

h

90

# RED BAITING:

ENEMY OF LABOR

by LOUIS BUDENZ

★ WITH A LETTER  
to HOMER MARTIN  
by EARL BROWDER

## A LETTER TO HOMER MARTIN

BY EARL BROWDER

Mr. Homer Martin, President,  
United Automobile Workers of America,  
Detroit, Mich.

Dear Brother Martin:

On August 31, I sent you the following telegram:

"May I ask you to deny or confirm statement of Milwaukee Journal today that you spoke of Communists as quote destructionists in the U.A.W. unquote and you asked quote what were Earl Browder and Clarence Hathaway doing in Milwaukee at the time the convention was in session unquote. Knowing unprincipled character of Milwaukee Journal and its desire to stir up strife among auto workers and their friends I am anxious to be able to denounce this particular example. I am awaiting your telegraphic answer before making any public statement."

Up to date I have received no answer. I must therefore conclude that the press did not misquote you, but that, on the contrary, you must have been misinformed by persons interested in creating artificial controversy. It is clear that the only camp interested in creating such controversies is that which launched the "Red scare" in the national elections, and those who move toward joining them. I am therefore writing this letter to you to place squarely on the record the truth about the Communist

attitude to trade union questions, that you may have no reason to be influenced by rumors circulated by trouble-makers.

First, let me state that whoever informed you that either I or Clarence Hathaway were "secretly" in Milwaukee during the Auto Convention is a liar. If I had been in or near Milwaukee I would not have kept it a secret, but would have publicly visited your Convention because of my interest in it, which I share with all intelligent people. The Communist Party has no secret aim or policies; it has not the slightest desire to control the Auto Union or any other; the Communists are opposed to unauthorized strikes, and are for a disciplined union in every case, based upon trade union democracy. The Party demands of all its members that their every word and act shall be directed toward unity of all constructive forces of the trade unions. There is absolutely no foundation for any antagonism between a progressive trade unionist and a Communist trade unionist.

I can only conclude, therefore, that your statements against the Communists are based upon a confusion of our Party members with certain irresponsible groups which play with the name of Communism for their own ends. I have in mind in particular Mr. Jay Lovestone and his group, who for many years have specialized in fighting against the Communist Party by misuse of its name. Mr. Lovestone and his group have long been exposed as unprincipled adventurers, intriguers and wreckers, in many ways related to the Trotskyists. Undoubtedly you have been the victim of their claim to be Communists, and therefore denounce the real Communists. It is absolutely true that they are dangerous,

*acc. # in next page.*

disruptive elements, but it is absolutely untrue that they are Communists. We of the Communist Party will be glad to cooperate with all responsible trade union leaders to protect their organization from the conspiracies of the Lovestone and Trotsky groups.

With very best wishes for unity, strength and success of the U.A.W.U., as an organic part of the glorious C.I.O. movement, I am

Fraternally yours,

EARL BROWDER

General Secretary  
Communist Party, U.S.A.

# RED-BAITING: Enemy of Labor

BY LOUIS BUDENZ

*Leon Kravits 2.50 Eco 1*

**I**N THE county fairs of the days that have passed, there was an old skin game which reaped shekels for charlatan. It still goes on and the Tory charlatans of the present day make overtime use of it. And reactionary labor leaders—William Green, "Colonel" John P. Frey and the anti-Semitic Arthur Wharton, as examples—pipe up with the same tune, to hide their strikebreaking and splitting policies.

In his Labor Day speech at Dallas, William Green trotted out this stuff by the wholesale, in his mud-throwing at the Committee for Industrial Organization.

The old county fair game works very simply: Just raise an outcry about some alleged wonder or some alleged danger in the distance, and while the startled citizenry look in that direction, calmly pick their pockets.

That is the great skin game attempted now, only in a new form. "The Reds are menacing the country and the labor movement. Look out for them," cried the Liberty League in the 1936 election, while it sought to slip over its Hearst-born presidential ticket.

