Looking back at things past.

IWOC member Malik Washington writes about fallen feminist heroes, while two FWs give reviews of a book on the Pinochet era and a film on the Bisbee Deportation.


IWW’s have a history of showing everyone that losing doesn’t mean giving in. The first piece is a statement from the past, while the second sets the stage for showing what “losing” can look like.

IW’s next issue is the Fall “In November We Remember” issue. Please get your articles about and photographs of your remembrances in to iw@iww.org before October 1, 2018. If you want to place an ad about someone you remember, get information about sizes and prices for ads by sending an email to iw@iww.org with “Ad for November issue” in the Subject line. Ads are due no later than October 5, 2018.
A feminist always!

By Keith “Malik” Washington

Revolutionary Greetings Comrades! I m 6’4” 240lbs—I am a devout Muslim and anti-imperialist who embraces ecosocialism. I am a close comrade and friend to many anarchists and anti-fascists. Could I be a feminist? Well, yes! In fact, I AM A Feminist!! It did not happen overnight; first I had to come to the understanding that a womyn was more than her physical attributes, I had to force myself to look her in the eye when I spoke to her and sometimes still find that difficult. Then I had to come to the realization that a womyn’s intellect was just as sharp if not sharper than any man’s.

Then I embraced the reality that from a revolutionary perspective, a womyn could stand shoulder to shoulder with me, armed with an AK-47 or carrying a mega-phone/microphone leading the masses in battle. Sometimes the “battle” may be political or ideological and at times the battle may be a military confrontation in a urban concrete jungle or in a foreign land where the imperialist oppression has decided to set up shop. Don’t underestimate winmin!!

As a racially mixed humyn being, living in Amerikkka and trapped in one of the many Amerikan gulags and slave kamps, I know how it feels to have your voice silenced. I know how it feels to be abused and when you cry out for help to be ignored. I know that feeling. That is why I began a #metoo project inside Texas prisons. I have discovered that there thousands of poor Black, Latina, and white winmin in Texas who have been thrown away by the state of Texas!

Many sit in the comfort of their living rooms and watch the TV program, Orange in America, and know that Marielle vigorously opposed police brutality. In fact, Marielle was elected to city council, and she campaigned against police brutality. In fact, Marielle was an expert on police violence. There are very few people who can do that.

Recently, a beautiful, intelligent, and passionate warrior of the people’s internationalist volunteer named Anna Campbell was killed in Syria. Anna was fighting alongside her comrades, who are a part of the Women’s Protection Units (YPJ) in defense of Afrin.

Anna was killed by Turkish forces. Anna was a dedicated feminist, a social justice and environmental campaigner known to members for her activism around the student occupation movement, ecological and community outreach projects in the United Kingdom, specifically Bristol and Sheffield. Anna was a key organizer in the IW W’s IWOC group, and also involved with the Empty Cages Collective, Smash IPP, and Bristol ABC.

If any of you know anything about me then you will understand why I am honoring this dedicated Servant of the People. And if you consider yourself a feminist then it should not be hard for you to share this brief essay and take moment to reflect and meditate on the life, death, and revolutionary work of Anna. More of us should aspire to be like her! You won’t be reading about Anna’s life in The New York Times, Cosmostropic, or The Wall Street Journal.

The next feminist warrior I will honor here is Brazilian politician and activist named Marielle Franco. On March 14, 2018, Marielle was murdered with her driver in Rio de Janeiro. Marielle had just spoken at an event aimed at empowering black winmin. In 2016, Marielle was elected to city council, and she campaigned against police brutality. In fact, Marielle was an expert on police violence. Marielle Franco was not just murdered—she was assassinated! You must understand and know that Marielle vigorously opposed...
and strongly criticized acting Brazilian President Temer’s military and federal police takeover of security in Rio’s slums also known as “favelas.” Marielle had recently been chosen to be the speaker of the commission which is examining the deployment of federal security forces into Rio’s favelas.

Marielle had a sister that she left behind named Anielle, and she said: “I’m seeking justice with blood in my eyes.” A banner at a mass protest in Rio on March 21st read: “Woman, Mother, Revolutionary, Feminist, Black Lesbian, Fighter Always.” This is how Marielle Franco will be remembered!!

I must tell you that tens of thousands of people in Rio de Janeiro and other cities across Brazil demonstrated in the days following Marielle’s killing. They demanded answers and got none.

This is becoming a pattern that we are seeing all over the world. Fascism is becoming the status quo and norm. When freedom fighters and servants of the people come on the scene and start to speak Truth to Power and challenge the oppressive practices and policies, these valiant fighters become marked for death or imprisonment. Trump and his US Attorney General, Jeff Sessions, are laying the groundwork for similar campaigns of repression, right here on the streets in Amerika where people of all genders and races are challenging the Trump’s Administration’s bigoted and racist immigration policy.

A long time ago, when I was a young man, my mother told me, “You know Malik, the hand that rocks the cradle, rules the world.” Back then, I didn’t have a clue what the hell she was talking about. However, today as I observe this arrogant buffoon in the White House and how he flaunts his power in such away that shows us what he is all about, I see “rude awakening” coming in November 2018, for him and all his cronies, both the complicit wimmin and males!!

So wimmin in Amerika most certainly have the power to change the political landscape in Amerika and possibly even the world, but the question that keeps me and many others dedicated revolutionaries awake at night is—“Will they give socialism a chance?” Or will they be fooled once again by the false purveyor of “hope and change?” Only time will tell.

Dare to struggle, dare to win, All power to the people!!

Keith “Malik” Washington is co-founder and chief spokesperson for the End Prison Slavery in Texas Movement, a proud member of the Incarcerated Workers Organizing Committee (IWOC), an activist in the Fight Toxic Prisons campaign and deputy chairman of the New Afrikan Black Panther Party Prison Chapter. Read Malik’s work at ComradeMalik.com. Send our brother some love and light: Keith “Malik” Washington, 1487958, McConnell Unit, 3001 South Emily Drive, Beeville, TX 78102.

