

[1942?]
Statements from the address given by Hubert
H. Humphrey, Jr. at the picnic of Minneapolis-
Moline employees, C.I.O. local 1138.

THE CHALLENGE TO LABOR

Possibly the most significant development of World War II is the importance of industrial production. Men and machines on the home front are but part of the army of men and machines on the battle front. Every man, woman, and child becomes an integral part of the nation mobilized for war. This is what we mean by "total war"; an entire economy, a whole nation, 130 million people dedicated to the business of victory. Everyone is important. There is no priority placed upon people. Unity and ingenuity are absolutely necessary.

The American worker, during the past generation and particularly during the recent decade, has organized himself into a gigantic labor movement. Much too often we think of American labor only in terms of membership, unions, dues, contracts, and the other symbols that identify a union movement. However, when a nation's life is at stake and, in particular, the survival of free labor, it is time to make an analysis of the responsibilities and duties that become the charge of such a powerful group. If this war is to be won it will be primarily because of the ingenuity and energy and capacity of American labor and business to out-produce and out-think the regimented minds and bodies of our Fascist opponents. There can be no doubt in the mind of any working man that democracy is the "last best hope" and that the

future of the common man lies in a victory of the United Nations.

The American labor movement has made great strides in the last ten years but with this increase in economic and political power it has become evident that not only the leadership but the rank and file membership must discipline itself to the requirements of a democratic movement. A basic knowledge of economic and political issues affecting the cause of labor and the whole American community is a primary responsibility of every union leader and of every trade union member. Democracy depends upon an intelligent and enlightened citizen body. With a large proportion of the American electorate organized into powerful unions there is no denying the duty of an intelligent understanding of community problems.

The era in which we live is possibly the most dynamic period in human civilization. The rapidity of change, both in technology and the organization of society, demands close study and observation of the factors involved. It is no longer sufficient to be able to read and write. Free people must remember that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. The answer lies in "knowing the reason why" and in analyzing the causes and results of economic and political policies. With this in mind, political alertness in war time is more vital and more necessary than in any other period. The impact of war could easily bring the eclipse of progressive thinking. The danger to democracy is not only from without but also from within. We may weaken our own ranks by political apathy during the war years which will put democratic programs years behind the problems to be solved

Laboring people know full well the dearness of freedom. It is to the eternal glory of organized labor that wherever the dictator came to power, the first group to be smashed was that of labor. Union leaders were the first victims of the firing squad or the concentration camp. The right to organize, the right to strike, the right to have independent unions - all of these were quickly taken away from the laboring people. No other group has felt the viciousness of the dictator quite so much as the trade union movement. The dictator knew where the wells of democracy existed and he was quick in his demolition of those believers in free thought. Let those in America who cry out against unions remember that trade unionism is as much a part of the American way of life as public education, freedom of religion, and private enterprise. If in the process of waging war for the rights of the common man, we here in America unwittingly crucify the associations and organizations of the American laboring man, then for what has the battle been fought?

 But, let me say to those who are devoted to the principles of organized labor that you must get your story of accomplishment, your program, before the American people. Americans are reasonable men and women; they want to do the right thing and they have an uncanny ability to be able to make proper judgment when the facts are presented to them. The day of knock-down and drag-out fighting in labor organization is over. The future of the labor movement depends upon public acceptance. This public acceptance can be gained not by becoming defensive in your approach but by explaining to the American public what organized labor means to the individual workers and to the community as a whole.

