POLITICAL CREDO OF A LABOR ORGANIZER

To apologize for and distort the real relations between capital and labor is a frequent and effective practice of capitalist ideologists. This is not unexpected, and a disgusting enough procedure. It is doubly revolting, however, when it comes out of the mouths of "labor" men, so-called, especially from those with a socialist background. Walter Reuther, head of the automobile workers union, was once, in the turbulent depression 30's, of socialist conviction. It seems tho, that few can rise in influence in the trade-union movement and deny the laborist faith. Success, and the monetary achievement that goes with it, has a way of going to men's heads, turning them upside down, causing them to forget what they once knew and believed in. Manifestly Reuther, too, succumbed to this mortal weakness. Concomitantly with the rise of his star he shed his socialist convictions, one by one, so that now he is a full-fledged member of the "bourgeois apologetic society."

It is the typical mark of an OPPORTUNIST to adjust his thinking, to abandon principle, in accordance with convenience as dictated by material, practical considerations.

Climbing to the top is no easy matter. Such a feat has its material compensations in wealth and prestige. It also means hobnobbing with labor's counterpart the big shots of industry. Brushing shoul- lers with them begets an intimate acquaintance as well as a sharing of their viewpoint. And before one knows, compromise grows on him and even their capitalistic attitudes. Mission accomplished. A la bor opportunist and apologist is born. Principle and conviction is dead.

In reply to a recent charge that he is seeking to establish a labor political party Reuther came out with a categorical "no" and said: "The American labor movement is overwhelmingly committed to oppose the creation of a third party, or a labor party, and I share that point of view. In many European countries there are such parties in power or about to take power. But those countries have different historic backgrounds than we in America. Their societies have been highly stratified in rigid class groups."

SOCIALISM, THE HOPE OF THE WORLD

Hope is an essential attribute to human existence. There's a saying: "where there is life there is hope" to which the converse might be added: "where there is hope there is also life." The two thoughts are actually interconnected so that when a situation is declared hopeless it means we are done, licked.

We can see it at work in our daily existence. Most people look forward to something: either a benefit for themselves or for their children; in general, towards an improvement. "Hope and tur­ nement is life. Some even cling to a dream of their "ship coming in some day"; others look towards early retirement; most cling to a hazy, spiritual substitute in a world hereafter for their earthly disappointments.

Religion retains most of its hold on the human mind by nurturing the hope in the human breast that all the earthly sufferings and tribulations will find their compensa­ tions in a life after death that will measure up to what they've always sought here without success: peace, serenity, freedom and abun­ dance, "Heaven and earth"; is a terrifically powerful slogan.

The impact and hold it has upon humanity is basically material, in the sense that it fills in a material vacuum, a substitute for what people desire and don't have.

The Church in concert with the powers-that-be is conscious of the power of hope among the people and plays it for all it's worth. It virtually preys upon human ignorance and seeks its perpetuation.

This would indeed be a hopeless situation were it not for the facts of life which themselves have the faculty of establishing conditions, only in time to upset and negate them.

It is the contradictory nature of things, of existence, to negate it­ self. That which is eventually ceases to be, dies and its opposite comes into being. Motion, flux is an attribute of all phenomena, material as well as spiritual or mental. Everything changes.

What bearing has this upon hope and a new society? It is this: just as the old contains and prepares the elements and conditions for the new, just as today grew out of, and is the continuation of yesterday, so tomorrow, the future, is the growth and the continuation of to­ day. The process, growth, develop­ ment, calls it evolution, if you will, is an essential fact of life, of existence.

It hardly needs reiteration to say that capitalism, present-day social existence, is in a hopeless state as well as flux. It is beset by all sorts of conflicts, fears, hardships and human frustrations. The harder a little honest folk work, strive and plan, the less they seem compen­ sated, their plans frustrated. The workman's job grows more insecure, in the face of technological development; the small business-
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They are a mixed joy as readily seen. Early expanding capitalism, in due time, found jobs for some of the industrial underclass. But now, with contracting capitalism, a growing army of permanent unemployed is envisaged. Youthful capitalism expanded to the four corners of the globe; today, aging capitalism is shrinking in all corners with the rise and growth of its rival, communism.

