

709

001246

WILLIAM WEINSTONE

FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

SOCIALIST - LABOR
COLLECTION

The **Case**

against

DAVID

DUBINSKY

THE CASE AGAINST DAVID DUBINSKY - WILLIAM WEINSTONE

635

New Century Publishers 47635

THE CASE AGAINST DAVID DUBINSKY

by WILLIAM WEINSTONE

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS: *New York*

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

William Weinstone, the author of this booklet, grew up in the concentrated needle trades community of Brownsville, in Brooklyn, New York, where a profound socialist consciousness and militant tradition of working class struggle had already developed among the cloak-makers and dressmakers who were his friends and neighbors in the years preceding the outbreak of the first World War. It was there that his own socialist inspiration and education began. In the years following World War I he actively helped their struggles and spoke at their strike meetings, particularly in the 1920's

It was with this background that the author first joined the Socialist Party in 1916 and later became one of the founders and charter members of the Communist Party in the United States. His activities as a Communist organizer in New York, New Jersey and Michigan, brought him in close contact with trade union workers in many other industries—furriers, textile workers, auto workers. He aided in the drive to organize the unorganized auto workers and participated in the militant strike struggles in Detroit in the years between 1934 and 1937, which led to the founding of the United Auto Workers Union, C.I.O., now one million strong. His account of these struggles and their lessons is incorporated in a pamphlet, *The Great Sit-Down Strike*.

In recent years, William Weinstone has been engaged mainly in educational activities. Formerly Director of the Workers School, in New York, he is at present New York State Educational Director of the Communist Party.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	5
I. RETURN TO REACTION	7
II. THE NEW DRIVE AGAINST THE LABOR MOVEMENT	12
III. ORGANIZE THE UNORGANIZED OR LOSE OUT	23
IV. DUBINSKY AND DISUNITY	31
V. INDEPENDENT POLITICAL ACTION— FOR WHOM?	42
VI. MACHINE RULE	54
VII. WAR AGAINST FASCISM—ON WHICH SIDE WAS DUBINSKY?	67
VIII. WORLD LABOR UNITY	80
IX. MONEY-BAGS FOR DISRUPTION	89
X. THE TRUE FACE OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRA- CY	97
XI. COMMUNISTS IN THE I.L.G.W.U	108

To
JOSEPH BORUCHOWITZ
(September 26, 1890 — April 24, 1943)

COMMUNIST
RANK-AND-FILE I.L.G.W.U. LEADER
SELFLESS FIGHTER FOR SOCIALISM
WHO DIED AT HIS POST
HOLDING HIGH THE BANNER OF
MILITANT DEMOCRATIC UNIONISM
AND UNFLINCHING STRUGGLE AGAINST FASCISM

PREFACE

Everyone familiar with the labor movement knows that David Dubinsky and the Social-Democratic group of labor officials which he leads, have a long record of promoting disunity. Not every one, however, realizes the full extent of the harm they do. Dubinsky is not only head of a big and important union, disposing of a large treasury; he has built and controls a web of other influential Social-Democratic organizations. In addition, he is now a member of the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. Through these positions, he and his group pursue a concerted and systematic policy, the menace of which is heightened today because of the role of American imperialism in world affairs.

It is a noteworthy fact that Wall Street imperialism finds it useful and necessary to build up such types of Social-Democratic labor leaders and to extend their influence for its own reactionary purposes. They find such leaders especially useful because as Social-Democrats, the Dubinsky groups pose as progressives—as opponents of capitalism and as belonging to the radical section of labor. Actually they are opposed to all progressive currents and act as a brake and stumbling block to labor's development. They are, in fact, masked reactionaries who perform their disruptive role in their own distinctive way.

The purpose of this pamphlet is to enable labor to see behind the mask and detect the real face of this Social-Democratic group and the harm they do. In particular it is hoped that it will enable the members of Dubinsky's own union to see how far he has led them away from the progressive past—a past which he now dishonors. If it

helps the I.L.G.W.U. members to combat and curb his dangerous activities the pamphlet will have served a useful end.

As this pamphlet goes to press, President Truman has emerged in his true light as No. 1 strikebreaker. This only confirms what has been written in the body of the pamphlet. The name of Truman is becoming a symbol of infamy to labor. This is not only a warning of the dangerous road ahead, it points up the primary lesson of this pamphlet—that labor cannot afford to allow the Dubinskys, Lewises and Wolls to split its ranks without paying a terrible price.

WILLIAM WEINSTONE.

Acknowledgement is made to the many friends and associates whose invaluable assistance made this volume possible, especially Rose Wortis, veteran trade union leader, long active in the needle trades; Paul Juditch, Labor Editor of the Morning Freiheit; and George Morris, Labor Editor of the Daily Worker; and, not the least, my wife, for her generous and unsparing efforts in all stages of its preparation.—W.W.

I. RETURN TO REACTION

The International Ladies Garment Workers Union has always occupied an important place in the labor movement. It was formed under the influence of the ideas of socialism, in a series of militant struggles against bitter exploitation and sweatshop conditions. Its membership has always had a high degree of culture, class consciousness and labor solidarity.

From the start the union has taken a keen interest in world affairs. It carried on political as well as trade union work, initiated and promoted social legislation, and as a result attracted wide and favorable attention and wielded considerable influence in the labor movement. This was particularly true in the earlier years of the organization.

The fact that the union has been concentrated in New York City, where half of its membership is located today, has given it weight in the affairs of the great metropolis.

The union today stands at the peak of its membership, with over 300,000 workers in its ranks. It has spread its organization to new territories and new branches of the women's apparel industry. Its membership has expanded beyond the pioneering groups of Jewish and Italian workers, and embraces large numbers of Spanish-speaking, Negro and native American workers, especially in the smaller communities. With 100,000 members now outside New York, the union has grown to be an international organization in fact as well as in name. Its financial position, according to the leadership, is in the best shape "with millions in the bank."

It would seem, then, that things are booming, and, if

judged by the statements of its leadership, the union is glowing with prosperity. And yet we must ask: how firm is the union position? Is it as strong as the leadership would have us believe?

These questions are pertinent in view of the fact that we have entered a new period for the country and for the union as well. We have just gone through a war marked by the greatest industrial activity and employment. It was also a time of relative peace in industry, with few labor disputes and struggles. Since the end of the war, however, a new offensive has been launched by Big Business against the trade unions.

How prepared is the I.L.G.W.U. for this new situation?

It will be recalled that the I.L.G.W.U. after the first World War had over 100,000 members and was among the strongest unions in the labor movement. But one year after the war its membership and organization began to fall, declining sharply even in the prosperous years of 1923 to 1929, just at the time when there should have been a further increase, and finally hit rock bottom with the dues-paying membership standing at about 20,000 in 1932—almost total collapse.

Collapse After World War I

This catastrophic decline was the result of the false policies of the union, then headed by Morris Sigman. The leadership, which included David Dubinsky, at that time manager of Cutters Local 10 and a Vice-President of the International, was unwilling to carry on a fight against the postwar drive of the manufacturers to worsen conditions and weaken the unions. Instead, it followed the leadership of the A. F. of L. and put forward a program of cooperation with the manufacturers which, in practice, meant capitulation and surrender to wage cutting and

speed-up. The members of the union fought against this policy but they could not alter it since they encountered the most violent attacks from the leadership.

The Sigman-Dubinsky group at the time believed the propaganda of Big Business which promised that expanding production would bring about higher wages and achieve eternal prosperity in the United States. But this policy only helped to produce the worst economic crisis in our history. *Thus the policy of the leadership after the first World War completely bankrupted a growing and expanding union.*

After 1933 the union recovered its position and grew in strength. The American workers ousted the reactionary Hoover and put in Roosevelt. They secured important reforms such as the right to organize. *Thanks to the fighting spirit of the needle workers, kept alive by left-wing groups in the shops right through the worst periods of the depression, the workers did not allow the reforms to remain on paper, but forced the garment manufacturers to carry them out.* Large numbers joined the union again.

Progressive Tide Sweeps Country

The union prospered further from the gigantic wave of strikes and the ground-swell of organization in the mass production industries—in auto, steel, electrical, packing-house and others connected with the establishment of the C.I.O. The I.L.G.W.U. and all labor also profited from the period of the peoples' war and from the aggressive fighting front which was set up in our country to defeat fascism. As a result union membership rose from 2,000,000 in 1932 to 14,000,000 today—an historic turn in the position of the labor movement.

In this period the I.L.G.W.U. leadership, under pressure of the left-wing of the membership, of the progressive

tide that swept the country and the evident bankruptcy of its previous policies, was compelled to adopt new tactics.

It yielded to the ardent desire of the masses for unity. It readmitted—with restrictions—the militant members whom it had driven out of the union. The leadership also took part in the formation of the C.I.O. and in organizing the American Labor Party, and gave support to the Roosevelt fight against the reactionary Liberty League that tried to seize power in 1936-38. These acts obviously stimulated the growth of the union.

But such progressive policies are not in force today. On the contrary, the leadership has for some time deserted these policies and returned to its old reactionary ways. It is not at all strange that this should happen. The Dubinsky group originally went along with the progressive labor swing much against its will. Within the leadership there was bitter opposition to the new tactics. For example, the vote in the General Executive Board on joining the C.I.O. when it was first formed was 12 to 10. It can be said that it was swept along by the advancing labor movement and was obliged to follow or be isolated. The leading group of the union never discarded its reactionary views and policies. Even while going forward, it looked eagerly for ways of turning back.

The Dubinsky group was basically fearful and hostile to the new democratic labor movement that arose with the C.I.O. and, at the first opportunity, began to betray it. This was shown by its withdrawal from the C.I.O. when the latter changed from the Committee into the Congress of Industrial Organizations. It became more evident in 1938 when Dubinsky supported the Munich sell-out to Hitler. In 1939 and 1940, he discarded his progressive cloak and joined with Hearst, Patterson and Big Business reactionaries in a wild outcry for war on the Soviet Union. The retreat was completed by re-affiliation to the A.F.L. In

this period of acute struggle other labor leaders, too, like John L. Lewis, showed their true colors and returned to the reactionary fold. But David Dubinsky led the way.

During the recent war against fascism and since then, Dubinsky has become an active agent for anti-Soviet intrigue and disruption, persistently working to undermine the coalition of democratic states. Moreover, he has allied himself with the ultra-reactionary elements in the labor movement and has joined forces with the political circles of Big Business.

Inside the union Dubinsky has established a virtual dictatorship.

It has been evident for some time that the *Dubinsky leadership is drifting ever farther to the right and is repeating and multiplying the mistaken policies which its reactionary predecessors adopted after the first World War.* Yet this development has remained hidden in part, because of the improved economic conditions due to the war and because of Dubinsky's sly tactics and demagoguery. During the period of the war, also, the harmful policies of Dubinsky have been more evident in the field of politics and world affairs. But such policies are bound to affect the economic conditions as well—to undermine jobs, wages, and working conditions. As we shall see, they are already threatening the hard-won gains of recent years.

II. THE NEW DRIVE AGAINST THE LABOR MOVEMENT

The I.L.G.W.U. today is confronted with several serious problems. In common with all workers, its members seek increased wages to meet the rising cost of living, the assurance of steady employment, and postwar security.

In the pre-war years, seasons were short and yearly earnings were scarcely enough to make ends meet. The average annual earnings of dressmakers in 1939, according to union statistics, for all lines of dresses, was \$1,034, or \$19.88 per week. Wages in the miscellaneous trades were at starvation levels. Cotton garment workers averaged 39 cents an hour; workers on corsets and allied products and outer knitwear workers averaged 46 cents an hour; knit underwear workers received only 41 cents an hour.

During the war, total earnings of garment workers advanced materially, especially for the higher-skilled workers. Although basic rates rose little, workers benefited from the current shortage of labor and simpler styles. They received most of their increased earnings from overtime, speed-up and steadier year-round employment. This was offset in large measure, however, by soaring living costs. Moreover, the terrific speed-up, the longer and harder work, brought an enormous toll of illness, disability and death which increased tremendously in the war years.

Profits of manufacturers, jobbers and contractors, on the other hand, were the highest in the history of the industry. In the years 1939-42, the reported net profits rose about 900 per cent in coats and suits, 800 per cent in dresses, 300 per cent in corsets and girdles, and 300 per cent in silk and rayon underwear.

These profits came not only from war prosperity and

increased output, but also from above-ceiling prices. Manufacturers saved on labor costs, materials, substitution of inferior grades of fabrics, and other business factors. But prices were not correspondingly reduced. Employers were able to evade ceiling prices because of the weak control by O.P.A. of this small-shop industry and the indifference of a union leadership which was aware of violations but did nothing about them. The union leadership, on the contrary, worked in various ways with the employers to increase prices. It is an open secret that the effective resistance of the manufacturers to the production of low-priced garments, insisted upon by the O.P.A., had the support of the union officialdom. This attitude of the union leadership sprang from the rotten theory held by many union officials that higher prices redound to the workers' benefit.

This policy is, of course, not only shortsighted but false. It amounts to collaborating with the manufacturers to fleece the consuming public. It shrinks their pay envelopes, reduces the market and ultimately increases unemployment in the trade. It intensifies the very evils which require remedy in the garment industry and throughout the country bringing little or nothing to the workers while boosting the manufacturers' profits.

What are the conditions of the garment workers today?

What Labor Needs

Work remains relatively steady but unemployment is beginning to increase. While a measure of prosperity will be enjoyed for a short time by the industry because of accumulated consumer demand, unemployment will grow because of over-expansion of the industry during the war and other factors. At the same time the take-home pay envelope is bound to grow thin. The garment workers, like labor generally, need substantial wage increases. They like-

wise need job security, guarantees of longer and fuller employment than in pre-war years—at adequate wages—and the continued strengthening of their union.

But such a program which labor looked forward to with the war's end is being blocked by Big Business. Big Business has other aims. It seeks to undermine the living standards and to weaken the power of organized labor, to reduce the unions' effectiveness by all kinds of crippling security and penalty clauses in contracts and to shackle them with anti-labor laws. This is all part of a program of American capitalist domination. Our industrialists, bloated with war profits, want to try their hand at world imperialist rule. To that end they seek to curb democratic developments in Europe and Asia and undermine the Soviet Union. Fascism and reaction, defeated in the war, have not given up hope of a restoration of power. On the contrary, they are being encouraged by our billionaires. And the Bilbos and Rankins are feverishly spreading their poison and working to bring the reactionaries to full power in the state and national governments.

Fight or Surrender

The labor movement is thus given the choice, either of fighting for its economic and political life or of going under in a new union-busting drive. It has chosen to fight.

The first round of the battle is just closing. In the greatest strike movement in the country's history labor defeated the union busters. It is raising wage levels 15 to 20 percent, increasing them well above the amounts offered by the corporations.

What role has the garment union been playing in this gigantic battle? The leadership of the I.L.G.W.U. has worked *against* the strike movement. It has supported the sabotaging activities of the A. F. of L. leaders and, in addition, carried on undermining work of its own. Dubinsky

backed up the pro-business stand of Lewis and Green at the Labor-Management Conference in November against Philip Murray, who demanded that wage increases be made the central question of discussion. Wages are paramount! But John L. Lewis and the A. F. of L. chieftains rejected this and put forward the view that what the country needs is the abolition of all government restrictions on "free enterprise" and the elimination of all price control—just what the National Association of Manufacturers has been clamoring for.

When the auto, steel and electrical strikes were under way, the Executive Council declared publicly that the wage demands of the C.I.O. were "excessive." It falsely boasted of big gains by A. F. of L. workers without strikes. It sought to discredit the strikes as "Communist-inspired," which was a stab in the back of the striking workers and a clear invitation to the industrialists to use police violence against the C.I.O. picket lines. Dubinsky, as a member of the Council, took part in that act of treachery. Moreover, the I.L.G.W.U. leadership failed to contribute a penny to the millions of steel and electrical strikers. The assistance rendered to the General Motors workers came under strange conditions which we will discuss later.

Truman Strikebreaks

The strikes were met in Congress by a shrill hysteria of the anti-union bloc. President Truman yielded to this outcry and called upon Congress to pass fact-finding, cooling-off legislation. He was denounced by the C.I.O. as strike breaking. Even the A. F. of L. opposed this act. But David Dubinsky, always one to meet reaction at least halfway, went on record approving fact-finding boards while opposing the cooling-off period: "Fact-finding bodies . . . have been used with more or less success in other industries outside the railways," said the resolution of the I.L.G.W.U.

General Executive Board at the time. (*Justice*, Jan. 1, 1946.) The same resolution approved the "good intentions" of the President and found that his only mistake was in not consulting labor. "Had he done so," said an editorial on the subject in *Justice*, December 15, 1945, "he would have found that a proposal for setting up fact-finding bodies unaccompanied by the 30-day waiting period would not have earned such utter opposition from labor as is now being directed against his double-headed plan."

When the anti-union Case Bill was pending in the House of Representatives, the Greater New York C.I.O. issued a call for a two-hour work stoppage in order to prevent its passage. Instead of at that moment fighting reaction, the Dubinsky group counselled a hush-hush policy and, as usual, directed its attacks against the progressives. It announced publicly that it would have nothing to do with such tactics which it regarded as mere "Communist hell-raising." Max Danish, Dubinsky's editor of *Justice*, wrote, in the usual Red-baiting vein, in the *New Leader* of February 8, 1946, that the proposed work stoppage was a "Quill-Curran maneuver to get the Communists into the larger limelight . . ." and that "these political strikes or stoppages . . . belong strictly to the category of tumult-raising and hell-raising." Of course, it is nothing of the kind. It is a form of pressure which labor is being forced to use in order to stop the blitzkrieg attacks of reaction. Failure to use its economic power against the violent destruction of its rights will result in catastrophe. The activities of the Dubinsky group, however, was not without success because the movement against the Case Bill was soon disrupted and this vicious measure was rushed through the House.

But worst of all was the St. Louis agreement, negotiated by Vice-President Meyer Perlstein at the height of the strike movement. This agreement gave the garment workers a small increase in wages, but at the same time granted

the employers the right to negotiate for *wage reductions* when business conditions change. We must ask the garment workers—where, in any union contract, have they seen such concessions to the employers? Labor has always insisted on the right, in contracts, to re-open wage questions in order to keep step with the rising cost of living. Employers have always resisted this, because they wish to pay as little for labor as possible and to make each advance of the workers costly and painful. But here the I.L.G.W.U. leadership has proclaimed a new principle—the right of the employer to *degrade* workers' conditions. The I.L.G.W.U. has often been proud of setting new standards for labor. In this case every member must blush for shame that his union has broken ground for impoverishing and weakening labor.

