Preface

1. The name of Walter Reuther adorns Wayne State University's outstanding Labor History Archives and has gained Detroit's special form of canonization: a freeway connecting the east and west suburbs has been named for him. For rather a long time, the popular history of the UAW was written as if it were a history of Reuther and his allies. That tradition was started by B. J. Widick and Irving Howe in their famous encomium, *The UAW and Walter Reuther* (New York, 1949). Frank Cornier and William Eaton's large biography, *Reuther* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1970), solidified it, and Victor Reuther's *The Brothers Reuther* (Boston, 1976), a remarkably insightful memoir with a wide reading audience, provided the benediction of Walter's more radical and idealistic brother. Recently, though lacking the public impact of these earlier trade books, a variety of studies emphasizing the importance of other leaders, especially those associated with the Communist caucus in the union, have appeared. Roger Keenan's *The Automobile Workers and the Communist Party* (Bloomington, IN, 1981) is the most partisan, but contains much new information. A new, more balanced biography of Reuther by John Barnard, *Walter Reuther and the Rise of the Auto Workers* (Boston, 1983), takes much of this new research into account, but still ignores aspects of Reuther's activities that won him an "opportunist" reputation among the Left and nonideological leaders such as George Addees and R. J. Thomas.

2. This introduces, of course, a massive debate, one revitalized by the publication of Harvey Klehr's extension of Theodore Draper's history of U.S. communism (*The Heyday of American Communism: The Depression Decade* [New York, 1984].) The problem with Klehr is the problem with Draper: they are not writing the "history of American communism" but the history of a formal party organization and its activities. "American communism" included those millions who never joined the Party and did not want to. They fought on various "fronts" (it is amazing how words are altered—the term was converted by the anti-Communists into the concept of "false front," a cover organization) to advance a socialism rooted in Leninist Marxism for which the Soviet experience provided the only model available. Most were not stupid enough to think it was perfect. See the exchange between Klehr/Draper and their critics in the *New York Review of Books*, May 9 and 23, 1985.

3. This study was largely completed before the appearance of Christopher Tomlins's fine book, *The State and the Unions: Labor Relations, Law, and the Organized Labor Movement in America, 1880-1960* (New York, 1985). Its theme in this regard is identical, although reading Tomlins helped me to sharpen some of my perspectives and integrate them into a larger canvas. The relevance of the containment of labor under the law today could not be greater.

Chapter 1

1. The essential information about Sugar’s boyhood environment has been drawn from the following sources: Brimley and Bay Mills manuscript census, 1900 and Michigan Gazetteer and Business Directory (Detroit, 1890–1908), s.v. Superior and Brimley, both in the Burton Historical Collection, Detroit Public Library (hereafter Burton Coll., DPL); Walter Romig, Michigan Place Names (n.d.; reprint, Detroit, 1986), 79; Charlotte Hamilton, “Place Names of Chippewa County,” Michigan History 27 (1943): 638–43. Maurice Sugar, manuscript autobiography (hereafter SAB), written 1962–70, Sugar Collection, Reuther Library (hereafter Sugar Coll., RL), Wayne State University, Detroit, ch. 2; Interviews with Jane Sugar, July 11–12, 1978, Black Lake, Onaway, Michigan (notes and tapes in possession of the author). All quotations from Sugar in this chapter, unless otherwise noted, are from his long chapters 2 (“I Was Born”) and 3 (“Detroit”).


3. Sigal, Going Away (see Preface, n. 4). On Sugar’s personality, interviews with Ernest Goodman (July 7–9, 1978), Jane Sugar and Emma and Gertrude Mayer (July 7–9, 1978), Jack Tucker (June 26, 1979), Nedwin Smoker (Aug. 28, 1979), Sidney Rosen (July 5, 1979), and John Safran (Sept. 22, 1979) were most useful, but all interviews and much more discussion with Sugar’s friends and associates contribute to these assessments. For very hard work, Sugar did not expect, nor did he allow his legal staff to expect, much reward. For example, Ernie Goodman (Sugar’s dearest friend) recalled on the subject, “As an illustration, I billed the Int. Union [UAW] at a rate of $5.00 per hour for all the work I did for it, beginning in 1939. Out of this I had to pay my own overhead. Without appearing egotistical about the value of my services, I think Sugar
got a real bargain. The $5.00 fee applied whether I argued the Thomas v. Collins case in the Supreme Court or defended a member in a local justice court” (Goodman to author [1980]). Goodman also noted that expenses were kept to a minimum (Sugar to staff, memo, Dec. 19, 1946 author’s copy). A memo written by Sugar to the staff on June 15, 1943 shows clearly the kind of exemplary behavior he expected of them, which was nothing more than what he expected of himself. Addressed “To those on the staff to whom it applies (they will know),” he chastised his people for showing up late for appointments with clients, reminding them that for the latter, seeing his or her attorney might well be “the most important thing in his life.” So “let’s forget the big shot complex and not treat the client as an inferior who is in dire need of our help and to whom we, busily engaged in more important matters (such as lying in bed), will get around to in due course” (Memo in possession of the author from the files of Goodman et al., Cadillac Towers, Detroit).


5. This analysis is based on the 1900 manuscript census, Brimley and Bay Mills. See also, for a comparable town (Lake Linden), Irving Rabideau “Canadiens in Copper Country: New Perspectives on the French Canadian Immigration Experience,” Wayne State University, Department of History, 1986; SAb, ch. 2, 36 ff.


9. SAb, ch. 2, 23–25, 27–29, 48–49; Sugar to Pressman, Sept. 12, 1939, Box 27, Sugar Coll., RL.

10. On Detroit in this period, see Zunz, Changing Face (see Preface, n. 4); Sidney Glazer, Detroit: A Study in Urban Development (New York, 1965); Holli, Reform (see Preface, n. 4); Robert Conot, American Odyssey (New York; reprint, Detroit, 1986), 101–79. On Jews, see Robert A. Rockaway, The Jews of Detroit, 1762–1914 (Detroit, 1986), 51–96. The quote is from Holli, Reform, 61. It should be noted that the German Jews of Detroit were acculturating rapidly and moving out of the old neighborhood. See map and discussion in Rockaway, Jews, 97–100. For a good overview of labor in this era, see Steve Babson, Working Detroit (Detroit, 1986), 2–28.

11. SAb, ch. 2, 39–41.

12. Sugar, “Handcuff King,” 17–20; Upton Sinclair, The Jungle (1906; reprint, New York, 1960), 264ff.; on racism and the struggle against it in the Socialist party, see James Weinstein, The Decline of Socialism in America, 1912–1925 (New York, 1967), 63–74. Sugar’s later statement is in his summation to the jury in the famous 1934 case of James Victory, a black man defended by Sugar against an assault accusation. Published as a brochure, A Negro on Trial for His Life (Detroit, 1935), Box 10, Sugar Coll., RL.

13. The Student, 6(Oct. 1909):22; (Feb. 1910):3, 24; (May 1910):15, 19–20. On the quality of Central, see the Oct. 1909 Student, which analyzes the previous graduating class. In a class of 250, a very high number for those days, 133, went to college—79 to the University of Michigan, 9 to State Normal (Eastern), 8 to Michigan Agricultural (later Michigan State). None went to Harvard or Yale, but 2 went to Cornell and Princeton, 1 to Columbia, 4 to Vassar, and 3 to Wellesley. Of the total, 42 women went to college, a significant percentage. Ethnically, the school was overwhelmingly of north and west European extraction. Jews, by Sugar’s reckoning, were few in number and, though names do not tell us a great deal, this seems corroborated by the list of graduates. From pictures scattered through issues of the students, there are no blacks prominent enough to be included, although the school was not officially segregated.