One Detroit economist points out that more than 6-manufacturers could be built with 200,000 idle workers, due to automation. A similar condition obtains in other fields as automation spreads. A few years ago, a Chrysler executive said: "Automate or die." And big business is automating and smaller business is dying, as attested by business failures and bankruptcies which are up sharply in recent years. The inherent economic laws of capitalism decree no other course.

We are told that capitalism is flexible and could be improved when necessary and jobs to go with it—that is—we could have the cake and eat it too. The experience is contrary to such facile expectations and concepts. The inexorable laws of the economic system are growing disparities between the production forces and the capability of the market to absorb the commodities without a periodic glut. The merchant must be sold at a profit to his owners, the capitalists, otherwise capitalism is shrinking absolutely and relatively. Absolutely in the sense that the whole earth has already been exploited and is in fact contracting as communism expands and even invades the existing markets. Relatively, as automation throws workers out of jobs, diminishing purchasing power at home. That is the core of the fix the system finds itself.

It can't change fundamentally and still be capitalism. It must continue in every manner of operation, of expanding production forces against a contracting market, thereby producing depressions, international crises and a permanent army of unemployed. Automation is hastening, heightening and sharpening the contradictory mess of the outmoded-late capitalism, but the recent development of automation is new and underscores the problem. Labour-saving (to capitalists) machines, robots or labor displacing (to workers) gadgets, are as old as capitalism, including the history of his own auto-workers. Little does he realize what's in store for his own union, the effects that capitalist automation is having to bear upon the skill and wellbeing of auto workers, which in time may displace even more workers than technological development of the
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- ed. It reputedly possesses the high-
est living standards, highest rate of crime and heart failures, the greatest number and largest sized -autonomous and hence beneficial toward labor movement and the largest number of labor misleaders. These -contrasts, of course, but also -differences are not one of a kind, but of degree. They are RELA-TIVE. For with the march of time its European capitalist counterpart could never catch up with the U.S. in wealth, productivity, and other matters. But the important oversight, con veniently made by Reuther is in the RESEMBLANCE of things.

All capitalist nations, regardless of size, location and historical background have similar composi-
tion and function. Their composi-
tion is their class division, capital and labor, exploiters and exploit-
ted. They all, alike, possess a state power, popularly called government, the purpose of which is to protect the interests of private property and its host, the capitalist, the real political power for the safe-
guard of economic interests. They all as one possess political parties, representative of the different and distinct economic and class social segments. Whether one capitalist nation is a republic and another a modified monarchy makes little difference. The various forms do not negate the capitalist essence which underlie their samesness.

In their function the resem-
bable nations are marked.

Wealth is in all of them amassed by the exploitable labor. Class con-
lict and social strife, generally, characterizes all alike, in which the state power is definitely com-
mited to the defense of the status quo and the powers-that-be. They are all imperialist-minded with adequate war machines ever ready for conquests and expan-
sion of rule beyond their respec-
tive borders.

For Reuther to look away from the points of similarity is to dis-
regard the history of American la-
bor, its many class conflicts,
THE THREAT OF WAR

The "cold war" between capitalism (led by the U.S.) and communism (led by the U.S.S.R.) is a world-class struggle on an international scale. Periodically it gets very "hot," that is, comes out into the open. Last month the two antagonists became so inflamed over the "Khrushchev-Mao" situation that it brought us close to breaking out into a conflict of world-wide proportions. The press commented that even if a compromise of some sort was worked out, that it at best could only be a truce and not a permanent solution.

The U.N. Debate

War threats filled the debate in the United Nations General Assembly over the fate of the offshore islands of China, especially when America's "brink of war" and "massive retaliation" expert, Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles spoke. He said, in effect, that if Communist Peoples China attempted to "conquer" the islands of Quemoy and Matsu, as a step toward the conquest of the Pescadores Islands and Formosa (Taiwan), then the United States would directly intervene and war would come.