A Stab in the Back

But more important, the leadership agreed in the same contract that the employer can impose a fine upon a worker who takes part in a wildcat strike.

Now, it is a well-known fact that there are few wildcat strikes in garment shops. *But the union leadership readily inserted the very clause which Ford, du Pont, and other magnates were demanding in the auto industry against the fierce resistance of the workers.* The leadership of the I.L.G.W.U. thus has the dubious honor of being the first to include in contracts what Big Business has been demanding as part of its union wrecking offensive. This too was nothing less than a stab in the back of millions of workers.

Of course, this disruptive policy also adversely affected the garment workers who were negotiating a 20 per cent wage increase. One would think that the leadership would take full advantage of the strike wave vigorously to press their own demands. This did not necessitate a strike call. By energetically supporting the strikes, by manifest-

ing through mass meetings and in other ways, that they were determined to win their full demands, they would have helped themselves as well as the general movement.

The Dubinsky leadership did not follow such a militant policy. It limited its fight merely to the hearings before the arbitrators, *without calling for any supporting action by the workers*. In consequence the cloakmakers received increases of only \$2 to \$5 per week, amounting to 7½ per cent, plus a health and vacation fund. The 80,000 dressmakers of New York received wage increases ranging from \$3 to \$6 per week which, according to official union statements, amount to an increase averaging 8.9 per cent. Actually the bulk of them received only a 7 per cent raise in wages. This is well under the 20 per cent demanded by the union and is in sharp contrast to the 15-20 per cent won by the striking C.I.O. unions. Despite the tactics of the officials, it was a gain—the result of the militant wage movement in the country. But it was by no means a sufficient increase, especially for the lower-paid workers.

Moreover, despite the prolonged negotiations lasting more than four months, the award gave the cloakmakers only 6 weeks retroactive pay while the dressmakers got nothing—although retroactive pay is generally granted, especially in cases of prolonged negotiations. In fact, it is an accepted procedure in collective bargaining negotiations as a condition for avoiding strikes.

Vice-President Julius Hochman is quoted, in an editorial in *Justice* of March 15, as saying that "*the members of our union may not be entirely satisfied with the outcome of the arbitration but they are proud that a wage dispute of this magnitude has been disposed of through the orderly processes of collective bargaining.*" (Emphasis mine—W.W.)

A Poor Compromise

We will not go into this big talk about the pride of the

membership in the system of arbitration. The simple question remains: *Why are the members "not entirely satisfied" with the award?* Is it because they realize that in arbitration, as in life, you can't get everything you want, as the editorial states? No, the membership is "not entirely satisfied" with the award because it considers that it was possible and necessary to secure better terms even by "orderly collective bargaining" procedure and that the leadership failed to do so.

It was surely necessary! The above editorial states that the cost of living has gone up 35 per cent since 1941. This is false. It has risen 50-60 per cent and continues to mount daily.

It was also possible to have won better terms. Considering the strength of the union, the huge profits of the manufacturers, the militancy of the workers, the strike movement in the country and the important fact that the needle trades industry (unlike the automobile or electrical industries) is working at top levels, it was possible *even without a strike* to have gained greater wage increases, retroactive for all workers to the date of opening negotiations.

Why was it not achieved?

No Strike at Any Cost

It was not achieved because the leadership did not carry out a fighting policy. It wanted to avoid a struggle at all costs and to demonstrate that "Dubinsky's union," unlike the C.I.O., is "reasonable" and "conciliatory" and does not have to engage in strike struggles to win its demands. At the hearing on the demands of the dressmakers, Julius Hochman boasted "Our industry is not going to be tied up; our workers are not going to go out on strike" (*Justice*, March 1, 1946), sneering at the strikes in the mass production industries.

The employers and the arbitrators knew this and that,

too, affected the nature of the award. Moreover, this servile attitude of the officials is bound to encourage the employers to juggle piece rates and thereby negate the pay increases—a process already under way in many shops.

This attitude is in marked contrast with Dubinsky's stand during the war. At that time the Dubinsky group defended Lewis in his strike threats and, when accused of supporting strikes in wartime, *Justice* indignantly appealed to the sanctity of the strike weapon and the effectiveness of a mere threat in achieving demands. That was during the people's war when strikes and strike threats were inappropriate and hurt labor. Now, when strike tactics are appropriate and necessary, it forgets these brave words and the traditional methods of struggle, and extols the line of appeasement. Anything to serve the masters!

The fact is that appeasement, in politics or economics, does not pay, especially today. Strikes are not called lightly. Every practical organizer carefully weighs the situation before proposing strike action. To belittle and oppose strikes, as the Dubinsky group is now doing, and to frighten the workers with talk of their terrible consequences when the big corporations are out to smash the unions is to play their game.

The Dubinsky officialdom denies such aims on the part of big capital. During the recent strikes it tried hard to create the impression that the corporations have at last reconciled themselves to the existence of labor unions. At the outset of that strike, *Justice* foolishly wrote that the General Motors Corporation is merely trying to "humble" the U.A.W. (*Justice*, December 1, 1945.)

How kind a word for the intentions of the fascist-minded du Pont Corporation which bled the union in a 113-day strike.

Hiding the Truth

As late as February 1, 1946, this paper created illusions

as to the nature of the Big Business attack. It wrote "whether or not we accept the *theory* that big business has formed a conspiracy to crush the unions . . . there is no doubt that organized industry is making a *concerted* effort at this hour to *halt* organized labor." (Emphasis mine—W.W.) Was this anti-union drive merely a *disputed* theory and not a *self-evident* fact? And merely to halt, not to crush labor? Why, then, their concerted action; were the poor industrialists perhaps the victims of a *labor* conspiracy? Who then refused collective bargaining, restored police violence and injunctions and railroaded the Case Bill through the House? The unions? How little the Dubinsky group understood (or rather preferred to understand) the situation is revealed by their forecast that "at this moment, picket line violence on a large scale is not foreseeable." (*Justice*, February 1, 1946.) A remarkable prophecy, as anyone can see, particularly the strikers of Philadelphia, Bloomfield and Stamford!

The workers knew better. That is why they rejected the counsel of the \$15,000 and \$25,000 a year labor chiefs who told them to be "reasonable" and not strike for a matter of a few dollars. They fully grasped the fact that they must fight the union-busting stand of the corporations or be thrown back to the pre-war years of low living standards, job insecurity, inevitable crises and unemployment; that the manufacturers, bent on retaining their high war profits, wanted to make the workers carry the burdens of reconversion. The auto and steel workers know from past experience that profit-greedy capitalism wants, at all times, to keep wages low and, if unchecked, pitilessly drives conditions down to unbearable sweat-shop levels, to killing speed-up and hunger wages. Don't the needle trades workers know that as well!

That is why the workers of the big production industries have made such great sacrifices, holding out stubbornly for weeks against the efforts to lessen union safeguards

and to win substantial wage increases.

And they proved right!

Hard Battle Ahead

Despite the sabotaging work of the A. F. of L. leaders, the steel union was not weakened, but strengthened by its strike. The same for the electrical and other striking C.I.O. and A. F. of L. unions. Wage levels are now higher than they would otherwise have been if the offer of the corporations had been accepted without struggle. The labor movement, including the garment workers, benefited by the militant battles. American labor has so far avoided the setback which it suffered after the first World War. The fighting policy of progressive A. F. of L. and C.I.O. leaders was fully justified.

In contrast, how pitiable is the policy of the I.L.G.W.U. leadership in meeting the new postwar problems.

But the struggle is by no means over. The trusts have succeeded, with the help of the Truman Administration, in raising prices which will cancel part of the gains and necessitate further battles. Anti-labor laws are being pressed, again with the help of the Truman Administration, which opened wide the gates to a flood of reactionary legislation. There is no doubt that if the workers are to maintain their hard-won economic and political gains and advance further, they will have to put forth the most militant efforts, fighting spirit and unity on both the political and economic fronts. To win they will have to defeat the Dubinsky policy in the labor movement.

It is Munichism on the labor front; the old Dubinsky attitude coming to light again. Where militancy is required, he holds back; where an advance is needed, he retreats; where the monopolists attack, he appeases; in times of struggle he is the apostle of class peace and leads the way to surrender.

III. ORGANIZE THE UNORGANIZED OR LOSE OUT

The garment workers are faced with special problems peculiar to the industry. These are the growth of new plants in low paid areas, the existence of a large number of unorganized shops in the East, West and South, the intensification of the chain store and mail order evil, and the extension of section work with its lower rates of pay.

The General Executive Board of the union wrote with some alarm about these developments in its 1944 report to the Boston Convention. It pointed out that "many new plants are located in the deep South where unionism is weak and labor standards are traditionally low. Coupled with the normal over-capacity of the women's garment industry, these new plants threaten a reversion to the disastrous forms of competition which characterized our industry before our union was able to make itself felt as a stabilizing force."

Discussing the chain-store problem, the report said: "The role of the chain store and mail order house as the virtual employer in important sections of the women's garment industry has, since the last convention of the International in 1940, been strengthened."

Again the Out-of-Town Problem

At its first postwar meeting in Miami, the General Executive Board of the union placed the number of unorganized workers at between 75,00 and 100,000. "Some of them," according to the report of the meeting in *Justice* (January 1, 1946), are "in growing markets which may eventually develop destructive competition in the organ-

ized production centers. In Los Angeles alone it is believed not less than 15,000 non-union workers are engaged in unorganized dress and sportswear shops."

Other reports, such as that of D. Gingold, head of the Cotton Garment Department (*Justice*, October 15, 1945), tell of "the mushroom growth of garment plants in Pennsylvania which has become one of the nation's outstanding garment producing areas." Pennsylvania was described as "a depressed area tearing down labor standards."

Summing up these reports, it is clear that the union is confronted with a serious and growing "out-of-town" problem of national proportions which has become aggravated during the war years.

What has the union leadership done about these problems, particularly in the recent years of the war, so favorable for organization? With regard to the chain store problem, the General Executive Board, in 1944, stated that the New York Cloakmakers Board is again considering a campaign to deal with the evil.

But nothing has yet been done.

Practical steps had been taken to organize the chain stores in 1937 when a committee, headed by Joseph Breslau and known as the Management Committee, temporarily directed the New York Joint Board. At that time a plan to organize the chain stores, proposed by J. Borochowitz and pushed by such cloakmaker leaders as Joseph Breslau and Isidore Sorkin, achieved some success in bringing the Lerner Shops under union agreement. But soon thereafter, when Israel Feinberg assumed the leadership of the Joint Board, the campaign was stopped. Eight years have now passed and no action has been taken.

The Grand Hochman Plan

In the dress industry, the New York Joint Board, in 1941, with the approval and support of the General Execu-

tive Board, came forward with a grand scheme to deal with the growing "out-of-town" problem. This is called "Industry planning Through Collective Bargaining," which, to the delight of the General Executive Board, was hailed by the *New York Herald Tribune* as a "new concept of unionism."

What is this "industry planning" which has won the praise of the capitalist press? It consists, according to Julius Hochman, its author, of a plan to (a) establish New York as the world's fashion center, (b) to organize the New York Dress Institute to popularize a New York fashion label for which the union contributes \$100,000 (half of which, strangely enough, has already been taken from the "Labor Solidarity Fund"), and (c) to promote efficiency in the industry, for which the union has established a union-management engineering department to advise employers how to improve production. It also conducts propaganda for efficiency among the workers. "Dress Experts Efficiency Lectures" reads a *Justice* headline April 1, 1946. "*Dress manufacturers and union officers . . . and old-timers coming straight from their machines sit side by side at the weekly lecture series . . . on efficiency factory management.*"

But how will this grand "industry planning" scheme check the trend away from the big cities to smaller communities and solve the "out-of-town" issue? Making New York instead of Paris the fashion center—if it is accomplished—may cause some increase of work in the field of higher-priced garments. So much to the good. But will this check the well marked tendency of the industry to move away from New York to areas of lower labor costs? When the trend in recent years (offset only during the war years) has been to lower priced garments due to the introduction of cotton and rayon fabrics, simpler styles and *lower purchasing power of the consumers*, will boosting efficiency in New York actually maintain the monopoly

of the New York market? Will not other centers do likewise in the restless competition of business, especially where they have the advantage of section work at low wages, integrated units and other high speed methods?

Efficiency was the answer given to the out-of-town problem in the industry in the period from 1920 to 1926 by the garment union, but all the union accomplished was to speed up the workers, degrade conditions to sweatshop levels while increasing unemployment. And that is what it will come to now.

Already "efficiency" is accounting for increased industrial production. Impartial Chairman Uviller remarks (*Justice*, March 15, 1946) that "the increase [in production] was due to greater employment and greater productivity per worker." He estimates the increase in worker productivity at 50 per cent.

Hochman himself says (*Justice*, March 1, 1946): "The really remarkable thing . . . is that the unprecedented demand for dresses was met . . . with fewer workers than we had in 1940 . . . in 1940, industry employed 85,439; in 1945, 72,965, a reduction of 15 per cent." Here, too, we see in part the effects of intense labor and speed-up.

No wonder the *Reader's Digest* honors this contribution of the I.L.G.W.U.'s "efficiency" schemes. It recently (April, 1946) featured a four-page article by Eugene Lyons reprinted from the socialist *New Leader*, highlighting this plan and describing the union as one whose goal is the creation of "an effective working partnership between organized labor and organized management."

Partners in Speed-Up

Partnership for what? For increased "efficiency!"

A union can, of course, set up departments to insure that piece rates are adequate, and, in this and other ways, safeguard the workers against speed-up. But where it undertakes to solve production costs in order to strengthen

some manufacturers in competition with others, a union will unavoidably be reduced to an appendage of the employer's production schemes, and invariably at the expense of wages. Big Business is trying to do this today. This is the meaning of their cry for increased production. And up front marches Hochman and Dubinsky with the banner of "efficiency."

Hochman, in his 1944 convention report, patted himself on the back, saying that this is "the first time that a union ever really concerned itself with . . . production matters as part of collective bargaining." He either has a short memory or is kidding the membership. This policy of "engineering and efficiency" by labor was the main tactic of the whole A. F. of L. and I.L.G.W.U. leadership after the first World War. It was known in the labor movement at the time as "New Wage Plan" and the "Higher Strategy of Labor"—for example, the A. F. of L. 1925 convention resolution which called for increased production as a means of obtaining higher wages, *urged upon management "the elimination of wastes in production in order that selling prices may be lower and wages higher."*

The I.L.G.W.U. leadership in that same period became notorious for agreements to boost production and efficiency. Among the worst of such agreements was the one signed June, 1921, by Israel Feinberg with the New York Cloakmaker Manufacturers to "bring up the productivity of the workers to a point fair and proper to both sides."

Small wonder that such an agreement was held secret and entitled "Supplemental Agreement."

Build Real Unions Out-of-Town

Hochman's scheme is in reality a substitute for practical measures to solve the very real problem of the growing shift of the industry away from New York; the shift occurs chiefly because the employers are able to pay less and

speed up the workers more in other areas. It is then a question of raising the pay and improving the conditions of the out-of-town areas by means of *organization, education and struggle*. But during the war years the leadership engaged in little organizational work. It passed up splendid years for organizing the unorganized. Its membership increase came chiefly from the influx of new workers into organized shops.

What is obviously needed, in the first place, is a full scale campaign of organization and union building in all branches of women's apparel, embracing not only the new centers of the West, Middle West and South, but also the Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, New Jersey and Connecticut areas which have been growing at a great pace at the expense of New York. What is also essential is a campaign to bring the chain stores and mail order houses, especially Sears Roebuck, Montgomery Ward and J. C. Penny, under union agreements.

No more favorable time than the present can be desired for this task, with all labor in motion. With the recent victories in the big strike movement, and with millions stirring, it should be possible to organize the unorganized, particularly if the union will use this splendid opportunity to bring to the workers in the South and West the consciousness that it fights for improved wages and conditions. The General Executive Board has announced that a campaign is to be started to organize the unorganized and that 25 organizers are being added for this purpose. But it will be impossible to organize the company towns of the South and Southwest if the union fails to link up its organizational campaign with the C.I.O. as well as the A. F. of L., if it refrains from militancy, if its organizers are not imbued with the spirit of struggle.

Nor can the campaign achieve enduring success if it is not accompanied simultaneously by real union building in these out-of-town areas. During the war many thou-

sands of members were added to the union rolls. But were these members brought into locals, educated in unionism, allowed to develop initiative, responsibility and authority to deal with the boss in the settling of prices? A resolution introduced to the 1944 convention by nine locals of out-of-town cloakmakers, comprising the states of New Jersey, Connecticut and up-state New York describe the out-of-town locals "as existing in name only" and called for local autonomy. (25th I.L.G.W.U. Convention Resolution, No. 81.) According to this resolution the locals "were supervised and managed by the Out-of-Town Department."

In many cases the union representative collected the dues like a real estate agent collecting rent. Such locals are bound to collapse at the first sign of pressure from the boss. Without real solid locals it is impossible to avoid chiseling and violations of agreements which in effect nullify the results of organization.

Enforce Uniform Standards

But the solution of the out-of-town problem also requires recognition of the fact that wide differences in wages and other conditions exist today among the various production centers—in many cases even among the contractors working for the same jobbers on like work. The I.L.G.W.U. leadership has been making much of overlapping and jurisdictional issues with the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America with regard to the production of women's garments and there are signs that this may develop into a harmful struggle which should by all means be avoided.

But would not the union do well to overcome competition in its own ranks arising from the lack of uniform national standards? It is a fact, which has been stressed within the union, that unequal wage scales, hours and conditions exist in the various centers producing like work

and competing for the same national market. Obviously this tends to create a struggle for work and jobs at the expense of wages and conditions. The working out and enforcement of uniform national standards seems to be the answer here. Since this inequality of rates often applies to shops working for the same jobber, it also appears necessary that measures be taken to see that the same scales be set and realized for like work if the struggle for the "bundle" is to be avoided, and if the out-of-town problem is to be effectively reduced.

IV. DUBINSKY AND DISUNITY

Central to the tasks of labor in the present period is the ending of the warfare within the trade union movement and the establishment of the utmost unity. Disunity is disruptive and crippling at any time. It is suicidal if it continues in the postwar period. The workers themselves know this instinctively; they demonstrated the power of unity in the recent strike battles with stirring examples of solidarity.