14. SAb, ch. 3, 6–7, 22–24; Michigan Gazetteer, 1906–10; Brimley and Bay Mills manuscript census, 1910.

15. Wilfred Shaw, The University of Michigan (New York, 1920), 130–37, 179–80; Elizabeth Brown, Legal Education at Michigan (Ann Arbor, 1959), 68–225 (quotations, 207) for changing practices; for the larger framework, see Auerbach, Unequal Justice (see Preface, n. 4), 83ff.

16. On Jane Mayer’s family background, interviews with her and her sisters Emma and Gertrude (Black Lake, July 10–11, 1978; Aug. 7–8, 1979) are the main sources, although a few family papers and a Bible in
their possession were useful, too. On German-American socialism, the furniture workers, and women see Richard Oestreich, Solidarity and Fragmentation: Working People and Class Consciousness in Detroit, 1875–1900 (Urbana, IL, 1986), and Mary Jo Buhle, Women and American Socialism (Urbana, 1983). Markwardt later taught at Wayne State. His papers include nothing from this period, but offer considerable insight into his personality and politics (University Archives, RL).

17. Markwardt to Sugar, Dec. 18, 1912, reproduced in SAb, ch. 4 (“I Go to College”).
18. Weinstein, Decline, ch. 2.

20. This is from a speech Sugar delivered many times, “Law and the Prevailing Order,” SAb, document labeled 6B. He wrote it in 1916, but the sentiments expressed here were doubtless part of Sugar’s developing sense of the place of the law in society.

21. Sugar details the books that influenced him in his memoirs (SAb, ch. 4). I read or reread several of them to familiarize myself with his evolving outlook and the interpretation offered here is the result of that effort. The roots and development of Marxist positivism (a subject treated with almost disdainful criticism in recent years) is best handled by Gustav Wetter, Dialectical Materialism (New York, 1958), George Lichtheim, Marxism (New York, 1961). In many respects, the break with such a perspective has been the most significant theoretical consequence of the revolt against Stalinism in contemporary Marxism.

22. Several copies of the ISS journal, the Intercollegiate Socialist, were in Sugar’s possession. His membership card has also been preserved (Black Lake materials). On the general story of Sugar’s years at Michigan, see his correspondence with Ann Fagan Ginger. SAb (files) (1960–61).

23. SAb, ch. 4 and “A Lecture Tour” (unnumbered).

Chapter 2

1. SAb, ch. 5 (“We’re Off! I Get Arrested”). This is the first of many stories that Sugar tells in his memoirs for which there no longer exists corroborative evidence. For the most part, I have used them not as historical facts per se but as a guide to Sugar’s development as a lawyer and activist.
5. Sugar, “Law” (see ch. 1, n. 20) and SAb ch. 7 (“The Speech That Started a Career”).
7. Waldman, Labor Lawyer (New York, 1945), ch. 1; SAb, ch. 8, 42–43, also discusses why labor law (or master-and-servant law, as it was then called) was unattractive.
8. See n. 6. On Frank Murphy’s role, see Fine, Frank Murphy (see Preface, n. 4), 32–33; Detroit Labor News, Apr. 21 and 28, 1916. Fine does not discuss this courtroom encounter with Sugar (though he notes the case) and in fact says virtually nothing about their ongoing relationship.
10. The story of the Mack strike and the antienjunction drive goes well beyond Sugar’s biography in importance. It is told here for the first time. The Detroit Labor News, Dec. 10, 1915 to Apr. 20, 1917 is the key source. SAb, ch. 8, provides the narrative of Sugar’s role. The question of anecdotes, I think, is an ignored issue in labor history. Perhaps their significance requires an anthropologist’s or folklorist’s eye, but most labor historians bypass them in their analyses. On the Detroit ITU, see also Herman Koss, “A History of the Detroit
Chapter 3

1. Sugar's imprisonment had a profound impact on his life and work. We are extremely well informed about it because of his prison journal, some 250 manuscript pages of notes and thoughts that he kept in prison-office order books, and his correspondence while in the House of Correction, which was carefully preserved by Jane Sugar and then—as some was being weeded out—by Philip Mason during the process of collecting the Sugar papers at their Black Lake home. Sugar also "wrote up" his experiences shortly after his release, which he incorporated, with few changes, as a 143-page chapter 19 ("H. of C.—The Narrative") in his autobiography. The order books are also excerpted in typed form thereafter (pp. 144-247). This material is probably even more important as a guide to Sugar's evolving political thought—as we shall soon see—but the reform work was a proud achievement for him (interspersed with other matters in SAb, ch. 19, 8-89). The relations with other prisoners—several continued after his or their release—provide much insight into his personality and also help us to understand better the remarkable rapport he had with his working-class clients. Located in the Sugar Collection, Box 9, RL. I also consulted the Detroit News, March-May, 1919; and the Detroit Labor News, all issues Nov. 1918-Dec. 1919; Westfall Papers, Labadie Collection, University of Michigan for originals of Westfall correspondence during this period. On treatment of political prisoners by fellow inmates, see Peterson and Hite, Opponents (see ch. 2, n. 11), 180 ff. and Salvatore, Eugene V. Debs (see Preface, n. 4), 308 ff.

2. On the 1919 revolutionary situation, see, among the hundreds of works one might cite, James Cronin and Carmen Siriani, eds., Work, Community, and Power: The Experience of Labor in Europe and America, 1900-1925 (Philadelphia, 1983), especially Cronin, "Labor Insurgency and Class Formation, 1917-1920" (pp. 20-48), Larry Peterson, "The One Big Union in International Perspective" (pp. 49-87), and David Montgomery, "Tendencies in Union Struggles in Europe and the U.S., 1916-1922" (pp. 88-116); David Brody, Labor in Crisis: The Steel Strike of 1919 (Philadelphia, 1965); and Robert L. Friedheim, The Seattle General Strike (Seattle, 1964).

3. Again told here for the first time, the story of the Michigan home front in the Socialist wars needs deeper study, especially in view of the role of the Michigan people in Chicago later on. Sugar's responses and
A u t o m o b i l e  W o r k e r s

D e t r o i t ,  D e t r o i t  T i m e s ,  A m e r i c a  (see  c h .  3 ,  n . 3 ).  S u g a r  d i d  n o t  k n o w  a b o u t  i t  w h e n  h e  r e s e a r c h e d  t h e  c a s e  f o r  P o u n d  o r  w h e n  h e

4 .  S u g a r ,  P r i s o n  j o u r n a l ,  s e l e c t e d  M a y – J u n e  191 9  e n t r i e s .  T h e  r i c h n e s s  o f  t h i s  d o c u m e n t  m u s t  b e  u n d e r s c o r e d .  T h e r e  i s  l i t t l e  t o  c o m p a r e  i t  w i t h ,  b u t  i t  a l l o w s  u s  t o  e n t e r  t h e  m i n d  o f  a  m a n  b e c o m i n g  a  L e n i n i s t .

