*Official Reports*

on the

# EXPULSION of COMMUNIST DOMINATED ORGANIZATIONS

from the

# C I O

Publication No. 254

September, 1954

*Compiled by Publicity Department*

**CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS**

**WALTER P. REUTHER**
*President*

**JOHN V. RIFFE**
*Executive Vice-President*

**JAMES B. CAREY**
*Secretary-Treasurer*

**718 Jackson Place N.W., Washington 6, D. C.**

**Price: 15 cents**

33

Use this for individual cases.

[Congress of Industrial Organizations.

# Official Reports on the EXPULSION of COMMUNIST DOMINATED ORGANIZATIONS From the CIO

[Washington, 1954]

# INDEX

## FOREWORD

During 1949 and 1950, the Congress of Industrial Organizations expelled from its ranks eleven international unions which had been found to be Communist-dominated organizations.

The process of expulsion was carried out in accordance with provisions of the Constitution of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, which bars affiliation with the CIO of "any national or international unions or organizing committee the policies and activities of which are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program or the purposes of the Communist Party, any fascist organization, or other totalitarian movement, rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the constitution of the CIO."

Two of the unions were expelled from the CIO by action of the 1949 CIO Convention.

The late Philip Murray, the president of the CIO, appointed a series of hearing committees which heard charges against the remaining nine accused unions. These committees filed reports of their findings and recommendations.

These recommendations, calling for the expulsion of the various accused unions, were approved and put into effect at subsequent meetings of the CIO Executive Board and formally ratified by the CIO Convention in 1950.

This was a unique process in the annals of American labor history, both in the United States and in other nations. It was marked by a firm decision to avoid resort to hysteria and to preserve the traditional democratic concept of due process of law.

The reports containing the findings and recommendations of these hearings are of considerable historical value. The CIO publishes them as a public service for trade union members and for all students of labor problems and of democracy's successful efforts to combat the menace of totalitarianism.

Five years after this expulsion process started, the strength of Communist-dominated unions in the United States has been tremendously weakened—essentially by the wisdom, fortitude and courage of trade union members themselves.

A number of these expelled unions have completely disappeared from the American scene: the Food, Tobacco and Agricultural Workers; the United Office and Professional Workers; and the United Public Workers.

Some have merged. All have lost membership to democratic labor organizations—most particularly, the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, which at the time of expulsion, numbered nearly a half-million members. Over 80 percent of these men and women have joined the ranks of the CIO's International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers (IUE-CIO).

The CIO and its members are proud of this record of the constructive opposition to Communist domination of labor organizations—under a program which has preserved the benefits of democratic unionism for hundreds of thousands of American workers while reducing to a minimum the influence and effectiveness of the agents of the Kremlin on the American labor scene.

Washington, D. C.
September 1954

## RESOLUTION OF THE 1949 CIO CONVENTION ON THE EXPULSION OF THE UNITED ELECTRICAL, RADIO AND MACHINE WORKERS OF AMERICA

We can no longer tolerate within the family of CIO the Communist Party masquerading as a labor union. The time has come when the CIO must strip the mask from these false leaders whose only purpose is to deceive and betray the workers. So long as the agents of the Communist Party in the labor movement enjoy the benefits of affiliation with the CIO, they will continue to carry on this betrayal under the protection of the good name of the CIO.

The false cry of these mis-leaders of labor for unity and autonomy does not deceive us.

In the name of unity they seek domination.

In the name of autonomy they seek to justify their blind and slavish willingness to act as puppets for the Soviet dictatorship and its foreign policy with all its twists and turns from the Nazi-Soviet Pact to the abuse of the veto in the UN, the Cominform attack upon the Marshall Plan, ECA, the Atlantic Treaty and arms aid to free nations.

Now that they are at the end of the trail, these Communist agents cry out against "raiding and secession." What they call raiding and secession is simply a movement of workers throwing off their yoke of domination. These workers seek refuge from a gang of men who are without principle other than a debased loyalty to a foreign power.

Their masters have long decreed the creation of a new labor federation into which they hope to ensnare the labor unions they think they control. This has already taken place in many countries of the world. It will not happen in America.

When they saw that their attempt to use UERMWA to subvert the CIO was failing, they resorted to the typical Communist tactic of systematic character assassination against the National CIO, our President, Philip Murray, and all affiliated unions and officers who opposed the Cominform policy.

Their program of vilification reveals the degradation of men who have surrendered the right and lost the ability to think for themselves. It brands them as unfit to associate with decent men and women in free democratic trade unions.

The CIO is a voluntary association of free trade unions dedicated by its constitution to the protection and extension of our democratic institutions, civil liberties, and human rights. Free unions are voluntary associations of free men, held together by common loyalties and the elements of decency and honesty. We will fight with conviction and vigor against all enemies within or without the CIO who would trample or seek to destroy these sacred principles.

The certificate of affiliation of the CIO is a symbol of trust, democracy, brotherhood and loyalty in the never-ending struggle of working men and women for a better life. There is no place in the CIO for any organization whose leaders pervert its certificate of affiliation into an instrument that would betray the American workers into totalitarian bondage.

By the actions of its leadership, by their disloyalty to the CIO, and their dedication to the purposes and program of the Communist Party, contrary

to the overwhelming sentiment of the rank and file membership who are loyal Americans and loyal CIO members, the leadership of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America have rendered their union unworthy of and unqualified for this certificate of affiliation.

The UERMWA has been selected by the Communist Party as its labor base from which it can operate to betray the economic, political, and social welfare of the CIO, its affiliates and the general membership. The program of the UERMWA leadership that has gradually unfolded is but an echo of the Cominform. At the signal of the Cominform, the Communist Party threw off its mask and assumed its true role as a fifth column. Its agents in the labor unions followed the Communist Party line. The UERMWA leadership abandoned any pretense of loyalty to the CIO and its program. The record is clear that wherever the needs of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union dictated, the leadership of the UERMWA was always willing to sacrifice the needs of the workers. The evidence, known to every CIO member, is overwhelming:

1. The CIO along with the American people support the Marshall plan as a humane policy of physical and human rehabilitation and reconstruction to stop the spread of totalitarianism and strengthen the forces of democracy.

The Soviet Union, the Communist Party and their highly placed agents in the UERMWA unite in denouncing the Marshall plan and vilify the CIO and the American people for their humanity.

2. The CIO along with the American people support the Atlantic Pact to prevent any further expansion of the Soviet Union's rule by force and terror.

The Soviet Union, the Communist Party and the UERMWA leadership attack the Atlantic Pact as war-mongering but are eloquently silent about the fact that the Soviet Union has the largest standing army in the world.

3. In the field of political action, the UERMWA leadership, crying aloud for unity and autonomy, joined with Wall Street and other forces of reaction in a desperate attempt to defeat liberalism and democracy in the United States. Against the desire and interests of the American labor movement, the UERMWA leadership joined with the Communist Party in creating the misnamed Progressive Party. In unity with Wall Street they did their utmost to divide the labor and liberal forces in an attempt to elect a reactionary national administration that could ride rough shod over the needs of the American people.

4. In their official organ, the UE News, on May 16, 1949, they maliciously charged that the CIO's hard fight to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act was a sellout. At its recent convention, the UERMWA leadership procured the adoption of a resolution charging the CIO with carrying out a program to further the policies of Big Business.

5. In cynical and outright defiance of the CIO, the UERMWA leadership secretly arranged a merger with the United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers of America, which had loudly proclaimed its demand for independence when ordered by the CIO Executive Board to merge with the UAW. This merger of FE and UERMWA was the first step in the long-range plans of the Communist Party to establish a Communist-dominated labor federation in America.

6. In the midst of the most important struggle ever to take place between labor and entrenched greed, the UERMWA leadership has once more made

common cause with the House of Morgan and the steel trust by shamelessly attacking the United Steelworkers of America and their President, Philip Murray—at a time when this great CIO union is engaged in a heroic struggle to obtain pensions and a health program for its million members. While the UERMWA leaders continue their campaign to sabotage the steel strike and slander Philip Murray, they hypocritically call for financial support for the strikers.

7. The final stage in the UERMWA leadership's program for leaving the CIO and establishing a Communist-dominated labor federation was reached on October 7, 1949, when the officers of the UERMWA served an ultimatum upon the President of the CIO. In that ultimatum they brazenly demanded that the CIO change its policies, that CIO subordinate itself to the UERMWA, and that President Murray plead guilty to false and defamatory charges under threat of withholding per capita payments to the CIO. This threat has now been carried out by the leadership of the UERMWA which, during the period that this Convention was in session, announced at a press conference November 1, 1949, that UERMWA was withholding further per capita payments from the CIO until and unless the terms of their ultimatum are met.

We believe that the workers in the electrical and allied industries want and need a union devoted to the principles of the CIO and of our democratic society. Their desire for such a union has been frustrated by the manipulations of the group that has maneuvered the UERMWA into opposition to the CIO on orders of the Communist Party.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. This Convention finds that the Certificate of Affiliation heretofore granted to the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America has fallen into the control of a group devoted primarily to the principles of the Communist Party and opposed to the constitution and democratic objectives of the CIO, and in particular to the following declaration in the Preamble of the Constitution of the CIO:

> "In the achievement of this task we turn to the people because we have faith in them; and we oppose all those who would violate this American emphasis of respect for human dignity, all those who would use power to exploit the people in the interest of alien loyalties.",

and, in conformance with the provisions of Article III, Section 6 of our Constitution, this convention hereby expels the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America from the Congress of Industrial Organizations and withdraws the said Certificate of Affiliation

2. This Convention recognizes that the overwhelming majority of the membership of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America are not members of the Communist Party, and further recognizes the desire of the working men and women in the electrical and allied industries for a free and autonomous union affiliated with the CIO and devoted to the constitutional principles and policies of the CIO.

3. This Convention hereby authorizes and directs the Executive Board immediately to issue a Certificate of Affiliation to a suitable organization covering electrical and allied workers which will genuinely represent the desires and interests of the men and women in those industries.

4. This Convention calls upon the working men and women in the electrical and allied industries to join in the building of a strong, autonomous union affiliated with the CIO that will fight on a sound trade union basis for the

interests of its members as workers and American citizens and which will join wholeheartedly with the CIO in its struggle to obtain the benefits of collective bargaining, including higher wages and better working conditions, to safeguard the economic security and promote the social welfare of the workers of America, and to protect and extend our democratic institutions and civil rights and liberties.

5. This Convention calls upon all the affiliates of the CIO to support with all their strength the determination of the electrical workers to free themselves from Communist domination and to create a strong, aggressive and democratic union affiliated with the CIO

With the full support of the CIO, the organized workers in the electrical and allied industries will win their campaign for freedom from the degradation of automatic obedience to a foreign dictatorship.

A victory here for democratic unionism will strengthen the constant drive of all American labor against economic monopoly and against all those forces which would deny to American working men and women the economic security and the democratic liberties which belong to all Americans.

We salute the rank and file members of the UERMWA as the way is opened for them to walk out of the shadows of Communist conspiracy, double-talk, division, and betrayal, into the sunlight of democracy to be enjoyed in the CIO and cherished and made equally available to all men and women who prize freedom, honesty and loyalty to their ideals and their union brothers and sisters.

In this cause and with this faith, we of the family of CIO shall defeat our open and our secret enemies; we shall grow stronger in numbers and in moral stature. Thereby the mission of the CIO, as stated at its founding, shall be realized in happy men and women, secure in their jobs, in their homes and in their trust in one another.

## RESOLUTION OF THE 1949 CONVENTION EXPELLING THE FARM EQUIPMENT WORKERS AND REVOKING ITS CERTIFICATE OF AFFILIATION WITH THE CIO

WHEREAS, A regular meeting of the National CIO Executive Board held in Washington, D. C., on May 18, 1949, after an investigation, hearing and due inquiry into the facts, adopted the following resolution:

"WHEREAS, the CIO Executive Board, meeting on Saturday, November 27, 1948, adopted, in accordance with decision of the Tenth Constitutional Convention of the CIO, the following resolution:

> " 'Whereas, for a number of years a jurisdictional dispute has existed between the CIO unions in the agricultural implement industry. Both the United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America and the United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers of America, CIO, hold CIO charters granting them jurisdiction in this field.
>
> " 'This division of jurisdiction between the two unions has retarded the completion of organizational work and has weakened the efforts of these workers to secure maximum economic gains and improved working conditions. A continuation of this division can only serve to further penalize these workers and weaken their collective bargaining power by strengthening the resistance of the powerful corporations in whose plants they work.
>
> " 'Efforts to resolve this problem through direct negotiations between the two organizations failed to eliminate the jurisdictional conflict and the workers in this industry continue to be penalized.
>
> " 'Therefore, Be It Resolved:
>
> " 'That the CIO Executive Board, in accordance with decision of the 10th Constitutional Convention of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and acting in the interest of the workers in the agricultural implement industry, both organized and unorganized, directs the United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers of America, CIO, to take immediate steps to affiliate with the United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, CIO, on a basis which is organizationally sound, consistent with the structure of industrial unionism and in keeping with the provisions of the Constitution of the UAW-CIO which guarantees membership rights and representation in accordance with democratic trade union principles. If, at the end of sixty (60) days, amalgamation is not consummated as provided for herein, the CIO Executive Board will act to implement this decision.'

"WHEREAS, The CIO Special Committee appointed by President Philip Murray to lend its good offices to the effectuation of the merger, met in Chicago on January 7, 1949, and was defied by officers of the FE-CIO who asserted, 'Your committee carries absolutely no status with our organization,' refused to discuss the directive of the CIO Executive Board and walked out of the meeting.

"WHEREAS, the FE-CIO has carried on a campaign of vilification, slander, misrepresentation, distortion, race-baiting and other anti-democratic activities in a consistent plan designed to defame and to injure the CIO, and has deprived the workers in this industry of the opportunity of achieving maximum benefits and protection through collective bargaining.

"WHEREAS, the report of the Special Committee appointed by President Murray recommends that the CIO Executive Board take such further action as it may deem appropriate in the circumstances to promote the consolidation of all CIO members in the agricultural implement industry in a unified collective bargaining agency.

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: That the National CIO Executive Board, on this 18th day of May, 1949, reaffirms the award of jurisdic-

tion in the agricultural implement industry to the International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, CIO, and does now recommend to the coming CIO Constitutional Convention, October, 1949, that the charter of the Farm Implement and Metal Workers Union be revoked."

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. This Eleventh Constitutional Convention, after full consideration, hereby accepts the report and recommendations of the National CIO Executive Board of May 18, 1949. This Convention finds that the United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers of America, CIO, has continued to defy the CIO and has violated the Constitution of the CIO. This Convention, therefore, hereby recalls, revokes and cancels the Certificate of Affiliation heretofore granted to the United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers of America, CIO, and in accordance with the provisions of Article III, Section 6 of our Constitution, hereby expels the United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers of America from the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

2. This Convention recognizes that the overwhelming majority of the membership of the United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers of America are loyal members of the CIO who joined the FE because it was an affiliate of the CIO and upon the express understanding and agreement that they would continue to remain affiliated with the CIO so that their interests as workers in the agricultural implement industry would thereby best be served. This Convention further recognizes the desire of the vast majority of that membership to affiliate with the International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO) in accordance with the constitutional mandate of the Tenth Convention of the CIO and of the National CIO Executive Board. Therefore, this Convention invites and calls upon the locals and membership of the United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers of America to continue loyal to the CIO and to affiliate with the UAW-CIO.

3. This Convention pledges the full support and strength of all CIO affiliates to the workers in the agricultural implement industry in their efforts to remain loyal to the CIO and its constitution and to achieve their just economic demands by uniting with the other workers in the agricultural implement industry as members of the UAW-CIO.

## REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CHARGES AGAINST THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF MINE, MILL, AND SMELTER WORKERS

Under article VI of the CIO constitution, the executive board is empowered by a two-thirds vote to—

> revoke the certificate of affiliation of or to expel or to take any other appropriate action against any national or international union or organizing committee *the policies and activities of which are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program or the purposes of the Communist Party, any Fascist organization, or other totalitarian movement, rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the constitution of the CIO.* [Italics supplied.]

On November 5, 1949, Mr. William Steinberg filed charges against MMSW and nine other-named affiliates under that section and requested the executive board to expel these unions from the CIO. Specifically, it was charged that the policies and activities of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union "are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program or the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the constitution of the CIO." The executive board ordered that notice of the charges be given to Mine, Mill and authorized President Murray to appoint a committee to hear the charges and to report to the executive board recommending appropriate action. The undersigned, Jacob Potofsky, Emil Mazey, and Joseph Curran were appointed by President Murray to hear the charges against the MMSW and the executive board approved the appointment of the committee.

Notice of the filing of the charges were given to MMSW on November 7, 1949. On December 14, 1949, the chairman of the committee gave notice that the committee would hold a hearing on January 4, 1950. The committee specifically invited the union's international officers to attend the hearing and to testify as witnesses. MMSW requested a postponement of the hearing. This request was granted and the hearing was postponed to January 18, 1950. MMSW also requested permission for 10 other witnesses to attend the hearing. When this request was granted MMSW immediately asked permission for the 10 additional witnesses to attend the hearing. This also was granted.

The committee's hearing began on January 18 and continued through the next day. At the hearing, Mr. Steinberg gave an introductory statement and introduced three witnesses to the committee. The first witness was Mr. Stanley Ruttenberg, the CIO director of education and research. Mr. Ruttenberg presented excerpts from official publications both of the Communist Party and of the MMSW, and, on the basis of these exhibits, compared the policies and activities of MMSW with the program of the Communist Party. The second and third witnesses presented by Mr. Steinberg were Homer Wilson and Kenneth Eckert, both of whom were former executive board members of the union. The witnesses testified in detail as to the manner in which the program of the Communist Party was translated into the policy of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers.

The representatives of the union were given ample opportunity to cross-examine all witnesses presented by Mr. Steinberg. They availed themselves of this opportunity with regard to Mr. Steinberg and Mr. Ruttenberg. They asked, however, that the cross-examination of Homer Wilson and Kenneth

Eckert be deferred so that the persons who were not present at the hearing, but were named in the testimony could be produced to refute it.

On behalf of the union, its secretary-treasurer, Maurice Travis, and five members of the union testified. None of the three other union officers who had been invited by the committee to testify utilized the opportunity so offered.

The hearing was adjourned on January 19, and, at the request of the union, a second hearing was scheduled for February 6 in order to permit the union representatives to examine both the exhibits that had been offered and the transcript of the hearing, and in order to enable them to procure the attendance, as rebuttal witnesses, of the persons named by Mr. Eckert, and Mr. Wilson as participants in the transmission belt by which the dictates of the Communist Party became the policies of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union. The union representatives promised the committee that if an adjournment was granted, they would produce testimony to refute the evidence offered by Wilson and Eckert.

Pursuant to this arrangement and this promise, the committee resumed its hearing on February 6, 1950. At that time, the representatives of the union presented to the committee a mimeographed statement, which had no reference to the testimony which had been heard on January 18 and 19, and had obviously been prepared in advance of the first hearing. The union reuresentatives announced their determination to offer no testimony in rebuttal to Mr. Eckert and Mr. Wilson. They refused to cross-examine Eckert and Wilson, although the committee expressly repeatedly invited such cross-examination. Instead of cross-examination, Mr. Travis read into the record a statement denouncing them as stool pigeons and finger men. At the conclusion of this brief hearing, the union's representatives asked for a further opportunity to file a brief. This was granted and, on February 5, a statement replying to the testimony of Mr. Ruttenberg was submitted.

On the basis of both the oral testimony and the written material thus presented to it, the committee reports to the executive board as follows:

## NATURE OF THE CHARGE

The charge made by Mr. Steinberg is that the policies and activities of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program or the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the constitution of the CIO. In order to dispel loose assertions which have been made by the accused that this proceeding is designed to destroy the autonomy of, and to impose political uniformity on CIO affiliates, we should like to state our understanding of the type of conduct at which the charge is aimed.

The charge is not aimed at affiliates which honestly differ with CIO policies. At our last convention, which authorized the executive board to proceed on the type of charge before us, it was made abundantly clear that there is room enough in the CIO for honest differences of opinion (eleventh constitutional convention, daily proceedings, November 1, 1949, pp. 21, 33, 35; November 2, p. 35; November 3, p. 71).

However, there is no room in the CIO or in any other voluntary association of independent members, for an affiliate whose policies over a period of time contravene and tend to undermine the fundamental objectives of the organization. It is at such an affiliate, and none other, that the charge we are

considering is directed. In short then, the charge against the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers Union is based on the proposition that by consistently pursuing the program and purposes of the Communist Party, the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers Union tends to undermine the democratic goals of the CIO.

There can be no doubt about the violent clash between the constitutional objectives and policies of the CIO and the program or purposes of the Communist Party. The CIO is dedicated to advancing the cause of liberty and never-ending struggle for equality begun by our forefathers; to the end of achieving a world of free men and women. The CIO is further dedicated to organizing the unorganized, to making workers participants in the collective-bargaining process, and to securing legislation insuring economic security and extension of civil liberties; prerequisites to a world of free men and women in a democracy. By command of the preamble to its constitution, the CIO is aligned against those who would use power to exploit the people for the benefit of alien loyalties.

The Communist Party is precisely this type of organization which the CIO is under a constitutional mandate to oppose—one which would use power to exploit the people for the benefit of an alien loyalty. The Communist Party speaks in the words of unionism and Americanism. But actually it matters not to the Communist Party whether a particular policy will advance or hinder the best interests of American labor The sole test is whether the policy is required by the need of the Soviet Union. Only to the extent that the Soviet line permits will the propaganda mill of the Communist Party grind out platforms which are in consonance with ideals of American labor. In event of conflict, however, between the needs of the Soviet Union and the best interests of American labor, the former must always prevail.

One need not look very far to see the reason for such slavish adherence to the ideology of a foreign country. The Communist Party in America is part of the world-wide Communist movement which seeks to organize workers into unions in various countries to spearhead a revolution for the establishment of a proletarian dictatorship. The first such dictatorship was established in Russia and the entire movement is primarily dedicated to protecting and preserving this dictatorship. Hence, whenever the policies of the Soviet Union change, the American Communist Party must do a flip-flop no matter how irrational the change may be in terms of the true interests of American workers. But to the moulders of Communist Party strategy in this country, there is no inconsistency because in their eyes, the interests of American labor are identical with those of the totalitarian Soviet regime. The Communist Party undoubtedly takes its cue for its innumerable twists and turns from the grand architect of the Russian revolution, Lenin, who said:

> It is necessary to agree to any and every sacrifice * * * to resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge, in order to penetrate the trade-unions, to remain in them, and *to carry on Communist* work in them at all costs.[1] [Italics supplied.]

Following this command, the Communist Party has always sought to rationalize its program in terms of the needs of American labor. But, clearly, it had done so for the sole purpose of aiding the Soviet Union and preparing for a dictatorship of the proletariat in America. Just as clearly, the CIO cannot tolerate the Communist Party in its midst. By the same token, the CIO cannot tolerate in its midst an affiliate which, although it speaks in the name

[1] Left-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder, International Publishers, (1934), p. 38.

of unionism and American labor, consistently pursues the program of the Communist Party, and pursuing that program, would destroy American labor if the Soviet Union should so dictate. MMSW is charged with being such an affiliate. We turn now to the examination of the evidence on this question.

The testimony at the hearings, both oral and documentary, demonstrates conclusively to this committee, and the committee finds, that the policies and activities of the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers are directed toward the achievement of the program, and the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives set forth in the CIO constitution. This conclusion is inescapable both from an analysis of the policies adopted by Mine, Mill, as shown by the documentary exhibits submitted to the committee and by direct and uncontradicted testimony by former officers of the union that the Communist Party directs the affairs of the union.

By introducing photostats of this union's newspaper, of the convention proceedings, Stanley Ruttenberg, the CIO's research director, proved beyond question that the policies of this union in the past 12 years followed every twist and turn of the Communist Party line and continues to follow that line today.

During the period prior to the signing of the Nazi-Soviet pact, the policy of the Communist Party was that announced by the Soviet Union a number of years before—a policy of collective security. In the United States that meant support by the Communist Party of a revision of the Neutrality Act, support of any administrative acts designed to isolate the Fascist politically or economically, and the boycott of the Japanese, Italian, and German goods. MMSW followed that policy to the letter. It supported wholeheartedly President Roosevelt's anti-Fascist policy, and it declared its opposition to the Neutrality Act and called for its revision as "vicious legislation."

Late in 1939 Russia signed a pact with Hitler, who took advantage of it by immediately attacking Poland and bringing on the European war. The change in Russia's attitude toward Hitler was promptly reflected in the stand of the Communist Party of the United States. The war was an "imperialist war" and the program of the Allies was "a program of imperialist aggression." Roosevelt's anti-Fascist policy was now termed "imperialism" and his program of aid to the enemies of Hitler was Fascist warmongering. The Communist Party opposed the defense program, it opposed aid to Great Britain, lend-lease, and the draft as instruments of imperialism and Wall Street.

The Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers promptly fell into line. Fascism was forgotten. The union now demanded strict neutrality. It urged strong support of the American Peace Mobilization, a Communist-front organization whose program was one of strictest isolationism. The Roosevelt program was repeatedly and violently attacked. The position of the union's leadership was that what happened abroad was unimportant. All of labor's problems were at home.

Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union occurred on June 22, 1941. Mine, Mill maintained its isolationist, anti-Roosevelt position right up to that date. But immediately thereafter everything changed. Now that Hitler had attacked the Soviet Union it became clear to Mine, Mill leaders that American labor did have an interest in aiding Hitler's enemies. Roosevelt, who was so wrong before, was now right. Indeed, said the officer's report to the 1941 convention: "Our stake, our future peace, and our future freedom depends on the defeat of fascism."

The contrast between the positions of the union's leaders before and after June 22 is made startlingly clear in the Mine, Mill's official newspaper. The issue of June 23, 1941, which had been printed 2 days earlier, reported at great length a speech by President Robinson to a Butte miners' meeting in which he denounced President Roosevelt's aid program as incipient dictatorship and fascism. One month later, on July 21, 1941, another meeting in Butte was given featured billing by the Mine, Mill's paper. This meeting, addressed by the Montana secretary of the Communist Party, demanded immediate aid to all peoples fighting Hitler and denounced isolationists as appeasers and enemies of labor. Thus, in the course of 3 years we see the union first interested in collective security and American participation in quarantining the aggressor, then calling for strict neutrality, and then reverting to allied action against the Fascists. These violent and precipitous shifts in policy bore no relation to any changes in American policy or in the position of American labor. The CIO, which had joined with Mine, Mill in opposing fascism in 1938, continued to oppose Hitler in 1940. It opposed involvement in war—as did Roosevelt—but it supported national defense and aid to the enemies of Hitler. But the Mine, Mill's policy shifted with the policy of the Communist Party and with the position of the Soviet Union, first one way, then another and then back again.

After the United States entry into the war the primary direction of Communist Party strategy was to call for the immediate opening of a second front in Western Europe. And early in the same year Mine, Mill followed suit. Its president took to the radio and voiced, as a "spokesman" for labor, the Communist Party's conviction that the opening of a European second front was the only military strategy which would insure the early defeat of Hitler.

The parallel between the Communist Party and Mine, Mill policy, which is clearly demonstrated by the 1938-41 pendulum swinging of both organizations, is further revealed by the happenings since 1945. Notably, since VJ-day the approach to foreign and domestic policy in terms of the interests of the Soviet Union rather than those of the workers of the United States become increasingly evident. Early in 1946, Mine, Mill published a story on the atom bomb "conspiracy" accusing Great Britain and the United States, but not the Soviet Union of failure to come to agreement on the atom bomb problem. This same year at the union's convention, a resolution, which criticized not only the United States and Britain but also the Soviet Union for having armed forces outside their borders was rejected by the union's leadership and, at their suggestion, by the convention. In 1947, the executive board passed a resolution on foreign policy criticizing American policies but containing no word of criticism of the Soviet Union. In line with the principles of the Communist Party, Mine, Mill has opposed the Truman doctrine and fought against the Marshall plan. Its newspaper had only praise for the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia.

The union's constant conformity with the Communist Party line has not been limited to matters of foreign policy. In matters of domestic policy and in matters of trade-union policy it has adhered scrupulously to the Moscow line.

The union not only supported the Progressive Party in 1948, as did the Communists, it devoted a major portion of its resources to that fight. Its newspaper was practically converted into a Progressive Party organ and trade-union news was subordinated to Progressive Party propaganda.

In its relations with the CIO, Mine, Mill also followed the party line. The party demanded that the CIO stay in the Communist dominated World Federation of Trade Unions. Mine, Mill not only made the same demand, it denounced the CIO's plan to resign from that body as a service to Wall Street. Similarly on the Taft-Hartley act, the Communist Party denounced the CIO for "selling out" the interests of labor. The Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers not only subscribed to this canard, it devoted two pages of its newspaper to it.

Finally, after the CIO 1949 convention, the officers of Mine, Mill not only supported the UE, which had been expelled from the CIO, it attacked CIO's entire program as a "boss-inspired invasion." In so doing it again followed, to the letter, the line laid down by official spokesmen for the Communist Party.

On the basis of this history, only briefly summarized above, the committee would have no doubt in concluding that the policies and activities of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers are directed toward the achievement of the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the basic American trade-union objectives set forth in the CIO constitution. It is not only that the Mine, Mill's program today is virtually a replica of the Communist Party's.

That alone is not enough. The important fact is that no conceivable judgment based solely on the interests of American labor could have subscribed to the violent and contradictory shifts in policy which have characterized Mine, Mill's history in the last decade. Only the Communist assumption that what is good for the Soviet Union is good for American labor could justify Mine, Mill's position. Only a constant subservience to the Communist Party can explain it.

The shocking character of the direct control by the Communist Party of the leadership of this union, and through them, of the union itself, was further brought home to the committee by direct testimony showing in detail the exact manner in which the policies of the union are dictated by the Communist Party.

This testimony was given to the committee by Homer Wilson and Kenneth Eckert. Mr. Wilson was a member of the union for 10 years. He was a member of its international executive board and at one time was vice president. Mr. Eckert is a former member of the union's executive board and a former member of the Communist Party. He had attended the Lenin School in Moscow and served in Mine, Mill as one of the members of the Communist Party steering committee which determined, in consultation with Communist leaders, the policies which the union leadership would adopt for the union.

Both Wilson and Eckert made it perfectly clear to the committee that the fact that this union followed the Communist Party line was not accidental. It was the result of complete domination of the union's leadership by the party. The party group within the union had a systematic working apparatus for making its decisions and for translating those decisions into union policy. At the top there was a party steering committee of four members. This committee, of which Eckert and Maurice Travis, now secretary-treasurer of the union, were members determined Communist policy within the union. They did this in consultation with the leaders of the Communist Party. Meetings were frequently held with Communist Party leaders such as William Z. Foster, the chairman of the party, Eugene Dennis, its general secretary, John Williamson, its labor secretary, and Gil Green, its Illinois director. In

addition there was a regular envoy of the Communist Party who was designated as liaison man between Mine, Mill and the party.

At meetings of this steering committee, which was sometimes enlarged to include such persons as the union's research director and the editor of its newspaper, the policies to be adopted by Mine, Mill were determined by these Communist leaders. Their decisions were then brought to the so-called progressive caucus of the union, which contained all of the Communist and pro-Communist leaders of the union. All anti-Communist groups in the union were excluded from this caucus. The Communist decisions were invariably adopted by the caucus and were then brought before the official bodies of the union and adopted as union policy.

This was the transmission belt by which the decisions of the Communist Party leaders became decisions of the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers.

Both Eckert and Wilson testified in detail to the control which this Communist Party machinery exercises over the affairs of the union. Such matters as who should be the officers of the Union, or whether the 1947 report of the CIO investigating committee should be accepted, or whether the union should comply with the Taft-Hartley Act, were first decided by the Communist Party steering committee, then transmitted to the progressive caucus and finally presented to the union's executive board or its membership for approval.

The membership, of course, had a theoretical veto power. But the party's control of the union's newspaper, control of its organization staff and control of its leadership, enabled the Communist Party to conceal its dictation of union policy and thus to maintain its power over the union's affairs. The right of the union membership to control policy, given lip service to by the leadership was thus frustrated. The membership had no voice, for instance, in the decision of Reid Robinson to resign as president—a decision made by the Communist Party for party reasons. It had no control over the appointment of Maurice Travis, a newcomer to the union, as executive assistant to President Robinson, an appointment dictated by the Communist Party for its own purposes. The membership had no control over the appointment of organizers and, as a result, approximately 90 percent of the union's staff are members of the Communist Party.

The career of Maurice Travis affords a good example of the role of the Communist Party within the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union. Travis was a steelworker. He was expelled from a local of the United Steelworkers of America as a Communist disrupter in 1941. Shortly thereafter, he was placed by the Communist Party on the staff of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers. After less than 2 years with the union, he was chosen by the party to be executive assistant to the president. Later he became vice president and, by virtue of Reid Robinson's resignation in 1947, president of the union. The party, however, decided that his Communist affiliation was too well known for him to function effectively as president. Accordingly, the Communist Party steering committee determined to support for the presidency a candidate who was not known as a Communist follower but who could be relied upon to go along with the party decisions. John Clark was selected as such a man. And, in accordance with this decision, Clark was elected and now serves as president, and Travis as secretary-treasurer.

The testimony of Eckert and Wilson was not contradicted. Although it

seemed clear to the committee from the documentary proof that the Mine, Mill follows the Communist Party line, the committee was nevertheless shocked and outraged by the direct testimony that the union's policies were determined in secret meetings with high officials of the Communist Party prior to their submission to the union's governing bodies and to the membership. Eckert and Wilson named names, places, and dates. Their testimony was not general in character—but specifically described the meeting of the secret Communist apparatus which runs the union. The committee was most anxious, therefore, for the union leaders, whose activities were so damningly described in their testimony to submit an answer to it. But, despite the committee's repeated invitation, they refused to do so.

The committee adjourned its first hearing and held a second hearing at a later date to afford the officers of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union an opportunity to produce testimony in answer to that given by Eckert and Wilson. The officers of the union had requested such an adjournment and had promised the committee that at the committee's second hearing such testimony would be offered. But at the second hearing, the officers of the union again refused to respond to the testimony.

The committee also attempted to check the accuracy of the testimony of Wilson and Eckert by asking questions of the union's representatives at the hearing. Mr. Travis was asked, for example, whether he had in fact participated in meetings attended by such leaders of the Communist Party as William Z. Foster, Eugene Dennis, and John Williamson at which the policies of Mine, Mill were determined. He refused to answer the question. Mr. Travis was asked whether his position on policy matters within the Union was formulated at meetings with members of the Communist Party. He refused to answer the question. Mr. Travis was asked, finally, whether, as a member of the Communist Party, he was under a duty to carry out the decisions of the party, irrespective of his own opinion as to their propriety for his union. He refused to answer the question.

The testimony of Eckert and Wilson therefore stands uncontradicted. The committee therefore concludes not only that the policies of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union follow the Communist Party line but also that they follow that line because the Communist Party is in direct control of the union's leadership and dictates to that leadership the policies it shall adopt.

The union, instead of attempting to meet the testimony against it, engaged itself in vilification and denunciation of the CIO and of this committee and in irrelevant arguments.

In its first statement filed with the committee, the union presented a detailed history of the pioneering organizational work of the Western Federation of Miners. The committee is conscious of that history. But, on the evidence before it, it can only conclude that the present leadership of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers Union has cast aside that heritage and has sold the union down the river of subservience to the Communist Party.

The union then argued that it had brought the benefits of collective bargaining to its membership and, therefore, was truly performing the function of American unionism. The difficulty with this argument is that it is not true. While it is true that some benefits have inured to the union's membership, it is also true that the union's blatant Communist orientation has driven more and more workers away from it and thus deprived it of its power genuinely to serve the interests of the workers in its industry. A few simple

figures tell the devastating story. In the fiscal year 1946-47, Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers reported and paid their per capita tax to the CIO on an average dues-paying, employed membership of over 100,000. In 1948-49, this average dropped to 65,000. And, as of October 1949, the figure reported to the CIO was 44,000. This union had thus, by blindly pursuing the goals of the Communist Party, driven away from it the major portion of its membership. This trend is continuing and furnishes the complete answer to the union's argument. This union's leadership, perhaps more blatantly than any other, has diverted the union's staff and resources away from the pursuit of trade-union objectives to the pursuit of the Communist Party program. The union leadership has, and it must in order to maintain its position, paid lip-service to the strictly bread-and-butter needs of its membership. But it has done so only to use the union organization so maintained to serve the interests of the Communist Party. This is the basic strategy of the Communist Party as originally prescribed by Lenin.

The union devoted a major part of its statement to the committee to an attack upon the CIO for "Red baiting" and "witch hunting" and a recital of the many instances in which the false charge of communism has been made against genuine, progressive American trade-unions. The committee knows that the charge of communism is often falsely made. It is convinced that the use of such a false charge against American labor is deplorable. In short, the committee is against the smearing of honest American trade-unionism by those who see communism in everything progressive and forward looking.

But abhorrence of false and malicious charges of communism does not require that the committee reject evidence that this union's leadership is in fact controlled by the Communist Party, that it is not an honest American union leadership, that it devotes itself to the achievement, not of the American, progressive aims of the CIO, but of the purposes of the Communist Party. And such evidence was submitted to the committee and was not denied by the union. Instead of denying the charge, the union leadership has sought to hide behind the skirts of honest progressives, and honest trade-unionists. It has sought to join company with those who honestly deny false charges of communism, without denying the overwhelming evidence that in this case the charge is true.