But the top leadership of the A. F. of L. blocks and disrupts unity. They still refuse to recognize the C.I.O. as a new virile and powerful labor movement, and regard it as a "split off" from the one and only "House of Labor" to which it is invited to return (and be chopped up, of course, in the grinder of craft unionism). They still think in terms of the year 1934 and want to break up the C.I.O., utilizing the postwar difficulties to achieve their end. During the recent strikes they speculated and hoped that the C.I.O. would be crippled or curbed by the industrialists whom they helped by their strikebreaking activities. They failed, but they continue their disruption, trying especially to tear the C.I.O. apart from within.

It is in this malevolent game of internal disruption that John L. Lewis and David Dubinsky, both newly elected members of the Executive Council of the A. F. of L., are playing leading roles. In fact, the danger of continued disunity and of further disruption comes not only from the old clique of Woll, Hutcheson and Green, but mainly from these two "prodigals," who are now back in the fold of the A. F. of L. and are working in closest cooperation with the "old gang." Making use of their factional con-

nections inside the C.I.O., Lewis and Dubinsky are the spearheads of the conspiracy to undermine and weaken the C.I.O. We will discuss the menace of Lewis later. Let us now consider the role being played by Dubinsky.

Relief a la Hoover

The most recent example of this disruptive work has come to light in connection with the factional fight inside the United Automobile Workers Union—the biggest affiliate of the C.I.O. It was charged at the recent convention of that union that an I.L.G.W.U. fund raised for the General Motors strike was being used by Dubinsky for political purposes—as a kind of “Hoover relief.” The substance of the charges made by R. J. Thomas, former president of the union, was that under the guise of solidarity, Dubinsky was working to influence the outcome of the elections within that union and was encouraging and aiding anti-Murray and anti-C.I.O. sentiment around Walter P. Reuther, a Social-Democrat, who works and thinks along the same lines as Dubinsky.

The accusation is a serious one, but it is supported by a number of undeniable facts and circumstances.

It is a fact that the I.L.G.W.U. did not contribute a penny to the relief of the million or more striking steel and electrical workers in the recent strike wave. It callously ignored the 70,000 Westinghouse workers who fought for 116 days against the savage police violence and injunctions. It shunned the 8,000 Western Union strikers, fighting a fierce battle against a giant corporation, almost at the door of Dubinsky's office in the heart of the needle industry. But it did raise a fund for the General Motors strike.

Contrary to the needs of the strikers and the spirit of solidarity, however, the I.L.G.W.U. leadership did not come at once to the aid of the General Motors workers,

or in its critical stage, but delayed its contribution until the last days of the battle. This will be seen from the following facts:

The General Executive Board of the I.L.G.W.U. closed its year-end meeting in Miami without contributing a cent or making an appeal for the G.M. strike, then in its sixth week. It issued an appeal only in the tenth week of the strike after the rank-and-file, out of a true sense of solidarity, were passing around collection cans in the shops. Although its appeal for the G.M. strike in *Justice* of February 1, urged that "Quick Help Counts Double in Crises," the leadership of the union did not dip into its multi-million-dollar treasury to give quick aid but called on the members to put in several hours relief work, and delayed its donation until February 25, the 96th day of the strike, and on the eve of the U.A.W.U. convention.

Strangely enough, it turned over only \$90,000 of a much larger fund and withheld the balance. According to Leonard Lyons in the *New York Post* of March 30, 1946, "the I.L.G.W.U. had raised \$230,000 to help the General Motors strikers: \$90,000 was contributed and the balance was about to be contributed. When Thomas delivered his attack," continues Lyons, "the \$140,000 donation was cancelled." Most likely, that is the sum collected, since *Justice* of February 1 stated that the union's aim was a fund of \$250,000 and it is known that the members contributed generously. In fact, Israel Feinberg, stung by the exposure, admitted at a meeting of the cloakmakers' shop chairmen and Joint Executive Board members on May 8 that the entire fund had not been distributed. He pleaded in defense that no union had made application for relief and that it was not the *policy* of the I.L.G.W.U. to go shopping for needy workers. Apart from the bureaucratic mind which this statement reveals (he had only to look in the papers to know which workers were in need of relief) it evaded the issue. The issue is: why was not the full sum, specifically

collected for General Motors workers, turned over while the strike was in progress? Why the maneuvering with strike funds *when quick help truly counts double* in so great a battle?

Dubinsky to Reuther

It is also a fact that Dubinsky helped to build up the myth that Reuther was a great labor leader, going out of his way to praise him for his "fine leadership and determination" in the strike (*Justice*, March 15, 1946). It is known, however, that the strike was badly led. It was started too early and settled too late and not on the best terms because of Reuther's irresponsible, factional and tactically false policies. Soon after the contribution by the I.L.G.W.U., the Reuther faction which had been sniping at Murray became bolder and more open in its attacks, trying to blame the C.I.O. leadership for the strike results.

These are the grounds which amply support the charge that Dubinsky was using relief funds for the purpose of splitting the big auto union. Of course, he has denied the accusation, claiming that his aid was motivated solely by considerations of solidarity. But it will be recalled that he denied a similar accusation once before. It is, however, well known today that he secretly meddled in the internal affairs of the U.A.W. in 1938. At that time Dubinsky made a loan of \$25,000 to Homer Martin, then U.A.W. president, who together with Dubinsky's fifth column in the U.A.W.—the Lovestone group—was trying to break it away from the C.I.O. This attempt failed when Martin was kicked out of that union and was soon afterward exposed as a Ford agent who was also working with Coughlin.

The misuse by the I.L.G.W.U. officials of the so-called "solidarity fund" of the union is so crass and brazen and practiced on so large a scale that we will devote a special chapter later to this scandal.

"We are frankly and utterly happy at the election of Walter P. Reuther," writes *Justice* editorially on April 1.

They have good cause to be for they now have in Walter P. Reuther and the presidency of the U.A.W. a strong base from which to operate more effectively to poison and disintegrate the C.I.O. from within and put over their reactionary policies. The U.A.W. Convention is a sharp warning that the reactionary Social-Democratic labor leaders are a growing menace to the unity and progress of the entire labor movement.

This exposure of Dubinsky's maneuvers in regard to the C.I.O. does not reveal something entirely new. It only highlights a development which has been apparent since he began his retreat back to the A. F. of L. Dubinsky has tried to hide his duplicity and has posed at times as a critic of the A. F. of L. officialdom and even as a friend of unity and peace with the C.I.O. Except for a brief period, the record proves otherwise. Let us look at that record:

In 1935 Dubinsky joined the initial group that formed the Committee for Industrial Organizations. He went in hesitatingly, and did not stay long. When the A. F. of L. chiefs expelled the Committee, Dubinsky did not go along to organize the C.I.O. After standing apart for a while, the I.L.G.W.U. re-affiliated with the A. F. of L. in 1940.

But Dubinsky can hardly do anything straightforwardly and honestly, in spite of the pose he assumes. He must cover up the retreat—or rather surrender—and even make it seem a fresh advance. He announced that he was returning to *reform* the A. F. of L. How did Dubinsky reform it?

How Dubinsky Reformed the A. F. of L.

At the A. F. of L. Convention in 1944, the A. F. of L. chiefs made a full scale attack on President Roosevelt. They denounced the administration for allegedly inter-

fering with the unions, spoke out for the unrestricted operation of "free enterprise" in the style of the National Association of Manufacturers, sneered at the President's program of 60 million jobs, inferred that he was partial to the C.I.O. and responsible for labor's split. They not only refused to endorse his candidacy for the Presidency but even failed to acknowledge Roosevelt's telegram of greeting to the convention. And to all this Dubinsky, who paraded as a staunch Roosevelt adherent, not only kept silent but lent an applauding hand.

When Matthew Woll deleted that part of a resolution declaring anti-Semitism a crime, the Dubinskyites again maintained a cowardly silence. The extent to which the Dubinskyites have gone in abandoning even a pretense of progressivism was shown in the debate on the Negro question. In the 1943 A. F. of L. Convention, A. Philip Randolph, head of the Pullman Porters' Union, denounced the Jim Crow policy which is widespread in the A. F. of L. He pointed out that some unions barred Negroes in their constitutions and others placed them in "auxiliary unions." He named names and presented facts. Of course, many of the union leaders who were mentioned rose to defend their stand. Some denied the charges, others dodged and some answered with sneering and contemptible Negro-baiting. *But the I.L.G.W.U. delegation, which represented many thousands of Negroes and has repeatedly gone on record against Jim Crow, took no part in the debate and said nothing.*

Stooge for Negro-Baiters

At the following convention in 1944, Randolph repeated the charge. This time the I.L.G.W.U. delegates did not abstain from the debate. They took a positive stand. Joseph Tuvim of the I.L.G.W.U. spoke—not in

support of Randolph, but on the side of the Jim Crow leaders. He pleaded for "understanding" and "education" and "patience"—the old plea of every apologist of Negro discrimination when faced with a specific proposal for action. Of course, such treachery, coming from a delegate of the Dubinsky group with whom Randolph works closely, gladdened the hearts of the Negro-baiters. It would seem that this would be a striking lesson as to the unreliability of the Dubinsky clique but unfortunately Randolph has failed to learn for he remains a political associate and still follows Dubinsky's general policies.

At the time of his entrance into the A. F. of L., Dubinsky introduced an anti-racketeering resolution in the A. F. of L. It looked like the beginning of a crusade. But it did not last long. It was only a cover-up for his backsliding. One bar-room fracas with Joe Fay, racketeering head of the Operating Engineers, and the campaign ended. When the rank-and-file longshoremen recently revolted against Czar Ryan, goon-squad head of the dockers union, they were denounced by Judge Jonah Goldstein, Dubinsky's candidate for Mayor, as "communists" while the I.L.G.W.U. delegates to the New York Central Trades and Labor Council of the A. F. of L. rushed to the defense of the Ryan gang against the rank-and-file workers.

Inside the A. F. of L., Dubinsky joined with the extreme tip of the reactionary wing of the A. F. of L. The I.L.G.W.U. always regarded these labor lieutenants of capital with utter contempt, but now its leadership is in a working alliance with them, sharing leadership of the A. F. of L.-controlled organizations and helping one another out in their specialties of disruption. And when Matthew Woll, for a quarter of a century, the lackey of the manufacturers on the A. F. of L. Executive Council, came to the 1944 Boston Convention, the Dubinskyites bowed to the ground in indecent adulation.

A Bouquet for Matthew Woll

In introducing Woll, Dubinsky referred to him as follows: "He [Woll] is one of our closest friends . . . who represents the great traditions, the philosophy, the ideology of American labor, one who is the outstanding representative of American labor. . . ." After Woll's speech a resolution was introduced by Louis Stulberg, of the international office, expressing the Convention's appreciation for his visit, and Dubinsky cast his personal bouquet at Woll's feet, saying: "*I know some people consider you a 'reactionary,' we, however, consider you as the most progressive force in the American labor movement.*" (25th Convention Proceedings, May 31, 1944, pp. 65, 73.)

At the same time Dubinsky's attitude on the C.I.O. became that of the ruling clique. In a letter to John L. Lewis on June 24, 1942, after the latter left the C.I.O., Dubinsky sank to the level of Rankin and Bilbo in characterizing the leaders of the C.I.O. as "prisoners of the communists." *

This is the way Dubinsky carried out his self-proclaimed mission to reform the A. F. of L.

Matters did not stop there. Dubinsky became the go-between to bring John L. Lewis back to the A. F. of L.

Since his desertion of the C.I.O., Lewis has become the most dangerous leader in the American labor movement. Absolute autocrat of the United Mine Workers, ruling by denying two-thirds of the mine districts the right to elect their own officials, he has crushed all opposition by strong-arm methods and ruthless force. Despite all the publicity making him seem "militant" Lewis has kept the mine wages at a low level while winning praise from the mine owners for increased speed-up.

* *Taylor's Progress*, by B. Stolberg, pp. 194-5.

Working for Lewis

Lewis was opposed to the war against Hitler and four times during the war closed down the mines. He is a brazen exponent of Big Business ideas in the labor movement, and openly aligned himself with the Hoover and Dewey crowd in the last elections. Having left the C.I.O., he works to smash the progressive labor movement. And to get Lewis back into the A. F. of L. and form a bloc with him there, Dubinsky went to work with crusading zeal.

When the affiliation of Lewis first came up there was opposition in the Executive Council from Daniel Tobin and others who feared his anti-war and anti-Roosevelt stand. But *Justice*, organ of the I.L.G.W.U., appealed to the Executive Council not to consider such political matters and to consider the Lewis application "from a purely trade union point of view."

The anti-Semitic propaganda of the *Lewis Mine Workers Journal* antagonized all progressives in the A. F. of L. It was so scandalous that even the *Jewish Daily Forward*, supporter of everything rotten in the labor movement, was compelled by the pressure of its readers to protest. "Why are the Jewish labor leaders of unions affiliated with the A. F. of L. and who have influence and prominence there, not coming out with protests against this anti-Semitic incitement?" asked an article in the *Forward*.

Dubinsky spoke out. Did he by chance denounce this Hitlerism of Lewis which won him the salute of the fascist sheets in America and the praise of Goebbels? No, Dubinsky engaged in a clever little game. He had his editor, Max Danish, write a general article on the subject of racial equality and the evils of anti-Semitism for the *Mine Workers Journal*. This had a foreword by its editor, K. C. Adams, endorsing the contents, and in this way the little matter of anti-Semitism was cleared up. You see, we all agree!

Whitewashing Anti-Semitism

Shrewd, wasn't it? But it did not stop the *Mine Workers Journal* from continuing its poisonous propaganda after the A. F. of L. shut its door to Lewis. The June, 1944, issue of the *Journal* published a summary of anti-Semitic propaganda carried by the magazine for two years, as if to make up for the time it withheld its poison during the negotiations. It was the Nazi kind of anti-Semitism which denounces "invisible government" of "international bankers" with deliberate and arbitrary listings of Jewish names, such as Lehman Brothers and others, those who were "in the control room for the New Deal in the invisible government. . . ."

Nonetheless, Dubinsky wrote in the Boston Convention report that "we regret that the application of the United Mine Workers for readmission into the A. F. of L. has been delayed and that no proper formula has as yet been found to effectuate this re-affiliation."

One of the main arguments hypocritically advanced by Dubinsky was that Lewis' admission would help unity. This argument was blasted by the *Hat and Millinery Worker*, organ of the Hat, Cap and Millinery Workers Union, headed by Max Zaritsky, in its issue of June 1, 1943. In a two-page editorial display under the title "Keep Lewis Out of the A. F. of L.," the *Hat and Millinery Worker* issued a terrific blast against this "unity" argument. Branding Lewis and Hutcheson as part of the Tory fifth column in the labor movement, it wrote "Lewis' re-entry into the A. F. of L. will not promote labor unity, but will hinder it. It will not hasten peace between A. F. of L. and C.I.O. but will retard it; will not work for amalgamation and mobilization of the progressive forces of our country, but for their dispersion and dissipation. On every count Lewis' prospective rejoining of the A. F. of L. can bring only damage to the Federation itself. It will be

a blow also to all the liberal and progressive forces of our country with which the labor movement is joined in mutual confidence in the effort to win the war and win the peace,"—a prediction fully borne out by Lewis' conduct since his re-affiliation and particularly in the recent strike movement.

Labor Must Unite

How can Dubinsky's support of Lewis be explained? First of all, by the fact that though there are differences in the way they operate—fundamentally their economic and labor policies coincide today. Both are working to put American imperialism on top of the world—and secondly, by "great aims." Dubinsky thinks that once back in the A. F. of L. Lewis will come quickly to leadership and under his iron dictatorship, the combination of Lewis, Woll and Hutcheson (with Dubinsky's help) will succeed in dominating the labor movement. "Great aims" indeed—to tie labor to the kite of the imperialists and make such reactionary America Firsters dominant in the labor movement.

Dubinsky's alliance with Lewis and Woll against the C.I.O. and progressive trade unionism within the A. F. of L. is nothing short of treason to the I.L.G.W.U. and the cause of labor. What is needed today is not vain and futile plots or maneuvers to smash progressive leaders and policies of the C.I.O., nor a unity of scheming leaders. *What is imperative for the well-being of labor and the nation is genuine labor unity of all the unions, A. F. of L., C.I.O., Railroad Brotherhoods and Miners, and common action against the advancing forces of Big Business, reaction and fascism.*

V. INDEPENDENT POLITICAL ACTION —FOR WHOM?

The garment workers cannot insure their future without correct politics, and correct politics today means the development of a strong fighting front of labor and progressives against the trusts and their political henchmen of both parties. It means the development of independent political action by labor.

It is clear that the two old parties are dominated by the economic royalists, as Roosevelt aptly named them. This is well known as far as the Republican Party of Hoover is concerned and it is becoming clearer every day with regard to the nature of the Democratic Party of Truman, Byrnes and Rankin.

The time has come to move more boldly along the path of independent labor politics, to put forward the perspective of a broad anti-trust and anti-fascist third party and to lay the groundwork for its formation in time to affect the elections of 1948. This is imperative if the present dangerous situation is not to continue, and especially if labor is not to have the shoddy choice in the next presidential election of two candidates, both serving Big Business reaction, imperialism and the war mongers.

The Road to a Third Party

Of course, the development of a third party is not easy because of the many difficulties which exist and those which will be added. But they can be surmounted because the time is ripe and the need is great. The millions of common people, if organized and combined, can wipe

out the legal and technical hurdles deliberately put there by Big Business to prevent the rise of independent third parties just as they swept aside the barbed wire entanglements that blocked the independent combination of workers into trade unions.

The road will have many twists and turns but its main direction is quite clear: to organize the local unions and their members to take an active part in politics; build up the existing political organizations of labor and progressive middle class forces (such as C.I.O.-P.A.C., National Citizens P.A.C., the A.L.P., the Independent Citizens Committee and the like) and form similar bodies on a local and state scale; work together for the needs of the people, and at the right time, to form the third party.

In the elections of 1946 the tactics of labor must be to come out against all open reactionaries and sham progressives who serve the trusts, and put up pro-labor people wherever possible; take part in the old-party primaries and win the nominations for true progressives; or, where this is impossible, run independent tickets; and in certain cases, in order to defeat the outright pro-fascist candidates, it will be necessary to endorse candidates who are pro-labor though they may waver on some issues.

Such is the independent, though many-sided policy and tactics that will defeat reaction and conserve democracy. Such is also the line that will advance labor to a new and higher stage when it will be free at last from dependence and bondage to the two old gangs of capitalist politicians.