A tsunami of atrocities

Book Review1 of The Pinochet File: A Declassified Dossier on Atrocity and Accountability, by Peter Kornbluh

By Raymond S. Solomon

American diplomat and historian of American reaction—and inaction—to twentieth-century genocides, Samantha Power,2 confirms the hellish U.S. policy towards Chile that Peter Kornbluh exposed in The Pinochet File: A Declassified Dossier on Atrocity and Accountability. Power says, “The smoking guns are all here.”

The heavily redacted government files, spread throughout the book, and the text with documentation, show the Nixon–Kissinger-sponsored subversion went as far back as 1970 and culminated in the U.S.-assisted September 11, 1973 Chilean coup. The coup overturned the moderately left-wing government of Salvador Allende, and it was accompanied by a tsunami of atrocities. As many as 3,200 people in Chile may have been executed from 1973 through 1990, when the junta rule ended.

The 1973 Chilean coup and the junta are of special concern to members of the Industrial Workers of the World. One of the four Americans killed by the junta was IWW member Frank Teruggi.3 Kornbluh, in describing the situation surrounding the murders of two young Americans, says:

The embassy never informed the family that the Chilean military seemed to have ready intelligence on Horman and Teruggi’s leftist activities, and that U.S. officials had failed to pursue the question of how, and from where, the regime had obtained such information.

The Costa-Gavras film Missing4 is set in an unidentified Latin American country, which is in reality Chile. It stars Jack Lemmon as Ed Horman, Charles Horman’s father; Sissy Spacek as Beth Horman (the character’s name; the actual woman was named Joyce Horman), Charles Horman’s wife; and John Shea as Charles (“Charlie”) Horman. The plot concerns the murder of Charles Horman, who was living in Chile and was interested in Salvador Allende’s reforms and the social developments, spearheaded by this first-elected Marxist government in Latin America. [Wikipedia notes that, “As a teenager, Allende’s main intellectual and political influence came from the shoemaker Juan De Marchi, an Italian-born anarchist.”]

Missing implies that Charlie Horman “knew too much.” Additionally, Missing implies US diplomatic complicity in his death. The movie’s storyline shows American diplomatic attempts at covering up what happened. Horman’s father goes to Chile to try to find and rescue his son. Diplomats know Charles Horman was killed and mislead Ed Horman, taking him to the Chilean National Stadium, where political prisoners are being held. Ed Horman calls for his son. A young Chilean prisoner shouts that his father can’t come there to retrieve him.

Later in Missing, United States diplomatic personnel are callous towards Ed Horman. A diplomat explains to him that United States prosperity depends on things hidden from North Americans. Doesn’t he want a prosperous United States? Charles Horman, in the film and in reality, is closer to the true American soul than are the diplomats portrayed in Missing.

With some differences, Kornbluh confirms Costa-Gavras’ view. Chapter 5 of Kornbluh’s book, “American Casualties,” begins with a quote bearing on the U.S. diplomatic perspective on American deaths:

In a “Memorandum of conversation between Assistant Secretary of State Jack Kubisch and Junta Foreign Minister Ismael Huerta, February 1974,” it was recorded that:

[The assistant secretary] raised the subject [of murdered Americans] in the context of the need to be careful to keep relatively small issues in our relationship from making our cooperation more difficult.

In Chapter 5’s footnote 3, we see that the real Ed Horman learns an extremely bitter truth regarding his son’s death:

“He was shot in the stadium. I’m sorry. Things like that happen here,” a Chilean officer told Ed Horman on October 19.6

Then there’s Kissinger’s attitude toward freedom vs. dictatorship, related by Howard Zinn:

“When in 1974 the American ambassador to Chile, David Popper, suggested to the Chilean junta . . . that they were violating human rights, he was rebuked by Kissinger, who sent word: “Tell Popper to cut out the political science lectures.””7

The New Press8 published three editions of The Pinochet File. First, a hardcover edition that lacked an index; next a paperback edition with an index; then an updated 2013 edition, for the fortieth anniversary of the 1973 coup.

Peter Kornbluh did a monumental research job. The book deserves a large readership. Your reviewer has given you a glimpse of the book. By reading the book you’ll get a full picture of U.S. participation in what was less than our finest hour.

Notes:


3The article “Killers of Fellow Worker Frank Teruggi Sentenced in Chile,” for which the author uses their IWW membership number instead of a name, was published on page 9 of the April 2015 Industrial Worker.


5Kornbluh did a monumental research job. The book deserves a large readership. Your reviewer has given you a glimpse of the book. By reading the book you’ll get a full picture of U.S. participation in what was less than our finest hour.


8The New Press is a nonprofit publisher dedicated to publishing quality books of social significance. Another great book they published is A Race Against Death: Peter Bergson, America, and the Holocaust by David S. Wyman and Rafael Medoff. IW
By X391043

I hope that Robert Greene’s new, powerful documentary will put the Bisbee Deportation back in the national consciousness. Largely ignored even by the residents of Bisbee Arizona, a copper-mining town near the Mexican border, the forced deportation of twelve hundred IWW miners in June 1917 resonates even today. As its 100th anniversary approached, a group of Bisbee residents set out to recreate the day of the deportation. Director Greene has specialized in films that show how actors slide from persona to persona. The anniversary recreation was a grand opportunity for him to show this on a grand scale.

This is not your standard documentary. Greene lets the past live in the present, sometimes literally with the reenactments, sometimes with the subtlety of his choices of whom to film. The viewer is always aware of the camera and crew on the other side of the lens. The documentary’s point of view, while completely sympathetic to the laborers, asks more questions than it gives answers.

Stage center is the young Fernando Serrano, a Mexican resident with little historical connection to the town, but with a history of his own. Fernando plays a miner who only gradually comes to the cause, mainly through the wonderful lyrics of Wobbly songs he often sings quietly to himself. Fernando is a great example of how the film blurs past and present to draw the viewer into not only the story, but also into the people who make up the story. They’re not just characters; they are flesh and blood.

[Another Bisbee resident featured is Laurie McKenna, the artist whose penny rubbings and drawings appeared in Summer 2017’s IW. She provided sources and documents that greatly enhanced the issue. –Ed.]