This war has taught us that America is not several communities but that we are one nation, a union of free people. American labor must broaden its horizon. It must think in terms of not only its own membership but of 130 million people equally convinced of the virtues of democracy. American labor must assume that other members of the society are as eager for a decent standard of living, for security, and for peace as is the union member. Finally, unless business and labor can forget their feuds and get down to the business of cooperating, our economy will be seriously jeopardized and our political system may be drastically weakened. We have not only a war to win, we have a peace to win. The victory of the peace will require even more cooperation between labor and management than the military victory. The production struggle of tanks, airplanes, and guns during wartime must be converted into a production schedule of homes, automobiles, of refrigerators, and other goods in peacetime. Full employment must be available to the American people or an economic crash and political upheaval is inevitable. There will be neither free labor nor private enterprise if the disaster of inflation and unemployment fall upon us in a postwar world. Never before have American business and American labor had so much in common. The day is fast approaching when American labor and American industry must unite in a program of postwar reconstruction. Your government needs you and your people expect you to lead the way, not follow. Let us make this symbol of wartime unity a peacetime reality. The idea of civilian defense which has found American labor an effective partner and has brought employer and laborer together on a basis of mutual responsibility and understanding must become the program for the new democracy.

Honorable Henry Wallace, Vice-President of the United States, has called this war the "people's war". He believes this century to be the century of the common man. There can be no doubt that the hope and life of free people is at stake in the struggle in which we are now engaged. But, that this century will be the "century of the common man" and for the common man is not a foregone conclusion. It can be - if the common man, the average man, is mentally prepared to cope with the numerous problems confronting him. Yes, this century will be the century of freedom, the century of opportunity for the common people, if the leaders and the people themselves are thinking, planning, and educating for the new day.

This war will not be won by men and machines alone. The power of an idea, the courage that comes through reason ^{and} understanding, these are the intangible, the secret weapons of a free people.

Total war means that this is your war. It is the struggle of all the people. Everyone is important. There are no priorities when we think of human beings. Our men of the armed forces, our industry, our labor, our farmers, all of us will fight for victory. Yet, let us remember victory is more than the military defeat of the enemy. Victory is the building of a new and better world. The hope of total victory lies in the willingness of the people of democratic faith to dream new visions, to chart new plans of social organization, to dare to try new ideas and make the so-called impossible a living practical reality.

Title of Speech " ~~new frontiers for democracy~~ ^{new frontiers for democracy} " ~~America~~

W. H. Humphrey Jr

We must recapture the audacious enthusiasm of democracy. A belief in the common man, a faith in ourselves and our God, these are the fundamentals of a free people.

Democracy is a constant challenge. It requires the best of everyone. It cannot be bought in the market place. Its cost is centuries of "blood, sweat, and tears". It is seemingly fragile, yet amazingly strong. It demands continuous nourishment. It lives only where men are willing to think and study, plan and achieve. Yes, it is the "rocky road" but its durability, its essential perfectibility is unequalled. A free people cannot long be free unless they are an informed people. "Seek ye the truth, and the truth shall make you free" - - - That is the challenge of democracy.

Suck slogans as "Let us defend the American way of life; let us preserve democracy", display an attitude of complacency and desire for the maintenance of the status quo. It is not enough to merely defend democracy or, as we say, "the American way of life". To defend it may be to lose it, to extend it is to strengthen it. Democracy is not property; it is an idea. Military victory on our part may not mean the preservation of this idea. It is entirely possible that the viciousness of Fascism may infect our lives until we have lost the faith of a free people. That is why in total war the military and economic aspects are not more important than the war of the spirit of the idea. We must recapture the audacious enthusiasm of democracy, a belief in the common man, a faith in ourselves and our God - these are the fundamentals

worker, the new investor, the farmer does not ~~revere~~ find a healthy economy at home. The war front & the home front are one and inseparable.

Faith

+ will take

It has taken new ideas, new plans, new inventions, new leadership to win the military victory. The "defensive mentality" - the old military ideas are no longer tolerated by our high command - we have moved away from the strategy of World War I, and now we are on the road to victory. Likewise, to win the victory of the peace, we must have new ideas, we must be willing to give up some of our past practices, we must plan in terms of the new day in which we live.

of a free people. We must become so convinced of the essential soundness and truthfulness of the democratic idea that no amount of defeat, sacrifice, or suffering can weaken our conviction and loyalty to the principles on which we live or die.