JUL 7 1953

671103

The pro-fascists did not win that time. They did not fool the American people on November 3. But they are "at it" once more, on the theory that "if you don't succeed at first, try, try again."

Eugene T. Weir of Weirton, who wrote the anti-union plank in the Republican-Liberty League platform, is "at it." To hide his foul oppression of the steel workers and his hatchet gangs, he has distributed in a condensed form the fantastic lies of the pamphlet "Join the C.I.O. and Build a Soviet America."

A sample of the character of this pamphlet is seen in its statements that grown men and Communist leaders in Moscow sat down and solemnly decided to change the name of Detroit to "Lewistown."

This nincompoopery is of a kind with the other degenerate forgeries of history, such as the "Protocols of Zion" against the Jews and the fantastic stories against American Negroes and American Catholics concocted by the Ku Klux Klan.

It is quite surprising to see this tissue of falsehoods reprinted in full, however, in the official organ of the Chicago Federation of Labor on Labor Day. This is an indication of how far a destructive policy can carry men of the type of President John Fitzpatrick of that federation. Formerly he was proud of his association in the campaign for industrial unionism with William Z. Foster, National Chairman of the Communist Party. Today he opposes organization of the unorganized through industrial unionism—and in the course of such a reactionary career countenances such open shop stuff as this degenerate pamphlet.

It is not particularly surprising that William Green

should use his Labor Day platform at Dallas to raise the ghost of the Red scare, against the C.I.O. Green's stand against industrial unionism for the mass production industries has been shown to be destructive and defeatist. The C.I.O. has proven in life, during this year 1937, that the unorganized can be organized in the giant trustified industries on that basis. What greater demonstration of that was there than the mammoth convention of the United Automobile Workers, which now proudly points to an enrollment of 400,000 union members in its ranks?

For his dog-in-the-manger sabotage against the great C.I.O. drives, Green has been branded a traitor by the C.I.O., these 400,000 auto workers and every American progressive. He has not a leg to stand on, in defense of the Executive Council's splitting policies. Hence his resort to the cry of "Red."

A great portion of his Dallas speech was devoted to this theme. Shrilly, he charged that the C.I.O. had been endorsed by the Communist Party and had employed Communist organizers in its campaigns.

### **The Communists and the C.I.O.**

Let us ask bluntly, right in the beginning: "What is wrong with that, anyway? What is so shocking about an endorsement of the C.I.O. by the Communist Party and its leader, Earl Browder?"

It was the Communist Party which raised the banner of "organize the unorganized" at the time when William Green and his ilk were saying that "it can't be done." It was the Communist Party which participated in the struggle against the vicious use of the injunction, when William Green and his colleagues were submitting to injunction

rule. It was the Communist Party which urged industrial unionism for the mass production industries and those other steps which are now winning for the workers, when William Green and his allies remained deaf, dumb and blind on such issues.

It was the Communist Party which stood for unity of Negro and white workers and for unity of foreign-born and native, at the time when Green was O.K.-ing by his silence the discrimination against Negroes and the foreign-born in certain A. F. of L. unions. It is the adoption of this principle of unity of all workers which has brought successes to the C.I.O. in the year 1937.

It was the Communist Party which first brought forward vigorously the urgent necessity for social security legislation, particularly unemployment insurance.

Then, reactionary A. F. of L. leaders dubbed such legislation "Communistic" and "alien to America," and the Executive Council issued statement after statement against it.

It is the Communist Party which today not only endorses the C.I.O.'s program for the organization of the unorganized—which is organizing these unorganized—but likewise calls for trade union unity on the basis of industrial unionism for the mass production industries. What is wrong with that? What is wrong with the effort to build a powerful, united labor movement that can meet the attack of the trusts and their vigilantes?

It is the Communist Party, also, which has pointed to the need for an alliance of the workers with the farmers, small business men and other middle class groups—for the benefit of those groups and for the winning of them away from the side of reaction. Is not that to the decided

advantage of the labor unions and of all the common people?

