

offer

# The Threat to the Labor Movement

## The Conspiracy Against the Trade Unions

Efficiency Unions for the Bosses  
*or*  
Effective Unions for the Workers

By  
WILLIAM F. DUNNE

Evidences of a New Offensive.

Introduction.

The purpose of this pamphlet is to show by documentary evidence, whose authenticity no one can impugn, that the campaign against all progressive tendencies in the labor movement which was launched at the A. F. of L. convention in 1923 has entered a new phase in which there is a more open combination than ever before of the trade union officialdom, the capitalist press, the employers and the government.

It will also be shown that the main motives which prompt the intensified attack, centering on the left wing, are (1) the desire of the capitalists to suppress all struggles which interfere with the development of American imperialist prosperity and either destroy the trade unions or force them to a general dead level of docility, (2) the desire of the trade union officialdom to force on the unions a policy which will make of them the docile organizations which the capitalists will accept, (3) the desire of both the capitalists and their labor agents to drive the most conscious and active left wing workers out of the unions and destroy their influence in the labor movement because they are trying to rally all workers for struggle on a program of immediate and necessary demands.

Finally, this pamphlet will show that the policy of the trade union officialdom, of which the latest attack on the left wing is a logical result, is based on one phase, and one phase alone, of American capitalist development, i. e. its present temporary upward swing, and that because of this neglect of other fundamental factors, can bring nothing but disaster to the labor movement.

The more "successful" this policy is, i. e. the more endorsement it receives from the masses now, the more disastrous will be the ultimate result. The left wing therefore fights the battle of the whole working class when it resists to the utmost the new offensive of the combined forces of American capitalism which, in the period of imperialism, include with some minor exceptions the whole bloc of trade union officialdom.

The present struggle is in reality produced by the determination of the left wing to prevent the agents of the capitalists in the unions splitting the labor movement or, failing this, turning it over to the bosses.

This struggle could be avoided only by the left wing abandoning its correct program and accepting the official program of unconditional surrender of the unions.

—W. F. D.

A SERIES of recent events indicate in an unmistakable manner that a new systematic and well-organized offensive against the left wing in the trade unions has been launched. The left wing, fighting against the official program of "efficiency unionism," in this struggle is actually fighting FOR TRADE UNIONISM which, as a weapon of the working class is being discarded by a leadership "soaked to the gills"—drunk, in other words—in the boss-begotten theory of the "identity of interests of worker and employer."

The tone of the capitalist press, the socialist press and the official trade union press leaves no doubt as to the intentions of the forces for which they speak. All are united in asserting that "the Communist menace" in the trade unions must be destroyed. In the tone of these articles there is nothing new but in their volume and intensity there is evidence of a method, mutual understanding and determination that shows this campaign to be of sufficient intensity to mark it as a new phase of the struggle in the American labor movement between the "worker-employer co-operation" policy and the policy of class struggle.

This is not to say that all the elements which support one side or the other are fully conscious of the policy to which they give allegiance. The

contrary is true and in general it may be stated that only conscious reactionaries of the type of Lewis (United Mine Workers), Woll (vice-president of the American Federation of Labor), Sigman (president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers), understand the full implications of the right wing position, and only the Communists and the workers closest to them realize that the struggle is actually one for the maintenance of the trade unions as weapons of the working class.

The drive against militant unionism took on new force with the settlement made by the New York Joint Board of the I. L. G. W. U. with the Industrial Council of Manufacturers.

The twenty-five weeks' strike resulted in the union making some gains, (the 42 and 40-hour week, an increase in the minimum rates of pay, guarantee of 32 weeks' work, a wage increase, etc.), but the union also sustained some losses (right of the bosses to reorganize shops with 35 or more workers).

From the beginning, the struggle of the union was for the elimination of the jobbers, but it was unsuccessful in its efforts. The jobbers demanded the same settlement terms as the manufacturers; the union refused this and the jobbers locked out the workers.

Role of Right Wing in the Strike.

THE strike was nominally a joint effort of both the right and left wings of the union, but was actually conducted by the left wing leadership

of the New York Joint Board in the face of sabotage from the right wing elements in New York and from the international officials of the union

Leon Kramer - 1.25 Edo

JUN 11 1948  
JUN 11 1948

576365

headed by President Sigman. The right wing was insistent on the acceptance of the findings of the commission appointed by Governor Smith—in other words, it was in favor of compulsory arbitration under the auspices of the state government controlled by Tammany Hall.

The stubborn attitude of both the manufacturers and the jobbers, who put up the fiercest resistance in the history of needle trades struggles, is a result of their knowledge that they had powerful allies inside of the union—the right wing leadership. The attacks of the bosses upon the left wing is proof of this.

### Right Wing Leaders Hold Conference.

WITH 20,000 workers out of employment due to the unsettled condition of the industry after the settlement of the strike, when every effort was needed to enforce the new agreement, the right wing in the needle trades got busy. To its aid came the officialdom of other unions in which the left wing was showing strength—the United Mine Workers of America and the United Textile Workers.

A conference of trade union officials, attended by Vice-President Woll of the American Federation of Labor, was held in New York during the week of November 28. Plans were made at this meeting to start a new offensive against the left wing in the trade unions.

The next week a conference of officials which claimed to represent 35 unions was held in the Rand school. This meeting did three things:

1. It adopted a manifesto calling

Even if we give such factors as the long period of unemployment which preceded the strike and the tremendous profits which the American capitalist class has at its disposal for aiding its various sections in their conflicts with the workers, it still remains true that the greatest weakness of the union was the treacherous character of the right wing activities.

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers' officialdom, in contrast to its previous unstinted aid in I. L. G. W. strikes, gave a paltry \$25,000 to a strike which has cost about \$100,000 per week.

upon the labor movement to exterminate the Communists.

2. It formed a permanent organization calling itself the "Committee for the Preservation of the Trade Unions."

3. It arranged for a larger conference to be called a "General Trade Union Conference," to which all unions in New York are invited to send three delegates and which was held Tuesday, December 21, in Beethoven Hall, New York City.

The manifesto is too long to reprint here, but the introduction denounces the Trade Union Educational League as "an integral part" of the Workers (Communist) Party. It recites a number of alleged Communist misdeeds and states that the Furriers and Cloakmakers' unions in New York have Communist leadership.

The "Call to Action" concludes with:

The time has come when the

preservation of the trade unions demands the expulsion of these elements from offices and control.

The unions must remain free from outside domination and from the interference of all political parties! Individually every worker may follow any religious or political creed, but the unions must remain independent of all.

We therefore call for war upon Communist disruption. We call for all workers in all unions to unite against the internal enemy, the disrupter, who is destroying the unions for the benefit of the external enemy, the capitalist. It is a common fight for all workers who believe that their protection lies in the preservation of their unions.

The division between the Communist adventurers and the trade union movement shall be definitely established! There shall be nothing common between these irresponsible elements and the trade unions. The labor movement shall lend no assistance to any undertaking which, directly or indirectly, shall

include the Communists. It shall be war to their finish. Down with Communism! Long live the trade unions!

The "Call to Action" was signed by the following trade union officials: Abraham Beckerman, Manager, Joint Board, Amalgamated Clothing Workers; Louis D. Berger, Manager, Neckwear Makers' Union; Samuel A. Beardsley, President, District Council, Jewelry Workers' Union; Morris Feinstein, Secretary, United Hebrew Trades; Rose Schneiderman, Women's Trade Union League; A. I. Shiplacoff, International Pocketbook Workers' Union.

So much for the organizational preparation for "war"—it is the word used in the "Call to Action"—against the Communists and the left wing in the needle trades. It must be kept in mind in this connection that the left wing in the I. L. G. W. and the Furriers' Union in New York is actually the union itself, so big is its majority. The attack on the left wing, including the Communists, is really an attack on the union.

### The Right Wing Press.

THE needle trades press plays the same note.

The Advance, official organ of the Amalgamated, devoted its whole editorial page to the Cloakmakers' strike and said:

What has happened since the beginning of the cloakmakers' strike and what is happening in the Cloakmakers' Union now is but the inevitable outcome of the way in which the Communist Party plays trade union politics. It is the in-

evitable outcome of the initial sacrifice of industrial policy to politics.

"Justice," official organ of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, likewise devoted its whole editorial page to the strike and the right wing offensive. Speaking of a circular sent to all members of the union except known Communists and left wingers by the General Executive Board, "Justice" says:

It appears at a moment when our members, stunned by the terrific

blow they have received as a result of the outcome of the cloak strike in New York, and boiling with indignation over the terrible mismanagement of the strike by its Communist leaders and directors, are searching for an answer to this calamity which has befallen their organization and are seeking light and guidance that would lead them out of the morass into which the political adventurers have dragged them.

The searching analysis contained in the G. E. B.'s statement supplies this light abundantly. It lifts the curtain over the New York cloak-makers' tragedy and exposes mercilessly the hypocrisy, insincerity and blatant incompetence which its principal actors, the Communist

camarilla, have displayed from the first day they became the masters of the destiny of the 35,000 cloak-makers involved in it.

The stage having been set for an attack all along the line it needed only some rank and file camouflage to allow the officialdom to appear as saviors of the union. A farcial "investigation" was held by the General Executive Board of the I. L. G. W., the board then met in solemn session and passed a resolution ordering the regularly elected members of the Joint Board and strike committee to surrender their positions and turn over all books and property to the G. E. B. Local union executive committees were removed from office and all positions filled by appointment by the G. E. B.

### National Character of Right Wing Drive.

**B**UT the new offensive of reaction is not confined to New York or to the needle trades and its official press. It was planned as a nation-wide movement and it developed rapidly in this direction.

Extension of the drive against the left wing to Chicago gave the campaign a national character.

A rapid succession of incidents showed that the drive was not conducted by needle trades officials alone, but that the Chicago Federation of Labor officialdom co-operated actively with the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' officials and the right wing in the Ladies' Garment Workers' Union and the Furriers' union. These events were:

1. The breaking up of the Temple Hall meeting on Friday, Dec. 10, at which Ben Gold, chairman of the Joint Board of the New York Furriers'

ing under the same auspices, with Ben Gold as the principal speaker, was broken up by the same combination of forces. The manager of Hertzl hall was bought up by the right wing after he had demanded a deposit of \$1,000 from the Needle Trades Committee, and the hall turned over to the Amalgamated officials, who were in charge of the fight.

The left wing went to another hall and held a meeting, which the gangsters tried their best to disturb.

3. On Tuesday, Dec. 14, a meeting of the Furriers' union, regularly authorized by the executive board, with International President Shachtman present at the time, was held in the Odd Fellows hall at 12th and Albany to hear Ben Gold.

This meeting was likewise broken up by police and gangsters, including officials from other than needle trades unions.