This policy will encounter many obstacles within the ranks of labor, from those who have illusions with regard to certain politicians as well as those who hesitate to break with the old ways in the face of fierce and growing opposition from the side of business. But the main opposition will come from the old clique of the A. F. of L. and from Dubinsky and his kind who work with them but who appear to favor independent political action.

If Dubinsky is a disrupter on the field of economic action, he is doubly so in the matter of politics.

Splitting the Political Front

This will be evident from his support to the reactionary Truman Administration which we will discuss a little later along, and from his activities in New York and national politics.

In the New York City elections of 1945 the Liberal Party, under the direction of Dubinsky, joined with Dewey and set up a Republican-Liberal Party slate which gained the support of anti-labor Democrats, establishing a reactionary coalition in the big city. Many alibis were offered for this unprecedented action, but the true motive was stated by Dubinsky at the city-wide conference of the Liberal Party on June 14: to isolate and defeat the American Labor Party. He said: "The part that the Liberal Party is bound to play in this election will serve to isolate the Communists from the true liberals and will stamp the A.L.P. now dominated by the Communists as a negligible factor in the city and New York State. It will convince some of the Democratic and Republican politicians that dealing with the Communists, no matter under what disguise, is the kiss of death." (*Justice*, July 1, 1945.)

Dubinsky, as usual, miscalculated. He has proven a bad prophet more than once. In this case his tactics missed fire entirely and lost the Liberal Party half its vote. But it meant that Dubinsky was drawing closer to the parties of the monopolists and bankers.

It was an inexcusable act at the time since it meant helping Dewey and Hoover in combination with like Democratic reactionaries to win the Empire State in 1946. Is that not a crime against labor? To assist the Dewey forces is to aid the enemies of full employment, job security and the worst opponents of increased wages, greater unemployment insurance, guaranteed annual wages and

the demands of the garment workers. It means to make a mockery of the resolutions adopted by the union.

This shift to Dewey was not accidental. It was the deliberate policy of the Dubinsky group. Let us recall its conduct during the presidential election. At that time it endorsed President Roosevelt but its actual support was only a formal matter. Its main efforts were spent in fighting Sidney Hillman, the Political Action Committee, the A.L.P. and the Communists. It rendered the greatest service to the Dewey camp by its Red-baiting campaign.

Star Witness for Dewey

Dewey's campaign reached the lowest level in American politics. It was shot through and through with demagogy, anti-Semitism, intolerance, prejudice against foreign-born, and Red-baiting. Toward the end of the campaign Dewey made a grand effort to stampede the country into believing that there was a secret underground conspiracy of the Communists and Hillman to take over the White House and establish a Godless regime. He carefully set the stage for a big exposure and on November 1, speaking before a huge meeting in Boston, he trotted out this conspiracy charge with all the trappings of a prosecuting attorney. And who was his star witness to "prove" the authenticity of the accusation? It was David Dubinsky! Here is what Dewey said:

You don't need to take my word for what the American Labor Party is today. Listen to the words of another set of my opponent's violent supporters. David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, was one of the founders of the American Labor Party. Here is what he said last spring about that party as of today. He said: "I regard the former American Labor Party as a Communist labor party. . . . Mr. Hillman can act as a front for Communists. I never did and never will."

So said David Dubinsky. . . .

Sidney Hillman has become the biggest political boss in the United States, and in the words of David Dubinsky, Sidney Hilman is a "front for Communists." (Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, *New York Times*, November 2, 1944.)

This speech was not made in New York City where Dubinsky's Red-baiting is well known and where his words carry little weight with labor. It was made before an audience filled with Christian Fronters; it was carried over the radio and through the press to the entire country. And it was echoed by the Republican machine in the highways and byways of big and small towns. "See," cried the reactionaries to the middle classes and to the politically less experienced and unsophisticated workers in small towns, "here's the proof of the Red Conspiracy to take over the White House. Dubinsky said it. He ought to know—no one can accuse him of being partisan—why, he's a labor man and even a Roosevelt supporter. He says the Reds through Roosevelt want to take over the country!" And in fact, Tom Girdler, the notorious open-shopper, scared the business world during the campaign in these very terms. This is what Girdler said:

I suppose no one would think that David Dubinsky, head of the I.L.G.W.U., was a labor-baiter. Yet it is a matter of public record that Dubinsky was one of the crowd of leaders who split off from the A.L.P. in New York on the ground that it was Communist-controlled. The leader of the A.L.P. and the Chairman of the C.I.O. Political Action Committee is one and the same man. His name is Sidney Hillman.

Wasn't this rolling ammunition for the guns of reaction?

It may be said that this was not an intentional aid to Dewey but just an unfortunate by-product of the inner fight in the American Labor Party. But how was it that the words of one side and not the other in that struggle

were so helpful to reaction? How was it that Dubinsky's words fitted in so neatly with the whole pattern of the Dewey campaign? How was it that both Dewey and Dubinsky were singing the same Hitlerite tune—Dewey against Roosevelt and Dubinsky against Hillman and Quill in the American Labor Party fight? The crime is not that Dubinsky necessarily held a meeting with Dewey (though that is not excluded) and agreed on the same strategy. The crime consists in the fact that even without a meeting, Dubinsky served Dewey's aims—one fought the progressive cause from outside, while the other did it from within the ranks of the progressive and labor movement, and both aided reaction in the country. What a price the labor movement would have paid had Dewey won!

Splitting the A.L.P.

The splitting of the American Labor Party by Dubinsky was nothing short of a scandal. The American Labor Party is the independent party of the working class and the fruit of many generations of effort. It is the sign that labor no longer trails behind the capitalists, but seeks to determine politics itself. No matter what combination might be essential as immediate tactics to defeat the danger of reaction, labor will have to build up its own independent political strength in the future and emerge more and more as the leading force in the fight against monopoly capital, encouraging and rallying around itself all progressive forces. The A.L.P. polled 500,000 votes in the last national election despite the split. With all progressive labor forces in the State united, the A.L.P. could become the second or first party in New York State. This is what Dubinsky is trying to prevent.

Why did Dubinsky split? Was it a matter of who should control the organization? Was it because some outside force, the Communist Party, was trying to take it over? That is what Dubinsky charged. But it has been

proven repeatedly that Red-baiting is only a smoke screen to conceal reactionary aims. The fact is that Dubinsky wanted no unity.

Unity Plan Rejected

Sidney Hillman offered a plan to unite the party by placing it in the control of the unions. He proposed that all trade unions of the State affiliate with the Labor Party and that all matters of party policy be determined by the vote of the representatives of the participating trade unions based upon per capita tax payments to the Party. Surely a labor party, if it is to be representative of the organized labor movement, should be controlled by the delegates of the unions. *This was rejected by Dubinsky* on the ground that it would give too much representation to Communists. But this was answered by Hillman with a new proposal—the selection of a leadership excluding those who were considered as Communists—a grossly unfair proposition, as Hillman himself declared, since it discriminates against political opinions and denies to trade unions the democratic right to select representatives of their own choosing. But for the sake of unity this was mistakenly agreed to by those considered as Communists. *This, too, was rejected by Dubinsky.*

The cry of Communist control was thus exposed as only a dodge. The Labor Party was split because Dubinsky could not use such a representative body for ultra-reactionary purposes. This was made clear by Dubinsky's own statements. Asked by Benjamin Stolberg, the author of *Tailor's Progress*, what his conception is of a political party of labor, Dubinsky answered: "Well, its first consideration should be no class government of any kind." "Labor . . . should be a social pressure group pushing its views on great social questions, lobbying for progressive legislation, keeping society in balance. Labor must be in *social* politics, not in *party* politics." (Emphasis mine—

W.W.) To which the author adds that Dubinsky insists on "believing that it [the Labor Party] is not fundamentally a political party." What a bureaucratic philistine view of labor politics. "No class government of any kind"—that must be "the first consideration."

Of course, the question naturally arises why was a political party started if it is not to serve class interests? Was it not organized because the capitalist parties serve the selfish class interests of big capital and therefore labor must have a party to advance its interests which correspond to those of the majority of the people? And once formed, is it not clear that such a party, if based on the unions, will not only push its views and lobby for legislation (which labor did in the past without a party of its own) but will put forward its own candidates, support progressives, fight for its own program against the other parties, strive to win the people to its side and achieve government control—in short, engage in *party* politics?

But even his words about "social politics" were mere window-dressing.

Dubinsky found himself pressed by events and a democratic-minded labor membership to fight reaction, whereas what he wanted was a party in which he would have a free hand to maneuver, make backstairs deals with reactionary Republicans and Democrats, and which would avoid militant political action. He wanted a different kind of party. That is why he split from the A.L.P. and formed the Liberal Party.

What Is the Liberal Party?

The Liberal Party is not a labor party—an organization of the trade union movement. It is the same Social-Democratic Federation which Dubinsky established many years back with the addition of some middle class lawyers and intellectuals. It is not a democratic organization, but a body controlled by the union officialdom, chiefly of the

I.L.G.W.U. The membership of the I.L.G.W.U. has no say in its decisions, just as it had no part in its formation.

The Liberal Party talks of itself as a third party, which will be a competitor to the Democratic and Republican Parties. But it will be nothing of the sort. It is already a rival of the American Labor Party and the Political Action Committee.

Forgotten Words

At the Boston Convention the leadership of the Liberal Party gave reassuring pledges that it did not intend to compete with the P.A.C. Addressing this convention, John Childs, chairman of the Liberal Party, said, "Outside of New York State, we shall give our full and hearty cooperation to the C.I.O. Political Action Committee (applause). It is not our purpose at this critical time to divide the liberal and labor forces, but to unite them" (*25th Convention Proceedings*, p. 76). But these words were forgotten soon after they were uttered. The Liberal Party not only fought the P.A.C. in the Presidential elections, but set about exploring the possibilities of national organization at the earliest opportunity. In December, 1944, Israel Feinberg urged the chairman of the Liberal Party to extend the organization nationally in a letter published in *Justice*. He wrote: "We must lay the basis for a permanent Liberal Party—not confined to New York, but extending throughout the country. We should make some exploratory moves to ascertain the possibilities of calling a national conference of liberals and progressives to lay the groundwork for a national Liberal Party." Such a semi-secret conference was held on April 6-7, 1946, in Chicago, attended by a number of Social-Democratic co-workers of Dubinsky from both the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. unions. It was, of course, a move to undermine the P.A.C. in the 1946 Congressional and State elections. Not a single leader of that movement was invited.

It is a startling but highly revealing fact that the New York *World Telegram* called for support to Judge Jonah Goldstein in the New York City elections *on the Liberal Party line*. This is the organ of the reactionary Scripps-Howard chain, notorious foe of the Roosevelt and labor program. Here is what the *World Telegram* wrote editorially on November 1:

The Liberal Party was formed three years ago by the former right-wing leaders of the American Labor Party who fought long and hard to save that party from falling into the complete control of Communist fellow-travelers like Sidney Hillman and Mike Quill.

The very nature of its birth, therefore, gives the Liberal Party the best possible claim to become the *rallying ground*, not only for anti-Communist labor, but also for *all independent voters* who see current Communist raids on labor unions and Communist meddling in elections as a grave and growing menace to American democracy. (Emphasis mine—W.W.)

This electoral support shows that a section of Big Business considers it good policy today to strengthen the Social-Democrats politically as a means of weakening labor from within because it is too strong at present to be crushed by attacks only from without. They find the Social-Democrats ready and willing to perform this role.

Events have been moving swiftly and the political picture has been changing rapidly since the end of the war. What is Dubinsky's attitude to the new Administration in Washington?

It will be remembered that the Dubinsky group was highly critical of the Roosevelt Administration, particularly in the years of the war, because of its policy of friendship toward the Soviet Union. In fact after the Yalta agreement in March, 1945, Jonathan Stout, Washington correspondent of the *New Leader*, semi-official organ of the Liberal Party, wrote that labor looked upon the Roose-

velt Administration "as unconsciously potentially fascist," which is a special way of saying that Roosevelt at that time was moving toward fascism—a preposterous conception and an attempt at forcing him to break the alliance with the Soviet Union. That was its attitude toward the late President Roosevelt just before his death.

Truman's Betrayal

But the Dubinsky group adopted an extremely friendly attitude to the Truman Administration from the very beginning, considering the President as a true progressive and people's man and as the "continuer" of Roosevelt's policies.

Truman's program is the very opposite of Roosevelt's. It is a program that helps the trusts, not the people. If here and there he makes concessions to hold labor votes, these are wrung from him only through hard struggle as the recent strikes showed. Today the reactionary quality of this administration is more evident in the sphere of foreign politics. It becomes increasingly evident in domestic affairs, too, for it is impossible for a foreign policy to be reactionary and a home policy to be progressive.

There are many progressives who are disturbed by Truman's policies, but either out of fear of the Hoover gang or because they mistakenly take Truman at his word, that he is for enacting the Roosevelt domestic program, these progressives have not yet completely broken with him but give him the benefit of the doubt, and await developments. Yet a number of them do not hesitate to criticize him openly and, in the case of Senator Pepper, bitterly denounce his imperialist and sword-rattling policies.

The Dubinsky group expresses no such doubts. It cheers the anti-Soviet policy of the administration which is being carried out in collaboration with Hoover, Vandenberg and the G.O.P.—the very opposite to the course indicated by

Roosevelt. It refrains from criticizing the price increases granted to the trusts and is even for them as a matter of policy. *Justice* of March 1 quotes approvingly the President's statement which regarded the empty shell of the employment bill passed by Congress as a "substantial beginning," while keeping silent about his inexcusable failure to take up a real fight for the 60 million jobs program to which the Democratic Party is committed. The Dubinskyites have nothing to say about the continuous replacement of liberals in leading government posts by Big Business politicians. They even found "good intentions" in the President's proposed anti-strike legislation which opened up the barrage against labor. They deceive the workers, saying that Truman helped to achieve the recent wage increases, whereas his fact-finding boards invariably proposed wage increases far below those demanded and needed by labor. By sowing such illusions, the Dubinsky group obstructs and immobilizes labor from developing independent political action to the fullest degree against growing reaction.

That is not all. By accepting Truman as a friend of labor or as a "lesser evil" it actually and deliberately is aiding Truman in his strike-breaking role as the spearhead of reaction. For it is a bitter, yet irrefutable, fact that under cover of being a Roosevelt man, he is destroying the gains of the New Deal and is making open war on labor. As we write, this is being starkly revealed in the railroad strike, where Truman openly appeared in the role of strike-breaker to the wild acclaim of the Big Business union-busters and their Congressional spokesmen.

VI. MACHINE RULE

Rank-and-file participation in the work of a union and in the making of its policies is the very heartblood of a democratic organization. But the Dubinsky group has been engaged unceasingly in the thirteen years of its administration in undermining and destroying the virile democracy which made the International at one time one of the foremost unions in the country.

The Dubinsky group set itself the task of establishing machine rule in the organization, centralizing power in the national office, reducing the independence and strength of the local organizations, and wiping out democratic rank-and-file expression. And it must be said that so far it has succeeded to an alarming degree.

Consider the position of Dubinsky himself. He occupies the offices of both President and Secretary-Treasurer, an unusual concentration of power. This not only gives him authority to appoint organizers, of which in 1945 there were 134 responsible to him alone, but in addition he exercises virtual control of the expenditure of the union finances. Executive Secretary Frederick F. Umhey is in fact an administrative officer subject to direction and control by the President-Secretary-Treasurer. Dubinsky controls the Eastern Out-of-Town Department with its 45 organizers and the Cotton Garment Department with 25 organizers; he has a staff of 64 others spread throughout the country, practically running the south and southwest areas, and overrunning other districts. They constitute a sort of hierarchy that owes no responsibility to the membership in their localities.

G.E.B.—Rubber Stamp

With such despotic control over appointments and finances, it is not surprising that the General Executive Board has been reduced to a rubber stamp which exercises the right of meeting every four or five months to okay the policies already initiated or to make general decisions whose fate are completely dependent upon the highly organized machinery of David Dubinsky himself. Moreover, a number of members of the Executive Board are on the organizing staff of the national office and subject to removal by the President, and thus are mere puppets. Others rarely dare to voice dissenting views in the face of such power.

Under such circumstances it is not surprising that the General Executive Board is a closed corporation. Rarely does a new person get elected to the Board. Though 75 per cent of the union are women, there is but one woman among its 23 members. With 15,000 Negroes in the union, there is not a single Negro on the Board. A large and growing number of members in the East and West are Spanish-speaking, but these workers are not represented either. In fact, though the Board is intended to be broadly representative of different areas, few local people who are native to their districts get a chance to come into the Executive.

The conventions reflect this machine rule. The convention committees which handle most of the business and prepare its decisions are all appointed by the President and are tightly controlled bodies. At the last convention every committee but one was headed by a Vice-President as chairman and by a local business agent or Joint Board head as secretary. The single exception was the Committee on Officers' Report and this was chaired by an appointed organizer. The rank-and-file delegates, most of

whom are well versed in union affairs, receive no such appointments.

As a result the International conventions, which once were robustly alive with floor discussion by the delegates, resemble the boss-controlled conventions of the Republican and Democratic Parties, serving chiefly as a forum for outside speakers and with practical business discussion of union affairs reduced to a minimum.

Rotten Borough System

The system of representation to the convention still remains extremely undemocratic. The small locals which are easily under the influence and control of the National Office are still in a position to outvote the large locals having a majority of the members. For example, 16 small locals with a membership of only 2,500 have the same number of delegates as a local having ten times greater membership. 81 small locals with members of several hundred each and totaling a membership of 18,000 have the same number of delegates as 14 locals with a membership of 125,000. The "rotten borough system" continues despite the bitter fight and changes brought about by the left wing 20 years ago.

The out-of-town membership of 30,000 in the Metropolitan District have no democratic rights at all; they are denied the right to select their business agents and are ruled by the Out-of-Town Department, which is subordinate to the President. *Repeated requests to grant them autonomy have been ignored.* The other big centers outside of New York are only formally independent. In most of the districts, and especially in the South and West, affairs are determined by the organizers on the payroll of the International. It would seem that, with the industry spreading continuously to these centers, strong and self-sustaining boards would be set up with sufficient funds

to select and direct their own organizers, but this is not the policy of Dubinsky who ensures a large part of the delegation to the National Convention by such means. This is one of the reasons for the large organizing payroll, which could be substantially cut without materially affecting the union welfare.