The Communist Party, in these and many other ways, has stood and now stands for the advance of the American labor movement. Its members are among the ablest and most devoted of trade unionists. Is it not time that the American workers grow sick and tired of this chant of "Red, Red" by men like Green who are using this cry for the purpose of concealing their anti-labor policies?

### **The C.I.O. Is Not "Red"**

The Committee for Industrial Organization is not a Communist organization. All of Green's efforts to label it as such—following the lead of Weir of Weirton and the other enemies of labor—will fall to the ground. That is said by way of fact, and not of apology.

The Communist Party stands for socialism. It points out that the experiences of the workers will show them that the machine system cannot be run under capitalist control. Capitalism, in its effort to pile up more and more profits, brings on an inevitable crash or inevitable world war. It dooms millions of people to periodical unemployment in the midst of the machinery and resources to meet the needs of all. That sort of a system cannot last, any more than feudalism could last as against capitalism. It is by ending the ownership of the means of production and distribution by the trusts and the Tories—and making it the common property of the people—that the evil power of the trusts and Tories will be irrevocably destroyed.

The Committee for Industrial Organization does not stand for socialism. It is a trade union movement, which of its very nature at this hour includes American workers

of all races, creeds, colors, national origins and political beliefs. The great bulk of its membership has not yet come to accept socialism as their goal. Its leader, John L. Lewis, does not stand for socialism. The Communist Party understands that. And so does William Green.

The C.I.O.'s record speaks for itself. In one year, it has organized more workers than William Green's policies have organized in fifty years. It has done this because it has insisted on industrial unionism for the mass production industries. For years the Communist Party has urged such industrial unionism, for the advance of the workers. The Communist Party has supported the C.I.O. because the C.I.O. has benefited the workers. If that is a crime, then William Green can make the most of it.

But despite these facts, what does Green proceed to say? Here are his words at Dallas: "We [of the reactionary American Federation of Labor leadership] stand now as we have always stood, as a barrier to any advance which the Communists may seek to make within the ranks of labor. We combat this destructive force in the front line trenches of our social order."

### **The Communists in the Unions**

Well, let us look at these words. What truth is there in them? Is Communism a "destructive force" within the unions? Or, is it not in reality a constructive force?

Look at the International Fur Workers Union; what has Communist leadership meant for it? Organization of the unorganized, end of the kick-back evil, extension of the union to a control of the industry which it never had before, a united front of constructive forces in the union.

Look at New York District 9 of the Brotherhood of Painters, Paperhangers and Decorators of New York. What has Communist leadership, working in a united front, spelt for that large organization? A death blow to racketeering, about which William Green was silent all during the time that this racketeering exercised its vicious gangster control over the district council. Extension of the union through organization of the unorganized, such as has not taken place before in that organization. Victory, now, in the general strike—a sensation the painters had not enjoyed for years until Communist leadership assumed a position of responsibility in the union.

In large districts of the Hotel and Restaurant Workers Union Communist leadership has made a similar contribution. In the automobile, steel, marine and countless other industries, Communist leaders have served to build the unions and to advance the welfare of the workers.

We could call the roll for a long time on the unions which have grown through Communist participation or Communist leadership. It is quite clear, however, that any leadership which in reality organizes the unorganized and wins victories against the trusts is dubbed "Communist," both by the trusts and by reactionary labor leaders. It is also quite clear that where Communists are participating in union activities or in union leadership, they lend a strong and effective force to the advancement of the union.

### **The Case of Homer Martin**

Unfortunately, President Homer Martin of the United Automobile Workers has begun to echo the Red-baiting nonsense of the open-shoppers and William Green. Since

the great convention of the auto workers at Milwaukee he has made three public statements against the Communists, in one of which he has declared that he will bar members of the Communist Party from position of organizers in the union.