The day before the meeting Edward Nockels, secretary of the Chicago Federation of Labor, called the police department, told them that "a Communist agitator by name of Gold" was "disrupting" the labor movement and that he wanted him taken care of.

In Boston, Hochman of the executive board of the I. L. G. W., with the assistance of gangsters and democratic politicians, broke up a left wing meeting.

The national character of the right wing campaign is clear. It is necessary now to determine two things:

1. If other sections of the labor movement outside of the needle trades, in which Communists are active, were affected.

2. The immediate reason for the launching of the campaign at the time and its connection with the rapid sweep to the right of the official labor movement.

### Background of Present Struggle.

**A** NUMBER of recent events in the labor movement have occurred which are strictly at variance with the "worker-employer co-operation" program mapped out for the labor movement by officialdom. It will be well here before listing the events which have disturbed the even tenor of life in official labor circles, to enumerate some of the actions and utterances of labor officialdom which furnish a background for the reactionary campaign and which gave notice of this offensive.

Writing in *The DAILY WORKER* for September 30 in the second of a series of twelve articles entitled "From Portland to Detroit," I listed a number of reactionary developments

in official labor circles from the Atlantic City convention of the A. F. of L. up to that time. These are:

1. The failure of President Lewis to call out the maintenance men in the anthracite strike, the acceptance of a five-year agreement, abandoning the union shop, the acceptance of arbitration in principle, failure to utilize the violation of the bituminous agreement by the coal operators to bring them out in support of the anthracite workers.

2. Legalization of the "worker-employer co-operation" policy by the enactment of the Watson-Parker law, supported by labor officialdom and railway managers.

3. Failure of railway union officials

to make any public opposition to the appointment by President Coolidge of known representatives of corporations to the mediation board provided by the Watson-Parker law.

4. The eulogy of this collection of Wall Street tools, individually and collectively, in the leading journals of the railway unions.

5. The welcome extended to a delegation of the fake British trade union leaders, organized by the leading British imperialist paper, the Daily Mail, by the executive council of the A. F. of L.

6. The organization of a "labor" life insurance company by heads of national and international unions with Matthew Woll as president.

7. The organization of a real estate corporation by a group of New York trade union officials.

8. The fight carried on by the A. F. of L. executive council against the proposed delegation to the Soviet Union, which was to be composed of trade union officials, labor editors, economists and attorneys for labor unions.

9. Sabotage of the Passaic strike, winding up with a public statement denouncing the strike as a "Communist enterprise" and attempting to stop further financial aid to the strikers.

10. Woll's article in the Photo Engravers' Journal (republished in the New York Times) proposing a conference of farmer organizations, labor organizations and BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS, under the leadership of Herbert Hoover, to devise ways and means for SAVING WASTE IN INDUSTRY.

11. The failure of the Chicago Fed-

eration of Labor to wage any kind of a struggle for the release of 91 members of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union imprisoned for violation of an injunction against their strike.

12. The failure of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor to give even sympathetic support to the struggle of the Mexican labor movement against catholic feudalism and American imperialism.

13. The endorsement of the Citizens' Military Training Camps by the A. F. of L. officialdom and the public offer of its aid in popularizing them.

14. The attempt of President Green of the A. F. of L. to force a settlement of the furriers' strike, ignoring the basic demand for a 40-hour week.

15. The investigation of the furriers' successful strike ordered by the A. F. of L. executive council in violation of all trade union custom and law.

The tremendous mass support received by the Passaic strike forced the A. F. of L. executive council to retreat from its original purely hostile position and accept the strikers as members of the United Textile Workers. It was smarting from this defeat when the A. F. of L. convention went into session.

Here it met a broadside from the hard-boiled open shop capitalists of Detroit, who appeared to take seriously the purely platonic statements relative to organization of the auto industry by the officialdom. It was impossible in this situation, without abandoning all pretense of loyalty to trade unionism, for officialdom to refuse aid to Passaic, altho Vice-President Woll did his best to postpone consideration of the question.

### Growing Influence of Left Wing.

THE Passaic strike was endorsed, aid from international unions pledged and another defeat administered to an officialdom which a few short weeks before had called it "a Communist enterprise."

It is probable that the report of the committee appointed to investigate the conduct of the furriers' strike would have been made at Detroit had it not been for the assault made by the open shoppers.

We have, then, in connection with the occurrences at the Detroit convention which irked sorely an officialdom whose reactionary tendencies can be traced clearly by the series of actions and utterances enumerated above, a series of militant strike actions by the rank and file supporting the left wing policies:

1. The Passaic strike.
2. The Furriers' strike.
3. The I. L. G. W. strike.

Worse than this for officialdom has been the splendid discipline and spirit of the workers in these struggles and the gains made by the workers in spite of the sabotage of the right wing.

These developments naturally are a menace to the policy of worker-employer co-operation, and there is no question but that there have been some sharp reprimands administered to their agents in the labor movement by such bosses' organizations as the Civic Federation.

But this is not all. There have been other indications of a growing organization of left wing forces that did not fit in with the plot of the play in which imperialist-minded labor officials were to be directors and the workers only actors—most of them without speaking parts.

One of the indications of a growing left wing movement, part of it inside and part outside the trade unions, has been the tremendous mass support for Sacco and Vanzetti.

This case has been neglected shamefully by the officialdom of the American Federation of Labor. It has confined its activities to the passing of formal resolutions, which, while asking for a new trial, expressed no opinion as to the guilt or innocence of these workers.

It is obvious that had labor officialdom pressed the issue honestly and militantly it would have been impossible for the Massachusetts government with fiendish cruelty to drag out this case for 5 years without giving these innocent men a new trial.

The Sacco-Vanzetti committee proper has always been unable to organize any broad mass support for the defense of the accused men. It was not until the International Labor Defense took up the case that the support took on a real mass character.

Big mass meetings were held throughout the country, demonstrations took place before the American consulates in the principal foreign capitals, dozens of prominent trade union leaders and public men of all shades of opinion throughout the world sent protests to Governor Fuller.

Sacco-Vanzetti conferences have been organized and preparations are being made for a huge national conference to be held in New York after the first of the year.

The International Labor Defense, a non-partisan organization for the defense of all class-war prisoners, in which Communists are, of course, active, can be said with truth to have saved the lives of Sacco and Vanzetti.

### Right Wing Treachery Towards Sacco and Vanzetti.

ON the heels of the drive against the left wing in the unions comes the following statement sent out by the press service of the "Sacco-Vanzetti Defense Committee." It is addressed: To Whom It May Concern:

The defense committee is constantly questioned as to the relationship existing between the Sacco-Vanzetti Defense Committee with the International Labor Defense, the Communist Party, and the so-called Sacco-Vanzetti conferences, because of their propaganda and collection of funds made in the name of Sacco and Vanzetti.

This committee specifically states that the Sacco-Vanzetti Defense Committee has no official relationship with the International Labor Defense, the Communist Party, or the Sacco-Vanzetti conferences, which we understand were organized thru the International Labor Defense.

We wish further to state that the defense committee has repeatedly urged them, since the International Labor Defense began to raise funds in the name of Sacco and Vanzetti, to send accounts of their activities and also accounts of the various Sacco-Vanzetti conferences. To date we received no satisfactory replies to our many letters regarding the purpose of the aforementioned organizations, or an accurate account of funds received and disbursed by them. We have been given to understand by the International Labor Defense that there are a number of Sacco-Vanzetti conferences throught the country from which we have never received any report. This was the reason why the committee has repeatedly ad-

vised friends of the Sacco-Vanzetti case to communicate directly with this office. Fraternally yours,

#### SACCO-VANZETTI DEFENSE COMMITTEE.

It is not hard to guess the source of the inspiration for this ambiguous and incorrect statement, which, nevertheless, deals a blow at the nation-wide movement for liberation of Sacco and Vanzetti and at the proposed national conference.

But we do not have to confine ourselves to a guess. The New York Times has already published as a news story the correspondence between the Sacco-Vanzetti committee and the reactionary "Committee for Preservation of the Trades Unions."

It may be stated here that the International Labor Defense is under no obligation to account to the "Sacco-Vanzetti Defense Committee" for any funds it may raise, but that its receipts and disbursements and duly audited financial statements are published monthly in its official organ, The Labor Defender.

It can be stated further that the International Labor Defense has forwarded sums as large as \$1,000 at a time to the "Sacco-Vanzetti Defense Committee," and has published photographs of the checks.

As in the cloakmakers' strike and the Passaic strike, the reactionary elements in and out of the labor movement have been willing to sacrifice the victory of the workers, to send Sacco and Vanzetti to the electric chair by sabotaging their chief support in order to do something they think will damage the left wing.

Undoubtedly these elements have

prevailed upon the Sacco-Vanzetti committee, by threats of withdrawal of the official support which has been so weak and grudgingly given, to issue such a statement. It is almost like signing the death warrant of Sacco and Vanzetti.

Here is a concrete example of what it means to the labor movement when the self-styled "Committee for the Preservation of the Trade Unions" puts into practice its slogan of:

**The labor movement shall lend no assistance to any undertaking which directly or indirectly shall include the Communists. It shall be war to their finish.**

• But it is not war "to their finish"—meaning the Communists. In this particular case it will mean the finish of Sacco and Vanzetti if the masses of workers are fooled or coerced into passivity by this drive of reaction. Communists are workers and they cannot be banished from the ranks of the working class. Such tactics merely aid the enemies of the workers.

To the strikes of furriers, textile workers and cloakmakers, mentioned before, we can add the great protest movement for Sacco and Vanzetti,

likewise organized and led by left wingers, as one of the examples of rank and file militancy which is in direct contradiction to the worker-employer co-operation policy of office-holders.

As this is written news comes of the action of the general executive board of the International Ladies' Garment Workers, headed by President Sigman, declaring the 25 weeks' strike of cloakmakers illegal, vacating the offices held by members of the New York Joint Board, regularly elected by the membership; vacating the offices held by members of local union boards who support the left wing and appointing hand-picked committees to take their places.

This action in the face of the mass support of the New York Joint Board, elected as a result of a membership revolt against right wing policies and tactics, is accompanied by an onslaught on a parade of the rank and file by police and gangsters.

Such occurrences as these, having a strong fascist character, can result only from the application of a policy which finds powerful support, not only in trade union circles, but from the capitalists and their press and from the socialist press.

### The United Front of Reaction—The Official Socialist Press.

THE united front of these elements against the workers who are fighting for militant unionism can be shown to exist beyond reasonable doubt. Their own utterances convict them.

In the public justification of the campaign against fighting trade unionism, there is a unanimity of expression in the socialist, capitalist and

official trade union press that can spring only from a common policy.