The union's final argument was submitted to the committee in a memorandum on February 8. In this memorandum, the union sought to answer the testimony of Mr. Ruttenberg concerning the parallel between the policies of Mine, Mill, and the program of the Communist Party. But it did not attempt to deny that parallel or to explain it. It did not seek to give any honest American trade-union viewpoint which could possibly have justified the twisting, shifting line of Mine, Mill policy. Instead it made the preposterous charge that the CIO had followed the Communist Party line from 1938 to 1947.

The committee states categorically that this charge is false. It is compounded of confusion and distortion. This is apparent from an analysis of Mine, Mill's arguments on this point. For example, Mine, Mill stated that the CIO in the 1939-41 period opposed involvement in war. The CIO did oppose involvement in war. So did President Roosevelt, as did the American people. But the CIO also supported aid to those who were engaged in the war against Hitler. The Communist Party did not support such aid because

the Soviet Union was at that time a friend of Hitler, and Mine, Mill, as distinguished from CIO, actively and viciously opposed aid to the Allies, and it termed the Roosevelt program a program of warmongering and fascism.

Mine, Mill also argues, for example, that the CIO supported the campaign for the second front in 1942 and the Mine, Mill's support of the second front was in pursuance of the CIO rather than Communist Party policy. Here again, Mine, Mill's statement is a distortion of the facts. The CIO in 1942 hailed the invasion of Africa as a "successful two-front attack on the Axis army in Africa" and it offered to our Government its wholehearted support in whatever military policy should be adopted. To Mine, Mill, as to the Communist Party, however, the second front could only be found in Europe. The Communist Party, and Mine, Mill, urged in the most extravagant terms the opening of a second front in Europe in 1942, since this was what the Russians desired. Unlike Mine, Mill, the CIO never harbored the illusion that the Communist Party was better able to determine proper military strategy than the United States Army.

Mine, Mill similarly argues that the CIO's foreign policy in 1946 and 1947 was the same as Mine, Mill's because that CIO, like Mine, Mill, called for peace and supported measures which would insure peace. Again Mine, Mill is guilty of confusion and distortion. The CIO, of course, called for peace. All Americans seek peace. But the CIO, unlike Mine, Mill and the Communist Party, did not devote itself to an attack upon American foreign policy and to a defense of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. The CIO called for the ending of intervention in China by all governments. Mine, Mill called for the ending of American intervention in China. The CIO favored economic aid to Europe. Mine, Mill, once the Soviet declared themselves against the Marshall plan, became most vociferous in its opposition to the United States program for aid to Europe.

Perhaps more important than the fallacies of these arguments of Mine, Mill is the record of the CIO on the issue of communism itself. Mine, Mill has never renounced communism. It has never criticized communism. But the CIO in 1940 announced its rejection of communism and "any movement or activity of subversive character, Trojan horses or fifth columns, and, in 1946 its convention delegates announced that they "resent and reject efforts of the Communist Party * * * to interfere in the affairs of the CIO."

In the above discussion the committee has attempted to deal honestly, fairly, and seriously with the arguments offered by the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union. But the most devastating response to the so-called defense offered by its leadership is provided by the fact that the defense in the main confirmed the Communist dictation of union policy.

The Daily Worker in the early part of December 1949, soon after the CIO convention, ran a series of articles stating the party's analysis of the way the unions charged by William Steinberg with adherences to Communist policies should handle their defense (Daily Worker, December 6, 7, 8, 9, 1949). These articles made the following points: That the expulsion proceedings and hearings were made part of an offensive to cut the workers' rights; that the trials were "phony"; that the trial committees were "rigged"; that the central demand of the labor unions must be for "autonomy"; that the union's successful wage policy should be emphasized as the primary answer to the charges; that "unity" for the CIO on the basis of its founding program and the right to autonomy for all affiliates was the crux of the issue; that all

unions should show their support for the UE (which, incidentally, was criticized for walking out of the convention instead of fighting); and that Phil Murray and his associates were turncoat labor leaders of the worst stamp.

Apparently, already conversant with party policy, the union in a letter of December 1 to President Murray alleged that this committee was biased and that the trials were phony. These allegations were repeated in statements throughout the trial by Mr. Travis and Mr. Robinson. In fact, the headings in the union's mimeographed statement presented on February 6 are almost a recapitulation of the points raised in the Daily Worker articles: "The charge is phony"; "The trial is a sham"; "The amendment is illegal"; "The trial committee is biased"; "The trial is part of a plot to destroy Mine, Mill"; "Red baiting is the weapon of reaction"; "Autonomy—cornerstone of the CIO policy"; "Mine, Mill has organized its industry"; "Who is really violating CIO policy"; "Preserving the autonomy and democracy of Mine, Mill." In its very defense, therefore, the union faithfully parrots the dictates of the Communist Party.

It is abundantly clear not only that the leadership of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers Union consistently follows the Communist Party line but also that it does so in response to a carefully organized mechanism by which the decisions of the Communist Party are translated into Mine, Mill policy. Mr. Ruttenberg's analysis, in which he showed the devastating parallel between the program of the Communist Party and the policies of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers' Union, has not been controverted. The testimony of Eckert and Wilson, in which the mechanism was disclosed by which the party insured compliance by the leadership of Mine, Mill with its decisions was not controverted. The only defense of leaders of Mine, Mill has been epithet, vilification, and confusion. They assert that they are defending the autonomous rights of their union. But false claims of autonomy cannot justify adherence to the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and a betrayal of the interest of American workingmen. The false cry of democracy cannot justify the existence of a secret apparatus, undisclosed to the members of the union, by which orders of outsiders become the policy of the union's leadership. The bogus defense that this union is interested only in the economic gains of the membership cannot justify the building of an organizational structure, 90 percent of it manned by members or adherents of the Communist Party.

The false cry of freedom to criticize cannot justify the Communist tactic of systematic assassination against the national CIO, its officers and all affiliated unions who oppose the policies of the Communist Party.

The CIO is a voluntary association of free trade-unions dedicated by its constitution to the protection and extension of our democratic institutions, civil liberties, and human rights. Free unions are voluntary associations of freemen, held together by common loyalties and the elements of decency and honesty. The policies and activities pursued by the group which dominates the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers brands them as unfit to associate with decent men and women in free democratic trade-unions.

The certification of affiliation of the CIO is a symbol of trust, democracy, brotherhood, and loyalty in the never-ending struggle for the working men and women for a better life. There is no place in the CIO for an organization whose leaders pervert its certificates of affiliation into an instrument that would betray the American workers into totalitarian bondage.

By the action of its leadership, by their disloyalty to the CIO, and their

dedication to the purposes and program of the Communist Party, the leadership of Mine, Mill have rendered their union unworthy of and unqualified for the certificate of affiliation with the CIO.

The leadership of Mine, Mill was warned, more than 2 years ago, that their devotion to the Communist Party was imperiling their status in the CIO. In 1947, a committee of the executive board, headed by the same chairman as this committee, was appointed to investigate a revolt within this union. That committee condemned the revolt and recommended that those who had seceded from the union should return to it and cease all activity which would tend to disrupt or injure the union's activities. On the other hand, the committee recommended to the leadership of the union that it remove the Communist Party influence which had led to the revolt and that it rededicate itself to the goals of American trade-unionism.

The union rejected that earlier committee's recommendation. Its leaders have continued on their evil path. They have refused to return to the principles of American unionism and have persisted in their devotion to the alien doctrines of the Communist Party. They and they alone are responsible for the union's plight.

The committee wishes to make it perfectly clear that its findings as to Mine, Mill are based, as they must be, on the policies and activities of the union which its leadership has proposed and directed. Those findings carry no implication that the individual members of the union are Communists or favorable to communism. To the contrary the committee is persuaded that many of the members of Mine, Mill have been taken in by the evasion and the subterfuge, the devices and the maneuvers, which the Communist-minded leaders of this union have used to maintain themselves in power, concealing all the while the fact that the union's policies and activities were not the real informed decision of the members but determined in accordance with the line of the Communist Party.

## CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated, therefore, and on the basis of all the evidence presented to it, the committee unanimously concludes that the policies and activities of Mine, Mill are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program and the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the CIO constitution. The committee recommends that the executive board exercise the powers granted to it by article VI, section 10, of the CIO constitution and, by virtue of those powers, revoke the certificate of affiliation heretofore granted to the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers and expel it from the CIO.

Respectfully submitted.

JACOB POTOFSKY, *Chairman.*
EMIL MAZEY.
JOSEPH CURRAN.

# REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CHARGES AGAINST THE FOOD, TOBACCO, AGRICULTURAL, AND ALLIED WORKERS OF AMERICA

## INTRODUCTION

Under article VI, section 10 of the CIO constitution, the executive board is empowered by a two-thirds vote to—

> revoke the certificate of affiliation of or to expel or to take any other appropriate action against any national or international union or organizing committee *the policies and activities of which are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program or the purposes of the Communist Party, any Fascist organization, or other totalitarian movement, rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the constitution of the CIO,* [Italics supplied.]

At the last CIO convention, held in Cleveland, Ohio, between October 31 and November 4, 1949, a resolution was adopted by the overwhelming vote of the delegates to the convention, which resolution reads as follows:

> Whereas this convention has amended the constitution to empower the executive board to take appropriate action to maintain the integrity of the CIO and to protect it against those who seek to pervert it from its constitutional objectives and purposes: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved,* That this convention hereby instructs the executive board immediately to exercise its powers under article VI, section 10 of the constitution and to take appropriate action to protect the CIO and to prevent the use of the good name of the CIO by those who have insistently directed their policies and activities toward the achievement of the program or the purposes of the Communist Party, any Fascist organization or other totalitarian movement.

On November 5, 1949, Mr. William Steinberg, president of the American Radio Association and a member of the CIO executive board, filed charges against the Food, Tobacco, Agricultural, and Allied Workers of America (hereafter called FTA) and nine other named CIO affiliates and requested the executive board to expel these unions from the CIO under article VI, section 10 of the CIO constitution. Specifically, it was charged that the policies and activities of the FTA—

> are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program or the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the constitution of the CIO.

The executive board ordered that notice of the charges be given the FTA and authorized President Murray to appoint a committee to hear the charges and to report to the executive board recommending appropriate action. The undersigned, Jacob Potofsky, Emil Mazey, and Joseph Curran, were appointed by President Murray to hear the charges against the FTA, and the executive board approved the appointment of the committtee.

On November 7, 1949, notice of the filing of these charges and a copy of the charges were sent to Donald Henderson, as president of the FTA, and formal notice of the date of the hearing was sent by this committee on December 19, 1949. The latter notice included an invitation to John Tisa, acting general president, Robert Lathan, international vice president, Armando Ramirez, international vice president, Armando Valdes, general secretary-treasurer, and Donald Henderson, national administrative director, to testify as witnesses.

## HEARINGS

The hearings began as scheduled on January 6, 1950. The committee heard oral testimony from Mr. William Steinberg and Mr. Stanley Ruttenberg, direc-

tor of education and research of the CIO, who testified in support of the charges. The latter's testimony was supplemented by 72 documentary exhibits denominated CP-1 through CP-31, and FTA-1 through FTA-41. Representatives of the FTA were permitted ample opportunity to cross-examine both Mr. Steinberg and Mr. Ruttenberg.

The union opened its defense with a statement by Mr. Donald Henderson. In addition, the following witnesses were produced by FTA and testified on behalf of the union: Veronica Kryzan, Robbie Mae Riddick, Robert C. Black, Miria M. Cliff, and Adele Ellis. These additional witnesses were representatives of locals of the FTA. The four other union officers who had been invited to testify by the committee chose not to utilize this opportunity to rebut the charges.

The hearings adjourned on January 7 until January 19 at the request of the FTA which asked for a delay on the ground that it needed this additional time to prepare rebuttal testimony in answer to the evidence and exhibits introduced in support of the charges.

On January 19, 1950, the committee reconvened, and Mr. Henderson presented a brief in behalf of the union. However, the union presented no oral testimony but requested a further postponement. It was agreed by all concerned that there would be no other meeting of the committee to hear testimony, but that the union might, before February 1, file a further statement. This additional brief was received by the committee on February 2. On February 1 the union requested an additional hearing so that it could present further oral testimony. This request was granted and the committee met for the third time on February 6. At this third hearing, the union presented a mimeographed brief virtually identical to the typewritten brief which had been submitted on February 2. Although the February 6 meeting was convened at the request of FTA for the sole purpose of affording it an additional opportunity to present oral testimony, FTA offered no oral testimony whatsoever.

This committee is forced to conclude that the officers of FTA acted in utter bad faith in repeatedly demanding these postponements and additional hearings which they failed to utilize.

## NATURE OF THE CHARGE

The charge made by Mr. Steinberg is that the policies and activities of the FTA are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program or the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the constitution of the CIO. In order to dispel loose assertions which have been made by the accused that this proceeding is designed to destroy the autonomy of, and to impose political uniformity on, CIO affiliates we should like to state our understanding of the type of conduct at which the charge is aimed.

The charge is not aimed at affiliates which honestly differ with CIO policies. At our last convention, which authorized the executive board to proceed on the type of charge before us, it was made abundantly clear that there is room enough in the CIO for honest differences of opinion (Eleventh Constitutional Convention, daily proceedings, November 1, 1949, pp. 21, 33, 35; November 2, p. 35; November 3, p. 71).

However, there is no room in the CIO, or in any other voluntary association of independent members, for an affiliate whose policies over a period of

time contravene and tend to undermine the fundamental objectives of the organization. It is at such an affiliate, and none other, that the charge we are considering is directed. In short, then, the charge against FTA is based on the proposition that by consistently pursuing the program and purposes of the Communist Party, the FTA tends to undermine the democratic goals of the CIO.

There can be no doubt about the violent clash between the constitutional objectives and policies of the CIO and the program or purposes of the Communist Party. The CIO is dedicated to advancing the cause of liberty and the never-ending struggle for equality begun by our forefathers; to the end of achieving a world of free men and women. The CIO is further dedicated to organizing the unorganized, to making workers participants in the collective bargaining process, and to securing legislation insuring economic security and extension of civil liberties; prerequisites to a world of free men and women in a democracy. By command of the preamble to its constitution, the CIO is aligned against those who would use power to exploit the people for the benefit of alien loyalties.

The Communist Party is precisely the type of organization which the CIO is under a constitutional mandate to oppose—one which would use power to exploit the people for the benefit of an alien loyalty. It matters not to the Communist Party whether a particular policy will advance or hinder the best interests of American labor. The sole test is whether the policy is required by the needs of the Soviet Union. Only to the extent that the Soviet line permits will the propaganda mill of the Communist Party grind out platforms which are on consonance with ideals of American labor. In event of conflict between the needs of the Soviet Union and the best interests of American labor, the former must always prevail.

One need not look very far to see the reason for such slavish adherence to the ideology of a foreign country. The Communist Party in America is part of the world-wide Communist movement which seeks to organize workers into unions in various countries to spearhead a revolution for the establishment of a proletarian dictatorship. The first such dictatorship was established in Russia, and the entire movement is primarily dedicated to protecting and preserving this dictatorship. Hence, whenever the policies of the Soviet Union change, the American Communist Party must do a flip-flop no matter how irrational the change may be in terms of the true interests of American workers. But to the molders of Communist Party strategy in this country, there is no inconsistency because in their eyes, the interests of American labor are identical with those of the totalitarian Soviet regime. The Communist Party undoubtedly takes its cue for its innumerable twists and turns from the grand architect of the Russian Revolution, Lenin, who said:

> It is necessary to agree to any and every sacrifice * * * to resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge, in order to penetrate the trade unions, to remain in them and *to carry on Communist work in them at all costs.* [Italics supplied.] [1]

Following this command, the Communist Party has always sought to rationalize its program in terms of the needs of American labor. But, clearly, it has done so for the sole purpose of aiding the Soviet Union and preparing for a dictatorship of the proletariat in America. Just as clearly, the CIO cannot tolerate the Communist Party in its midst. By the same token, the CIO cannot tolerate in its midst an affiliate which, although it speaks in the

[1] Left-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder, International Publishers (1934), p. 38.

name of unionism and American labor, consistently pursues the program of the Communist Party and, pursuing that program, would destroy American labor if the Soviet Union should so dictate. FTA is charged with being such an affiliate. We turn now to an examination of the evidence on this question.

## FINDINGS

The testimony at the hearing and the exhibits demonstrate conclusively to this committee and the committee finds that the FTA has in the past and continues today to set its policies in accordance with those of the Communist Party and without regard to the objectives set forth in the constitution of the CIO. The meanderings of FTA policy which will be described in detail below cannot be explained on any basis other than that they are set by the Communist Party. In fact, except in a few isolated and minor instances, no attempt was made before this committee by the FTA leaders to justify its subservience to the Communist Party line on grounds of furthering genuine trade union objectives. Such an attempted justification would be ridiculous in the face of the most glaring evidences of FTA endorsement of the Communist Party line, detailed in the record.

Available publications of the FTA permit of a comparison of the policies and activities of FTA with those of the Communist Party commencing in 1939 and until the present time. It will be recalled that prior to 1939 the Soviet Union had espoused a policy of collective security with the democratic countries of the West. Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy appeared as threats to the security of the Soviet Union, and the latter sought the aid of the western countries. In line with the needs of the Soviet Union, the Communist Party of the United States also advocated a collective security policy to contain fascism, and American labor was told that its primary interests lay in curbing Fascist aggression by collective action so as to preserve free institutions in America and throughout the world. To this end the Communist Party took an active part in urging amendments to the United States Neutrality Act to permit the United States to come to the aid of victims of Fascist aggression.

However, in September 1939 the Soviet Union entered into a most unholy political alliance when it became a party to the infamous Nazi-Soviet Pact, which was soon followed by the outbreak of hostilities between Nazi Germany and the western powers. Equally unholy were the actions of the Communist Party at that time. In true puppet-like fashion, the Communist Party conveniently forgot its program of collective security safeguarding American labor against its worst enemy—fascism. No longer was it necessary to aid the very victims of Fascist aggression whom American labor was previously told by the Communist Party to prepare to defend. The new threat to American labor became the "imperialist war" (CP-4, 5, 6), and the threat became more serious as the United States took positive steps to aid the victims of Fascist aggression. From September 1939 to June 1941, Communist Party policy was opposed to any aid to any country which was defending itself against the brutal Hitler war machine. No aid to Great Britain was the watchword, and, of course, the party opposed lend-lease (CP-8, 9), and the draft (CP-4).

The FTA in its publications during this time parrotted the Communist Party and expressed fervent opposition to involvement in the European war which it attacked as an "imperialist war." It frequently attacked the British people, defending their very lives against aggression, as being participants

in an "imperialistic war" (FTA-1, 2).[2] Although CIO policy was to aid "reasonable national defense plans while maintaining the rights of labor," the FTA News, in its report of the June 1940 CIO executive board resolution which enunciated that policy, managed to distort it into one of opposition to imperialist war (FTA-2), a typical subterfuge of Communist-oriented groups. Moreover, its opposition to lend-lease paralleled that of the Communist Party, and it went down the line with the Communist Party in opposing selective service legislation. President Henderson, in his report to the 1940 convention, called for support of those who advocated American isolationism, no aid to Great Britain, and no lend-lease (FTA-5).

On June 22, 1941, Germany attacked the Soviet Union which found itself in desperate need of economic and military aid. Once again the lackey of the Soviet Union—the Communist Party of the United States—was prepared to do its master's bidding. Overnight slogans such as "imperialist aggression" and "no lend-lease" were placed in mothballs, and were loudly replaced by the old slogans of the collective security days. In a complete about-face, the Communist Party belatedly told American labor that its prime interest was once again the defeat of Fascist aggressors. All of a sudden the Communist Party called for "all aid" to the enemies of fascism—Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China—with the same vigor with which, only days before, it had denounced Great Britain as "imperialistic." Great Britain was no longer an imperialist, it was a friend of the workers of the world (CP 11-17). Those, who previously had been hailed for their isolationism, were transformed from heroes into appeasers, although their position remained the same after June 22 as before that date. The Daily Worker deplored the passage of the draft extension by only one vote (CP-15), although a few months before it had opposed the draft.

These changes in the party line are notorious. Equally clear are the same overnight changes in policy adopted by FTA. The union's previously determined policy against involvement in the imperialist war changed by October 1941 into one of fervent support for aid to Great Britain and the Soviet Union and equally violent attacks on all isolationists. All this took place before the entrance of the United States into the war, and is only explicable on the grounds of following the Communist line. Likewise, FTA repeatedly called for the release of Earl Browder, then head of the Communist Party (FTA-9, 12A).

On the economic front the union, for the first time on October 6, 1941, suddenly found merit in President Murray's labor-management plan and announced support for the Murray Industry Council Plan which had been proposed 10 months before (FTA-6). The union, of course, was under no obligation to support Mr. Murray's economic proposals. The significance of the episode is that it chose to support them only after the Communist Party line had switched from opposition to approval of the war effort.

After the United States entry into the war, the primary direction of Communist Party strategy was to call for a second front (CP-19). And throughout the year 1942, FTA followed suit (FTA 12-16). Its preoccupation with this issue is demonstrated by the exhibit (FTA 14), its newspaper which contains an editorial on June 1, a lead article on August 1, and a lead article and editorial on August 15—all calling for a second front in typical Communist fashion.

[2] All CP exhibits are from the Daily Worker. All FTA exhibits are from the FTA News, except those specifically described otherwise.

Another shift in the Communist line took place immediately following the Tehran Conference. The fact that the United States and the Soviet Union reached this agreement seemed to indicate to the Communist Party and its adherents that not only all foreign problems but also all labor problems were automatically solved. The Communist Party dissolved itself in January 1944 and reappeared under the guise of the Communist Political Association. Thus, trade unions like the FTA which followed the Communist Party line took their cue and aggressively asserted that all problems between labor and management in the United States were nonexistent or easily resolvable. The FTA, which now speaks so militantly, immediately following Tehran espoused the views of the desirability of a coalition between labor and capital. The FTA, which prior to the Soviet-Nazi Pact, had labeled the war as "imperialistic," after Tehran became a super-patriotic organization.

It called for support of national service legislation which the CIO opposed with no explanation other than it could help win the war (FTA-17). Legislation of this character to bring about forced labor is abhorrent to those whose sole allegiance is to American trade union principles. It violates these principles which are designed to advance the welfare of individuals as free workers in a democratic society. Its effect on the lives of workers was dismissed by FTA with the statement that "this proposed legislation would provide against loss of retirement and seniority rights and benefits. It would not mean reduction of wages." One could hardly say that this represented the protection of trade union rights called for in the statement of objectives in the CIO constitution and, indeed, the union offered no such explanation at the hearing for its conduct. In order to do what was best for the Soviet Union, as dictated by the Communist Party, the leaders of FTA were willing to sacrifice this most valuable right of American workers—the right to remain free to work in employment of their own choosing.

The parallel between FTA policy and Communist Party policy, which existed regardless of CIO objectives, was again made crystal clear during the period after the end of the war when Soviet and American relations were deteriorating. For example, even on points in which there was nominal agreement with the CIO, the FTA in its newspaper publicized the point in a way which was in accord with the interests of the Soviet Union. The CIO like most Americans after VE-day wanted to "bring the boys back home." But with FTA this campaign was admittedly connected with the resolution to stay out of the internal conflict in China between the Nationalists and Communists (FTA-18). The Communist Party viewpoint that United States and Great Britain were imperialists (a charge reminiscent of the days of the Hitler-Stalin Pact), and that the point that the Soviet Union was a democracy, was precisely reflected in an editorial of May 15, 1946, in which the FTA News called for a new system of world food distribution because the United States and Great Britain regarded world food supplies as monopolies they could use for exploiting their political advantages while "the Soviet Union and other democratic and friendly countries" were excluded from the distribution (FTA-20).

Throughout this time and up until the 1948 election, the Truman administration was pictured in the Communist Party press as a tool of big business (CP 22-24), and FTA took the same line in stating that American big business was "acting through the Truman Administration" (FTA-22).

The Marshall plan, according to the Communist Party press, was the way for reaction to prepare for war against the Soviet Union and also to put across

its political and economic program in the United States. The Taft-Hartley Act and the Marshall plan were cut from the same cloth (CP 22-24). And the FTA publication soon followed suit by describing the Marshall plan as one to be used to create a European sweatshop (FTA-26), and to prepare a war machine in the United States which would eventually include forced labor for workers (FTA-27, FTA-29). This last comment is in sharp contrast with the FTA support of national service legislation when the CIO was opposing it, but when it was to the interests of the FTA, the Communist Party and the Soviet Union to call for all-out production in the United States.

In the election campaign of 1948, the union, as well as the Communist Party, supported Wallace and the Progressive Party. The union, of course, had a right to do so. The CIO has never and does not now impose political uniformity on its affiliates. And, it is true that there were non-Communists supporting Wallace. But the union's action in this regard is an additional link, the committee finds, of consistent support of the political program announced by the Communist Party.

After the election of 1948, the Communist Party concentrated its efforts in the labor field on libelous attacks against the officers of the CIO, and particularly violent attacks on their legislative handling of the fight to repeal the Taft-Hartley law. On April 29, 1949, they claimed that the fight for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law had been lost because of the machinations of labor leaders who compromised on amendments instead of demanding outright repeal (CP-29). This precise attack was repeated by FTA at this very expulsion hearing. Such smearing attacks are another instance of the use of the "subterfuge" urged by Lenin. Ironically, in view of these attacks, the affirmative side of the Communist Party's labor policy is to be found in its rallying cry of autonomy and democracy in the unions. And here FTA displays its complete subservience to the autocratic will of the Communist Party by reflecting almost the very language of the Communist Party's press itself in its publication (FTA-30, 40).

Although democratically oriented trade unions rebelled against Soviet domination of the World Federation of Trade Unions, the Communist Party's demand for continued affiliation with the World Federation is also repeated by FTA. At its tenth convention in 1948 the CIO authorized the executive board to withdraw or take such other action in connection with the WFTU as it thought advisable. Subsequently, in April 1949 Donald Henderson, then FTA president, attended a meeting of a group of WFTU unions in Paris at which he addressed a meeting, calling for continued "unity" of world labor. Although Mr. Henderson protested at the trial that this was in accordance with CIO policy, since the executive board did not formally decide to disaffiliate until May 18, 1949, it is clear that he and FTA continued to be devoted to the cause of affiliation with WFTU long after the CIO repudiated it as Communist dominated and in June 1949 FTA still demanded CIO support of that organization.

The Daily Worker in the early part of December 1949, soon after the CIO convention, ran a series of articles stating the party's analysis of the way the unions charged with adherence to Communist policies should handle their defense (CP 32-36). These articles made the following points: That the expulsion proceedings and hearings were part of an offensive to cut the workers' rights; that the "trials" were "phony"; that the trial committees were "rigged"; that the central demand of the labor unions must be for

"autonomy"; that the union's successful wage policy should be emphasized as the primary answer to the charges; that "unity for the CIO on the basis of its founding program and the right to autonomy for all affiliates was the crux of the issue"; that all unions should show their support for the UE (which, incidentally, was criticized for walking out of the convention instead of fighting) and that Phil Murray and all his associates were turncoat labor leaders of the worst stamp.

Almost step by step this advice was followed by the FTA. The December 28 letter of the union to President Murray alleged that this committee was biased and that the "trials" were phony. These allegations were repeated in the first brief presented by Mr. Henderson on January 6. The reference to "autonomy" is made throughout the trial so that it did, indeed, become the central theme of the union's defense. The union produced, as had been suggested, much evidence as to its wage policy both in its brief and through the testimony of rank-and-file witnesses. Again as directed by the Communist Party, the union affirmed its support for the UE (R. 240). In fact, adherence to the suggestions of the Daily Worker was so complete that on pages 177, 178 and 258 of the transcript in the union's brief, the language of FTA is almost identical with the long unity statement of the Communist Party referred to above.

The support by FTA of the UE, which the CIO convention in 1949 expelled because of its Communist domination, is of particular significance. It cannot be explained on any ground other than adherence to the line of the Communist Party. Certainly, after the convention's action expelling the UE because it had been captured by the Communist Party, no loyal affiliate of the CIO would associate itself with the expelled organization. To protect the interests of the CIO and its membership, the CIO convention had recognized and chartered the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers and granted it jurisdiction over the electrical industry. But the Communist Party, and FTA consistently following its line, has openly proclaimed that the old UE must be supported against the CIO.

The action of the president of FTA when the union decided to comply with the Taft-Hartley Act is also significant. Donald Henderson resigned as president of FTA and was appointed national administrative director. At the time of his resignation Henderson made a statement that the resignation was a "protest" against the signing of the unconstitutional non-Communist affidavit on principle (FTA 38). Thereafter, the NLRB refused to certify the union as being qualified because it questioned the authenticity of Mr. Henderson's resignation. Donald Henderson then signed the non-Communist affidavit and announced that while he had been a member of the Communist Party, he resigned his membership. Up to that very point Henderson had concealed his membership in the Communist Party from the membership of his union and from the CIO.

The slavish adherence by the FTA leadership to the program and policies of the Communist Party has resulted in a steadily declining membership as is indicated in the following statistics of employed dues paying members for whom per capita tax was paid to the CIO by FTA:

| | *Membership* |
|---|---|
| Sept. 30, 1946, to Sept. 30, 1947 | 46,700 |
| Sept. 30, 1947, to Sept. 30, 1948 | 29,370 |
| Sept. 30, 1948, to Sept. 30, 1949 | 22,590 |

Total industry membership potential, according to FTA figures, is between 200,000 and 300,000 people.

Even on the basis of FTA's own figures, it stands condemned for failure to organize the broad mass of workers in its jurisdiction. However, this failure is even more startling when it is realized that FTA's membership potential is actually at least 3,000,000 workers, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture.

Significantly, the sharp drop came at a time when much of the energy of union leaders was being dissipated in opposing CIO policies, in attacking the leadership of the CIO, and in espousing the various changes in line of the Communist Party.

In its brief submitted on January 19, 1950, the union states as its defense that the real issues of the trial are whether the policies of FTA were based on the will of the membership and whether they advanced the economic, social, and political interests of FTA. Leaving aside the question, certainly in doubt in view of the membership figures outlined above, whether the economic interests of the membership of FTA were actually advanced, the defense of the union refused to come to issue with the sole question this committee had before it—whether the activities of the union were consistently directed toward the achievement of the program and policies of the Communist Party rather than the objectives of the CIO.

This is not to say that this committee considers that the executive board can expel or disaffiliate unions for any and all disagreements with CIO decisions. Such is not the purpose of the constitutional provision vesting it with expulsion power. In our convention proceedings, President Murray, and Brothers Rieve, Reuther, and Baldanzi all pointed out in discussing this and the related amendments that they were not against honest differences of opinion (11th Constitutional Convention, CIO, Daily Proceedings, November 1, pp. 21, 33, 35; November 2, p. 35; November 3, p. 71). But the provision is directed against those unions who are today directing their activities toward the objectives of the Communist Party rather than those of the CIO.

The changes in policy on our involvement in war, on our attitude toward Great Britain, on the draft, on support of the Democratic administration, and on almost every issue, outlined in Mr. Ruttenberg's testimony, show no internal consistency in FTA's policies. They show no constant consistency with CIO policy. They show only one undeviating parallel—the damning parallel between the policies of FTA and the Communist Party.

None of the defenses offered by the union are addressed to an explanation of why their conduct was consistent only with the line of the Communist Party. Indeed, not many of the charges have been answered in detail despite the two extra briefs which this committee has permitted the union to file.

On a number of specific issues the union has claimed that their statements were based on CIO policy. They make this claim in regard to their prewar isolationist stand (R. II, 19-20).[3] In fact, this was not so. The CIO did not take a stand opposing aid to the allies and the February 10, 1941, issue of the CIO News reports testimony by President Murray before a congressional committee on the lend-lease bill in which he advocated aid to Great Britain.

In regard to other policies which coincided with those of the CIO, i.e., support of the unity of the allies, criticism of big business, and appeals for peace-

[3] The transcript of the hearings on January 19 is referred to as R. II.

ful cooperation among the great powers, it can be pointed out that while FTA policy did meet on these points with those of the CIO, on equally important points it deviated sharply. As we have said above, it is not determinative that there was some adherence to CIO policy, when there was also frequent and bitter opposition to CIO policy motivated by objectives foreign to those of the CIO. It is determinative that there never was any opposition to or criticism of Communist Party policy in the United States.

The union's explanation of its support of Wallace as a valid trade union decision based on certain aspects of Truman's labor record, could be accepted by this committee if the support of Wallace represented one, or one of a few similar sincere disagreements with CIO decisions. But its existence as one of a long series of disagreements always occurring when the Communist Party disagreed with the CIO policy, makes it impossible to accept this explanation.

It is abundantly clear that the FTA consistently follows the Communist Party line. The record is plain that wherever the needs of the Communist Party and the Soviet Union dictate, the leadership of the FTA is always willing to sacrifice the needs of the workers in that industry and organized labor in America as a whole.

It is equally clear that the certificate of affiliation granted to the FTA by the CIO has fallen into the control of a group devoted primarily to the principles of the Communist Party and opposed to the constitution and democratic objectives of the CIO. So long as this group enjoys the benefits of affiliation with the CIO they will continue to betray the workers in the interests of alien loyalties under the protection of the good name of the CIO.

The FTA asserts as a defense that they are defending the autonomous rights of that union. This false cry of autonomy does not deceive us. In the name of autonomy they seek to disguise their uniform and slavish adherence to the foreign policy of the Soviet Union with all its twists and turns from the Nazi-Soviet pact to the abuses of the veto in U. N., the Cominform attack upon the Marshall plan ECA, the Atlantic Treaty, and arms aid to the western democracies. Under the guise of autonomy the FTA seeks to justify the typical Communist tactic of systematic character assassination against the national CIO, its officers, and all affiliated unions who oppose the Cominform policies.

The CIO is a voluntary association of free trade-unions dedicated by its constitution to the protection and extension of our democratic institutions, civil liberties, and human rights. Free unions are voluntary associations of free men, held together by common loyalties and the elements of decency and honesty. The policies and activities pursued by the group which dominates the FTA brand them as unfit to associate with decent men and women in free democratic trade-unions.

The certificate of affiliation of the CIO is a symbol of trust, democracy, brotherhood, and loyalty in the never-ending struggle of the working men and women for a better life. There is no place in the CIO for an organization whose leaders pervert its certificate of affiliation into an instrument that would betray the American workers into totalitarian bondage.

The evidence is inescapable that by their disloyalty to the CIO, and their dedication to the purposes and program of the Communist Party, the leadership of the FTA has rendered their union unworthy of and unqualified for their certificate of affiliation with the CIO.

This committee's findings and conclusions as to FTA are, of course,

grounded on the consistent adherence to the program of the Communist Party of FTA's policies and activities which its leaders have developed and directed. However, this committee wishes to emphasize its conviction that these findings carry no implication that individual members of the union are Communists or sympathetic to communism. On the contrary, the committee is persuaded that many members of FTA have been taken in and deceived by the evasion and the subterfuge, the devices and the maneuvers, which the Communist-minded leaders of this union have used to maintain themselves in power, in disregard of the interests of their members, concealing all the while the fact that the union's policies and activities were not the real informed decision of the members, but were determined in accordance with the line of the Communist Party.

## CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated, therefore, and on the basis of all the evidence presented to it, the committee unanimously concludes that the policies and activities of the FTA are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program and the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the CIO constitution. The committee recommends that the executive board exercise the powers granted to it by article VI, section 10, of the CIO constitution and, by virtue of those powers, revoke the certificate of affiliation heretofore granted to the FTA and expel it from the CIO.

Respectfully submitted.

JACOB POTOFSKY, *Chairman.*
EMIL MAZEY.
JOSEPH CURRAN.

# REPORT OF EXECUTIVE BOARD COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY PRESIDENT MURRAY TO CONDUCT HEARINGS ON UNITED PUBLIC WORKERS OF AMERICA

## INTRODUCTION

On November 5, 1949, William Steinberg, president of the American Radio Association and a member of the CIO executive board, charged that the policies and activities of the United Public Workers are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program or the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives set forth in the constitution of the CIO. The charges were received by the executive board and it authorized the appointment by President Murray of a committee to conduct the hearings and to report back to the board. President Murray designated the undersigned, Emil Rieve, Harry Sayre, and Joseph Beirne, all of whom are members of the CIO executive board, as a committee to conduct hearings, and this designation was approved by the executive board. Notice was duly given to the UPW of the existence of the charges and of the appointment of the committee.

On November 23, 1949, the chairman of the committee gave notice to the UPW that a hearing would be held on December 12, 1949. The UPW, however, filed suit in a Federal district court in Philadelphia in an attempt to enjoin this committee from holding a hearing. Although no restraining order was issued by the court in this suit, the general counsel of the CIO agreed to a postponement of the hearing on the UPW in order to permit the Philadelphia court to dispose of the litigation. Accordingly, the hearing was postponed and was not held until January 9, 1950, after the suit was dismissed.

The hearing began at 10 a.m. on January 9, and concluded at 10:45 p.m. on Wednesday, January 11. The case against the UPW presented to the committee consisted of four parts:

1. An introductory statement by Mr. Steinberg;
2. A description of the program of the Communist Party, and a comparison of the policies and activities of the UPW with that program, presented by Meyer Bernstein, assistant research director of the United Steelworkers of America, by way of photostats of publications and convention proceedings of the UPW and its predecessor organizations;
3. Testimony as to the policies and activities of the UPW and its predecessor organizations by Joseph Adamson, a former member of the executive board of the UPW and the State, County, and Municipal Workers (SCMWA):
4. Testimony by Charles Rindone, a former member of SCMWA and of the Communist Party, that there were Communist Party meetings, attended by leaders of SCMWA, at which union policy and tactics were determined, in advance of union meetings, by the Communist "fraction" within the union.