This threatened creation of a second-rate citizenship in the unions smacks so much of fascist ideas that it is almost incredible that a representative leader of a C.I.O. union could be guilty of such utterances. To follow such a policy is contrary to the entire spirit and action of the Milwaukee convention. To do so, under pressure from big employing interests, would lead to dry-rot in the C.I.O. unions such as has debilitated many unions in the A. F. of L.

If the "Reds"—after their remarkable work in that organization of the auto workers—are to be penalized for membership in the Communist Party, under employers' pressure, then threats against "liberals" and all militants will follow in quick order. Martin himself has been branded a "Red" by Bishop Manning of the New York Episcopal diocese. He cannot meet such attacks by panicky moves against the Communists.

President David Dubinsky, of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, correctly said at Milwaukee that Communists should be welcomed into the life and activities of the unions—"in order to encourage initiative and activity within the union."

A program of Red-baiting is anti-union and anti-labor. It has been recognized in other countries as the hallmark of fascism. It was spawned in America by the pro-fascist forces, led by Hearst and the Liberty League. Its objective is the splitting and emasculation of the labor move-

ment. Where it raises its head among the labor leadership it is the certain mark of the beginning of a dry-rot that leads to the weakening of the union and pays into the hands of the open-shoppers.

There is plenty of healthy sentiment against Red-baiting in the American labor movement and among American labor leaders.

The rank-and-file workers and the progressive leaders know that any assault upon the "Reds" is merely the prelude for a general onslaught upon the entire labor movement.

Many of them also recognize that the Communists have devoted themselves untiringly to the building of the movement and to the preservation of its unity.

They appreciate that Red-baiting is the particular tactic of fascists, here and abroad. They understand that this Red-baiting is concocted by big business, and when it is uttered by reactionary labor leaders that these men are merely acting as phonograph records for big business.

We are pleased to be able to point to such understanding on the part of the leadership of a large union in the American Federation of Labor. It is the International Typographical Union.

In the current issue of its monthly organ, the secretary-treasurer of the I.T.U., Woodruff Randolph, raps the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. for opposing organization of the unorganized in the mass production industries. Then he adds:

"The Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor is fast making itself ridiculous as an active aid to the enemy [of labor] by using the common tactics of anti-union employers in Red-baiting."

That estimate is a correct and healthy one. It says, in so many words, that Red-baiting is the enemy of trade unionism. We can add that it is a device set up to strangle and destroy the union movement, and is properly the property only of stoolpigeons and vigilantes.

This estimate of the secretary-treasurer of the I.T.U. is likewise the view of outstanding C.I.O. leaders. We have referred to the statements of President David Dubinsky of the I.L.G.W.U. at the Milwaukee convention of the United Automobile Workers Union.

You will also recall that at Johnstown, Pa., in an unhappy moment of fear for his political future, Governor Earle of Pennsylvania assailed the "damned Communists" and advised that they be driven out of the C.I.O. ranks. It was then that Philip Murray, chairman of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee, declared emphatically that there was no political passport required for membership in the C.I.O. unions.

Van A. Bittner, Chicago regional director of the S.W. O.C., has been credited with similar statements on several occasions. And Allan Haywood, New York regional director of the C.I.O., was emphatic in his attack on Red-baiting when speaking before the recent convention of the United Rubber Workers at Akron.

Chairman John L. Lewis of the C.I.O. has reiterated over and over again that the C.I.O. unions are open to all workers in a given industry regardless of their political opinions or other characteristics.

It is upon such a foundation only that dynamic and effective unionism can be built and extended. It is upon that foundation that the future of the C.I.O. depends.

Those labor leaders who, because of fear or because

of employers' pressure, may be tempted into Red-baiting had better scan the New York City primary returns to see how the common people feel on this matter. The gigantic wave of popular indignation which washed Royal S. Copeland, Hearst's quack, overboard in both Republican and Democratic primaries, tells its own story.

