

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Alternatives For UE Members

Editor, Daily Worker:

The desire of the workers in UE to get back into the mainstream of the labor movement was not determined by George Morris as implied by E. Thompson in two recent articles appearing in this column.

The fact is that if anything, the Daily Worker has been much too slow in coming to the conclusion that UE workers should enter the mainstream of the labor movement as quickly as possible and under the most desirable conditions.

The UE has made a valuable contribution to the American labor movement. However, this contribution has become more limited every day because of its isolation from the mainstream and because of its rapidly shrinking membership.

The conclusion to be reached from the two articles by E. Thompson is that UE should continue as is until some national agreement can be reached between the national officers of the UE and national officers of the IUE-AFL-CIO.

However, difficult this was before, it became less of a possibility each day that goes by because of the attitude and outlook of these national officers as well as the outlook that the UE national officers and the IUE-AFL-CIO national officers have towards affiliation of the UE.

To effect any affiliation on as broad a basis as possible, it is therefore necessary that affiliation be done on a district or geographical basis, with the UE if possible because of the nature and composition of this union.

If this is not possible as it seems to be in some districts, then we can see no reason why no affiliation with the IAM should not be consummated.

It is true that many UE workers particularly the Negro workers have serious criticism of the IAM that are justified. However, the weaknesses of this organization, one of the largest in this country, cannot be overcome from the outside.

Some important struggles for Negro rights have been waged and won within the IAM such as the victory won in one im-

portant IAM plant in Cleveland where there are five Negro journeyman machinists. This came as the result of the combined forces of the IAM District leadership and the left and progressive forces.

Negro-white unity can only be achieved in the American labor movement by a struggle for this unity in such unions as the IAM. The entrance of UE members into the IAM can step up this fight to new heights.

The IAM has well over twice as many members organized on an industrial basis as the entire size of the UE nationally and are conscious of the role of industrial unionism within the new federation, placing much emphasis on this all important matter. Here too, UE members can make their contribution.

While UE members and particularly the Negro workers have many reservations regarding any affiliation, they also feel limited and hesitant because of the isolation of UE from the mainstream of the labor movement together the weaknesses can be overcome.

The "go it alone" policy advocated by many UE leaders only indicate a lack of confidence in the workers and a limited outlook of the role of the new federation in our country.

—Two Cleveland UE Members

"Leadership Complex" In Our Own County

Editor, Daily Worker:

Leadership glorification at least in its extreme form is not to be found prevalent on the American scene.

But related and leading to this is the "leadership complex" which is widely spread amongst all sections of the population.

What are some of the manifestations of it? Briefly, on the American scene generally:

The driver who insists on being at the head of the line.

Children playing "follow the leader." Everyone wants to be the leader.

The worker in the shop who accepts a dead end petty supervisory position even though it pays less money (prestige, authority).

This petty bourgeois trait is bound to exist to some extent

in our own party. A few brief examples:

A party person who doesn't contribute to the struggle for a "correct line" but waits until he sees "which way the wind blows" and then "jump on the bandwagon," thereby limiting the possibility of expressing incorrect ideas and thereby building a background of always "taking a correct position."

A party person who is overly concerned about his "success" in the party, the degree of his "success" being measured by what level of leadership he attains.

A party person who "toadies" to the leadership, to gain their good graces, to be "on the in."

A party person who considers himself above "Jimmy Higgins" work.

Leadership complex is an important question to our party, deserving more than these few limited thoughts. I think it would be an important contribution if some more able people elaborated on it more profoundly.—C.D.

Some Facts that Critics Forget

Editor, Daily Worker:

It is easy to say that our leadership is no good and that we should change it. . . .

In "speaking their piece" some people insist in forgetting the facts to put everything upside down. According to them the leaders are bureaucratic and narrow; they didn't try to work among the masses and even could not speak their language. According to these "critics" the leadership is to blame because of the decreasing of membership of the Party. . . .

Are they trying to kid somebody? Why they don't say—for instance — that a great lot of those who left the ranks got cold feet when the conditions got rough? Why not mention the well-known betrayal of the union leaders and the legion of opportunists everywhere? The lack of civil liberties, the difficulty or impossibility to hold public meetings, the pressure against our press, the closing of many progressive newspapers and magazines, the campaign to intimidate the people 24 hours a

day and the general atmosphere of persecution and fear.

There is another factor that nobody cares to mention. . . . I mean the easing of the economic condition since the war. Everybody seems to forget that, right now, the immense majority of the American people seems to be more or less contented with their overtime or the television.

To make it short: I believe in criticism. But we should try to be realistic and honest with ourselves and the people. . . . I may be wrong in a lot of things stated here, but I can not help to see what is before my nose. And unless we try to take all the facts into account I am afraid that we would waste our time when seeking the reason why we are not a mass party.

—MAURITIUS.

Widening Field for A Youth Movement

DENVER, Colo.

Editor, Daily Worker:

The article by "A Young Marxist" must be regarded as outstanding in relation to the present discussion in 'Speak Your Piece.' It answers partly one of the most basic questions of the present — why socialist ideology in the U.S.A. is so utterly backward.

In spite of the various economic depressions, in spite of the tremendous strikes and lockouts taking place in the last few generations, we have not even a labor party in Congress, let alone a Socialist or Communist representation as is the case in most European countries and elsewhere.

As an old timer, I have seen worthwhile progressive organizations simply fade away, for lack of attracting the youth. Is it that some Fata Morgana is dangling before some of the youth and even older ones? That they will pick up the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow waiting for them?

But as monopoly capitalism more and more diminishes the chances for youth or anybody else to step into wealth, so will the degree of attracting the youth into the socialist movement increase. The reality of life will ultimately assert itself, even in the U.S.A.—A.S.

Let the Doctors Handle Drugs

Editor, Daily Worker:

Daily Worker editorials have in recent days seemed so near to perfection from my point of view that I was all the more shocked at the ridiculous stand taken the other day on the law making sale of narcotics to minors an offense punishable by death.

Of course, you were right in that the law is a stinker and should never have been passed. But then you miss the whole point of what's wrong with our Government's narcotics program by saying that the trouble lies in not granting enough money for proper enforcement!

It's a sad day when the New York Times is more advanced than the Daily Worker on any issue, but on this subject, this is what has happened, for the Times Magazine section recently carried a provocative piece that stated the facts as they have long been known to sociologists and the medical profession—namely that drug addiction is a disease, and should be treated as such. The philosophy behind the Harrison Act, from its inception, guaranteed that trafficking in drug would become a major criminal activity by taking the control of drugs out of the hands of those most capable of handling them—the doctors.

As is well known, England, where doctors may freely prescribe drugs for addicts, has a total of less than 300 drug addicts. If a drug addict knows he can buy drugs freely at a reasonable cost, it immediately ruins the racket of drug pushing, thereby cutting down on the first evil, the economic necessity of drug pushers, most of whom are addicts, of finding ever more addicts to support their habit. From there on the problem of reducing the number of addicts would become a problem for the psychiatrist and sociologist, rather than the policeman and tax officials.

Could the Daily's position on this question be related to the still primitive prejudice against psychiatry prevalent on the Left?

—HANK