The UPW's presentation consisted of (1) a statement from Alfred Bernstein concerning the UPW's fight against President Truman's loyalty investigation program; (2) a statement from Thomas Richardson denouncing discrimination against Negroes and describing the UPW's antidiscrimination program. These two items were the major portion of the UPW's oral presentation. In addition, (3) Ewart Guinier presented a short statement denouncing Red-baiting and discrimination and dealing cursorily with the testimony against the UPW.

The committee agreed to receive any additional evidence which either party desired to offer in writing subsequent to the close of the hearing. Mr.

Steinberg submitted several additional documents to the committee. The United Public Workers submitted a defense consisting of (1) a series of letters protesting the hearings, (2) a series of photostats of the CIO News, (3) a comparison of the CIO policy with SCMWA policy during the 1938-45 period to show that the CIO, as well as SCMWA, had followed the Communist Party line.

The committee has considered carefully both the testimony given at the hearing and the documentary material offered by the parties after the conclusion of the hearing. On the basis of this consideration, the committee finds as follows:

## I

Since the charge against the UPW was that it pursues the program and the purposes of the Communist Party, the committee was necessarily required to give consideration to the program of the Communist Party. The evidence submitted to the committee on this question was undisputed and was identical with that submitted in the hearings concerning the United Office and Professional Workers of America. The committee therefore adopts, and repeats here, its findings as to the program and the purposes of the Communist Party contained in the report of the committee on the Office and Professional Workers.

The policies of the Communist Party, the committee believes, can be understood only in the light of the basic characteristics of the Communist movement. The Communist movement, from its inception, purported to be a movement of working people. Its basic thesis was that a new order of society must be created by revolution of the working classes and that the "dictatorship" of the "proletariat" must be established. Because of this basic thesis, Communist philosophy has always been predicated upon the use of trade-unions as an instrument of Communist policy and as a weapon by which the party could organize the working classes and bring nearer the revolution from which the dictatorship of the party would emerge. As Lenin said:

> It is necessary to agree to any and every sacrifice * * * to resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge, in order to penetrate the trade-unions, to remain in them, and to carry on Communist work in them at all costs.[1]

The Communist movement has thus always sought to operate through trade-unions, to speak in the language of labor and as a spokesman and leader of labor, and thus, by trickery and strategem, to direct labor toward the goals of communism.

It is not the purpose of this committee to pass on the theoretical political goals of the Communist Party. But, from the evidence presented to the committee, one simple conclusion can be drawn. Whatever may be the theoretical goals of the party, its program is based upon one fundamental objective: the support of the Soviet Union, the country in which the Communist Party first achieved its goal of dictatorship. This objective is never expressly stated to be the sole controlling factor in determining the party's program. To the contrary, because of its desire to speak as an American rather than a Soviet agency and to maintain its position within the trade-union movement, the party presents its program as a program for American, not for Russian, labor. The policies which the party adopts are stated to be policies for the achievement of the goals of American labor—not for the advancement of the cause of the Soviet Union. But, over a period of years it is clear that the

[1] Left-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder, International Publishers, (1934), p. 38.

goals of American labor, as stated by the party, are always found to be those policies which will aid the Soviet Union. As the tactical position of the Soviet Union in the world has changed, the program of the American Communist Party "for American labor" has accommodated itself. And, when it seemed in the interest of the Soviet Union for American labor to forsake its heritage and to adopt policies contradictory to the whole fabric of the labor movement, the Communist Party adopted such policies.

## II

The program of the Communist Party in the United States, from the time of the formation of the CIO to the present, can be divided into six periods, each of them corresponding to a change in the relationship of the Soviet Union with the world.

*The first period*

The first period was the period of "collective security." During this period, the Soviet Union felt itself menaced by Fascist Germany. It needed the help of the Western powers and, because it needed that help, it urged a system of collective security against aggression. Accordingly, the Communist Party of the United States firmly supported a policy of collective security and urged that the United States enter into such a system with the Soviet Union. The interest of American labor, the Communist Party said, was in the elimination of fascism wherever it was found. American labor had a stake in the maintenance of free institutions throughout the world and labor should, the party declared, go all out for aid to the victims of Fascist aggression and for the creation of a genuine system of security against such aggression.

In pursuit of this policy the Communist Party supported vigorously, and urged labor to support, President Roosevelt's anti-Fascist policy and the amendments to the United States Neutrality Act, which would permit the United States Government to support victims of aggression.

*The second period*

In September 1939, however, the foreign policy of the Soviet Union changed. Instead of allying itself with the powers opposed to Hitler, the Soviet Union signed a nonaggression pact with him. The Russians chose the course of allying themselves with the power which previously had seemed to it a great threat. The war between Germany and the Western Powers began immediately thereafter. This shift in Soviet tactics was immediately echoed by a shift in the program of the Communist Party of the United States. The evils of fascism were no longer important to the American Communist Party. The threat to American labor, the party said, was the "imperialist war." As the United States slowly developed toward a program giving aid to the enemies of Hitlerism, the party became more and more certain that this developing program was an imperialist program and was opposed to the interests of America. Roosevelt, whose policy of quarantining the aggressors had been praised so loudly in 1937 and 1938, was now a Fascist warmonger, while Senator Wheeler truly expressed the interests of American labor. The defense program of the United States was a program fostered by Wall Street. The draft was an instrument by which Wall Street intended to impose a dictatorship upon America. The lend-lease bill was a "war powers bill." The party tried, through the mechanism of such movements as the American

Peace Mobilization and such slogans as "The Yanks Are Not Coming," to capitalize upon the isolationist-pacifist sentiment in the United States and to defeat every measure intended to aid the powers that were opposing Hitler.

*The third period*

When Hitler, on June 22, 1941, attacked the Soviet Union, then of course the second period ended abruptly. The Soviet Union needed help. And so a third period for the American Communist Party was ushered in. Roosevelt's "war program" now became "the people's program of struggle for the defeat of Hitlerism." All aid to the peoples of Great Britain and the Soviet Union was called for. Extension of the draft act, which had been so vigorously opposed when originally enacted in September of 1940, was demanded by the Communist Party in September 1941. Senator Wheeler, whose isolationism had been praised by the party in 1940, was now a Munichman and a traitor. Labor, again said the Communist Party, had a stake in the defeat of fascism throughout the world and should direct its energies to the support of all-out production to defeat Hitler.

*The fourth period*

When the United States entered the war in December 1941, no change in Communist Party policy was called for. The Communist Party's Pearl Harbor had already occurred on June 22, 1941, and the party had favored United States entrance into the war since that time. But the party continued to grind its ax. The United States and Russia did not see eye to eye on military strategy. The Russians wanted the immediate opening of a second front. And so the Communist Party decided that American labor had an interest in this question of military strategy and that it was to labor's interest to prove to the military that an immediate second front was the best military policy for the opening of a second front in 1942.

"It is imperative," said Eugene Dennis, "that the labor movement unitedly should make its voice heard and its influence felt on * * * such life-and-death questions as insuring America's participation in the opening of a second front in Europe this spring." [2]

*The fifth period*

The second-front issue was a symptom of the lack of confidence which the Communist Party felt, during the fourth period, in the genuineness of the American-Russian collaboration. These doubts, however, vanished when President Roosevelt had his first meeting with Premier Stalin at Tehran and when an agreement was reached on the basic problems confronting the two countries. This agreement seemed to the Communist Party to herald a complete change in the relationship of America to the Soviet Union and, therefore (in the Communist Party's distorted view of America), in the relationship between labor and the rest of the American community. The fact that the United States and the Soviet Union had reached an agreement seemed to mean to the Communist Party that all problems between labor and capital in the United States were on their way to being settled. The Communist Party, accordingly, dissolved itself in January 1944. Tehran became the watchword, the magic touchstone, which not only solved foreign problems but laid at rest all of labor's problems. Earl Browder, the leader of the party,

[2] The Communist, April 1942, p. 212.

announced that if J. P. Morgan would join in support of the American-Soviet coalition Browder would clasp his hand and join with him. The party's program of "socialism" was abandoned and everything was to be devoted toward the achievement of the new "progressive" coalition between labor and capital. During this period the Communist Party supported national-service legislation, a policy directed contrary to every tradition of the American labor movement. It supported most vigorously the no-strike pledge and urged that it be continued in the postwar period. In short, the Communist Party, then called the Communist Political Association, was—as it later described itself —an opportunist tail to the capitalist class.

*The sixth period*

With the close of the European war, differences and tensions began to develop between the Soviet Union and the United States. Accordingly, the Communist Party again reversed its field. Taking its lead from an article by the French Communist leader Duclos, it reconstituted itself, in June 1945, as the Communist Party and once again asserted its so-called aggressive role in domestic affairs. It no longer supported national-service legislation, and the talk about continuation of the no-strike pledge after the end of the war was abandoned.

The development of communism in the postwar era did not exhibit any rapid and sudden shift, since the position of the Soviet Union did not exhibit any such shifts. It was, rather, a slowly developing policy of opposition to the aims of the Truman administration which became clearer as the diplomatic conflict between the United States and Soviet Union developed. The postwar Communist program included the following specific items:

1. A demand that United States troops be withdrawn from China and Greece;

2. A claim that the United States had failed to live up to the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, and a demand that United States foreign policy be based on friendship with the Soviet Union based on those agreements;

3. Opposition to the Truman doctrine;

4. Opposition to the American plan for control of atomic energy and denunciation of American atomic-bomb production;

5. Opposition to the Marshall plan;

6. Support of Henry Wallace and the Progressive Party in 1948;

7. Opposition to the Atlantic Pact;

8. Support of the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade-Unions and opposition to the CIO- and AFL-sponsored International Confederation of Free Trade-Unions;

9. Support of the Marcantonio bill (which had no chance of passage), rather than the Thomas-Lesinski bill (which could have been passed), in the fight against the Taft-Hartley Act;

10. Denunciation of the CIO as a tool of reaction and imperialism. In particular, the party charged that the CIO had "sold out" the fight against the Taft-Hartley Act;

11. Support for the UE in its fight with the CIO.

Throughout this curious history, the Communist Party never ceased to claim that it made its decisions on the basis of a genuine appraisal of the interests of the American people and of American labor. Those claims were, of course, false. The record shows that the purpose of the Communist Party

is the support of the Soviet Union and that the program of the party is designed with only the interests of the Soviet Union in view.

This purpose was never avowed, and the program was always phrased in terms of the interests of America and of American labor. Throughout this decade in which the party favored first one objective and then another, it continually purported to be the champion of organization and of unionism. But it always found that the interests of organization and unionism favored whatever policy would aid the Soviet Union. This was not limited to foreign-policy matters. A peculiar and consistent characteristic of the Communist Party program is that it always finds a tie-in between domestic and foreign policy. Thus, in the first period when the Communists supported the Roosevelt foreign policy, they also supported his domestic policy as progressive and pro-labor. In the second period, however, Roosevelt was seen by the party as a reactionary and a Fascist, and his domestic program was roundly attacked as being antilabor. The most blatant example of the controlling influence of matters of foreign policy was, of course, the Tehran period when the fact that Stalin and Roosevelt had met and agreed was regarded as proof that an era of peace between capital and labor within the United States was possible. But almost equally blatant was the Communist position with regard to President Truman's domestic policy in the postwar period. The President was charged with a sell-out of labor and a betrayal of the fight for civil liberties. The Fair Deal was denounced as a sham. The administration was, in short, a tool of the reactionary capitalists, and its domestic program and its foreign program were both a part of the "bipartisan reactionary coalition." Similarly, attacks on the administration's foreign policy were tied in, however illogically, with attacks on Republican domestic policy. Thus, the Marshall plan (which had been opposed by Senator Taft and the most reactionary Republicans) was, in the Communist view, simply the application of the Taft-Hartley Act to foreign affairs.

On the basis of this evidence the committee finds that the purpose of the Communist Party is to promote the interests of the Soviet Union. It finds that, although the Communist Party has claimed to champion unionism and organization, it has always done so in order to carry on Communist work within trade-unions and in order to pervert their policies to the advantage of the Soviet Union. The Communist Party, the committee finds, does not believe in trade-unions. It believes in using trade-unions. And it believes in using them for the purposes of the Soviet Union.

It should not be necessary for this committee to repeat here in detail the basic objectives set forth in the constitution of the CIO. The preamble of the constitution of the CIO states that the CIO is proud of the American quest for liberty and the struggle for equality, that it is dedicated to the responsibility of furthering the goals of our American heritage. It states the opposition of the CIO to all those who would use power to exploit the people in the interests of alien loyalties. It dedicates the CIO to the achievement of a world of free men and women

The objectives set forth in article II of the constitution spell out the goals of an American trade-union movement dedicated to the general principles set forth in the preamble of the constitution. The objectives of the CIO are to bring about the organization of the working men and women of America, to extend benefits of collective bargaining to them, and to secure legislation protecting the economic security of America and protecting and

extending our democratic institutions and civil rights and liberties, all to the end that the cherished traditions of our democracy be perpetuated.

These are the objectives and policies set forth in the constitution of the CIO. They contrast most violently with the purposes of the Communist Party which are, as the committee has found, devoted completely to the interests of alien loyalties and to the exploitation of the trade-union movement in the interests of the Soviet Union, although always professing to be interested in trade-unionism and in American labor.

## III

Before making findings on the policies and activities of the UPW, certain preliminary questions had to be decided by the committee. The UPW contended at the outset that the committee had no power to consider evidence of the activities of the union prior to the date of the constitutional amendment under which the charges were brought. This contention is rejected by the committee. The charge against the UPW is that it now follows the program of the Communist Party. But the history of the past activities and policies of the UPW leadership is relevant to a determination of whether the present policies and activities of that leadership are directed toward the achievement of the purposes of the Communist Party or are based on an honest judgment as to the best policies to achieve the objectives set forth in the CIO constitution.

The UPW further contended that because the UPW was not formed until 1946 evidence concerning policies and activities prior to 1946 should be excluded. This contention also must be rejected. The UPW was not a new union in 1946. It was simply an amalgamation and a continuation of the State, County, and Municipal Workers (SCMWA) and the United Federal Workers (UFWA). Its leadership was not new. The greater proportion of that leadership was drawn from SCMWA, with a lesser representation for the UFWA. In order to determine the character of the present leadership of UPW, and the direction which its leadership gives to the affairs of the UPW, therefore, the committee feels that it is not only proper but necessary to consider the history of the policies and activities adopted by the leadership of the predecessor unions.

In examining this earlier history, it is SCMWA which is significant. The present UPW is, in reality, merely a continuation of the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, with the addition of a minor insignificant segment of membership derived from the old United Federal Workers.

The Public Workers have refused to answer questions directed at the disclosure of the present balance of its membership between the former SCMWA and UFWA locals. At the time of the amalgamation in 1946, however, SCMWA had a membership almost three times that of the Federal Workers. And it is clear that the history of the organization since then has been largely a history of the disintegration of that portion of the union which formerly comprised the United Federal Workers.

The officers' report to the 1948 convention of the UPW states that "the Federal section of the union was hit very hard" by the postwar cuts in Federal employment. Although the report gives no figures as to membership, it does contain elaborate percentage classifications of the membership of the UPW by various categories and these classifications disclose that the Federal workers section of the United Public Workers is a very small proportion of

its membership. Thus the report lists, at page 33, the distribution of UPW members by civil service status. This distribution shows that 11 percent of the total union membership had Federal civil service status, 64 percent of the membership had State, county, and municipal civil service status, and the remaining 25 percent of the membership, mostly comprising members working for private employers, according to the report, had no civil service status. We can assume, therefore, that, as of 1948 Federal membership in the United Public Workers was in the neighborhood of 11 percent. The UPW's membership has continued to drop since 1948 and the percentage of Federal workers in its membership, excluding the entirely new Panama Canal Zone membership, may now well be less than 11 percent.

Reflecting this relative balance in membership, two of the three founding international officers of the UPW were former officers of SCMWA. Its president, Abram Flaxer, was the former president of SCMWA. And, as of the present time, three of the four international officers of the Public Workers are former officers of SCMWA.

For these reasons the committee concludes that SCMWA and the present United Public Workers are, in substance, the same organization. And, in attempting to examine the character of the leadership of the UPW, the committee has examined not only the activities after 1946 but also its policies and activities under the union's former name, SCMWA.

## IV

The evidence introduced by Meyer Bernstein at the hearing clearly showed that SCMWA followed the basic outline of Communist policy. In the first period, it supported the Roosevelt anti-Fascist policy and found in the fight against fascism a counterpart of the New Deal's domestic struggle for social welfare, but the second period the union, and its officers, with equal strength, opposed any and all aid to the countries engaged in a war with fascism. The union's paper featured the slogan "The Yanks Are Not Coming." The Roosevelt program was described as "the road to war" and it was urged that all loans, either public or private, to the Allies be banned. President Flaxer was a sponsor of the American Peace Mobilization and a frequent speaker at its meetings.

There was one war in which SCMWA took sides, however. That was the war between China and Japan. The Communist Party differentiated between the European war, in which the Soviet Union was allied with Hitler, and the Asiatic war, where Russia's interests were opposed to the Japanese. And so SCMWA urged strict neutrality concerning the European war, but at the same time opposed Japanese imperialism. And in an article on trade-unions under wartime conditions the union's paper drew a sharp contrast between conditions in China, where it found that trade-unions were given more freedom than they had enjoyed before, with the conditions of trade-unions in Germany, Britain, and France.

When Hitler attacked the Soviet Union, the union's position violently changed. It immediately called for war. The best comment on this change was made by a delegate to the union's 1941 convention. The resolution under discussion at the time declared that "the swift and crushing military defeat of fascism is America's No. 1 job." The delegate said:

> To begin with you will recall that approximately 3 years ago the position of our union as expressed through our national organization, as ex-

pressed in the convention of the New York State district of our union, was for the support of the democracies against fascism. That is, support of the democratic powers against Hitler and Nazi aggression. Suddenly with the advent of the war against Russia, the position of our union, the position of our convention 2 years ago was reversed. At that time we took the position that the war was imperialist and we said furtherance of the extension of the war in this country would be in direct contradiction to the interest of our workers as Government employees. I believe the secretary-treasurer at that time pointed out that the national-defense program would siphon off social legislation, and that democracy must be fought for here in America, and that our real fight was here in this country, and that we would have no part in this foreign imperialist war.

This position was reiterated just recently at a meeting of the American Peace Mobilization. Our national president, Brother Flaxer, was one of the sponsors of the American Peace Mobilization. I attended that meeting as a delegate of my local, and I know many of you people were there also representing your various organizations. At that time we again took a clear-cut position in opposition to the war as an imperialist war, an imperialist war on the part of Britain, and we recognized Churchill as being decided and determined not in the interest of the British workers, of the masses, but in the interest of the imperialists of Britain who dominated their colonies in an unequitable, ruthless fashion, similar to the fashion in which Germany dominates today.

In addition, we also pointed out that if the United States took part in this struggle it would be for the benefit of Wall Street, and so on. At that time we pointed out that it was a fallacy to speak of fighting for democracy in Europe when a third of our population still can't vote, when we have segregation and discrimination throughout the Armed Forces, and there is still a battle in Dearborn to bring that city back into the United States.

* * * * * * *

Now we find the same people that took an ardent anti-imperialist war position tell us now it is all different. Now we have a war for democracy against fascism. Now our main job is to defeat nazism, Hitlerism.

No voice was raised at the convention to dispute this devastating chronology. An amendment to the resolution which proposed to state that the union was not simply supporting the position of the Soviet Union was ruled out of order and no amendment or resolution of that nature was brought before the convention by the union leadership.

The committee could not examine in detail SCMWA's wartime policies since the union published no newspaper between 1940 and 1943, and the report of the proceedings of the union's 1943 convention were not made available to the committee. From other material, however, it is clear that the union adopted the superpatriotic line which the Communist Party at that time adopted. The officer's report to the 1943 convention, for example, seems to have been formulated on the theory that the union's only reason for being was to further the war effort. Thus, the table of contents reads:

1. The war.
2. Problems facing the public service during wartime.
3. The union as a war weapon.
4. Sharpening the war weapon.
5. The four freedoms in the back yard of the public service.

This position was maintained through the spring of 1945. In March 1945, for example, the union placed implicit trust in President Truman and it cited with particular favor his foreign policy, noting that he had "fought for and voted for lend-lease" (which SCMWA had opposed) and that he had "fought for and voted to revise the Neutrality Act" (which SCMWA had opposed).

The Communist Party shift in the latter part of 1945 was followed by a SCMWA shift. In December 1945, President Flaxer described Truman's foreign policy as "a foreign policy that is dictated by the profit-greed of the imperialistic finance barons." In common with other left-wing unions, SCMWA distorted the CIO's support of the desire of the American people to "Bring the Boys Back" into a campaign to cease anti-Russian intervention in China.

In 1946, this anti-administration, pro-Soviet position was made clear. President Truman's foreign policy was described in the officers report to the 1946 convention as a policy of "warmongers and politicians." Profit-hungry big business was found behind any actions in opposition to the Soviet Union. The expenditure of money for atomic bomb production was attacked. SCMWA, in short, adopted again—as did the Communist Party—the isolationist position which it had plugged so hard in the September 1939-June 1941 period.

This attitude was not limited to foreign affairs. Like the Communist Party, SCMWA attempted to give a domestic twist to its opposition to the Truman foreign program. Thus, President Flaxer, in December 1945, stated clearly his view that the administration's "imperialist" foreign policy would necessarily have its reflection in a "reactionary domestic policy" and that, therefore, labor must oppose the "Truman-Byrnes" administration no matter what its stated aims were. When the union newspaper in 1946 ran an editorial on the housing shortage, it laid the blame for that shortage on an entirely new door—the production of atom bombs.

SCMWA's position with relation to the Communist Party is not only shown by the conformity of its policies to the Communist pattern, but also by its position on communism itself. The union frequently denounced false cries of communism, as did the CIO. It never, however, denounced communism. Its position is best illustrated by a story in the August-September 1939 issue of Government Guide, the union's then official newspaper. At that time the CIO supported the fight of Harry Bridges against deportation. The CIO, however, did not support communism. The August-September issue of Government Guide, however, in reporting on the Bridges trial, laid the greatest emphasis on the defense testimony at that trial as to the nature of Communist Party policy. The paper's clear predilections were disclosed in the manner in which it reported this testimony. The story was headed "Bridges Trial Educates America," and it said:

> What [Communists] do teach, according to these witnesses, is this: As the people of a nation, victimized more and more by unemployment and a lower standard of living (attendant on the inevitable decay of capitalism), utilized their democratic form of government to improve their conditions by passing more and more legislation of a social and socialistic character, the minority who own the means of production will engineer a violent antidemocratic revolution. In such an event the people will defend themselves, and their government and, as a defense measure, take over the means of production. The Communist Party, the witnesses said, teaches that the people should be prepared to meet such a situation so that they would be victorious in the struggle.

This is the testimony which according to SCMWA, educated America. Not a word was said about any contrary testimony concerning communism. The clear—and false—implication was that the crucial issue in the Bridges case was the nature of communism and that the CIO, in supporting Bridges' denial that he had been a member of the Communist Party, was supporting communism.

## V

In April 1946, SCMWA absorbed UFWA and emerged as the present UPW. The history of UFWA policy prior to the merger does not exhibit the shifts and contortions that SCMWA policy does. The union, however, went through several changes of leadership. Until 1940, Jacob Baker was president; and from 1940 until 1944 the union was under the administratorship of the CIO's director of organization, Allan Haywood. The union's record during this period is straightforward. In the postwar period, however, it clearly took positions identical with those taken at that time by SCMWA. Thus it, as well as SCMWA, distorted the CIO campaign to bring surplus soldiers home into an anti-Chinese intervention campaign and it opposed, although somewhat less violently than SCMWA, the administration's anti-Russian stand as a program for war.

## VI

The new union, UPW, lost no time in declaring its stand. Resolution No. 1 of the convention in which the SCMWA-UFWA merger was consummated reads as follows:

> Whereas the unity of Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States was the foundation for military defeat of fascism, and their continuing unity is absolutely essential if the United Nations is to provide a sound and lasting peace; and
>
> Whereas the friendship and cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union is the essential basis for an enduring peace; and
>
> Whereas powerful influences are attempting to drive a wedge between the peoples of the United Nations for the purpose of furthering their imperialist ambitions, as evidenced by ex-Prime Minister Churchill's speech; the forming of Anglo-American bloc within the U. N. and the policy of assisting by armed force in some cases the most reactionary groups in friendly countries such as China, the Philippines, France, Belgium, and others; and
>
> Whereas to further these policies the demobilization of American troops now stationed throughout the world is being deliberately delayed; and
>
> Whereas the failure to establish international cooperation in the development and control of atomic energy and the continued secrecy and manufacture of atomic bombs have created world fear and distrust which weaken the peace: therefore be it
>
> Resolved, that the UPWA, meeting in convention April 24-26, 1946, calls upon President Truman, Secretary of State Byrnes, and Members of Congress to take the following immediate steps:
>
> 1. To halt the present policy of attempting to isolate the Soviet Union in the U. N. and world affairs and call for an immediate meeting of the minds of the Big Three.
>
> 2. To take positive steps to reestablish friendly United States-Soviet relations by word and deed.
>
> 3. To withdraw American troops and call for the withdrawal of British troops from all friendly countries, including China, the Philippines, France, Greece, India, Indonesia, Belgium, and Iceland.
>
> 4. To support the policy of U. N. regulation and control of all phases of atomic energy, including the immediate possession of all atomic bombs and the passage by Congress of legislation vesting full control of atomic energy in a civilian commission.

According to a story by Jerry Kluttz in the Washington Post, this resolution was adopted out of order, on a day when no resolutions were scheduled to be considered, at the suggestion of George Morris, a correspondent of the the Daily Worker, so that the Daily Worker would have a story to offset the criticism directed at Russian foreign policy at the Textile Workers' con-

vention on that day. According to Mr. Kluttz, opponents of the resolution were called reactionaries and Red baiters and a suggestion by a delegate that a line be added to the resolution recommending the withdrawal of Russian troops from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, and other countries was shouted down.

Other newspapers also reported that the foreign-policy resolution was the only resolution adopted on that day of the convention. Moreover, the UPW representatives, although they made several adverse references to Mr. Kluttz, did not deny the accuracy of the story. The committee, therefore, accepts it as true. The resolution speaks for itself. That it was taken out of order at the behest of an agent of the Daily Worker seems to the committee to be entirely consistent with the pro-Communist text of the resolution and with the history of the union leadership that sponsored it.

In the period following the 1946 convention and continuing up to the present moment, the UPW has never repudiated the basic pro-Soviet position exhibited at its first convention under its new name. Within the councils of the CIO it has continued to support the program sponsored by the Communist Party. The union, however, did tone down the blatancy of its public position in order to protect its position as a union of Government workers. But it continued, by indirection and subtle phraseology, to serve the Communist Party's purposes even in its official public pronouncements.

Thus, the UPW's 1948 resolution on foreign affairs was more modestly phrased than the 1946 resolution, but its content was the same. It decried the "cold war" as an attempt by "big bankers and industrialists to force us into another war." It called for Big Three unity, and it stated its support for peace discussions based on the open letters exchanged between Henry Wallace and Joseph Stalin.

The UPW executive-board resolution on the Wallace campaign was similarly adroitly worded. The union did not officially support the Progressive Party. Instead, it urged full discussion of the issues presented by the third party, noting that there had been no disposition on the part of the Democratic and Republican Parties to give heed to the problems of the labor movement. The hidden meaning of this resolution was clear. Indeed, evidence presented to the committee by Joseph Adamson, a former member of the UPW executive board, confirms that the intention of the resolution was to support the third party and that its ambiguous language was deliberately adopted so as to protect the union's Federal members while at the same time making it clear that the union supported Wallace.

The Marshall-plan issue was handled in the same way. According to Adamson's testimony, the executive board of the UPW scornfully rejected a resolution supporting the Marshall plan in August 1947. Later when President Murray of the CIO released a statement in which he set out 10 principles which he urged should be incorporated in the legislative implementation of the Marshall plan, the UPW remained silent. In the spring of 1948, such legislation was introduced, and the CIO, finding that legislation satisfactory, urged its passage. The UPW remained silent. The legislation passed. Finally, in May of 1948, the UPW spoke. It did not approve of the enactment of the Marshall plan. Somewhat despairingly, it recited that Congress had passed the statute and then urged that the agency administering the statute use its administrative latitude to comply with the 10 points specified by Mr. Murray prior to the introduction of the legislation.

Whatever may have been the deliberate ambiguities of the union's formal resolutions, the position of its leaders at CIO conventions and within the executive board of the CIO has been clear. At the 1948 convention, it opposed the resolutions endorsing the Marshall plan, supported the clearly Communist-controlled World Federation of Trade-Unions and opposed CIO resignation from it, attacked the CIO position on wages, and, in general, supported the position of the unions within the CIO which have either already been expelled as Communist-dominated or are now under investigation on that charge. At the meetings of the CIO executive board it has uniformly, and without fail, supported Communist-line policies and opposed any action which in any way ran counter to the interests of the Soviet Union.

## VII

In addition to the convention proceedings, officers' reports and official national newspapers of UPW and its predecessors, Mr. Meyer Bernstein introduced a number of exhibits from the publications of subsidiary groups within the union. Since these publications were apparently not distributed nationally and were not officially sanctioned as presenting national union policy, the committee has not placed primary reliance on them in finding that the policies of this union have followed the outlines of the Communist Party program. The committee does regard these publications, however, as confirming its findings.

Excerpts from two different publications were submitted to the committee. The first publication was the Civil Service Standard, organ of the New York district, district No. 1, of SCMWA. Excerpts from this publication for the year 1941—in which no national newspaper was published by the union—show in startling relief the isolationist, anti-Roosevelt position prior to June 22, 1941, and the iterventionist, pro-Roosevelt position subsequent to that date. Since that contrast has already been found in the statements of the national union's officers and in its convention proceedings, the evidence from the Civil Service Standard is merely cumulative.

The second was the New York Teacher News, official organ of the Teachers Union of New York, local 555 of SCMWA and, later, of UPW. Excerpts from this publication were submitted covering the 1945-48 period. They need not be reviewed by the committee in detail. They exhibit a uniform and almost open pro-Communist position, not only in the policies adopted by the local but also in the activities publicized by the newspaper, such as the opening of courses at the Jefferson School, meetings of the national Council of Soviet-American Relationship, meetings sponsored by the editors of Masses and Mainstream, etc.

As already stated, the committee regards the evidence from these publications as confirmatory of its findings based on other evidence. The committee wishes to point out, however, certain facts which would support the relevance of this material. First, district No. 1 was clearly the most important district of SCMWA. New York was the national headquarters of the union. The officers' report to the union's 1939 convention declared that New York was the "center of activity of its membership" and that "New York holds the position in relation to the government service akin to the position that Pittsburgh has to the steel industry." It further stated that "the most experienced and self-reliant branch of our national union is located in New York."

Clearly, the policies and activities of that branch cannot be divorced from the policies and activities of the national union.

Second, the UPW representatives at the committee's hearings were repeatedly challenged to produce evidence that these locals had departed from SCMWA and UPW policy, or that any other locals had published papers taking contrary, anti-Communist positions. This challenge was not met and the committee therefore feels that it is proper to conclude that no such evidence exists and that the policies and activities of the New York district and the teachers union are representative of the policies and activities of SCMWA and UPW locals generally.

## VIII

In addition to the documentary material already referred to, Mr. Steinberg presented two additional witnesses—Charles Rindone and Joseph Adamson.

Rindone testified that he had been a member of the Communist Party and of local 1 of SCMWA, that as a member of the party he attended "fraction" meetings of the Communist Party members at which SCMWA policies were determined, and that various officials of SCMWA had attended these meetings. In particular he named Abram Flaxer, now president of UPW, as a leader at these Communist Party meetings.

The UPW representatives at first pretended that they did not recognize Mr. Rindone and had never heard of him before. But they then subjected him to grueling examination in which it developed that they were well acquainted with the witness and his record both inside and outside the union. In the course of this examination they attacked Mr. Rindone violently and succeeded in showing that his memory of exact dates as to matters occurring more than 10 years before was not precise. The crucial parts of Mr. Rindone's testimony, however, were never denied or rebutted.

President Flaxer did not deny that he had been a member of the Communist Party during the period referred to or that he had attended Communist "fraction" meetings. Although the committee at the close of the hearings invited the UPW to submit statements from President Flaxer, or from any other union officers named by Mr. Rindone, refuting his testimony, no such statements were submitted. In the documents submitted by the UPW the only denial of Mr. Rindone's testimony is the statement that President Flaxer denied that he is a member of the Communist Party in a newspaper interview published on January 9 and 10, 1950. This denial was made in a press conference held in Washington during the period when the committee's hearings were in progress. It was not made to the committee. Furthermore, the committee has ascertained that President Flaxer, in that interview, refused to answer as to whether he ever had been a member of the party. In view of the recently announced resignations from the Communist Party of such persons as Donald Henderson of the FTA, Maurice Travis of Mine, Mill, and Max Perlow of the Furniture Workers, President Flaxer's announcement of his present nonmembership at a press conference is meaningless. As shown by exhibits introduced at the hearing, President Flaxer had previously refused to answer questions as to his past or present Communist affiliation on the ground that such questions were improper. By stating to the press, although not to the committee, his present nonmembership in the party, President Flaxer seems to have indicated that the

question was a proper one at that time. In that light, his refusal to discuss the question as to past membership and his failure to make any statement on the subject at the hearing, where he would be subject to cross-examination, tends to confirm Mr. Rindone's testimony.

Mr. Joseph Adamson, the third witness introduced by Mr. Steinberg, was an organizer and a member of the executive board of both SCMWA and UPW. He testified to the following:

1. That the Communist reputation of the union severely hampered its organizational efforts.

2. That he had been approached by a Communist organizer as a fellow traveler, on the evident assumption that all UPW officials were friends to the party.

3. That when he offered to the UPW executive board in August 1947 a resolution, adopted by his local, supporting the Marshall plan, he was severely criticized both for offering the resolution and for permitting his local to pass it.

4. That the UPW executive board resolution on political action in 1948 was intended to serve as an oblique endorsement of the third party. Mr. Adamson testified that the board members all agreed that the union should support Wallace, but that outright endorsement was not specifically made in order to protect the Federal membership of the union. He testified that the resolution was adopted only after the board majority was persuaded that its implicit support of the Wallace candidacy would be clear to the membership.

Mr. Adamson's testimony as to the Marshall plan resolution was derided by the UPW on the ground that the CIO had not yet taken a position on the Marshall plan and that the Marshall plan, was, in fact, not yet in existence. Absence of CIO policy, however, had never been a deterrent to SCMWA-UPW policy. It claimed and still claims the right to autonomy on policy matters. Furthermore, the Marshall plan, although not yet reduced to legislative form in August 1947, was sufficiently definite so that the Daily Worker, on July 21, 1947, could take a firm position in opposition to it. Mr. Adamson's testimony that he was severely criticized for presenting the resolution and even for allowing his local to pass it was never adequately answered, in the committee's opinion. Nor was adequate answer ever made to his testimony concerning the 1948 executive board resolution.

## IX

*The UPW's defense*

The UPW was given an adequate opportunity to present its defense against the charges. Cross-examination by the UPW of the witnesses introduced by Mr. Steinberg, and the presentation of its own defense by the UPW's representatives, took up the major portion of the time devoted by the committee to the hearing of oral testimony. The UPW was given the further right to respond in writing to any of the evidence presented against it and it availed itself of that opportunity.

Although the UPW, unlike the UOPWA, thus availed itself of the opportunity offered by the committee to respond to the charges, the committee finds that the defense offered was of no value whatsoever because it was in no way directed to the truth or falsity of the charge or the evidence introduced in support thereof. Indeed, the nature of the defense offered by the

UPW was extremely persuasive evidence that the UPW had no defense to offer.

1. At the hearings, the UPW tactic was clearly one of filibuster and delay.

At the beginning of the hearing, on Monday, January 9, the parties were informed that the hearing would terminate by Wednesday night because of the committee members' other duties. The committee offered to hold night sessions every night so that there could be no question as to sufficiency of time. The UPW, however, refused to appear at evening sessions on either Monday or Tuesday.

When the evidence in support of the charges was introduced the UPW's representatives immediately began a series of delaying and time-wasting maneuvers. Technical, legalistic objections were made on one occasion after another, each time repeated again and again even after a ruling had been made. In cross-examining the witnesses in support of the charges, time was deliberately wasted by asking irrelevant and even foolish questions. Thus, after Mr. William Steinberg presented an introductory statement, he was rigorously cross-examined on such subjects as the length of time he had worked in the radio industry and the number of executive board meetings he had attended. Mr. Steinberg's statement takes up 17 pages of the transcript of the committee's proceedings. The entirely irrelevant examination of him by the UPW's representatives takes up 40 pages.

The same dilatory tactics were followed with other witnesses. Mr. Adamson was questioned at great length about such questions as his age, his marital status, and his employment as a youth. Mr. Rindone was rigorously examined as to where he had purchased a leather case in which his special officer's badge was enclosed. Mr. Meyer Bernstein, who presented the evidence from the union's newspapers, was questioned concerning the nature of his work for the Steelworkers Union and his general knowledge of the UPW prior to his assignment as a research specialist.

Due to these dilatory tactics, the presentation of the evidence in support of the charge was not concluded until Tuesday, the second day of the hearing. The UPW began, on Tuesday afternoon, to present its own witnesses. At this point, the strategy of delay became transparent. The first witness was Alfred Bernstein, director of negotiations for the UPW. He read to the committee an extremely lengthy treatise on the Federal Government's loyalty program and the UPW's fight against it. He insisted, over the committee's protest, on reading page after page of quotations from letters and documents concerning the loyalty probe.

The UPW's next witness was Thomas Richardson, the chairman of the UPW's antidiscrimination committee. He delivered to the committee a lengthy dissertation on the evils of discrimination and on the UPW's fight against it. When the committee protested against this irrelevant and lengthy testimony, the UPW representatives charged that the protest showed that the committee was biased and insisted on continuation of testimony along the same lines.