The New Leader, "a weekly journal devoted to the interest of the socialist and labor movement," used a column of editorial space in its December 2 issue for an attack on the left wing. Said the New Leader:

**It is because ALL THE OTHER POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS**

**GROUPS STOOD TOGETHER** against this exotic menace that there is any union left at all and any hope of recovering lost ground. (Emphasis mine.)

That "all the other political and religious groups" constitute a minority of the membership of the New York section of the I. L. G. W. and are supported by the bosses and the capitalist press did not cool the holy ardor of the New Leader. It proceeds to incite its readers, by what is a finished example of official socialist demagogy, in preparation for the national conference of the "Committee for the Preservation of the Trades Unions" on December 21:

Yet in the presence of the disaster they have wrought, Foster's league announces that it will hold a national conference of its shock troops in the needle trades in New York York City Jan. 1 and 2. Families of union members are today suffering privation because of the dual allegiance brought into the union by this league and now it is proposed to rub salt into the gaping wounds. The measureless insolence of this proposal is amazing. Its sponsors might at least have the grace to beg forgiveness of their victims. Instead of this they have the impudence to gather at the scene of their bungling and propose further meddling in the union.

The above sounds much like the provocative statements published by the patriotic press against socialists during the war. It was plainly designed to incite gangster violence against the meeting of the Trade Union Educational League after which the New Leader would claim that the

work of hired underworld elements was the spontaneous reaction of honest union men.

The New Appeal, in its issue for December 18, publishes an article by Morris Seskind of Jewish Daily Forward fame, in which he describes the breaking up of meetings of the left wing of the Chicago I. L. G. W. by gangsters, police and detective squads co-operating with labor officialdom, as a magnificent protest of the masses against the Communists. Seskind says:

The trade unionists of Chicago are determined not to permit the Communists to come here and demoralize the unions the way they did in some of the New York needle trade unions. They have resolved to oppose them in and out of the unions, wherever they attempt to come and bring in their demoralizing influence.

Inasmuch as the national headquarters of the Workers (Communist) Party is in Chicago, as the Joint Board of the I. L. G. W. in Chicago has a majority of Communists and left wingers elected by the usual trade union procedure, as there are several hundred Communists in the Chicago trade unions, as a number of them are regularly elected delegates to the Chicago Federation of Labor, the zealous Mr. Seskind seems to have overplayed his hand somewhat in trying to picture the recent rise of gangsterism against the militant rank and file in Chicago as an effort to repel a Communist invasion from New York.

The official trade union press, and the public statements of prominent trade union officials are even more definite if less vituperative than those of the socialist press.

### The Official Trade Union Press.

**I**N the American Federationist for December, President Green, in an editorial entitled, "Communists," delivers himself of the following (republished in the A. F. of L. press service for Dec. 2):

Let no union think it can tolerate Communist propaganda or compromise with Communist propositions. The difference between trade unionists and Communists are as diverse as the two poles. Communists are unalterably committed to destroy the trade unions. . . . They are not interested in building better industrial conditions. . . . They do not wish to co-operate in promoting union activities, but only to use the union for their own ends. . . . **THERE IS ONLY ONE WISE WAY TO HANDLE A COMMUNIST FOUND IN A UNION: MAKE PUBLIC HIS AFFILIATION AND EXPEL HIM.**

**IT IS UNWISE TO PERMIT COMMUNISTS ANY OPPORTUNITY FOR LEADERSHIP. THEY WILL LEAD TO DESTRUCTION.**

The Communist method is to form a nucleus and let this group carry on extended activities. (Emphasis mine.)

We have here a new principle laid down for the trade union movement—the principle that Communists per se (by the fact of their belief in the political and economic theories of the Communist Party), are ineligible to both membership and leadership in trade unions irrespective of the fact that they may be (and generally are) working at the trade over which the union has jurisdiction.

There have been expulsions of Communists before this—on both a whole-

sale and individual basis. A number of unions have made membership in the Communist Party adequate grounds for expulsions, but for the most part these expulsions have been carried out under other pretenses and for alleged breaches of union discipline. But this is the first time that the head of the American trade union movement has made the categorical statement that the trade unions and trade union positions are closed to Communist working men and women.

This is a denial of the very doctrine trade union officialdom is so fond of preaching (and which contrary to the general line of its statements is entirely correct) that is, that trade unions by virtue of the fact that they are working class organizations, must take in all workers of the craft, occupation or industry in which they operate.

The socialist party press and the trade union press are thus to be seen expressing the same policy which finds tactical expression as follows:

1. An effort to picture the Communists merely as disrupters, and as individuals who, taking orders from their party, care nothing whatever about the immediate victory of the workers in their daily struggles.

2. An attempt to convince the trade union membership and the working class at large that Communists are not workers but interlopers of a mysterious kind who wriggle their way into unions by other methods than the correct one of working for wages and joining the union for their occupation or industry in the regular manner.

3. The Communists—and the Communist Party—are working for the destruction of the trade unions instead of trying to make them effective in-

struments of the working class.

4. An effort to deceive the workers into believing that the Communists as a revolutionary political party are more of a menace to the trade unions than are the capitalist democrat and republican parties.

5. An effort to make the trade union membership believe that the Communists alone of all political groups form and hold caucuses to decide on what policy and methods they shall pursue and use in the unions.

6. An effort to convince workers that not difference in policy but Communists are responsible for internal union struggles which in all countries center around the same basic issues.

In this the phase of the campaign against militant trade unionism and militant trade union members mentioned above, the official trade union and socialist press is receiving the wholehearted support of such open organs of the industrial and financial lords as the New York Times.

### Capitalist Press Supports Right Wing.

THE support given by the capitalist press to the drive against militant unionism is of three kinds:

1. Agitation against the left wing which follows—shapes, is probably nearer the truth—the tactics of the socialist and right wing trade union press.

2. Completely false statements as to the gains made by the workers in Passaic and the cloakmakers' strike with the purpose of making victories obtained under left wing leadership appear as defeats.

3. Propaganda for "class peace"—the worker-cooperation policy of the official trade union leadership—"efficiency unionism."

The first and second types of agitation against the left wing are generally combined as in the following quotations from editorials in the New York Times:

Whether a strike is won or lost, it is a victory, in the Communist doctrine, if the operation of peace machinery is destroyed, if a six month's strike leaves behind it a rankling bitterness. To be sure it does not

always work out that way. Among the local garment workers the indications are that the lessons have been learned and the left wing's power for harm will be wiped out.

The above was written before the mass meeting of 18,000 needle trade workers in Madison Square Garden categorically demanded the resignation of President Sigman and endorsed the left wing leadership of the New York joint board in the cloakmakers' strike. It will be seen from this that with The Times, as with the socialist and official labor press, the wish is father to the thought. "The Communists should be driven out of the trade unions and the left wing should be crushed." No sooner said than done—on paper.

The Times again:

... precipitated 30,000 workers into an unnecessary strike, protracted over five months, involving a loss of millions of dollars in wages and terminating in an admittedly disastrous defeat. This is the characterization of the cloakmakers' strike by the president of the International

Ladies' Garment Workers' Union. The conflict was planned and let loose by the left wing element in the local unions.

This terrible "left wing" that insists on fighting when the kind-hearted bosses are simply oozing peace and good will all over the place, with the minor reservation, so far as The Times and its friends in the labor movement are concerned, that all concessions to the workers must be secured thru a Tammany Hall governor whom The Times controls! No capitalist sheet was louder in its denunciation of the left wing demand for the 40-hour week, which has been secured by both the furriers and cloakmakers' unions under left wing leadership but since it has been obtained, The Times and reactionary union officialdom which it supports have conveniently forgotten all about it.

The Times, however, reaches highest into the realm of hypocrisy when

it laments the struggle in the union:

War within the garment workers' organization is on, and may yet end in disruption of the union.

Such an outcome would be all the greater pity because of the long years it took the unions and the garment industry to escape from chronic conflict and chaos.

The right wing leadership which is responsible for the struggle in the union should welcome this new ally of trade unionism and give its representative a high place on the "Committee for the Preservation of the Trade Unions." Altho a belated convert to trade unionism, The Times is doubtless just as honest in its assertions as are the leading elements in this committee and it is certain that they would feel far more at ease with a representative of The Times than they would at the recent Madison Square Garden meeting, for instance.

### Lying About Passaic.

BUT it is when The Times speaks of the Passaic strike that it throws all caution to the winds and out-Munchausens the famous baron while at the same time not forgetting to say a good word for its particular hero—President Sigman. It says: (I quote at length so that readers may be able to form some idea of the amount of lying that can be done in a few paragraphs by a skilled editorial writer on a capitalist sheet.)

Passaic's textile strike is virtually brought to an end amid circumstances that have now become the regular thing with labor conflicts conducted under Communist inspi-

ration and leadership. The same formula operated as in the cloakmakers' strike. Hostilities are proclaimed without sufficient cause. . . . Bitterness and violence are engendered. Exhaustion casts the deciding vote. The Communist leadership decamps, as in Passaic, and leaves the task of bringing order out of chaos to moderate labor, or subscribes to a defeat which it hails as a victory.

It seems useless to argue with a sheet which dismisses such gains as the establishment of a union in a hitherto unorganized industry, the recognition of the right of union com-



mittees to take up and settle grievances, the restoration of the 10 per cent wage cut, the acknowledgment of the right of workers to be hired thru the union office, the securing of an agreement that there shall be no discrimination by the companies against strikers and the provision that no employes are to be hired until all strikers who wish to return have done so, as a defeat.

"The Communist leadership de-camps" is a method of describing one of the most tremendous sacrifices ever made by a strike leader possessing the full confidence of the masses, and one of the most dramatic incidents in the history of the labor movement, to which The Times editorial writer is welcome. His ability to distort and conceal the truth in the interests of the capitalists shows that he has socialist leanings.

We challenge the writer of this canard to make the same statement concerning Albert Weisbord to a mass meeting of the Passaic textile workers.

It may be well to say here that the policy followed by the Passaic strikers did not change with the voluntary withdrawal of Weisbord, but that the left wingers in the U. T. W. have led the struggle which has forced the Botany, Passaic Worsted, the Dundee and the Garfield mills to capitulate and settle with some 8,000 organized textile workers.

I have kept for the last the juiciest morsel with which The Times has regaled its readers on this particular subject and it is here that President Sigman is again quoted approvingly:

**President Sigman of the International Ladies' Garment Workers justly accuses the radical leaders**

**in control of the cloakmakers' strike of having alienated public sympathy. THIS WOULD BE EVEN TRUER OF PASSAIC.** The textile workers failed notably to win the support of a body of public opinion which has usually expressed itself in strikes affecting large bodies of low-paid workers. The reason was not indifference . . . . But despite the partial merits of the strikers' case, despite the unfavorable impression created by unwise or arbitrary police methods, popular feeling refused to be stirred. The dominant, and justified, impression was of a strike conducted by a little coterie of revolutionary leaders for purposes of their own. (Emphasis mine.)