The majority of the workers who were deported at gunpoint from Bisbee were either Mexican or Slavic immigrants. The vast majority of the people on the other side of the guns were white Anglo-Saxons. It’s not a stretch to apply the heartbreak of Bisbee to the rounding up of the undocumented immigrants of today, or to liken the baby cages for children of people seeking asylum to the cattle cars that took the twelve hundred strikers to the middle of the desert to be dumped—and told if they came back to Bisbee they’d be killed. But Greene’s film leaves it to the viewer to make that connection.

Fernando’s real mother was deported when he was seven and jailed in Mexico until he was 18. He’s made his way in the world alone. On the other hand, Richard Hodges—whose family worked the mine for generations—worked his way up in the mines through the ’50s and ’60s to become a top manager. He chooses to play the mine’s owner and an apologist for what was considered “The Law of Necessity” that allowed Bisbee residents to violently eject not only the strikers themselves but their sympathizers.

There’s lots of talk about the haunted buildings of Bisbee, particularly the old hotel and the courthouse. Although there’s never any spooky music or ethereal recreations, Bisbee itself is seen as haunted. The mines stopped production in 1975, but cliffs of refuse from the digging surround the town. The mineshafts still have to be actively maintained by company men. A miner train to take workers into their subterranean job is still functional. The baseball field where the deportees were gathered is still there and in use. The railroad tracks are gone, but the rail bed still runs boldly from Bisbee to the middle of the desert, just off a four-lane highway. These threads are woven with care into the film’s narrative.

Bisbee ’17 is divided into five chapters, working from background information and character development through to the day of the reenactment. What is exceptional in Greene’s exposition is how he builds the tension from chapter to chapter and moves from good-natured planning by the residents to emotional stress during the reenactment, particularly for people whose own relatives were on one side or the other.

And as the tension builds, the presence of the IWW bursts into a flood of red—signs, booklets, and banners. Red, in fact, is the significant color scheme of the film, and its significance gets to be clear by the end. It’s genuinely heartbreakingly to see the final boarding of residents onto the cattle cars we’ve watched being built during the film. Heartbreaking for us, as well, as the people onscreen were locked into the cars. We’ve seen them live their past, and the years of ignoring that past break like a wave on the rocks of their souls. Greene has made his own living document, and it’s an experience we live together.
By Alan Smithee

You might think working in a movie theater, particularly one in a hip urban environment with many film festivals, would be a dream job. Meeting movie stars, great camaraderie with staff, free movies, many great memories. But it comes at a cost.

Last Saturday, I sat in the New Mission Theater in San Francisco watching *Sorry to Bother You*. The film, directed and written by rap artist Boots Riley, is a surreal critique on the bait-and-switch practices of low-level employers. In the script, the telemarketers work for Regal View. Cassius Green is the protagonist—an unmotivated guy from Oakland. He gets hooked on rising above low-level telemarketing to become a “power caller.” His rise is meteoric after he perfects a “white voice.” Success doesn’t go well for Cassius. He uncovers more than one diabolical motive behind one of Regal View’s main customers. And then, there’s the whole thing with altering people’s genetics. It’s a strong critique on exploited labor.

Alamo Drafthouse owns and runs the New Mission, a tasteful renovation and multiplexing of the largest remaining movie palace in the Mission District of the city that the tech boom is attempting to remake in its own image. Alamo Drafthouse cofounder Tim League, despite starting Alamo in Austin, Texas, represents the worst qualities of the Bay Area gentrification. Just recently, a series of sexual harassment claims against Alamo managers and friends that League and his cofounder wife Karrie have chosen to ignore has lit up headlines in film industry presses and blogs. In spite of Alamo Drafthouse’s Code of Conduct website page that declares “No harassment of any kind,” women who work for the theaters have been groped, grabbed, and harassed, while the customers who have been the perpetrators have been given second, third, fourth, and more chances for reform. But consider this: The chain’s success has been built on faithful employees who are willing to work long hours for low pay because it’s a cool job. And, like the owners of *Sorry to Bother You*’s fictional Regal View, the Leagues built a cult. They took the model from film festivals, where a nonprofit builds its entire success on getting people to work for low wages in terrible conditions alongside unskilled volunteers in order to pay Executive Directors and Development Directors six-figure salaries—just to maybe rub shoulders with a movie star. In fact, in 2005, Tim League and others started Fantastic Fest, now the U.S. premiere festival for horror, fantasy, and sci-fi.

What do you have to do to work as a server at an Alamo Drafthouse? On the most basic level it’s food service, but you can’t stand up. While the screen is lit, servers scurry through expanded aisles between seats hunched over, kneeling, or squatting to take orders in order not to block sightlines. And it’s all in a much darker room than a bar. On employment sites like Glassdoor and Indeed, former Alamo Drafthouse employees paint a pretty grim picture of favoritism, arbitrary rules, wild swings in pay depending on attendance at specific films (and the film festivals that are hosted at Alamo Drafthouse theaters), understaffing, very poor communication from management, and even a doctor’s note being required for a sick day (when very few have health care insurance). But this is often leavened with “I loved that job, but I couldn’t afford to keep it” and “best coworkers I’ve ever had.” This is the state not only of Alamo Drafthouse but also of US film festivals in general. Waiting tables is hard enough, and not a universally lauded career choice, but imagine the physical problems resulting from being bent like a pretzel during most of your shift.

There has been little examination of movie-theater or festival labor practices. I know of some festival workers at Mill Valley Film Festival who... Continues on page 9
Request for Workers’ Stories

From Marion Hersh

I am based in Glasgow, Scotland, and am working with a Polish colleague on a book about ethical issues and behavioral problems related to the research, development, manufacture, and implementation of technology. In particular, control, automation, information, and communication technologies are of interest. Many of our examples relate to the early computer industry in Poland. However, we also want to put together a chapter with case studies from other countries.

I am looking for a range of different things. It could include workers losing their jobs or being down-skilled due to automation, particularly if automation could have been applied differently. Offshore work raises a whole range of issues. It could also include issues associated with bosses behaving unethically around automation, the introduction of technology, or workers having had to make difficult choices, particularly during the McCarthy era, with the rise of automation.