By-Passing the Members

This autocratic machine deprives the membership of the right to pass and decide on important matters of policy, and saps the vitality of the local organizations. Such major matters as the union's attitude to international trade union unity, severance from the A.L.P. and formation of the Liberal Party, withdrawal of the union from the C.I.O. and re-entrance to the A. F. of L., were all decided by the G.E.B. or by conventions without first submitting the matter for discussion and approval by the membership. Dubinsky uses the device, perfected by John L. Lewis, of bringing important questions of policy to the machine-controlled convention, getting its Okay, and then wielding its authority to put them into practice, thus either by-passing a membership discussion or holding one as a postscript to the decision. Even the endorsement of the candidate for mayor of New York, Jonah Goldstein, was decided by the General Executive Board, despite the avowed position of Dubinsky that this election was exclusively a local matter. The New York membership was given no chance to pronounce its judgment.

"Not on the Agenda"

In the locals, too, the membership, which should be the deciding body in the union, is generally on the receiving end of things, being "told" of what has taken place in long reports by the union heads. Efforts to discuss matters when they are still in the deciding stage are ruled

“out of order” as not being on the agenda, or members are told to wait for a “report” which comes generally when the question is already decided by events, or when the report is meaningless and decision useless.

Since 1937, the existence of groups has been prohibited, except for a period of three months before elections. This was carried with the agreement of left wing groups who voted for it out of a mistaken conception of unity. Groups are unnecessary and rarely exist where there is unity of policy and where democracy and free expression is practiced. This is not the case in the I.L.G.W.U. In practice this decision has worked only to stifle membership criticism and opinion and solidify machine rule. Groups favorable to the administration function in various locals protected by the officials and actively prepare for elections long before the three-month period, whereas the rank-and-file groups must await the stated time.

Reactionaries With Trimmings

The local administration generally reflect the national bureaucratic setup. In some locals, as in Local 89, New York, and some of the miscellaneous locals, it is straight boss-control with the members reduced simply to dues-payers. In locals where a rank-and-file militant tradition prevails, as in Dressmakers Local 22, the leadership maintains a show of democracy which consists of the right of members to speak for five or ten minutes at membership meetings, which are held only three or four times a year. Here the will of the members is frustrated by the device either of excluding urgent controversial issues from the order of business, or of ruling them out should they be raised from the floor, on the ground that they must be proposed and put on the agenda three weeks before the meeting takes place. This in effect disposes of them without action, since the next meeting is generally three or

four months off. When opposition opinions are vigorously pressed at meetings, it is not at all an unusual sight to have administration ring-leaders set up a brawl to cut off the speaker.

This local of 25,000 members, covering a jurisdiction of more than a thousand shops, has no system of shop representation in the control of union affairs. In progressive unions of both the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. nowadays, even locals with a thousand members have a shop steward or shop chairman system of control in which representatives of the shop meet regularly at least once a month to discuss and decide policies. These meetings, composed of elected shop representatives, not only serve as the democratic clearing house for the common problems of the trade and the direct voice of the membership, but are the means—and in fact the only means—whereby such large numbers scattered in so many shops can truly exercise control over the affairs of the union. But in Local 22, administration and control is centered in the manager and business agents, with a *small* executive doing its bidding. At one time this local, which prided itself on its membership, held meetings of “active” people, but this has long ago been discarded. Meetings of shop chairmen which are held at times, upon the will of the officials, generally have only consultative powers and have no deciding say over union business. The local regime today is thoroughly bureaucratized, with appointments to paid office and even unpaid committee posts made almost exclusively from among those who pledge to follow the factional clique of Charles Zimmerman, whose reactionary policies and activities, trimmed at times with progressive phrases, in all important respects correspond to those of David Dubinsky.

Blitzkrieg Tactics

Since the managers and officers of the union have complete control in the locals, let us inquire into the manner

in which elections take place and to what extent they are democratic. This is pertinent since the Dubinsky group likes to speak much these days about the suppression of democracy in Europe, especially about how minorities and opposition "are being ruthlessly crushed" in Rumania, Bulgaria, Poland and Yugoslavia by the Red Army. How much democracy do they themselves practice in their own organization?

The last elections in 1944 showed that in the matter of elections, as in all things, the Dubinsky group practices much hypocrisy but little democracy. In these elections, it outdid itself in violations of democratic procedures in its eagerness to register a complete knockout of the left wing. The election from beginning to end was organized as a blitzkrieg against the opposition groups. What were the methods used?

How to Crush Minorities

First, *a new system* of voting by slates was introduced. The intent of this system of voting is to enable the machine to avoid selection on the basis of merit and to perpetuate division on group lines. This system was recommended by Dubinsky and Luigi Antonini on the grounds that it simplified the elections and followed the two party system of voting. "Under the slate system," said Antonini, "the member knows for whom he votes . . . each and every member knows for what policy a group stands. In that way they vote as in the political elections. In the political elections the Republicans have their eagle, the Democrats have their star . . . and the voters know more or less what their platforms or principles stand for." (*25th Convention Proceedings*, p. 312.)

This sounds reasonable. But if voting is to be done on the basis of groups, why was not the right of groups to exist re-established at the same time? If group voting is

correct and resembles "political elections" why is not the existence of groups also correct and, in fact, essential for such type of voting? Imagine a government in Washington making a law that you must vote by party ballot but at the same time declaring that parties have no right to exist except on the eve of the election. Would that not be a farce? In substance that is what is in force in the I.L.G.W.U. today.

The effect of the new system of voting has been to reduce to zero the possibility of minority representation.

This method of voting inevitably introduces the spoils system characteristic of the boss-controlled two-party set-up. "Either get on a slate or be defeated," is the situation presented to candidates by this method of voting. "Either support the administration slate where it is strong or suffer the consequences and be left off as possible candidates in the future"—this is the atmosphere created by this system. It was rightly opposed by a delegate from Los Angeles as a system "which does not extend democracy but on the contrary stifles the desire of the membership to run for office." (*25th Convention Proceedings*, p. 312.)

Second, the Dubinsky group undertook a wild and unprecedented Red-baiting campaign supported by the reactionary press to frighten off progressive members and to divide and confuse the ranks of the opposition.

Third, where these extreme methods did not ensure victory they resorted to outright intimidation, strong arm methods and plain election steals.

The Dubinskyites were victorious in the election, but they failed to rout the opposition and deliver a knockout blow. Despite the full scale blitz attack, 25,000 votes were cast against them.

Expulsions in Local 10

Two examples will illustrate the methods used in this election:

In Cutters Local 10, a strong opposition developed and a complete slate for all offices was put forward. It was sponsored by a large list of members and from the very outset showed considerable support. But no sooner was the ticket launched than Isidor Nagler disbarred four of the candidates, including his opponent for manager of the local, Arnold Ames. The latter was eliminated on the trumped-up charge that he had entered a shop, misrepresented himself as a business agent and negotiated a grievance affecting a member belonging to the rank-and-file group. It was obviously a crude frame-up manufactured out of thin air and proven as such at the hearing where witnesses called against Ames testified in his behalf and cleared him of any charges. But Nagler managed to wangle a "reprimand" through his Executive Board and on the ground that Ames had been disciplined used the constitution to disqualify him from running.

Not content with beheading the ticket by this crude frame-up and still fearing defeat, the Nagler slate then went on a rampage to ensure its victory.

In violation of the constitution, which forbids use of the union machinery for election purposes, business agents used the authority of their offices to canvass the shops for "contributions" to the election campaign. Meetings were called ostensibly as regular union meetings, but were converted entirely into campaign meetings, with only representatives of the Nagler group as speakers. Business agents ordered shops to come down to vote and demanded that they report to them before entering the polls. Worst of all, Assistant Manager Stulberg of the Nagler group, in a most flagrant attempt at intimidation, called members into his office and threatened them with a denial of privileges if they refused to work for the slate. The whole campaign was conducted in an atmosphere of antagonism, provocation and terror. When Ames spoke at a large meeting of Cutters against the frame-up and illegal disbarment, he

was met by organized interruption by Nagler himself who seized the microphone from him (in complete disregard of the chairman) and prevented him from speaking. Protests to Nagler against the obvious election steal went unheeded and a proposal to ensure a fair count by inviting the Honest Ballot Association to supervise the election was ignored.

This is the way in which the Nagler group carried through the election and ensured its perpetuation in office. *Not content with this election steal, the Nagler group followed with the suspension of seven members of the opposition on the ground that they issued leaflets during the election slandering the officials.*

The indictment against the seven suspended members reads: "Between January 1 and April 30, 1944, the defendants . . . committed acts and engaged in conduct detrimental to the best interests of the International and local by libeling the officers of the International and the officers of Local 10 in at least seven circulars, leaflets and other written and printed matter. . . ." The indictment follows with quotations from the leaflets in which disagreement with the policies and practices of the administration leaders was expressed and which appealed to the membership to defeat the administration slate and elect the rank-and-file candidates. The leaflets discussed such issues as the opposition of Dubinsky to world labor unity, the anti-Soviet attitude of Nagler and other officials of the local, the disruptive policies of Dubinsky in the American Labor Party and similar legitimate issues of controversy within a labor union, particularly at the time of elections. Yet, on these grounds, the seven members were disciplined.

What a mockery of an election and what a monstrous suppression of opinion! For issuing literature criticizing the machine during the election period and fighting for their rights to invalidate the undemocratic election members were suspended for periods of three to five years.

Where Antonini Rules

In Local 89, of which Luigi Antonini, first Vice-President of the International, is boss, a slate of candidates headed by Frances Ribauda was put forward. But this opposition was crushed by similar means. The meeting at which candidates were nominated was carefully policed by Antonini stooges who walked up and down the aisles, an ominous warning to those who might challenge the leadership. The elections lacked even a pretext of democracy. Committeemen appointed by Antonini conducted the election, entered the booths, "advised" voters and counted the vote in good old Tammany style. In making up the ballot the machine resorted to the petty trick of printing Antonini's name in large, bold type while putting his opponents at the end of the ballot in inconspicuous type.

Appointed Officials

Some words are in order about the general conduct of this local. Democracy is a phrase which Antonini loves to roll, especially in his weekly broadcasts and in appeals for Italy, but Lady Democracy is a complete stranger in the affairs of this huge local of 30,000 members. Whereas the business agents are elected in all other locals except those denied autonomy, they are appointed in Local 89 by the Executive Board which is itself virtually a hand-picked affair. To qualify for the Executive or as an officer of the local, a candidate must be passed by an Examinations Committee which is given broad powers "to examine the *legal* and *moral* ability of the candidates and decide accordingly. . . ." And this Examinations Committee, which approves or disapproves candidates, is itself not elected, but an appointed body! It is set up in a highly selective way "with one member of the General Executive

Board duly *appointed* by the President of the I.L.G.W.U., the general manager of the Joint Board and three others who are well recognized in the labor movement *selected* by the Executive Board of the local" (Article 23, Chapter VIII of the Local By-Laws). Is it surprising that Antonini has repeatedly weeded out opposition and built a subservient machine with this Examinations Committee?

Meetings are rare events and take place at the discretion of Antonini about once in six months. How then do the members learn of the union business? This is done by weekly broadcasts over Station WEVD, "Meetings of the Air" as the members call them, where Antonini does all the talking.

To cover up this autocratic control, Antonini has set up a general shop council which meets on call. But it has not the slightest resemblance to a democratic shop organization. It is a council elected at a general meeting from a list of candidates nominated by individual members and not on the basis of the shop, which means most of the candidates cannot be known to the members and do not and cannot represent the shops. Ironically enough, this caricature of a shop council was put over by the Soviet-baiting Antonini in the name of "democracy of the Soviet type!" Is it any wonder that the name of Antonini is a by-word to the members of this local?

Machine rule in the I.L.G.W.U. is not a new development in this union but is rooted in the past. Bureaucracy long ago established itself and worked out its high-handed methods of dealing with membership opposition. Never at any time did the ruling hierarchy permit democracy to the point where it might jeopardize its position. Whenever confronted with such a threat, the leadership resorted to the policy of expulsion, even to the point of ousting the majority of members as in the infamous case of the expulsion of the leadership of Locals 2, 9, and 22, in 1926. The entire history of the union in the twenties is filled with

numerous expulsions whereby the leadership entrenched itself. As we see in the Local 10 case, it is again resorting to these methods, and, if confronted with rank-and-file militancy, will no doubt continue to wield this club.

VII. WAR AGAINST FASCISM— ON WHICH SIDE WAS DUBINSKY?

We have so far discussed the national policies of the Dubinsky leadership. We must now go over to its international policies and activities. This is necessary not only because this group has been extremely busy in world politics, regarding it as one of their specialties, but also because world affairs have become an inseparable part of daily life. There is not a single family or a single person whose life and fortune has not been directly affected by international policies, by the struggle between democracy and fascism, and especially by the great war which has just ended.

This colossal struggle cost the lives of 50 million persons and destroyed wealth running into hundreds of billions. It was brought about by German and Japanese fascism which sought to conquer and dominate the world. Fascism turned entire nations into rubble, converted millions into slaves and exterminated whole regions and peoples, annihilating one-half the Jewish people of the world. Not a wall remains of the Ghetto which made up one-third of Warsaw. Fascism which overran Europe and Asia threatened the independence of the entire world. Had Hitlerism and Japanese imperialism been victorious, civilization would have been blotted out and darkness would have descended on the world for 30 to 40 years. This terrible menace was defeated by the alliance of democratic states and peoples, and in the first place by the Soviet Union whose great armies tore the guts out of the Nazi Wehrmacht.

What was the policy of the Dubinsky forces toward this tremendous conflict with fascism, particularly toward the war with Nazi Germany? For years they regarded the Soviet Union as the chief menace of the world; they talked of the Soviet state as a "totalitarian" state and as "masked fascism," more open to condemnation than open fascism. The associate editor of the Jewish issue of *Justice*, replying to a strong criticism by the president of Pressers Local 362 of Baltimore to an anti-Soviet campaign of the paper in 1943, justified his position on the ground that the Soviet system was "Russian fascism [which] masks itself as the dictatorship of the proletariat . . ." and "*a masked fascism,*" he wrote, is even more condemnable because it *is more dangerous than open fascism.*" (*Jewish Justice*, April, 1943. Emphasis mine—W.W.)

Before the attack of Germany upon the Soviet Union, the Dubinsky group tried to stir up America for war against the Soviet Union in behalf of "little Finland"—the Finland which was in the grip of the Czarist Mannerheim who tried to take Leningrad and open the road to Moscow for the Nazis.

Against Collective Security

When the Soviet-German pact was signed the group carried on a campaign of unprecedented violence, trying to turn the wrath of the people away from the Chamberlain gang that was responsible for the appeasement policy and which refused a pact with the Soviet Union that could have prevented the war. They blamed the outbreak of the war in 1939 on the Soviet Union and deliberately misrepresented the pact between Germany and the Soviet Union as designed by Stalin to aid Hitlerism. Yet it is well known today that the pact served to defeat the cunning attempts of reactionaries to create a front of Britain, France and Germany against the Soviet Union. It also

gave the Soviet Union two additional years to prepare for the eventual war with Hitler and at the same time enabled it to save large numbers in Eastern Europe, including one million Jews.

The fact is that the Dubinsky group opposed the policy of collective security which Communists and progressives advocated in order to stop Hitler and insure the peace. It supported the policy of appeasement which cost so much blood and torment to the peoples of the world. The coalition of democratic states was finally formed, however, after the invasion of the Soviet Union by Hitler. England and America, which had refused such an alliance with the Soviet Union before, were now compelled to join forces with the Soviet Union out of sheer necessity. Yet even then there were imperialist forces in Britain and America that continued to work for the destruction of the Soviet Union. Churchill and the Chamberlain gang in Britain, and Hoover, Byrnes, Vandenberg and Farley in America, had as their paramount aim to bleed the Soviet Union to death. Having nourished the Nazis, and built up a Frankenstein monster that turned on them, they fought not to destroy fascism but to weaken Nazi Germany as an imperialist competitor and to use it as a tool against the Soviet Union. They never intended, nor do they intend now, to wipe out fascism, *whose revival they are again fostering*. Their purpose was two-fold—subjugation of an imperialist rival—destruction of the Soviet Union. Towards this end, they blocked the opening of a second front for several years and deliberately dragged out the war.

The Dubinsky group worked along the same lines. Their paramount aim, too, was the destruction of the Soviet Union. *They, too*, favored the dragging out of the war so that the Soviet Union would finally collapse. Moreover, they worked for a regrouping of forces with the United States finally aligned against the Soviet Union.

"The Last Shot"

This shameful purpose was first stated by I. Chanin, secretary of the Workmen's Circle, a long and intimate associate of Dubinsky in the Jewish labor movement. Writing in the Workmen's Circle publication *Friend*, in 1942, soon after the outbreak of the war between Germany and the Soviet Union, he declared: "*The last shot [in this war will] be fired by the United States and from that shot the Stalin regime too will be shot to pieces.*" (Publication of Workmen's Circle, *Friend*, Vol. XXXIII, No. 1, January, 1942.)

This call for the overthrow of Stalin and the Soviet Union aroused tremendous indignation among the Jewish people. But it was nonetheless brazenly endorsed and repeated by David Dubinsky. Speaking before the Workmen's Circle Convention in the following year in April, 1943, he said:

When Chanin wrote that the Stalin dictatorship would be shot to pieces, the accusation also fell on me and Abe Cahan [editor of the Jewish Daily Forward]. I want to declare here openly that I am in agreement with Chanin's words. (Jewish Daily Forward, May 3, 1943.)

Clear enough. War on the Soviet Union—that must be the final aim of this war. That there may be no mistaken idea that these were just chance remarks, or mere spilling of spleen, we will burden the readers with just one more document.

A conference of American and European Social-Democrats took place in the New York Rand School on July 1, 1941, just nine days after the invasion of the Soviet Union. These Social-Democrats, with whom the Dubinskyites maintain the closest ties, and some of whom they finance in the name of helping "anti-Nazi exiles," drew up a

declaration of war aims and peace terms which was signed among others by William E. Bohn, editor of the *New Leader*, and Algernon Lee, director of the Rand School. The declaration reads:

If the Bolshevik regime should survive the war, the democratic nations must recognize it as a source of danger. The League of Nations should prepare *armed force* against the Soviet Union and use all means of moral and economic pressure to hasten the liquidation of Bolshevism. (*War Aims and Peace Terms*—Rand School Press, p. 10.)

That was in 1941.

Chanin spoke out in 1942.

Dubinsky affirmed this despicable aim in 1943.

And it was the guiding strategy of the group in every phase of the war.

This explains why the *New Leader*, political organ of the Dubinsky group, insisted that lend-lease be given to the Soviet Union only on condition that "the Stalin regime be overthrown first."