5 .  S u g a r ,  "D i c t a t o r s h i p  a n d  D e m o c r a c y , "  t y p e s c r i p t ,  B o x  9 ,  S u g a r  C o l l . ,  R . L .

6 .  W e  o w e  t h e  i d e n t i f i c a t i o n  o f  t h e s e  p e o p l e  t o  J a n e  S u g a r .  I t  i s  q u i t e  i m p o r t a n t  b e c a u s e  i t  c l e a r l y
delineates Sugar's friendship network.

7 .  S u g a r  d o e s  n o t  d i s c u s s  t h i s  i n  h i s  n o t e b o o k s ,  b u t  d o e s  s o  i n  h i s  "N a r r a t i v e , "  S A b ,  c h .  1 9 ,  9 1 b f f .

Al s o  s e e  t h e  D e t r o i t  L a b o r  N e w s ,  M a y  2 ,  1 9 1 9 ;  D e t r o i t  N e w s ,  M a y  3 ,  1 9 1 9 ;  D e t r o i t  F r e e  P r e s s ,  M a y  3 ,  1 9 1 9 ;

D e t r o i t  T i m e s ,  M a y  2 4 ,  1 9 1 9 .

8 .  T h e  e s s e n t i a l  g u i d e  t h r o u g h  t h e  l a b y r i n t h  o f  1 9 1 9  L e f t  p o l i t i c s  r e m a i n s  D r a p e r ,  R o o t s  ( s e e  P r e f a c e ,
n .  4 ) ,  e s p e c i a l l y  p p .  1 5 9 – 9 6 .  S e e  a l s o  W e i n s t e i n ,  D e c l i n e  ( s e e  c h .  1 ,  n .  1 2 ) ,  2 0 1 – 3 3 .  N e i t h e r  f u l l y  a p p r e c i a t e s
the significance of the Michiganders' role or of their pouty response to the convention majority's position. The Proletarian: Journal of International Socialism 2 (O c t .  1 9 1 9 )  a n d  S u g a r ' s  b r o c h u r e  [ G e o r g e  H a m i l t o n ,  p s e u d .]
The House of the Masses Trial (D e t r o i t ,  1 9 2 1 )  c l a r i f y  t h e i r  s i t u a t i o n  a n d  t h e  a f t e r m a t h .

9 .  O n  t h e  v i t a l i t y  o f  t h e  D e t r o i t  l a b o r  m o v e m e n t  i n  1 9 1 9  a n d  t h e  r o l e  o f  t h e  D F L ,  s e e  B a b s o n ,

W o r k i n g  D e t r o i t  ( s e e  c h .  1 ,  n .  1 0 ) ,  3 9 – 4 0  a n d  e s p e c i a l l y  t h e  D e t r o i t  L a b o r  N e w s '  d e t a i l e d  w e e k l y  c o v e r a g e  o f
events and editorial pronouncements throughout the year (M a y 9 – S e p t .  1 2 ,  1 9 1 9 ,  e s p e c i a l l y  t h e  e d i t o r i a l  b y
Julius Deutelbaum in the last, "The Tide Cannot Be stemmed") .

10 .  O n  t h e  A W U ,  s e e  e s p e c i a l l y  T h e  A u t o  W o r k e r ,  m o n t h l y  i s s u e s  M a y  1 9 1 9 – A p r .  1 9 2 1  a n d  K e e r a n ,

A u t o m o b i l e  W o r k e r s  ( s e e  P r e f a c e ,  n .  1 ) ,  3 2 – 3 5 .  O n  t h e  L a b o r - p a r t y  i d e a ,  s e e  W e i n s t e i n ,  D e c l i n e ,  2 2 2 – 3 0 a n d
Detroit response, see the excellent information and discussions in the Detroit Labor News, Aug. 18, 1919–Jan.
23, 1920. See also Sue Ellen Masry, "Labor and Radicalism in Detroit, 1919–1920" (masters thesis, Wayne
State University, 1980).

11. M ur r a y ,  R e d  S c a r e  ( s e e  P r e f a c e ,  n .  4 )  r e m a i n s  t h e  k e y  s t u d y  o f  t h i s  t e r r i b l e  i n t e r l a d e  i n  U . S .  h i s t o r y ,
o n t h o u g h  o n e  s e n s e s  t h a t  h e  f e e l s  t h a t  " p u b l i c  o p i n i o n "  w a s  g e n e r a l l y  r e s p o n s i b l e  f o r  t h e  o f f i c i a l  a s  w e l l  a s  t h e
popular excesses. His sources are largely newspapers, hardly the best guide to public opinion. On that problem,
see Melvin Small, ed., Public Opinion and the Historian (Detroit, 1970). For Detroit, see Babson, Working
Detroit, 39–40 and, above all, Sugar, House of the Masses Trial. The Palmer quote is cited by Murray, Red Scare,
219. See the Detroit daily press in Jan. and Feb. 1920 for local reactions. The best contemporary analysis was
by Labor Secretary Lewis F. Post, The Deportation Delirium of 1920 (Chicago, 1923).

12. I investigated this dramatic tale with some care. The "smoking gun," of course, is the letter from
Blumenberg to Steedman of Jan. 5, 1920, which remains neatly arranged in the Papers of the Socialist Party of
Am er i ca ( s e e  c h .  3 ,  n .  3 ) .  S u g a r  d i d  n o t  k n o w  a b o u t  i t  w h e n  h e  r e s e a r c h e d  t h e  c a s e  f o r  P o u n d  o r  w h e n  h e
wrote the brochure on the trial. The latter includes much of the verbatim record of the trial, but the briefs of
both lawyers contain further information. The Detroit Labor News carried stories on the trial, but the daily press
ignored it. Interviews with Davidow (Aug. 18, 1979) and Jane Sugar (cited above) corroborated several facts
and provided the information on the Sugar family situation. Anne Davidow, Larry's sister, would later marry
Sugar's brother Vic. The main source is Hamilton/Sugar, House of the Masses Trial.

13. S A b ,  c h .  2 1 ( " B a c k  t o  t h e  B a r") .  S u g a r  w o u l d  n e v e r  f o r g e t  M u r p h y ' s  k i n d n e s s ,  a n d  t h e y  w o u l d
remain friends until the latter's death in 1949. Sugar would deliver one of the eulogies at the National Lawyers
Guild ceremony on that occasion.