"I wouldn't say he is a liar," said Abraham Lincoln in speaking of the reputation of a certain farmer for veracity, "but I do know that he has to get some one else to call his hogs at feeding time."

No strike of similar size has ever met with such wide popular support as has Passaic. The workers were able to hold out for over ten months just for this reason. Something like \$500,000 was contributed to the relief committee by unions, fraternal societies, individual workers and liberals.

Sympathizers and supporters of a strike make up the most diverse group in American society. They include organizations like the I. W. W., the Civil Liberties Union, protestant and catholic organizations, liberal middle class elements and prominent individuals like Rabbi Wise and Senator Borah.

But the Times, like the reactionary union and socialist press, is

interested only in "selling" the idea that fighting leadership is bad for the trade unions.

The simple truth, in a campaign of this kind, is an obvious handi-cap.

### "Selling" a Dangerous Doctrine to the Workers.

NEXT we will see how the capitalist and official labor press are engaged in a joint selling campaign to put over a still more dangerous doctrine.

The dangerous doctrine which right wing leadership and capitalist spokesmen join in preaching is our old enemy, "identity of interest of labor and capital," now put forward as "worker-employer co-operation," or in a still fairer guise as "union-management co-operation."

In the December issue of the American Federationist, an editorial by President William Green entitled, "Company Unions" (in which the head of the trade union movement puts forward reasons why capitalists should deal with the trade unions rather than form company unions) makes the following statements:

**Under various systems of union-management co-operation, workers have felt a responsibility and a partnership in the industry which has stimulated intellectual effort AND BROUGHT SUBSTANTIAL BENEFITS TO THE INDUSTRY. Prevention of waste, saving of materials, better production methods, EVEN INVENTIONS OF MACHINERY TO INCREASE EFFICIENCY have been part of the workers' contribution. THEY HAVE GONE OUT TO THEIR COMMUNITIES TO SOLICIT TRADE FOR THEIR EMPLOYER. Local union meetings have become discussion FORUMS**

**FOR PLANT PROBLEMS, producing practical suggestions that are carried into the shops for practical demonstration. National officers have contributed expert advice and direction. UNIONS WITH BANKING SYSTEMS HAVE GIVEN FINANCIAL HELP TO EMPLOYERS IN DIFFICULT TIMES. THE WORKERS' DEMANDS UNDER THIS SYSTEM OF CO-OPERATION HAVE BEEN RESTRAINED by better understanding of the facts of production. . . . The individual effort of the most enlightened employer cannot maintain as high a production impetus as the collective efforts of management and unions. (Emphasis mine.)**

Here we have an almost perfectly complete description of the "worker-employer-union-management co-operation" paradise. It requires no comment except to say that it is 100 per cent proof of the left wing charge that the policy of the present trade union leadership has as its object the transformation of unions into "efficiency agencies" of the capitalists.

I urge every worker in the United States, whether he be a member of a trade union or not, to get a copy of the December issue of the American Federationist and read carefully the two editorials from which I have quoted in these articles. I am sure that they will stimulate thought. Intelligent trade unionists especially will be delighted to know that they are

paying President Green \$12,000 per year—with a princely expense account thrown in—to put over a policy that makes local unions “discussion forums for plant problems.” We are sure also that as an unsolicited gift to the

members of the American labor movement the knowledge that “the workers’ demands under this system of co-operation have been restrained” will evoke gladsome encomiums of this kind of labor leadership.

### Evidences of Degeneration of Labor Movement.

**I**N their crass frankness the statements of President Green are a terrible tribute to the process of degeneration which is taking place in the labor movement under the control of such labor agents of American imperialism.

Is it any wonder that the labor aristocracy is becoming utterly shameless? For instance, can anyone familiar with the labor movement in the pre-war period imagine such a statement as the following appearing in the local correspondence section of a labor journal before the movement was debauched from the top down?

Read this from the Cambridge, Ohio, correspondence in the December number of *The American Flint*, official organ of the Flint Glass Workers’ Union:

**Walter Anderson is contemplating retiring from the glass workers and joining the Pinkerton detective force as he has already had some experience.**

Cambridge, Ohio, and Coshocton, the home of President Green, are not very far apart. When Brother Green brags that under his policy “the workers’ demands . . . . have been restrained,” and Brother Anderson

announces in his union journal that he is joining the Pinkerton detective force as he has already had some experience,” there is something more than a geographical proximity—there is a unity of stoolpigeonism from above and below so clear and complete that it cannot be mistaken. The main difference is that one gets paid by the labor movement better than the other gets paid by the enemies of labor. As in other occupations, there are high grade and low grade strikebreakers.

The chilling ooze of corruption from above seeps down thru every crevice of the labor movement.

“Partnership in industry” is another euphemistic catch-phrase used by both trade union officialdom and the capitalist press in describing the surrender of trade unions to the capitalists in pursuance of the worker-employer co-operation policy. The *New York Times* considers this phrase especially apt and never overlooks an opportunity to use it. This hard-boiled capitalist sheet is just as strong a supporter of “union-management co-operation” and “partnership in industry” as are President Green and other apostles of “efficiency unionism.”

### Leading Capitalist Organ in Full Accord.

**T**HE *TIMES* in a recent editorial makes a comparison between the methods of arbitration under government supervision—the logical and inevitable extension of the “union-management co-operation” policy—and militant unionism. It compares the outcome of the arbitration proceedings affecting trainmen and conductors on eastern lines with the outcome of the cloakmakers’ strike, and says:

**Two labor stories of importance stand out in the day’s news. They supply chronicle and comment on the rival methods of reason and war in industry. A board of arbitration acting under the new railroad law awards an increase to the conductors and trainmen on eastern railroads, equivalent to a 7½ per cent increase in wages.**

**Simultaneously, a mass meeting of garment workers in New York City bitterly denounces . . . a leadership which precipitated . . . an unnecessary strike . . . terminating in an admittedly disastrous defeat. . . . The conflict was planned and let loose by the left wing element in the local unions.**

Arbitration wins, strikes lose—this is the burden of the duet sung by the right wing and capitalist press. I propose to diverge here from the main line of my argument for a moment and deal briefly with the attempt of *The Times*, in which it is not alone by any means, to confuse issues by an analogy which is no analogy at all.

In the first place anyone who tries to make the wage problems of garment workers appear to be the same as those of conductors and trainmen

is either ignorant or dishonest. Trainmen and conductors, occupying strategic positions in a key industry, are accorded privileges by the capitalists which are denied to less favored sections of the workers. But this is no reason why these workers should adopt arbitration as a method of securing their demands. As a matter of fact, the greatest concession ever secured by these workers was gained by the threat of a general strike. (The eight-hour provisions of the Adamson law enacted in 1916.)

The 7½ per cent increase in wages given by the mediation board, seems to be a great victory when it is stated in a lump sum as *The Times* does (\$15,000,000). But, figured out in dollars and cents per worker it dwindles surprisingly. To be exact:

The average wage of these two groups of railway workers, according to the figures of the railroad labor board, was \$5.71 per day in 1925. Based on a thirty-day month (this is far above the average, but I am inclined to be generous) this would be a monthly income of \$171.30.

The boasted 7½ per cent increase therefore shrinks to \$12.74 per month—certainly representing no tremendous victory for unions which had demanded an increase of 20 per cent especially when we take into consideration the fact that railway profits for this year are estimated in round figures at \$1,380,000,000.

The garment workers secured an increase of \$2 and \$3 per week and in addition a reduction of hours from 44 to 42 for the first half of the life of the agreement and a 40-hour week for the last half. Neither are the gar-

ment workers bound to any arbitration scheme—the union has retained its freedom of action.

For a trade union this is of fundamental importance.

We see that The Times' estimate of the two events is sadly lacking in veracity. The garment workers, even tho led by the left wing to "an admittedly disastrous defeat," as The Times puts it, did considerably better than the trainmen and conductors in spite of the privileges granted these key workers by an anxious imperialist system.

But The Times is, like the official trade union leadership, concerned with "peace in industry" and "partnership in industry." Cassius-like, it pretends friendship only to stab. As we have seen, The Times professes to be worried greatly by the dissension in the union, but its greatest grief is reserved for the passing of the submission of the New York Joint Board to the governor's commission. It says:

The principle of arbitration, and beyond that, of **CO-OPERATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF PEACE AND THE WELFARE OF THE IN-**

**DUSTRY, SEEMED TO BE WELL ESTABLISHED. . . . A noteworthy advance had been made TOWARD THAT PARTNERSHIP IN INDUSTRY WHICH UNDERLIES THE SANEST THOUGHT among both employers and workers. (Emphasis mine.)**

We can be certain that The Times will agree that the "sanest thought" in this direction among employers is voiced equally well by President Green.

The Times is for "partnership in industry."

So is the American Federationist.

Both publications, one typically capitalist, the other typical of the official trade union press, denounce the left wing because it warns the workers of the danger of the policy expressed in this phrase and organizes them for a policy of struggle.

Official labor leadership and the organs of labor's class enemies here show conclusively that they at least have established an "identity of interest."

This same collusion of reaction appears in other fields.

### Unity of Bosses, Government and Trade Union Officials.

**C**O-OPERATION of the official trade union, capitalist and socialist press in the drive against militant unionism has been shown.

Co-operation of the right wing trade union leadership with government agencies such as the industrial commission of Governor Smith has been shown by the attempt of President Sigman and Morris Hillquit, leader of the socialist party, to settle with the governor's commission over the heads

of the duly elected leadership of the New York joint board in the cloakmakers' strike.

The clubbing of strikers by police and right wing gangsters during the demonstration of strikers before the Sigman headquarters and the Forward building is another instance.

The condemnation of the left wing strike leadership contained in the report of the arbitration board of three which passed on the controversy with

the sub-manufacturers, written in by appointees of Governor Smith to aid the right wing,—is another example.

The breaking up of a regularly called meeting of the Chicago Furriers' Union by labor officials, gangsters and police is still another example as were the two meetings of left wing needle workers broken up before the furriers' meetings by the same elements.

American Federation of Labor officialdom takes a more active and open part in the drive against militant unionism in the needle trades and thus gives it the character of an official movement on a national scale. This is shown by the appointment of Vice-President Woll, also a vice-president of the Civic Federation, as honorary chairman of the finance committee of the Sigman machine in New York.

Here is shown again a close connection between labor officialdom and capitalist agencies like the Civic Federation. (In the mad scramble of officialdom for the favor of the bosses, it has been generally forgotten that the largest union in the A. F. of L., the United Mine Workers, prohibits membership in the Civic Federation under penalty of expulsion).