The hope of democratic government lies in the wisdom and virtue of the people. Surely if this century is to be the century of the common man, then the plain people, the little people, must be intellectually and morally equipped to make the right decisions. If America is to assume her proper place in a world needing rebuilding and redirection, this America must have the impelling force of public will to carry through. There can be no return to normalcy, no renunciation of our responsibility. We cannot repudiate a suffering humanity twice in one generation and still profess to be democratic and Christian people. Either we recognize and practice the basic principles of our moral and political faith - the dignity of the individual, freedom of conscience, and the brotherhood of mankind, or we forfeit the privilege of freedom and the claim to decency. Our task is almost overpowering; the world expects so much, and as yet we are ready to do so little. This time we must ^{not} have it written, "Too little and too late".

Possibly the greatest political achievement of World War II is the formation of a coalition known as the United Nations. The common denominator and the common bond of all of the members of the United Nations is their belief in the essential dignity of the individual. This factor transcends all differences and produces a symbol of unity which can become the nucleus of a world federation, such as many of us wish for and dream about.

third. While we fight for freedom abroad, we must set an example of justice and progressive democracy at home. The young men + women of America will have very little patience with a government or an economic system that tolerate mass unemployment, poverty, and social inequality in a post-war era. This war has proved for once and for all that American industry can provide jobs, that American labor can and will out produce all competitors, that prosperity can be secured. We have released the dynamic of democracy + free enterprise to run a war; we dare not chain + shackle our people to disillusionment + economic chaos while we seek to preserve + secure the peace. In plain words, there will be no peace in the world, if the returning soldier, the war

There are those people who say we should fight the war and win the war first and then talk about the kind of a world we want after the war, after the military victory is gained. There are others who spend all of their time talking about the beautiful world they hope to have at the end of the war and do little or nothing about winning the war. Somewhere in between these two extremes lies the answer to our salvation now and in the future. It is my firm conviction that how we fight this war and how we deal with our Allies and what kind of political pronouncements we make now will determine the future or the postwar period.

Let me state it this way: If during the war when we need every ounce of energy and sacrifice that our Allies can give us, if we can't master the problems of collaboration and understanding between our respective nations, there will be little hope of doing it once the peace is signed and we revert back to the period of so-called normalcy. If we can't work out our problems with Russia now when Russia is practically saving our very lives, I ask you, how can we solve them at the end of the war when all of the fears and prejudices creep out and confuse the public? Today is the time to make the idea of an international organization - the United Nations - a living reality. Tomorrow may be too late. Now is the time to cement relationships between America, Britain, China, Russia.

How we fight this war, both on the foreign battlefields and on the home front, will determine our future. For example, the colored people of the world (and they are in the majority) watch every move that is made in America in regard to the American Negro. Every act of intolerance and discrimination against this great race of patriots and citizens is a victory for Hitler. The people of

principles, must lead the way.

Second, There can be no compromise with Fascism or Fascist stooges. Peace can never be secured by sacrificing the principles of democracy for a momentary armistice between armies. Those nations which are fighting for the right of freedom and individual liberty, cannot afford to make Convenient deals ~~that appear to be~~ with the agents of the Axis powers. This victory must be complete - let us ~~surely~~ insure world peace ~~by working with and the~~ by practising the idealism of Lincoln when he said "with malice toward none, with charity for all, but with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right" - yes, we must stand firm by our principles now, or reap a whirlwind of chaos in the future.

India, of China, of Arabia, of Africa, yes, all of the colored peoples of the world see in America the actual testing ground of race relations. It simply does not make sense to ask American Negroes to fight for freedom in Burma and deny them democracy in Birmingham or Detroit.