I have worked most of my life in universities, where there is a massive amount of precarious work. We have won some victories, but I am not sure whether it is one step forward and two back, or two forward and one back. When I was younger I did some office work and worked briefly in a shop, but I think then I was more chuffed to be able to earn some money than thinking how I was exploited.

If you would like to know more or think you might have an interesting example/case study, whether relating to the McCarthy period or more recently, then please contact me at marion.hersh@glasgow.ac.uk.

For most people it's not a career choice but temporary employment. You've been told it's a fun job. And it often is. But it's a dead end, even as temporary employment, and it requires self-abasement—just like telemarketing. I'm waiting for a movie to come out about rapacious chain-theater owners and film festival execs who prey on our desire to commune with celebrity.

Please write me with any question or to say, “I'm in. Let's go!” at: quixote2@ix.netcom.com.

Solidarity,
Thomas Adams
Madison, WI

IW
By X384480

On a recent trip to Europe, I had the good fortune of stumbling across the office of CNT Local 1 in Barcelona. While evening was approaching and I was content with just snapping a photo of their office, my wife luckily pushed me to ring their bell. Before I could, two CNT members happened to exit and asked whom I was looking for. I explained that I was a member of the IWW and interested in any English-language literature they might have on hand. They had none, they explained, but were happy to answer whatever questions I had. I suggested grabbing a drink at a nearby bar; they came back with the superior idea of splitting the large bottle of beer they had in tow at the park across the street.

After a couple of drinks and a beer run, they invited us up to the office—which was apparently their headquarters during the Spanish Civil War! Graciously, they introduced my wife and me to their fellow workers, gave us a tour of their office—still bustling though night was descending—and gave us gifts of a commemorative tile, a poster, and stacks of stickers.

We parted ways shortly after—them to a picket line, us to dinner. (It was my honeymoon, after all.) It was one of my fondest experiences on a very memorable trip.

All of that is to say, should any Wobblies find themselves in Barcelona, I wholeheartedly recommend visiting the office of CNT Local 1 at Plaça del Duc de Medinaceli 6. For those who can’t make the trip, consider writing to them at sov@barcelona.cnt.es. They have quite a few English-speaking members, and they are all Fellow Workers through and through.

IW

With solidarity from Barcelona

Another group of Burgerville fast foodworkers join I.W.W.

By Burgerville Workers Union
May 22, 2018

The following report comes from the Burgerville Workers Union, a part of the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW).

82nd and Glisan has joined the union! On May 18th, workers at Burgerville #4 announced to management that they were officially signing up with the BVWU, naming unjust firings, inconsistent scheduling, and low wages as some key concerns.

“Many of us can hardly make rent and other necessities, even while working full time. We have erratic schedules which makes it hard for us to take care of our kids, travel to and from work, and go to school,” workers said in their official announcement today. “We deserve better.”

With two successful union elections in the bag, the BVWU’s wins just keep coming! Welcome to the union, 82nd and Glisan.

Much love and solidarity. IW
The speech that put Eugene V. Debs in prison

In 1918, Eugene V. Debs was tried and convicted under the Sedition Act of 1918. Although he was careful not to tell his listeners to avoid the draft, the government interpreted his meaning—rightly—to be critical of the Great War, which the United States had entered in April of 1917. The government's prosecution claimed that Debs' intent was to encourage disloyalty among Americans by dissuading them from enlisting for service and encouraging resisting service in the war if drafted. Here are some excerpts from Debs' 7,200-word speech to the crowd gathered in Nimisilla Park in Canton, Ohio, on June 16, 1918.

I realize that, in speaking to you this afternoon, there are certain limitations placed upon the right of free speech. I must be exceedingly careful, prudent, as to what I say, and even more careful and prudent as to how I say it. I may not be able to say all I think; but I am not going to say anything that I do not think. I would rather a thousand times be a free soul in jail than to be a sycophant and coward in the streets . . . .

Wars throughout history have been waged for conquest and plunder. In the Middle Ages when the feudal lords who inhabited the castles whose towers may still be seen along the Rhine concluded to enlarge their domains, to increase their power, their prestige and their wealth they declared war upon one another. But they themselves did not go to war any more than the modern feudal lords, the barons of Wall Street go to war. The feudal barons of the Middle Ages, the economic predecessors of the capitalists of our day, declared all wars. And their miserable serfs fought all the battles.

The poor, ignorant serfs had been taught to revere their masters; to believe that when their masters declared war upon one another, it was their patriotic duty to fall upon one another and to cut one another's throats for the profit and glory of the lords and barons who held them in contempt. And that is war in a nutshell. The master class has always declared the wars; the subject class has always fought the battles. The master class has had all to gain and nothing to lose, while the subject class has had nothing to gain and all to lose—especially their lives.

They have always taught and trained you to believe it to be your patriotic duty to go to war and to have yourselves slaughtered at their command. But in all the history of the world you, the people, have never had a voice in declaring war, and strange as it certainly appears, no war by any nation in any age has ever been declared by the people.

And here let me emphasize the fact—and it cannot be repeated too often—that the working class who fight all the battles, the working class who make the supreme sacrifices, the working class who freely shed their blood and furnish the corpses, have never yet had a voice in either declaring war or making peace. It is the ruling class that invariably does both. They alone declare war and they alone make peace.

"Yours not to reason why; "Yours but to do and die."

That is their motto and we object on the part of the awakening workers of this nation.

If war is right let it be declared by the people. You who have your lives to lose, you certainly above all others have the right to decide the momentous issue of war or peace.

First Published: 1918; Source: The Call
One hundred years ago, in the dead of a Massachusetts winter, the great 1912 Lawrence Textile Strike—commonly referred to as the “Bread and Roses” strike—began. Accounts differ as to whether a woman striker actually held a sign that read “We Want Bread and We Want Roses, Too.” No matter. It’s a wonderful phrase, as appropriate for the Lawrence strikers as for any group at any time: the notion that, in addition to the necessities for survival, people should have “a sharing of life’s glories,” as James Oppenheim put it in his poem “Bread and Roses.”