Vice-President Woll is one of the important links binding labor officialdom to the employers' organizations and their instrument—the United States government. Woll keeps Presi-

dent Coolidge informed of the activities of labor officialdom. In a letter given wide circulation in the official labor and capitalist press during the week of November 21-28, written by Woll and addressed to President Coolidge, he said:

For a year past the country has been watching the efforts of Communists to capture and direct all the more important strikes, especially in and around New York, such as those of the cloakmakers, the furriers and the Passaic textile mill workers. The American Federation of Labor is steadily defeating these efforts but there is no question that by confusing the real issue between employer and employes, the Communists have made the task more difficult.

Vice-President Woll (of the A. F. of L. and the Civic Federation) does not openly ask assistance from Coolidge for the A. F. of L. campaign but Coolidge would have to be much less astute than he is not to be able to understand that such assistance would be welcomed as Woll is making what he believes are serious charges against the Communists.

How have the Communists, in the strikes mentioned, confused the "real issue between employer and employes," as Woll charges, and what does he mean by such a statement?

Is it a crime for Communist workers to lead or to try to lead strikes?

### Strikes—the Achievements of Right and Left Wings Compared.

**B**EFORE an answer is given to these questions it should be noted that there have been only four strikes of any consequence this year—the an-

thracite strike, the furriers' strike, the Passaic strike and the cloakmakers' strike. As Woll does not mention the anthracite strike in his indictment we

may conclude that the Communist influence was not an important element in this strike and that Woll therefore has no criticism to make of the outcome.

It will be interesting to compare the methods and results of three strikes which Woll charges the Communists with "trying to capture and direct" with the methods and results of the anthracite strike under direction of one of the most bitter opponents of militant unionism—John L. Lewis.

In the first place the fact that a strike occurred under such reactionary leadership is sufficient proof that even in this period of "prosperity" strikes cannot be prevented except by surrender on the part of unions. Surely Vice-President Woll will not charge that John L. Lewis, a member of the National Committee of the republican party, called the anthracite strike as part of a revolutionary plot against the government which in 1919 he said "we cannot fight."

But Woll, and all the other apostles of "worker-employer co-operation," are insistent that militant unionism in the garment industry, the fur industry and the textile industry has nothing whatever to do with wages, hours and working conditions but is simply the result of the activities of Communists who are trying to stir up trouble. The New York Times and other capitalist organs make the same categorical statement.

These spokesmen of the bosses go farther and say that Communists do not care whether the workers win strikes or not, that the strikes in the fur, garment and textile industry were unnecessary. They then try to prove their assertions by claiming that the cloakmakers have won nothing, have

in fact suffered a defeat. The New York Times makes the same statement about the Passaic workers.

These statements have been shown to be without foundation in another part of this pamphlet and here we wish only to ask why the self-appointed saviors of the garment workers, fur workers and textile workers do not apply this same test to the anthracite strike.

This is a strike that was lost if ever a strike was lost. After five months of struggle by 150,000 miners, during all of which time Lewis allowed the maintenance men to work and keep the owners' properties in better condition than ever before. Lewis signed an agreement with the coal operators which does not provide for the closed shop (the check-off) the union previously had and which accepts exactly those arbitration methods (participation of other persons than representatives of operators and the union) which the United Mine Workers have hitherto refused to be bound by.

These statements may be denied by friends of President Lewis but President Coolidge, whom President Lewis supported for election, knows otherwise. In his recent message to congress Coolidge says:

**No progress seems to have been made within large areas of the bituminous coal industry toward creation of voluntary machinery by which greater assurance can be given to the public of PEACEFUL ADJUSTMENT OF WAGE DIFFICULTIES SUCH AS HAS BEEN ACCOMPLISHED IN THE ANTHRACITE INDUSTRY. (Emphasis Mine.)**

The miners are bound by a five-

year arbitration agreement and the president is therefore pleased.

The Mining Congress Journal also states that the coal operators believe they have won a victory, in its issue for December:

**The operators claim that it (the contract) PROVIDES FOR A RECIPROCAL PROGRAM OF EFFICIENCY AND CO-OPERATION, which will be the basis of arbitration for any disputed points hereafter. (Emphasis mine.)**

Here is "efficiency unionism" again—a magnificent "victory" for miners after a five months' strike. Under the brilliant leadership of Lewis, the arch-foe of the left wing, the anthracite miners won the right to work harder for the coal barons.

The wage scale of the anthracite miners is not even guaranteed by this Lewis "victory." The Mining Congress Journal further states:

**It is presumed that on January 1 some operators will ask for a re-**

**duction in the wage scale and thus test out the matter.**

If such a condition prevailed in the fur, cloakmakers and textile workers' unions, after the left wing leadership had failed to use the full power of the unions as Lewis did, then the worker - employer co-operationists would have a slightly better case.

As it is, facts show that the only strike that was lost this year was the anthracite strike, led by John L. Lewis, in a section of industry where the Communists did not have sufficient membership at the time to be a decisive factor.

The campaign of the reactionary trade union officialdom, the socialist party, the bosses, the various agencies of the government and the capitalist press appears as a drive on the Communists and the left wing in the unions. Where Communists are numerous and active, strikes are won.

Actually it is a drive against the right to strike and therefore a drive against the whole working class.

### The Fight Is on the Right to Strike.

**I**F, as stated previously, the real objective of the united front offensive of labor officialdom, socialist party bureaucracy, capitalists and the capitalist press, aimed now at the left wing, is not for the purpose of supplanting militant struggle by the worker-employer co-operation policy and against the right to strike, why is the drive being made in precisely those unions which have not succumbed entirely to paralysis as a result of having this policy of "efficiency unionism" foisted upon them—cloakmakers and furriers?

The burden of proving their superior loyalty to the workers and their superior understanding of the problems of the labor movement in this period of rising American capitalism rests upon the sponsors of the present campaign.

Not only the New York Times but other powerful capitalist dailies which when the garment workers were struggling to build their unions, denounced them in much the same language as they use now in speaking of Communists, openly support the trade union officialdom. This is con-

sciously for reasons which these sheets state frankly. The New York Evening Post says that the present reactionary campaign is:

... one of the most hopeful events in the history of organized labor . . . THE WISEST LEADERS OF AMERICAN LABOR UNIONS ARE AWARE THAT THE VERY FOUNDATION STONE OF SUCCESS IS THAT THEIR AIMS AND METHODS SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE AMERICAN SPIRIT. AMERICAN WORKINGMEN ARE, FIRST OF ALL, AMERICANS WITH AMERICAN SPIRIT AND IDEALS. Some of their more important leaders, notably William Green . . . have taken pains to emphasize this fact. (Emphasis mine.)

So this is the old struggle for "100 per cent Americanism" in a new form. It is interesting to note that in its defense of labor officialdom The Post manages to use the word "American" four times in two lines. In ad-

### Political Parties and Trade Unions.

THE Post in the above extract echoes the plaint of the socialist and official trade union press i. e., it infers that the Communist workers seek only to capitalize union struggle for the interests of their party without regard for the immediate interests of the union and its members. This charge is formulated by The Post as an "attempt to manipulate American labor organizations for political ends."

One will search the files of the official trade union and capitalist press for the last twelve years without finding any denunciation of the republi-

dition to being "the wisest leaders" the official elements are patriots of the purest type in the estimation of the capitalist spokesmen.

The Post continues:

The local unions are to be congratulated upon their resolve to assume the aggressive against Communism within their ranks. When Communists or other groups attempt to manipulate American labor organizations for political ends, there is only one course to take—open war.

No group of persons in this country can make it hotter for the Communists than the labor organizations. IF THE LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS GO INTO FIGHT WITH THE SPIRIT THEIR LEADERS ARE DISPLAYING, the battle will be over almost before it has begun.

But there is one drawback. It is that "the local organizations", that is, the workers, are not following "their leaders" in this fight.

can and democrat parties for their open corruption of unions and union officials for their own interests—interests which are those, not of the working class, or even a section of it, but solely the interests of the capitalist class of this country.

Have the huge sums of money spent in debauching the electorate in general and the trade unions in particular by Frank L. Smith of Illinois, whose campaign was financed by Samuel Insull, head of the open shop movement in that state, called forth any denunciation of his party as a party making an "attempt to

manipulate American labor organizations for political ends?"

Not so one could notice it. On the contrary, the president and secretary of the Illinois State Federation of Labor and the chairman and secretary of the Chicago Federation of Labor openly supported Smith before and after the exposure of the Insull slush fund.

What is true in Illinois of the republican party is true in New York of the democrat party—Tammany Hall. It is public knowledge that the great majority of the New York unions, including certain sections of the needle trades unions, where the Communists are now charged with "attempts to manipulate for political ends," are appendages of the Tammany Hall political machine.

President Ryan of the New York Central Labor Council, and the executive of the Council itself, in the New York Times for Jan. 16, defended Tammany Hall's "industrial squad"—the "bomb squad" of the police department which specializes in slugging pickets, arresting strikers and suppressing working class activities.

John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America, used his position openly in an attempt to swing the union in support of Coolidge. Gompers was for years, and Green is now, a wheelhorse of the democrat party chariot.

Allow us to say, to the capitalist party henchmen holding positions in the unions, and to the New York Times, The Post and other of their capitalist defenders, with all the politeness that we can muster, that we Communists were not born yesterday and that we understand you very well indeed. We understand what you are

saying and so do many thousands of workers who are not ready to incur the blacklist in an open struggle with you just yet.

For what you are saying is just this:

The only parties that you will tolerate in the trade unions are parties of the capitalist class and parties like the socialist party which instead of fighting you in the interests of the workers, does the dirty work that you cannot do in the drive against militant unionism, because of its ardent desire to be taken close to your bosom and given a more equal share of the profits the capitalists dispense to you as a reward for leading the labor movement into the camp of its enemies.

The Washington (D. C.) Star sounds the note of "peace". It is against Communists because

One of the principles of Communism is to promote conflict between workers and employers. Strike settlements are not sought in a spirit of adjustment. The performance in New York was obviously designed to continue the turmoil.

It is becoming so unusual for a union to strike in America that a whole theory is being based on the absence of strike movements in which American workers formerly engaged. The inference is that strikes are unnecessary and that only the callous Communists will inflict such struggles upon the masses. This is the spiritual justification of the drive against militant unionism but the theory is as false as its principal proponents are deep in collusion with the bosses and the political parties of the bosses.

### The Role of the Socialist Party Officialdom.

IN giving the whole conspiracy against militant trade unionism a "spiritual" character the socialist press and bureaucracy has a special role to play. It is being played, not very wisely, but certainly with an enthusiasm which only the smell of the fleshpots in the upper circles of labor officialdom can evoke in the breasts of the high priests of a party whose chief leader, Morris Hillquit, is numbered among the wealthy elite of Riverside Drive.

The socialist party leadership has found its niche at last. It is that of flunkying to the flunkies of American imperialism in the labor movement.