There can be no return to normalcy at the end of this war. Normalcy is what produced World War I and World War II. Normalcy for young men of my generation has within its meaning not only the good things of the American way of life but some glaring abuses and demoralizing defects. Normalcy for this generation has been represented by the advent to power of a Benito Mussolini, the rise of a Hitler and his Nazi storm troopers, the destruction of Czechoslovakia, Austria, Poland, and other countries, the attack upon Shanghai, the unprovoked assault upon Manchuria, and the ravaging of a peaceful China. Normalcy to many Americans has meant ever-mounting public and private indebtedness, vast numbers of unemployed willing workers, the soothing syrup of patent remedies for economic maladjustments, a stock market crash which wiped out five million investors - this has been normalcy for many of the young men who are now fighting to save this civilization.

These men are not going to be content to come back to conditions which produced this horrible conflagration. A soldier from Alabama, a son of a share cropper, who now receives \$50 per month along with medical care, clothing, food, ^{recreation, & housing} and a ~~\$10,000 in-~~ ~~surance policy~~ is not going to be content to come back to a society that permitted a family of four in Alabama to have a cash income of under \$350 per year. This young man will demand a chance for work and an opportunity for improvement.

America has always represented that which is new,
that which is bold; that which is daring.
Let us not seek to live on our heritage and
our past - we must move on to new
frontiers, new goals for humanity. I
offer you a program for ~~the~~ today
and for the future - a program that requires
the unselfish devotion and allegiance of every
American - young & old, ~~capital & labor~~

First - ~~there can be no~~ We must demand
a clear and understandable statement
as to foreign policy on the part of
both major political parties. We
must ~~have~~ have a system of
international cooperation that
recognizes the common humanity
of all people. America must give
its unqualified support and effort
to the establishment of a new
league of nations, ~~a new world~~
America, because of its strength
its resources, and its understanding
of large scale political organization
concerned in a spirit of democracy

If American business, American labor and American political parties do not start to plan now for the re-absorption of those who are protecting your home and my home, then I tell you that the world will not be safe for democracy.

It should be remembered by those who condemn and criticize the trade union movement and the rules and regulations applying to unions and union organization that those officials of our government in high places, and in particular those in the War Department and the Department of Navy, have repeatedly emphasized officially and publicly the unqualified support which has been given to the production program by organized labor. It would be well for those critics of labor to remember that the production record of American industry since Pearl Harbor is not only the accomplishment of management but even more directly is the product of American workingmen who have dedicated their labor and skill to the unqualified victory over Fascism and all for which it stands. The production program called for by our President cannot be realized if American labor is to be unfairly criticized and harangued by loose-tongued, self-styled patriots who are unaware of the importance of unity between management and labor.

The United Nations are looking forward to the year 1943 as the year of victory. America, the arsenal of democracy, must not become the victim of disunity either in the ranks of labor or between labor and farmer, and labor and employer. It will take the combined effort of 130 million Americans to win this war. This is no time for sneak punches and disruptive criticism. Surely the

American people have every reason to believe that the masses of labor, both organized and unorganized, are dedicated to victory. The men and women in the armed forces of this great nation are not only the sons and daughters of professional and business people but, to a greater extent, are the sons and daughters of workingmen and farmers. Total war is a peoples' war without regard for class, race, or creed.

It is impossible to expect responsible statesmanlike and creative action on the part of organized labor if people in high places in government and industry regard trade unions as an enemy of society. It is not to be wondered at that industrial relations in America have not always been peaceful when in many instances American business has chosen to fight labor rather than to confer and reason with labor. The American principle and the American way is not one of brass knuckles and "might makes right" but rather one of respect and tolerance for your fellow man and a willingness to see his point of view and to confer with him. Trade unions which are denied freedom of action are no longer free institutions. They either become wards of the state or ineffective associations cluttering up the economic society.