C h a p t e r  4

1. The following discussion, focusing on Sugar's development as a lawyer, is based primarily on brief
chapters in his autobiography, each devoted to a single case that he felt was important in his growth or
interesting in its own right. Other sources will be noted where appropriate.
2. SAb, ch. 11 (“Lewd and Lascivious Behavior”), 6a–b.
3. SAb, ch. 9 (“Use a Sharp Pencil”) deals with a similar failure to provide evidence supporting the exact terms of a statute.
6. Cochran, Labor (see Preface, n. 4), 20–42; Nelson, Barrett, and Ruck, Steve Nelson (see Preface, n. 4), 29–52 (the Weisbord interlude, however, was the cause of Nelson’s departure for New York); SAb, ch. 35; Reynolds to Sugar, Apr. 30, 1960, Black Lake materials. Also Reynolds’s account of the Martel intervention was sent to Sugar in 1964 and is located in Box 7, Sugar Coll., RL. Maurice Iserman, “Three Generations: Historians View American Communism,” Labor History 26 (1985): 517–41 underscores the problem of local autonomy versus Moscow/New York control. It is perhaps the central issue of debate in the current literature on the U.S. CP. Harvey Klehr argues strongly for central authority and lockstep discipline among Party workers, wherever they might be, while many writers take a more nuanced perspective. The issue exploded in the pages of the New York Review of Books, May 30, 1985, as Theodore Draper mounted his steed in defense of Klehr’s honor. Klehr, Heyday (see Preface, n. 2), nevertheless provides much useful information on the gyrations of Party central. For an excellent review of the problem and an example of greater local autonomy, see Bruce Nelson, “Unions and the Popular Front: The West Coast Waterfront in the 1930s,” International Labor and Working-Class History, Fall 1986, 59–78. For the tens of thousands of Communists who were never in the Party, of course, “autonomy” was all the easier, a point that is central to this book.
7. On the ILD, see Klehr, Heyday, 6–7, 104ff. The Sugar-Reynolds connection can be gleaned from their later correspondence and from Sugar’s autobiographical accounts of their work together (SAb, ch. 14). See also Nelson, Barrett, and Ruck, Steve Nelson. 29. Malvina Reynolds was a songwriter, a fact that made Sugar’s personal friendship with them all the closer.
8. The standard study on the Sweet case and black Detroit in the twenties is Levine, Internal Combustion (see Preface, n. 4).
9. “Maurice Sugar,” circular and Sugar campaign letter, Burton Coll., DPL.
10. Dunn, Labor (see Preface, n. 4). This little-used contemporary study is remarkable in its depth, thoroughness, and determination to ask the right questions. Dunn was a journalist close to the Communist party. For other aspects of the foregoing discussion see Keran, Automobile Workers (see Preface, n. 1), chs. 2–3; Joyce Shaw Peterson, “Auto Workers and their Work, 1900–1933,” Labor History 22 (1981): 213–36; Babson, Working Detroit (see ch. 1, n. 10), 48–54; Thomas Klug, “Management Strategies in the Labor Market: Detroit, 1900–1935” (Ph.D. diss., Wayne State University, 1988). Another important study of the industry, never published, was William E. Chalmers, “Labor in the Automobile Industry: A Study of Personnel Policies, Workers’ Attitudes, and Attempts at Unionism” (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 1932). The Sugar Collection Supplement (materials donated by the author), RL contains an excellent selection of the shop papers.
11. Clayton Fountain, Union Guy (New York, 1949), 36–37. SAb, ch. 28 (“The Ford Hunger March”), 12–15; Box 53. (Folder 9), Sugar Coll., RL.
12. This story, of special interest to Sugar, was reconstructed in his memoirs; Olds had turned the amazing transcript over to him. SAb, ch. 25 (“The Judge Was Black”); see below, pp. 194ff.
13. Christopher Alston, one of the first black organizers in the auto industry, remembered this as his first experience with the old Left. It won his respect and his commitment to industrial unionism (Alston interview, October 12, 1979). Browder quote is from the Communists 9 (June 1930). On the unemployed councils, see Daniel Leab, “United We Eat: The Creation and Organization of the Unemployed Councils in 1930,” Labor History 8 (1967): 300–317. Also, thanks are due to Ernst Benjamin for allowing me to look at his father’s papers from those years. See Babson, Working Detroit for other examples of the councils’ work and influence, especially in fostering black-white cooperation around questions of poverty and unemployment. On the same issue, see Scott Craig, “Black Workers and the Communists in Detroit, 1929–1941” (masters thesis, Wayne State University, 1986).
15. The story is recounted in detail in Sugar’s memoirs. SAb, ch. 22 (“The Best Brains of the Depression”), 22–32. The original manuscript (from which this version is taken) is located in Box 53, Sugar Coll., RL.
Chapter 5

1. In the chapter in his memoirs on the trip, Sugar clearly chose to report on cases that supported his sense that building a Socialist society seemed to override individual concerns, and they even have a ring of “Socialist realism” to them. They were undoubtedly those that he discussed in his speeches after his return (see SAb, ch. 30 (“A Trip to the Soviet Union”). For a profound critique of Socialist realism, see Herbert Marcuse, Soviet Marxism (New York, 1961), ch. 6. The Reuther letter is in Box 65, Sugar Coll., RL. See also Reuther, Brothers (see Preface, n. 1), chs. 9–11. Nelson, Barrett, and Ruck, Steve Nelson (see Preface, n. 4), ch. 5.


3. This framework of analysis is provided by James Coppess, whose outstanding master’s thesis, “The Briggs Strike, 1933” (Wayne State University, 1973) provides the foundation for the discussion of the 1932–33 strikes. See also Keenan, Automobile Workers (see Preface, n. 1), 77–98; Babson, Working Detroit (see ch. 1, n. 10) (again a marvelous summary), 62–63; and the interesting brochure by a participant, John Anderson, Auto Workers Strike, 1933–1933 (Cleveland, 1933). The quotations below are from Coppess, “Briggs Strike,” 24–25, 66–69. Also, the press, including the Detroit Labor News and Detroit Saturday Night, carried many stories during the month of January. Finally, AWU files relating to the Briggs strike are found in Box 1, Henry Kraus Collection, RL.

4. Phil Raymond interview, transcript, Oral Histories, RL.

5. Keenan, Automobile Workers (see Preface, n. 1), 96–103; Fine, Automobile (see Preface, n. 4), 38–41.

6. Harry Dahlheimer, A History of the Mechanics Educational Society of America in Detroit from Its Inception in 1933 through 1937 (Detroit, 1951); interview of Smith’s long-time secretary, Elizabeth McCraken, Oral Histories, RL; Colliers, May 12, 1943.

7. On the national origins and role of militant tool-and-die men, see, above all, Steve Babson, “Class, Craft, and Culture: Tool and Die Workers and the Organization of the UAW” (paper delivered at the 1986 Social Science History Association Meeting, Saint Louis). His Ph.D. dissertation (Wayne State University, forthcoming) on this subject will provide rich detail on these issues.

8. Quoted in the Detroit News, Oct. 7, 1933. SAb, ch. 29a (“The Referee Was Fixed”) provides many details on his activity and offers Sugar’s perspective. Dahlheimer, History, 13–17 and Keenan, Automobile Workers, 104–7 both analyze the strike. The local press followed the events very closely and the clippings collected by Joe Brown are an excellent guide through the September–December 1933 period (Box 15, Brown Collection, RL). Fine, Automobile, 163–73 provides much information on the NLB’s relationship to the strike.

9. The foregoing is from the official transcript of the meeting, a copy of which Sugar retained, included in SAb, ch. 29a, 11–15.
10. Sugar, SAh, ch. 29a, 16.

11. A major theme of this book, the mobilization of the Left community on behalf of the labor movement was certainly one of Sugar’s key contributions. On the Buck Dinner, see “The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Buck Dinner,” brochure, 1979, Supplement, Sugar Coll., RL.

12. See, above all, the Detroit Labor News, Mar. and Apr. 1934; Sugar, telegram, Mar. 16, 1934, Box 18, Metro-Detroit AFL/CIO Collection, RL.


