

# Does Industrial Food Union Support Dutch Shultz Gang?

By JOSEPH ZACK

The situation that prevails inside the Communist party is reflected in the unions it controls. The workers believe that the party fraction in the unions discusses their problems and then brings recommendations to them for approval.

In reality that is not what happens. The leader of the party fraction lays down the law, then there is more or less latitude in discussion—less in the needle trades and more in the foodworkers' unions.

Authority to decide policy is thus so concentrated that what results is a **one-man union**. Those who object are either "tamed" or eventually eliminated.

The only thing that Rubin, Gold, Potasch, etc., really have to worry

about is getting an O.K. from the top; that is, from Browder or Stachel (or Krumbein, N. Y. district). Then the decision becomes a party law. The trusted ones in the party fraction may be taken into the leaders' confidence.

The policy as a whole is then put into effect from on top, often without previous approval by the membership of the union. Even the fraction as a whole does not always have any part in this farce. The "leader" in the union may even put a few things over on the party, this has often happened in the needle trade union. Thus all kinds of "bootlegging" of policy are possible under such a system.

Knowing this, I was not surprised when a group of cafeteria workers came to me the other day with some very interesting information. With the whole swing to the right in the party's policy, it does not surprise me that there should be—as in 1925-26 in the needle trades—class collaboration politics once more in unions led by the C.P. Nor is it surprising that now, as then, the members should not know what is going on.

Inasmuch as it is our policy to build up the Foodworkers Industrial Union as a genuine class struggle union of the workers, we will give its leadership a chance to answer a few questions before we tell some of the facts in the next issue of the **New Militant**:

1. What is the role of the Industrial Union in building up the new Metropolitan bosses' association jointly with the Dutch Shultz gang which controls Locals 16 and 302 of the A. F. of L.?

2. Is the Industrial Union supporting the Dutch Shultz gang which engineered the organization of the Metropolitan in order to break up the old United bosses' association?

3. Can the Industrial explain how this kind of "unity" advances the cause of unionism and what, specifically, are the benefits the workers derive from it?

4. How is it that the Sherman Cafeterias and others coming within this "unity" arrangement can hire and fire workers at will, dispose of militants individually and retain scabs at the same time? What is the actual agreement between these bosses and the union?

3. What is actually the "united front" agreement between the Industrial and A. F. of L. locals 302 and 16, and how is it that the rank and file of none of these three organizations know about it or are represented in it?

Finally, we ask what do Gold, Potasch, Rose Wortis, Mahlors and others who are with Rubin on the Trade Union Unity Council think about this?

## n Revolt "Brotherhood"

mous percentage of the total payroll, due to the fact that they average five to ten times the yearly earnings of the regular subway worker.

How could the company pension off these men, and pay them any considerable percentage of their regular salary without it costing an enormous sum of money?

The answer was simple: Make the younger men pay for it.

And after eighteen months of discussion, the arguments boiled down to something like this:

Murray, the receiver, speaking: "But won't the men see through it? Won't they refuse to pay?"

Keegan, the President: "The men will see through it, but they will not refuse to pay into the Pension Fund. Why? Because we will tell them it is **voluntary**, and they know what **that** means. We still have the old reliable Brotherhood delegates. If there is opposition among the men we will send the delegates over the road and they'll put it over."

### Putting It Over

Sure enough, it was done just that way, but with different results from those expected by Murray and Keegan. In the first place, many of the men were signed up without knowing what it was all about, especially in the track dept. This caused plenty of trouble later. In other places, many were told by their supervisors or foremen that they had to sign or get out; this happened in the turnstile dept. "Skunk" DeWyrall told the men working in his department that they must sign the pension or get fired on the spot. These are among the most miserably paid men on the whole road, and the worst treated. Even so, seven of them refused to sign at first, and only signed when forced to. One refused to the last.