The UPW's final witness was its secretary-treasurer, Mr. Guinier. He began his testimony in the committee's last session, on Wednesday night. Although informed that his time was limited, he insisted on reading to the committee lengthy quotations from speeches by Philip Murray and from CIO convention proceedings. Although he alone of the UPW's witnesses made some comments on the evidence introduced in support of the charges,

he introduced no evidence whatsoever to show that the UPW had in any way ever departed from the program of the Communist Party.

The hearing concluded at 10:45 p.m. on Wednesday night. The purpose of the delaying tactics adopted by the UPW throughout the hearing was then made clear. President Flaxer protested that he had been denied the right to testify. He had been informed from the beginning that the hearing would terminate by Wednesday. He had refused the committee's invitation to hold night sessions on Monday and Tuesday. He had engaged in frivolous and irrelevant examination of Mr. Steinberg's witnesses. He had insisted on the right of the UPW witnesses to read lengthy documents unrelated to the question of Communist Party policy. He had protested every effort by the committee to eliminate repetitions and irrelevant matter and the committee had yielded to his protests. And yet, when the hearings were finally closed, he insisted that the committee had denied him the right to testify.

The committee finds, on the basis of this record, that the UPW's defense against the charge was not in good faith, that the president of the UPW deliberately refused to testify before the committee by delaying the hearing until there was no time in which to testify, and that the evident purpose of this refusal was to avoid giving testimony and also to provide a basis upon which to attack the committee.

This conclusion is supported by the actions of the UPW subsequent to the close of the hearings. President Flaxer was invited by the committee to submit any statement that he desired to make in writing and he was given 2 weeks in which to do so. No statement by President Flaxer was submitted.

The self-created inability to testify was, however, made the basis of completely false and vicious attacks on the committee. Thus, in the Labor Herald (organ of the left-wing California unions) for January 17, 1950, the following appears in a report of an interview with Guinier:

> In a voice crowded with disbelief [Guinier] reported that the union's president, Abram Flaxer, was denied an opportunity to testify and was forced to limit his participation in the trial to cross-examination of some of the witnesses.
>
> "Imagine it," Guinier said, "the president of a union charged with all sorts of things not allowed to testify in defense of his union."
>
> * * * When Flaxer was to take the stand * * * Rieve suddenly announced that the time set aside for the hearing had already elapsed, and that, therefore, he was calling an end to the trial.

This cannot be described as a misquotation by the interviewer. Precisely the same kind of falsification was made in the January issue of the union's official organ, The Public Record, where it was said that "The CIO committee * * * cut short the hearing because it was 'tired of the union's story'."

Further evidence of the complete lack of honesty or good faith of the UPW's representatives is shown by several of President Flaxer's statements to the committee. He asserted to the committee that the observers who sought to attend the hearing came voluntarily, not at the union's instigation. Yet an official memorandum of President Flaxer's has been submitted to the committee in which all UPW local presidents, staff representatives, and business agents were instructed to "encourage" rank and file members to come to Washington and to inform them that the international would provide a meeting hall for such "volunteers" in Washington.

Still again, President Flaxer informed the committee, on Monday afternoon, that he had an important meeting scheduled for 4:30 that afternoon. When the chairman of the committee asked whether it was a press confer-

ence, President Flaxer denied emphatically that he had scheduled any such conference. Yet the committee has ascertained that he had, in fact, scheduled a press conference for 4:30 and did, in fact, hold one immediately after the hearing adjourned. This planned, scheduled press conference was reported in the UPW's newspaper as a spontaneous meeting. Flaxer, according to the newspaper, was "beseiged by the press" when he arrived at a meeting of union members.

2. As already stated, the UPW, although it consumed much time at the hearing, offered no testimony relevant to the charge. The UPW proved only that it opposed discrimination against Negroes and that it had waged a fight against the Federal Government's program of loyalty investigations. Neither item, of course, was relevant to the charge. The CIO opposes discrimination. It has also objected to some of the unfair procedures utilized in the loyalty program. But the fact that the UPW, on these two items, has supported CIO policy does not prove that it has not devoted itself to the program of the Communist Party. For the Communist Party has always exploited the Negro issue as an instrument of "class warfare" and, for obvious reasons, has opposed not only the unfair elements in the loyalty program but the program itself.

The testimony of the UPW's two major witnesses was, therefore, entirely irrelevant to the charge. Mr. Guinier, the third witness, did address himself to the charges but again failed to present any evidence that the UPW had ever in any way departed from the Communist Party program. He did attack most vehemently the credibility of Mr. Rindone, one of Steinberg's witnesses. He did not, however, submit affirmative evidence contradicting Mr. Rindone's testimony. He also sought to discredit Adamson's testimony. He did not refer, however, to Adamson's testimony concerning the UPW executive board discussion on the Wallace question.

The major portion of Mr. Guinier's testimony was taken up by the lengthy reading of speeches by Philip Murray and by a moving denunciation of the evils of promiscuous Red-baiting and a description of the magnitude of the fight against racism and reaction. The committee agrees—and it agreed at the hearing—that there is much to be done in the fight for freedom and equality. The committee agrees—and it agreed at the hearing—that the promiscuous labeling of all progressive American trade unionism as Communist is wrong and should everlastingly be opposed. But neither of these things has relevance to the charge. The fact that the cry of communism has in the past been falsely used against genuine American trade-unions does not make the charge against the UPW false. The boy who cried "wolf" was wrong in doing so when there was no wolf. But that did not make the real wolf any less a wolf when it appeared. The committee's function was to discover whether this union consistently pursues the program of the Communist Party. It was not aided in this function by the repeated assertion that the charge of communism had been falsely made in the past.

3. The UPW was invited by the committee to submit written testimony in addition to its oral testimony, to refute the charge made against it. The UPW did submit such material. Again, however, it failed to come to grips with most of the evidence submitted against it. Mr. Rindone's statements were not denied. Mr. Adamson's testimony was not referred to. The only document submitted which had relevance to the testimony against the UPW was a 67-page analysis of the exhibits introduced by Mr. Bernstein.

This "analysis," it is apparent, contains the sum and substance of the UPW's defense. That defense is that UPW and its predecessor organizations were following CIO policy during the period in which, according to the evidence, their policies followed the Communist Party line. The defense, in short, is that the CIO itself has consistently pursued the program of the Communist Party.

The committee has examined the material submitted by the UPW to "prove" the preposterous assertion that the CIO followed the Communist Party line from 1938 to 1945. It finds that this charge is wholly false and completely unsupported by the evidence.

The UPW has charged, in substance:

1. That CIO opposed Hitler in 1938.
2. That CIO opposed war in the 1939-41 period.
3. That CIO urged the defeat of Fascism in the fall of 1941.
4. That CIO sponsored a Bring the Boys Home campaign in 1945.
5. That CIO repeatedly in the past has deplored Red-baiting.

The committee has examined the record of the CIO and compared it with the SCMWA-UPW record and finds as follows:

1. The CIO opposed Hitler in 1938, as did SCMWA, President Roosevelt, and the entire liberal movement in the United States.

2. After the German-Russian pact was signed and war in Europe began, the CIO opposed direct involvement in the war, as did President Roosevelt. It continued to support his program of aid short of war to those fighting Hitler and it supported the defense program. The CIO in fact proposed several plans (the Murray and Reuther plans) to increase production for aid to the allies and for national defense, and its representatives participated in the National Defense Advisory Commission and the National Defense Mediation Board. SCMWA, on the other hand, opposed aid to the allies, opposed the national-defense program, attacked Roosevelt as a warmonger, and attacked the labor-management boards in which the CIO participated.

3. The CIO, consistently with its prior position, urged the defeat of fascism in the fall of 1941. SCMWA, inconsistently with its prior position and consistently only with the position of the Communist Party, supported that position after Hitler invaded the Soviet Union.

4. The CIO, in 1945 urged that all surplus troops be brought home. It did not urge the withdrawal of troops from China or from any other place where the administration thought they were needed. Its program was solely one directed toward the use of every conceivable effort for the immediate return of troops who were not needed. SCMWA, on the contrary, utilized this campaign to urge a withdrawal of American troops from China and the cessation of necessary shipments to Britain—a Communist, not a CIO policy.

5. The CIO has frequently in the past and still today does denounce those who would use the cry of "Communist" to destroy honest American trade-unions. But, at the same time, it has also frequently announced its rejection of communism and "any movement or activity of subversive character, Trojan horses or fifth columns" (CIO executive board resolution of June 4, 1940). Its members "resent and reject efforts of the Communist Party * * * to interfere in the affairs of the CIO" (resolution adopted by CIO convention, November 18, 1946). SCMWA and UPW, on the other hand, have opposed red-baiting but not on the ground that false charges of communism are dangerous and should be opposed but rather on the apparent

theory that all charges of communism, true or false, should be rejected. SCMWA and UPW thus have used the CIO's opposition to false charges of communism as a weapon to protect the Communist Party.

## X

The charge which this committee was appointed to investigate is that the policies and activities of the UPW are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program and purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the constitution of the CIO. On the basis of the findings above set forth the committee finds and concludes that this charge is true and that the policies and activities of the UPW have been in the past, and are today, directed toward the achievement and the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives set forth in the constitution of the CIO.

In view of some of the charges which were made by the representatives of the UPW, the committee feels that it is necessary to state here most emphatically that the committee's conclusion is not based upon any theory that the international unions composing the CIO must conform to CIO policy or be labeled disloyal. The charge against the UPW is not that it differs from CIO policy. Under the CIO constitution, unions have a right to differ on policy matters if they honestly believe that the policies they advocate are the proper ones to achieve the objective set forth in the CIO constitution. The charge against the UPW is much more fundamental. The charge is that the leadership of this union does not adopt its policies on the basis of any honest objectives of American industrial unionism set forth in the CIO constitution, but rather, adopts policies and takes actions with regard only to the achievement of the antithetical purposes of the Communist Party. The charge, in short, is disloyalty to American trade unionism.

The truth of this charge has not been established merely by showing that the policies of this union coincided at one point of time with those of the Communist Party. Unlike those who label all progressive labor union activity as "Red", this committee does not believe that the fact that a union adopts a policy which happens to coincide with the policy of the Communist Party proves, by itself, that the union is serving the interest of the Communist Party. The Communist Party, for example, purports to believe in the elimination of discrimination among Negroes. The CIO does believe in the elimination of such discrimination. This no more proves that the CIO follows the Communist Party line than did the fact that the Communist Party hailed the House of Morgan in the Tehran period prove that Morgan was a Communist.

Nor, on the other hand, does the fact that this union has opposed discrimination against Negroes prove that its policies and activities are directed toward the achievement of the objectives set forth in the CIO constitution. The basic question posed by the charge against the UPW is whether its leadership is an honest trade-union leadership, genuinely devoted to the advancement of the cause of American Labor and American democracy, or a leadership whose policies and activities are determined by the philosophy and the program of the Communist Party. We have found that the purposes of the Communist Party are antithetical to the basic objectives of American industrial unionism and that the adherents of that party, although they talk in the language of labor, are devoted primarily to the advance-

ment of the interests of the Soviet Union. And the question as regards the UPW is whether the leadership of that union is devoted primarily to the CIO on the one hand or to the Communist Party on the other.

On the basis of the evidence which has been submitted to the committee, only one conclusion is possible. The present leadership of the UPW is the same leadership which led SCMWA in the tortuous paths of the Communist Party for years. Over the years it has been isolationist, interventionist, and then isolationist again. It has been pro-Roosevelt, then anti-Roosevelt, then pro-Roosevelt again. It has been both pro-Truman and anti-Truman. And it has taken these positions in sequence in exact time with the beat called by the Communist Party. These contradictory positions cannot possibly have resulted from any honest estimation of the best interests either of its membership or of American labor. They can only have resulted from a subservience to the interests of the Communist Party, and through that party, to the Soviet Union.

The committee is conscious of the fact that the union, in its public pronouncements, tends to tone down its support of the Communist Party program. But, the committee is convinced that there has been no change in that leadership's subservience to the purposes of the Communist Party. Within the CIO certainly it has continued to support, both at the executive board meeting and the convention, the program of the party. And it never publicly adopted any policy which in any way ran counter to the policies of the Communist Party or the interests of the Soviet Union.

It is in connection with this most recent reticence of the UPW leadership that Adamson's testimony is so significant. It is not so much that it shows that the union leadership intended to support Wallace. The UPW had a right to support Wallace. Much more significant is that it shows a calculated policy of ambiguous expression, balancing the leadership's desire to further the Communist line with the necessity of concealing that desire because of the growing anxiety about Communist activity within the Government. Such strategems are, of course, consistent with Communist theory. In the words of Lenin, before quoted, it is necessary to resort to all sorts of devices and evasions in order to remain in the trade unions and to carry on Communist work in them at all costs.

Most significant, in the committee's view, was the utter bad faith demonstrated by the UPW representatives at the committee's hearings. No honest trade union leadership could have resorted to the vilification and the slander employed by the UPW representatives. No union which truly believed in its innocence, would have employed the maneuvers, the insincerity, the outright falsehoods, which the UPW leadership presented to the committee. UPW's representatives made it apparent to the committee that the UPW was not sincerely attempting to disprove the charges. It was attempting only to entrap the committee and to make a false record which it could use to attack the committee and the CIO. In so doing, it served not the interests of American labor or even its own membership, but the program of the Communist Party, as prescribed by its labor secretary in the Daily Worker.

And so the committee necessarily concludes that the UPW's leadership has not changed. It still today pursues the course prescribed by the Communist Party as it did in the past. It has no higher regard for the objectives of American unionism today than it had in the years when it frankly and openly switched its course day by day as the Communist Party called the signals.

The members of the UPW are, in the main, Government employees. Although the persistent Communist Party line tactics of its leadership have driven out of the UPW the major portion of its American membership, the committee has no doubt that there still remain within the union members who are fooled by the pseudo-unionism and the false militancy of the UPW leadership. And there are undoubtedly others who have opposed that leadership but have remained within the union. But the committee wishes to make it crystal clear that its condemnation of that leadership, and of the union, does not necessarily reflect a condemnation of each individual member. But the committee is forced to conclude that the leadership of the union has directed and does direct the policies and activities of the union consistently toward the achievement of the program and purposes of the Communist Party.

For the reason stated, therefore, and on the basis of all the evidence presented to it, the committee unanimously concludes that the policies and activities of the UPW are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program and the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the CIO constitution. The committee recommends that the executive board exercise the powers granted to it by article VI, section 10, of the CIO constitution and, by virtue of those powers, revoke the certificate of affiliation heretofore granted to the UPW and expel it from the CIO.

Respectfully submitted.

EMIL RIEVE, *Chairman.*
JOSEPH E. BEIRNE.
HARRY SAYRE.

# REPORT OF EXECUTIVE BOARD COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY PRESIDENT MURRAY TO INVESTIGATE CHARGES AGAINST THE UNITED OFFICE AND PROFESSIONAL WORKERS OF AMERICA

## INTRODUCTION

On November 5, 1949, William Steinberg, president of the American Radio Association, and a member of the CIO executive board, charged that the policies and activities of the United Office and Professional Workers of America are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program or the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives set forth in the constitution of the CIO. The charges were received by the executive board and it authorized the appointment of a committee to conduct hearings and to report back to the board. President Murray designated Emil Rieve, Harry Sayre, and Joseph Beirne, all of whom are members of the CIO executive board, as a committee to conduct hearings and this designation was approved by the executive board. Notice was duly given to the UOPWA of the existence of the charges and of the appointment of the committee.

On November 23, 1949, the chairman gave notice to the UOPWA that a hearing would be held on December 15, 1949. The UOPWA, on December 9, 1949, however, filed suit in a Federal district court in Philadelphia in an attempt to enjoin this committee from holding a hearing. Although no restraining order was issued by the court, the general counsel of the CIO agreed to a postponement of the hearing on the UOPWA in order to permit the court to dispose of that suit. Because of this delay, committee member Beirne was unable to attend the hearing and President Murray, pursuant to the resolution of the executive board of November 5, 1949, exercised his power of appointment to appoint an additional member of the committee, Martin Wagner, president of the United Gas, Coke, and Chemical Workers, and a member of the CIO executive board.

The committee, as thus constituted, held a hearing in Washington on December 19, 1949, after the Philadelphia suit had been dismissed. At this hearing the charging party, Mr. William Steinberg, and the CIO's director of research, Mr. Stanley Ruttenberg, appeared. Mr. Steinberg gave an introductory statement in which he stated the basis for the charge. Mr. Ruttenberg presented a detailed analysis of the policies of the Communist Party and of the UOPWA and presented documentary material to the committee on this subject.

On behalf of the UOPWA, its president, Mr. James Durkin, its secretary-treasurer, Mr. Bernard Mooney, and six other officials of the union, comprising its entire national administrative committee appeared. The UOPWA was given full opportunity to present oral testimony by its officers and any written documents, statements, or exhibits. The UOPWA, however, chose not to present any testimony or documentary material in response to the charges.

The president of the UOPWA delivered a statement denouncing the trial committee of the CIO and submitted some 20 letters from rank and file committee members, but did not address himself to the truth or the falsity of the charges. No other oral testimony or documentary material was offered. Upon the conclusion of the hearing, the UOPWA was furnished with a transcript of the hearings and photostatic copies of all exhibits introduced before the committee.

Although UOPWA failed to produce any evidence relevant to the charges, and failed to respond to the evidence introduced by Mr. Steinberg, the committee has nevertheless given most careful consideration both to the adequacy of the evidence in support of the charges and to the theory upon which the charges were based. The committee's findings and its recommendations are as follows:

## FINDINGS

1. Since the charge against the UOPWA was that it pursues the program and the purposes of the Communist Party, the committee was necessarily required to give consideration to the policies of the Communist Party. Those policies, the committee believes, can be understood only in the light of the basic characteristics of the Communist movement. The Communist movement, from its inception, purported to be a movement of working people. Its basic thesis was that a new order of society must be created by revolution of the working classes and that the "dictatorship of the proletariat" must be established. Because of this basic thesis, Communist philosophy has always been predicated upon the use of trade-unions as an instrument of Communist policy and as a weapon by which the party could organize the working classes and bring nearer the revolution from which the dictatorship of the party would emerge. As Lenin said:

> It is necessary to agree to any and every sacrifice * * * to resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge, in order to penetrate the trade-unions, to remain in them and to carry on Communist work in them at all costs.[1]

The Communist movement has thus always sought to operate through trade-unions, to speak in the language of labor and as a spokesman and leader of labor, and thus, by trickery and strategem, to direct labor toward the goals of communism.

It is not the purpose of this committee to pass on the theoretical political goals of the Communist Party. But, from the evidence presented to the committee, one simple conclusion can be drawn. Whatever may be the theoretical goals of the party, its program is based upon one fundamental objective—the support of the Soviet Union, the country in which the Communist Party first achieved its goal of dictatorship. This objective is never expressly stated to be the sole controlling factor in determining the party's program. To the contrary, because of its desire to speak as an American, rather than as a Soviet, agency and to maintain its position within the trade-union movement, the party presents its program as a program for American, not for Russian, labor. The policies which the party adopts are stated to be policies for the achievement of the goals of American labor—not for the advancement of the cause of the Soviet Union. But, over a period of years it is clear that the goals of American labor, as stated by the party, are always found to be those policies which will aid the Soviet Union. As the tactical position of the Soviet Union in the world has changed, the program of the American Communist Party "for American labor" has accommodated itself. And, when it seemed in the interest of the Soviet Union for American labor to forsake its heritage and to adopt policies contradictory to the whole fabric of the labor movement, the Communist Party adopted such policies.

2. The program of the Communist Party in the United States, from the time of the formation of the CIO to the present can be divided into six

[1] Left-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder, International Publishers (1934), p. 38.

periods, each of them corresponding to a change in the relationship of the Soviet Union with the world.

*The first period.*—The first period was the period of "collective security." During this period, the Soviet Union felt itself menaced by Fascist Germany. It needed the help of the Western powers and, because it needed that help, it urged a system of collective security against aggression. Accordingly, the Communist Party of the United States firmly supported a policy of collective security and urged that the United States enter into such a system with the Soviet Union. The interest of American labor, the Communist Party said, was in the elimination of fascism wherever it was found. American labor had a stake in the maintenance of free institutions throughout the world and labor should, the party declared, go all-out for aid to the victims of Fascist aggression and for the creation of a genuine system of security against such aggression.

*The second period.*—In September 1939, however, the foreign policy of the Soviet Union changed. Instead of allying itself with the powers opposed to Hitler, the Soviet Union signed a nonaggression pact with him. The Russians chose the course of allying themselves with the power which previously had seemed to it a great threat. The war between Germany and the Western powers began immediately thereafter. This shift in Soviet tactics was immediately echoed by a shift in the program of the Communist Party of the United States. The evils of fascism were no longer important to the American Communist Party. The threat to American labor, the party said, was the "imperialist war." As the United States slowly developed toward a program giving aid to the enemies of Hitlerism, the party became more and more certain that this developing program was an imperialist program and was opposed to the interests of America. Roosevelt, whose policy of quarantining the aggressors had been praised so loudly in 1937 and 1938, was now a Fascist warmonger, while Senator Wheeler truly expressed the interests of American labor. The defense program of the United States was a program fostered by Wall Street. The draft was an instrument by which Wall Street intended to impose a dictatorship upon America. The lend-lease bill was a "war powers bill." The party tried, through the mechanism of such movements as the American Peace Mobilization and such slogans as "The Yanks Are Not Coming," to capitalize upon the isolationist-pacifist sentiment in the United States and to defeat every measure intended to aid the powers that were opposing Hitler.

*The third period.*—When Hitler, on June 22, 1941, attacked the Soviet Union, then of course this period ended abruptly. The Soviet Union needed help. And so a third period for the American Communist Party was ushered in. Roosevelt's "war program" now became "the people's program of struggle for the defeat of Hitlerism." All aid to the peoples of Great Britain and the Soviet Union was called for. Extension of the Draft Act, which had been so vigorously opposed when originally enacted in September of 1940, was demanded by the Communist Party in September 1941. Senator Wheeler, whose isolationism had been praised by the party in 1940, was now a Munichman and a traitor. Labor, again said the Communist Party, had a stake in the defeat of fascism throughout the world and should direct its energies to the support of all-out production to defeat Hitler.

*The fourth period.*—When the United States entered the war in December 1941, no change in Communist Party policy was called for. The Communist Party's Pearl Harbor had already occurred on June 22, 1941, and

the party had favored United States entrance into the war since that time. But the party continued to grind its ax. The United States and Russia did not see eye to eye on military strategy. The Russians wanted the immediate opening of a second front. And so the Communist Party decided that American labor had an interest in this question of military strategy and that it was to labor's interest to prove to the military that an immediate second front was the best military policy for the opening of a second front in 1942.

"It is imperative," said Eugene Dennis, "that the labor movement unitedly should make its voice heard and its influence felt on * * * such life-and-death questions as insuring America's participation in the opening of a second front in Europe this spring." [2]

*The fifth period.*—The second-front issue was a symptom of the lack of confidence which the Communist Party felt, during the fourth period, in the genuineness of the American-Russian collaboration. These doubts, however, vanished when President Roosevelt had his first meeting with Premier Stalin at Tehran and when an agreement was reached on the basic problems confronting the two countries. This agreement seemed to the Communist Party to herald a complete change in the relationship of America to the Soviet Union, and therefore (in the Communist Party's distorted view of America) in the relationship between labor and the rest of the American community. The fact that the United States and the Soviet Union had reached an agreement seemed to mean to the Communist Party that all problems between labor and capital in the United States were on their way to be settled. The Communist Party, accordingly, dissolved itself in January 1944. Tehran became the watchword, the magic touchstone, which not only solved foreign problems but laid at rest all of labor's problems. Earl Browder, the leader of the party, announced that if J. P. Morgan would join in support of the American-Soviet coalition, Browder would clasp his hand and join with him. The party's program of socialism was abandoned and everything was to be devoted toward the achievement of the new progressive coalition between labor and capital. During this period the Communist Party supported a program for national service legislation, a policy directly contrary to every tradition of the American labor movement. It supported most vigorously the no-strike pledge and urged that it be continued in the postwar period. In short, the Communist Party, then called the Communist Political Association, was—as it later described itself—an opportunist tail to the capitalist class.

*The sixth period.*—With the close of the European war, differences and tensions began to develop between the Soviet Union and the United States. Accordingly, the Communist Party again reversed its field. Taking its lead from an article by the French Communist leader, Duclos, it reconstituted itself, in June 1945, as the Communist Party and once again asserted its so-called aggressive role in domestic affairs. It no longer supported national-service legislation, and the talk about continuation of the no-strike pledge after the end of the war was abandoned.

The development of communism in the postwar era did not exhibit any rapid and sudden shift, since the position of the Soviet Union did not exhibit any such shifts. It was, rather, a slowly developing policy of opposition to the aims of the Truman administration which became clearer

[2] The Communist, April 1942, p. 212.

as the diplomatic conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union developed. The postwar Communist program included the following specific items:

1. A demand that United States troops be withdrawn from China and Greece;

2. A claim that the United States had failed to live up to the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, and a demand that United States foreign policy be based on friendship with the Soviet Union based on those agreements;

3. Opposition to the Truman doctrine;

4. Opposition to the American plan for control of atomic energy and denunciation of American atomic-bomb production;

5. Opposition to the Marshall plan;

6. Support of Henry Wallace and the Progressive Party in 1948;

7. Opposition to the Atlantic Pact;

8. Support of the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions and opposition to the CIO- and AFL-sponsored International Confederation of Free Trade-Unions.

9. Support of the Marcantonio bill (which had no chance of passage), rather than the Thomas-Lesinski bill, in the fight against the Taft-Hartley Act;

10. Denunciation of the CIO as a tool of reaction and imperialism. In particular, the party charged that the CIO had sold out the fight against the Taft-Hartley Act; and

11. Support for the UE in its fight with the CIO.

3. Throughout this curious history, the Communist Party never ceased to claim that it made its decisions on the basis of a genuine appraisal of the interests of the American people and of American labor. Those claims were, of course, false. The record shows that the purpose of the Communist Party is the support of the Soviet Union and that the program of the party is designed with only the interests of the Soviet Union in view.

This purpose was never avowed and the program was always phrased in terms of the interests of America and of American labor. Throughout this decade in which the party favored first one objective and then another, it continually purported to be the champion of organization and of unionism. But it was found that the interests of organization and unionism favored whatever policy would aid the Soviet Union. This was not limited to foreign-policy matters. A peculiar and consistent characteristic of the Communist Party program is that it always finds a tie-in between domestic and foreign policy. Thus, in the first period when the Communists supported the Roosevelt foreign policy, they also supported his domestic policy as progressive and prolabor. In the second period, however, Roosevelt was seen by the party as a reactionary and a Fascist, and his domestic program was roundly attacked as being antilabor. The most blatant example of the controlling influence of matters of foreign policy was, of course, the Tehran period when the fact that Stalin and Roosevelt had met and agreed was regarded as proof that an era of peace between capital and labor within the United States was possible. But almost equally blatant was the Communist position with regard to President Truman's domestic policy in the postwar period. The President was charged with a sell-out of labor and a betrayal of the fight for civil liberties. The Fair Deal was denounced as a sham. The administration was, in short, a tool of the reactionary capitalists, and its domestic program and its foreign program were both a part of the "bipartisan reactionary

coalition." Similarly, attacks on the administration's foreign policy were tied in, however illogically, with attacks on Republican domestic policy. Thus, the Marshall plan (which had been opposed by Senator Taft and the most reactionary Republicans) was, in the Communist view, simply the application of the Taft-Hartley Act to foreign affairs.

On the basis of this evidence the committee finds that the purpose of the Communist Party is to promote the interests of the Soviet Union. It finds that, although the Communist Party has claimed to champion unionism and organization, it has always done so in order to carry on Communist work within trade-unions and in order to pervert their policies to the advantage of the Soviet Union. The Communist Party, the committee finds, does not believe in trade-unions. It believes in using trade-unions. And it believes in using them for the purposes of the Soviet Union.

4. It should not be necessary for this committee to repeat here in detail the basic objectives set forth in the constitution of the CIO. The preamble of the constitution of the CIO states that the CIO is proud of the American quest for liberty and the struggle for equality; that it is dedicated to the responsibility of furthering the goals of our American heritage. It states the opposition of the CIO to all those who would use power to exploit the people in the interests of alien loyalties. It dedicates the CIO to the achievement of a world of free men and women.

The objectives set forth in article II of the constitution spell out the goals of an American trade-union movement dedicated to the general principles set forth in the preamble of the constitution. The objectives of the CIO are to bring about the organization of the working men and women of America, to extend the benefits of collective bargaining to them and to secure legislation protecting the economic security of America and protecting and extending our democratic institutions and civil rights and liberties, all to the end that the cherished traditions of our democracy be perpetuated.

These are the objectives and policies set forth in the constitution of the CIO. They contrast most violently with the purposes of the Communist Party which are, as the committee has found, devoted completely to the interests of alien loyalists and to the exploitation of the trade-union movement in the interests of the Soviet Union, although always professing to be interested in trade-unionism and in American labor.

5. The committee has examined the publications of the UOPWA, the reports of its officers to its convention, and its convention proceedings. The committee has examined these materials and compared them with the program of the Communist Party of the United States. From this examination the committee finds that the policies and activities of the UOPWA followed and continue to follow exactly, without deviation, the program of the Communist Party.

Of great significance is one single fact. Never in the history of the UOPWA has any policy ever been adopted which in any way runs counter to the policies of the Communist Party or to the interests of the Soviet Union as those interests are reflected in the program of the Communist Party. If the Communist Party program had been a consistent one, this absence of conflict might not be significant. But, in view of the fact that in a period of 10 years the Communist Party has taken almost every conceivable position on every issue of public importance in the United States, the absence of any conflict between the position of the party and the position of this union is

of great significance. The constant parallel between the position of the Communist Party and the position of the UOPWA cannot possibly be explained as coincidence or as the simultaneous but independent adoption of similar policies. The reason it cannot be so explained is that the policies of the Communist Party, as we have stated, have undergone repeated violent shifts, shifts which are explainable only on the basis of the party's subservience to the interests of the Soviet Union. And the policies of the UOPWA have, in each instance, exhibited the same fatal shift.

In the first, or collective security, period the UOPWA expressed fervent support for Roosevelt's antiaggression program. Its 1938 convention called for a boycott of German-Italian and Japanese goods. It expressed its support of the policy of quarantining the aggressors and of giving aid to the victims of Fascist aggression. In its newspaper, the UOPWA generally supported the position that the threat of nazism was one of the most important problems confronting American labor.

Beginning immediately after September 1939, the UOPWA, in consonance with the Communist Party, sharply reversed its field. The union not only opposed involvement in the war, it opposed lend-lease, it opposed aid to Britain and, in general, took the position that American labor's problems were at home and that what happened abroad was of no significance. The dangers of fascism were forgotten, and any measures looking toward aid for the powers opposing fascism were attacked as attempts to involve us in an imperialist war. The UOPWA general executive board statement for 1940 on National Defense and Peace ignored the fight against fascism and denounced both the Republican and Democratic parties as a combination war party, a fifth column whose program of aid to the enemies of fascism was against the interests of the American people.

Immediately after the attack on the Soviet Union, however, the UOPWA again shifted its field. Through its newspaper, it called briskly and with no uncertainty for "full aid to Britain and Soviet Russia." Its general executive board, in September 1941, issued a statement on National Defense and Foreign Policy in which it called upon all white-collar workers to join in support of "the embattled free nations of the world to destroy forever the menace of Hitlerism." Those same free nations, with the exception of the Soviet Union, had been engaged in the battle against Hitlerism since 1940, but prior to June 1941 the UOPWA had fought violently any attempt to give aid to them. It is not without significance that the 1940 statement was entitled "National Defense and Peace," while the 1941 statement issued after the attack on the Soviet Union was entitled Union; its leadership even urged the entrance of the United States into the shooting war.

As we have already stated, the Communist Party's Pearl Harbor Day was June 21, 1941, not December 7, 1941. Upon the evidence before it the committee concludes that the UOPWA's Pearl Harbor Day, like that of the Communist Party, was June 21, 1941.

When the United States did become involved in the war, the Soviet Union, as we have stated, pressed strongly for the immediate opening of a second European front and the Communist Party called upon labor unions to bring to bear full influence to support that military strategy. The UOPWA was not remiss in supporting that call. In April 1942 the UOPWA newspaper carried a banner across its front page reading, "For World Victory—Open Up a Second Front." The May 1 issue contains a full page not devoted to

news of any sort but to a full-fledged, all-out propaganda demand for the immediate opening up of a second front. It was as if the UOPWA had contended the white-collar workers of the Nation were the only experts on military strategy. On August 1, 1942, the newspaper editorially said:

> You will see that almost every local, every division, has made its major concentration point the campaign to back up the Government and get that second front opened now.

And it concluded that the real importance of a union victory in obtaining a contract was that it "magnified and strengthened" the fight for a second front.

The union continued its fight for a second front throughout 1943. In October 1943 its newspaper made the basis for this campaign clear. In a full-page article entitled "Your War, Your Wages, and the Second Front" it declared that the Anglo-American leaders had not fully accepted partnership with the Soviet Union. Because of that fact labor was endangered and the position of the American worker injured. Hence, the necessary tie between Your Wages and the Second Front.

This period ended, of course, with the conclusion of the Tehran agreement. The second-front issue was no longer pressed. Now, the new slogan upon which the union's activities were to revolve was Tehran. The position of the Communist Party, that Tehran was the all-encompassing basis upon which a new world was to be built, was adopted wholeheartedly. According to the union's president, the Tehran decision made all things possible. In his column in the union's newspaper, he announced his support for President Roosevelt's statement that the issue was no longer the New Deal but winning the war and he called for unity in labor and an end to any considerations other than the Tehran goals. In February 1944 the union's president appeared before a Senate subcommittee and announced that salaries must be raised in order to achieve the goal of Tehran. The call to the 1944 convention of the union announced that the important issue was whether the Tehran promise would be fulfilled. Tehran was, in short, everything. It showed the way to a new alliance between capital and labor in the postwar world. Thus, in the keynote address to the union's 1944 convention, the president stated plainly that "labor offers a nonaggression pact," and in his column in the union's newspaper he commented favorably on Harry Bridges' proposal that labor continue its no-strike pledge into the postwar period. He regards it as symptomatic of labor's desire to extend the wartime national unity into the postwar period.

During this Tehran period the UOPWA was most vociferous in denouncing any signs of labor militancy. As the war in Europe drew to a close, certain leaders in the CIO began to urge abandonment of the no-strike pledge. This, to the UOPWA, was heresy and traitorism. Even worse, its newspaper announced, in typical Communist terminology, it was the work of Trotskyites and disrupters.

This position was maintained by the UOPWA until June of 1945. In June of 1945, the Communist Party reconstituted itself and denounced the Tehran approach. And in June of 1945 the union's general executive board passed a resolution on the international situation extremely critical of the Truman administration. In August 1945 it revised its position on labor's no-strike pledge. While it still supported the pledge, the all-out Tehran position was modified. Those who broke the pledge and engaged in strikes were now not condemned as traitors. To the contrary, it was urged by the union that those

strikes which did occur and which were not directly connected with industries essential to the war effort should be supported wholeheartedly. This, it should be noted, was prior to the end of the war and during a period in which the CIO's no-strike pledge was no different than it had been when the UOPWA in March 1945 declared that those who in any way opposed the no-strike pledge were Trotskyites and disrupters.

The end of the war brought new problems to the UOPWA and the CIO. The CIO, sharing the views of most Americans, urged the immediate return of all surplus troops. This policy was supported wholeheartedly by the UOPWA, but with a peculiar twist. An editorial in the September 1945 issue of its newspaper declared that the problem of getting the boys back home was the same problem as the problem of securing a decent postwar world and that problem, in turn, depended upon the maintenance of unity among the Big Three. Therefore, the UOPWA newspaper declared, the real problem was the abandoning of the administration's policy which was said to provide unrest in China and Eastern Europe. In December 1945, the UOPWA made it clear that its policy of getting the boys back home was a policy properly entitled "Get Out of China."

In 1946, the UOPWA's position on international affairs became clearer as the disagreement between the Soviet Union and the United States became more obvious. The union first merely expressed its concern over the manner in which the United States was conducting its international affairs. Then, it discovered that America's foreign policy was just a reflection of the fact that big business is driving toward war, and its general executive board endorsed the promotion and sale within the union of a low-price edition of The Great Conspiracy (which the UOPWA newspaper called the Great Conspiracy Against Russia), a book dedicated to the proposition that there was a secret alliance to provoke a war against the Soviet Union.

During this period the growing concern in the United States concerning the activities of the Communist Party was reflected in the UOPWA's newspaper. The position of the union's leaders was that an attack on communism was an attack on labor. In connection with this question the UOPWA's treatment of the 1946 CIO convention is worthy of note. At that convention CIO adopted a resolution which denounced promiscuous red-baiting but announced that the delegates resented and rejected efforts of the Communist Party to interfere in the affairs of the CIO. The Office and Professional News, describing this resolution, completely ignored the latter part of that statement. It treated the resolution as a denunciation of red-baiting and nothing more. It distorted the resolution so that it would appear to its membership that the CIO had simply denounced red-baiting, although the resolution also made it clear that the CIO wanted nothing to do either with unwarranted red-baiters or with the Communist Party.

The attitude of the union's leadership to the Communist issue underwent no change when James Durkin was elected president. Durkin made it clear that he carried on the policy of supporting Communists in the trade-union movement. He made a specific point of this in a speech to the 1948 convention of the union. This support was always phrased in terms of civil liberties, but the action of the union's general executive board with regard to the Taft-Hartley non-Communist affidavit was most revealing as to the real basis for that opposition.