I am in no way implying that American business as a whole wishes to thwart organized labor. As a matter of fact, the spirit of cooperation and helpfulness on the part of management and labor in this war has been one of the encouraging signs of the vitality of our democratic life. Surely if Great Britain can feel free to entrust the utilization of manpower and the control of the economy to a labor leader such as Ernest Bevin. we here in America have

little to fear from the intelligent leadership of American labor; and may I say that not only has labor in Britain been given an equal place in government but it has been given equal position in the planning and accomplishment of production. Possibly this is the answer to the miracle of the Battle of Britain. Yet here in America there has been a rising tide of resentment and protest against unions. Few people have attempted to distinguish between good and bad unions or between cooperation and lack of cooperation on the part of labor or management. It is not to be wondered that working people, and particularly trade union members, are becoming disturbed at the criticism leveled at them.

First of all, they are much disturbed about the criticism of high wages. Of course those men of skill are receiving wages that to many of us seem unusually high but a master mechanic who can produce an instrument vital to the war effort with the precision and accuracy of a surgeon's knife is not only a laboring man but a craftsman, an artist, and may I say an indispensable person worthy of his hire. We here in America must learn that it is proper for people to be highly paid for production and skilled craftsmanship in industry. The golden glow of the 1920's and its era of getting rich through speculation is a blight on this economy of ours which needs to be forgotten and discredited. Few Americans protested when a speculator made thousands off the stock market. That was good business. Yet such speculation produced nothing and had nothing to add to our national welfare and our national defense. The machinist who can produce a machine tool vital to aircraft production, the welder who can make liberty ships that must carry the goods for the United Nations, these in my mind are as important as the doctor who may save the life of the soldier or the business man who may be able to complete a contract or establish a plan of production.

We need to revise our sense of values. Victory will not come to those who can speculate on the stock market; democracy will never defend itself with ticker tape. Peace and security will come only to the nation that has industry dedicated to the task of production and workers skilled in the techniques of producing goods and services. The Bureau of Labor Statistics revealed that in December, 1942, 40% of the American workers in factories were receiving a salary or wage of not over \$30 per week. I ask any man, would you want to live on less in a wartime economy where prices have raised at an average of 1% per month? Then to those who would condemn labor for receiving excess wages in war time, let them first examine the entire economy. American corporations made a net profit in 1942 of 12 billions of dollars. Their income increased 400% from 1939 to 1942. In the same period American wages increased only 70%. Farm income had doubled itself. I have yet to see very many laboring men becoming millionaires in peacetime or wartime.

It might be well to also remember that the prosperity that this country is now enjoying is the result of fuller pay checks and of a nation that is totally employed. Strangely enough, it has taken a war to make business prosperous and salaries high enough for a decent standard of living.

thin

It should be remembered by those who condemn and criticize the trade union movement and the rules and regulations applying to unions and union organization that those officials of our government in high places, and in particular those in the War Department and the Department of Navy, have repeatedly emphasized officially and publicly the unqualified support which has been given to the production program by organized labor. It would be well for those critics of labor to remember that the production record of American industry since Pearl Harbor is not only the accomplishment of management but even more directly is the product of American workingmen who have dedicated their labor and skill to the unqualified victory over Fascism and all for which it stands. The production program called for by our President cannot be realized if American labor is to be unfairly criticized and harangued by loose-tongued, self-styled patriots who are unaware of the importance of unity between management and labor.

thin

The United Nations are looking forward to the year 1943 as the year of victory. America, the arsenal of democracy, must not become the victim of disunity either in the ranks of labor or between labor and farmer, and labor and employer. It will take the combined effort of 130 million Americans to win this war. This is no time for sneak punches and disruptive criticism. Surely the American people have every reason to believe that the masses of labor, both organized and unorganized, are dedicated to victory. The men and women in the armed forces of this great nation are not only the sons and daughters of professional and business people but, to a greater extent, are the sons and daughters of workingmen and farmers. Total war is a peoples' war without regard for class, race, or creed.