14. The Detroit Labor News covered the Henderson hearing carefully (see issue of Dec. 20, 1934). Sugar’s testimony was reprinted in full in a brochure for his recorder’s-court campaign, “Sugar Tells the Auto Labor Board Plenty” (Detroit, 1935) Box 10, Sugar Coll., RL. Waning enthusiasm for Roosevelt at this time was reflected everywhere in labor and on the Left. See Fine, Automobile, 372 ff. A good example is the Nation’s withering editorial, “Our Surrendering President,” Feb. 20, 1935, 172.

15. Meier and Rudwick, Black Detroit (see Preface, n. 4), 3–33. My research on this question suggests a stronger role for the Left in changing black opinion than Meier and Rudwick allow. The problem was one that they were concerned about, but their research turned up little evidence of it. Their main problem, besides a pro-NAACP and anti-Communist bias (see especially how they slight the role of the National Negro Congress later on), is that they were not very familiar with the Detroit Left and its political history, particularly in the early and mid-thirties. This book fills some of that gap, but the reader is also referred to Craig’s outstanding study, “Black Workers” (see ch. 4, n. 13).

16. See Snow Grigsby’s remarkable contemporary study, recapitulated in “Detroit Civic Rights Committee Writes Open Letter to the Citizens of the City of Detroit, Fourth Educational Letter,” Box 11, Sugar Coll., RL. Sugar thanked Grigsby for sending this analysis to him remarking, “These are lessons of the kind I like to study,” Sugar to Grigsby (cc), Sept. 21, 1935, Box 11, Sugar Coll., RL.

17. SAh, ch. 32e, “The Frame-up of James Victory” and a brochure, Sugar, “A Negro on Trial” (see ch. 1, n. 12), which includes Sugar’s moving final speech to the jury.

18. The Detroit Labor News, Dec. 21 and 28, 1934; “Outline of Policy and Organization of the Campaign for Maurice Sugar,” typescript report, Box 10, Sugar Coll., RL. The willingness of the Detroit federation to work with the Communist party is interesting and surprising. On Sept. 11, 1934, in its continuing battle against the reds, the national office issued a circular letter calling for the expulsion of all Communists and “cells” from all affiliated organizations “when it has been clearly established that such members . . . [are] carrying on communist propaganda.” It included both “every proven communist” and “communistic propagandist.” (Box 1, Henry Kraus Coll., RL). The Detroit federation did not hesitate to follow orders either: we read on page 1 of the same Labor News that called for Sugar’s candidacy (Dec. 21, 1934) a small article entitled “Communists Not Wanted in F. of L.” that tells of the expulsion of William [Billy] Allan from his seat as a delegate of the Bakers Union Number 20 “for his communistic activities.” Allan became the long-time Detroit correspondent for the Daily Worker. This coincidence dramatically underlines the role of a Maurice Sugar. Through figures like him, the Left could continue the struggle despite the most strident formal opposition to the CP from organized labor.

19. This detailed report (“Outline of Policy”) is part of an important body of materials on this campaign and on Sugar’s campaign later that year for city council, as will be seen in what follows. It provides marvelous documentation for understanding the work of the Left community in building prolabor sentiment in Detroit, especially among black citizens. Boxes 10 and 11, Sugar Coll., RL.

20. The best documentary source for the structure of these organizations in Detroit is a detailed FBI “Survey of Communist Activities in the City of Detroit and Vicinity,” 1936, Box 1 (“Communism” file), Metro-Detroit AFL/CIO Collection, RL. Using this material, which goes well beyond formal and specifically Communist organizations, along with interviews (Stanley and Margaret Nowak, William Weinestone, Jane Sugar, Jack Tucker) and Sugar’s invaluable “File: Recorder’s Court Race,” which includes a notebook of his daily activities through the campaign and considerable correspondence (Box 10, Sugar Coll., RL), allows a very close look at the problem posed in this section.

21. Fine, Automobile, 373 ff. provides the general story. See also, the Nation, Feb. 13, 1935, 181;

22. This debate gives a taste of the themes in Sugar’s campaign. Unfortunately, despite the excellent material on the progress of the campaign itself, we do not have copies or detailed reports on his speeches. Thus the quotations here are very important in apprising the mood of his rhetoric. Its radicalism is unequivocal, something that makes the positive results all the more interesting. Detroit Labor News, Feb. 8, 1935.


25. On the first two cases, see SAb, “The Cemetery Case” and “The Case of Munroe Brown and Charles Lee” and Sugar campaign literature (Box 10, Sugar Coll., RL). Sugar mistakenly puts the latter case in 1941. The Detroit *Tribune Independent* (Feb. 2, Mar. 2 and Mar. 9, 1935) reported on all three and the *Detroit Free Press* also had a story on the last.

26. The details on the timing of presentations are drawn from Sugar’s campaign notebook, Sunday, Feb. 3, 1935—Saturday, March 20, 1935. The list of endorsements from black leaders that Sugar was proudest of is worth recording in full (from an undated list in the campaign file from late March):

- Rev. William H. Peck, Greater Bethel AME
- Rev. S. D. Ross, Greater Shiloh Baptist
- Rev. Charles H. Hill, Hartford Avenue Baptist
- Rev. R. L. Bradby, Second Baptist
- Rev. J. B. Ford, Second Mt. Olive Baptist
- Rev. R. L. Carson, Centennial Baptist
- Dr. O. H. Sweet, physician
- Dr. R. L. C. Markoe, physician
- Dr. Julian J. Rucker
- Mrs. Kate Johnson, president of the State Association of Colored Women’s Clubs
- Dr. W. E. Rainwater, dentist
- Dr. J. A. Graham, physician
- Dr. S. H. C. Owen, physician
- L. C. Blount, vice president and secretary, Great Lakes Mutual Insurance Co. and president, Detroit Branch of the NAACP.
- Mrs. C. S. Smith, member of the Administrative Committee of the National Association of Colored Women
- Mrs. Cora Seymour, president, City Association of Colored Women’s Clubs
- Robert A. Crump, newspaper correspondent
- Russell J. Cowan, newspaper correspondent

See also the endorsement letter of James Williams (chairman, East Side Progressive League), Mar. 26, 1935, Box 10, Sugar Coll., RL.


28. The leaflet and clippings are located in the “File: Recorder’s Court Race,” Box 10, Sugar Coll., RL. See also letters from Sugar and Weinstone, Box 1, Wayne County AFL/CIO Collection. *It’s About Time!* 1, no. 1 (Mar. 26, 1935) carried the endorsements and remarks by Murphy. For details of the campaign operations, see Sugar’s campaign notebook in “File: Recorder’s Court Race,” Box 10, Sugar Coll., RL.

29. *Detroit Labor News*, Apr. 6, 1935. The ward-by-ward breakdown was as follows (analysis made by Sugar campaign workers, Nov. 1935):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Recorder’s Court</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Place in Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>2,352</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3*</td>
<td>1,689</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,867</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3,123</td>
<td>2,497</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Notes to Pages 166–76

(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Recorder's Court</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Place in Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5*</td>
<td>1,954</td>
<td>2,105</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7*</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,525</td>
<td>3,896</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3,112</td>
<td>3,405</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2,321</td>
<td>2,071</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* heavily black wards.