The union's 1948 convention had opposed the signing of the non-Communist affidavits as a matter of principle. In November 1948, however, the general

executive board voted to comply with Taft-Hartley. In order to do so, however, certain drastic changes in the union's constitution and its leadership apparently were necessary. The union's constitution had provided for a president, a secretary-treasurer, and three vice presidents. When the decision to comply with Taft-Hartley was made the secretary-treasurer resigned and was promptly appointed director of organization (in which post a non-Communist affidavit presumably was not required). The three vice presidencies were simply abolished by amending the constitution, and two of the former vice presidents were given positions as "directors." Thus, four out of five of the union's officers gave up their offices. The inference that this shuffle was necessary so that the union could comply with the Taft-Hartley Act without fear of perjury indictments is, the committee feels, so consistent with the general policies and activities of the UOPWA leadership as to be deserving of credence.

The union's general postwar position was the same as that of the Communist Party and it remains the same today.

The union specifically—

1. Demanded the withdrawal of United States troops from China and Greece.

2. Demanded a peace policy board on Big Three unity.

3. Opposed the Truman doctrine.

4. Opposed the Marshall plan, as a foreign policy manifestation of Taft-Hartleyism.

5. Supported Henry Wallace and the Progressive Party in 1948.

6. Opposed the Atlantic Pact.

7. Supported the Marcantonio bill (which had no chance of passage) in opposition to the CIO-supported Thomas-Lesinski bill, which could have passed if supported.

8. Supported the WFTU and opposed the decision of the CIO to break with it.

9. Denounced CIO leadership as a tool of reaction and imperialism.

The union's position at the present time as regards the CIO is, as is the Communist Party's, one of violent and destructive opposition. The UOPWA has denounced the settl pomts made by CIO unions in the steel and auto industries. It has accused the CIO of "selling out" the fight against the Taft-Hartley Act. It has, finally, supported wholeheartedly the postconversion fight of the United Electrical Workers, now an independent union, against the CIO and against the new CIO union in the electrical industry. It is inconceivable to the committee that an organization loyal to the CIO would support a union, already expelled from the CIO because of its Communist domination, in its fight against the CIO unless that union were itself committed to the support of the Communist Party against the CIO.

6. The policies above discussed have been maintained and continued up to the present moment. The committee finds that the parallel between this union's position and the program and purposes of the Communist Party is maintained today exactly as it has been maintained throughout the past decade. This parallel is further confirmed by the position taken by the UOPWA before the committee and by the UOPWA's attitude toward the CIO.

The position of the Communist Party toward CIO and toward the proceedings which followed the November 1949 convention of the CIO has been

clearly stated. John Williamson, the labor secretary of the Communist Party, wrote a series of articles which appeared in the Daily Worker on December 6-9, 1949. In these articles he stated that the CIO's convention policy was clearly an integral part of American imperialist domination over the entire world, that the expulsion of Communists from the CIO was an attempt to destroy the labor movement by the bosses and an attempt to secure compliance with Wall Street's plan for imperialist domination of the world. The committee's hearings to investigate the unions in the CIO were described as "rigged trials." Finally, the attitude to be taken by the unions in the hearings was carefully set forth. The hearings should be utilized, said Williamson, as a forum to show the 6 million CIO members that these unions, and not the CIO, were the true defenders of the CIO's founding program and that the expulsion policy was contrary to the fundamental interests of the CIO's members.

Similarly in an article in Political Affairs, the official organ of the Communist Party, in January 1950, the leaders of the CIO were described as "labor flunkys" who were assigned the task of splitting and dividing the ranks of labor in order to strangle resistance to the war makers.

The so-called defense put in by the UOPWA at the committee's hearings was in perfect conformity with these statements by Communist Party spokesmen. The UOPWA did not attempt to deny that it had followed the Communist Party line. It did not attempt to produce evidence that the UOPWA had ever, in any respect, differed from the policies advocated by the Communist Party. It, in fact, admitted that there might be a parallel between the policies taken by the UOPWA and the positions taken by the Communist Party.

The UOPWA's notion of a proper defense in these proceedings was an attack upon the CIO, upon its conventions, and upon its leadership. The hearing was called a trial and was denounced as "rigged." Instead of answering the charges, the UOPWA's president read a statement which constituted a denunciation of the CIO. The policies of the CIO were denounced as the program of the reactionary employers and their political agents. The CIO was described as a Government-dominated and regimented organization. It was charged that the CIO leaders had committed the CIO to the Democratic Party and had given up their independence. They were charged with serving the purposes of those international financiers and reactionary politicians who are fomenting a third world war. Finally, the UOPWA issued a call for unity almost identical with the call for unity issued by the Communist Party. It called for a unity based on freedom of any union to follow the dictates of any political party or organization and upon a return to what UOPWA described as the CIO's founding principles.

The committee wishes to state frankly that no single piece of evidence examined by it was as persuasive as to the tie between the Communist Party and the UOPWA as the statement given the committee by the president of the UOPWA. There was a peculiar inconsistency in this statement. If the CIO is, as was charged by the president of the UOPWA, a Government-dominated organization, serving the purposes of international financiers and reactionary politicians and following the program of reactionary employers and their political agents, then it would seem most reasonable that the UOPWA would not wish to be associated with an organization so opposed to every basic precept of trade-unionism. If the CIO is a reactionary agent of the employers—as the UOPWA charged—it is inconceivable that any honest

trade-union would desire to remain within that organization. But the president of the UOPWA simultaneously denounced the CIO as a tool of the bosses and announced his determination to fight to stay in it.

The inconsistency between the vitriolic attack upon the CIO and the stated desire to remain within the CIO can be explained in only one way. In the Williamson articles in the Daily Worker, the UE was strongly criticized for having abandoned the fight against the CIO before it was actually expelled by the convention. Williamson said that the other unions brought before the rigged committee should utilize those hearings to show the CIO members and their own members where they stand. And, in attempting to use the hearing before a committee of executive board members of the CIO as a public platform to denounce the policies of the CIO, the UOPWA is following the Communist Party line to the letter.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The charge which this committee was appointed to investigate is that the policies and activities of the UOPWA are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program and purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the constitution of the CIO. On the basis of the findings above set forth the committee finds and concludes that this charge is true and that the policies and activities of the UOPWA have been in the past, and are today, directed toward the achievement and the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives set forth in the constitution of the CIO.

In view of some of the charges which were made by the representatives of the UOPWA, both in correspondence with the committee and at the hearing, the committee feels that it is necessary to state here most emphatically that the committee's conclusion is not based upon any theory that the international unions composing the CIO must conform to CIO policy or be labeled disloyal. The charge against the UOPWA is not that it has differed from CIO policy. Under the CIO constitution, unions have a right to differ on policy matters if they honestly believe that the policies they advocate are the proper ones to achieve the objectives set forth in the CIO constitution. The charge against the UOPWA is much more fundamental. The charge is that this union has not adopted its policies on the basis of any honest objectives of American industrial unionism set forth in the CIO constitution, but has, rather, adopted policies and taken actions with regard only to the achievement of the purposes of the Communist Party. The charge, in short, is disloyalty to American trade-unionism.

The truth of this charge has not been established merely by showing that the policies of this union coincided at one point of time with those of the Communist Party. Unlike those who label all progressive labor union activity as "Red," this committee does not believe that the fact that a union adopts a policy which happens to coincide with the policy of the Communist Party proves, by itself, that the union is serving the interest of the Communist Party. The Communist Party, for example, purports to believe in the elimination of discrimination among Negroes. The CIO does believe in the elimination of such discrimination. This no more proves that the CIO follows the Communist Party line than did the fact that the Communist Party hailed the house of Morgan in the Tehran period prove that Morgan was a Communist.

The mere fact that this union's program and the program of the Commu-

nist Party were the same at a single point of time was not, therefore, considered by the committee as sufficient to establish the truth of the charge against it. Nor did the committee regard as significant its members' agreement or disagreement with any particular policy adopted by this union. Some of the policies adopted by the UOPWA, could, by themselves, have been adopted by honest trade-unions in an honest, if sometimes misguided, effort to serve the best interests of American democracy. Certain trade-unions have been isolationists in the past. Certain unions are today isolationists. Other unions, including the vast majority of the unions making up the CIO, were always persuaded that fascism was a menace to American labor and that tyranny wherever found must be opposed in the interest of American labor. Both of these positions can be accepted as honest trade-union positions, and this committee does not believe that the CIO can or should, because it disagrees with a particular position, honestly adopted by a union, label that union disloyal or Communist-dominated.

But the UOPWA has been both isolationist and interventionist. It has been first pro-Roosevelt, and anti-Roosevelt, and, then again, pro-Roosevelt. It has been both pro-Truman and anti-Truman. And it has taken these positions in time with the beat called by the Communist Party. These contradictory positions cannot possibly have resulted from any honest estimation of the best interests of either its membership or of American labor. They can only have resulted from a subservience to the purposes of the Communist Party, and, through that party, to the Soviet Union.

It is for this reason that the committee has examined at length the past policies and activities of the UOPWA. The history of this union, when compared with the history of the Communist Party on the one hand, and, on the other hand, with any possible straightforward trade-union position, demonstrates beyond question the present character of the UOPWA's leadership and shows beyond doubt that the present similarity of the program of the Communist Party and of the UOPWA is not just a coincidence but the result of devotion by this union to the over-all purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives of the CIO.

The UOPWA has insisted that this committee should consider only bread-and-butter trade-union issues and that so long as the UOPWA stands for organization and for collective bargaining it cannot be said that it is not devoted to the objectives set forth in the CIO constitution.

But, as the committee has found, the Communist Party also purports to be in favor of unionism and organization. It adopts that policy, as Lenin prescribed, so that it can use the trade-unions as instruments of the Communist Party. Its purpose is not genuinely the advancement of the cause of the workingmen in our democracy but the advancement of the Communist Party. And where there is conflict between the cause of communism and the cause of unionism, communism is always preferred.

So it is that this union, the UOPWA, by following the twists and turns, the zigs and zags, of the Communist Party line has prevented itself from genuinely representing the interests of the white-collar workers of America. It has failed dismally to organize those workers and most of the few that it has organized have been driven away from it as the subservience of the union to the Communist Party became more obvious. In the fiscal year of 1946-47, this union reported to the CIO an average dues-paying membership of approximately 45,000. But, as of November 1949, this membership has dropped to the pitiable figure of approximately 12,000.

By its findings as to the UOPWA, the committee does not mean, of course, that all of those 12,000 are members of the Communist Party or sympathizers. There undoubtedly remain within the union, members who are fooled by the pseudo-unionism and the false militancy of the UOPWA leadership. And there are undoubtedly others who have not opposed that leadership but have remained within the union. But the committee is forced to conclude that the leadership of the union has directed and does direct the policies and activities of the union consistently toward the achievements of the program and purposes of the Communist Party.

For the reasons stated, therefore, and on the basis of all the evidence presented to it, the committee unanimously concludes that the policies and activities of the UOPWA are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program and the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the CIO constitution. The committee recommends that the executive board exercise the powers granted to it by article VI, section 10, of the CIO constitution and, by virtue of those powers, revoke the certificate of affiliation heretofore granted to the UOPWA and expel it from the CIO.

Respectfully submitted,

EMIL RIEVE, *Chairman.*
HARRY SAYRE,
MARTIN WAGNER.

# REPORT OF EXECUTIVE BOARD COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY PRESIDENT MURRAY TO INVESTIGATE CHARGES AGAINST THE AMERICAN COMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION

## INTRODUCTION

On November 5, 1949, William Steinberg, president of the American Radio Association, and a member of the CIO executive board, charged that the policies and activities of the American Communications Association are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program or the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives set forth in the constitution of the CIO. The charges were received by the executive board, and it authorized the president to appoint a committee or committees of executive board members to conduct hearings and to report back to the board. President Murray initially designated Emil Rieve, Harry Sayre, and Joseph Beirne as a committee to conduct hearings with respect to the charges against the ACA. Notice was duly given to the ACA of the existence of the charges and of the appointment of the committee.

Thereafter Joseph Beirne notified President Murray that he would not be available to serve on the committee, and President Murray designated Joseph Froesch as a member of the committee in Mr. Beirne's place. The ACA was notified of this substitution.

On March 21, 1950, Emil Rieve, as chairman, notified the ACA that the hearing would begin on April 11, 1950. Subsequently, on April 5, 1950, Emil Rieve advised President Murray that he would not be available to serve further on the committee, and President Murray designated David J. McDonald as a member and as chairman of the committee in Mr. Rieve's place. The ACA was likewise notified of this substitution.

The committee as ultimately constituted thus consisted of David J. McDonald, as chairman, and of Harry Sayre and Joseph Froesch. The committee, as thus constituted, held hearings in Washington on April 11 and April 12, 1950.

At these hearings Mr. William Steinberg, the charging party, Mr. Stanley Ruttenberg, the CIO's director of research, and Mr. James Gildea, an assistant to CIO secretary-treasurer James Carey, appeared. Mr. Steinberg gave an introductory statement in which he stated the basis for the charge. Mr. Ruttenberg presented a detailed analysis of the policies of the Communist Party and of the ACA and presented documentary material to the committee on this subject. Mr. Gildea testified as to positions taken on certain issues at CIO executive board meetings by Mr. Joseph Selly, president of ACA and its representative on the CIO executive board.

On behalf of the ACA, Mr. Joseph Selly, its president, Mr. Joseph Kehoe, its secretary-treasurer, all the members of its international executive board except one, and various of its local union officials appeared. The ACA was given full opportunity to present oral testimony and written documents, statements or exhibits, and it availed itself of this opportunity. In addition, all parties were permitted to submit statements and documentary material subsequent to the close of the hearings.

The committee has considered carefully both the testimony and the documentary material submitted at the hearings and the documentary material offered by the parties subsequent to the conclusion of the hearings. On the basis of this consideration, the committee finds as follows:

## FINDINGS

### I

Since the charge against the ACA is that it pursues the program and the purposes of the Communist Party, the committee was required to scrutinize the policies of the Communist Party. The evidence submitted to the committee on the subject was undisputed, and was in large part identical with that submitted in prior hearings involving other unions, although the evidence on this subject submitted in the present hearing is in some respects more elaborate and complete than that in the prior hearings. The committee's findings as to the program and the purposes of the Communist Party will therefore necessarily closely resemble the findings of the committees which conducted the prior hearings.

The Communist movement has, from its inception, purported to be a movement of working people. Its claimed purpose is to bring about through revolution the "dictatorship of the proletariat" and thereby to establish a new order of society run by and in the interest of the working class. Because of this asserted objective, Communist philosophy has always prescribed the use of trade-unions as an instrument through which the Communist Party could propagandize the working classes and promote a revolution from which the dictatorship of the party would result. Lenin said:

> It is necessary to agree to any and every sacrifice * * * to resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge, in order to penetrate the trade-unions, to remain in them and to carry on Communist work in them at all costs.[1]

The Communist movement has thus always sought to operate through trade-unions, to speak in the language of labor and as a spokesman and leader of labor, in order, by trickery and strategem, to direct labor toward the goals of communism.

The Communist Party first achieved its goal of party dictatorship in the Soviet Union. From that day forward unquestioning support of the Soviet Union has been the one policy consistently pursued by the Communist Party in every country. To this policy all other policies are ruthlessly subordinated.

Support of Russia is never expressly stated to be the ultimate controlling factor in determining the Communist Party's program in the United States. To the contrary, because of its desire to speak as an American, rather than as a Soviet agency, and to maintain a position within the trade-union movement, the party presents its program as a program for American labor. The policies which the party pursues are always asserted to be in the interests of American labor—not of the Soviet Union. But, it is clear over a period of years that the interests of American labor are always asserted by the party to be served by whatever policies will aid the Soviet Union. As the relationships of the Soviet Union with other countries have changed from time to time, the program of the "American" Communist Party "for American labor" has accommodated itself accordingly. And, in the interest of the Soviet Union the Communist Party has not hesitated to urge American labor to forsake basic policies and objectives of the American labor movement.

### II

The program of the Communist Party in the United States can be divided into some five different periods, from the time of the formation of the CIO

[1] Left-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder, International Publishers (1934), p. 38.

to the present. Each of these periods corresponds to a particular period in the international relations of the Soviet Union.

*Collective security and the popular front*

The first period, extending from shortly after Hitler's acquisition of power until August 1939 was the period of collective security and of the popular front. During this period, the Soviet Union was menaced by the Fascist powers, Germany, Italy, and Japan. It wanted the help of the Western powers, and urged that they enter with it into a system of collective security against aggression. To promote the adoption of such a system of collective security, the Communist parties in the various countries were willing and even anxious to collaborate with all other groups which, for whatever reasons, supported a program of collective security against the aggression of the Fascist nations.

During this period the Communist Party of the United States supported a policy of collective security and urged that the United States enter into such a system with the Soviet Union. The Communist Party hailed Roosevelt's Chicago speech urging that the aggressors be quarantined. It favored changing the Neutrality Act to permit the shipment of arms to victims of Fascist attack. In line with the popular front strategy, the party was friendly to the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

During this period the American Communist Party found that the interest of American labor lay in the elimination of fascism wherever it was found. The party declared that American labor had a stake in the maintenance of free institutions throughout the world, and that it should support a program for the creation of a system of collective security against fascistic aggression of aid to the victims of such aggression.

*The Russian-German pact*

In August 1939, the foreign policy of the Soviet Union abruptly changed. At the very time it purported to be seeking the alliance of the powers opposed to Hitler, the Soviet Union signed a nonaggression pact with him. The war between Germany and the Western powers began immediately thereafter.

This change of Soviet strategy immediately brought about a violent change in the program of the Communist Party of the United States. The American Communist Party lost interest in the evils of nazism and fascism. The threat to American labor, the party now said, was the "imperialist war."

As the foreign policy of the United States slowly developed into a program of giving aid to the enemies of Hitlerism, the Communist Party became more and more certain that such aid was imperialistic and was opposed to the interests of America. Not only did the party no longer desire revision of the Neutrality Act, it now opposed it. Roosevelt, whose policy of quarantining the aggressors had been loudly praised by the party in 1937 and 1938, was now a Fascist warmonger, while Senator Wheeler truly expressed the interests of American labor. The defense program of the United States was a program fostered by Wall Street. The draft was an instrument by which Wall Street intended to impose a dictatorship upon America. The lend-lease bill was a "war powers bill." The party sought, through the mechanism of such movements as the American Peace Mobilization and such slogans as "The Yanks Are Not Coming," to capitalize upon the isolationist-pacifist

sentiment in the United States and to defeat every measure intended to aid the powers that were opposing Hitler.

*All-out aid to Russia*

On July 22, 1941, Germany, in disregard of its 10-year nonaggression pact, attacked the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union needed help. It was, however unwilling, fighting on the same side as Great Britain and China.

A second rapid reversal in the policies of the American Communist Party now took place. In essence, the party went back to its prepact position of the collective-security days, but with its policies tuned to the war crisis in which the Soviet Union found itself. Roosevelt's program so lately denounced as warmongering now became the people's program of struggle for for the defeat of Hitlerism. The Communist Party now called for all-out aid to the Soviet Union, to Great Britain, and to China. Once more the party denounced the evils of nazism and fascism.

In September of 1940 the Communist Party had vigorously opposed enactment of the Draft Act. In September 1941 it demanded its extension. In 1940 the Communist Party praised Senator Wheeler for his isolationist position. A year later it denounced him as a Munichman and a traitor. The Communist Party rediscovered that labor had a stake in the defeat of fascism throughout the world, and declared that it should direct its energies to all-out production to defeat Hitler.

When the United States entered the war in December 1941 no change in Communist Party policy was needed. The Communist Party's Pearl Harbor had already occurred on June 22, 1941, and the party had favored United States entrance into the war since that time. But the party continued to grind its ax. The United States and Russia did not see eye to eye on military strategy. The Russians wanted the immediate opening of a second front. And so the Communist Party decided that American labor had an interest in this question of military strategy, and that it was to labor's interest to bring pressure on the military commanders for the immediate opening of a second front.

"It is imperative," Eugene Dennis declared early in 1942, "that the labor movement unitedly should make its voice heard and its influence felt on * * * such life-and-death questions as insuring America's participation in the opening of a second front in Europe this spring."

*Tehran*

The second-front issue was a symptom of the lack of confidence which the Communist Party felt, during this period, in the genuineness of American-Russian collaboration. These doubts, however, vanished when President Roosevelt met with Premier Stalin at Tehran, and an agreement was reached on the basic problems confronting the two countries.

This agreement seemed to the Communist Party to herald a complete change in the relationship of America to the Soviet Union, and therefore (in the Communist Party's distorted view of America) in the relationship between labor and the rest of the American community. The fact that the United States and the Soviet Union had reached an agreement meant to the Communist Party that all problems between labor and capital in the United States were on their way to being settled. Tehran became the watchword, the

magic touchstone, which not only solved foreign problems but laid at rest all of labor's problems.

The Communist Party, accordingly, dissolved itself in January 1944. Earl Browder, then the leader of the party, announced that if J. P. Morgan would join him in support of the American-Soviet coalition, he would clasp his hand and join with him. The party's program of socialism was abandoned in favor of the new progressive coalition between labor and capital. The party declared that there was only one yardstick against which all trade-union activities were to be measured, and that was the winning of the war. During this period the Communist Party even supported national service legislation, a policy directly contrary to every tradition of the American labor movement. It supported most vigorously the no-strike pledge, and urged that it be continued in the postwar period.

In short, during this period the Communist Party, then called the Communist Political Association, was—as it later described itself during one of its periodic orgies of Marxist self-criticism—an opportunist tail to the capitalist class. During this period the Communist Party exhausted its superlatives in praise of the wise and courageous leadership of President Roosevelt—the same leadership which it had denounced during the period of Russia's pact with Hitler.

*The postwar period*

With the close of the European war, differences and tensions began to develop between the Soviet Union and the United States. The Soviet Union no longer needed American military assistance, and its ambitions began to conflict at many points with the policies of the United States.

Accordingly, the "American" Communist Party again reversed its field. Taking its lead from an article by the French Communist leader Duclos, it reconstituted itself, in June 1945, as the Communist Party and once again asserted its so-called aggressive role in domestic affairs. It no longer supported national service legislation and stopped talking about continuation of the no-strike pledge after the end of the war.

The policy of the American Communist Party in the postwar era did not exhibit any rapid and sudden shift, since the international position of the Soviet Union did not exhibit any such shifts. It was, rather, a slowly developing policy of opposition to the aims of the Truman administration. This opposition became clearer as the diplomatic conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union developed and deepened. The postwar Communist policies included the following specific items:

1. Identification of the Chinese Communists with the "democratic" forces in China;

2. A claim that the United States had failed to live up to the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, and a demand that United States foreign policy be based on friendship with the Soviet Union;

3. Opposition to the Truman doctrine;

4. Opposition to the Marshall plan;

5. Support of Henry Wallace and the Progressive Party in 1948;

6. Opposition to the Atlantic Pact;

7. Support of the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade-

Unions and opposition to the CIO and AFL sponsored International Confederation of Free Trade Unions;

8. Denunciation of the CIO as a tool of reaction and imperialism; and
9. Support for the UE in its fight with the CIO.

## III

Throughout this curious history, the Communist Party has never ceased to claim that it makes its decisions on the basis of a genuine appraisal of the interests of the American people and of American labor. That claim is, of course, false. The record shows that the basic purpose of the Communist Party is the support of the Soviet Union and that the program of the party is designed with only the interests of the Soviet Union in view.

This basic purpose is never avowed and the program is always phrased in terms of the interests of America and of American labor. Throughout this 12-year period during which the party favored first one objective and then another, it continually purported to be the champion of organization and of unionism. But it always found that the interests of organization and unionism favored whatever policy would aid the Soviet Union.

The Communist Party's single-minded devotion to Russia controls its position on domestic issues, as well as on matters of foreign policy. A pecular and consistent characteristic of the Communist Party program is that it always finds a tie-in between domestic and foreign policy. Thus, during the collective security period when the Communists supported the Roosevelt foreign policy, they also supported his domestic policy as progressive and prolabor. In the next period, however, when the German-Russian Pact was in effect, Roosevelt was seen by the Communist Party as a reactionary and a Fascist and his domestic program was roundly attacked as being antilabor. The most blatant example of the controlling influence of Russian foreign policy on the domestic policies of the American Communist Party was, perhaps, the Tehran period, when the fact that Stalin and Roosevelt had met and agreed was regarded as proof that an era of peace between capital and labor within the United States was assured. But almost equally blatant was the Communist position with regard to President Truman's domestic policy in the postwar period. The President was charged with a sell-out of labor and a betrayal of the fight for civil liberties. The Fair Deal was denounced as a sham. The administration was, in short, a tool of the reactionary capitalists and its domestic program and its foreign program were both products of the "bipartisan reactionary coalition." Similarly, attacks on the administration's foreign policy were tied in, however illogically, with attacks on Republican domestic policy. Thus, the Marshall plan (which had been opposed by Senator Taft and the most reactionary Republicans) was, in the Communist view, simply the application of the Taft-Hartley Act to foreign affairs.

The committee finds that the fundamental purpose of the Communist Party is to promote the interests of the Soviet Union. It finds that, although the Communist Party has claimed to champion unionism and organization, it has always done so in order to carry on Communist work within trade-unions and in order to pervert their policies to the advantage of the Soviet Union. The Communist Party, the committee finds, does not believe in trade-unions. It believes in using trade-unions. And it believes in using them for the purposes of the Soviet Union.

## IV

The Committee has examined the publications of the ACA, the reports of its officers to its conventions and its convention proceedings, and the positions taken by ACA representatives at CIO conventions and executive board meetings. From these materials the committee has ascertained the policies which have from time to time been followed by ACA. The committee has compared these policies with the program of the Communist Party of the United States. From this examination the committee finds that the policies and activities of the ACA have followed and continue to follow exactly, without deviation, the program of the Communist Party.

On fact is of great significance. Never in the history of the ACA has any policy been adopted which in any way ran counter to the policies of the Communist Party or to the interests of the Soviet Union as those interests are reflected in the program of the Communist Party. If the Communist Party program had been a consistent one, this absence of conflict might not be significant. But, in view of the fact that over a period of 12 years the Communist Party has taken almost every conceivable position on every issue of public importance in the United States, the absence of any conflict between the position of the party and the position of this union is of great significance. The constant parallel between the position of the Communist Party and the position of the ACA cannot possibly be explained as coincidence, or as the simultaneous but independent adoption of similar policies. For the policies of the Communist Party, as we have stated, have undergone repeated violent shifts, shifts which are explainable only on the basis of the party's subservience to the interests of the Soviet Union. And the policies of the ACA have, in each instance, undergone the same sinister shift.

During the collective security or "popular front" period the ACA expressed fervent support for Roosevelt's antiaggression program. Its 1938 convention called for a boycott of Japanese goods, and expressed its support of President Roosevelt's speech calling for quarantining the aggressors. It favored amending the Neutrality Act to permit the shipment of arms to victims of Fascist attack and condemned a policy which makes no distinction between "right and wrong." The 1938 convention declared that—

> the greatest threat to the welfare and security of the international trade-union movement arises from the activities of the Fascist aggressor nations.

In its newspaper, the ACA, during this period, urged that the American Government act with England and France to stop Hitler.

With the ACA, as with the Communist Party, support of the Roosevelt administration's foreign policy during the "collective security" period carried over into the domestic field. In August 1939 (just before the Russo-German Pact) the ACA executive board adopted a resolution supporting the principles, program, and accomplishments of the New Deal, and urging the reelection of President Roosevelt, although the next election was more than a year away.

The same issue of the ACA news which carries this resolution condemns Congress for not amending the Neutrality Act—"tying the hands of President Roosevelt so that he could make no move in the event of a conflict." A conflict did occur some 2 weeks later, but by then the ACA, like the Communist Party, was no longer interested in having President Roosevelt move against the aggressor.

For on August 22, 1939, Russia entered into the infamous nonaggression

pact with Nazi Germany, the immediate consequence of which was World War II. The signing of this pact produced, as we have seen, violent changes in the program of the Communist Party, and precisely the same changes took place in ACA's policies.

After the Russo-German Pact was signed, the ACA spoke no more of amending the Neutrality Act to permit the quarantining of aggressor nations. The union not only opposed involvement in the war, it opposed lend-lease, it opposed aid to Britain, and, in general, took the position that American labor's problems were at home and that what happened abroad was of no significance. The dangers of fascism were forgotten and any measures looking toward aid for the powers opposing fascism were attacked as attempts to involve us in an imperialist war. Burton K. Wheeler was quoted with approval by the ACA News.

It was now the ACA which made no distinction between right and wrong. At the very time in April 1940 when the Nazi armies were seizing Denmark and Norway, (the then) president of ACA, in his speech to its annual convention, asserted that the war "is being fought for nothing but profit.

In October 1940 Joseph P. Selly became president of the ACA. This event was not marked by any change in the policies of ACA. Its paper, in February 1941, denounced the "Lend-lease war powers bill," and stated that President Selly, returning from a tour, "reported that the paramount question in everyone's mind was keeping the United States out of war" and that all other questions "were sharply influenced by the attempt of the administration to drag us into the war."

In the March 1941 issue of the ACA News, President Selly again denounced Roosevelt and the lend-lease bill, and declared that events since the 1940 election had proven the correctness of the position then taken by the ACA executive board that neither Roosevelt or Willkie were worthy of the support of labor.

In 1938 and 1939, before the Russo-German Pact, the Communist Party and the ACA supported Roosevelt, both on his foreign policy of quarantining the aggressors and on domestic policy. From the signing of the pact until the German attack on Russia on June 22, 1941, the Communist Party and the ACA opposed Roosevelt, on both foreign and domestic policy.

The shift in Communist policy which was necessitated by the German attack on Russia was again paralleled by an identical shift in ACA policy. For ACA the shift required considerable agility, since its executive board had met on June 16 and 17 and had made no change in ACA's policies. But ACA was equal to the occasion. A special meeting of the executive board was called for June 28, at which the board adopted a statement—

> decrying the vicious aggressions of Fascist Germany and calling upon the administration to give full aid to the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and all other nations opposing Hitlerism.

Once more Russia needed American help, so ACA, like the Communist Party, refurbished the slogans discarded 2 years before and again took up the cry for collective action against the Fascist aggressors. The ACA executive board, in the statement adopted at its special meeting 6 days after Hitler attacked Russia, even had the effrontery to assert that "Our union has always opposed fascism" and to condemn those "who are still flirting with the idea of appeasing Hitler."

From the date the Soviet Union was attacked, the ACA continued, through its newspaper, to call briskly and with no uncertainty for—

all conceivable material aid to Great Britain, the Soviet Union, China, and all peoples engaged in a life-and-death struggle with fascism.

As we have already stated, the Communist Party's Pearl Harbor day was June 22, 1941, not December 7, 1941. The ACA's Pearl Harbor day, like that of the Communist Party, was June 22, 1941.

When the United States did become involved in the war, the Soviet Union, as we have stated, pressed strongly for the immediate opening of a second European front and the Communist Party called upon labor unions to bring to bear their full influence to support that military strategy. The ACA was not remiss in responding to that call. In March 1942 the ACA newspaper called editorially for an all-out offensive against Hitler's—

exposed western flanks by the forces of the United States and Great Britain. Hitler must be crushed on the continent of Europe.

That same spring, 1942, the ACA convention adopted a resolution calling for the opening of—

a second front on the continent of Europe by the armed forces of Britain and America.

The ACA and the Communist Party demanded the opening of the second front in Europe at a time when the United States was not even able successfully to hold Bataan. They kept right on demanding a second front all through 1942 and 1943, until their fears that the United States would not give Russia the aid Russia desired were set at rest by Tehran. The conclusion of the Tehran agreement reassured the ACA, as it did the Communist Party. President Selly, in an open letter to President Roosevelt, published in the ACA News, hailed his—

wise and courageous leadership in our Nation's struggle against our Fascist enemies.

In the same letter Selly declared that he had—

a real appreciation of what you have done to make possible a world in which the value of human dignity and labor will be universally recognized.

Selly, like the Communist Party, drew from the Tehran Agreement inferences as to domestic, as well as foreign, policy.

After Tehran, the second front issue was no longer pressed. ACA went all-out in support of the war and paid repeated tribute to the brilliant leadership of President Roosevelt. In his report to the 1944 convention, President Selly declared that every action of the union—

must be judged by one yardstick: how will it contribute to winning the war for our Nation's survival against the brutal forces of fascism in the shortest possible time.

In the same report President Selly spoke of the recognition by organized labor and by "the enlightened section of capital" of the need to rally round President Roosevelt's program. This, it will be remembered, was just after Earl Browder had offered to clasp J. P. Morgan's hand if he would back the Tehran agreement.

With the end of the war, however, the ACA, like the Communist Party, began to have its doubts about American foreign policy. The July 1945 ACA News, which was not printed until after VJ-day, charged that American lend-lease munitions were being used against the—

democratic Chinese forces who are seeking to unify China around a program of democracy and to replace the existing dictatorship with forms of government consistent with the needs of the people.

It will be recalled that in July 1945 the Communist Party reconstituted itself and hurled Earl Browder, the apostle of Tehran, into the outer darkness.

In 1946, the ACA's position on international affairs became clearer as disagreement between the Soviet Union and the United States became accentuated. In his address to the ACA convention in April 1946 President Selly declared that—

> big business is out to destroy the labor movement, threaten the Soviet Union, and expand American imperialism.

And Selly further declared that—

> just as during the war the Soviet Union was the friend of the people who want peace it is the same friend today.

The October 1946 ACA News ridiculed the "hell-bent-for-war paragraph-troopers of the newspaper industry and the get-tough-with-Russia-at-any-cost swivel chair political generals," and praised Henry Wallace, who the preceding month had delivered the Madison Square Garden speech which resulted in his departure from President Truman's Cabinet.

From that time forward, ACA was in the forefront of the Wallace drive. The ACA News made every effort to build up Wallace's candidacy and declared that "politicians are scratching their heads in amazement at the tremendous turn-outs in every section of the country at the public appearances of Henry Wallace." By April of 1948, President Selly and Secretary-Treasurer Kehoe of the ACA were members of the National Wallace for President Committee. The ACA News gave continuous publicity to Wallace, and ran news stories on Wallace's campaign containing such assertions as that the Marshall plan "will cost every man, woman, and child $1.85 in taxes, and serve only to consolidate the hold of United States big business over the economy of Europe."

Support for Wallace was coupled with opposition to the Marshall plan. The June 1948 ACA News declared that Truman had called for "militarizing America" and it criticized both the Truman doctrine of military aid to Greece and Turkey and the Marshall plan, which, it said, "set up a policy of relief to Europe—to those governments whose policies the bankers and generals O. K.'d." The ACA News declared that in adopting these policies "Truman and his generals and bankers" had ignored the United Nations, and that "they are now trying to destroy a four-power agreement on Trieste." No ACA organ ever suggested, either then or later, that Russian obstructionism and use of the veto was the reason that certain programs could not be handled through the United Nations.

Through the balance of 1948, up until the election, the ACA News continued to play up Wallace's compaign. It gave prominence to the fact that "among the ACA members attending the Progressive Party convention as delegates and observers from the American Labor Party and the Communications Workers' Committee for Wallace" were President Selly, Secretary-Treasurer Kehoe, and various ACA vice presidents and local union officers.

The January 1949 ACA News, following the CIO convention at Portland in November 1948, announced pridefully that President Selly had frequently led the minority fight at Portland against the policies followed by the CIO majority. The ACA News was correct: At Portland, Selly spoke against the Marshall plan and against aid to Nationalist China and to Greece. He declared that the resolution supporting American foreign policy, which was adopted by the convention, gave "a blank check to the militarists, to the brass hats, to the bankers who control the economy of this country, and who are directing its foreign policy." The Communist-line resolution prepared by the minority for whom Selly was the spokesman declared that the Marshall plan

"has obstructed European reconstruction, impaired the conditions of European workers, and carried with it interference in the affairs of other nations * * *."

Evidently realizing that ACA was completely out of step with CIO, ACA began, in the January 1949 ACA News, to demand "respect" for the "autonomy" of the affiliated unions. It supported the Farm Equipment Workers Union in its refusal to comply with the CIO's direction to merge with the UAW.

The same issue of the ACA News describes its former hero, Burton K. Wheeler, as an "arch reactionary, America Firster, and darling of American Fascists." Like the Communist Party, ACA loved Wheeler during the period of the Russo-German pact, but repudiated him when Germany attacked Russia. Wheeler remained an isolationist after June 22, while the Communist Party and the ACA went all-out for aid to the countries fighting Hitler.

When the CIO (and the British TUC) withdrew from the WFTU because of its subservience to the Soviet Union, the ACA protested violently and threatened nevertheless to continue its affiliation with the WFTU.

The ACA News has been hostile to the Atlantic Pact.

The November 1949 ACA News carried a report on the CIO convention, stated to have been prepared by President Selly, Secretary-Treasurer Kehoe, and Vice President Panza, which was critical of almost all of the actions of the CIO. It particularly criticized the expulsion of UE for following the Communist Party line.

The December 1949 ACA News deals at length with the pending CIO hearings on the charges against ACA and other unions. John Williamson, labor secretary of the Communist Party, had already written a series of articles in the Daily Worker on the attitude which ought to be taken toward the pending hearings. ACA followed Williamson's lead. The following is from Selly's column in the January 1950 ACA News:

> The question must reasonably be asked, "Why does the powerful CIO descend to such vicious undemocratic procedures? What are they trying to hide?" The "trials" increasingly reveal that the leadership of the CIO, like all power-hungry people who resort to undemocratic oppression, do it for the purpose of concealing their own crimes against the working people of America. These people have abandoned the principal objective and policies of the CIO, which ACA helped to establish.

This diatribe could as well have appeared in the Daily Worker.