That is why we say that it is unfortunate that Homer Martin, president of the United Automobile Workers Union, has been betrayed into Red-baiting declarations to the public press. The union of which Martin is president has a membership of 400,000. It has become a powerful organization, and its future is of concern to all American working people.

### "On to Ford's!"

What will be the contribution of Martin to that future, if he carries his words over into deeds or if he persists in repeating his anti-Red declarations?

"On to Ford's!" is the great battlecry of the auto workers. It rang out over and over again in the Milwaukee convention. The successful storming of this citadel of the open shop in the auto industry will make more certain that great objective of the union—a national agreement in the industry.

Every ounce of energy on the part of the union is called for in this drive for the organization of the Ford Motors plants. To bring this energy into action, there is one great prerequisite—the unity of the United Auto Workers International Union.

It is to this unity that the Communists have dedicated themselves. In the Milwaukee convention they strove for "unity of all constructive forces." Their contribution to



the happy outcome of that convention cannot be over-estimated. The restraint and good counsel which they used to bring about such an outcome, while winning their contentions for democracy within the union, played an outstanding part in making the United Automobile Workers emerge from that convention stronger than on the opening day.

Further than that, let us ask quite frankly: "Who are those workers who are among the most outstanding in support of the union campaign at Ford's?" Are they not the Communists? Of course they are!

Who stood with the progressive workers in the front line trenches of Flint, Cleveland, and in the other auto centers when the battle for unionization was on there? The Communists, in instance after instance.

That solid front imperative to the conquering of Henry Ford will not be achieved by reflections in public against a section of the most militant workers, who have given their energies and blood for the building of the auto union. Nor can favor be curried with the General Motors Corporation, in its whining about unauthorized strikes, by throwing overboard the "Reds" as food for these big business sharks.

The Communist Party sets its face like flint against unauthorized strikes, as Earl Browder stated quite definitely in his recent letter to President Martin. That is not a new declaration. The Communist Party made its viewpoint clear on tactics of this character in its national convention in 1936.

Communists understand full well that such unauthorized strikes injure the democratic discipline of the union—and oppose such infractions of such discipline not only

because they hamper the present health of the union but also because they interfere with the building of an organized working class movement which later can proceed to the winning of socialism.

Some such considerations have apparently begun to suggest themselves to Martin. In his public letter to all local unions of the A. F. of L. in Detroit, Martin has condemned Frank X. Martel for his assertion that the "Communist element in the auto workers has seized control of their political activities."

In that connection Martin says: "The Red scare doesn't fool intelligent workers any more."

In the Detroit elections, in support of the labor ticket, Martin appreciates that "the Red scare" is the enemy of unity and success. In the union battlefield, the Red scare and Red-baiting are equally harmful. They tend to weaken the union. They tend to rob the organization of that militant and progressive character which goes with the letters "C.I.O."

Homer Martin can appreciate this, we believe, when he understands that applause for his anti-Communist utterances come from The New Leader, Old Guard Socialist organ. It is this publication which has devoted much time and attention in attempting to undermine the C.I.O. and to aid the Greens and Wolls and Hutchesons. For the advancement of those objectives to which he is pledged, Martin cannot take his place beside William Green, as The New Leader would have him do.

### **Unionism and Communism**

"That is all very good," some one may say. "We know that Red-baiting injures trade unionism. We know

that Communists, who are among the most active and devoted members of unions, cannot be denied full rights in such unions, any more than any other worker can. We know that such a course would be committing hari-kari for unionism. But is not trade unionism in reality opposed to Communism? Are not the objectives of trade unionism and Communism so different that there is a contradiction there?"

To that we answer unqualifiedly: "No."

We appreciate that John L. Lewis, chairman of the C.I.O., pressed by the reactionary barrage against the C.I.O. as "Red," said the following in his radio speech on the Friday before Labor Day:

"Unionization, as opposed to Communism, presupposes the relation of employment; it is based upon the wage system and it recognizes fully and unreservedly the institution of private property and the right to investment profit. . . . The organized workers of America, free in their industrial life, conscious partners in production, secure in their homes, and enjoying a decent standard of living, will prove the finest bulwark against the intrusion of alien doctrines of government."