It would be well to remember in our praise of Great Britain and her determination in those dark months of 1940-41, that over 60% of the entire labor force of British industry is union labor. Not a single contract for war production is given by the government of Britain to any plant or employer unless such industry has an effective collective bargaining labor organization within the plant. Every industry in Britain has an active labor management committee. The astounding record of British war production is in no little part due to the cooperation between labor and management. British industry for 40 years or more has accepted the principle of trade unionism with its mechanism of collective bargaining as an integral part of the economic system. Possibly we should stop criticizing the lack of democracy in Britain and remember that working people in our sister nation have enjoyed the rights of free laboring men for many years prior to the recognition of collective bargaining and union organization in America.

thin

It is impossible to expect responsible statesmanlike and creative action on the part of organized labor if people in high places in government and industry regard trade unions as an enemy of society. It is not to be

wondered at that industrial relations in America have not always been peaceful when in many instances American business has chosen to fight labor rather than to confer and reason with labor. The American principle and the American way is not one of brass knuckles and "might makes right" but rather one of respect and tolerance for your fellow man and a willingness to see his point of view and to confer with him. Trade unions which are denied freedom of action are no longer free institutions. They either become wards of the state or ineffective associations cluttering up the economic society.

~~***~~

I am given to understand that over 1400 members from the Teamsters' Joint Council #32 are now part of the armed forces of this country. I also understand that this does not include the sons or daughters of the fathers and mothers in this organization. Surely with such a number of men out in the foxholes and firing lines and with many more sons and brothers in our armies, it would hardly seem fair to say that the Teamsters' Council is not interested in victory and in sacrificing necessary for that victory. I, for one, cannot believe that members of organized labor are any more selfish or desirous of special privilege than other members of the American community. To select organized labor as a whipping post for all the weaknesses or "asserted" weaknesses of our production program is a bit preposterous in view of the production record and the statements of high ranking members in government and industry.

warfare, underground movements and other tactics of undermining the dictator in his own country. Those men of France who have fought against collaboration with Hitler are not the so-called upper class but are the workers and peasants of that country. They are the leaders in the church and the school system. I believe that labor is in good company when it associates with such friends.

I have been disturbed by what to me seems like a planned attack upon organized labor. This does not mean that I feel that all union officials and all unions are as pure as Ivory soap. Any organization encompassing over 13 million individuals is bound to have within it a certain number of rascals, racketeers, and rowdies. I would be the last to deny that labor has not committed its share of irregular conduct but I would like it also to be noted that the nature of conflict is in most cases determined by the kind of opposition confronted. A business community that would spend over 80 million dollars per year for the hire of spies and strike breakers and who would employ an average of 40 thousand "labor disorganizers" - these figures are to be found in the LaFollette report on civil liberties, 1936 - cannot expect peace and quiet and good will toward man. America has had its full share of industry unrest and employment disturbances but we had hoped that those days could be forgotten and forgiven. However, if in time of war certain groups or individuals are determined to bring up the old issues and to find new cause for trouble, one cannot help but wonder if industry peace is even desired while the very safety of our country is in doubt.

this

I am in no way implying that American business as a whole wishes to thwart organized labor. As a matter of fact, the spirit of cooperation and helpfulness on the part of management and labor in this war has been one of the encouraging signs of the vitality of our democratic life. Surely if Great Britain can feel free to entrust the utilization of manpower and the control of the economy to a labor leader such as Ernest Bevin, we here in America have little to fear from the intelligent leadership of American labor; and may I say that not only has labor in Britain been given an equal place in government but it has been given equal position in the planning and accomplishment of production. Possibly this is the answer to the miracle of the Battle of Britain. Yet here in America there has been a rising tide of resentment and protest against unions. Few people have attempted to distinguish between good and bad unions or between cooperation and lack of cooperation on the part of labor or management. It is not to be wondered that working people, and particularly trade union members, are becoming disturbed at the criticism leveled at them.