For some time, beginning exactly at the moment when the American Federation of Labor officialdom discovered that the only real opposition to American entry into the war came from the left wing of the socialist

party which made up the great majority of the Communist Party later, there has been an approach on the part of the socialist bureaucracy and the ruling group of the A. F. of L.

It was marked first by the cessation of opposition by socialist party members, who were at the same time officials of needle trades unions, to the A. F. of L. machine. Opposition candidates of the socialist type, backed by the needle trades and Jewish trade union bloc, were no longer nominated in A. F. of L. conventions.

Then came the expulsion policy against militant unionists in which socialist or former socialist union officials joined heartily and, as in the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, took the initiative. The Amalgamated Clothing Workers' officials, to which anything savoring of A. F. of L.ism had been anathema hitherto, also instituted the expulsion policy.

### Further Steps Toward Unity of Reaction.

WHEN the demand for recognition of Soviet Russia became an issue in the labor movement, A. F. of L. officialdom found its most valuable allies in two places—among socialist trade union leaders and among the most hard-boiled section of the capitalist class. It was socialist union officials who mouthed the most outrageous slanders of Soviet Russia and its workers' and peasants' government.

This united front of trade union and socialist reaction knit very closely the bond between the two.

The socialists, in their attack on the left wing, at first got only sympathetic support from the A. F. of L. officials. Without something more than this their attack resulted in a miserable failure, as in the struggle in the New York section of the union in 1925. The A. F. of L. gave little if any organizational support to President Sigman and his henchmen on the joint board.

The struggle ended with the defeat of the socialist party leadership (in which can be included all the elements supported by the Daily For-

ward, whether actually members of the socialist party or not).

Then came the struggle in the furriers' union, which, likewise, ended in defeat of the Forward elements.

In both of these struggles the basic issue was worker-employer co-operation versus a policy of struggle, the abolition of gangsterism in the unions which had throttled all rank and file

expression, and amalgamation of all unions in the industry.

There had been a number of struggles in the Amalgamated, but in this union the issues were less clear because of the split between President Hillman and the Forward gang, and the left wing never attained the strength it has in the other needle trade unions.

### The Rise of the Needle Trades Left Wing.

BUT the failure of the right wing to crush the rank and file opposition in the furriers and the I. L. G. W., together with the knowledge that amalgamation was becoming a popular mass issue which would soon force something more than platonic expressions of endorsement, with the further certainty that the A. C. W. officialdom would be unable to dominate any amalgamated block because of the preponderance of left wing leadership, undoubtedly prompted the Hillman machine to enter into a truce with the Forward and an alliance with A. F. of L. officialdom and officialdom in other needle trades and Jewish unions against the left wing.

Hillman now proposes amalgamation

with the I. L. G. W.—but without the left wing.

The failure to arouse any real enthusiasm among the A. C. W. membership for the new 2-year New York agreement (it was voted for by only something like 10 per cent of the membership, according to statements of members present at the meetings) made the possibility of a rapid development of the left wing in the A. C. W. possible and a united offensive against the left wing in the labor movement desirable—especially in the needle trades.

The offensive has been launched. Socialist party and A. F. of L. officialdom are fighting side by side, as has been shown previously.

### S. P. Bureaucrats and the S. P. Press.

THE "Committee for Preservation of Trade Unions," whose first act was to attempt to split the forces of labor supporting Sacco and Vanzetti, is an organization of delegates mostly from unions in which the officialdom is controlled by the Daily Forward.

Abraham I. Shiplacoff, chairman of the committee, is part of the Forward

machine in the International Pocket-book Workers' Union. The Hebrew Trades Council is controlled by the Forward and it is the center of the newly-formed body. The Amalgamated Clothing Workers officialdom is represented by Beckerman, manager of the New York Joint Board.

The New Leader, official organ of

the socialist party, is trying with might and main to become the official organ in English of the reactionary drive. In its issue for December 28 it had no less than eight news stories and articles directed against the left wing and the Communists. It accompanies this truckling to the right wing of trade union officialdom with a front page appeal for funds.

The national executive committee of the socialist party, meeting in New York last week, officially assured the needle trades officialdom of its support. Its resolution on the subject, published in the New Leader, after making it plain that the N. E. C. will not oppose the present officialdom, or allow socialist party members to do so in the name of the party, goes on to state:

We rejoice that the members of the needle trade unions have united in a campaign to save the unions from the influence that has brought them to the brink of ruin. To the extent that socialist party members can be of service in this work we pledge their willing co-operation. . . .

That the real policy of the socialist party is in conflict with its professed neutrality can be seen by a comparison of the above with the following statement which is made in the first part of the N. E. C. resolution:

The socialist party has always been opposed to any capturing of the trade unions by political parties and TO ANY ATTEMPTS TO DIRECT AND CONTROL THE AFFAIRS OF TRADE UNIONS BY OUTSIDE PARTIES. (Emphasis mine.)

One statement negates the other. The position of the socialist party officialdom amounts to this:

No struggle in the unions against

any party except the Communist party—the only revolutionary working class party in the United States.

That this is its actual policy is to be discerned by the fact that its official organ chronicles approvingly denunciations of the Communists and left wing made to meetings under right wing control by such well-known Tammany Hall revolutionists as Matthew Woll, Hugh Frayne, New York organizer for the A. F. of L., and Joseph D. Ryan, president of Mayor Walker's labor club, the Central Trades and Labor Council of New York City.

The program of the "Committee for Preservation of the Trade Unions," dominated by the Jewish Daily Forward and supported by the New Leader, is too long to quote in full, but one or two extracts will give a clear idea of the objective of this body.

Point 5 reads:

To make a survey of the "innocents' club" and camouflaged organizations formed by the Communists or the Communist Party thru which they have received funds ostensibly for the protection of the foreign-born, the Negroes, the Filipinos, for release of political prisoners, for the protection of civil rights, etc., all of which are intended to further the destructive work of American Communism.

As in the case of Sacco and Vanzetti, the various non-partisan mass movements mentioned cannot be stripped of Communist workers and sympathizers without either crippling or wrecking them. It is apparent that the socialist party leaders are quite willing to wreck these movements, all of them of vital importance to the labor movement as a whole, to get a crack at the Communists.

All of the movements mentioned are non-partisan movements in which workers and liberal middle-class elements take part. The Communists may be and generally are the most active section, but that they control them mechanically or can work in them for any other purpose than stimulating them, achieving immediate gains for the whole working class and thereby profiting as a revolutionary party from the generally improved

militancy of the masses, is an idea that could originate only in a diseased brain.

It is true, however, just because of the active part taken by Communist workers, that most of these movements will die if the Communists are driven out or will become moribund and powerless, so empty of working-class vigor that the capitalists will have nothing to fear from them.

### Difference on Policy in S. P.

NORMAN THOMAS, who wants to fill the shoes of Eugene Debs, and is more to the left than the other leaders in practice if not in words, seems to have had some misgivings as to the wisdom of the red-baiting crusade launched by the socialist bureaucracy that has shoved him quietly into the background, to be fumigated since his contact with Communists in the Passaic strike—against the wishes of the high priests of socialism.

Thomas likewise is not enthusiastic over the reactionary allies with which his leaders have made a pact for war on the will to struggle in the trade unions. In the December 25 issue of the New Leader Thomas, after doing obeisance at the shrines of Sigman and Hillquit and repeating the invocation against the Communist devil, utters the following warning:

Nevertheless, no labor unions generally nor socialist labor unionists particularly can afford to fight Communism by witch-hunting, by MAKING LOVE TO REACTION, or by a merely negative policy. In the long run THE BEST WAY TO

FIGHT COMMUNISM WILL BE BY SETTING UP STANDARDS OF HONOR, EFFICIENCY AND IDEALISM WHICH WILL GIVE COMMUNISTS NO JUST GROUNDS FOR CRITICISM. Above all, it will be necessary for the unions in their sphere and the socialist party in its sphere TO DO BETTER SOME OF THE JOBS—like organizing the unorganized, and defending political prisoners and fighting against imperialism—WHICH THE COMMUNISTS HAVE AT LEAST HAD THE ENERGY TO TRY TO DO. (Emphasis mine.)

We can say to Norman Thomas that we have not the slightest objection to being fought in the way he suggests, but principally because he believes that the present leadership of the trade union movement and the socialist party will some day fight Communism this way is the reason he aids reaction by giving it at times—the present, for instance—a semi-respectable covering which prevents the imperialist lackey uniform being seen by unskilled working-class observers.

Thomas continues:

It is with joy that one turns to Passaic. There the heroic struggle is resulting in victory. The settlements in the Botany Mills and a number of smaller organizations are all that could reasonably be expected from a local strike in the textile industry.

It is a matter of public knowledge that Communists and left wingers organized and led the Passaic strike, built up the relief machinery, fed the strikers, and that left wing union organizers and members still are the backbone of the struggle. But how does Thomas explain that the same Matthew Woll, who denounced the Communists to President Coolidge

### Pure Reaction Is Official S. P. Policy.

THE present position of the socialist party bureaucracy is the inevitable result of its inability and unwillingness to draw the correct conclusions relative to imperialism—the final stage of capitalism; of their denial of the role of a revolutionary party, of the necessity for the dictatorship of the working class, of their failure to understand the role of the trade unions as the rallying centers of the whole working class, of their failure to understand the methods and reasons for the struggle for immediate demands in the period of imperialism, and of their endeavor to draw a line between the masses of the Soviet Union and the proletarian state power of the Soviet Union.

The socialist bureaucracy becomes the ally of the trade union bureaucracy and, not so openly because of their better understanding of the

last November for their activity in the Passaic strike, is now lionized by the socialist party press as a savior of the labor movement?

But these are minor inconsistencies of a socialist policy which is consistent as a whole and which brings them in organizations other than the trade unions into conflict with the class interests of the workers.

In the words of Norman Thomas, the socialist bureaucracy is "making love to reaction." It is a neat phrase, delightfully descriptive and perfectly appropriate.

I am indebted to Norman Thomas for this apt characterization and shall use it hereafter in referring to the socialist leaders, of course giving Thomas credit for it.

means of fooling the masses, but just as consciously, the ally of imperialism itself.

For the struggle between right and left in the trade unions is essentially a struggle between those working class elements who feel the pressure of imperialism and those who benefit from it to some extent.

The socialist party bureaucracy has the ambition to become the intellectual expression of the trade union bureaucracy. It dreams of leading a labor party, of becoming His Majesty Morgan's loyal opposition. It will not lead workers to struggle because it thus comes into conflict with trade union officialdom and the ruling class and jeopardizes its chances of "sane and constructive leadership."

Lest some reader think the above is an exaggeration of the policy of the socialist party bureaucracy and

that it still retains some integrity, I will quote from an article by David P. Berenberg, socialist party lecturer in the Rand School, published in the New Leader for Dec. 25. It is called "Until the 'Spree' Is Over."