Chapter 6

1. Frank W. McCulloch and Tim Bornstein, *The National Labor Relations Board* (New York, 1974), 18–24 (quotation, 19). This is the opinion of a liberal board member (McCulloch). Christopher Tomlins, *The State and the Unions* (see Preface, n. 3) roots his general analysis in this framework; for the act itself, see pp. 119–47. The most exhaustive (if a bit exhausting) study is James A. Gross, *The Making of the National Labor Relations Board* (Albany, NY, 1974).


3. The reconstruction of the split between Martel and Sugar—a telling example of the growing alienation of the AFL from anything smacking of communism or Labor-party politics—has been made from the following documentation: ULCPA Continuations Committee, *Labor Holds the Key!* (Detroit, 1935); *Detroit Labor News*, Mar. 30 and May 3, 11 and 17, 1935; *It's About Time!* 1, no. 2 (Sept. 16, 1935); *Report on the Proceedings of the 55th Annual Convention of the A.F. of L.* (Atlantic City, 1935); Sugar correspondence, Box 18, Metro-Detroit AFL/CIO Coll., RL. The key document is *The Progressive Trade Unionist Bulletin*, Oct. 23, 1935, Box 10, Sugar Coll., RL. Also see ch. 5, n. 17. Sugar later assumed that the reason for his being “cut off” (for this meant no AFL business in the long run) was the rise of the CIO (SAb, ch. 8, 43–46). The split was coming, of course.


6. ULCPA Continuations Committee, *Labor; It's About Time!* 1, no. 2 (Sept. 16, 1935); *Detroit Labor News*, Sept. 20, 1935, for reactions to Sugar's claims and condemnation of the locals that bolted: “Local Endorsements Should Wait Until Central Body Acts,” said a headline. The song was printed separately (Box 14, Sugar Coll., RL). Martel to Pattern Makers Association, Nov. 25, 1935, Box 8, Metro-Detroit AFL/CIO Coll., RL. Two unions—the Federation of Teachers and the Associated Auto Workers of America—protested that they had not endorsed the trio (letters to Sugar, one undated, one dated Sept. 17, 1935). Letters from MESA, the pattern makers, and others of support may be found in Box 10, Sugar Coll., RL.


Notes to Pages 178–91

9. On the Motor Products strike see Ray Borzycka, “Auto Union Factionalism and the Motor Products Strike of 1935–1936,” Michigan History 61 (1977): 3–32; Box 4, Kraus Coll., RL and “Summary of the Motor Products Strike,” Box 2, Martin Coll., RL; and especially Dahlheimer History (see ch. 5. n. 6), ch. 6. On the takeover and the events leading to the South Bend convention, the standard sources should be supplemented with a careful reading of Homer Martin’s voluminous correspondence, Jan. 7–Mar. 29, 1936 (the Mortimer-Martin letters are especially fascinating), from which several of the details above are drawn (Box 1, Martin Coll., RL). A copy of the Toledo charter is in Box 2, Martin Coll., RL. See also Wyndham Mortimer, Organize! (Boston, 1971), 96–99.

10. This is the best reconstruction that I can make of this controversial issue. William Weinstone, in our interview, Mar. 9, 1979, presented a well-rehearsed version with all the details in place. But from all I and close friends like Ernest Goodman know about him, Sugar would never have escorted anyone to a Party meeting. Moreover, that Weinstone “remembered” nothing about the political campaigns of 1935 was indeed curious, since the details of the Reuther encounter were so vivid. Still, his remarks are useful. The key item, of course, was Nat Ganley’s assertion that he collected CP dues from Walter Reuther. (See Martin Glaberman, “A Note on Walter Reuther,” Radical America, Nov.–Dec. 1973, 113–17). Sugar’s own discussion of these events (“My Relations with Walter Reuther,” 1–3, SAB (Supplement) supported by the letter from the brothers while they were in the Soviet Union, Box 6, Sugar Coll., RL) ring true. The Ternstedt Left connection is well known and denied by no one. The point, however, remains that all these perceptions and suspicions are relevant only in that they help explain the origins of the mistrust that the pro-Soviet Left felt toward Reuther. Whether or not he was briefly a Party member is of no historical interest to anyone except red-baiters and (perhaps) the Party Historian (Weinstone’s official title). As we shall see, Weinstone’s other recollections were very helpful, and I thank him for his hospitality. See also Reuther, Brothers (see Preface, n. 1), 126–27; Keenan, Automobile Workers (see Preface, n. 1), 157.

11. Call, May 2, 1936. Among the dozens of studies and analyses of the Popular Fronts that emerged in 1936, the reader’s attention is called to the special issue of International Labor and Working Class History, no. 30 (Fall 1986) on the Popular Front and to papers from a University of Michigan Conference on the Popular Front, Nov. 15–16, 1985 (Geoff Eley and Ronald Suny, University of Michigan, organizers). The issue of the CP role and the place of the Comintern in setting policy is central to several of the articles and papers in these collections. On Spain, see also Gabriel Jackson, “The Spanish Popular Front, 1934–1937,” Journal of Contemporary History 5 (1970).

12. The details on this bizarre, fascinating, and tragic story have been drawn from Sugar’s own extensive collection of materials, the daily press, and the Detroit Labor News. Sugar kept an excellent clippings file and it was virtually complete with regard to the Black Legion. I went through the reels for the Times, News, and Free Press (along with the unmicrofilmed folio bindings of the Labor News) from the summer and fall of 1936 and found that Sugar had ignored nothing. The interpretation offered here has been checked from various angles and found accurate. It goes beyond the analysis provided by Amann and seems counter to his assessment that the Black Legion, because it was secret, mattered little as a force in the history of the era (“Vigilante Fascism,” 517–19). Sugar’s materials are found in Boxes 18–23, Sugar Coll., RL. See, above all, his “Memorandum on the Black Legion,” undated 80-page typescript in Box 18, (Folder 1); on the threats to Sugar’s life, see Sugar to Concealed Weapons Licensing Board, July 8, 1940, Box 19.


14. Rather extensive materials on this campaign are located in Box 11, Sugar Coll., RL. On Left politics in 1936, see Klhr, Heyday (see Preface, n. 2), chs. 10–12; Shannon, Socialist Party, 244–48. Shannon argues that the election of 1936 marked the end of the Socialist party as a real political force; it was swamped by Popular Front and, above all, by Roosevelt (pp. 249–68.) See also Kenneth Walitzer, “The Party and the Polling Place: American Communism and an American Labor Party in the 1930s,” Radical History Review (1980): 104–29.

Chapter 7

2. Jeremy Brecher, *Strike!* (Boston, 1972) ignores and simply misrepresents the positive role of leadership in the upheavals of the CIO years. This issue—which had long been central in the arguments within Marxism in particular—is also a major problem in interpreting the contemporaneous labor upheaval in France. See especially Herrick Chapman, “The Political Life of the Rank and File: French Aircraft Workers During the Popular Front, 1934–38,” *International Labor and Working Class History* Fall 1986, 13–31, for a review of the literature and an important contribution. Steve Babson’s forthcoming Ph.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, will examine the ranks/leadership problem in the development of the UAW, offering an interpretation paralleling and influencing my own.