But the Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko, denouncing the American armed intervention, stated that if Peoples China is attacked then the Soviet Union will come to her aid. He demanded American withdrawal of American forces from the area, and declared that, "More and more evident becomes the simple truth that there cannot be a stable peace in the Far East until American armed forces are withdrawn fully and for all time from the Chinese island of Taiwan (Formosa) and from the Taiwan Strait.

Khrushchev vs Eisenhower

There has also been plenty of acrimonious exchange, diplomatically and thru correspondence, between President Eisenhower and the Soviet leader. Eisenhower over the Chinese question. Letters and notes between them passed so furiously that it was a problem for the press to keep track of them.

Very early on this issue, Soviet Premier Khrushchev warned Eisenhower by declaring that, "An attack on the Peoples Republic of China . . . is an attack on the Soviet Union." Khrushchev further stated, that "all we want to do is to call your attention to the situation which, no one would be able to get out of, neither you nor we, should a war break out in the Far East." Khrushchev suggested a negotiation.

What the Soviet Union desires most is to preserve peace, yet at the same time defend the interests of her ally, Peoples Republic China.

In rebuttal, Eisenhower's reply was his bellicose "no appeasement" radio-TV speech of Sept. 12th in which he committed the U.S. to intervention by force in the so-called "defense of Quemoy." That was great justification by Chiang Kai-shek (the heart of the Nationalist forces on those islands including Formosa) who wants to invade Peoples China.

But within the American nation it was received with great feelings, and even with open criticism by those few who dared brave any investigation into the "f.b.i." that might subsequently occur to ascertain whether they have any "communist leanings." For example: the Chicago Daily News publisher editorially condemned the Eisenhower-Dulles "brink of war" policy, calling it "openly stupid" and "most utter mental madness" and that the island of Quemoy is "not worth one American life." (Is he under investigation now?)

The sharpest attack on the President came from Senator Wayne Morse, Democrat of Oregon, who declared, "The U.S. is being dragged into a war through the back door by a dictator, a Chinese war lord who was driven off the mainland of China." This was in reference, of course, to his own, to Chiang Kai-shek, and is being booted out of China by the October 1949 Revolution.

The Soviet Premier Khrushchev answered Eisenhower's Sept. 12th letter and warned him that the U.S. troop "detonation" from Taiwan (Formosa), and the surrounding seas, by the Chinese Communists unless they withdraw "now"; that an attack on Peoples China would mean "certain death" to American sons and a world war. He also pointed out that neither the Soviet Union nor Peoples China was "frightened" by what they considered "atomic blackmail" from the U.S. Khrushchev also revealed much of the tense negotiations which was, "that the United States has seized inalienable Chinese territory—Taiwan (Formosa) and a number of other islands; keeps the property of the Chinese, including the Chiang Kai-shek clique, thrown out by the Chinese people, and encouraged its sallies and provocations against Peoples China."

He further declared that the U.S. once "recognized" Chinese sovereignty over those islands in the Cairo Declaration of 1943. It was reaffirmed in the Potsdam Declaration of 1945 which was signed by the United States and some other great powers. Khrushchev pointed out that the United States is planning to be Chinese territories after the victory of the People's Revolution which established a government representing the entire Chinese people and which "guarantees itself by the ideas of communism." He declared that, "To deny this is to interfere in the internal affairs of other peoples and to arrogate to oneself some police functions." What Khrushchev attempted was to convince President Eisenhower that Peoples China has a legal and historical right to the ownership of the islands.

However, the United States is in the reactionary and ridiculous position of recognizing only the Chiang Kai-shek clique or the island of Formosa as the "legitimate" or "nationalist" government of China. This is in direct contrast to the situation in other countries—like realist England, France, and Japan—and have given their recognition to the Communist government of Peoples China.

Khrushchev's letter must have hit a sore spot in President Eisenhower who returned it in anger declaring it to be "abusive," etc. This was very childish behavior, not befiting a man holding such an important office. It was an insulting gesture to the Soviet Union.