The whole theory of betrayal and of profiting from betrayal is set forth in detail in this article. I will quote at length for the reason that rarely does one come across such a

perfect sample of "socialist" thot.

Berenberg predicts a crisis and a crash. Does this lead him to the conclusion that a united front with the Communist Party and the left sections of the labor movement, will be needed to beat back the tide of reaction?

Does Berenberg even visualize the socialist party leading these struggles?

### Basing a Policy on Betrayal of Masses.

HE does neither. He simply lays down a program by which the masses can be betrayed wholesale—by the socialist party.

In "Point 4" Berenberg says:

When wages all along the line go down, the worker will begin to come out of his trance. . . He will be reduced to penury—in some cases to starvation. Then what? If this were Great Britain the worker would turn to the Labor Party. **HERE, THE COMMUNISTS WILL GET HIM. . . LET US NOT FOOL OURSELVES. . . WHEN THE AMERICAN WORKER GROWS RADICAL HE WANTS TO BREAK SOMETHING.** He has not been trained to constructive political thinking. . . The Communist clap-trap is going to get him.

I am not predicting the Communist revolution. **WASHINGTON AND WALL STREET WILL BE PREPARED TO MEET THE EMERGENCY. . . The jails will be filled with politicals; new "red" laws will appear. . . a feeling of futility and soreness will be left behind.** (Emphasis mine.)

One will notice that nowhere does

Berenberg speak of the role of the socialist party in the gigantic struggles he predicts—and in which prediction he is correct. The reason he does not mention the socialist party or issue a clarion call for it to prepare for this period of battle is apparent in "Point 3.":

**Then WILL FOLLOW THE SOBER MOOD** during which the American worker will learn to approach his problems like a mature person. . . **THEN WE WILL HAVE OUR INNINGS**, if we have sense to offer him. (Emphasis mine.)

It is almost needless to say that this is precisely the line of reasoning followed by socialist officialdom the world over. The conditions of life become unendurable (as in Germany), the workers organize to overthrow their oppressors and the oppressors' state, the socialist bureaucracy sabotages the struggle, becomes the ally of the capitalist class and when the workers are beaten back to a lowered standard of living (as they have been in Germany) cries out to them:

"See, didn't we always tell you, you must wait for evolution and not try revolution?" Among workers there is



a very obscene but completely descriptive phrase for characterizing this kind of treachery.

So far, a fascist or semi-fascist dictatorship has followed this kind of "evolutionary" policy.

### No Program for Present.

**B**UT what of the present period when the basis must be laid for the inevitable struggle? What of the millions of workers who do not share in the prosperity and who need organization, instruction in the elementary theory and tasks of the class struggle? What of the paralysis and death that come to a labor movement which abandons all idea of struggle because of sops thrown to various sections of it by the ruling class with a deadly purpose in mind—like a thief throws a chunk of poisoned meat to the dog who endangers the success of his looting expedition?

Berenberg replies and in replying he gives away the secret:

"Item 4:"

**FOR THE PRESENT THERE IS NOTHING TO BE DONE. NO AMOUNT OF 'HUSTLING,' 'DRIVING,' 'URGING,' 'GETTING TOGETHER,' or whatever else it may be called, WILL BRING NEARER BY A SINGLE SECOND THE TRAIN OF CIRCUMSTANCES THAT ALONE CAN MAKE THE WORKER RECEPTIVE TO OUR PROGRAM. Social forces will bring**

### Accept Policy of Trade Union Officialdom.

**T**HIS policy, hitherto pursued with some caution by the leadership of these unions, has been given a tremendous impetus by the outright

him our way at last. (Emphasis mine).

It is any wonder that a leadership which exudes this poisonous fatalism finds itself in the camp of the worst enemies of the working class—the agents of imperialism in the labor movement?

This doctrine, a product of a pseudo-intellectualism which partakes of the atmosphere of the dim recesses of Greenwich Village and the smugness of the well-paid labor leaders in claw-hammer coats at a Civic Federation dinner, is a denial of Marxism which sees social forces as something the revolutionist must use and not wait for. Revolutionists, as Marx, pointed out, make history just as well as history makes revolutionists.

This is the philosophy with which the intellectuals of the socialist party have been saturating the leadership of the trade unions under their influence. It finds its reflection in the policy of worker-employer cooperation and "efficiency unionism" in such formerly militant organizations as the International Ladies' Garment Workers and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers.

pressure of the American Federation officialdom and now converges with the "Baltimore and Ohio" plans, Watson-Parker government mediation

(the governor's commission in New York) in war on the sections of the membership which are not under the influence of the socialist party bureaucracy.

Only agreement on main lines of policy could bring such close organizational cooperation as can be seen in New York and elsewhere with Tammany Hall supporters enlisted side by side with the New Leader, the Daily Forward, the needle trade union officialdom and the socialist party bureaucracy against the majority of the membership.

### "Destroying" Trade Unions.

**W**E have seen how the socialist party bureaucracy has become part of the united front against genuine trade unionism and how parrots the cry of the official union leadership that "trade unionism" must be preserved from the very same sections of the trade union movement which have waged all the militant and successful struggles in 1926.

It is well to inquire here as to what is meant when the accusation is made by labor officialdom that their critics and opponents in the labor movement are trying to "destroy trade unionism."

Do they actually believe that the left wing and the Communist workers are trying to wipe out the trade unions and leave the working class unorganized?

Of course they do not, but the accusation is made in the above terms with the idea in mind that trade unionists and workers generally will so understand it.

The socialist party leadership is not only "making love to reaction," as Norman Thomas so delightfully puts it, but has long ago lost its virginity, become promiscuous and appears as a hardened old madam whose role is that of procuring new recruits for the house of prostitution where workers are, supposed to lose all shame and which is run under the name of "American trade unionism" by the labor agents of imperialism—the Greens, Wolls, Lewises and other lesser lights.

They have in mind, when they make the accusation, that there is a clash of policies in the trade union movement—that a section of the organized working class, either more exploited than supporters of officialdom, more class conscious, or both, tries to guide the unions into the path of POLITICAL struggle based on their economic demands, while the more privileged group of trade union members led by the labor bureaucracy strive to keep the unions DIVORCED FROM POLITICAL ACTION and confine them to the old program of "pure and simple" trade unionism as Daniel De Leon characterized it, or still worse—make them outright efficiency organs of capitalist production. As a matter of fact there is no difference between the two except that the former takes a little longer to render the unions entirely helpless.

William English Walling, the renegade socialist (he will now find plenty of his former colleagues in the same camp) who early saw the

trend of the official trade union policy and has become the semi-official spokesman of A. F. of L. officialdom, says in his book, "American Labor and American Democracy," favorably reviewed in all the official labor sheets:

The American labor movement always has been and doubtless will remain, fundamentally economic in character.

We have seen the pronouncements of President Green of the A. F. of L. and other official spokesmen relative to the role of trade unions as production organs in close connection with management and we have likewise seen that the New York Times and other mouthpieces of capitalism share the same opinion.

All of these forces are united against the section of the organized workers and of the unorganized, as in Passaic, who are "disturbing" the

### "Uninterrupted and Increased Production"—Slogan of American Imperialism.

IT is noticeable that only where highly exploited workers revolt, as in the textile industry recently, or only in militant strikes with some political consciousness, like those of the furriers and cloakmakers, does the capitalist class conduct a direct offensive and heap columns of abuse upon them in its press.

Wage demands of large and decisive groups of workers, as in the railroad industry, do not evoke such open hatred and abuse, when the capitalist class knows that they will be compromised thru the compulsory arbitration machinery, as do relatively small and unimportant strikes in less decisive industries.

"peaceful" development of American imperialism.

The dogma that strikes are unnecessary and "wasteful" has been put forward and an attempt clearly is made, as in the New York needle trades, to show that workers, by accepting the principle of slightly higher pay for much more work, can better their conditions substantially WITHOUT strikes.

The struggle in the labor movement now between right and left is a struggle for the right to strike. But it is something more than that—it is also a new kind of a struggle, a struggle for the abolition of trade unions as weapons of the working class which is being conducted INSIDE of the union by agents of the capitalists. The left wing workers fight to STAY in the unions and forge them into real weapons of all the workers.

"Uninterrupted and increased production" is the slogan of American imperialism and it is echoed by the trade union bureaucracy. The present labor leadership, as has been stated in the introduction to this pamphlet, has no policy beyond that of securing a small share of the enormous wealth produced for the workers by means of "cooperation" agreements providing for increases in output per worker—piece work in a wholesale scale for the working class. When the inevitable period of crisis comes, the labor leadership is helpless. Still worse, as it has done in the past, it becomes the open ally

of the suppressive machinery of the capitalist government.

Its fight on the movement for the formation of a labor party can be explained by no other reason than its fear that it may become an effective weapon of the masses in periods of depression.

The official policy of the American Federation of Labor, based on the present temporary prosperity, can be shown easily to be similar to the viewpoint of the most representative spokesmen of imperialism. For instance, Charles E. Mitchell, president of the National City Bank of New York, the bank to whose service more gunboats and marines have been devoted than to any other American financial institution, in an interview relative to prospects for 1927, said:

Increasing powers of production are the basis of prosperity. The problem of maintaining this prosperity will not be solved by indiscriminate wage increases which necessitate price increases, interfere with distribution and threaten a slow-down of industry. ONLY WHEN WAGE ADVANCES ARE ACCOMPANIED BY CORRESPONDING INCREASES IN PRODUCTION ARE THEY COMPATIBLE WITH ENDURING PROSPERITY. (Emphasis mine.)

Compare this statement by one of America's leading imperialists

with a statement made for the same purpose (a forecast of prospects for 1927) by the head of the trade union movement—President Green:

MANY OF OUR INDUSTRIES HAVE MADE REAL PROGRESS IN DEVELOPING PRODUCTION POLICIES AND METHODS THAT SUSTAIN PROSPERITY... THE WAGE INCREASES FOR THE CONDUCTORS AND TRAINMEN ON EASTERN ROADS AND THE SHOPMEN ON THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO AND THE CANADIAN NATIONAL railroad may reasonably be regarded as indicative of what is to be expected in 1927. (Emphasis mine.)

To this statement by President Green which was given to the press we can add another statement, previously quoted, from his editorial in the December number of the Federationist:

The workers' demands UNDER COOPERATION HAVE BEEN RESTRAINED by better understanding of the facts of production. (Emphasis mine.)

It is hardly necessary to point out that there is no essential difference between these statements—one by an open and avowed imperialist, head of a bank whose depredations in Haiti, Cuba and Nicaragua are notorious, the other by the head of the American labor movement.