Thus, ACA has continued up to the present moment to hew rigidly to the line laid down for it by the Communist Party. Never has it taken a position at variance with the policies of the party. Never has ACA criticized Russia, or taken the side of the United States in a dispute between the two.

The Communist line to which ACA has publicly adhered has likewise determined the positions which Selly has taken as the ACA representative on this executive board. Selly opposed the 1947 resolution censuring Communist penetration of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers. He opposed CIO's position in the 1948 elections, and announced that he would have opposed CIO support of the Marshall plan had he been present when the resolution of support was adopted. Selly opposed the expulsion from the CIO of the New York City Industrial Union Council for its subservience to the dictates of the Communist Party. He likewise opposed the withdrawal of CIO from the WFTU.

## V

ACA's principal defenses to the charges against it, were, as stated by President Selly, that "the ACA based its policy on the will of its membership and, second, that the ACA's policy" was the same as the CIO's until some time during the postwar period when "our membership no longer found it posible to follow CIO policy."

We reject any suggestion that American workers would knowingly subordinate their union to the ends of a foreign police state, and we are fully aware of the devices used by minority Communist factions to impose their policies upon organizations.

ACA has submitted a 43-page "statement" in support of its claim that ACA's policies were, until the postwar period, the same as CIO's. Since, as has been shown, ACA's policies for the past 12 years, and up to the present time, have closely paralleled those of the Communist Party, the assertion that the ACA's policies were the same as the CIO's until the postwar period is equivalent to an assertion that CIO policy paralleled Communist policy.

The committee has examined the material which ACA submitted to "prove" this preposterous claim. It finds that this charge is wholly false and completely unsupported by the evidence.

The ACA has charged, in substance:

1. That CIO opposed nazism and fascism in 1938.
2. The CIO opposed war in the 1939-41 period.
3. That CIO urged the defeat of nazism and fascism in the fall of 1941.
4. That CIO sponsored a "bring the boys home" campaign in 1945.
5. That CIO repeatedly in the past has deplored Red-baiting.

The committee has examined the record of the CIO and compared it with the record of the Communist Party and of ACA, and finds as follows:

1. The CIO opposed Nazi and Fascist aggression in 1938, as did President Roosevelt and the entire liberal movement in the United States. The Communist Party and ACA also opposed Nazi and Fascist aggression during this period.

2. After the German-Russian pact was signed and war in Europe began, the CIO opposed direct involvement in the war, as did President Roosevelt. The CIO continued to support Roosevelt's program of aid short of war to those fighting Hitler, and it supported the defense program. The CIO in fact proposed several plans (the Murray and Reuther plans) to increase production for aid to the Allies and for national defense, and its representatives participated in the National Defense Advisory Commission and the National Defense Mediation Board. The Communist Party and ACA, on the other hand, opposed aid to the Allies, declared that the war was being fought for nothing but profit opposed the national defense program, and asserted that the administration was trying to drag this country into the war.

3. The CIO, consistently with its entire prior position, continued to urge the defeat of nazism and fascism in the fall of 1941. The Communist Party and ACA, inconsistently with their immediately prior position and consistently only with the interests of Russia, urged the defeat of Germany only after Hitler invaded Russia.

4. The CIO, in 1945, urged that all surplus troops be brought home. It did not, like ACA and the Communist Party, couple this demand with criticism of American policy vis-a-vis China.

5. The CIO has frequently in the past and still today does denounce those

who would use the cry of "Communist" to destroy honest American trade-unions. But, at the same time, it has also frequently announced its rejection of communism and "any movement or activity of subversive character, Trojan horses, or fifth columns" (CIO executive board resolution of June 4, 1940). Its members "resent and reject efforts of the Communist Party * * * to interfere in the affairs of the CIO" (resolution adopted by CIO convention, November 18, 1946). ACA, on the other hand, has opposed "Red-baiting" not on the ground that false charges of communism are dangerous and should be opposed but rather on the apparent theory that all charges of communism, true or false, should be rejected.

## CONCLUSION

The charge upon which this committee was directed to hold hearings and report is that the policies and activities of the ACA are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program and purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the constitution of the CIO. On the basis of the evidence before this committee, the committee finds and concludes that this charge is true, and that the policies and activities of the ACA have been in the past, and are today, directed toward the achievement of the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives set forth in the constitution of the CIO.

ACA repeatedly sought to create confusion as to the purpose of the hearing by injecting the false issue of international union autonomy. It is, of course, not the position of this committee that the international unions composing the CIO must conform to CIO policy or leave the CIO. Even less does this committee take the position that unions must conform to CIO policy or be labeled disloyal. The charge against the ACA is not that it has differed with CIO policy. Unions affiliated with CIO have a right to differ with CIO policies if they honestly believe that the policies they advocate are the proper ones to achieve the objectives set forth in the CIO constitution. The charge against ACA is that this union has not adopted its policies on the basis of any honest judgment as to how to forward the objectives of American industrial unionism set forth in the CIO constitution, but that it has, rather, adopted policies and taken actions with regard only to promoting the purposes of the Communist Party. The charge, in short, is disloyalty to American trade unionism.

The truth of the charge against ACA has not been established merely by showing that the policies of this union with respect to various issues are the same as those of the Communist Party. The fact that a union adopts a policy which is the same as a policy of the Communist Party does not, standing by itself, prove that the union's purpose is to serve the interest of the Communist Party. The Communist Party purports to believe in many worthy policies, such as the elimination of discrimination against Negroes. The CIO does believe in the elimination of such discrimination. This no more proves that the CIO follows the Communist Party line than did the fact that the Communist Party and J. P. Morgan both supported the American war effort during the Tehran period prove that Morgan was a Communist.

The basic question posed by the charge against ACA is whether it is an honest trade-union, genuinely devoted to the advancement of the cause of American labor and American democracy, or a union whose policies and activities are determined by the philosophy and the program of the Commun-

ist Party. We have found that the purposes of the Communist Party are antithetical to the basic objectives of American industrial unionism, and that the adherents of that party, although they talk in the language of labor, are devoted primarily to the advancement of the interests of the Soviet Union. And the question as regards the ACA is whether that union is devoted primarily to the CIO on the one hand or to the Communist Party on the other.

On the basis of the evidence which has been submitted to the committee, only one conclusion is possible. The ACA has followed the tortuous paths of the Communist Party for years. Over the years it has been interventionist, isolationist, interventionist and then isolationist again. It has been pro-Roosevelt, then anti-Roosevelt, then pro-Roosevelt again. And ACA's occupancy of these positions has invariably coincided with the Communist Party's tenure of them. ACA's contradictory positions cannot possibly have resulted from any honest estimation of the interests of its membership. They can only have resulted from subservience to the interests of the Communist Party, and through that party, to the Soviet Union.

For the reasons stated, therefore, and on the basis of all the evidence presented to it, the committee unanimously concludes that the policies and activities of the ACA are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program and the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the CIO constitution. The committee recommends that the executive board exercise the powers granted to it by article VI, section 10, of the CIO constitution and, by virtue of those powers revoke the certificate of affiliation heretofore granted to the ACA and expel it from the CIO.

Respectfully submitted.

DAVID J. McDONALD, *Chairman.*
HARRY SAYRE.
JOSEPH FROESCH.

# REPORT OF EXECUTIVE BOARD COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY PRESIDENT MURRAY TO INVESTIGATE CHARGES AGAINST THE INTERNATIONAL FUR AND LEATHER WORKERS UNION

## INTRODUCTION

On November 5, 1949, William Steinberg, president of the American Radio Association, and a member of the CIO executive board, charged that the policies and activities of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program or the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives set forth in the constitution of the CIO. The charges were received by the executive board, and it authorized the President to appoint a committee or committees of executive board members to conduct hearings and to report back to the board. President Murray initially designated Emil Rieve, Harry Sayre, and Joseph Beirne as a committee to conduct hearings with respect to the charges against the IFLWU. Notice was duly given to the IFLWU of the existence of the charges and of the appointment of the committee.

Thereafter Emil Rieve notified President Murray that he would be unable to serve on the committee, and President Murray designated David J. McDonald to serve in Mr. Rieve's place as a member and as chairman of the committee. The IFLWU was notified of the substitution.

On April 4, 1950, David J. McDonald, as chairman, notified the IFLWU that a hearing would begin on April 18, 1950.

On April 11, 1950, Mr. Ben Gold, president of IFLWU, requested Chairman McDonald, as chairman of the committee, to postpone the hearing until after the impending IFLWU convention. Pursuant to this request, the hearing was postponed until June 1, 1950, and the IFLWU was notified accordingly. Subsequently, on May 26, 1950, Mr. Joseph Beirne advised President Murray that he would not be able to serve on the committee, and President Murray designated Jack Moran as a member of the committee in Mr. Beirne's place. On May 29, 1950, Harry Sayre notified President Murray that he would not be available to serve on the committee, and President Murray designated Martin Wagner as a member of the committee in Mr. Sayre's place. The IFLWU was notified of these substitutions.

The committee as ultimately constituted thus consisted of David J. McDonald, as chairman, and of Jack Moran and Martin Wagner. The committee, as so constituted, met in Washington on June 1, pursuant to the notice theretofore given to the IFLWU.

When the hearing was called to order, Mr. William Steinberg, the charging party, and two witnesses called by him were present. These witnesses were Mr. Everett M. Kassalow, acting director of research of CIO, and Mr. James C. Gildea, an assistant to CIO Secretary-Treasurer James B. Carey.

No representative of IFLWU appeared for the hearing. Chairman McDonald had that morning received from Ben Gold, president of IFLWU, a telegram which reads:

> Resolution adopted at Eighteenth Biennial Convention of International Fur and Leather Workers Union rejects "charges" by CIO officials against our union as "false and dishonest." It rejects "kangaroo hearing" set by CIO officials against our union. It condemns raiding, splitting, union wrecking, and strike-breaking directed by officials of national CIO. It condemns policy of CIO officials as declared by Carey to unite with

Fascists in Third World War. In view above, convention decided overwhelmingly to disaffiliate from CIO with only three opposing votes. Our union stands for united labor movement of AFL, CIO, miners union, railroad brotherhoods, and all independent unions on policy of trade-union democracy and original policies of CIO against war and fascism for security, democracy, and peace. Full statement and resolution follow.

The committee determined to proceed with the hearing despite the failure of the IFLWU to appear, since it was the opinion of the committee that the executive board would in any event wish the committee to investigate and report on the charges.

At the hearing on June 1, Mr. Steinberg made an introductory statement in which he set forth the basis for his charges against the IFLWU. Mr. Kassalow presented analyses, supported by documentary material, of the policies followed over the last 12 years by the Communist Party and the IFLWU, respectively. Mr. Gildea testified as to the positions taken on various issues at CIO executive board meetings by Mr. Ben Gold, president of IFLWU and its representative on the CIO executive board.

On June 2, the day following the hearing, there were received at CIO headquarters a statement and resolution which are evidently those referred to in Mr. Gold's telegram. The statement had in fact been printed some time before as a part of the IFLWU officers' report to the IFLWU convention, and is merely a diatribe against the CIO. The resolution reads as follows:

We, the delegates at this Eighteenth Biennial Convention of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union, reject the so-called charges of the CIO officials against our union as false, dishonest, and fraudulent.

We reject the kangaroo hearing set by CIO officials as a deliberate sham and hypocritical attempt to perpetuate a colossal swindle not only on the members of our union, but also upon all members of CIO and the entire labor movement. We refuse to be accomplices in such a bare-faced fraud.

Our union, built by the sweat and toil and sacrifice of our membership, is dedicated to the well-being of our members and to the preservation of their autonomous and democratic rights as free Americans.

We approve the statement on CIO recommended by the international executive board in the officers report.

Having further heard from the representatives of the Gloversville leather workers the shocking story of outright scabbery and strike-breaking engaged in and directed by officials of national CIO, this convention goes on record to disaffiliate from CIO.

This convention further instructs the international officers to send the approved statement, with this resolution appended thereto, to the Congress of Industrial Organizations, to all the unions affiliated to CIO and to make it known to all members of CIO unions.

We have no quarrel with CIO membership. We are also confident that every decent, honest member of CIO unions will join with us in denouncing and condemning the shameful raiding, splitting, and dictatorial policies of the present CIO officialdom. We have faith that the millions of rank-and-file members of CIO will, by their repudiation of the bankrupt policies of the CIO leaders, soon lay the basis for a reunited, mighty, progressive, and democratic American trade-union movement. To this end, we pledge our organization and all our strength.

The committee has considered carefully both the testimony and the documentary material submitted at the hearings. On the basis of this consideration, the committee finds as follows:

## FINDINGS

Since the charge against IFLWU is that its policies and activities are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program and purposes

of the Communist Party, the committee was required to examine the policies of the Communist Party. The evidence submitted to the committee on this subject was undisputed and was substantially identical with that submitted to other committees in prior hearings involving other unions.

## I

The claimed purpose of the Communist movement has from its inception been to establish a new order of society—the dictatorship of the proletariat—which would be controlled by and operated in the interests of the working class. In deference to this asserted objective, the Communist movement has always purported to be a movement of working people. Communist strategy has prescribed the use of trade-unions as an instrument for propagandizing the workers and promoting through them the revolution which is to place the party in power. The Communist Party, in all countries of its operation, has therefore always sought to control trade-unions and to speak for labor, in order that it might direct labor toward the goals of communism. Lenin said:

> It is necessary to agree to any and every sacrifice * * * to resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge, in order to penetrate the trade-unions, to remain in them and to carry on Communist work in them at all costs.[1]

The Communist Party, contrary to the expectations of its founders, first achieved its goal of revolution and party dictatorship in the Soviet Union. From that day forward, unquestioning support of the Soviet Union has been the invariable rule of conduct for Communists in every country. To this cardinal principle, all other policies have been and are ruthlessly subordinated.

Support of Russia is never openly admitted to be the factor determining the Communist Party's program in the United States. To the contrary, the Communist Party always asserts that its policies of the moment are in the interests of American labor. But the interests of American labor are always found by the party to be served by whatever policies will aid the Soviet Union.

As the international relations of the Soviet Union have changed from time to time, the program of the "American" Communist Party has changed accordingly. When the interests of the Soviet Union have so required, the "American" Communist Party has taken positions diametrically opposed to the national interests of the United States and to the basic interests of American labor.

The program of the Communist Party in the United States, from 1938 to the present, can be divided into four different periods, or five periods if the Tehran period be considered separately. Each of these periods corresponds to a particular phase in the international relations of the Soviet Union.

*Collective security and the popular front*

The first period, extending from shortly after Hitler's acquisition of power until August 1939 was the period of "collective security" and of "the popular front." During this period, the Soviet Union was menaced by the Fascist powers, Germany, Italy and Japan. It wanted the help of the Western Powers, and urged that they enter with it into a system of collective security against aggression. To promote the adoption of such a system of collective security, the Communist Parties in the various countries were willing and

[1] Left-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder, International Publishers (1934), p. 38.

even anxious to collaborate with all other groups which, for whatever reasons, supported a program of collective security against the aggression of the Fascist nations.

During this period the Communist Party of the United States supported a policy of collective security and urged that the United States enter into such a system with the Soviet Union. The Communist Party hailed Roosevelt's Chicago speech urging that the aggressors be quarantined. It favored changing the Neutrality Act to permit the shipment of arms to victims of Fascist attack. In line with the popular-front strategy, the party was friendly to the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

During this period the American Communist Party found that the interest of American labor lay in the elimination of fascism wherever it was found. The party declared that American labor had a stake in the maintenance of free institutions throughout the world, and that it should support a program for the creation of a system of collective security against fascistic aggression of aid to the victims of such aggression.

*The Russian-German pact*

In August 1939, the foreign policy of the Soviet Union abruptly changed. At the very time it purported to be seeking the alliance of the powers opposed to Hitler, the Soviet Union signed a nonaggression pact with him. The war between Germany and the Western Powers began immediately thereafter.

This change of Soviet strategy immediately brought about a violent change in the program of the Communist Party of the United States. The American Communist Party lost interest in the evils of nazism and fascism. The threat to American labor, the party now said, was the "imperialist war."

As the foreign policy of the United States slowly developed into a program of giving aid to the enemies of Hitlerism, the Communist Party became more and more certain that such aid was imperialistic and was opposed to the interests of America. Not only did the party no longer desire revision of the Neutrality Act, it now opposed it. Roosevelt, whose policy of quarantining the aggressors had been loudly praised by the party in 1937 and 1938, was now a Fascist warmonger, while Senator Wheeler truly expressed the interests of American labor. The defense program of the United States was a program fostered by Wall Street. The draft was an instrument by which Wall Street intended to impose a dictatorship upon America. The lend-lease bill was a "war powers bill." The party sought through the mechanism of such movements as the American Peace Mobilization and such slogans as "The Yanks Are Not Coming," to capitalize upon the isolationist-pacifist sentiment in the United States and to defeat every measure intended to aid the powers that were opposing Hitler.

*All-out Aid to Russia*

On July 22, 1941, Germany, in disregard of its 10-year nonaggression pact, attacked the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union needed help. It was, however unwillingly, fighting on the same side as Great Britain and China.

A second rapid reversal in the policies of the American Communist Party now took place. In essence, the party went back to its prepact position of the collective security days, but with the policies tuned to the war crisis in which the Soviet Union found itself. Roosevelt's program so lately denounced as warmongering now became "the people's program of struggle

for the defeat of Hitlerism." The Communist Party now called for all-out aid to the Soviet Union, to Great Britain and to China. Once more the party denounced the evils of nazism and fascism.

In September of 1940, the Communist Party had vigorously opposed enactment of the Draft Act. In September 1941, it demanded its extension. In 1940, the Communist Party praised Senator Wheeler for his isolationist position. A year later it denounced him as a Munichman and a traitor. The Communist Party rediscovered that labor had a stake in the defeat of fascism throughout the world, and declared that it should direct its energies to all-out production to defeat Hitler.

When the United States entered the war in December 1941, no change in Communist Party policy was needed. The Communist Party's Pearl Harbor had already occurred on June 22, 1941, and the party had favored United States entrance into the war since that time. But the party continued to grind its ax. The United States and Russia did not see eye to eye on military strategy. The Russians wanted the immediate opening of a second front. And so the Communist Party decided that American labor had an interest in this question of military strategy, and that it was to labor's interest to bring pressure on the military commanders for the immediate opening of a second front.

"It is imperative," Eugene Dennis declared early in 1942, "that the labor movement unitedly should make its voice heard and its influence felt on * * * such life and death questions as insuring America's participation in the opening of a second front in Europe this spring."

*Tehran*

The second front issue was a symptom of the lack of confidence which the Communist Party felt, during this period, in the genuineness of American-Russian collaboration. These doubts, however, vanished when President Roosevelt met with Premier Stalin at Tehran, and an agreement was reached on the basic problems confronting the two countries.

This agreement seemed to the Communist Party to herald a complete change in the relationship of America to the Soviet Union, and therefore (in the Communist Party's distorted view of America), in the relationship between labor and the rest of the American community. The fact that the United States and the Soviet Union had reached an agreement meant to the Communist Party that all problems between labor and capital in the United States were on their way to being settled. Tehran became the watchword, the magic touchstone, which not only solved foreign problems but laid at rest all of labor's problems.

The Communist Party, accordingly, dissolved itself in January 1944. Earl Browder, then the leader of the party, announced that if J. P. Morgan would join in support of the American-Soviet coalition, he would clasp his hand and join with him. The party's program of socialism was abandoned in favor of the new progressive coalition between labor and capital. The party declared that there was only one yardstick against which all trade-union activities were to be measured, and that was the winning of the war. During this period the Communist Party even supported national service legislation, a policy directly contrary to every tradition of the American labor movement. It supported most vigorously the no-strike pledge, and urged that it be continued in the postwar period.

In short, during this period the Communist Party, then called the Com-

munist Political Association, was—as it later described itself during one of its periodic orgies of "Marxist self-criticism"—an opportunist tail to the capitalist class. During this period the Communist Party exhausted its superlatives in praise of the wise and courageous leadership of President Roosevelt—the same leadership which it had denounced during the period of Russia's pact with Hitler.

*The postwar period*

With the close of the European war, differences and tensions began to develop between the Soviet Union and the United States. The Soviet Union no longer needed American military assistance, and its ambitions began to conflict at many points with the policies of the United States.

Accordingly, the "American" Communist Party again reversed its field. Taking its lead from an article by the French Communist leader Duclos, it reconstituted itself, in June 1945, as the Communist Party and once again asserted its so-called aggressive role in domestic affairs. It no longer supported national service legislation and stopped talking about continuation of the no-strike pledge after the end of the war.

The policy of the American Communist Party in the postwar era did not exhibit any rapid and sudden shift, since the international position of the Soviet Union did not exhibit any such shifts. It was, rather, a slowly developing policy of opposition to the aims of the Truman administration. This opposition became clearer as the diplomatic conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union developed and deepened. The postwar Communist policies included the following specific items:

1. Identification of the Chinese Communists with the democratic forces in China;
2. A claim that the United States was following an imperialistic foreign policy, and a demand that United States foreign policy be based on friendship with the Soviet Union;
3. Opposition to the Truman doctrine;
4. Opposition to the Marshall plan;
5. Support of Henry Wallace and the Progressive Party in 1948;
6. Opposition to the Atlantic Pact;
7. Support of the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions and opposition to the CIO and AFL sponsored International Confederation of Free Trade Unions;
8. Denunciation of the CIO as a tool of reaction and imperialism; and
9. Support for the UE and the other Communist-line unions in their fight with the CIO.

Throughout this curious history, the Communist Party has never ceased to claim that it makes its decisions on the basis of a genuine appraisal of the interests of the American people and of American labor. That claim is, of course, false. The basic purpose of the Communist Party is the support of the Soviet Union and the program of the party is designed with only the interests of the Soviet Union in view.

The Communist Party's single-minded devotion to Russia controls its position on domestic issues, as well as on matters of foreign policy. During the collective security period, when the Communists supported Roosevelt's foreign policy, they also supported his domestic policy as progressive and pro-labor. In the next period, however, when the German-Russian pact was in effect, Roosevelt was seen by the Communist Party as a reactionary and a

Fascist, and his domestic program was roundly attacked as being anti-labor. As soon as Germany attacked Russia, Roosevelt became once more, in the eyes of the Communist Party, a great and far-sighted leader. Since his foreign policy was now acceptable, his domestic program was once more praised by the Communist Party. Equally, blatant is the Communist position with regard to President Truman's domestic policy in the postwar period. When American foreign policy became inacceptable to Russia, the Communist Party declared that the administration was a tool of the reactionary capitalists and that its domestic program and its foreign program were both products of the "bipartisan reactionary coalition."

The committee finds that the fundamental purpose of the Communist Party is to promote the interests of the Soviet Union. It finds that, although the Communist Party has claimed to champion unionism and organization, it has always done so in order to carry on Communist work within trade-unions and in order to influence their policies in the interest of the Soviet Union. The Communist Party, the committee finds, does not believe in trade-unions. It believes in using trade-unions. And it believes in using them for the purposes of the Soviet Union.

## II

The members of the committee were of course aware that Ben Gold, the president of IFLWU, is and has for many years been an avowed Communist. They were aware that Irving Potash, manager of the Furriers Joint Council of New York, is and for some years has been a high official of the Communist Party, and that he has recently been convicted, along with other party leaders, of conspiring to advocate the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence. These facts would not, however, if they stood alone, sustain the charges against the IFLWU, since those charges are laid under article VI, section 10, of the CIO constitution and are based on the policies and activities of the union. It was therefore necessary for the committee to ascertain what policies and activities the IFLWU has followed and is following, and whether those policies and activities are directed toward achieving the program or the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives set forth in the constitution of the CIO.

The committee has therefore examined the publications of the IFLWU, including its convention proceedings, and the positions taken by the IFLWU representatives on the CIO executive board. From these materials the committee has ascertained the policies and activities which have been and are being pursued by the IFLWU. The committee has compared these policies and activities with the program of the Communist Party of the United States. The committee finds that the policies and activities of the IFLWU have been and are today directed toward the achievement of the program and purposes of the Communist Party.

There follows a chronological summary of IFLWU's policies and activities from 1938 up until the present time:

1. During the collective security or "popular front" period, the IFLWU strongly supported Roosevelt's antiaggression program. The January 1938, Fur Worker declared that "We must carry out the principle enunciated by President Roosevelt. We must quarantine the war makers." It demanded a boycott of Japanese goods and a ban on the sale of war materials to Japan. It hailed "as an event of international importance" a meeting of the American League for Peace and Democracy, which was a well known Communist-

front organization during this period. The general executive board of the IFLWU had voted to affiliate with the League for Peace and Democracy, and the Fur Worker declared that the league's collective-security program "deserves the support of all progressive, peace-loving people" The January 1939 Fur Worker warned that the monster, Hitler, was hatching plans to conquer the world, and called for "A united front of peace—uniting the democratic people of England and France and the two great democratic powers, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." The fur workers convention, meeting in May 1939, condemned the appeasement of Germany by Chamberlain and Daladier, and called for amendment of the Neutrality Act to distinguish between aggressor nations and their victims and for a boycott against all Nazi- or Fascist-made goods.

2. On August 22, 1939, Russia entered into the infamous nonaggression pact with Nazi Germany which led immediately to World War II and the Russo-German partition of Poland. The Fur and Leather Worker was as prompt to defend Russia as the Daily Worker, and its attempt was as pitiable. The September 1939, Fur and Leather Worker declared:

> By her timely nonaggression pact with Germany, Soviet Russia not only moved to a neutral position comparable to the United States as a measure of self-defense, but also succeeded in splitting the "axis" wide open and in stiffening democratic resistance to Hitler. * * * Were it not for the nonaggression pact, there is little doubt that Poland would already have suffered the fate of Czechoslovakia, with Soviet Russia marked as the next target of aggression.

In October 1939, the Fur and Leather Worker, like the other Worker, was already denouncing the imperialist war. It even had the effrontery to criticize the failure of France and England to give Poland effective aid and to assert that the "quick and effective action of Soviet Russia had saved eastern Poland from the clutches of the Nazis and the intrigues of Chamberlain." "The president's page," in the same issue of the paper, signed by Ben Gold, is given over to justifying the Nazi-Soviet pact and Russia's seizure of a large portion of Poland. In attempting to defend the indefensible, Gold employed the same shameless gibberish found in the contemporary Daily Worker. He declared that Soviet Russia had "smashed" the Nazi plans, and that the guilt of Britain and France—

> in building up Hitler can no longer be erased from the pages of history. Peace might have been saved by truly democratic governments in England and France. The reactionary, monopolist-dominated governments of theses two countries chose rather another imperialist war for redivision of imperialist spoils.

In November 1939, Ben Gold, on the president's page, denounced modification of the Neutrality Act to permit the shipment of arms to France and England. This was, of course, the very sort of modification of the act for which the IFLWU had called until Russia signed up with Germany. Significantly, the declaration issued by the national committee of the Communist Party following the Russo-German pact, had declared that the party was no longer interested in amendment of the Neutrality Act. Foster and Browder had spoken so Gold knew, what to say.

From the signing of the Nazi-Soviet pact until the German attack on Russia the IFLWU continued to pursue a violently isolationist line. John L. Lewis, because of his isolationist position, was the fur worker's hero. The IFLWU strongly supported the American Peace Mobilization. In the spring of 1941 the IFLWU opposed the lend-lease bill. The Fur and Leather Worker

declared editorially that the bill was totalitarian and un-American, and said that it didn't like the administration's attitude toward labor anyway. Like the Communist Party, whenever the IFLWU has been out of agreement with the administration's foreign policy, it has automatically disagreed with its domestic policy too.

In May of 1941, the IFLWU was still opposing aid to Britain.

3. On July 7, 1941, the Furriers Joint Council of New York, IFLWU, reversed the union's prior policy and unanimously adopted a resolution calling for "unlimited and immediate aid to Great Britain and the Soviet Union in the fight against Nazi fascism." The resolution declared:

> Every blow to the Nazi monster is a ray of hope for the European nations bleeding under the heel of fascism. Victory over nazism will assure the people of our own country and the entire world of freedom and true democracy.

What had happened between May and July to account for this startling reversal? On June 22, Germany had attacked Russia.

From this time onward, the IFLWU demanded all-out aid for Britain and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The IFLWU had criticized the administration for giving any aid to Britain, but now it criticized it for not doing enough to aid Russia. In October 1941, the Fur and Leather Worker demanded the outright repeal of the Neutrality Act and denounced the "appeasers" who wished to keep at least a part of the Neutrality Act in effect. Within a 15-month period the IFLWU, following the lead of the Communist Party, had urged amendment to the act, opposed any amendment, and urged complete repeal.

In the same issue, Ben Gold, on the president's page, demanded the opening of a second-front. "Hesitation and equivocation in this crisis are fatal," he declared. "No one can remain 'neutral' when the entire world is on fire and the flames are licking closer and closer to our shores." Ben Gold even rediscovered that "the labor movement cannot exist side by side with fascism." The IFLWU, like the Communist Party, was back to its prepact position.

When the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor it called for no change in the policies of the IFLWU or of the Communist Party. Their Pearl Harbor had taken place on June 22.

The Fur and Leather Worker had demanded the opening of a second front to aid Russia even before this country was in the war. It kept right on demanding a second front, with shrill insistence, until Tehran. The April 1942, Fur and Leather Worker carried editorials by both Gold and Potash demanding the immediate opening of a second front. The Fur and Leather Worker, May 1942, convention unanimously adopted a resolution demanding a second front on the European Continent. The same resolution paid tribute to the "armies of the great Chinese Republic * * * under their great leader, Chiang Kai-shek."

In September 1941, the youth conference of IFLWU had adopted a resolution urging the President to pardon Earl Browder, "great pioneer in the struggle against world fascism." The May 1942 issue of the Fur and Leather Worker carried an editorial paying tribute to Earl Browder and rejoicing in his pardon by the President. The editorial related that when "the news of Browder's release reached the fur workers' convention * * * the spontaneous demonstration and cheers which swept the convention * * * for a time completely stopped the proceedings." Happily disregarding the period of the Russo-German pact, the editorial continued:

> Earl Browder has a long record of consistent, unwavering, and determined struggle against fascism and reaction. * * * Browder has long been one of America's outstanding anti-Fascists, a champion of liberty and democracy against the evil forces of reaction.

The convention sent to President Roosevelt a telegram of thanks for "releasing that great anti-Fascist champion fighter, Earl Browder."

In June 1942, Ben Gold denounced as a "traitor," John L. Lewis, whose isolationist leadership he had gladly followed until Germany attacked Russia.

Throughout 1942 and 1943, each issue of the Fur and Leather Worker contained numerous stories or editorials urging the immediate opening of a second front in Europe. In support of this demand, it quoted such outstanding military authorities as Soviet Foreign Commissar Molotov, Pietro Lucchi (secretary-treasurer, fur division, IFLWU), Ben Gold, and Irving Potash.

The September 1942, Fur and Leather Worker devoted a page to a fur workers rally held to greet three visiting Soviet heroes. The "roaring welcome" which the fur workers gave the Soviet heroes—

> was equaled only by the thunderous demand for a second front in Europe now. * * * International President Ben Gold sounded the workers' somber warning to the appeasers and defeatists within our own country who are holding up the opening of the second front. He pointed out what happened to France, Norway, and the other occupied countries when their traitorous fifth column betrayed the common people of those countries.

(International President Ben Gold apparently omitted to say where he, his union, and Soviet Russia stood when France and Norway were being overrun.) The meeting adopted a resolution expressing their "painful regret that the understanding reached" by Roosevelt, Churchill, and the Soviet Government "on the urgent necessity of opening the western front in Europe in 1942 has not yet been carried out."

Like the Communist Party, the IFLWU was, until Tehran, mistrustful of American and British cooperation with the Soviet Union. As late as October of 1943, Ben Gold devoted the president's page to another call for a second front. He complained that more workers were killed in industry during 1942 than American soldiers on the battlefield, and criticized as excessively cautious a prediction by Harry Hopkins that we would win the war in 1945. Ben Gold was very impatient with the American armies.

The November 1943 Fur and Leather Worker contains on its front page a telegram to Joseph Stalin from "Ben Gold, president, International Fur and Leather Workers Union, CIO," extending "fraternal greetings to the people of the U. S. S. R. on the anniversary of the October Revolution. The telegram states:

> We join with many millions the world over, hailing October Revolution and building of Soviet Union as one of the greatest achievements of mankind. * * * Fur and leather workers of United States and Canada salute great Socialist country, Soviet Union, erected on indestructible foundation of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism.

The December 1943, Fur and Leather Worker has a picture of Irving Potash presenting a fur-lined coat from the fur workers for George Dimitroff, prominent Bulgarian Communist. Earl Browder made a speech at the presentation calling for unity to smash the "red bogy."

4. In December of 1943 came Tehran. To the IFLWU, as to the Communist Party, Tehran, was "world-shaking." The IFLWU's international executive

board promptly and unanimously endorsed President Roosevelt for a fourth term.

From Tehran onward, the IFLWU was completely satisfied with American-Russian cooperation. It made no more demands for a second front, but called repeatedly upon Roosevelt "to serve the Nation and humanity for a fourth term." The IFLWU thought Tehran would not only secure an enduring peace but "the elimination of tyranny, slavery, and intolerance." The officers' report to the 1944 convention pays lengthy tribute to "the priceless and decisive triumph of the people of the world at Tehran." The report recites that—

> the international executive board in December 1943 stated that the declarations of Moscow, Cairo, and Tehran will without doubt take their place with such historic documents as the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, the abolition of chattel slavery by the Emancipation Proclamation, and the constitution of the U. S. S. R.

5. As the end of the war approached, the fur workers, like the Soviet Union and the Communist Party, began to find fault with the foreign policies first of Britain and then of the United States. The January 1945 Fur and Leather Worker carried an article by John Vafiades, manager of Greek Fur Local 70, criticizing British intervention in Greece, and declaring that the EAM represented the Greek people and that "the case of Greece is the case of all liberated peoples of Europe whose freedom has been guaranteed by the Tehran agreement." The same issue of the Fur and Leather Worker declared that "Yugoslavia is making its preparations for genuine democracy" but that "unfortunately, for Italy, Greece, and Belgium the road to freedom and democracy is blocked." To the Fur and Leather Worker as to the Daily Worker, "democracy" and "freedom" mean the Soviet system.

In October 1945, the IFLWU's executive board condemned British policies in Greece and its paper demanded that Secretary of State Byrnes resign, accusing him of getting tough with Russia and of failing to live up to the Potsdam agreement. The paper also declared that—

> Our Government must stop assisting reactionary forces in China and other Pacific countries in their attacks against the rising democratic forces.

In recent years the Fur and Leather Worker has become more and more open in its devotion to marxism and stalinism. Its February 1945 issue asserted that the Soviet Union was able to achieve its military victories "only because the free peoples of the Soviet Union and their tremendous, free trade-unions are loyal to the death in the defense of their democratic land." The November 1945 issue congratulated Communist Ben Davis upon his reelection to the New York City Council, noting that "Our union wholeheartedly and energetically supported Ben Davis for reelection." The same issue attacked the Liberal Party in New York and the British Labor Party, which, it asserted, pretended to be Socialist but was really imperialist.

> "They are 'Socialists' like the Social-Democrats in Germany back in 1932 who refused the plea of the Communists to unite the ranks of the working class in order to prevent the seizure of power by Hitler * * *. They are 'Socialists' like the Social-Democrats in New York City who split away from the American Labor Party, made a coalition in the recent election with Governor Dewey and make a profession out of Red-baiting and disunity."

The same issue of the paper carried the usual greeting of President Gold

and Secretary-Treasurer Lucchi to Stalin hailing the anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution.

> Our members fully appreciate the great contributions of Soviet Union toward victory in the Pacific, the destruction by Red Army of imperialist Japan's most powerful Kwantung Army in Manchuria. We know that the victorious Soviet peoples desire and work for lasting peace; that they are now turning all their enormous energies toward the reconstruction of devastated areas and toward building that better, happier life they have earned at such great sacrifice. We know that in the world's first Socialist country, there will be no unemployment, no exploitation or oppression of people or of nations; no discrimination against national minority groups because of race, color, or religion. We know that the Soviet peoples are dedicated to peaceful construction; to industrial, scientific, educational, and cultural progress; to the democratic rights and opportunities of all the people * * *. Long live the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics and its great leader, Generalissimo Joseph Stalin.

The March 1946 Fur and Leather Worker called Bevin a phony "Socialist" showing his imperialist fangs. It ridiculed charges of Russian espionage in Canada, and denounced as "villainous" the claim that the Polish Government is Russian-dominated. "The Polish Government is not Russian-dominated, and you know it. It is a free government, a coalition government." It hailed the Soviet Union as a truly Socialist country "where the workers and farmers run the government." "The Russians live under the system of socialism—the people own the factories and farms—there are no bosses, no bosses' profits, no unemployment." All of this is, of course, Communist propaganda of the most barefaced sort. The 1946 Fur Makers convention even adopted, unanimously, a resolution urging the nationalization of all of this country's basic industries.

The July-August 1946 Fur and Leather Worker denounced the Bikini test editorially as atom-bomb diplomacy designed to intimidate the Soviet Union—

> into submission to the demands of the big businessmen who control our country. It is an attempt to establish the United States as the world's dominant force, as an imperialist overlord to all other nations.

The editorial called for outlawing the manufacture of atomic bombs. Like the Soviet Union and the Communist Party, the IFLWU sought simply to disarm America rather than to establish full and effective international control of atomic energy.

The same issue of the Fur and Leather Worker made the preposterous assertion that the "imperialist" actions of the United States Government had "fomented" the civil war in China, and denounced the use of American arms by Chiang Kai-shek "against Chinese Communists and other democratic groups." Actually the Chinese civil war had been going on since 1927, when Chiang Kai-shek broke with his Soviet advisers. Subsequent issues of the Fur and Leather Worker have continued to label the Chinese Communist forces as "democratic forces" and as "the People's Army of Liberation."