3. Mortimer, *Organize!* (see ch. 6, n. 9), 84–125; Kraus, *Many* (see Preface, n. 4), 1–106; Fine, *Sitdown* (see Preface, n. 4), 100–48; Kecrank, *Automobile Workers* (see Preface, n. 1), 148–64; UAW Executive Board minutes, Nov. 30–Dec. 5, 1936, Box 1, Addes Coll., RL; Carl Haessler interview, Oral Histories, RL; Interview with George Addes, Aug. 30, 1979. Davidow, of course, was also the brother-in-law of Victor Sugar and Maurice’s old friend and confidante. Even at this point, politics had firmly separated them. As we shall see, Davidow, more or less following Martin, became a reactionary.


5. Like so many of the controversies regarding the Who’s Who of the Flint strike, this one pits Social Democrats (proto-Reutherites) against Communists and friends. Kraus rooted for the latter, Fine for the former. The Davidow testimony (Aug. 28, 1978) is crucial, for had he been familiar with the controversy, his memory might well have been influenced by politics. What he does is corroborate Sugar’s own account in “Item” (Black Lake materials, now at RL), Kraus, *Many* 113. Fine, *Sitdown* 193–94.


10. Sugar, “Flint, 1937,” dictated to Bob Cruden, 1970; Sugar to Murphy, telegram (copy), Box 25, Sugar Coll., RL; *Detroit Times*, Feb. 4, 1937. (Sugar does not mention the singing of his song in his memoirs.)


12. Kraus, *Many*, 274–76. The final terms were reported verbatim in the *Detroit Free Press*, Mar. 13, 1937; see also Box 25, Sugar Coll., RL.

13. What follows owes a great deal to the pioneering work of Steve Babson, Dave Ebsila, Ron Alpern, and John Revitte and their research for a labor-history site tour of Detroit, a project of Workers Education Local 189. Several publications and slide presentations were produced from this project (as well as numerous guided tours for visiting groups). The most accessible and first full account of the Detroit sit-down movement is in Babson, *Working Detroit* (see ch. 1, n. 10) 72–91. Many of the photographs on these pages in Babson were published there for the first time. See also Carlos A. Schwantes, “The 1937 Non-Automotive Sit-downs in Detroit,” *Michigan History* 58 (1972): 179–200.

14. This strike (not highlighted by Babson) was reported fully in the local dailies, which now scrambled for every shred of news about the unfolding labor drama. Sugar’s magnificent clipping collection picks up significantly from this point and provides one of the best sources for day-to-day UAW history that we have. Boxes 105–17, Sugar Coll., RL. Used in conjunction with the many collections deposited by the union and Sugar’s own extensive collection of correspondence and other union business, the recreation of Sugar’s relationship to the developing history of the auto labor movement in Detroit becomes relatively easy. On the other hand, it is also at this point that we lose Sugar’s own recollection since, apart from a few vignettes, his vast manuscript cuts off.

15. There is no way to stress this point enough. It is a central theme of this book. Despite the strain between Martel and the Left and the CIO, the old lines of solidarity and friendship held AFL leadership in this city to a pattern far to the left of Green and his cronies.

Chapter 8

1. On the opening salvo in the Ford fight, see the Daily Worker, Apr. 14, 1937; for Ford’s opinions, the Detroit Times, Apr. 10, 1937 and Keith Sward, The Legend of Henry Ford (New York, 1948); and the Detroit News, May 14-15, 1937 for Ford’s initial response to the union initiative. There was extensive coverage of the Yale and Towne strike from Apr. 10 to the end of the month in all three Detroit papers. For details on the conflict and its aftermath see especially the Detroit News, Apr. 15, 1937 and the Detroit Free Press, Apr. 16. The jail photos are in the Times and News, Apr. 29, 1937. The first hints of the impending fight with Homer Martin also surfaced in April as he opposed Bob Travis’s ascendency in Flint by fielding a conservative slate in the local election against the Travis/Roy Reuther men. See especially the excellent analysis by Martin Hayden in the Detroit News, Apr. 18, 1937 (“Two Tickets Emerge”). On the Power Strike and the Industrial Relations Bill, see the Detroit News and Detroit Times, May 4; Detroit Times, May 20; Detroit Free Press, May 21; New York Times, June 10—all 1937. The last provides a detailed analysis of the repressive Michigan law. The Murphy quote appeared in that article.

2. Jerold Auerbach provides the standard picture of the guild’s founding and an excellent discussion of its make up and orientation in its early years (Unequal Justice (see Preface, n. 4), 198-204). This is virtually the only time in his entire autobiography when Sugar claims personal credit for an idea or development (that north-woods modesty would not permit it), so I am inclined to believe him. Morris Ernst does not refer to Sugar’s role in his memoirs, A Love Affair with the Law, (New York, 1968), but his letter to Sugar seems conclusive. The story is in SAh, ch. 33 (“A Lecture Tour and an Idea”). Letter and Sugar, “Suggestions for an Association of Lawyers,” 1933, Box I, Papers of Maurice Sugar (all relating to lawyers guild), Meiklejohn Civil Liberties Institute, Berkeley, CA.


4. Detroit News, Apr. 18, 22, and 23 and May 2, 1937 (Martin Hayden and Archie Robinson bylines); Ternstedt statement, Box 1, Walter P. Reuther Coll., RL (another copy among Sugar’s personal papers, Black Lake materials); Cormier and Eaton Reuther (see Preface, n. 1), 124 ff. On the CP shift in 1937, see Harvey Klehr, “American Communism and the UAW: New Evidence on an Old Controversy,” Labor History
24(1983): 404–13. Unfortunately, Klehr knows nothing (or says nothing) about the Flint affair, which clearly is the origin of the conflict (not the Communist approval of wildcats), and, indeed, that was what sealed Weinestone’s fate. The CP position reprimanding Weinestone made sense in any case, given the remarkable opportunity that the Ford beatings seemed to offer.


6. This important (and largely unnoticed) piece in the mosaic of the Ford struggle is reconstructed from Sugar to Brooks, July 23, 1937 and Sugar to Greene, Aug. 9, 1937, Box 26, Sugar Coll., RL and the *Detroit Free Press* and *Detroit Times*, Aug. 10, 1937. It is at this point (summer 1937) that Sugar’s voluminous official correspondence and legal materials become the key source for our story. See also Sugar to Murphy, June 28 and July 23, 1937; Murphy’s notes on dealing with the Dearborn situation and of Greene to Sugar, Aug. 6, 1937 (copy), Murphy Papers, Michigan Historical Coll. (photocopies in Box 26, Sugar Coll., RL).

7. On the economic/membership problems of late 1937, see the important contribution of Raymond Boryczka, “Militancy and Factionalism in the UAW, 1937–1941,” *Maryland Historian* 8(1977): 13–25; on the CP, Keenan, “The Communists and UAW Factionalism, 1937–39,” *Michigan History* 60(1976): 115–36; and Klehr, “American Communism.” Most of the analysis laid out here, however, is drawn from Sugar’s extensive legal files and even more extensive clipping collection relating to the factional fight. The Lovestonite connection was proved by Sugar through the “liberated” correspondence between Martin and Jay Lovestone. His detailed thirty-one-page brief (over the names of the five officers) is the key document. Perhaps the best source available for the factional-fight documents is to be found in Boxes 27–28, Sugar Coll., RL. A convenient summary is found in a “newspaper” published by the five officers and largely written by Sugar, *An Appeal to the Members of the UAW* (August 1938).