First of all, they are much disturbed about the criticism of high wages. Of course those men of skill are receiving wages that to many of us seem unusually high but a master mechanic who can produce an instrument

vital to the war effort with the precision and accuracy of a surgeon's knife is not only a laboring man but a craftsman, an artist, and may I say an indispensable person worthy of his hire. We here in America must learn that it is proper for people to be highly paid for production and skilled craftsmanship in industry. The golden glow of the 1920's and its era of getting rich through speculation is a blight on this economy of ours which needs to be forgotten and discredited. Few Americans protested when a speculator made thousands off the stock market. That was good business. Yet such speculation produced nothing and had nothing to add to our national welfare and our national defense. The machinist who can produce a machine tool vital to aircraft production, the welder who can make liberty ships that must carry the goods for the United Nations, these in my mind are as important as the doctor who may save the life of the soldier or the business man who may be able to complete a contract or establish a plan of production.

his

We need to revise our sense of values. Victory will not come to those who can speculate on the stock market; democracy will never defend itself with ticker tape. Peace and security will come only to the nation that has industry dedicated to the task of production and workers skilled in the techniques of producing goods and services. The Bureau of Labor Statistics revealed that in December, 1942, 40% of the American workers in factories were receiving a salary or wage of not over \$30 per week. I ask any man, would you want to live on less in a wartime economy where prices have raised at an average of 1% per month? Then to those who would condemn labor for receiving excess wages in war time, let them first examine the entire economy. American corporations made a net profit in 1942 of 12 billions of dollars. Their income increased 400% from 1939 to 1942. In the same period American wages increased only 70%. Farm income had doubled itself. I have yet to see very many laboring men becoming millionaires in peacetime or wartime.

It might be well to also remember that the prosperity that this country is now enjoying is the result of fuller pay checks and of a nation that is totally employed. Strangely enough, it has taken a war to make business prosperous and salaries high enough for a decent standard of living.

Maybe it would be wrong to say that there has been a planned attack upon labor but the sequence of events and the criticism is so well timed and apparently so well organized that even the most naive cannot help but doubt whether this is sheer coincidence. I think you remember that first of all there was the criticism of the 40 hour week. Thousands of Americans were lead to believe that labor could not or would not work over 40 hours per week. The real reason for the shorter working week was that men were willing to work but peacetime economy production, not converted

to a wartime economy, was not capable of providing over 40 hours per week employment. Secondly, American industry that had been geared to a national income of 70 billion dollars per year did not have the materials available, the material of aluminum so necessary for aircraft production, of steel for ships, yes, and of rubber for mechanized equipment. The shortage of materials was not the result of a strike on the part of labor but must be admitted to be the product of monopoly industry which was unwilling to expand even under the threat of government order and cajolery and persuasion of cost plus contracts. All of this talk about the 40 hour week finally centered around the real issue of time and a half for overtime. Labor was willing to work more than 40 hours per week. In fact, it was to its advantage to do so. The crux of the situation was that many industries were unwilling to pay time and a half for overtime. American labor had fought for fifty years for the 40 hour week, a 40 hour week which is part of the American way of life as much as private business is a part of that life. To ask labor to give up its fruit of a half a century's struggle without an equal sacrifice on the part of other groups in the community is not only grossly unfair but a denial of the purpose of this struggle.

At the end of this war it will not be easy to reclaim social gains lost in war time. At the end of this war, with a problem of reemployment such as you and I can hardly fathom, a 40 hour week will be as essential as a stabilized currency or a social insurance system.

In the words of Al Smith, "Let us look at the record," about this 40 hour week proposition. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reveals that 7 out of every 10 workers in war industries are working from 44 to 48 hours per week, that 4 out of 5 in aircraft industry are working from 48 to 52 hours per week, that 70% of all workers in ship yards are working from 48 to 54 hours per week. Labor is willing to work and may I say that industry in most instances is willing to pay. The research bureau of the Mutual Broadcasting System revealed during a recent Sunday night broadcast that approximately 75% of all the cases before the War Labor Board for wage increases were presented by employers and not labor unions, employers who must compete with other industries having cost plus contracts, employers who are in need of labor and are willing to pay any price to get it.