The IFLWU has bitterly opposed the Truman Doctrine since its inception. The Fur and Leather Worker made the same lying charge against the Truman Doctrine that it did against American policy in China; that is, the Truman Doctrine has brought on the civil war. Actually, of course the civil war in Greece was precipitated by the Communists, and had been going on for 2 years when the Truman Doctrine was enunciated. The civil war was the cause, not the consequence, of the doctrine.

The IFLWU was out in front in support of Wallace and the third party

from the very beginning of Wallace's campaign. Unlike some of the Communist-line unions, the IFLWU never made any bones about the fact that it was officially, as a union, supporting Wallace. The 1948 Fur Workers Convention adopted a resolution officially supporting the third party and directing the executive board to take all necessary steps to further the cause of the new party within the union. The IFLWU continued to support Wallace throughout the campaign, and its paper was plastered with the third-party slogan: "A vote for Wallace is a vote for peace!"

The 1948 Fur Workers Convention also unanimously adopted resolutions condemning American and British policy in Greece, demanding the immediate end of the Truman Doctrine and denouncing the Marshall plan. The Truman Doctrine and the Marshall plan were condemned "as political, economic, and military intervention by American big business in the affairs of other nations." The officers' report to that convention, which was formally approved by the convention, asserted that the Marshall plan had created unemployment among the European workers, lowered their wages and standard of living, and "is used by big business against both the European workers and the American workers."

When Russia blockaded Berlin, the IFLWU sided, of course, with Russia. Its paper declared that "Our 'cold war' bankers and generals are afraid that 'peace will break out.' "

Like the Daily Worker, the Fur and Leather Worker has coupled the foreign policy of the Truman administration and the domestic policy of the Republican Party, and damned them both together as if they were one and the same thing. Its columns join the Taft-Hartley "slave labor" law, the Truman Doctrine, and the Marshall plan. The Fur and Leather Worker has repeatedly asserted that the Marshall plan has worsened living conditions in Europe. In its view, "The Atlantic Pact is the fuse that will dynamite the peace."

When the Atlantic Pact was endorsed by the CIO, Ben Gold denounced both the pact and the CIO. He declared that Wall Street was planning a third world war and coupled the pact with the housing shortage, inflation, and the Taft-Hartley Act. Gold, however, did not blame Wall Street alone. He declared that also to blame were union leaders who had failed to raise their voice against the "murderous" Truman Doctrine and the so-called Marshall plan. He warned these union leaders that when "judgment day" arrived they would have a lot to explain about their disgusting role.

Contrasting with the IFLWU's denunciation of American policy and of American trade-union leaders is its saccharine praise for the Soviet Union. The August 1949 issue of its paper, for example, carried a letter from William Gropper written from the Soviet Union. Gropper reported that in Russia—

> There is plenty of food and clothing; there are luxury items. The shops are full of goods and people buying. I have experienced the thrill of seeing dancing and listening to singing, not only at concerts or ballet, but with people on the street. * * * There are no police watching me. * * * There is no anti-Semitism. * * * The peasants today ride in automobiles. * * * They are wealthy and educated. * * * They own original paintings by the top Soviet artists, among many other luxuries.

When the CIO and the British TUC withdrew from the WFTU, because of its subservience to Soviet interests, the IFLWU sided with the WFTU. The Fur and Leather Worker stated that the CIO and the TUC withdrew "under pressure from the State Departments of both Governments."

The IFLWU was highly critical of the CIO after the Portland convention in 1948. Since the Cleveland convention in 1949, its hostility has known no bounds. The IFLWU has repeated all the canards about the CIO devised by the Communist Party. It has charged that the CIO has made no effort to secure wage increases; that the CIO leadership has made no effort to secure repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act; that the CIO leadership has done nothing to secure the enactment of civil-rights legislation, and so on and so on.

Following the CIO convention, John Williamson, labor secretary of the Communist Party, wrote a series of articles which appeared in the Daily Worker on the attitude which ought to be taken toward the pending hearings on the charges against various unions of following the policies of the Communist Party. The lead which Williamson gave in his articles was scrupulously followed by the IFLWU. Its executive board denounced the—

> witch-hunting so-called investigation launched by CIO against minority unions, the star-chamber kangaroo courts designated by CIO to purge entire unions and split and disrupt the CIO, and the setting up of so-called trial committees in which persons who have already publicly pronounced judgment are permitted to act as prosecutors, judge and jury, all in one.

When the CIO executive board voted to expel four unions for adherence to the policies of the Communist Party, the Fur and Leather Worker's headline was "CIO board expels four progressive unions in labor-splitting Taft-Hartley purge." The story on the expulsion again repeats the Williamson line about a kangaroo court, biased judges, arbitrary hearings, witch hunts, and comparison of the hearings to the activities of the Un-American Activities Committee.

With each passing month, the IFLWU has become more hysterical in its hostility to the CIO and its leadership. When the Supreme Court upheld the non-Communist affidavit, the Fur and Leather Worker blamed the decision on the leadership of the CIO. Actually, it was the Steelworkers, along with the ACA, who had carried to the Supreme Court their challenge to the constitutionality of the oath requirement. Ignoring this fact, the IFLWU paper declared that the CIO leadership had encouraged the Supreme Court decision, and that they were not genuinely opposed to the Taft-Hartley Act but had "embraced that Fascist act." The IFLWU paper asserted that the CIO leadership had betrayed the people.

> Their policies encourage the Ku Klux Klan, the Jew-baiters, the Negro-baiters, the red-baiters, the witch-hunters, and the warmongers.

Precisely the same sort of billingsgate can be found in the Daily Worker.

Thus, the IFLWU has continued up to the present moment to hew rigidly to the line laid down for it by the Communist Party. Never has it taken a position at variance with the policies of the party. Never has the IFLWU criticized Russia or taken the side of the United States in a dispute between the two.

The Communist line to which the IFLWU has publicly adhered has likewise determined the positions which Gold has taken as the IFLWU representative on the CIO executive board. Gold opposed the 1947 resolution censuring Communist penetration of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers. He opposed CIO support of the Marshall plan. He opposed CIO support of the Democratic Party in the 1948 elections. He opposed the expulsion from the CIO of the New York City Industrial Union Council for its subservience to the dic-

tates of the Communist Party. He opposed the withdrawal of CIO from the WFTU.

## CONCLUSION

The charge upon which this committee was directed to hold hearings and report is that the policies and activities of the IFLWU are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program and purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the constitution of the CIO. On the basis of the evidence before this committee, the committee finds and concludes that this charge is true, and the policies and activities of the IFLWU have been in the past, and are today, directed toward the achievement of the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives set forth in the constitution of the CIO.

The charge against the IFLWU is not that it has differed with CIO policy. Unions affiliated with the CIO have a right to differ with CIO policies if they honestly believe that the policies which they advocate will achieve the objectives of American industrial unionism set forth in the CIO constitution. The charge against the IFLWU is that it has not adopted its policies on the basis of any honest judgment as to how to achieve those objectives, but has simply taken its policies from the Communist Party.

The basic question posed by the charge against IFLWU is whether it is an honest trade-union, genuinely devoted to the advancement of the cause of American labor and American democracy, or a union whose policies and activities are determined by the Communist Party. To this question there can, in the light of the evidence, be only one answer: The IFLWU has for years followed the tortuous paths of the Communist Party. Over the years it has been interventionist, isolationist, interventionist, and then isolationist again. It has been pro-Roosevelt, then anti-Roosevelt, then pro-Roosevelt again. The IFLWU's occupancy of these contradictory positions has invariably coincided with the Communist Party's tenure of them, and can only have resulted from the IFLWU's subservience to the wishes of the Communist Party and the Soviet Union. Indeed, the IFLWU's publications are rife with Marxist and Stalinist doctrine, and with Soviet propaganda.

For the reason stated, and on the basis of the evidence presented to it, the committee unanimously concludes that the policies and activities of the IFLWU are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program and the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the CIO constitution. The committee recommends that the executive board exercise the powers granted to it by article VI, section 10, of the CIO constitution and, by virtue of those powers, revoke the certificate of affiliation heretofore granted to the IFLWU and expel it from the CIO.

Respectfully submitted.

DAVID J. McDONALD, *Chairman.*
JACK MORAN.
MARTIN WAGNER.

## REPORT OF EXECUTIVE BOARD COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY PRESIDENT MURRAY TO INVESTIGATE CHARGES AGAINST THE INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S AND WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION

On November 5, 1949, William Steinberg, president of the American Radio Association and a member of the CIO executive board, charged that the policies and activities of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU) are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program or the policies of the Communist Party rather than the objectives set forth in the constitution of the CIO. The charges were received by the executive board of the CIO, and it authorized President Murray to appoint a committee of executive-board members to conduct hearings on the charges and to report back to the board. President Murray designated O. A. Knight (chairman), James E. Fadling, and Joseph Fisher as a committee. Notice was duly given to ILWU of the filing of the charges and of the appointment of the committee. Thereafter Mr. Fadling advised President Murray that he would be unable to serve on the committee, and Mr. Murray appointed Jack Moran to serve on the committee in place of Mr. Fadling. On April 18, 1950, O. A. Knight, as chairman, notified ILWU that the hearings on the charges against it would be held in the board room at CIO headquarters and would begin on Wednesday, May 17, 1950. He also advised ILWU of the substitution of Mr. Moran for Mr. Fadling.

The committee, as constituted of Mr. Knight, Mr. Fisher, and Mr. Moran, held hearings beginning at 11 a.m. on Wednesday, May 17, 1950, and continuing until Friday, May 19, at 6:30 p.m. Present for ILWU at the hearings were Harry Bridges, president of ILWU; J. R. Robertson, vice president of ILWU; William Glazier, Washington legislative representative of the union, and several ILWU executive-board members and local union members.

Mr. Steinberg, the charging party, made an introductory statement to the committee in which he gave the basis for his charges. He then called 4 witnesses. Everett Kassalow, associate director of research, CIO, presented detailed analyses of the policies of the Communist Party and of ILWU, supported by numerous documentary exhibits. Michael Quill, president of the Transport Workers Union of America and a member of the CIO executive board, and Mr. Hedley Stone, secretary-treasurer of the National Maritime Union of America and a member of the CIO executive board, testified that Harry Bridges had attended meetings of functionaries of the Communist Party and of representatives of Communist-controlled CIO unions at which the party functionaries announced the policies which those present were to follow in their unions and in the CIO. George L-P. Weaver, assistant to the secretary-treasurer of CIO, testified as to statements and positions taken by Mr. Bridges in meetings of the CIO executive board.

ILWU was permitted to cross-examine at length all four of the witnesses, as well as Mr. Steinberg. ILWU then called 6 witnesses, in addition to Mr. Bridges, who testified as to the functioning of ILWU, its constitution, its economic role, and its manner of arriving at decisions. Mr. Steinberg was permitted to cross-examine the ILWU witnesses.

In addition, ILWU submitted a 66-page statement and numerous exhibits. At the close of the hearings ILWU requested and received from the committee permission to file a further statement, and ILWU has filed such a statement. The committe has carefully considered both the testimony and

documentary material submitted at the hearings and the additional documentary material submitted by ILWU following the close of the hearing.

## INTRODUCTION

*The Communist Party and its position in the labor movement*

1. The charge made by Mr. Steinberg is that the policy and activities of the ILWU are consistently directed to the achievement of the program or the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the constitution of the CIO. Before proceeding to a detailed consideration of that charge it will, the committee believes, be helpful to review generally the nature of the Communist Party and the history of its relations with the trade-union movement.

For many years following the Russian Revolution there was a great deal of confusion among liberals in the United States concerning the nature and functioning of the Soviet system, the world-wide Communist movement, and the Communist Parties of the various countries. The Russian Revolution, because it overthrew an autocratic, feudal society, initially created a favorable reaction among many Americans.

However, this initial favorable reaction soon became tempered by the realization that the Soviet regime was as harshly autocratic as its predecessor. For many of those who remained sympathetic with the Soviets, based upon the false hope that time would bring more democratic practices, the signing of the Stalin-Hitler pact in 1939 marked a turning point. Doubts as to the nature of the Soviet system and of the Communist Party were, however, again somewhat quieted when in 1941 the German armies marched on the Soviet Union. The antipathy most Americans had for Hitler and his cohorts was crystallized into feelings of sympathy for the Russian people and admiration for their fight against the German armies. After the Japanese attack upon the United States on December 7, 1941, most of the questions in the minds of the American people concerning the nature of the Soviet state and the Communist Party were laid aside in the life-and-death struggle against Hitler and the Japanese. Russia was our ally.

Following the cessation of hostilities, however, the drive of the Soviet Union for world power was nakedly displayed, and the true nature of the Communist Party and the Soviet state was more sharply revealed. Today not much confusion should exist as to the real, in contrast to the apparent, nature of the Soviet system and of the Communist Party of the United States.

2. From a movement which in 1917 purportedly set out to bring a new and better life to millions of people, there has emerged a monster, secret-police state which negates in every phase of its operation the principles for which it was ostensibly founded. Hand in hand with this abandonment of its own stated principles has gone unlimited application of the thesis that if the end to be achieved is a desirable one, any means used in reaching that end are acceptable.

There exists in the world today a group of highly trained, dedicated, and fanatical professional revolutionists whose code of morals and standard of values have nothing in common with the codes and standards of western civilization. To the Communist, a lie is the truth if it serves the purpose of the party. To the Communist, murder and robbery are dignified and hallowed acts if performed in the name of the ultimate revolution. Subterfuge and evasion are praiseworthy if they promote the ends of the party. American

**ERRATUM**

On Page 101, second line, substitute "possible" for "impossible."

Communists, like their counterparts throughout the world, accept on faith the thesis that the party itself can do no wrong. Hence it is impossible for these people unquestioningly to accept sharp changes in policy as being not only necessary but completely natural.

Side by side with this subversion of moral principle, there has developed a political concept upon which depends the strategy of the Communist Parties of the various countries. That political concept is that the preservation of the present regime in the Soviet Union is the basic all-important task for Communists throughout the world. Only within this context can the nature of the American Communist be understood.

3. Since the political thesis of the Communist Party depends to a large extent upon the seizure of power by the proletariat led by its alleged vanguard, the party, control of the trade-union movement has always been a primary objective of the Communists. From its inception in the United States, attempts have been made by the party to infiltrate the labor movement, gain control of its leadership, and direct the energies of the unions toward assisting the objective of the Communist Party to preserve the power of the present ruling group in the Soviet Union. Communists have sometimes been able to gain control of American unions either by organizing in those areas where organization was sorely needed or by utilizing apathy and indifference on the part of union members to gain control of existing unions.

Once the Communists gain control of a union, the union inevitably becomes nothing more than a robot-like instrument of the world-wide Communist movement, with the true economic and social interests of the workers in the union sacrificed to the interests of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. Thus, when it serves the needs of the Soviet Union for American workers to be out on strike, the Communist-controlled unions attempt to provoke strikes, to lengthen such legitimate strikes as may be taking place, and generally to disrupt the productive system. When the foreign policy needs of the Soviet Union require a high degree of productivity by American workers, the Communist unions attempt to fulfill the need for uninterrupted production by opposing all strikes, establishing speed-up committees, and foregoing any economic gains which might require strike action in order to be achieved.

The techniques used by the Communist Party in achieving control of a union and in then using the union for its purposes vary according to the nature of the industry, the tradition of the union, and the degree to which the union can be subjected to rigid control. As these factors change from time to time, the operation of the party group within the union (i.e. the "party fraction") changes to meet the new situation. Although the party fraction functions in a highly mechanical fashion on the theoretical level, accepting without question the line handed down from above, its tactical maneuvering may shift from day to day and even from meeting to meeting depending upon the particular needs of the moment. Thus, the operation of the party fraction within one union may be completely different from that within another union. In all cases, however, the party fraction in the union acts as a disciplined group and takes the orders of the day from the party functionary assigned to or responsible for trade-union work.

4. What we do about Communists in the labor movement is a question which has plagued and beset American unions. On the one hand, because American Labor has been in the forefront of the fight for civil liberties it has been extremely loath to restrict the liberties of any group operating within the framework of the unions. On the other hand, the labor movement has

learned that unless it adequately protects its unions a small Communist group can gain control and subvert the basic policy of the union.

Political uniformity within the labor movement, as in the rest of our society is a highly undesirable and retrogressive concept. Political differences are essential to the development of any democratic society. It is, however, equally essential to the functioning of the democratic system that political differences be openly aired and discussed. People cannot choose intelligently unless they know what they are really choosing.

No group or individual has the right to come into the labor movement with a specific political purpose and then to hide its purpose by deception, evasion, lying, and subterfuge in order to mask its true objective. Since that is precisely the method of operation of the Communist Party, the CIO has a right to exclude the servants of the Soviet Union.

Moreover, there is no room in the CIO, or in any other voluntary association of independent members, for an affiliate whose policies over a period of time contravene and tend to undermine the fundamental objectives of the organization. And there can be no doubt about the violent clash between the constitutional objectives and policies of the CIO and the program or purposes of the Communist Party. The CIO is dedicated to advancing the cause of liberty and the never-ending struggle for equality begun by our forefathers; to the end of achieving a world of free men and women. The CIO is dedicated to organizing the unorganized, to making workers participants in the collective-bargaining process, and to securing legislation insuring economic security and the extension of civil liberties.

The Communist Party, in contrast, seeks to exploit the workers for the benefit of an alien loyalty. The Communist Party speaks in the words of unionism and Americanism. But actually it matters not to the Communist Party whether a particular policy will advance or hinder the best interests of American labor. Only to the extent that the Soviet line permits will the propaganda mill of the Communist Party grind out platforms which are in consonance with the ideals of American labor. In event of conflict between the needs of the Soviet Union and the best interests of American labor, the former must always prevail.

Within the CIO there is the greatest freedom for differences of opinion on political and trade union matters, so long as those differences stem from an honest belief as to what constitutes good trade union policy or the best method of promoting the objectives set forth in the CIO constitution. But there is no room for differences of opinion when those differences reflect a fundamental divergence in basic objectives such as the divergence between the CIO and the Communist Party. A volutary association created to promote certain objectives is fully entitled to exclude from its midst those who rejected such objectives and accept an entirely contrary set of values.

That is, in essence, the charge which has been made against the ILWU. It is charged that the policies and activities of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, under the international union's present top leadership, are not designed to unite the working men and women of America into labor unions for their mutual aid and protection but to unite them for the purpose of advancing the interests of the Communist Party.

## FINDINGS

The testimony, both oral and documentary, at the hearing demonstrates incontrovertibly, and the committee finds, that the policies and activities of

the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, under the leadership of its international officers and executive board, have long been and are today directed toward the achievement of the program and the policies of the Communist Party rather than the objectives set forth in the constitution of the CIO.

The ILWU has consistently and without a single deviation followed the sharp turns and swerves of the Communist Party line and has sacrificed the economic and social interests of its membership to that line. The defense presented by Harry Bridges and his fellow officers was an evasion of the real issue involved in the trial; they objected on hypertechnical grounds to the introduction of all revelant evidence; introduced extraneous and irrelevant evidence; made unsupported and slanderous attacks upon the witnesses; and generally evidenced a hysterically evasive attitude toward the charges and toward the trial committee.

*I. Policies of the Communist Party*

Since the charge against the ILWU is that it pursues the program and the purposes of the Communist Party, the committee was required to scrutinize the policies of that party. The policies of the Communist Party in the United States, from the time of the formation of the CIO to the present, can be divided into five different periods, each corresponding to a particular phase in the international relations of the Soviet Union.

*Collective security and the popular front.*—The first period extended from 1935, shortly after Hitler's acquisition of power, until the signing of the Russo-German Pact in August, 1939.

When Hitler came into power, the Soviet leaders at first expected his immediate collapse. It soon became evident, however, that this expectation was doomed to disappointment. The Soviet Union thereupon devised a new defensive tactic, by which it hoped to contain Hitler. This tactic was the "Peoples' Front policy," announced in 1935 at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International.

Since the Soviet Union was menaced by the Facist powers, Germany, Italy, and Japan, it wanted the help of the western powers and sought to persuade them to enter with it into a system of "collective security" against agression. To advance the adoption of such a system of collective security, the Communist Parties in the various countries sought to promote a "people's front" or "popular front" with other groups which, for whatever reasons, supported a program of collective security against the aggression of the Fascist nations.

During this period the Communist Party of the United States supported a policy of collective security and urged that the United States enter into such a system with the Soviet Union. The Communist Party hailed Roosevelt's Chicago speech urging that the aggressors be quarantined. It urged the boycott of German, Japanese, and Italian goods. It favored changing the Neutrality Act to permit the shipment of arms to victims of Fascist attack. In line with the popular front strategy, the party was friendly to the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

During this period the American Communist Party found that the interest of American labor lay in the elimination of fascism wherever it was found. The party declared that American labor had a stake in the maintenance of free institutions throughout the world, and that it should support a program

for the creation of a system of collective security against Fascist agression and of aid to the victims of such aggression.

*The Russian-German pact.*—In August 1939, the foreign policy of the Soviet Union abruptly changed. At the very time it purported to be seeking the alliance of England and France against Hitler, the Soviet Union signed a nonaggression pact with him. Hitler was freed to attack Poland, and World War II began.

This change of Soviet strategy immediately brought about a violent change in the program of the Communist Party of the United States. The American Communist Party lost interest in the evils of nazism and fascism. The threat to American labor, the party now said, was the "imperialist war." The defense program of the United States was a program fostered by Wall Street. The party sought, through the mechanism of such movements as the American Peace Mobilization and such slogans as "The Yanks Are Not Coming," to capitalize upon the isolationist-pacifist sentiment in the United States and to defeat every measure intended to aid the powers that were opposing Hitler.

*All-out aid to Russia.*—On July 22, 1941, Germany attacked the Soviet Union. The Soviet union needed help. It was, however, unwillingly, fighting on the same side as Great Britain.

A second rapid reversal in the policies of the American Communist Party now took place. The party called for all-out aid to the Soviet Union and to Great Britain. The "imperialist war" was now a "people's war." Roosevelt's program, so lately denounced as warmongering, now became "the people's program of struggle for the defeat of Hitlerism."

The Communist Party rediscovered that labor had a stake in the defeat of fascism throughout the world, and declared that it should direct its energies to all-out production to defeat Hitler. Once more the party denounced the evils of nazism and fascism. Hitler was again a Fascist mad dog.

When the United States entered the war in December 1941, no change in Communist Party policy was needed. The Communist Party's Pearl Harbor had already occurred on June 22, 1941, and the party had favored United States entrance into the war since that time. But the party continued to grind its ax. The United States and Russia did not see eye to eye on military strategy. The Russians wanted the immediate opening of a second front. And so the Communist Party decided that American labor had an interest in this question of military strategy. "It is imperative," Eugene Dennis declared early in 1942, "that the labor movement unitedly should make its voice heard and its influence felt on * * * such life and death questions as insuring American participation in the opening of a second front in Europe this spring."

*Tehran.*—The second-front issue was a symptom of the lack of confidence which the Communist Party felt, during this period, in the genuineness of American-Russian collaboration. These doubts, however, vanished when President Roosevelt met with Premier Stalin at Tehran, and agreement was reached on certain of the problems confronting the two countries. This agreement seemed to the Communist Party leadership to herald a complete change in the relationship between America and the Soviet Union, and therefore, in the party's role in the United States.

There was thus ushered in the period later designated in the party as "Browderism." The party's program of "socialism" was abandoned in favor of the new "progressive" coalition between labor and capital. Henceforth

the party's function was not to be "revolutionary" but merely "educational." The Communist Party, accordingly, dissolved itself in January 1944, and the Communist Political Association came into being in its stead.

Earl Browder announced that if J. P. Morgan would join in support of the American-Soviet coalition, he would clasp his hand and join with him. The party declared that there was only one yardstick against which all trade-union activities were to be measured, and that was the winning of the war. The party exhausted its superlatives in praise of the wise and courageous leadership of President Roosevelt—the same leadership which it had denounced during the period of Russia's pact with Hitler. The party even advocated national service legislation, a measure anathema to labor. The party supported most vigorously the no-strike pledge, and urged that it be continued in the postwar period.

In short, during this period the Communist Party was—as it later described itself in an orgy of "Marxist self-criticism"—an opportunist tail to the capitalist class.

*The postwar period.*—With the close of the European War, differences and tensions began to develop between the Soviet Union and the United States. The Soviet Union no longer needed American military assistance, and its ambitions began to conflict at many points with the policies of the United States.

Accordingly, the "American" Communist Party again reversed its field. Taking its lead from an article by the French Communist leader Duclos, it reconstituted itself in June 1945 as the Communist Party and once again asserted its so-called aggressive role in domestic affairs. It no longer supported national-service legislation and stopped talking about continuation of the no-strike pledge after the end of the war.

As the diplomatic conflict betwween the United States and the Soviet Union has developed and deepened in the postwar period, the hostility of the Communist Party to the policies of the American Government has become clearer and clearer. The postwar Communist policies have included the following specific items:

1. Demand for the withdrawal of American troops from China, and support of the Chinese Communists;
2. A claim that the United States had failed to live up to the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, and a demand that United States foreign policy be based on friendship with the Soviet Union;
3. Opposition to the Truman doctrine;
4. Opposition to the Marshall plan;
5. Support of Henry Wallace and the Progressive Party in 1948;
6. Opposition to the Atlantic Pact;
7. Support of the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade-Unions and opposition to the CIO- and AFL-sponsored International Confederation of Free Trade-Unions;
8. Denunciation of the CIO as a tool of reaction and imperialism; and
9. Support for the UE in its fight with the CIO.

*II. Policies of the ILWU*

By examining the publications of ILWU, the reports of its officers to its conventions and its convention proceedings, and the positions taken by ILWU representatives at CIO conventions and executive-board meetings, the committee has ascertained the policies which ILWU, through its international

leadership, has, over the years, followed. The committee has compared these policies with the program of the Communist Party of the United States. From this examination the committee finds that the policies and activities of ILWU have followed and continue to follow exactly, without deviation, the policies of the Communist Party. Each of the four major shifts in policy made by the Communist Party during the period since 1938 was faithfully followed by ILWU. At no time during that 12-year period has there been one single instance of ILWU's deviating in any appreciable degree from the line of the Communist Party.

1. During the collective-security or "popular front" period ILWU strongly supported Roosevelt's antiaggression program. In 1938, at its first convention, ILWU called for support of the O'Connell bill, which would have amended the Neutrality Act to define aggressor nations and to permit the shipment of arms to victims of aggression. The 1938 convention also called for a ban on shipments of helium to Germany and pledged full and unqualified support of President Roosevelt's New Deal. Resolutions adopted at the convention condemned isolationism and endorsed a world labor conference as a means of arresting the world-wide Fascist offensive.

As late as June 1939, ILWU locals submitted and supported resolutions at the convention of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific which called for support of President Roosevelt and the New Deal and commended the President's foreign policy of stopping the Fascist nations. District conventions of ILWU adopted resolutions to amend the Neutrality Act and to boycott German-, Italian-, and Japanese-made goods, and requesting closer collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union "for the protection of their mutual interests against any provocation within the Rome-Berlin-Tokio Axis."

2. With the signing of the Stalin-Hitler Pact, the ILWU suddenly discovered that the war in Europe was of no concern to it. It attacked President Roosevelt and his policy of giving aid to the allies.

In April 1940, Harry Bridges in his report to the ILWU District 1 convention, stated:

> It generally recognized that the present administration's policies in regard to the international situation, its pro-allies sympathizers, the endorsement of millions of dollars being sent abroad while millions of Americans suffer unemployment and poverty can result in the embroiling of America into a foreign war in which she can have no concern except the protection of the investments of the large bankers and industrial interests of the country.

The District 1 convention endorsed the slogan "The Yanks are not coming."

The 1940 convention of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific adopted a resolution submitted by ILWU denouncing the war profiteers who "have attempted to create a war scare" and demanding that Congress cease "playing chess with the lives of Americans by encouraging loans to warring nations." Newspapers published by ILWU locals carried headlines such as "Convoys mean shooting, shooting means war," and news stories on the activities of the American Peace Mobilization, a front set up by the Communists to promote isolationism. In his report to ILWU's April 1941 convention, Harry Bridges attacked the idea that labor should make sacrifices "in the interests of so-called 'national defense.' " Throughout this period, which ended with the attack upon Russia by Hitler, the ILWU consistently urged a policy of isolation, and criticized aid to the countries fighting Hitler.

3. Following the opening of hostilities between Germany and Russia in June 1941, the ILWU leadership suddenly discovered that the war in Europe was, after all, a matter of vital concern to the labor movement. Harry Bridges called for immediate aid to the Soviet Union and to Britain. In July 1941, Bridges declared that American labor, in backing aid to Britain and the Soviet Union, was "taking a militant anti-Fascist position in support of the people's right to freedom and peace." In contrast to "Convoys mean shooting, and shooting means war," Bridges, in October 1941, in an article in an ILWU local paper, stated:

> The American trade-unions have a real decision to face and make today. We are on the verge of having to start making motions or passing resolutions as to whether we shall not only support the President in an actual declaration of war to stop Hitler but as to whether we will insist that such declaration be made. Whether we like it or not, it is pretty hard to dodge this conclusion, because already Hitler is not only telling us but he is driving home the fact that American ships can't sail to certain places; therefore certain American seamen can't man and sail these ships; therefore, our American longshoremen can't load such ships; and, therefore, our warehouse workers in turn are not able to work at their particular industry handling goods to go to ships eventually.

In the same article, Bridges declared that "the greatest real threat to all our unions and democracy today is that Hitler might win the present war on the eastern front."

When Japan attacked the United States, no radical change in ILWU policy was necessary; the change had been made when Germany attacked Russia. ILWU was all out in its support of the war effort. The officers' report to the 1943 convention declared:

> The basic policy of the ILWU centered around national unity of all the win-the-war forces in America * * * This policy meant the subservience of many of our individual interests of our Nation. The union could not remain an economic agency and do its job * * *
>
> Steps were taken to convert the union into a win-the-war agency. This * * * meant unity with any and all people who were pledged to faithfully prosecute the war * * *.
>
> No longer do we think of employers as a group. Our judgment of employers is predicated on their participation in the war. The same judgment governs our measurement of all other people and agencies.

In actuality, ILWU, like other Communist-line labor unions, went much further in abandoning its economic aims and in its attacks upon any interruption of production than did legitimate American trade-unions. John L. Lewis was described in the 1943 ILWU officers' report as "the single most effective agent of the Fascist powers within the ranks of labor." Wages, hours, and working conditions, according to this same report—

> had to be measured in terms of maintaining efficiency and morale of our members and providing a free flow of war production.

During this period, ILWU, like the Communist Party, called for the opening of the second front. ILWU lauded the Soviet Union and the Russian Army in every possible way, and when Senator Lodge suggested that the Soviet Union should supply bases for bombing Japan, ILWU's paper, The Dispatcher, indignantly rejected this suggestion.

4. After the Tehran conference in December 1943, ILWU, like the Communist Party, was fully satisfied as to the good intentions of the American Government toward the Soviet Union. After Tehran ILWU called no more for a second front. ILWU was now satisfied with the Roosevelt administration. It supported Roosevelt for reelection in 1944. ILWU even, in January

1944, endorsed a proposed National Service Act, although such a measure would have destroyed labor's most basic freedoms, and was opposed by the CIO and the AFL. The Dispatcher, supporting the measure editorially, declared that "The right of the people to be secure against the enemy certainly transcends any fancied individual rights."

In the summer of 1944 Bridges and the ILWU executive board urged that the no-strike pledge be extended into peacetime. Such an extension, Bridges declared, "would defend the security of the Nation now and after the war." The Dispatcher likewise supported editorially the extension of the no-strike pledge beyond the end of the war.

5. With the end of the war in Europe and the collapse of the war-time collaboration between the Soviet Union and the democratic nations, the position of the ILWU, like that of the Communist Party, underwent another change. Britain was no longer a gallant ally; Bridges opposed an American loan to the "so-called Socialist" Government which would use the money against Russia. Bridges declared that "the so-called British Labor Government has made it crystal clear that it has no real intention of freeing the slave peoples now held captive by the Empire." The Soviet Union, in contrast, was represented as a country which "exploits no colonies of its own and seeks to exploit none" and "is naturally in favor of freedom and independence for all peoples."

The no-strike pledge was forgotten; "Strike time is here," the May 1946 Dispatcher declared.

When the Truman plan for Greece and Turkey was announced in the spring of 1947, it was bitterly attacked by the Dispatcher in a front-page editorial which compared it with the "international gangsterism of Hitler." The editorial described Russia as "the great Socialist nation" while the Greek and Turkish Governments were described as "cruel dictatorships" and the British Empire as the "British slave empire." The editorial further asserted that—

> Their cry against Russia is precisely because Russia insists that the peoples of all countries have the right to organize unions and choose their own forms of government.

At the 1947 ILWU convention Bridges made a speech during which he declared, "If the Communists of China are wrong, so were the people in this country who overthrew the British in the American Revolution." In the same speech he protested against equating communism and fascism.

Shortly after the Truman plan was announced, the Dispatcher commenced to play up Henry Wallace. Its news account in May 1947 of Wallace's European tour asserted that the tour "to warn against the new Truman doctrine in foreign policy" was a "thrilling success." Its account of a west coast speech of Wallace stated that—

> Wallace spoke out in ringing terms against this doctrine which seeks to fasten the yoke of American imperialism on the world, the crippling of Ameican trade-unions and the suppression of civil liberties.

When the Marshall plan was enunciated, it too was condemned by the ILWU. In December 1947 ILWU's executive board denounced the Marshall plan "as nothing more than a monstrous plot against freedom and living standards." The ILWU executive board declared that the Soviet Union, in contrast, was—

> supporting coalition governments of nations which are pledged to programs whereby the common people of foreign countries obtain greater ownership and control of raw materials and protection for the greater good of the majority of the peoples of those countries.

The Dispatcher declared editorially that money would be spent under the Marshall plan in order to impose "Wall Street puppet dictatorships" upon the European countries.

When the CIO executive board, in January 1948, announced its support of the Marshall plan and its opposition to a third party, Bridges declared that "ILWU would stand by its determination to give all-out support to the third-party movement and would continue to oppose the Marshall plan." Bridges' cohorts on the ILWU executive board joined with him in opposing the Marshall plan and in supporting Henry Wallace and the Progressive Party.

Like Soviet Russia and the Communist Party, ILWU has demanded that the United States end stockpiling of the atomic bomb without calling for international inspection of the Soviet's production of atomic weapons.

ILWU has also opposed the North Atlantic alliance. At its 1949 convention ILWU declared that while the North Atlantic alliance was ostensibly for the purpose of protecting Western European nations against threatened aggression from Russia, it would permit the United States to move into the signatory countries.

The Communist coup in Czechoslovakia was applauded by ILWU. To the ILWU this destruction of a democracy was merely the ousting of "reactionaries."

When the Russians established their blockade of Berlin, ILWU supported Russia. It said that all Russia wanted was for the United States to abide by the Potsdam agreement.

When the CIO and the British TUC withdrew from the World Federation of Trade-Unions because of its subservience to Soviet interests, ILWU sided with WFTU. ILWU Secretary-Treasurer Louis Goldblatt called the CIO withdrawal a "sell-out of American workers." Goldblatt was ILWU's delegate to the WFTU Conference at Marseilles in July 1949 at which WFTU established a "Maritime Federation of the World" with Harry Bridges at its head.

When the CIO, the AFL, and the TUC called the London conference to form a new international trade-union federation, ILWU declared that the conference smelled of the Fascist labor fronts, that Red baiting was the conference's only concern, and that the bonafide labor movements of most countries were not represented at the London conference but at the World Federation Trade-Union Conference in Peiping, which was going on simultaneously.

When in May of 1949 the Republican-Dixiecrat coalition blocked passage of the Thomas-Lesinski bill, ILWU, like the Daily Worker, declared that the administration, the CIO, and the AFL had sold out Taft-Hartley repeal. ILWU circulated to its membership a lengthy mimeographed release peddling this Communist Party lie. Confronted with this release of the hearing, Harry Bridges declared that it was a "complete out-and-out forgery." Presumably Bridges overlooked the fact that he had been confronted with the document at the CIO executive-board meeting in May 1949, and had at that time asserted that he took "full responsibility" for it.

The June 1949 Dispatcher hailed the "Chinese liberation," comparing it with the United States, French, and Soviet Revolutions. It declared that—

> Like the American Revolution, it has won independence from foreign imperialism for a vast area of the earth. Like the Russian Revolution, it enlists one of the world's most numerous peoples in a constructive effort leading to socialism.

The Dispatcher viewed the Chinese Revolution as "creating a new force of unprecedented proportions and turning it to the satisfaction of human needs."

When the UE was expelled from the CIO at the Cleveland convention last November because of Communist domination, ILWU stood by the UE, not the CIO.

6. ILWU's publications reflect a sympathy not only with Marxism but with the particular Stalinist brand thereof, and even utilize the peculiar Stalinist terminology. Like the Daily Worker, ILWU's paper, The Dispatcher, uses the term "democratic" as synonymous with communism. To it a "people's democracy" of Eastern Europe is democratic, as are the Italian Communist Party and the Chinese Communists. The Dispatcher's strongest term of approbrium is "Trotskyite."

The Dispatcher carries in each issue a column which appears under Harry Bridges' signature. In a November 1943 column, Bridges declared that Russia's position was that the people of liberated countries should choose their own forms of government. In December of 1943, he declared that—

> the men of the Russian Red Armies are loved and deeply respected by the people of that country and elsewhere. They have been welcomed with open arms and sympathetic understanding, and as deliverers and defenders of freedom and the people. The Red Army men have responded by being exemplary in conduct toward the people and their dearest possessions and community customs to the point where the civilian population and the armed forces unite, work and fight as one.