This was not a Red-baiting statement—even though the allegedly liberal New York Post hit upon it immediately to advise Lewis to throw out of office all Communists in C.I.O. unions. Please note that fact carefully. For it was this same New York Post a few weeks before which—struck with fear at the howls of the Girdlers and their ilk—came out for the Liberty League program of regulation and incorporation of labor unions. So in this instance, likewise, when the cry of "Red" rose to a shrill pitch from the open-shop camp, the Post was willing and ready to doublecross the C.I.O. into violation of trade union democ-

racy to save that paper's own "liberal" hide.

What Lewis said was not Red-baiting, but it was the expression of John L. Lewis' opinion that unionism and Communism are contradictory in their aims. It proved, above all, that John L. Lewis is not a "Red" or thinking as yet in terms of socialism.

Let us look at Lewis' words and see how they measure up with the experiences of the workers and with life as it is today. If trade unionism alone, operating within the capitalist system, could permanently win "security in their homes," "decent standards of living" and "freedom in industrial life for the workers," then Communism would be unnecessary. But these objectives—of trade unionism and Communism alike—can never be won completely or held for any length of time under the capitalist regime.

Right at this moment, capitalism is moving more or less rapidly toward either crash or war. The very system of "private property"—which today means the preservation and extension of the "private property" of the trusts, based on the crudest robbery of the people—brings on this debacle, from capitalism's constant thirst for profits and more profits.

Right at this moment the trusts and Tories are meeting the great C.I.O. advance by the formation of widespread vigilante movements and by the sabotage of all progressive legislation. To halt this assault on their democratic rights, will not the trade unions have to do more than rely on their own strength on the industrial field? They will be obliged to rally the farmers and the small businessmen in a political alliance to stop the Morgans, Rockefellers and Fords.

In such a battle for democracy and security of their

homes, what will the trade unionists find? That they will not be able to prevent the constant warfare upon them from the trusts and Tories until they have taken away the stolen economic power of these trusts and Tories and made it the national property. That can be achieved only through socialism, which is the highest democracy because it is based on the democratic ownership of those giant means of production and distribution which make for power.

We Americans pride ourselves correctly on our aim of "government of the people, for the people, and by the people." But that sort of government cannot be won completely or held permanently while in its midst there exists the power in the hands of a few autocratic men to sear the nation with panic, to bring on recurring periods of depression (which they inevitably do in their greed for profits), and to plunge us into war.

To win that sort of government, it will be found necessary to establish "ownership and conduct of industry and finance of the people, for the people and by the people." That is socialism, the aim of the Communist movement. That, also, the trade unions will find is the aim which they must adopt—since it is the only road to "security of homes," "a decent standard of living" and "freedom in industry."

It is the only way, further, in which the trade unionists will become "partners in production"—not with the capitalists but with all the common people in the ownership and control of the steel plants, automobile factories and the entire national plant.

John L. Lewis has seen something of this in his address to the Milwaukee convention of the United Automobile

Workers. What did he say there? That if the best that the capitalists and their statesmen have to offer is constant periods of cyclical depression—bringing misery to millions of Americans—then labor would organize to stop such policies and panics.

When labor does that, it will find that these crashes and slumps and panics cannot be stopped permanently until the causes of them are stopped—the constant draining of the national income into the pockets of the few finance capitalists who have a monopoly grip on the springs of American life.

The trade unions have a mighty job to do. They are now called on to engage in collective bargaining, and in the winning of higher wages and better conditions for the workers. Thus, they give the working people that strength which can enable them to go forward against all obstacles.

In doing this, the unions will find that they must protect their democratic rights through wide political action and wide political alliances with other sections of the common people. In the protection of their democratic rights, they will find that they cannot succeed in full until socialism is established.