Though 100 years have passed, the Lawrence strike resonates as one of the most important in the history of the United States. Like many labor conflicts of the 19th and early 20th centuries, the strike was marked by obscene disparities in wealth and power, open collusion between the state and business owners, large scale violence against unarmed strikers, and great ingenuity and solidarity on the part of workers. In important ways, though, the strike was also unique. It was the first large-scale industrial strike, the overwhelming majority of the strikers were immigrants, most were women and children, and the strike was guided in large part by the revolutionary strategy and vision of the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW).

Beyond its historical significance, elements of this massive textile strike may be instructive to building a radical working class movement today. It is noteworthy that the Occupy movement shares many philosophical and strategic characteristics with the Lawrence strike—direct action, the prominent role of women, the centrality of class, participatory decision-making, egalitarianism, an authentic belief in the Wobbly principle that We Are All Leaders—to name just a few. During the two months of the strike, the best parts of the revolutionary movement the IWW aspired to build were expressed. The Occupy movement carries that tradition forward, and as the attempt at a general strike in Oakland and solidarity events such as in New York for striking Teamsters indicate, many in Occupy understand that the working class is uniquely positioned to challenge corporate power. While we deepen our understanding of what that means and work to make it happen, there is much of value we can learn from what happened in Lawrence a century ago.

A town on the brink of labor unrest

The city of Lawrence was founded as a one-industry town along the Merrimack River in the 1840s by magnates looking to expand the local textile industry beyond the nearby city of Lowell. Immigrant labor was the bedrock of the city’s development. Early on, French Canadians and Irish predominated. By 1912, when Lawrence was the textile capitol of the United States, its textile workforce was made up primarily of Southern and Eastern Europeans—Poles, Italians and Lithuanians were the largest groups, and there were also significant numbers of Russians, Portuguese, and Armenians. Smaller immigrant communities from beyond Europe had also been established, with Syrians being the largest. Though very small in number, a high percentage of the city’s African-American population also labored in textile.

Mill workers experienced most of the horrors that characterized 19th century industrial labor. Six-day workweeks of 60 hours or more were the norm, workers were regularly killed on the job, and many grew sick and died slowly from breathing in toxic fibers and dust while others were maimed or crippled in the frequent accidents in the mills. Death and disability benefits were virtually nonexistent. Life expectancy for textile workers was far less than other members of the working class and 20 years shorter than the population as a whole. It was a work environment, in short, that poet William Blake captured perfectly with the phrase “these dark Satanic mills.” Living conditions were similarly abominable: unsanitary drinking water, overcrowded apartments, malnutrition and disease were widespread. Thousands of children worked full time and were deprived of schooling and any semblance of childhood because families could not survive on the pay of two adult wage earners. Constituent unions of the American Federation of Labor (AFL) had no interest in organizing workers who were immigrants, “unskilled,” and overwhelmingly women and children. The local of the United Textile Workers (UTW) had a small number of members drawn, true to the AFL’s creed, exclusively from the higher-skilled, higher-paid segment of the workforce.

The IWW was also in Lawrence. The Wobblies led several job actions in 1911 and its radical philosophy resonated with mill hands far beyond the several hundred who were members. Faced with lives of squalor and brutally difficult work, despised by their employers, the political sub-class, the press, and mainstream labor, textile workers, once introduced to the IWW, came increasingly to see that militant direct action was both viable and necessary. Many had experience with militant working class traditions in their native lands—experience the IWW, in contrast to the AFL, not only respected but cultivated. Though there was an undeniable spontaneity to the Lawrence
hundred (and six) years on

strike, the revolutionary seeds the IWW planted in the years before 1912 were also a catalyst.

**Workers walk out on strike**

The spark was lit on Jan. 11, 1912, the first payday since a law reducing the maximum hours per week from 56 to 54 went into effect on Jan. 1. Because mill owners speeded up the line to make up the difference, workers expected their pay would remain the same. Upon discovering that their pay had been reduced, a group of Polish women employed at the Everett Cotton Mill walked off the job. By the following morning, half of the city’s 30,000 mill hands were on strike. On Monday, Jan. 15, 20,000 workers were out on the picket line. Soon, every mill in town was closed and the number of strikers had swelled to 25,000, including virtually all of the less-skilled workers. The owners, contemptuous of the ability of uneducated, immigrant workers to do for themselves, did not bother to recruit scabs, certain they would prevail quickly. By the time they realized they had a fight on their hands, the strikers were so well-organized that importing scabs was a far more difficult proposition.

Several days after the strike began, workers in Lawrence contacted the IWW’s national office for assistance, and Joe Ettor and Arturo Giovannitti were dispatched from New York to help organize the strike. Though Ettor would spend most of the two-month strike as well as the rest of 1912 in a Lawrence prison, the work he did in the strike’s early days was indispensable to victory. Radiating confidence and optimism, Smilin’ Joe had the workers form nationality committees for every ethnic group in the workforce. The strike committee consisted of elected reps from each group, and meetings, printed strike updates and speeches were thereafter translated into all of the major languages.

In addition to the democratic nuts and bolts, Ettor brought an unshakable belief in the workers to the strike. The IWW had a faith in the working class that is markedly different from the often self-serving proclamations of union organizers of today who are mostly out to build their organizations. In contrast to the all too common practice of organizers “taking charge,” Ettor displayed a fundamental belief in the ability of workers to do for themselves. He, Giovannitti, and, later, Bill Haywood and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, made every aspect of the strike a learning experience. As the strikers worked to achieve greater power in the short term by winning their demands, many came to see that the society could not function without workers and that there was no job or task that was beyond the collective skill of the working class.

Ettor, Haywood, and Flynn also provided a vision of workers managing society, underscoring that it was an achievable goal. Without ever downplaying the particularities of the strike or of the strikers’ lives, they boldly proclaimed their opposition to the capitalist system and encouraged the Lawrence workers to explore what that meant. In practice, the vision of a new world played out in the decision-making process, the support services the strikers established with the help of contributions from around the country (soup kitchens, food and fuel banks, medical clinics, free winter clothing and blankets) and in direct action on picket lines, in the courts, during the strike’s many rallies and parades, and in the IWW’s insistence that all negotiating be done directly by rank and files.