This explains why Dubinsky made such a terrific campaign against the Soviet Union when it executed Alter and Ehrlich—two spies of the London Polish Government trying to carry out the program of the "last shot."

This explains why only 8 per cent of the large funds collected by the International for war relief went to the Soviet Union which carried the overwhelming burden of the war and whose peoples suffered the greatest deprivation.

With the Polish Fascists

This explains why the last International Convention at Boston did not have a single speaker who talked of cementing the alliance with the Soviet Union. Speaker after speaker sniped, denounced and warned the gathering of

the danger of the Soviets communizing Europe, in a language indistinguishable from Hitler's fulminations against Bolshevism. Of all the statesmen in Washington to address the convention, Dubinsky chose Attorney General Biddle and Adolphe Berle, Jr., two well-known Soviet-baiters.

And finally, it makes clear the ardent support and defense by the Dubinskyites of the ex-Polish government of London. David Dubinsky, speaking before an A. F. of L. postwar forum at the Hotel Commodore on April 12-13, 1944, made an appeal on behalf of this government "as representing a cross-section of Poland itself" and "composed of a majority of sincere democrats, many of them well-known leaders of the labor movement." (Complete Report of Proceedings, p. 16.) Of course, everyone knows that this was a government composed mainly of Pans and Colonels. It was the group that persecuted the Jews in the Polish London Army and whose agents in Poland circulated propaganda that "it is a good thing the Germans are killing the Jews; we will have less work to do after the war." It was the government whose underground army in Poland, headed by the Fascist General Okulicki, carried on terroristic acts against the Red Army, *had dealings with the Nazis and prepared for a war jointly with Germany against the Soviet Union.*

General Okulicki admitted that the underground army was maintained after the Soviets entered Poland precisely for that purpose. He stated the calculations of the Polish reactionaries as follows: "In the event of the victory of the U.S.S.R. over Germany this will not only threaten Britain's interest in Europe but the whole of Europe will be frightened. . . . Considering their own interests in Europe, the British will have to proceed to the mobilization of the forces of Europe against the U.S.S.R. It is clear that we shall take a place in the front ranks of this European anti-Soviet bloc; it is also impossible to visualize this bloc without the participation of Germany which will be con-

trolled by the British.* *And this band of anti-Semites and fascists, determined to continue as mercenary troops of reaction and imperialism, was embraced, defended and regarded as democrats by the Dubinskyites.*

Thus, in the most epoch-making war, when progressive humanity was united and fighting in all parts of the far-flung globe against barbarous reaction which historically seeks to halt the advance of civilization, the Dubinsky officialdom of the I.L.G.W.U. was on the side of reaction, seeking to split the unity of the democratic powers and viley intriguing for a reactionary war against the main bulwark of victory—the Soviet Union. *There can be no greater condemnation of any group.*

Intrigue Goes On

The policy of Dubinsky and the pro-fascist reactionaries in our country met defeat. The alliance of the United Nations withstood the cunning maneuvers of Hitlerism and its aides. The Dubinskyites had miscalculated the strength of the land of socialism. Lacking faith in a working class regime and blinded by hatred, they believed their own fairy-tales about the weakness of the Soviet Union, or else they were taken in by their Polish cronies. Steeped to their eyes in prejudice, they were unable to rightly assess the profoundly democratic nature of the Soviet state, whose rights (including the right to work) are the widest in the world, and whose people are free of any form of economic, national or political oppression because there are no classes which live by exploiting others in that Socialist country. And that is why the Soviet Union fought so heroically and emerged more powerful. But this fact did not stop the game of intrigue. On the

* *The Case of the Sixteen Poles*, published by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, pp. 24-25.

contrary, Dubinsky and his group, frightened at the growth of the Soviets and the resurgence of democracy in Europe, have become even more desperate.

Strategy Today

The strategy for the postwar period which is now being followed by the Dubinsky group was laid down by Raphael Abramovitch, dean of political advisers to Dubinsky on world affairs, a bitter and cynical old plotter against the Soviet Union. Writing in the *Jewish Daily Forward* on March 1, 1945, after the Yalta Conference, Abramovitch said:

The Yalta Declaration on liberated Europe is an empty shell if it is to be interpreted as an earnest guarantee of European democracy. It is not an earnest guarantee and cannot be as long as the allies cannot and *do not want to quarrel with Russia*. (Emphasis mine—W.W.)

Thus we are told that the key to everything is a willingness to quarrel with Russia.

But, adds this crafty schemer, "Let us not give up hope. The first time in the history of both America and Europe, Europe's order and democracy becomes the business of the United States."

As yet it is only in principle. "But from principle the real thing can develop."

The real thing!—to develop a quarrel between the United States and the Soviet Union, the two greatest powers upon whom the peace of the world in highest measure rests. To create quarrels and to tear the alliance asunder, the Dubinsky gang, together with other Social-Democratic plotters, have been seizing upon every difficulty arising from the multitude of world problems.

They are unrestrained in their attacks on the new

democratic governments of Rumania, Bulgaria, Poland and Yugoslavia. Their stand on these countries is bitterly shameful because it is directed against a people, enslaved for centuries, who are finally carrying out a great democratic revolution against the feudal oppressors who sold their countries to Hitler.

With Luce and Hoover

They violently attack the unity of the Big Powers and particularly strive to abolish the veto power which is a mainstay of unity and peace and a guarantee that the new security organization will not degenerate into another League of Nations. They energetically support and encourage the Big Stick and atom bomb diplomacy of American reactionaries, and defend the British Labor Party's foreign policies which are indistinguishable from those of the former Tory Government.

They have warm words of praise for MacArthur's appeasement line in Japan while keeping up a drumfire against the Soviet Union, whose determined efforts to protect democracy in Europe and Asia they decry as Soviet imperialism.

They do not content themselves with merely echoing the pro-fascist Hearst and Patterson press, but are in the van of the campaign, fabricating slogans and arguments to keep it at fever pitch, joining hands with the crudest imperialists. This can be seen from two unprecedented acts: In July, 1945, Antonini signed a joint memorial with Hoover and Landon to President Truman, then at the Potsdam Big Three Conference, urging him to demand the immediate withdrawal of Russian troops from Poland or to occupy that friendly country with British and American soldiers. This was done at a time when the Polish Government was still in the throes of establishing order in that fascist-ridden land.

On May 5, 1945, the Dubinsky-Woll led American Labor Conference for International Affairs, under the signature of its Executive Director, Varian Fry, mailed to all its labor affiliates, the *manifesto of the multimillionaire publisher, Henry Luce*. This manifesto called for "an Anglo-American agreement . . . continuing the combined military staffs and pooling British and American bases in every part of the world for 20 years. . . ." Thus, almost a year before Churchill, the Dubinsky group raised the imperialist banner of an Anglo-American bloc after the war.

Anti-Soviet politics, it may be said, makes strange bed-fellows. The Luces, Hoovers and Landons are by no means strangers to the Dubinskys and Antoninis. They are becoming quite good friends.

Their campaign has not been without success. Today we stand in danger of a new world slaughter—a war against the Soviet Union. Of course, if it comes, such a war will be a reactionary war against the interests of the people of the world. It will be an imperialist war against the new democracies, the colonial nations as well as the Soviet Union. It will be a war for the domination of the American dollar over the world, with Britain acting as junior partner. It will revive the fascist forces of Europe and destroy the newly-found liberties of the people. This is the kind of war which Winston Churchill called for in his infamous address at Fulton, Mo., which was given the blessing of President Harry S. Truman.

Through a Picket Line

Yet, Dubinsky, Antonini and Zimmerman walked through a C.I.O. picket line to attend the Churchill dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria on March 15, 1946, to sit with the Park Avenue upper crust and to lend the prestige and name of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union

to this terrible conspiracy. We must ask the members of the I.L.G.W.U., who surely have not the slightest sympathy with such purposes: is it not a disgrace to your organization and to labor to have your President and two Vice-Presidents walk through a picket line to cheer the spokesman of the rotten British Empire which suppresses the Greek people, terrorizes and enslaves the Indian people and helps to keep the Butcher Franco in power? Was it not a slap in the face of all who are fighting the deceitful imperialist policy in Palestine and which prevents the people of Italy from achieving their full freedom and sovereignty? Is it not time to speak out in clear and forceful tones that this desperate intrigue of the I.L.G.W.U. officials must cease, that labor and I.L.G.W.U. want friendship with the Soviet Union, want to advance the democratic cause and do not want to be a pawn of the du Ponts and McCormicks and Hearsts to choke the cause of the people's progress?

An Incident at the Convention

The dangerous road which the leadership of the union is traveling is glaringly revealed by an incident at the Boston Convention in 1944, which must be related.

The Baltimore Joint Board and the Maryland-Virginia District presented a resolution (No. 60) to the Committee on Foreign policy. The resolution simply and forcefully demanded that the aims of the war be set forth clearly as the end of the Nazi system. It is a brief resolution. Here is its main section:

Wheras, in the opinion of organized labor, the present war is a war to the death for the destruction of fascism and nazism and the resurgence of democracy, and

Whereas, there exists among influential officials of our State Department the view that the war will be won when Hitler, Mussolini and Tojo all have been deposed, and

Whereas, in the opinion of organized labor the above viewpoint is a narrow one and unless a broader view is substituted may lead to a recurrence of the evil conditions which caused the present war,

Therefore, be it resolved that the idea of unconditional surrender be interpreted to mean the *total destruction of fascist and Nazi machines and the elimination of all fascist and Nazi officials and supporters.* (Emphasis mine—W.W.)

This is a direct and forceful warning against appeasers and the danger of fascism (which is surely valid today), a call to overthrow the whole Nazi system, and a direct challenge to the ideas of a negotiated peace which were current in the country at that time.

You would think that among anti-fascist trade unionists there should be no trouble whatsoever in passing this resolution.

Let us see what happened to it.

It was referred to the Committee on National and International Affairs, of which Israel Feinberg was chairman. In reporting, Feinberg mentioned this resolution and stated that the committee had given it serious consideration and wished to submit a statement of principles in relation to foreign policy.

What was this statement of principles? What is the adoption and elaboration of this anti-fascist resolution?

No. The statement piously declared in vague and general terms that the war should bring a better social system, serve democracy, peace and cooperation of peoples, etc., with which all could agree, but—*it did not contain a single demand of Resolution 60.* It did not mention by a single direct word the view that the Nazi regime must be overthrown and that the fascist machine must be destroyed.

What happened? By a sleight-of-hand trick under the cloak of a few general words against "military dictatorship" and "aggressive nationalism" which can mean anything and

everything, Feinberg substituted the anti-Soviet resolution, No. 155 of the New York Cloakmakers Joint Board, which he heads, for the anti-Hitler Resolution No. 60.

Anti-Nazi Resolution No. 60 was out. Anti-Soviet Resolution No. 155 was adopted.

Such is the inevitable result of the game of intrigue, trickery and appeasement that the Dubinskyites got into.*

It is not hard to see that if you want a war against the Soviet Union, you will not adopt a resolution which calls for a "war to the death" against Nazism.

If you want the end of the Soviet Union, you inevitably lean to the idea of preserving the remnants of fascism, of German generals, of the German armed forces, of economic power which might be useful for a bloc against the Soviet Union to deliver finally the shot that will destroy it—especially if the Soviet Union itself can fire not one but many shots against the fascists, as has been proven to the gratitude of mankind.

* We refer the reader to Resolutions No. 60 and No. 155 in Resolutions, 25th Convention, I.L.G.W.U., pp. 16 and 39. Also to *25th Convention Proceedings*, pp. 337-8.

VIII. WORLD LABOR UNITY

The newly-created World Federation of Trade Unions is one of the chief forces insuring a democratic postwar world. After 25 years of disunity, as a result of which fascism came to power in Europe, the labor movements of the United States, Britain, the Soviet Union, France, China and other United Nations met at London and Paris, and set up an international organization. This unity was in response to a deeply felt desire of the trade unionists of the world, and naturally its birth has aroused tremendous enthusiasm among all progressive people. The new organization unites 75,000,000 working men and women.

Bulwark of Peace

The World Congress has issued a manifesto backing up the need for a permanent security organization of the United Nations, for rooting out fascism and for the advancement of democracy. It is acting to defend the unions of Greece, Spain and other oppressed countries and it is aiding the rebirth of unionism in Germany as the solid foundation of democracy in that land. It calls for economic cooperation instead of rivalry among nations, proposing extensive world trade to avoid an economic crisis and to provide full employment, and it urges higher wages to raise the living standards and to elevate the social and economic conditions of the people of all countries.

The international labor body will work to raise the wages and abolish the terrible sweatshop conditions of workers in colonial countries.

Above all, it will be a bulwark of the people against

the warmakers, for in the last analysis, peace rests in the vigorous and united stand of the working people—of the labor movement.

But the one labor organization absent from the London Conference, and standing aside from the united world labor movement, is the American Federation of Labor.

That is a queer situation for the garment union which has always been international-minded. World solidarity of labor has always been a cherished tradition and close to the hearts of its members. In fact, when the A. F. of L. in former years stood aside from world labor, I.L.G.W.U. delegates to A. F. of L. conventions fought for affiliation. And today the union stands in the shabby position of trailing behind the backward-looking officials of the A. F. of L. and holds itself aloof from the working men of London, Paris, Moscow and Milan. No, *it would be more correct to say that Dubinsky and his group are among the prime movers in this trade union isolationism.*

Nagler in England

Consider the actions of Isadore Nagler at the British Trade Union Congress at Southampton in September, 1943. Appearing before the British trade unions at a critical period in the world, when the fascists were maneuvering in every way to pull the big democratic powers apart, Nagler, speaking as delegate of the A. F. of L., not only declared his opposition to an alliance between the Soviet and American unions "because the Soviet trade unions are instruments of the State," but he went farther and made a deliberate effort to disrupt the alliance already formed and functioning for some time between the British and Russian unions. Here are his words:

The Soviet trade unions are not free labor organizations in the democratic sense of the term but are the instruments of a state.

We would oppose any liaison with such trade unions in any country. Moreover, any liaison with the Soviet trade unions would not help the war effort. On the contrary, it would only accentuate already existing ideological differences and conflicts and would carry division into the ranks of labor in *this* country, thus injuring the primary concern of the United Nations, that of speeding up production and prosecuting the war to a successful conclusion. (Emphasis mine—W.W.)

(From the General Executive Board Report to the 25th Convention.)

What a dishonorable role Nagler assumed to attack the Soviet unions before British labor and to seek to disrupt the well-functioning Anglo-Soviet Unity Committee. This scurrilous attack on the Soviet Union so infuriated the needle workers that 3,000 cabled their opposition to Nagler's stand to the British Trade Union Congress.. And yet this disgraceful speech was endorsed by the G.E.B. in its Boston Convention report "as a notable address." It reprinted the above words as a summary of its own position.

Of course, the British unions disregarded the remarks of Nagler. Their experience proved the very opposite to what Nagler predicted. Far from accentuating differences, they were lessened. Far from hurting the war effort, the alliance helped to raise morale and boosted production. Far from injuring the unity of labor within the country, it strengthened it. The election victory over the Tories showed that. The World Trade Union Conference is the fruit of Anglo-Soviet cooperation.

Nonetheless, Dubinsky and the A. F. of L. continued their opposition on the alleged ground that they would not sit with unfree unions, with the Soviets in particular. Is it really a matter of principle with them? Is it directed at the Russian unions alone? What do they mean by "free unions"?

Isolationism

In a recent statement, the A. F. of L. chiefs explain their conception of freedom. They declared "unions can be free only if they are based on the system of individual initiative and private ownership." And what of Europe, where much of the industries are nationalized and more will become government-operated to overcome the ravages of war? What of the European unions that advocate nationalization? What of the French or the British unions that have championed this demand for many years and are beginning to put it into practice? Evidently, then, the unions in continental Europe are not free unions. Sir Walter Citrine, secretary of the British unions, was assailed by George Meany, secretary of the A. F. of L., at a meeting of the New York Central Labor Trades on the ground that, according to Meany, he packed the London Trade Union Conference, at the behest of the "Foreign Office." Meany added that the unions of the colonies could come to London only through air passage provided by the British government. They, too, then, are "government controlled" unions. It turns out that the only free unions are those of the A. F. of L.

But can you have an international labor movement if you exclude the Russians "because they are not free," exclude the C.I.O. "because they are dual unions," exclude the European trade unions "because they are not based on individual initiative and private ownership," brush aside the British unions as "Foreign Office dictated," eliminate the Latin American unions because "they are totalitarian dominated," and all of them because they are a "front for the Communists." Obviously, you cannot. The picture is clear. Beginning with the Russian unions, the attack is now directed against nine-tenths of the world labor movement. Fine world unity, indeed!

The fact is that the A. F. of L. leaders, including Dubin-

sky, do not want a virile international organization. Just as they oppose unity with the C.I.O. because they are progressive, but on the pretext that they are "dual unions," so they are afraid of the fresh winds blowing throughout the world, of the new vigorous anti-fascist trade unions that have arisen in Europe and elsewhere. Their position is much like that of Hoover, Byrnes, and Rankin, who are opposed to real world cooperation, but do so under the mask of liberal talk about "justice," "protection of small nations," "democracy," etc.—all empty declarations on their lips.

A Bad Guess

Yet to carry through such a policy is not easy. The workers want and need unity. Dubinsky and Woll had the answer—"Re-establish the old International Federation of Trade Unions"—that's a safe organization because it never included the C.I.O. and the Russian unions. Never mind that it died a dishonorable death a long time ago and was never heard of during the many critical years of the war. Reurrect the dead and use the corpse to block the new international. That was the slogan of these crafty officials. And indeed, it was the hope of Dubinsky that with this slogan he would prevent an agreement at the recent London and Paris meetings. In fact he declared at a meeting of Local 117, in March, 1945, that the chances were 75 per cent that the London Conference would not even be held. He guessed badly. And what is more, his friends of the old international left him in the lurch. What remained of that organization joined up with the new, and became a part of it! However, this did not stop their opposition. They not only continue their verbal attacks but cling to the International Labor Office, an offshoot of the deceased League of Nations, and use it to prevent the full representation of the World Federation of Trade Unions

in the councils of the United Nations organization.

