year away from equality. Though it is hard to see what good this does us, since Russia now has enough bombs to kill out in a brief holiday visit with his son who lives here.

ONLY DEFENSE IS PEACE

It is silly to think that the nations can agree to cut down to conventional weapons. No country would be willing to go down to defeat in a major conflict because it had a preposterous agreement not to use its stockpile of bombs.

The only defense against nuclear war is outlaw war.

There is only one safe policy. That is to stop this arms race and start setting problems by negotiations and agreements instead of waiting for some nation already forcing the great nations to do this.

Last March US military and government leaders were insisting on continuing bomb tests—even though there was nothing left to be learned except such things as advantages as how to make a $100,000 bomb for $90,000. Yet within a few months, public opinion was in favor of a treaty like the one sent by ILWU Local 142—had the government really seen what we would suspend our tests October 31.

American and Soviet scientists meeting in Geneva last year quickly agreed that a network of 190 monitors in major cities would enable any nation to discover an international agreement to stop testing.

Now a second Geneva meeting is trying to reach agreement on ending nuclear tests. The United States has already agreed toexpiry of the ban on testing, which was to expire in 2½ years. The USSR has already agreed to partial ban that the United States had earlier promised by international personnel, on her soil.

Dr. Pauling believes that no nation
will risk the wrath of world public opinion by allowing this conference to fail. He expects an agreement in end tests, at least for a long period of time.

It is only a first step. Next we must get agreement among all nations to stop manufacturing fission materials.

It wouldn't help much to destroy existing stockpiles. Dr. Pauling believes. They are too easy to replace; and if they were gone it might encourage someone to start a "conventional" war, that would later turn "nuclear."

And he doesn't think the big danger is that some Russian will decide the time is ripe to wipe out the U.S. The real danger is that some accident—either physical or psychopathic—might go off on the chain reaction of war before anyone realized it was an accident. We need to work on agreements to slow down these processes.

It is silly to think that the nations can agree to cut down to conventional weapons. No country would be willing to go down to defeat in a major conflict because it had a preposterous agreement not to use its stockpile of bombs.

The only defense against nuclear war is outlaw war.

There is only one safe policy. That is to stop this arms race and start setting problems by negotiations and agreements instead of waiting for some nation already forcing the great nations to do this.

Last March US military and government leaders were insisting on continuing bomb tests—even though there was nothing left to be learned except such things as advantages as how to make a $100,000 bomb for $90,000. Yet within a few months, public opinion was in favor of a treaty like the one sent by ILWU Local 142—had the government really seen what we would suspend our tests October 31.

American and Soviet scientists meeting in Geneva last year quickly agreed that a network of 190 monitors in major cities would enable any nation to discover an international agreement to stop testing.

Now a second Geneva meeting is trying to reach agreement on ending nuclear tests. The United States has already agreed to expiry of the ban on testing, which was to expire in 2½ years. The USSR has already agreed to partial ban that the United States had earlier promised by international personnel, on her soil.

Dr. Pauling believes that no nation
will risk the wrath of world public opinion by allowing this conference to fail. He expects an agreement in end tests, at least for a long period of time.

It is only a first step. Next we must get agreement among all nations to stop manufacturing fission materials.

It wouldn't help much to destroy existing stockpiles. Dr. Pauling believes. They are too easy to replace; and if they were gone it might encourage someone to start a "conventional" war, that would later turn "nuclear."

And he doesn't think the big danger is that some Russian will decide the time is ripe to wipe out the U.S. The real danger is that some accident—either physical or psychopathic—might go off on the chain reaction of war before anyone realized it was an accident. We need to work on agreements to slow down these processes.

It is silly to think that the nations can agree to cut down to conventional weapons. No country would be willing to go down to defeat in a major conflict because it had a preposterous agreement not to use its stockpile of bombs.

The only defense against nuclear war is outlaw war.

There is only one safe policy. That is to stop this arms race and start setting problems by negotiations and agreements instead of waiting for some nation already forcing the great nations to do this.

Last March US military and government leaders were insisting on continuing bomb tests—even though there was nothing left to be learned except such things as advantages as how to make a $100,000 bomb for $90,000. Yet within a few months, public opinion was in favor of a treaty like the one sent by ILWU Local 142—had the government really seen what we would suspend our tests October 31.

American and Soviet scientists meeting in Geneva last year quickly agreed that a network of 190 monitors in major cities would enable any nation to discover an international agreement to stop testing.

Now a second Geneva meeting is trying to reach agreement on ending nuclear tests. The United States has already agreed to expiry of the ban on testing, which was to expire in 2½ years. The USSR has already agreed to partial ban that the United States had earlier promised by international personnel, on her soil.

Dr. Pauling believes that no nation
will risk the wrath of world public opinion by allowing this conference to fail. He expects an agreement in end tests, at least for a long period of time.

It is only a first step. Next we must get agreement among all nations to stop manufacturing fission materials.

It wouldn't help much to destroy existing stockpiles. Dr. Pauling believes. They are too easy to replace; and if they were gone it might encourage someone to start a "conventional" war, that would later turn "nuclear."