Perhaps the most important of the IWW’s contributions was its incessant emphasis on solidarity. The only way to victory, they emphasized, was unity and the only way to unity was to respect the language and culture of each nationality group. Ettor, Haywood and the other Wobblies understood that solidarity did not mean dissolving differences; it meant enriching the experience of all by creating space for each to participate in their own way. They encouraged the workers to view each other that way and emphasized again and again that the only people in Lawrence who were foreigners were the mill owners (none of whom lived in town). With each passing day, the strikers’ solidarity increased. They came to understand that solidarity was not just the only way they could win the strike; it was also the only way to build a better world.

So inspired, the strikers rose to every challenge. They circumvented injunctions against plant-gate picketing with roaming lines of thousands that flowed through Lawrence’s streets and turned away would-be scabs. After early incidents where some scabs were attacked, they embraced Ettor’s emphasis on nonviolent direct action without ever diminishing their militancy. When Massachusetts Governor Eugene Foss—himself a mill owner—pleaded with them to return to work and accept arbitration, the workers refused, recognizing the offer as a ploy that would leave their demands unaddressed. Whenever strikers were arrested (as hundreds were), supporters descended en masse to Lawrence’s courtroom to express their outrage.
The involvement of women was absolutely crucial to victory, beginning with the rejection of the self-destructive violence of some male strikers. Though the IWW’s record on promoting female leadership was spotty at best, Ettor and the other Wobblies in Lawrence were sensible enough to let the women’s initiative fly free. The presence of Flynn, the “Rebel Girl,” was a factor, but the large-scale participation of women resulted overwhelmingly from the efforts of the women themselves.

State violence was so extreme that it actually reverberated in the strikers’ favor, as there were outcries from around the country over the police killings of a young woman and a 16-year-old boy as well as the large-scale beating of women and children. There were also national howls of outrage when strikers were arrested for “possessing” dynamite in what turned out to be a crude frame (it was later determined that a prominent citizen close to the mill owners had planted it). Similarly, the Stalin-esque jail of Ettor and Giovannitti without bail as “accessories before the act of murder” in the police killing of Annie LoPizzo, was widely criticized and served only to spur the strikers on.

In the end, in the face of the state militia, U.S. Marines, Pinkerton infiltrators and hundreds of local police, the strikers prevailed. They achieved a settlement close to their original demands, including significant pay raises and time-and-a-quarter for overtime, which previously had been paid at the straight hourly rate. Workers in Lowell and New Bedford struck successfully a short while later, and mill owners throughout New England soon granted significant pay raises rather than risk repeats of Lawrence. When the trials of Ettor, Giovannitti and a third defendant commenced in the fall, workers in Lawrence’s mills pulled a work stoppage to show that a miscarriage of justice would not be tolerated. The three were subsequently acquitted.

Longer-term, the strike focused national attention on workplace safety, minimum wage laws and child labor. Though change in these areas was still too slow in coming, it did come and it came much sooner because of Lawrence. Locally, patriotic forces campaigned vigorously against “outside agitators” in the years after the strike and IWW membership eventually slid back to pre-strike levels. Still, despite tremendous repression, the IWW maintained a solid local chapter in Lawrence until the state effectively destroyed the organization with a massive campaign of jailings, deportations, lynchings and other violence after U.S. entry into World War I.

However, just as it was never the IWW’s objective to gain official recognition from employers, its accomplishments should not be measured by its membership rolls or the limited span of its organizational presence. The goal was to build a revolutionary movement of the working class and the Wobblies implemented the strategy for achieving that end in Lawrence. This is not to say the IWW was without weaknesses in building lasting organization; it was and there are lessons for Occupy and all future movements to learn from those weaknesses. However, the IWW’s weaknesses are ones that virtually every radical group from the Knights of Labor to the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) share. These weaknesses speak more to the difficulty of building a revolutionary movement than to specific organizational flaws. The fact that the Wobblies were not able to sustain the great work they did over a longer period does not detract from the thoroughgoing way they imbued the Bread and Roses strike with revolutionary values, strategy and vision.

Lessons from the Strike

There are several aspects of the Lawrence strike that may be helpful to building a radical working class movement today. One is the symbiotic relationship between the strikers and the IWW. Since at least the bureaucratization of the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) 70 years ago, unions have approached organizing workers with the goal of building membership rolls, as opposed to building working-class power. The type of organization workers may want, not to mention what they may
want beyond organization, has been largely irrelevant. The choices that workers are presented with are quite limited: join one or another top-down union, or else fight on alone. The best features of pre-union formations—direct democracy, easy recall of representatives, requirements that all officers remain in the workplace, widespread rank-and-file initiatives, and so forth—are almost always killed quickly after affiliation. Workers will reject top-down approaches and embrace unionism that speaks to their needs if they are given the chance. The fact that they are not presented such an option is neither accidental nor inevitable; it is because the union bureaucracy is as threatened by an independent rank and file as any employer.

Workers are not even really free to join the union of their choosing. Once an exclusive bargaining representative is chosen, no matter how that’s determined, the affected workers cannot join any other labor organization, often at the risk of expulsion and loss of employment. The IWW, rather than seeking to ensure itself a steady flow of dues revenue, sought to challenge capitalism. Through direct action, particularly strikes, the working class would learn how to fight capital and in so doing would discover and develop its own potential until it was strong enough to wrest control of work away on a massive scale. That goal remains. To build such a movement today and on into the future, we will either have to do away with many of organized labor’s entrenched ways or increasingly circumvent mainstream unions altogether, much as is happening so far with Occupy.

The flip side of the IWW/striker relationship in Lawrence is that the workers did not strike to gain unionization or even to win the strike without addressing any of their demands, for example, the workers refused. Their distrust extended not just to the owners but to the machinery of the state, not to mention the top-down UTW—whose head attacked them relentlessly throughout and whose members scabbled from the outset. The strikers embraced the IWW philosophy of doing for themselves while utilizing its highly developed solidarity network because their experience showed them it was the only way they could win.