It would be a mistake to think that this represents the sentiments of the membership of the A. F. of L., or of the I.L.G.W.U. The membership does not want isolationism either in relations between nations or unions. That day is gone. Practically all districts of the machinists have gone on record—700,000 are for the World Conference; in the Painters Union, 200,000 members favor it; District Councils in Cleveland, Minneapolis and New Haven are against the A. F. of L. stand; three hundred local unions of the A. F. of L. sent wires to the Paris meeting of the World Labor Federation endorsing the organization. And garment union members would stand for the World Federation of Trade Unions if free debate were allowed. *Will Dubinsky invite representatives of the World Federation to present the issue to the locals of the I.L.G.W.U.?*

Such is the position of Dubinsky and Nagler on international unity—they are working against it. And in whose company do they stand?—in the company of such “free unions” as the International Longshoremen’s Union, with its president, John P. Ryan, “elected for life”; with the Hod-Carriers Union whose indicted president held off a convention for 30 years; with the Carpenters’ Union, headed by Czar Hutcheson.

Soviet Trade Unions

Since so much has been said about the Soviet trade unions that is false and intended to poison our relations with our Soviet ally, let us see what the Soviet unions are really like. Are they independent, and free “in the democratic sense of the term?” In order to avoid any argument about the truth, we will quote from the celebrated authorities on the British trade unions and for 30 years leaders in the British Labor Party, the noted Sydney and Beatrice Webb.

In their study of the Soviet Union, *Soviet Communism*, the Webbs state that trade union membership in the Soviet Union is voluntary, not compulsory. One pays an initiation fee on entrance and regular monthly dues. The unions carry on negotiations for wages and working conditions and sign agreements with management. They have clubs, theatres, sports groups, daily newspapers, and other educational institutions and in matters of culture do on a large scale what any good union in the United States can at best do only in a very limited way. The unions work, however, in a socialist country where the workers control industry. They, therefore, have rights and functions which we do not have. They have the control of the whole social insurance fund of the country, and take part in matters affecting production, since an increase in output benefits them directly in wages, and indirectly through improvement of the national wealth.

Describing the democratic spirit and interests of the members of the Soviet trade unions, the Webbs write: "The workers' meetings are free and well attended to the extent of 50 per cent and sometimes over 75 per cent of the whole body, and by women as well as men. They are the occasions for much unrestrained discussion of persons as well as of industrial policy and local conditions of life."*

The Soviet trade unions are independent of the Soviet government and the Communist Party. At the same time they work in closest collaboration with these and other organizations to advance the welfare of the workers and toilers. The allegation that the trade unions are not free because they are dominated by the Communist Party is without any foundation, as can be seen from the fact cited in a report in 1939 by N. Schvernick, then head of the Soviet unions, that "among the members of the trade

* *Soviet Communism*, p. 180.

union committee of factories and other establishments 80 per cent are non party. . . .”*

Discussing the work and influence of the Communist Party, the Webbs ridicule the idea that it pushes the trade union members around, stating that “if the Party influences or directs the policy of individuals or public authorities, it does so openly by persuasion. If it exercises power, it does so by ‘keeping the conscience’ of its own members and getting them elected by the popular vote.”**

As to the absence of strikes in the Soviet Union, Michael P. Tarasov, Soviet trade union leader, writes: “Naturally American workers who have taken the no-strike pledge understand why we have no strikes during the war. But even in peace time we have no strikes because the workers have always had other and effective means for adjusting their grievances. There is not and never has been any anti-strike legislation in our country because the question of strikes simply does not arise.” He continues: “Although the unions at all times fully criticize management for any inefficiency or failure to protect their interests, there is no basis for hostility between labor and management. Our workers are fully acquainted with the financial situation in the country as a whole and in their own enterprises. They know that under our economic system, no individual receives any profit but that everyone including the plant management is a wage earner . . . for all these reasons there can be no question of strikes which curtail production. We can only speak of the constant effort to raise productivity still higher, which in turn results in still better working conditions and greater cultural facilities.”***

Since this was written, a report has been made by a

* *The Land of Socialism Today and Tomorrow*, p. 405.

** *Soviet Communism*, p. 340.

*** *Soviet Russia Today*, p. 30.

delegation of C.I.O. union leaders to the Soviet Union which fully substantiates the fact that the unions of the Soviet Union are strong, virile, democratic organizations.

What slander, then, to talk of the Soviet unionists as "slave labor." What is the test of the freedom of unions and unionists? It is heroism, productivity, culture and independent bearing of their members. And on this basis do they not stand among the first in the world? Slave labor is not heroic. It is notoriously wretched and unproductive, whereas the Soviet unionists have performed marvels of production. What are the Red Army men whom the world applauds for their heroism? Are they not trade unionists in uniform? You would think that labor leaders, especially those who once claimed that they were "believers in socialism," would take pride in the accomplishments of union men in any part of the world. Not so with the officials of the garment International.

IX. MONEY-BAGS FOR DISRUPTION

The Dubinsky group does not limit its disruption to the sphere of tactical maneuvers. It uses hard cash as well. It is a fact that the International raises large sums of money for other than direct union matters. A yearly dollar tax for "labor organizations and institutions," imposed in 1941, brought in over \$900,000, according to the 1944 financial report. Where do these funds go and for what purpose? A number of useful public welfare institutions received money from this fund. But to which labor bodies did the money go?

Two of the main recipients of the International's money are the Jewish Labor Committee and the Italian-American Labor Council. The Jewish Labor Committee, which is headed by Adolph Held as president and Dubinsky as treasurer, received from the International in the period 1940-44 sums from both the "Labor Solidarity Fund," as well as directly from the War Relief Assessment, a total of \$91,500, not including \$15,000 assigned to the Jewish Labor Committee to forward to Russian War Relief. ("Financial and Statistical Report," *25th Convention Proceedings*.)

This committee receives funds from other unions and from the general public. Let us see how it disposed of them. It must be said that its reports of expenditures are very vague and the purposes very general. It is not easy to tell *specifically* where the funds go. In its report for the year ending Dec. 31, 1944 the Jewish Labor Committee gives the figure of \$332,295.13 for *European* work, which it describes with the all-inclusive title: "Underground and

Labor Institutions, Rescue and Activities Against Anti-Semitism and Intolerance." Not very definite. But let us look further for a light on its doings. The report quite early published a letter of thanks, apparently from the French labor movement and supposedly as a token for work in the restoration of the French unions. The name of the General Confederation of Labor is mentioned in the letter, but it is signed by one Albert Giulio, who calls himself "Representative of the French Union Movement."

The report, strangely enough, fails to say whether money was sent by the Committee to the French Confederation of Labor which continued to function during the occupation. If it did, why was no letter received from that organization or from its representatives, but instead from an individual with such an unofficial, non-existing office? Evidently, it is from some group within the Confederation. Why did groups receive funds and not the Confederation itself? And why say in the report that it is a "tribute from the French labor movement?"

The same report (page 4) also says we "started building the council for the underground a year and a half ago . . . a council in which are represented the labor movements of Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary, Germany, Norway, France, Poland, Luxembourg, Belgian, Holland, Denmark, the International Transport Federation and the Jewish Trade Union Movement in Poland." What is this council? Is it the revival of the bankrupt Socialist International?

The report continues, "the American labor movement was primarily interested in the trade union movement in Europe, we had to place our primary interest in the democratic European socialist movement." But the trade union movement in Europe is wider than the socialist movement. It includes workers of all political beliefs and in most countries is united into single trade union bodies. Why

was money, collected for aid to the *labor movement*, used *exclusively for the Socialist parties*? Why has it not turned over such funds to the united trade union organizations? The report records no such donations.

Which Underground?

The "Underground of Poland" is mentioned as receiving funds. It says "our help went constantly to Poland, to the Jews in the Ghettos, to those engaged in the *underground movement*." Which underground is this? The underground in Poland was controlled by the ex-Polish Government forces and, as facts show, this was an anti-Semitic group engaged in preparing for war on the Soviet Union, having relations with the Nazis and still, today, carrying on anti-Semitic fascist attacks on Jews in Poland. Will the Jewish Labor Committee state to whom the funds went? In its report the year before, in 1943, it says that funds were sent through the Polish Government in London for refugees who came from Poland to the Soviet Union. To what extent have they been working through this anti-Semitic Polish government?

Other funds are listed as distributed for relief to refugees from nazism in Europe. But this, too, hardly tells to whom the funds went. The reason for anonymity is not strange. These funds were used to bring to the United States the Social Democratic general staff from European countries, men like Abramovitch, Seghers and Stampfer of the German Social-Democratic Party who were responsible for paving the way for the victory of fascism in those countries and whose main occupation in the United States is to plot against allied unity, and who seek to return to power in Germany as agents of the imperialists.

The fact of the matter is that the Jewish Labor Committee is the main arm of the Social-Democratic leaders in the United States to prevent Jewish unity and the

development of a strong labor movement abroad. With agents in the main cities of our land and with other connections in Europe, it intrigues and works to prevent a real democratic labor movement arising in liberated Europe. It serves as a divisive force in the Jewish world at a time when the Jewish people are suffering the worst torments in history. That is why the Jewish leader of the British Workmen's Circle, Dr. W. Baron, condemned the splitting work of the Helds, Dubinskys, Chanins and others in this committee, saying that their Red-baiting was harmful to the American people.

Antonini and Pope

The Italian Labor Council is headed by Liugi Antonini and received from the International in the years 1940-44 directly the sum of \$50,000. Another sum of \$25,000 was assigned from the 1943 War Relief Fund for "Italian Underground," and a like sum for the "Free Trade Unions in Italy." ("Financial and Statistical Report," *25th Convention Proceedings*.) The Italian Labor Council was organized to assist the rise of a democratic Italy. The nature of the work of Antonini is revealed by his alliance with Generoso Pope, publisher of the *Progresso Italia America*, after the fall of Mussolini. This scandalous alliance outraged the Italian labor movement. It caused the resignation from the Council of its secretary, Joseph Cattalonati, and two members of the Board, Angelica Bellanca of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, and George Baldanzi, executive vice-president of the Textile Workers Union of America, who denounced such collaboration with Pope as appeasement of fascists "*who extolled the beauties of fascism and all the crimes committed in its name.*"

Now Pope's paper publishes weekly the addresses of Antonini delivered over Station WEVD, the price he pays for such useful collaboration.

Funds are raised by Antonini for a free Italian labor movement and the International gives funds for this purpose. In 1944 Antonini announced a trip to Italy and at the same time the press reported that he was taking with him \$250,000 for the union movement. Antonini went and returned, but failed to leave this fund for the Italian unions. On his return he reported that the Confédération is united, including all former divisions of the labor movement, Socialist, Communist and Catholic. Very well, why not give the \$250,000, or the amounts raised for this fund, to this representative, free and united labor movement? The answer is found in the fact that this unity was not to the liking of Antonini, that he wanted a movement with the Communists out. He wanted a divided labor movement controlled by people of his type and was using the fund as bribery and blackmail to achieve it. The new labor movement in Italy is poor and needs funds. And the rich uncle coming from America with a fund announced as \$250,000 thought he could club the Italian unions into accepting his dictation.

The Rich Uncle from America

But this is outside interference of the rankest sort and the free Italian labor movement, including the Socialist leaders, branded it in that way. Here is what the Socialist Ignazio Silone wrote in *Avanti* (February 24, 1945) of Antonini's work in the United States, his broadcasts over WEVD and his trip to Italy:

By working for a split between the Socialists and the Communists and by setting the proletarian and democratic parties one against the other, they hope to be able to isolate the most active anti-fascist groups and to defeat one at a time the forces of the Left, as it happened 25 years ago in Italy and some 15 years later in Germany and in other countries. Wherever this happened, the reactionary forces prevailed. First it was the

turn of the Socialists and Communists, then the Democrats were singled out for destruction, and then the Catholics, the Liberals and the very conservative elements.

We know these schemes of the reactionary forces, because we were their first victims. . . . We would be criminally stupid if we should allow ourselves to fall once again into this vulgar trap. This is why we cannot but condemn the scandalous campaign waged by Liugi Antonini against the Communist Party of Italy, through those broadcasts which are largely advertised, from time to time, in our country, by the INS agency of the Hearst group.

That is the sordid use to which the funds of the International union are being put.

A third channel to which the "solidarity" funds go are Social-Democratic organizations of all kinds. Aside from the large sums expended for the fight in the American Labor Party to keep the Dubinsky group on top, a sum of between 45 and 50 thousand dollars went to 40 or 50 such organizations in the years 1940-44, some old and many new, and not a few of them just plain "back-door" organizations (see "Financial and Statistical Report," *25th Convention Proceedings*, pp. 26-27-28). Among them are the *Socialistike Vestnick*, the notorious anti-Soviet Russian paper edited by R. Abramovitch, which received \$700; the *Paris Novy Mir*, another such sheet which received \$200; the American Labor Conference for International Affairs, which got \$6,500, and the *New Leader*, \$5,000. This latter weekly is a Social-Democratic fifth-column sheet, which has among its contributors William Henry Chamberlin, who also writes regularly for Hearst, and *Eugene Lyons*, whose writings, according to the *Army paper Stars and Stripes of May 19, 1945*, were found among tons of propaganda used by Goebbels to demoralize American troops.

We must ask, by what right are funds which are raised

by direct tax from people of *all political opinions* and for "labor solidarity" used for such purposes? If people wish voluntarily to give to any specific political party, Social-Democratic or otherwise, that is a matter of their own consciences and they are obviously free to do so. But to tax workers for labor solidarity and use it for partisan, political purposes and of disruptive nature to boot, is that not a violation of elementary democratic rights? It is of course proper and necessary to donate money to aid the labor movement here, in Europe and in Asia. But surely the workers who donate the money, and indeed all of labor, have the right to demand and to know that it be done fairly, squarely and through representative agencies.

This cannot be said about the use of these funds.

Two Internationals in One

The International under Dubinsky has become one of the chief money-bags for anti-Soviet plotting and for sowing division in the world labor movement by direct agents and through connections which it helps to finance. Usually such work is carried on by a political party, and in the past was the work of the parties joined together in the Socialist International. Since that organization disappeared, such work is now carried on by Dubinsky, the *Jewish Daily Forward* and others. Rich America has become the center of world reactionary propaganda and Dubinsky's office has become one of its main centers. How neatly that fits in with the role of American imperialism on the new postwar scene! In fact what we have centralized in Dubinsky's office are two internationals—the trade union body which is known, and the secret, political organization and its ramifications which are not so known.

To carry on such work requires funds and time, and for this a special apparatus is necessary. Such an apparatus exists in the International under the direction of Jay Love-

stone, who sits in the International office and receives his salary from the International payroll as the expert wire-puller; added recently is the head of the Jewish Labor Committee, A. Held. They are assisted on the outside by such experts as William Chamberlin, Eugene Lyons of the *New Leader*, Raphael Abramovitch, and other intriguers.

Who is this Jay Lovestone? He was expelled from the Communist Party in 1929 as the head of a group of factional schemers who tried to tie the Communist Party to the policy of the trusts and monopolists. He attached himself later to Homer Martin of the Automobile Workers Union, which became torn by a bitter factional fight. Martin was expelled by the auto workers and joined the payroll of Henry Ford. Jay Lovestone later turned up in the International office of Dubinsky.

Is it not about time for the garment workers to put an end to such intrigue and financial misuse which only does the work of American imperialists in the labor field?

X. THE TRUE FACE OF SOCIAL- DEMOCRACY

We can now sum up the position of the Dubinsky group. Our discussion shows that we are dealing with a group that is not merely mistaken in its views, i.e., "men of good will—but wrong." We are dealing with a group whose policies and acts correspond to the needs of the most reactionary classes in our country.

What is at the bottom of its reactionary policies? Why does it perform such a degrading role? The answer is found in the fact that over a long period of time the social outlook of this group has degenerated. It has ceased to think and act from the standpoint of the working class; it has adopted a capitalist viewpoint and has cast its lot with the dying capitalist order.

At one time Dubinsky and his immediate followers believed in socialism, but they have discarded these "ideals of their youth," and have become defenders of the system of monopoly capital and trusts, called by the deceptive name of free enterprise.

Now we all know that there are many leaders of labor and millions of rank-and-file members who do not yet realize the need for socialism. That is a weakness, because labor can move forward with sureness and vigor only when it finally sees the need for a fundamental change in the present system of society. Labor leaders can act determinedly and consistently in behalf of the workers only if they stand on the viewpoint of the class struggle and realize clearly that labor's progress and its ultimate freedom will come not from the good will of the capitalists

but from the strength and fighting spirit of the working class itself.

These men and women are, nonetheless, progressive and militant trade unionists; most of them have awakened to unionism only recently and have not yet lost their faith in capitalism, but they are fighting the trusts and are becoming class conscious. They promote independent political action by labor. They are demanding government checks on the trusts, and they are bound to develop further. They are moving from backward to advanced positions in relation to the big social and political questions of the day. They will in time take up the viewpoint of socialism.

The Dubinsky group, however, has moved the other way; it has receded steadily from a more advanced to a backward position. "As you know I was a Socialist for many years. When I resigned from the Socialist Party in 1936 it was for purely political reasons. We believed in the New Deal and wanted Roosevelt elected. But since that time I have come to the conclusion that Socialism, certainly the orthodox variety, will not work," said Dubinsky, in expounding his views to Benjamin Stolberg, as recorded in *Taylor's Progress*. "Trade unionism needs capitalism like a fish needs water," he continued. "Democracy is possible only in a society of free enterprise and trade unionism can live only in a democracy.*"

Lock, Stock and Barrel

These are the same views held for 50 years by Samuel Gompers, the leader of the American Federation of Labor, and which were bitterly criticized and fought by socialists in the past, not only because such views rejected the struggle for a new system of society, but because they tied labor to the capitalist class. Such views stunted its growth and

* Benjamin Stolberg, *Taylor's Progress*, p. 197.

made it a pawn in the hands of the capitalists—accounting for the fact that the labor movement during the Gompers regime was the smallest and most backward in the world. Today the Dubinskyites have taken over these outworn views lock, stock and barrel.

When Gompers held these views they were, of course, wrong; but they were formed in the youth of the labor movement, when capitalism was still competitive and developing and seemed to be imbued with the spirit of eternal life. Then socialism had not yet appeared or seemed a remote thing, and capitalism in the main countries still practiced democracy, though always of a restricted kind. Most of these features, however, changed even before Gompers died in 1924. But Dubinsky and his group have renounced socialism and have taken to the system of capitalism when it has evolved into large scale national and international monopolies and cartels which smother small business and wipe out free enterprise. They extol capitalism when the country is being throttled and choked by the trusts; when capitalism on a world scale has proven that it is an outmoded and dying system which dooms millions to starvation, unemployment, recurring crises and wars. They lend their support to the present system when socialism has not only been established in one-sixth of the world, in the U.S.S.R., but works and has proven to be a far superior system, and when capitalism wipes out democracy, curbs and destroys trade unionism and when the whole system is shot through and through with reaction, violence and fascism.