9. Martin to Sugar, Box 27, Sugar Coll., RL; Keenan, “Communists”; Klehr agrees but gets his chronology mixed up (“American Communism,” 409–10; UAW executive board minutes, June 6, 1938; on Reuther and Martin, see Reuther’s public statement, *Detroit News*; Tucker Smith to Norman Thomas, July 29, 1938, the Papers of the Socialist Party of America (see ch. 3, n. 3); Sugar, “Memorandum on the Existing Situation in the International Union,” May 23, 1946 Box 1, Sugar Coll., RL; Sugar, “My Meetings with the Reuthers,” 1971, Sugar Coll. Supplement, R.L. Cormier and Eaton, *Reuther* (p. 138) and Barnard (*Walter Reuther*) stress the CIO election double-cross as the root of Reuther’s anti-Communist perspective, thus putting the onus on the CP. This is perhaps understandable, but since the Party reversed itself in the name of unity and simultaneously moved Frankensteen away from Martin and since Martin then made it clear that he would destroy the union rather than give up power, and since the Socialist leadership would rather back a fool like Martin because he might back their line on U.S. foreign policy than join the fight to preserve a militant union movement in the auto industry, Reuther’s equivocations do look rather opportunistic. These facts certainly help explain why large numbers of his opponents—whatever their politics—thought him to be so. See also, “Confidential Report of the Socialist Party of America (1938),” Box 41, Sugar Coll., RL.

10. For Sugar to Martin and other materials relating to the trial, see Box 42, Sugar Coll., RL; the press followed the outward events closely, especially the Dies Committee visit to Detroit. See Sugar’s dippings, Box 49, Sugar Coll., RL.

11. See above all the long deposition of Ralph Rimar, a former Martinite, Box 54, Sugar Coll., RL. The Martin Coll., RL, is no help on this, or most, issues relating to the factional fight; he obviously weeded out any evidence that might show ties to the companies. The Ford Motor Company Library and Archives provides no information either, since Bennett, who would have arranged any deals, left no paper trail at all.

12. See Sugar’s extensive papers relating to the legal aftermath of the faction fight and his correspondence with Taft, Boxes 3 and 46, Sugar Coll., RL. Again, press coverage provides much information.
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13. The much discussed issue of the electoral maneuverings at Cleveland (see Cochran, Labor [see Preface, n. 4] 141–43; Keenan, Automobile Workers [see Preface, n. 1], 199–203; Mortimer, Organize! [see ch. 6, n. 9], 162–65) is here thrown in new light by our interview with Sam Sweet (a perceptive and well-informed union member and activist), then close, like Sugar, to the CP, (Dec. 10, 1979) and with George Addes himself, Aug. 30, 1979.

14. The reports (Aug. 9, 1937 and Apr. 24, 1939) are located in Box 1, Sugar Coll., R.L. John Safian interview, Sept. 22, 1979. Christopher Tomlins analyzes with care the growing reliance of the entire CIO movement on the NLRB and stresses the importance of its jurisdictional battles with the AFL unions, which, for the most part, condemned such reliance. Tomlins seems to say that the AFL took a more principled (and wiser) stand on the question. Obviously their vested interest in pre-Wagner Act union structures had much to do with their position. Moreover, explicitly to blame the CIO for getting caught up in such a situation ignores the political realities of 1937–39 and beyond. Still, to witness a radical and most perceptive lawyer such as Sugar become drawn into the position laid out here shows how powerful the attraction was and, in light of later events, how fatal for the kind of labor movement he believed in.

15. Davidow, The Genesis and Present-Day Methods of Communism (South Bend, 1938); Reford Record (a weekly), 1939–50, for his regular column. For the trial record and all the supporting materials, see the voluminous file assembled by Sugar, “The Tessmer Case,” Box 7, Sugar Coll., R.L.


19. Much detail on both cases is to be found in the private records, consulted on the premises, of Goodman, Eden, Millender and Bedrosian. Also see the Michigan Daily, Nov. 10, 1940 (photo of Sugar also); Detroit News, Nov. 10 and 17 and Dec. 4 and 5, 1941, Detroit Free Press, Oct. 28 and Dec. 4 and 6, 1941.

20. Detroit Free Press and Detroit News, December 28, 1940. Tomlins offers much detail on the changing structure of the board, particularly the growing role of “neutral” Leiserson, (State [see Preface, n. 3], 204–24). (Tomlins chronology is somewhat incorrect.) On Lewis’s break with Roosevelt, see Dubofsky and Van Tine, John L. Lewis (see ch. 6, n. 2), 243–67. Also the Detroit News, May 15–19, 1940.

21. Sugar’s files on these cases are enormous. The Gallo Case (“Syllabus: Laughter on the Assembly Line not Misconduct under Act,” Appeal Docket No. 5071) was one of hundreds (Boxes 54–55, Sugar Coll., R.L). Again, press reports were numerous as well, fueling the publicity mill (Boxes 56–59, Sugar Coll., R.L). See also Box 2, UAW Public Relations Dept., R.L). Besides demonstrating the centrality of the legal work in the Ford fight these files contain fascinating personal histories of Ford workers.


23. The fascinating depositions of former Ford spies may be read in Box 54, Sugar Coll., R.L. Also Box 92, Addes Coll., R.L for Rimar correspondence (Nov. 1941).

Chapter 9

1. Sugar kept a detailed account of the legal fee situation. See correspondence with Addes and attorneys like Johnson in Box 93, Addes Coll., R.L. For the general financial situation, see Box 3, Addes Coll., R.L. Among the other efforts Sugar made to save money for the union, after Louis Rosenzweig, a tax attorney, discovered that Local 157 could reduce its personal property tax from $155 to $12, Sugar then circulated the information to other locals and was of the opinion that such reductions were retroactive to the previous year
(Sugar to Addes, May 4, 1939, Box 3, Addes Coll., RL). The correspondence between Sugar and Addes on the financial state of the union in 1939 demonstrates clearly the devastating effect of Martin's idiocy. For the turnaround, see “President's report,” in Proceedings of the Sixth Constitutional Convention of UAW (Buffalo) (Detroit, 1941); Addes interview, Aug. 30, 1979. On Ford legal work see also Box 92, Addes Coll., RL.

2. The Addes Collection is often regarded as boring by researchers because of the minor, “routine,” questions the secretary-treasurer dealt with. But this was the test of union democracy: the fairness with which problems—especially nonpayment of dues—were dealt with. Trials for “antiunion” behavior, which often grew out of nonpayment, occurred all the time and required very careful oversight. Sugar and Addes showed themselves to be marvelous advisors. See especially Boxes 92–93, Addes Coll., RL, which contain the direct correspondence between Addes and Sugar about such matters; but the reader is also referred to the vast Box 64, Sugar Coll., RL. Advice to R. J. Thomas, Box 63, Sugar Coll., RL.
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5. Gigal, Going Away (see Preface, n. 4) 329; Tomlins, State (see Preface, n. 3) 275–30; on the general political atmosphere and the struggle of liberals to stay the course, see Alonzo L. Hamby, Beyond the New Deal: Harry S. Truman and American Liberalism (New York, 1973), 53–186; in general see Robert J. Donovan, Conflict and Crisis: The Presidency of Harry S. Truman, 1945–1947 (New York, 1977).
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