A second possible lesson from Lawrence is that the IWW is a feminist approach to organizing. Though the IWW too often adopted an approach premised on rugged (male) individualism that relegated women to secondary roles, that was not the case in Lawrence. Rather, its radical approach encouraged women strikers and supporters to act in highly creative ways. Whenever women workers in Lawrence struggled with the men for full participation, Flynn and the other Wobblies sided with them. It is impossible to imagine the strikers winning otherwise, and though Ettor, Haywood, and Flynn’s efforts on this score were not insignificant, it was the tireless work of thousands of rank and file members that made the strike decisive.

The degree to which women took to heart Ettor’s declarations that striker violence would inevitably boomerang and that the state to reciprocate, certainly not as the strike progressed and state violence escalated, nor did it necessarily mean that an absolute principle of nonviolence was appropriate in all situations. In Lawrence, however, it was clear early on that the strikers would lose if the physical confrontations that have been so prominent in the almost apocalyptic vision that many men through history have brought to the class struggle continued. The women, more than the men, understood that the complete withdrawal of their labor was the strongest blow the workers could strike. In the end, it was the ability to keep the mills almost completely non-functional for two months that won the strike.

Women were also at the heart of the singing and parading that characterized the Bread and Roses strike. Surrounded by enemies, with death a very real possibility, the Lawrence strikers, the women most of all (much like the black liberation activists in the Deep South in the early 1960s, also mostly women), sang to foster strength, courage and solidarity. Their songs and that tradition echo as loud and true as a drum circle through Occupy.

Lastly, Lawrence was the first major strike along industrial lines. Not only did the strike reverberate throughout textile mills, it made real the IWW goal of organizing wall-to-wall. The violent suppression of the IWW forestalled capital’s day of reckoning, but the seed had been planted. When industrial organizing exploded two decades later, it was thoroughly Wobbly-esque, especially in the sit-down strike with its explicit challenge to private ownership.

Again, the degree to which Occupy implicitly understands the importance of such approaches is one of its great strengths. The massive withdrawal of labor, the large scale Occupation of workplaces—these are lessons of Lawrence, direct and indirect, that Occupy (as well as movements of the future) can build on and go deeper. In so doing, we can perhaps begin to create a world where everyone has both sufficient bread to eat and “life’s glories” as vivid as the reddest roses.

Much has been written about the Lawrence strike. Here are just a few of the better accounts:

* Rebel Voices: An IWW Anthology, edited by Joyce Kornbluh*

* The Rising of the Women, by Meredith Tax*

* The Bread and Roses Strike of 1912, by Julie Baker*

* Bread & Roses, by Bruce Watson*

Andy Piascik is a long-time activist and award-winning author whose most recent book is the novel In Motion. He can be reached at andypiascik@yahoo.com.
Why the IWW is not Patriotic to the United States

Because of their opposition to World War I, members of the Industrial Workers of the World were put on trial for violating the Espionage Act of 1917. The following is the statement of one member to the court.

You ask me why the I.W.W. is not patriotic to the United States. If you were a bum without a blanket; if you had left your wife and kids when you went west for a job, and had never located them since; if your job had never kept you long enough in a place to qualify you to vote; if you slept in a lousy, sour bunkhouse, and ate food just as rotten as they could give you and get by with it; if deputy sheriffs shot your cooking cans full of holes and spilled your grub on the ground; if your wages were lowered on you when the bosses thought they had you down; if there was one law for Ford, Suhr, and Mooney, and another for Harry Thaw; if every person who represented law and order and the nation beat you up, railroaded you to jail, and the good Christian people cheered and told them to go to it, how in hell do you expect a man to be patriotic?

This war is a business man's war and we don't see why we should go out and get shot in order to save the lovely state of affairs that we now enjoy.

—Anonymous, 1918

https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Why_the_IWW_Is_Not_Patriotic_to_the_United_States;
By Andrew Miller, x379583  
Treasurer, Central Ohio IWW GMB

The June AFSCME v Janus decision by the Supreme Court of the United States was by no means a deathblow to unions, but you’d never know it based on the howls coming from the paid staff of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME AFL-CIO) and the Ohio Civil Service Employees Association (OCSEA).

I’m a state worker in Ohio, one of the few states where workers managed to fight back and win when a state-level Right-to-Work law passed but was then overwhelmingly struck down by voters. That victory was sweet given what happened to fellow workers in Wisconsin that same year. Unfortunately, resting on that victory seemed to provide little incentive to take the Janus case as seriously as it should have within these trade unions.

To anyone reading this in Industrial Worker today, you know how important solidarity is in organizing, which is why we’re for the One Big Union. By necessity of my position, I am a dual cardholder. The one that rests in my pocket is my AFSCME/OCSEA Local 11 card; the one that rests in my heart is my Red Card.

The next three-year contract for my state worker union was ratified just a month ahead of the Janus decision being released. Shortsightedly, and perhaps selfishly, I’m thankful that it happened this way. I’m pretty certain that the union bosses (such an oxymoron) are thankful as well since they are steadfastly against the direct action that represents real worker power.

Leading up to, and in the wake of, the Janus decision, both AFSCME and OCSEA have been prompting conversations to take place between union members and the nonunion, bargaining-unit employees commonly referred to as “fair-share” members. The point being that these are individuals who will no longer be required to pay into the union unless they choose to become dues-paying members. What is the change then? Well, the amount of money available to AFSCME and OCSEA will decrease.

As long as we live under capitalism, we have no choice but to recognize that money is important to organizing. On the Janus side of the equation were billionaires propping up the Right to Work Foundation, and the money that helped elect the majority neoliberal conservatives (both Republican and Democrat) ultimately led to a SCOTUS willing to side with Janus. Within my own IWW branch in Central Ohio, we are struggling to fully support a couple of organizing campaigns currently underway with limited resources. What we lack in financial resources however, we make up for in comradery—being united in ideology, being in union with one another—that is what makes our solidarity unionism so special.