And he doesn't think the big danger is that some Russian will decide the time is ripe to wipe out the U.S. The real danger is that some accident—either physical or psychopathic—might go off on the chain reaction of war before anyone realized it was an accident. We need to work on agreements to slow down these processes.
Sugar Quotas High Wages May Be Low

WASHINGTON. D. C. — Industrial sugar users won a resounding victory over the longshoremen in the annual contest to set a figure on estimated sugar consumption requirements in a previous year.

As authorized by the Department of Agriculture, the Longshoremen's Union of year-end, the initial estimate to meet requirements for the current year 1959 is an unprecedented 9,200,000 tons.

This figure comes very close to meeting the demands of the industrial users, such as soft drink and bakery companies, who account for two-thirds of the sugar consumed in this country. They requested a 9.1 million ton quota, indicating a vote for "small agencies." 

MODEST QUOTA URGED

Although producers did not propose a definite figure for the estimate, their spokesmen indicated that a "reasonable" figure, presumably not more than 9.5 million tons, should be assigned for the opening of the year.

1959, completed with protecting the welfare of sugar workers, urged a modest quota pending additional hearings (under certain provisions of the Sugar Act) to review how the Department of Agriculture is discharging its obligations to workers employed in the various branches of the industry.

The 1958 estimate, 9.0 million tons, of the quota lies in the fact that a large increase Estimating which permits the possibility of a surplus in supplies, tends to depress prices for producers. Such a condition, it is agreed, makes it tougher for workers to win decent wages.

The 1959 initial estimate announced for 1959 compares with a consumption quota of 8.9 million tons set at the beginning of 1958. The estimate for 1958 was gradually increased to meet declining market conditions, a procedure that made available ample sugar along with a stable price structure.

INDUSTRY CIRCLES FEARED THAT THE Government, in setting the abnormally high 1959 estimate, was primarily concerned with getting as much sugar out of Cuba as possible, and the larger quotas needed would have that effect.

Whatever the explanation, the fact remains that prices quotations on the New York Board for Jan. 1 began dropping on January 2, with all indications pointing to further declines.

The price break gave fresh emphasis to a warning sounded by the ILWU at the time the quota was announced last December. "A predictable result of an unresolution and a policy of 'wait and see,'" warned the union, "will be to catch the producers and the refiners in a squeeze when January 1 rolls around".

In comparing pineapple yields with last year's sugar negotiations, Milen Holka, chairman of the union's bargaining unit, pointed out that sugar workers failed to make any wage proposal until "just a few days before the agreement expired." He pointed out that "pineapple workers are as determined to obtain our demands as were the sugar workers."

"We hope that our demands will be reciprocated by the sugar companies," he added, "that pineapple has not been set aside for the nature of our strength in the same fashion he discovered the strength of the sugar workers."

ILWU Warns Hawaii Pineapple Industry

HONOLULU—Hawaii's pineapple industry appears to be "following the lead" of the sugar producers and may well find itself in a very different situation unless some very real progress is made before the agreement expires at midnight January 31," says ILWU President Greg Miller, who has been holding bargaining sessions with the railroad company for more than two months.

"The pineapple workers have been held with industry representatives for far, far too long, and even given counter-proposals to the three basic demands: a 10 cent hourly across-the-board pay boost; the reclassification adjustments for skilled equipment operators and truck drivers; community warehouse rates for packing and containerizing products for shipment.

"In comparing pineapple yields with last year's sugar negotiations, Milen Holka, chairman of the union's bar-

Local 26 Names Delegates

LOUISIANA—Four members of Local 26 will represent the local at the International Convention in Seattle, Wash., in April.

They are Sid London, Paul Pefin, President; Charles Williams and Secretary-Treasurer Lou Sherman.

Brown Tops Ceremonies for New Building

(Continued From Page 1)

The Saturday ceremonies, which began at 8 a.m., ended with a reception. They will be of the three days devoted to dedication.

On Sunday, January 18, the building will be dedicated at 10 a.m. on. In the evening of that day, at 8 p.m., there will be a free public concert given by the local Symphony orchestra conducted by Carl Holka, assisted by the cooperation of Local 6 of the American Federation of Musicians, AFL-CIO, through a grant from the Recording Industries Trust Fund.
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Southern Integration Battles Described from the Inside

Martin Luther King, Jr., *Stride Toward Freedom* - $1.50
Harper and Bros., N. Y.

The Wall Between

Anne Braden
Monthly Review Press
ILWU Price $3.00

IT WILL not come as a surprise to any member of the ILWU to hear repeated again and again that we face a tough job. But it can also be a lively and creative year for us, and we can win surprising gains that will set the stage for years to come.

We are going to find ourselves—as we have so many years just outside the ILWU's vivid history—playing the role of pioneers. We are going to find new paths for an old problem. For this isn't the first time in the history of working people that they had to face new machines and new methods and threats to their livelihood and job security. We have been planning new approaches to this old problem, new ways of making sure that our members keep their jobs, and what is more important, continue to maintain high living standards while the burden of work becomes ever more complex.

In other words, we are thinking of the near future when machines will work for the benefit of each worker, and not just for those who profit from the use of machinery. That's why we aren't running scared, because we are not opposing mechanization. We are opposed to progress, just as we want to do in our opinion of the union's.