Even under socialism, their task has not ended. Indeed, in many ways it has just begun. Then, they have the huge job of participating in the democratic conduct of the factories, the national plant and the nation itself.

What country is more ready for this socialism, insofar as national plant is concerned, than our United States? Is it not a crime that this great wealth of our country and these great resources are constantly tied up—and their

benefits denied the people—through the interference of the profit system?

The trade unions will come to learn, out of their battles, that the advice of Karl Marx to them is good:

"Instead of the conservative motto: 'A fair day's wages for a fair day's work,' the unions ought to inscribe on their banner the revolutionary watchword: 'Abolition of the wages system.'"

Where will you find a more convincing championship of the value of the trade unions than in Marx's "Value, Price and Profit,"\* the address made by him to the First International in 1865? Where will you find in compact form, at the same time, a more devastating proof of the urgency of socialism to win irrevocably all those things to which trade unionism is dedicated?

There is a reason for that. It is that the objectives of trade unionism and Communism must be the same—that trade unionism, to win and hold those things it stands for, must come to embrace the Communist viewpoint of how they can be attained for good.

The majority of trade unionists at this moment do not accept this view. John L. Lewis does not accept it. The Communists understand that. But Communists are certain that the trade unionists will come to accept this view out of their experiences.

That is why the "Communist Manifesto" declared in 1848:

"The Communists fight for the attainment of the immediate aims, for the enforcement of the momentary interests of the working class; but in the movement of the present they also represent and take care of the future of that movement."

\* Karl Marx, "Value, Price and Profit," International Publishers, New York. 15 cents.

## In the Front Line

That is why the Communists place themselves in the front line trenches of the fight for trade unionism and democracy, along with other progressive trade unionists.

That is why the Communists strive so zealously to build the unions and to preserve their unity from disruption.

That is why the Communists urge the unions so ceaselessly to ally themselves politically in a great Farmer-Labor political movement, that can halt the economic royalists and fascism.

That is why the Communists, fighting shoulder to shoulder with progressive workers for the strengthening of the unions, will constantly call to the attention of these progressives the need for socialism to win the fullest democracy and security.

That is why Communism is not opposed to trade unionism, but is the great force which can aid and strengthen the trade union movement.

That is why Communism is no more "alien" to America than is the Declaration of Independence or the Emancipation Proclamation. Because it points the way to the fullest security and democracy in our United States, it is indeed twentieth-century Americanism.

That is why—beyond all other considerations—Red-baiting is the mark of the enemies of the labor movement and is the tactic used most consistently by those who wish to wreck the trade unions.

That is why the Communists can so wholeheartedly and vigorously participate in the immediate struggles of all the workers, meanwhile emphasizing what lies ahead and those things with which other workers may not yet agree.

# In Step With Labor

JUST as the triumphal march of the C.I.O. required leadership and a proper knowledge of conditions and tactics . . . so does the labor movement require a day-to-day report of events, presented honestly and interpreted forcefully.

Only the Daily and Sunday Worker give you the really important news of the day . . . the kind of news considered "too hot" by ordinary newspapers. In its 14 years of existence, the Daily Worker has been America's outstanding fighter for the rights and aims of labor.

Read the Daily and Sunday Worker—and keep in step with labor!

## DAILY AND SUNDAY WORKER

### Mail This Coupon

DAILY AND SUNDAY WORKER  
50 East 13th Street  
New York, N. Y.

Please send me the Daily and Sunday Worker for six weeks, as per your special offer. I enclose \$1.

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... State .....

### Special Offer!

By using this special coupon, you can secure a six-weeks' subscription to the Daily and Sunday Worker for only \$1. This offer is for a limited period only, and does not apply to Manhattan and the Bronx, where the paper is for sale on the newsstands.

Published by Workers Library Publishers, Inc.

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York

October, 1937