When the U. S. S. R. went through the empty form of granting autonomous rights to its constituent republics, Harry Bridges hailed it as a momentous development. He declared:

> The vicious lie that both philosophies [i. e., communism and fascism] have the same basic antidemocratic totalitarian foundation was never more clearly exposed than by the willingness and the determination of the Soviet Union to allow each of its component republics full freedom to choose its way of life and granting full equality for all the people in such republics regardless of race, creed, or color.

When Bridges wished to criticize Ireland's role in the war he declared that it was simply another Finland.

Bridges devoted his column in the June 1944 Dispatcher to the same sort of attack upon "Trotskyites" which may be found regularly in the Daily Worker. He shrilled:

> Let the rank and file of the ILWU be on guard and take notice. The luxury of leaving these fifth columnists in the ranks of labor, especially in our local unions, go undetected and unexposed before the eyes of our thousands of patriotic and loyal hardworking members is something that we cannot afford.

The July 1944 issue of the Dispatcher went all-out to demonstrate just how fatuously doctrinaire Communists can be. It carried a cartoon labeling Dewey and Hoover as Trotskyites. Its editorial, after warning against the Hoover-Dewey machine, declared:

> The open agents of Hoover, such as the Lewises and the Hutchinsons, are not the real danger. It is the fifth column that will do the damage. Beware the Trotskyites and the Norman Thomas Socialists! They are your enemies.

7. Thus, ILWU has continued up to the present moment to hew rigidly to the line laid down for it by the Communist Party. Never has ILWU adopted any policy which in any way ran counter to the policies of the Communist Party or to the interests of the Soviet Union.

If the Communist Party program had been a consistent one, this absence of conflict might not be significant. But over a period of 12 years the Communist Party has taken almost every conceivable position on every issue of

public importance in the United States. This vacillating course can easily be understood in the light of the advice offered by Lenin:

> To wage war for the overthrow of the international bourgeoisie * * * while renouncing beforehand the use of maneuvering * * * would not such renunciation be the height of folly? We might as well, when climbing a dangerous and hitherto unexplored mountain, refuse in advance to make the ascent in zigzags, or to turn back for a while, to give up the chosen direction in order to test another which may prove to be easier to negotiate.[1]

The absence of any conflict between the position of the party and the position of this union under the leadership of its international officers and board is, therefore, of great significance. The constant parallel between the position of the Communist Party and the position of the ILWU cannot possibly be explained as coincidence, or as the simultaneous but independent adoption of similar policies. For the policies of the Communist Party, as we have stated, have undergone repeated violent shifts which are explainable only on the basis of the party's subservience to the interests of the Soviet Union. And the policies of the ILWU have, in each instance, undergone the same sinister shift.

ILWU has never criticized Russia, nor has it ever taken the side of the United States in a dispute between the two countries.

*III. Direct evidence of Communist control of ILWU*

The documentary evidence of the subservience of ILWU, through its top leadership, to the Communist Party was corroborated by the oral testimony of Mr. Quill and Mr. Stone, both of whom gave testimony showing direct Communist control of ILWU. Both testified that Harry Bridges had, over a period of years, participated in numerous secret meetings between Communist Party functionaries and officers of Communist-controlled unions in the CIO at which the party functionaries instructed the union officers as to the party line and as to the positions that they were to take in the CIO and in their unions. Needless to say, these meetings were concealed from the CIO and from the rank-and-file membership of the unions. Such meetings took place from the inception of the CIO, and continued, to Mr. Stone's knowledge, until 1945, and, to Mr. Quill's, until 1948, those being the dates of their respective breaks with the party. Such meetings took place contemporaneously with every CIO convention, and were often held at the time of CIO executive-board meetings. The party functionaries who participated in these meetings included Eugene Dennis, William Z. Foster, John Williamson, Roy Hudson, Robert Thompson, Jack Stachel, and William Schneiderman.

One such meeting of particular importance, to which Mr. Quill testified, took place in New York shortly after the CIO convention in Boston in October 1947, and was attended by Dennis, Williamson, and Robert Thompson and others for the party and by Bridges and other representatives of the controlled unions. Dennis announced that the Communist Party would back Wallace on a third-party ticket, and instructed the Communist-controlled unions to support him.

This meeting was followed by similar meetings preceding the 2-day CIO executive-board meeting in Washington in January 1948. At these meetings Williamson, speaker for the Communist Party, instructed Bridges and the other union representatives present to endeavor to have the CIO executive

[1] Leninism by Joseph Stalin, p. 158.

board support Wallace, and, if that were impossible to achieve, to at least block any CIO resolution opposing Wallace. The CIO executive board did, however, adopt a resolution condemning the third party after Harry Bridges had unsuccessfully sought to postpone the CIO's taking a position by proposing a referendum of the membership.

Mr. Quill further testified that when he refused to go along with the Communist Party on the Wallace candidacy, Bridges telephoned him in the spring of 1948 from the west coast urging him not to break with the party and proposing that he, Bridges, come East to heal or prevent the breach.

M. Hedley Stone, secretary-treasurer of the National Maritime Union, and himself a Communist from around 1935 to 1945, testified to Bridges' participation in numerous such meetings between Communist Party functionaries and the Communist Party fraction in CIO.

One such meeting as to which Mr. Stone testified took place in New York City, in 1937 or 1938, and was called by the party to discuss starting a longshore organizing campaign on the east coast. Roy Hudson was the Communist Party functionary present, and Harry Bridges was also present. Hudson chose Al Lannan, another Communist Party functionary, to head up the proposed organizing drive. Bridges without revealing the Communist Party's role in the matter, persuaded John Lewis, then president of the CIO, to put up the money for the drive, and Lannan was placed in charge of it.

Stone testified that in 1939, during the CIO convention in San Francisco, he and Bridges attended a meeting of the Communist Party fraction in the CIO at which William Schneiderman, the party representative on the west coast, was present. Party policies and the manner in which they could be promoted within the CIO were discussed. Bridges acknowledged that such a meeting had taken place, but stated that he could not remember who was there.

In 1943 or 1944, according to Mr. Stone, he took Joe Curran to a CIO Communist Party fraction meeting held on a Sunday morning at the home of Saul Mills in Brooklyn. Curran was not aware in advance of the nature of the meeting and, when he discovered through a remark of John Santos that it was a Communist Party fraction meeting, Curran insisted on leaving and took Stone with him. Bridges and others of the Communist Party fraction in the CIO were present at this meeting.

Just as Bridges later, in 1948, sought to make peace between Quill and the Communist Party, so in 1946 he sought, unsuccessfully, to make peace between Stone and the party. Stone testified that many meetings were held between the Communist Party fraction in the CIO and Communist Party functionaries from 1937 or 1938 onward. Such meetings took place at every CIO convention and usually at the time of CIO executive-board meetings. At these meetings the party functionaries explained the latest developments in the party and its current policies, and those present then discussed how the party policies could best be promoted in the CIO. They decided, for example, what resolutions should be brought into the resolutions committee by the fraction members, and assignments were made as to who was to talk on each particular subject. This was all done secretly and conspiratorially, and was concealed from the CIO; and Bridges' role was likewise concealed from his rank and file. Bridges, according to Stone, was present at all of these meetings, unless it was physically impossible for him to attend. When Bridges was not present at a meeting, a party member was designated to

advise Bridges as to the line which was to be followed by the party fraction.

The question of whether Bridges is or was a member of the Communist Party is not, in the judgment of the committee, relevant to the purpose of the present inquiry. The committee is not concerned with anything more than whether the ILWU followed Communist Party policy. Quill and Stone testified, and the committee finds, that Bridges did participate in Communist Party fraction meetings and did receive at these meetings instructions from party representatives as to the line that was to be carried out, not only in the ILWU itself but also within CIO. The documentary evidence, almost all of it official ILWU material, further clearly proves that the efforts of the party to control the policies of ILWU were highly successful.

Mike Quill, in his testimony, also placed Bridges at Communist Party fraction meetings during 1946 at the CIO convention at Atlantic City, although he did place him on the floor of the convention. Quill also described a meeting with Bridges in New York on Tuesday of the following week; i. e., on November 26. Bridges did not appear publicly at the Atlantic City convention in 1946, and, at the hearings, denied being in Atlantic City at the time of the 1946 convention or in New York City the following week. In an attempt to prove that he was in San Francisco throughout the period in question, Bridges introduced, among other things, two letters dated, respectively, November 16, and November 21, and a contract dated November 17, all signed with what Bridges represented to be his signature. It is, however, obvious from even superficial examination that the signature on the letter of November 21 is not in the same handwriting as the signatures on the other documents.

In the view of the committee, it is not necessary to resolve the conflict in the testimony with regard to Bridges' presence at these particular meetings, since it was clearly established that Bridges did participate in numerous meetings with Communist Party functionaries at which he received instructions from the party as to the policies he was to pursue. It may be that Quill was confused as to when the conversations with Bridges which he described as taking place at these meetings actually took place. Since the conversations had no connection with the convention, they might well have occurred at some other time. It is, of course, extremely difficult precisely to place events which took place several years before. Bridges, for example, admitted to attending a meeting at Saul Mills' house, as testified to by Stone, but stated that he was unable to say in what year it took place.

Bridges did not deny participating in the other meetings referred to by Quill in his testimony, nor did he deny attendance at the meetings testified to by Stone. Instead, in his closing statement, Bridges merely asserted evasively that he attended meetings of all kinds of groups.

*IV. ILWU's defense*

ILWU's defense consisted largely of attacks upon the CIO and upon the committee, and of lies, evasions, and irrelevancies.

ILWU's representatives asserted that the committee was "biased," "rigged," and a "kangaroo court"; and that the "trial" was "phony." Harry Bridges' cries of "frame-up" fill pages of the record. He protested the use of photostats and charged repeatedly, and without the slightest basis, that various ILWU documents introduced against it "had been printed in the basement." As has been noted, Bridges even screamed forgery with regard to a document

for which he had taken full responsibility at a CIO executive board meeting only a year ago.

Following the lead given by the Daily Worker, ILWU insisted that its autonomy was being violated, and that it was being denied the independent status guaranteed it when it went into the CIO.

ILWU also stressed at great length the economic gains it had achieved for its members. Indeed, the oral testimony given for the ILWU consisted in the main of statements by members of its executive board that ILWU was a democratic union which had achieved great economic gains for the workers in its industry.

It is unquestionably true that, during those periods when the Communist Party line had required militancy, ILWU's leadership has been militant. ILWU's present chiefs came into the leadership of ILWU at a time when militancy was the order of the day for the Communist Party, and they are still trading on the reputation for militancy built up long ago.

It should not, however, be forgotten that when the Communist Party line has called for cooperation with employers these same leaders of ILWU have used their positions to smother the militancy of the ILWU membership. It was Harry Bridges who supported a National Service Act and who, along with Earl Browder, urged that the no-strike pledge be continued after the war. Bridges now prefers, however, to forget this nonmilitant period of his history and trade on his reputation for militancy developed during periods when that was the Communist Party line.

Bridges also asserted as a defense to the charge that ILWU has followed the policies of the Communist Party, that ILWU's policies have reflected the will of its membership. The committee rejects this assertion. The committee members are fully acquainted with the devices employed by Communist minorities to impose their policies upon organizations. We reject any suggestion that American workers would knowingly permit their union to be used to further the ends of a foreign police state. The reaction of Harry Bridges' own local to Bridges' attempt to foist the Communist Party line upon it in the current Korean crisis demonstrates that when the lines are clearly drawn American workers are loyal to America, not to Russia.

The committee wishes to make it perfectly clear that its findings as to ILWU are based, as they must be, on the policies and activities of the union under the leadership of its present international officers and executive board. Those findings carry no implication that the individual members of the union are Communists or favorable to communism. To the contrary, the committee is persuaded that many of the members of ILWU have been taken in by the evasion and the subterfuge, the devices and the maneuvers, which the Communist-minded leaders of this union have used to maintain themselves in power, concealing all the while the fact that the union's policies and activities were not the real informed decision of the members but determined in accordance with the line of the Communist Party.

### *V. International Fishermen and Allied Workers of America*

The members of this committee were also designated as a committee to hear charges against the International Fishermen and Allied Workers of America (IFAWA) identical with those against ILWU. A hearing was conducted and voluminous documentary evidence of IFAWA's adherence to the Communist Party line was introduced.

Since the close of the hearing on the charges against the IFAWA, how-

ever, that organization has been merged into ILWU. The members of the committee have therefore concluded that it is unnecessary for them to make any separate report on their investigation of the charges against IFAWA. They wish to state to the executive board, however, that in their judgment these charges were fully substantiated.

## VI

Since the conclusion of the hearing there has come to the attention of the committee a "Statement of Policy on National CIO" adopted by the executive board of ILWU. This statement repeats all of the familiar canards about CIO invented by the Communist Party and peddled by the unions it controls. In addition the "statement" instructs the national officers of ILWU—

> to initiate the calling of a national conference of those unions already expelled from CIO or about to be expelled, in order to make appropriate plans and to take all possible constructive steps toward such unions working collectively for their own mutual protection and advantage.

If any doubt had existed, and none did, that ILWU was a Communist-line, Communist-controlled organization, this "statement" would have removed the doubt. The ILWU leadership has made its own choice between the CIO and the Communist Party, and has chosen the Communist Party.

## CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated, and on the basis of all the evidence presented to it, the committee unanimously concludes that the policies of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program and the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the CIO constitution. The committee therefore recommends that the executive board exercise the powers granted to it by article VI, section 10 of the constitution, and, by virtue of those powers, that it revoke the certificate of affiliation heretofore granted to the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union and expel it from the CIO.

Respectfully submitted.

O. A. KNIGHT, *Chairman.*
JOSEPH FISHER.
JACK MORAN.

# REPORT OF EXECUTIVE BOARD COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY PRESIDENT MURRAY TO INVESTIGATE CHARGES AGAINST THE NATIONAL UNION OF MARINE COOKS AND STEWARDS

## INTRODUCTION

On November 5, 1949, William Steinberg, president of the American Radio Association, and a member of the CIO executive board, charged that the policies and activities of the National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards (MCS) are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program or the purpose of the Communist Party rather than the objectives set forth in the constitution of the CIO. The charges were received by the executive board, and it authorized the president to appoint a committee or committees of executive-board members to conduct hearings and to report back to the board. President Murray initially designated O. A. Knight, Joseph A. Fisher, and James E. Fadling as a committee to conduct hearings with respect to the charges against the MCS. Notice was duly given to the MCS of the existence of the charges and of the appointment of the committee.

Thereafter, James E. Fadling notified President Murray that he would be unable to serve on the committee, and President Murray designated J. J. Moran as a member of the committee in Mr. Fadling's place. MCS was notified of this substitution.

On April 18, 1950, O. A. Knight, as chairman, notified MCS that the hearing would begin on May 22, 1950.

The committee as constituted of O. A. Knight, chairman; of Joseph A. Fisher and J. J. Moran held hearings in Washington on May 22 and 23, 1950.

At these hearings William Steinberg, the charging party; Everett Kassalow, the CIO's associate director of research, and George Weaver, an assistant to CIO Secretary-Treasurer James Carey, appeared. Mr. Steinberg gave an introductory statement in which he stated the basis for the charge. Mr. Kassalow presented detailed analyses of the policies of the Communist Party and of the MCS, supported by documentary material. Mr. Weaver testified as to positions taken on certain issues at CIO executive-board meetings by Mr. Hugh Bryson, president of MCS and its representative on the CIO executive board.

On behalf of MCS, Hugh Bryson, president; Eddie Tangen, secretary-treasurer; Paul G. Pinsky, research director; William Glazier, Washington representative; C. C. Johanson, New York port agent, and some 15 or 20 rank and file members appeared. MCS was given full opportunity to present oral testimony and written documents, statements or exhibits, and it availed itself of this opportunity. In addition, MCS was given permission to submit a reply brief subsequent to the close of the hearings, and it did so.

The committee has considered carefully both the testimony and the documentary material submitted at the hearings and the reply brief filed by MCS subsequent to the conclusion of the hearing. On the basis of this consideration, the committee finds as follows:

## FINDINGS

### *I. Policies of the Communist Party*

Since the charge against the MCS is that it pursues the program and the purposes of the Communist Party, the committee was required to scrutinize

the policies of the Communist Party. The evidence submitted to the committee on this subject was in large part identical with that submitted to the same committee members at the hearings on the charges against the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union. The committee therefore adopts, and repeats here the findings as to the program and the purposes of the Communist Party contained in the report of the committee on the ILWU. The policies of the Communist Party in the United States, from the time of the formation of the CIO to the present, can be divided into five different periods, each corresponding to a particular phase in the international relations of the Soviet Union.

*Collective security and the popular front.*—The first period extended from 1935, shortly after Hitler's acquisition of power, until the signing of the Russo-German Pact in August 1939.

When Hitler came into power, the Soviet leaders at first expected his immediate collapse. It soon became evident, however, that this expectation was doomed to disappointment. The Soviet Union thereupon devised a new defensive tactic, by which it hoped to contain Hitler. This tactic was the "people's front" policy, announced in 1935 at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International.

Since the Soviet Union was menaced by the Fascist powers—Germany, Italy, and Japan—it wanted the help of the Western Powers and sought to persuade them to enter with it into a system of collective security against aggression. To advance the adoption of such a system of collective security, the Communist Parties in the various countries sought to promote a "people's front" or "popular front" with other groups which, for whatever reasons, supported a program of collective security against the aggression of the Fascist nations.

During this period the Communist Party of the United States supported a policy of collective security and urged that the United States enter into such a system with the Soviet Union. The Communist Party hailed Roosevelt's Chicago speech urging that the aggressors be quarantined. It urged the boycott of German, Japanese, and Italian goods. It favored changing the Neutrality Act to permit the shipment of arms to victims of Fascist attack. In line with the popular-front strategy, the party was friendly to the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

During this period the American Communist Party found that the interest of American labor lay in the elimination of fascism wherever it was found. The party declared that American labor had a stake in the maintenance of free institutions throughout the world, and that it should support a program for the creation of a system of collective security against Fascist aggression and of aid to the victims of such aggression.

*The Russian-German Pact.*—In August 1939, the foreign policy of the Soviet Union abruptly changed. At the very time it purported to be seeking the alliance of England and France against Hitler, the Soviet Union signed a nonaggression pact with him. Hitler was free to attack Poland, and World War II began.

This change of Soviet strategy immediately brought about a violent change in the program of the Communist Party of the United States. The American Communist Party lost interest in the evils of nazism and fascism. The threat to American labor, the party now said, was the "imperialist war." The defense program of the United States was a program fostered by Wall Street. The party sought, through the mechanism of such movements as the Ameri-

can Peace Mobilization and such slogans as "The Yanks are not coming" to capitalize upon the isolationist-pacifist sentiment in the United States and to defeat every measure intended to aid the powers that were opposing Hitler.

*All-out aid to Russia.*—On June 22, 1941, Germany attacked the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union needed help. It was, however unwillingly, fighting on the same side as Great Britain.

A second rapid reversal in the policies of the American Communist Party now took place. The party called for all-out aid to the Soviet Union and to Great Britain. The "imperialist war" was now a "people's war." Roosevelt's program, so lately denounced as warmongering, now became "the people's program of struggle for the defeat of Hitlerism."

The Communist Party rediscovered that labor had a stake in the defeat of fascism throughout the world, and declared that it should direct its energies to all-out production to defeat Hitler. Once more the party denounced the evils of nazism and fascism. Hitler was again a Fascist mad dog.

When the United States entered the war in December 1941, no change in Communist Party policy was needed. The Communist Party's Pearl Harbor had already occurred on June 22, 1941, and the party had favored United States entrance into the war since that time. But the party continued to grind its ax. The United States and Russia did not see eye to eye on military strategy. The Russians wanted the immediate opening of a second front. And so the Communist Party decided that American labor had an interest in this question of military strategy. "It is imperative," Eugene Dennis declared early in 1942, "that the labor movement unitedly, should make its voice heard and its influence felt on * * * such life and death questions as insuring America's participation in the opening of a second front in Europe this spring."

*Tehran.*—The "second front" issue was a symptom of the lack of confidence which the Communist Party felt, during this period, in the genuineness of American-Russian collaboration. These doubts, however, vanished when President Roosevelt met with Premier Stalin at Tehran, and agreement was reached on certain of the problems confronting the two countries. This agreement seemed to the Communist Party leadership to herald a complete change in the relationship between America and the Soviet Union, and therefore, in the party's role in the United States.

There was thus ushered in the period later designated in the party as "Browderism." The party's program of "socialism" was abandoned in favor of the new "progressive" coalition between labor and capital. Henceforth the party's function was not to be "revolutionary" but merely "educational." The Communist Party, accordingly, dissolved itself in January 1944, and the Communist Political Association came into being in its stead.

Earl Browder announced that if J. P. Morgan would join in support of the American-Soviet coalition he would clasp his hand and join with him. The party declared that there was only one yardstick against which all trade-union activities were to be measured, and that was the winning of the war. The party exhausted its superlatives in praise of the wise and courageous leadership of President Roosevelt—the same leadership which it had denounced during the period of Russia's pact with Hitler. The party even advocated national-service legislation, a measure anathema to labor. The party supported most vigorously the no-strike pledge, and urged that it be continued in the postwar period.

In short, during this period the Communist Party was—as it later described itself in an orgy of "Marxist self-criticism"—an opportunist tail to the capitalist class.

*The postwar period.*—With the close of the European war, differences and tensions began to develop between the Soviet Union and the United States. The Soviet Union no longer needed American military assistance, and its ambitions began to conflict at many points with the policies of the United States.

Accordingly, the "American" Communist Party again reversed its field. Taking its lead from an article by the French Communist leader Duclos, it reconstituted itself in June 1945 as the Communist Party and once again asserted its so-called aggressive role in domestic affairs. It no longer supported national-service legislation and stopped talking about continuation of the no-strike pledge after the end of the war.

As the diplomatic conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union has developed and deepened in the postwar period, the hostility of the Communist Party to the policies of the American Government has become clearer and clearer. The postwar Communist policies have included the following specific items:

1. Demand for the withdrawal of American troops from China, and support of the Chinese Communists;
2. A claim that the United States had failed to live up to the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, and a demand that United States foreign policy be based on friendship with the Soviet Union;
3. Opposition to the Truman Doctrine;
4. Opposition to the Marshall plan;
5. Support of Henry Wallace and the Progressive Party in 1948;
6. Opposition to the Atlantic Pact;
7. Support of the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade-Unions and opposition to the CIO- and AFL-sponsored International Confederation of Free Trade Unions;
8. Denunciation of the CIO as a tool of reaction and imperialism; and
9. Support for the UE in its fight with the CIO.

### *II. Policies of the MCS*

In order to ascertain the policies which MCS has followed, the committee has examined the publications and convention proceedings of MCS, and also of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific with which MCS was affiliated. Consideration has also been given to the positions taken by MCS at executive-board meetings.

Materials to reveal the policies of MCS during the years before 1945 were not available in quantity to the committee. MCS did not itself commence the publication of a paper until 1943, and the earliest issues of this paper available to the committee were for 1944, and the file even for that year was very incomplete. The first convention of MCS was not held until July 23, 1945.

To ascertain MCS's policies during the earlier years, the committee has resorted to some extent to the publications and conventions proceedings of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific. It has not, however, been willing to attribute to MCS the resolutions adopted by the federation, unless they were proposed by MCS itself. The committee has likewise been unwilling to attribute to MCS the general policies of the federation's paper, The Voice

of the Federation, but has used only materials in that paper relating specifically to MCS or appearing on the "Official Marine Cooks and Stewards, CIO, Page."

Despite the scarcity of materials for the early years, the committee has been able to secure an adequate picture of the policies which MCS followed. Materials disclosing MCS's position for the latter years are quite abundant.

The committee has compared the polices which MCS has followed over the years with the program and policies followed by the Communist Party of the United States. From this examination, the committee finds that the policies and activities of MCS have followed and continue to follow exactly, without deviation, the policies of the Communist Party. Each of the four major shifts in Communist policy has been followed by MCS. At no time during the 12-year period since 1938 has there been one single instance of MCS's deviating in any substantial degree from the line of the Communist Party.

1. During the collective-security or "popular front" period, MCS supported the policy of containing the Fascist aggressors. At the June 1939 convention of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, MCS submitted, and the convention adopted, a resolution calling for an International Workers Conference "to discuss ways and means of halting the Fascist aggressors." The resolution declared that a "positive" peace policy on the part of the democracies would have prevented recent wars; that "only by keeping war out of the world can we keep America out of war"; that the French GCL had proposed an International Workers Conference to deal with Fascist aggression; and that such a plea had been made by the Spanish trade-unions before fascism broke them. This resolution had previously been adopted by an MCS headquarters in San Francisco.

2. When the Soviet Union signed its pact with Hitler, and World War II began in August and September 1939, MCS, like the Communist Party, changed its tune. MCS called no longer for a program to stop the Fascist aggressors. Instead it promptly adopted a resolution that "America should stay out of the imperialist war."

In June 1940, MCS adopted, and supported at the Maritime Federation Convention, a typically Communist-line resolution condemning the war and asserting that "The Yanks are not coming!" The resolution asserted that the war in Europe—

> is not a war for the advancement of democracy in any part of the world, but a war whose sole purpose is the further enrichment of the few who would gain new and profitable economic positions from such a war.

It declared that the war aims of the allies were exposed as "mercenary" by such undemocratic actions as England's refusal to grant independence to the Irish and Indian people, and France's intensive drive against the civil liberties of the French people. This resolution was adopted by the federation approximately 1 week before the fall of France.

The MCS page in the October 5, 1940, Voice of the Federation supported the American Peace Mobilization. It also reported that the regular MCS headquarters meeting had endorsed the People's World, which is the west-coast edition of the Daily Worker, and had elected a committee to assist the People's World in its sustaining-fund drive. The same page also carried a statement by Hugh Bryson demanding the repeal of the draft law. The MCS page in the October 26, 1940, Voice continued the attack on the draft

law. It declared that conscription was not for the purpose of defending the United States:

> It is for the regimentation of the working people, and without a doubt they will be sent out of the country for aggressive purposes and not for defense of our Nation.

The MCS page denounced Sidney Hillman for his role on the War Resources Board.

As late as June 4, 1941, MCS was still screaming for American neutrality in the "imperialist war." It submitted a resolution to the federation convention, which was adopted by the convention on that date, condemning convoys. The resolution recited that:

> Unions affiliated to the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, the Marine Cooks and Stewards in particular, have characterized the present war as an imperialist war in which the spoils of the victor will be the oppressed people of India, China, Egypt, etc.

During this period MCS was hostile to President Roosevelt and his policies.

3. On June 22, 1941, Germany attacked Russia. The views of MCS with regard to the war, like those of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party, underwent a prompt and violent change. On July 3, 1941, the headquarters local of MCS adopted a resolution calling for all support to Russia and Great Britain in their fight against fascism. The resolution declared that the people of the U. S. S. R. who "were engaged in peaceful labor for the building of their property and their country and who followed a genuine peace policy" had been attacked by Germany, and that the defense of the Soviet Union "constitutes a defense of the people of the United States and all other peace-loving people of the world." The resolution expressed sympathy for the Soviet and English people, and urged the extension of all possible aid to the Soviet Union and the people of Great Britain.

About this time the Voice of the Federation ceased publicaton. Documentary evidence as to the policies followed by MCS is accordingly very sketchy from the summer of 1941 until 1944. MCS started publishing its own paper, also called Voice, in 1943, but no issues before those for 1944 were available to the committee.

During this period there was, however, no change in the position of the Communist Party except for its intensified support of the American war effort after the Tehran agreement in December 1943.

4. The first issue of Voice available to the committee is that for February 25, 1944. It contains a front-page editorial by Burke and Bryson hailing the Tehran agreement and endorsing President Roosevelt for a fourth term, and a column by Frank McCormick, MCS agent, New Orleans branch, hailing Tehran as—

> the most hopeful and promising light ever held up to mankind, since the advent of Christ. * * * The political, economic, and social outcome is breathtaking in its possibilities.

He averred that the postwar world would for the first time "be a world based on business and economic collaboration between a capitalist and a socialized world." McCormick, who acknowledged that he had been critical of free enterprise in former columns, now asserted that "the genuine brand of free enterprise" was the only means of carrying out the American way of life. He looked forward to cooperation and planning between labor and management.

In June 1944 Hugh Bryson looked forward—

> to a postwar world where strife and chaos won't necessarily exist either.

> * * * And the program is the one reached at Tehran—that is, full cooperation with all the people all over the world for a better life.

Bryson declared that the Tehran agreement was like a union contract. "It has to have full support by the people in order to make it effective."

Thus to MCS, as in the Communist Party, the supposed solution at Tehran of American-Soviet issues meant a new golden age in the relations between capital and labor in the United States.

5. As has been seen, and as is common knowledge, the policies of the Soviet Union and of the United States began to diverge in numerous particulars shortly after the end of the war—a divergence which led gradually to the extremely strained relations which now exist between the two countries. On each of a dozen or more issues which have separated the United States and the Soviet Union, MCS has stood with the Soviet Union and the Communist Party against the United States. Never has MCS criticized the Soviet Union or taken a position at variance with the position of the Communist Party. Never has MCS sided with the United States against Russia.

In August of 1945, the MCS convention adopted a resolution condemning British imperialism in Greece. The convention likewise once more took up the cry for self-government for India—an issue with which MCS had shown no concern since Germany attacked Russia. The convention condemned the Chinese Nationalists for fighting the Communists and demanded "unification of all Chinese democratic forces in the fight against Japan." The convention also called for cementing of the unity between the United States and Soviet Russia by "collaboration of labor leaders, and exchanges of scientific discoveries" and it condemned attempts of big business to split this unity "with their imperialist plans."

In November 1945 the San Francisco headquarters local of MCS adopted a resolution demanding the withdrawal of American troops from China. In the language of this resolution, the Nationalist troops were now "Fascist Chinese forces" while the Communists represented "the democratic desire of the Chinese people." In December 1945 the MCS Voice, like the Communist Party, coupled its demand for the GI's return with a call for the evacuation of American troops from China. It accused the United States of waging an undemocratic war on the Chinese people.

In March 1946 Voice defended Russia's looting of Manchuria, and sought to pass off Russian intervention in Iran as a "British-Iranian gang-up on Russia." Voice declared that the reason for these charges against Russia was that—

> Russia has stood for a policy that would limit British and American imperialists' profits, would end oppression of subject peoples, and strengthen the American labor movement to fight for a larger share of the Nation's wealth for the workers.

It asserted that—

> Progressive American trade unionists see a strong ally in the Soviet Union toward helping to raise living standards of workers of all nations together.

The May 1946 Voice declared that the Truman administration was backing Chiang Kai-shek against—

> the Communists and other Chinese peoples' forces. * * * The Truman administration is backing big business, which fears that if peoples' groups are not checked, there will be drives for higher wages and independence to threaten profits of American business interests abroad * * *.

When Wallace was dropped from the Cabinet, MCS sided with Wallace.

Its national office issued a release declaring that Truman and Byrnes "are trying to control our foreign policy to build the profits of big business throughout the world."

When President Truman proposed his plan for aid to Greece and Turkey in the Spring of 1947, MCS vigorously opposed it. Voice asserted that the sponsors of the Truman plan hoped that its results would be to weaken the working classes throughout the world. Stories denouncing the Truman plan carried such headlines as "United States drive to rule the world" and "Truman doctrine is strongest antilabor force in the world." Voice declared editorially that—

> United States foreign policy has become the world's major force for squelching progress and robbing the world's working people of their power.

It charged that the United States had forced the expulsion of the Communists from the French Government, and that—

> The French labor movement suffered, since the Communists were the only party to support their demands for wage increases.

MCS likewise opposed the Marshall plan. A December 1947 issue of Voice declared:

> While the Marshall plan has been dressed up to look like a general program to save Europe from starvation, there are many strings attached to the aid offered, which actually tend to keep the people of Europe poorer and even more strongly under the domination of United States big business.

Hugh Bryson, the MCS representative on the CIO executive board, strenuously opposed the resolution which the board adopted in January 1948 supporting the Marshall plan. In December 1948 Voice again revealed that the Marshall plan was—

> being used not to help Europe recover, but instead to advance the profits of big-business men in the Government who drew up and are administering the Marshall plan.

MCS took an active role in support of Henry Wallace's candidacy for President. On December 22, 1947, Hugh Bryson, the president of MCS, and all of the members of its general council signed a petition urging Wallace to run. The letter stated:

> This endorsement of your candidacy by the leadership of this union is a natural result of our union's political program. * * *
> * * * Only an independent political coalition led by a vigorous defender of democracy and fighter for world peace, such as yourself, can beat the bipartisan policies of the two major parties directed against the peoples of the world in the interests of the American trusts and monopolies.

In January 1948 the CIO executive board, over Bryson's protest, adopted a resolution opposing the third party. Bryson announced that MCS officials would nevertheless continue to support the third party. They did.

When the Communists executed their coup in Czechoslovakia, Voice denied that the Communists had seized control and asserted that nothing had happened except that some disloyal members of the coalition government had been dropped.

When the CIO delegation, along with the British and Dutch trade-unionists, walked out of the WFTU because of that organization's subservience to Soviet interests, MCS was indignant. Its general council promptly adopted a resolution reaffirming support of the WFTU and condemning the walkout of the CIO delegation. In 1949, when the CIO executive board formally

withdrew from WFTU, Bryson voted against the withdrawal, and also against the appointment of a delegation to work for the creation of an international free trade-union body.

The point 4 program to aid in the development of backward areas likewise met the condemnation of MCS. Voice declared that the purpose of point 4 was to enable big business to seek new profits outside the United States.

In May 1949 when the Republican-Dixiecrat coalition defeated the administration's attempts to supplant the Taft-Hartley Act with the Thomas-Lesinski bill, MCS joined in peddling the Communist Party lie that the administration had betrayed labor.

MCS opposed the North Atlantic Pact. It declared that the pact could commit the United States to war against the independence movements in the territorial possessions of Britain, France, or other signers of the pact.

### *III. MCS's Defense*

MCS's defense to the charges against it consisted in part of a series of evasions. MCS's representatives at the hearing attacked the charging party, the witnesses, the committee, the hearing. They asserted that the charges were illegal and unfair, that the committee was illegal and unfair, et cetera. This "defense", like MCS's other policies over a period of years, was of Communist origin—it was taken straight from the Daily Worker. In December 1949 that publication carried a series of articles by John Williamson, labor secretary of the Communist Party, on the attitude which the unions charged with subservience to communism ought to take toward the pending hearings. In their "defense" Messrs. Bryson and Tangen carefully followed Williamson's suggestions, and even his language. As the Daily Worker articles had suggested, MCS asserted that its independence was being violated, and that it was being denied the autonomous status guaranteed to it when it went into the CIO. MCS followed the Daily Worker's suggestion that it emphasize its trade-union activities as an answer to the charges.

A prepared statement which was read into the record by MCS as part of its defense consists mainly of an attack upon the CIO and its leadership. This attack repeats all the lies and canards currently being circulated by the Communist Party about the CIO, viz, that the CIO is anti-Negro, pro-Ku Klux Klan, in favor of discrimination, pro-Dixiecrat, anti-Semitic, not militant on wages, for unity with Fascists, against international labor unity, et cetera. The committee confesses that it is at a loss to understand why Bryson and Tangen thought that by parroting these Communist Party lies about CIO they were disproving charges of following the Communist Party line.

In its "defense" MCS charged CIO with splitting the labor movements of Italy and France and of supporting in France "the Force Ouvriere". MCS asserted:

> The sad fact is that CIO has become just a pawn in the hands of the bipartisan coalition, just one among the supporters of the cold war.

MCS went on to assert, still supposedly in its defense, that—

> By pulling out of the WFTU, the CIO has done an immeasurable disservice to the international labor movement.

MCS then read into the record various WFTU documents defending its position and criticizing the CIO and the British TUC. MCS concluded this section of its defense by stating:

> We agree.

Indeed, it was a most curious defense which MCS put forth. Had the case against MCS not been proved already, any deficiency would have been supplied by MCS defense. For in its defense MCS continued to hew as rigidly as ever to the Communist Party line.

## CONCLUSION

The charge upon which this committee was directed to hold hearings and report is that the policies and activities of MCS are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program and purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the constitution of the CIO. On the basis of the evidence before this committee, the committee finds and concludes that this charge is true, and that the policies and activities of MCS have been in the past, and are today, directed toward the achievement of the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives set forth in the constitution of the CIO.

The issue posed by the charge against MCS is whether it is an honest trade union, genuinely devoted to the advancement of the cause of American labor and American democracy, or a union whose policies and activities are determined by the philosophy and the program of the Communist Party. The issue is one of basic loyalty. The purposes of the Communist Party are wholly antithetical to the basic objectives of American industrial unionism. And the question as regards MCS is whether that union is devoted primarily to the CIO on the one hand or to the Communist Party on the other.

On the basis of the evidence which has been submitted to the committee, only one conclusion is possible. MCS has followed the tortuous paths of Communist policy for years. MCS's shifting and contradictory positions cannot possibly have reflected any honest estimation of the interests of its membership. They can only have resulted from subservience to the interests of the Communist Party and the Soviet Union.

For the reasons stated, therefore, and on the basis of all the evidence presented to it, the committee unanimously concludes that the policies and activities of the National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program and the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the CIO constitution. The committee recommends that the executive board exercise the powers granted to it by article VI, section 10, of the CIO constitution and, by virtue of those powers revoke the certificate of affiliation heretofore granted to the National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards and expel it from the CIO.

Respectfully submitted.

O. A. KNIGHT, *Chairman.*
JOSEPH FISHER.
JACK MORAN.