Bulletins and flyers being put out by my trade unions present a bleak picture of lost membership due to Janus. What members, though? The losses are a financial setback, not a membership setback. Ultimately by signing away the right to strike, the right to work slowdowns, etc. during the process of negotiating contracts is what left workers answering to a union boss as much as they have to answer to the employers.

This is what we saw with the West Virginia Teachers Strike. Union bosses trying to negotiate had nothing to threaten the employers with; instead they trotted out baby carrots hung from a miserable contract to convince the teachers they have to work. One boss is as good as another, seemed to be the underlying statement. As we all know though, the teachers were through with bosses and took up the model of solidarity. They used the power of the worker united. For that is all that a union is. Campaigns, organizing, flyers, contracts, etc. is all subordinate to the united workforce.

What then does this dual-cardholder think of Janus? I think that if there was a deathblow struck, it struck our corporatized trade-union model, not the solidarity of the workers, which now seems alight and ready to burn down the master’s house. IW
The teacher pay penalty has hit a new high

Report: Trends in the teacher wage and compensation gaps through 2017
By Sylvia Allegretto and Lawrence Mishel
September 5, 2018
Summary and key findings
Teacher strikes in West Virginia, Oklahoma, Arizona, North Carolina, Kentucky, and Colorado have raised the profile of deteriorating teacher pay as a critical public policy issue. Teachers and parents are protesting cutbacks in education spending and a squeeze on teacher pay that persist well into the economic recovery from the Great Recession.

These spending cuts are not the result of weak state economies. Rather, state legislatures have enacted them to finance tax cuts for the wealthy and corporations. This paper underscores the crisis in teacher pay by updating our data series on the teacher pay penalty— the percent by which public school teachers are paid less than comparable workers.

Providing teachers with a decent middle-class living commensurate with other professionals with similar education is not simply a matter of fairness. Effective teachers are the most important school-based determinant of student educational performance. To ensure a high-quality teaching workforce, schools must retain experienced teachers and recruit high-quality students into the profession. Pay is an important component of retention and recruitment.

As noted in an earlier paper, retention and recruitment is a challenge as states struggle to return to pre-recession teacher levels. Every state headed into the 2017–2018 school year with teacher shortages, and new EPI research indicates the teacher shortages persist.

A study of the teacher shortage in California points to a number of factors limiting the supply of teachers, from layoffs that “left a mark on the public psyche” to frozen salaries, declining working conditions, and increased class sizes. “One sign of the impact is that only 5 percent of the students in a recent survey of college-bound students were interested in pursuing a career in education, a decrease of 16 percent between 2010 and 2014,” the authors noted.

To address teacher shortages, it is necessary to focus on both recruiting and retaining high-quality teachers. Many policies are needed to accomplish this goal, and providing appropriate compensation is a necessary, major tool in addressing shortages:

Even if teachers may be more motivated by altruism than some other workers, teaching must compete with other occupations for talented college and university graduates.

Teachers are more likely to quit when they work in districts with lower wages and when their salaries are low relative to alternative wage opportunities, especially in high-demand fields like math and science.

As we have shown in our more than a decade and a half of work on the topic, relative teacher pay—teacher pay compared with the pay of other career opportunities for potential and current teachers—has been eroding for over a half a century. In How Does Teacher Pay Compare, we studied the long-term trends in teacher pay. We followed this up with The Teaching Penalty, published in 2008, and updated our findings in other papers. As noted, this body of work has documented the relative erosion of teacher pay. For instance, female teachers enjoyed a wage premium in 1960, meaning they were paid more than comparably educated and experienced workers. By the early 1980s, the wage premium for female teachers became a penalty. The total compensation penalty (how much less teachers make in wages and benefits relative to comparable workers) has also increased.

Here we extend our analysis through 2017. Our examination of the teacher wage gap begins in 1979. Our examination of the teacher compensation penalty (combining wage and benefit data) begins in 1994, the earliest year for which teacher benefit data are available.

With this update, we continue to sound the alarm regarding the long-run growth in the pay penalty. We also provide estimates of teacher wage penalties by state. Following are key highlights of the report:

The mid-1990s marks the start of a period of sharply eroding teacher pay and an escalating teacher pay penalty.

Improvements in benefits relative to professionals have not been enough to offset the growing teacher wage penalty.

Teacher wage and compensation penalties grew from 2015 to 2017.

The Great Recession can’t be blamed for the erosion in teacher pay.

This report was produced in collaboration with Center on Wage and Employment Dynamics at the University of California, Berkeley.
The full report is at https://www.epi.org/publication/teacher-pay-gap-2018/
I cannot remember where I found this online, but both its tastelessness and its audacity struck me. The page is anonymous except for the drawing credit given to Emily Schroeder, but it pretty clearly came from page 16 of a student publication. Note the date: June 2018.—Ed.
Preamble to the IWW Constitution

The working class and the employing class have nothing in common. There can be no peace so long as hunger and want are found among millions of the working people, and the few, who make up the employing class, have all the good things of life.

Between these two classes a struggle must go on until the workers of the world organize as a class, take possession of the means of production, abolish the wage system, and live in harmony with the Earth.

We find that the centering of the management of industries into fewer and fewer hands makes the trade unions unable to cope with the ever-growing power of the employing class. The trade unions foster a state of affairs that allows one set of workers to be pitted against another set of workers in the same industry, thereby helping defeat one another in wage wars. Moreover, the trade unions aid the employing class to mislead the workers into the belief that the working class has interests in common with their employers.

These conditions can be changed and the interest of the working class upheld only by an organization formed in such a way that all its members in any one industry, or in all industries if necessary, cease work whenever a strike or lockout is on in any department thereof, thus making an injury to one an injury to all.

Instead of the conservative motto, “A fair day’s wage for a fair day’s work,” we must inscribe on our banner the revolutionary watchword, “Abolition of the wage system.”

It is the historic mission of the working class to do away with capitalism. The army of production must be organized, not only for everyday struggle with capitalists, but also to carry on production when capitalism shall have been overthrown. By organizing industrially we are forming the structure of the new society within the shell of the old.