Might Has Got The Message

In terms of returns on the U.S. government investment in the support of the Chiang Kai-shek clique as a "bulwark against communism" it has been a dead loss to the American government. The cost of that intervention, to preserve the Chiang Kai-shek reactionary, semi-feudal, capitalist regime on the mainland of China, in post-war years from 1945 to 1949 while he was trying to crush the revolutionary movement, has been high. The combined cost was that huge sum of upwards of 6 billion dollars in American aid, mainly in guns, tanks, planes, etc. The American taxpayers grained, and the taxpayer has never been given a number of the money that has been spent. Some have commented: "And we had lost China anyway— all that money thrown down a rat hole!"

During World War Two, before 1945, there was some justification in supporting the Chiang Kai-shek regime in the common struggle against Japan. However, there was much corruption in Chiang's regime; many of his bureaucrats were looting the American aid dollars, and some actually collaborating with the enemy, Japan.

But with the war coming to an end in 1945, the internal conflict against Communists was resumed. It was a revolutionary struggle of the poverty-stricken workers and peasants against all their oppressors and exploiters, native as well as foreign (the imperialists). In spite of all the billions of dollars in American aid, mainly in arms for Chiang's counter-revolutionary forces, the Chinese masses were able by October 1949 to rid themselves of that "bulwark against communism," Chiang Kai-shek. The Chinese Red Army of Liberation captured all of his (American) weapons, together with millions of his soldiers, most of whom were glad to surrender rather than fight their own countrymen. So, the many billions of dollars worth of American aid did not exactly go down a "rat hole." It was the American government itself that armed the Chinese revolutionary masses against Chiang; although it did not plan it that way.

Since Chiang Kai-shek was pushed off the mainland of China (in spite of American support), there is no way that he can hold on to Formosa? None at all, If he is going to depend upon his own efforts. To keep him there has cost the American government (or rather the U.S. taxpayers) over a billion dollars so far, and "there is no end in sight" as to future costs as some press commentators put it. But the cost of aiding him in an attempted invasion of China would be tremendous, not alone in dollars but human lives as well. It could result in complete destruction of the United States itself, in the event it precipitated a world-wide conflict.

Can War be Abolished?

An attempt has been made to negotiate a peaceful settlement by a conference held in Warsaw, Poland, between diplomats speaking for the U.S. and Peoples China. Suggested plans were aimed for a "cease fire," and neutralizing the offshore islands of China. So far, at this writing, nothing definite has been decided. Whether, or not, something in the nature of a Korean "truce" will be arrived at remains to be seen. This much is certain: if there is a "cease fire" any conflict will spread. But even if a "truce" is agreed upon, there is no guarantee that some day it will not be violated by Chiang Kai-shek and his followers. As the Marxist philosophers have said, war is inherent in the ruling class gives up without a struggle," and Chiang has never given up hope that some day he will "get back China." But that is not the only reason that the threat of war will continue to affect the peoples of the world. This is because the world today is divided socially and politically into two parts: first one is the communist section world with its growing nation in the capitalist section but which is shrinking.

Capitalist imperialism (American, British and French, especially) is in a most disadvantageous position as the world today there is less room for capitalist expansion, and the struggle for the portion (two-thirds) that's still left to the imperialists becomes most keen. To make matters worse for them they have to contend with the growing hordes of fighters as the Algerians, Iraq, etc. All of these factors make for a most troubled world.

Wars will only be abolished by getting rid of the system that breeds them: capitalism. World peace could only be achieved if the exploited masses against their exploiters within each capitalist nation. This is the only way to end wars and bring permanent world peace.
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past has. He must be blind not to recognize the international aspect of capitalism. The U.S. is not an isolated entity. Its interests and involvements are too great, so too, its armed forces. The competitive nature of capitalism is such that one country's industry is intensely and directly affected by automobile competition from Europe and elsewhere. Under these conditions for him to deny the resemblance of capitalism is either outright ignorance or conscious distortion.

He mentions that "our society has been in a state of flux." Well, you wouldn't know it by the static opinion he expresses. Certainly, the American economy has been in a state of flux. Does that mean the European countries have not, even if not the same pace? And if it is in two or three fluxes what does that prove? Precisely what the contentions of socialism are, what Reuther knew in the '30s, namely that the problem was the size of capitalism is getting too big for its shoes, that it is laying the economic and social groundwork for socialism and for the creation of a new social order inevitable.