A Dying Sytem

It is true that capitalism is still strong in the United States, but it is affected by the same mortal ailment as capitalism elsewhere and is unable to solve the problem of finding markets for its huge output, or avoid shatter-

ing crises. Only shallow opportunists who live from day to day and cannot see further than their noses would argue that American capitalism can free itself of the effects of general decay. It is now trying to do so by aiming to subject the whole world to its rule and the Dubinskyites are helping, but this will not improve the situation of capitalism. It can only worsen it.

The Dubinskys, Wolls, Hutchesons and Lewises, still talk of themselves as hard-headed people concerned with practical affairs who have no use for the "visionary ideas of radicals." But they are nothing of the kind. Experience proves that they are the most shortsighted people who sacrifice both the immediate as well as future interests of the working people, injure trade unionism, undermine democracy and the economic well-being of the nation the same as their kind of opportunists did in Europe in the past 25 years. They are really organizers of defeat of the working class.

They also make it appear that they are broad social-minded people whose horizon includes national matters, the well-being of the whole country, whereas those opposing them are narrowly selfish and interested only in a class. But they are nothing of the kind. They represent the narrowest craft interests of a very small section of well-paid workers (and nowadays even betray them) while they serve the most selfish interests of the top layer of capitalists, and sacrifice the well-being of the millions of toilers and of the nation as well. Only a working class leadership that vigorously acts in behalf of the whole of labor and the people can strengthen and promote the nation.

To the Rescue

The degeneracy of the Dubinsky group did not begin in 1936. It began much earlier and was already evident in 1917 when the Russian Revolution occurred. The revolu-

tion brought the workers to power and established socialism. It was a test for all who avowed a belief in socialism, and in that test the Social-Democratic Dubinsky group failed. They disavowed the Russian Socialist Republic and joined with the capitalist world to fight it. Their view was summed up by Morris Hillquit, attorney for the International Ladies Garment Workers Union and leader of the Socialist Party. "The Soviet Government has been the greatest calamity that has ever occurred to the Socialist movement. Let us disassociate ourselves from the Soviet Government." They not only disassociated themselves from the Soviet Union, but became its avowed enemy and worked unceasingly against it.

They not only adopted a reactionary attitude to the Russian Revolution, but became ardent defenders of the capitalist system and worked to restore it to normal again after the shattering effects of the First World War and the revolutionary upheavels of the working class which their Social-Democratic friends in Europe helped to crush. In practice, in the period after the first World War this became support for the plans of American capital to turn labor into a collection of docile workers. They supported the notorious speed-up schemes which the corporations camouflaged as systems of profit-sharing and labor-capital partnership, and spread the big business propaganda that a "new capitalism" was arising which would develop into "industrial democracy." They signed secret supplementary agreements with the employers to boost production which nullified the written agreements. They insisted then, as they are doing again today, that labor must fulfill a new role which excluded the policy of class struggle. That role was to collaborate with capitalism in its production schemes and at the same time establish labor banks and insurance companies by which means they claimed the workers would be able to secure a dominant position in our society. In reality, this course trapped

the labor movement and enfeebled it. The membership of the trade unions dropped to its lowest point. And in the end the "new capitalism" went down in the Big Crash of 1929.

Surrender

Of course, the surrender to the employers did not improve but worsened conditions of the garment workers. A large section elected a left-wing leadership in New York and in 1926 went on strike. At first the Sigman and Dubinsky group, apostles of class peace, who controlled the national leadership of the union, opposed a strike. However, when the workers demonstrated an overwhelming will to strike because of the fearful conditions, they agreed and sanctioned it, but they sabotaged it, worked against its success, and finally settled it to the detriment of the union, going over the heads of the New York Joint Board and the leaders of the strike. They then ran the whole gamut of crimes against the union by expelling the New York locals under left wing leadership which had a majority of the members of the union behind them, and cooperated openly with the employers and the police to perpetuate themselves in office.

Their subsequent history was described in the opening chapter of this pamphlet. The union, under their leadership, suffered a catastrophic decline. It recovered in the Roosevelt period as a result of the general upsurge of the labor movement and the militant activities of the membership. The Dubinsky group was swept along with the progressive tide but detached itself at the first opportunity and began a retreat which it is continuing with renewed speed.

Having assimilated themselves with capitalism, they go on with the system from one crisis to another and their past lives with them. Today, as the whole social structure of

capitalism is filled with new tension and as American imperialism seeks to solve its problems by becoming master of the world, they are at their self-appointed task of helping capitalism.

Without Principles

In their activities within the union, they reflected this degeneration, becoming people more and more without principles, without faith in the working class, admirers of the big corporations and their billions, which they regard as omnipotent. They bow in awe before the top crust of society while they grow contemptuous of those below in the rank-and-file of society. They become lackeys of Big Business, capitalist-minded bureaucrats, more concerned with winning the applause of the employers and the institutions they control than in servicing the workers, and they have reduced unionism from a great class movement of the oppressed workers aspiring to freedom to a business enterprise in which the main function of the union official is that of keeping the workers in line and holding them back from "radical" outbursts. Such subservience is bound to influence officials personally and it does. William Z. Foster, in his *Misleaders of Labor*, noted as early as 1927 that there is hardly another industry in which there has been so steady a stream of business agents graduating from unionism into business.

Most of the Dubinsky group belongs to or work with the Social-Democratic Federation, the Liberal Party, the Socialist Party and other Social-Democratic organizations. Despite some differences, these are bound by a common policy and cooperate in one way or another. Through these and subsidiary organizations, through the press which they control, such as the *Jewish Daily Forward*, the *New Leader* and, in part, the *New York Post*, through their writers in various capitalist publications, through labor

leaders and professionals whom they influence, the Social-Democrats operate a chain of connections which they move into common action against progressive causes.

Who Are the Social-Democrats?

To achieve leadership of the labor movement, the Social-Democrats today center their attention upon the top circles of both the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O., form all kinds of unprincipled blocs and build various committees and organizations, such as the American Labor Conference for International Affairs, Jewish Labor Committee and Italian Labor Council.

In this effort to expand their organizations and influence, they receive the aid of the capitalists. In the past, despite their energetic activities, Social-Democracy for many reasons never won a dominant position in the United States. Capitalism was able to rely on its direct and open labor supporters. Things have changed and capitalism needs their aid. New ways are essential to keep the workers down—open violence on the one hand, and social demagoguery on the other. And in respect to the latter, the Social-Democrats are past masters.

For if these erstwhile socialists have renounced their principles, that does not mean that they retain nothing from the past. *They have given up the substance of the fight for socialism but they still hold on to the form and the phrase.* They have been trained in talking to masses, and radical masses at that, becoming experts in social demagoguery; and here they are of utmost service to reaction. That is what makes the group so dangerous. A William Green is clumsy at attempting to conceal his loyalty and subservience to capitalism. He is too hard-set and inflexible. David Dubinsky and his group of Social-Democrats, people who bounce around like rubber balls, can give up

or take up the phrase of socialism whenever it is advisable to steer the movement of the workers into safe channels and to help capitalism. They are adept at performing the reactionary deed under the guise of the progressive phrase, and like skilled actors adopt many radical disguises to fool workingmen, especially those who have entered factories only in recent years, or whose political experience with leaders and movements do not yet enable them fully to detect the false from the true, and to judge people by their actions and not alone by their words.

Ardent Red-Baiters

It is this training and experience as Social-Democrats, this desertion of working class principles and unrestrained hostility to every solid democratic cause, that has made them such ardent Red-baiters. Red-baiting is the favored device of reaction to curb and wipe out democratic movements and in this the Dubinsky group have become specialists. They are the most frenzied opponents of the Communist Party because that Party is the militant and consistent advocate of the end of capitalism. They not only oppose the viewpoint of the Communist Party, which is natural where political groups differ, but in flagrant violation of the rights of minority political parties and of the principles champion of working class struggle and unflinchingly of working class organization, they have sought to bring pressure in government circles to outlaw the Communist Party and its organ, the *Daily Worker*. We will cite only one shameful incident: In 1940 in the midst of the reactionary, anti-Soviet hysteria in which it shared, the Dubinsky group introduced a resolution at the 1940 convention of the union, calling for an investigation of the Communist Party by the infamous un-American and anti-labor Dies Committee!

Hearst and Dubinsky

These leaders have made a practice of taking over renegades who are cast out of the Communist movement and of giving jobs to weaklings who quit the Communist movement when the going gets tough—at a price, of course. They seek to bribe militant workers to give up their principles, while persecuting those who remain faithful, and in this sordid manner they have built up a machine that is a watchdog for reaction. It is a venal machine which profits from keeping the factional fires burning within the union while outside it kindles division, keeping track of every development of progressive united action of the people and taking measures to break it up. They set few boundaries in selecting the elements with whom they work, joining with disruptive Trotskyites and finding words of apology and understanding for such downright fascists as Czarist Denikin.

Thus we see the true face of Social-Democracy today. The record of the Dubinsky group shows: it was the first in the postwar period to discourage strikes and, in effect, advocate a no-strike policy. It was the first to raise the Big Business banner of “efficiency” which is nothing but speed-up of the workers.

It was the first to introduce mass expulsions in the unions, is today one of the chief Red-baiting centers and seeks to convert the unions into agencies of repression.

It was the first to call for an Anglo-American bloc, is working unceasingly to break up Big Three unity and to bring about a war against the Soviet Union, and for that reason acts as an imperialist tool, to destroy world labor and democratic unity.

It is the main foe of work stoppages, strikes and other new weapons of American labor to combat the violent assaults on its economic security and democratic rights.

It works against real independent political action, striv-

ing to build, not a broad anti-trust and anti-fascist third party, but a narrow anti-Communist party that will be an additional instrument of reaction.

Wherever these servants of reaction tread they leave disruption in their wake. Is it any wonder then that William Randolph Hearst ran a biographical story of David Dubinsky in his chain of papers as a model labor leader?

Eugene V. Debs, the great socialist leader, one of the founders of the American trade union movement, once said that if ever he were praised by the capitalists, he would search his conscience to discover what wrong he had committed against the working class. But Dubinsky welcomes such praise as a sign of achievement, even if it comes from the most indecent figure in American public life—the holder of an Iron Cross from Hitler.

XI. COMMUNISTS IN THE I.L.G.W.U.

We have, in passing, referred to the Communists in the I.L.G.W.U. and labor movement generally. This subject deserves fuller treatment if only to answer the irresponsible lies about the Communists.*

A quick glance over the past quarter of a century since the founding of the Communist Party shows that the Communists in the trade unions have been tireless workers to build and strengthen the unions and develop them as honest, democratic, fighting organizations. They tried to unite the unions against the onslaughts of reaction after the first World War. They made efforts to get the A. F. of L. officialdom to organize the unorganized, and when these leaders refused to do so, they stimulated workers to form independent unions. In the period of 1926-1933 the Communists led big battles in textile, auto, coal and marine and laid the basis for the great organizational and strike movements of the past decade.

Communists were the most powerful factor in the unemployment movement and in the winning of unemployment insurance, in promoting the policy of independent political action, and in raising the banner and aggressively fighting for the rights of the Negro people. They played a

* Many works have been published on the I.L.G.W.U., mostly from the viewpoint of the Social-Democrats. They are in the main devoted to a glorification of the Dubinsky group and a falsifying of the position of the Communists. The worst of these is the recent semi-official "history" of the union, *Tailor's Progress*, by Benjamin Stolberg, a work so slanderous and false as to draw the ire of several officials of the union. Joseph Breslau, for example, in a special pamphlet, characterized it as "a cruel and heartless caricature" in the style of a Pegler. A thoroughgoing review which refuted the falsehoods about the Communists was made by Rose Wortis in the January 1945 issue of *Political Affairs*.

memorable part in the fight against fascism, first signaling its danger, called upon labor to establish a common front against it, and pursued every possible avenue to establish a broad coalition to defeat this vicious enemy. Though President Roosevelt was essentially an up-holder of capitalism who worked to reform it, the Communists did not hesitate to support him in every step directed against the trusts and reaction.

In the I.L.G.W.U., the Communists have carried forward the best traditions of this union, whose founders were inspired by the hope that the union would serve as a powerful lever to advance the labor and Socialist movement in our country. Communists were among the first to initiate a broad educational and cultural program in this union. Today the union leadership refer to this feature as a sign of progressivism of the I.L.G.W.U. But they have robbed it of its dynamic working class character and turned it into an instrument for class collaboration. Communists have vigorously and repeatedly defended the democratic rights against the bureaucratic violations of the officialdom. They fought for the right of the members democratically to elect their leaders, for the freedom of all political opinions within the organization, for proportional representation on joint boards and for the elimination of the rotten borough system of elections to the conventions.

The Communists have always been the most reliable fighters for union standards against the sweat-shop tendencies of the employers. They fought to eliminate subcontracting, to establish security on the job, to maintain union rates against the constant violation by jobbers and contractors, against the recurring introduction of speed-up, for the organization of the out-of-town shops, and for establishment of uniform rates, and for the organization of the new and growing branches of the industry. In the struggles for these demands the Communists, along with large num-

warn that unless a militant stand is taken against the monopolists and ^{sts and trus} their drive to a new war, the labor movement will be weakened and undermined. They combat the false optimism of the union leadership that all things are well in the union, and point out that recent gains will be lost by competition from the unorganized low paid areas unless aggressive action is taken to organize the unorganized as part of the unfolding union drive of the labor movement. The Communists stress above all the imperative need for unity.

Unity is the critical need of the I.L.G.W.U. as it is of the labor movement. The ranks of this union have too long been divided by artificial means. Above all, unity is needed between Communists and Socialist workers in the union for a forward-looking program of action. Throughout Europe today, Communist and Socialist workers have learned to work together against reaction and fascism. They are determined not to repeat the division and disunity which brought about a triumph of fascism. Their joint efforts produced the united World Federation of Trade Unions. In the United States, too, such unity of Communists and Socialist workers is absolutely vital.

In the I.L.G.W.U., agreement of all progressive workers and leaders is possible and necessary around the urgent economic and political issues of the day—but above all, against a new imperialist war, the anti-labor offensive, anti-Semitism and Negro discrimination—in short, unity in the fight to preserve democracy and prevent fascism.

It is said by some that Communists follow a contradictory policy when they call for unity in the union, and at the same time criticize the Dubinsky leadership. Communists do not criticize for the sake of criticism, nor do they hesitate to support progressive policies even though they come from sources with which they may differ politically. But they criticize reactionary policies because these do not

warn that unless a militant stand is taken against the monopolists and ^{sts and trus} their drive to a new war, the labor movement will be weakened and undermined. They combat the false optimism of the union leadership that all things are well in the union, and point out that recent gains will be lost by competition from the unorganized low paid areas unless aggressive action is taken to organize the unorganized as part of the unfolding union drive of the labor movement. The Communists stress above all the imperative need for unity.

Unity is the critical need of the I.L.G.W.U. as it is of the labor movement. The ranks of this union have too long been divided by artificial means. Above all, unity is needed between Communists and Socialist workers in the union for a forward-looking program of action. Throughout Europe today, Communist and Socialist workers have learned to work together against reaction and fascism. They are determined not to repeat the division and disunity which brought about a triumph of fascism. Their joint efforts produced the united World Federation of Trade Unions. In the United States, too, such unity of Communists and Socialist workers is absolutely vital.

In the I.L.G.W.U., agreement of all progressive workers and leaders is possible and necessary around the urgent economic and political issues of the day—but above all, against a new imperialist war, the anti-labor offensive, anti-Semitism and Negro discrimination—in short, unity in the fight to preserve democracy and prevent fascism.

It is said by some that Communists follow a contradictory policy when they call for unity in the union, and at the same time criticize the Dubinsky leadership. Communists do not criticize for the sake of criticism, nor do they hesitate to support progressive policies even though they come from sources with which they may differ politically. But they criticize reactionary policies because these do not

unite but divide the union. Criticism of such policies alerts, informs and stimulates the membership and strengthens the union. Surely a progressive Congressman does not divide or weaken the nation when he attacks the poisonous work of a reactionary like Rankin. Nor is the union hurt when the policies of Dubinsky are opposed. In the years 1937 and 1938, when the leadership of the union was withdrawing from the C.I.O. and preparing for its return to the A. F. of L., the Communists out of a mistaken notion of unity at all cost failed vigorously to oppose these back-tracking policies and to arouse the workers against them. Such an error neither helped the union nor unity. It only made it easier for Dubinsky to switch back to the disastrous course that he follows today.

The Union Needs More Communists

The I.L.G.W.U. not only needs greater unity of Communist, Social-Democratic and all advanced workers, it needs more Communists as well. In many locals the presence of Communists would give voice to the desires of the membership for the first time. More Communists would strengthen the union immensely in the people's fight against the men of the trusts and banks. More Communists in the union would advance to new heights the historic struggle of labor for economic security, democracy and peace. They would imbue the union with greater vision and courage, and create once again the living spirit of the pioneers of the union—those indomitable dress-makers and cloakmakers who built the union not alone to defend wages and working conditions, but to help achieve a new social order. They were proud to inscribe on their banners the glorious watchword, "Abolition of the wage system."

Yes, a greater number of Communists would serve as a powerful factor to place the I.L.G.W.U. once more in the front ranks of the labor movement.

More New Century Pamphlets

- THE "FREE PRESS"—PORTRAIT OF A MONOPOLY,
by George Marion \$.15
- WHO OWNS AMERICA?, by James S. Allen10
- SOCIALISM—WHAT'S IN IT FOR YOU, by A. B.
Magil10
- ENEMIES OF THE PEACE: PROFILE OF THE "HATE-
RUSSIA" GANG, by Sender Garlin..... .10
- PEACE OR WAR: THE PEOPLE AGAINST THE
WAR-MAKERS, by Eugene Dennis03
- REACTION BEATS ITS WAR DRUMS, by William Z.
Foster02
- AMERICA'S HOUSING CRISIS, by Louise Mitchell.. .05
- WHAT AMERICA FACES, by Eugene Dennis..... .10
- MEET THE COMMUNISTS, by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn .03
- THE RANKIN WITCH HUNT, by William Z. Foster.... .05
- COMMUNISTS ON THE WATERFRONT, by Herb Tank .35
- WHAT RUSSIA DID FOR VICTORY, by
nakoff05
- THE FIGHT FOR A NEW CHINA, by

NEW CENTURY PUBLISHERS • 832 Broadway, New York 10010