Along with the argument about the 40 hour week, there has been continuous talk about strikes in war plants, strikes that were apparently, in the words of the commentators and orators, "crippling war production." I for one am unalterably opposed to strikes in war industries. This is labor's war, this is America's war and it is no time to be off on strike when our men need all possible material and munitions. Organized labor has given its word to the President and to the executive offices of this government that it is on a no-strike basis. Does this mean that there have

been no strikes? The record, of course, reveals that there have been, but there has been no strike authorized or organized by the responsible officials of either the CIO, AFL, or the Railroad Brotherhood. With the mushroom growth of war plants, the tremendous influx of workers into defense areas, and with rising prices in unheard of proportions, in some of these war industry centers strikes have occurred but at the earliest possible moment official representatives of organized labor have ordered their men back to work and have actively cooperated with the agencies of government in settling the difficulties. What more can America ask from responsible trade unions? There was less than 1/100 of 1% of the gainfully employed persons in the factories in America on strike in February, 1943.

Possibly one of the most vicious and reprehensible attacks upon organized labor was the recent newspaper story concerning maritime workers on ships in the Solomon Island area. You remember - a story was released to the American press that the marines, yes, marines, from the hospital in the Solomon Islands were compelled to unload ships because union regulations stood in the way of maritime workers or merchant seamen working on Sunday. The story was given wide publicity. Quickly responsible officials in our Navy Department and Admiral Halsey of the Pacific fleet repudiated the story as false and not founded upon any semblance of fact. However, the story had already done its damage. The American public was aroused. Yet this same group of merchant seamen, members of the Maritime Workers Union, some 600,000 of them have carried the cargoes of American goods to the Solomon Islands, to India, to North Africa, and to every other point where American troops or our Allies are stationed. These same maritime workers have been the victims of submarine attacks, bombings, and surface raiders. They are in truth the unsung heroes of the war. To attack and accuse them or their organization of shirking on the job, of failing to fulfill their duty, is neither kind nor American. It represents a technique of Goebells' propaganda worthy of our scorn.

While there have been issues such as the 40 hour week, the maritime union, and specific strikes, a columnist such as Mr. Pegler keeps up a continuous barrage of criticism that is bound to have its effect upon the thought and opinion of the American citizens. Mr. Pegler is not always wrong in his statements. He has in many instances exposed corruption, racketeering, and abuses. For this the American Labor movement should be grateful. My criticism of Mr. Pegler is not that he has been able to find "one skunk in the woodshed" here and there or that he has been able to point out that dues in some unions are high, and that here and there, there is an individual in position of leadership whose character is not beyond reproach. I think this statement could apply to some business organizations and to some educational institutions. In fact, all of the gangsters did not get into unions. The FBI managed to put some of them in jail and others

became the owners and operators of so-called respectable places of business. It would be just as unfair to any organization that may have within its membership a few doubtful characters to say that because of these men the whole organization is bad. My criticism of Mr. Pegler is that he generalizes from specific instances, that he assumes or infers from a few unrelated cases that the whole union movement is honeycombed with corrupt racketeers. Even if Mr. Pegler were right, any union in America can oust the rascals by a vote of the membership and if there is any housecleaning to be done, I am sure that the rank and file membership know how to do it. The poison pens of writers who have a chronic dislike of trade unionism add nothing to our internal unity and produce a kind of public opinion which is not based upon a full knowledge of the facts but upon a select, and may I say purely select, sample of isolated cases. If American opinion is to be intelligent and reasonable, it must not draw its information from sources which are unwilling to play the game fairly. The old admonition of "Seek ye the truth and the truth shall make you free" requires more than a one-sided presentation of an argument. I think it would be well for American trade union leaders and membership to recognize that the way to beat Mr. Pegler and his arguments is not to whitewash the known corruption and abuses which may exist but to get at the source of the trouble and effectively clean house with the arm of government, if this be necessary.



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org