

One example here that sticks out is modicum of job-control secured by several of the separate unions in several industries in part. Job-control is OK in itself but when the control is divided as between several competing unions it is not of the value to the workingclass that it should be and enters as a weapon in the hands of the employer in the sense that he can perpetuate the division in workers ranks by tossing his patronage to whatever union at will.

NLRB election doesn't apply because of the employers habit of weeding-out recalcitrants and replacing them ^{with} new-blood of whatever proper type he chooses. Another employer may foster an entirely different union (hiring at their hall) etc and so a three (4) point split is created in workers ranks and no happy landing. Did the workers first organize a ONE union before they "went in for job-control" then the weapon would be in workers hands instead of the employers.

The present amount of job-control, if in the hands of one union, would swing the rest in line and the victory would be complete without further ado or stuttering.

Coordination of job-controls is not the remedy. So I guess it resolves itself into simple arithmetic — Organize first your One Big Union.

Job-control under present set-up does no bring you One Big Union; One Big Union under any set-up brings you complete Job-control.

I hear theres a war going on in Europe — and the allied armies are being cut-up piecemeal, divided in three parts in the trap on Belgia-French border.

How familiar that all sounds when we consider the divisions in the American workingclass — Divide and conquer seems to be the rule; clearly an employer tactic.