### Labor Agents of Imperialism.

**N**OR is this an accidental occurrence. The policy of worker-employer cooperation, of a definite increase in the amount of work for an increase in wages, is the policy of both American imperialism and the trade union bureaucracy. Those elements of the working class that have not been whipped or bribed into line must be crushed.

This is what the struggle in the trade unions centers around.

The unity of capitalists, trade union officialdom and socialist party bureaucracy in this struggle is explained by the facts of imperialism and their effects upon the working class.

Lenin, in his "Imperialism," after mentioning the enormous super-profits from foreign investments in the pre-war imperialist period (American imperialism now has \$13,000,000,000 invested abroad) shows the use to which a portion of them are put:

It is easy to perceive, that from such a large additional profit (for it is received in addition to the profit which the capitalists extract from 'their own' country) labor leaders and the upper strata of the workers' aristocracy CAN BE

### Incomes of Labor Officials.

**SALARIES** in the American trade union movement run from \$5,000 per year up. The "up" is twice the salary of a congressman, senator or cabinet officer. Warren Stone, late head of the locomotive engineers, held the record with \$25,000 per year.

Even small fry in the labor movement get salaries which a small business man envies.

**BRIBED.** So the capitalists of the "progressive" countries bribe them by a thousand means, direct and indirect, open and secret. (Emphasis in the translation.)

Some details of the manner in which the trade union officialdom shares in the loot of American imperialism, and how their status has become that of the lower and central section of the middle class, will make clear the wide gap which separates them from the workers upon whom, in company with the bosses and the socialist bureaucracy, they are making war in the trade unions.

If we listen to the typical American labor leader we discover that he harps long and loud upon his services to the movement. Rarely, if ever, does he mention the matter of reward. As a matter of fact, it is considered bad taste in official labor circles to speak of salaries and expense accounts except in those moments of confidence when, liberally supplied with pre-war liquor, American labor leaders gather around the poker table and "kid" one another about the uncomplaining manner in which the rank and file foots their bills.

Fitzpatrick and Nockels, chairman and secretary respectively of the Chicago Federation of Labor, get \$5,200 per year.

Walker and Olander, holding similar positions in the Illinois State Federation of Labor, get \$6,500 a year.

Petrillo, head of the musicians' union in Chicago, gets \$13,000 per year.

Jewell, head of the railway department of the A. F. of L., gets \$7,500.

Daniel Tobin, president of the teamsters' union, one of the lowest paid group of workers in the country, gets \$15,000 per year.

Mahon, head of the Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees' Union, gets \$14,000 per year.

President Green of the A. F. of L. gets \$12,000.

These salaries in most instances are accompanied by expense accounts ranging from \$10 per day to \$20, and labor leaders without a continual expense account are as scarce as Indian rajahs without harems.

When Farrington was president of District 12 (Illinois) United Mine Workers of America, he had his home in Indianapolis and had a perpetual expense account because he had to be in Springfield. John L. Lewis lives in Springfield and charges a continual expense account because he has to be in Indianapolis, the headquarters of the union. The two cities are a few hours apart.

A witty coal miner once suggested that Farrington and Lewis exchange wives and save the union about \$10,000 per year.

The needle trades unions are not stingy with their officials—especially those with some intellectual attainments. J. B. Salutsky (Hardman), on the staff of Advance, official organ of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, was drawing \$110 per week a few years ago, and probably gets around \$125 per week now. Charles Erwin, socialist and former editor of the Call, gets less than Salutsky, but about twice the wages of the average member of the A. C. W.

A book can and should be written

on the methods by which labor officials add to their incomes, but their salaries and expense accounts alone place them a long way above the needle workers whom they "serve."

Some of the methods by which labor officials add to their huge salaries can be listed as follows:

1. By receiving a commission on union printing contracts over which they have control.
2. By blackmailing employees. (New York Electrical Workers.)
3. By sharing in the campaign funds of the capitalist parties and receiving subsidies from individual candidates.
4. By uniting for the capitalist press. (Green, Woll.)
5. By fees for delivering speeches before capitalist and middle class organizations.
6. By income from investments (hotels, banks, coal mines, etc.)
7. By organizing "testimonials" for themselves at which they are presented with sums of money, jewelry or other valuables for their "services." (Fitzpatrick of the Chicago Federation of Labor recently was given \$300 in this manner.)

8. By receiving salaries for serving on committees and various other public and semi-public bodies other than the trade union.

The above by no means exhaust the possibilities for labor officialdom turning a few "honest" pennies but serves to give some idea of their opportunities.

As none of them ever go back to work at their trade we are justified in believing these opportunities are not neglected.

The needle trades unions, begin-

ning as unions of sweated workers, have rapidly developed an aristocracy which differs little, except in social-democratic cleverness, from the typical A. F. of L. bureaucracy.

There has also developed in other unions of Jewish workers an aristocracy which shares its plunder in some small degree at least with the socialist party leadership.

With their economic status far superior to that of the masses of workers, the elements listed above, with the aid of the bosses and the govern-

ment, make war upon the section of the membership which insists that union officials should belong to the working class.

It must not be thought that these elements do not have some mass support. They do. It consists of workers who, for one reason or another, enjoy better wages and working conditions than the majority of the working class, who are more backward politically for historical reasons than the rest of the union membership.

### Lenin's Views on Official Corruption.

SAID Lenin:

This upper strata of workers or "workers' aristocracy," which is wholly petty bourgeois with regard to their manner of living and the size of their earnings, as well as in regard to their entire world viewpoint, constitutes one of the main props of the Second International, and at present the main peace-time SOCIAL PROP FOR THE BOURGEOISIE. For the truest AGENTS OF THE BOURGEOISIE IN THE LABOR MOVEMENT are the labor lieutenants of the capitalist class, who are the truest apostles of re-

formism and chauvinism. (Emphasis in translation.)

We have here the explanation for the united front of socialist bureaucracy and trade union officialdom. They live the same way, they are joint participants in the distribution of the enormous surplus which American imperialism accumulates from all quarters of the globe, and their task is to crush out all tendencies towards militant struggle for economic demands and development of mass political consciousness as workers and trade unionists.

### Proof of Guilt from Official Statements.

FROM our survey of the forces organized against the left wing, their public statements, the statements of the capitalist press in support of the right wing, the twin-like character of the capitalist program for the unions and the program of officialdom-worker-employer co-opera-

tion, the joint demand of labor officialdom and capitalist spokesmen for definite increase in production in return for slight wage increases, the assertions of both trade union officialdom and socialist party leaders that the unions are and must remain only economic organizations, from the fact

that the attack on the left wing centers now in unions which have fought and won strikes after rejecting the worker-employer co-operation policy, from the extension of the fight into all broad mass movements of a militant working class character we can say that the premises laid down in the introduction to these articles have been proven. They have been proven by the statements of labor officialdom, capitalist apologists, socialist party leaders and government officials.

Against the offensive of the united front of reaction the Communists and left wing represent the interests of

the masses of the workers and fight for the right to strike, the right to free expression of political opinions in the unions, the right of the rank and file to make decisions without intimidation from gangsters in the pay of the official machine.

It is not for "the preservation of the trade unions" that officialdom is contending, but for trade unionism in name only—a lifeless, impotent organization managed in the interests of the bosses and resembling trade unionism only in that it supports an officialdom which talks of trade unionism—with its tongue in its fat jowl.

### Goal and Methods of Left Wing.

THE left wing is fighting to make the unions instruments and weapons of the whole working class, to amalgamate them into powerful industrial unions, to bring ALL the workers into the trade unions, to build a labor party based on the trade unions as the mass political expression of the workers.

This fight it will win by raising those issues which are of the most immediate importance to the masses, concentrating all efforts on winning these elementary struggles, exposing the true role of the present labor leadership, organizing, teaching, fighting the battles of the workers, extending the struggle to the whole labor movement and spreading it by determination and activity to the ranks of the unorganized, drawing into the struggle every available force against the agents of capitalism in the labor movement.

As for the Communist Party, its interests, as a revolutionary party,

are the same as those of the American working class. The Communists want no better guarantee of the success of the social revolution in America than a powerful trade union movement, honestly and capably led, steeled and skilled in fighting American imperialism.

As the gap between the masses of exploited workers and labor officialdom widens by reason of the open reaction of the latter, the left wing, still small and weak in numbers but mighty with potential power, will tend more and more to become THE labor movement.

The millions of workers in America whose wages have not increased in two years, who toil long hours for low wages and to whom labor officialdom pays no attention except to sabotage their struggles, are a guarantee that the left wing program will become the program of the American masses.

The Communist Position.

FAR from wishing to "destroy the trade unions" as the right wing claims, the Communist position is exactly the reverse. In the instructions given to all Communist parties by the enlarged session of the Executive of the Communist International held February-March, 1926, it is stated clearly:

New forms of mass organizations like Soviets, only become feasible just at the beginning of the revolution. **TO FOSTER THE BELIEF THAT COMMUNISTS WILL BE ABLE, UNDER THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM, TO DEVISE MASS ORGANIZATIONS OTHER THAN TRADE UNIONS IS TO ABANDON THE REALMS OF REALITY.** (International Press Correspondence, Vol. 5, No. 47, Page 617—Under heading "Bolshevization and Work in the Trade Unions.")

As to the charge that Communists systematically, or accidentally, minimize the importance of wage and hour struggles, that they care only for "creating discontent" and nothing about the immediate interests of workers in the shape of improvements in their working conditions and living standards, the same resolution quoted above says:

To enable Communists **TO TAKE UP A CORRECT ATTITUDE** in all movements which bring the workers into conflict with capitalism, **COMMUNIST PARTIES MUST MAKE A CAREFUL EXAMINATION OF ALL THE FACTORS OF THE CONCRETE CONDITIONS** of all such struggles: the nature of the business of the factory or factory groups, the bulk

and genuineness of the orders places, the connection and mutual interrelation of the various factories, syndicates and trusts, the organized strength and capacity for resistance of the employers and also the strength of the trade union organizations and the readiness for struggle of both organized and unorganized workers, the possibility of the strike spreading and its political consequences.

Why does the Communist International insist on the Communist parties securing this exact information and develop the greatest possible ability for all situations—great or small?

The answer is obvious. The Communist parties want the workers to WIN. It goes without saying that if Communists cannot show workers their class how to win strikes, or how to better their conditions without a strike at times, then it is very unlikely that the working class will follow the lead of the Communists in a revolutionary struggle against capitalism and the capitalist state.

Communist parties have to prove their capability as well as their honesty and devotion to the cause of the working class if, as the above resolution concludes, Communists are "to be in a position to give exact directions and to ensure that they take the lead in all proletarian encounters with capitalism."

Defeats of workers by the capitalists are, because the Communists are part of the working class, just as bad for them as they are for the workers who do not belong to the party. The Communists want **EVERY STRUGGLE OF THE WORKERS TO END IN VICTORY.**