But Reuther draws another conclusion, that in contrast to Europe's developing rigid class relations American fluid development permitted workers to move from their social status and into the ranks of capital. That's not a lie. However, it has happened in few instances. It has happened to Reuther, we suppose. Still that doesn't disprove the existence of classes in America. The general numerical increase of the labor force in America shows there are more falling into the ranks of the working class than escaping from it. The fluidity and the movement in and out of it is certainly no contradiction of its existence.

The growth and entrenchment of trusts in industry and agriculture, both, if anything, makes for more stratified class groups, right here in America, Reuther, notwithstanding. This is a definite trend which, too, is part of the fluidity of American society. Incidentally, this may have a bearing on the U.S. high economic development. Conversely, in Europe with a less high industrial development the proletariat is so politically advanced that it is to be expected that with time and the economic forces as set into motion by existing social forces the proletariat in America will increase in its militancy and political understanding.

It is Reuther's contention that American labor does not need a political party of its own; that its interests can be satisfied thru the existing capitalist parties. All we need is more "integration" and "political responsibility," he holds. Correctness that is the very heart and soul of it. But what does that prove? That capital will use that integrity and responsibility to labor's benepleasure? That the capitalist interests, are in business for? Is that what labor's history proves? Or is it greater profits that motivates them in their relations? And how does Mr. Reuther propose that capital will get what it's after except out of the hands of the workers, his own auto workers included.

By the same token, if "integration" and "responsibility" is the criterion, then might it not be equally logical to disband the labor unions (economic class organizations) and rely on the economic bargaining, upon the integrity and responsibility, of General Motors, Ford, Chrysler and the rest.

It should be clear that Reuther's line is clearly a trap for labor and if carried to its logical conclusion would leave labor completely at the mercy of the employers. The class lines are real. They are real economically. They should be equally so, politically. No organized private industry or its private interests, as the books say they are, would leave the American economy to labor's mercy.

Reuther demonstrated his complete renegacy, loyalty to the men of capitalism. Labor's future lies not in the direction as outlined by Reuther but in the opposite direction. Labor needs to break with capitalist politics, with capitalist thinking in general. Socialism is on the march. Labor is its banner bearer. The true political mouthpieces for business and Republican parties are the political manipulators. The working man can satisfy conflicting class interests alike. The Manorial society where industry will be economically. They should be more politically advanced. It is to be expected that with time and existing social forces the proletariat in America will increase in its militancy and political understanding.
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It is Reuther's contention that American labor does not need a political party of its own; that its interests can be satisfied thru the existing capitalist parties. All we need is more "integration" and "political responsibility," he holds. Correctness that is the very heart and soul of it. But what does that prove? That capital will use that integrity and responsibility to labor's benefits? That the capitalist interests, are in business for? Is that what labor's history proves? Or is it greater profits that motivates them in their relations? And how does Mr. Reuther propose that capital will get what it's after except out of the hands of the workers, his own auto workers included.

By the same token, if "integration" and "responsibility" is the criterion, then might it not be equally logical to disband the labor unions (economic class organizations) and rely on the economic bargaining, upon the integrity and responsibility, of General Motors, Ford, Chrysler and the rest.

It should be clear that Reuther's line is clearly a trap for labor and if carried to its logical conclusion would leave labor completely at the mercy of the employers. The class lines are real. They are real economically. They should be equally so, politically. No organized private industry or its private interests, as the books say they are, would leave the American economy to labor's mercy.

Reuther demonstrated his complete renegacy, loyalty to the men of capitalism. Labor's future lies not in the direction as outlined by Reuther but in the opposite direction. Labor needs to break with capitalist politics, with capitalist thinking in general. Socialism is on the march. Labor is its banner bearer. The true political mouthpieces for business and Republican parties are the political manipulators. The working man can satisfy conflicting class interests alike. The Manorial society where industry will be economically. They should be more politically advanced. It is to be expected that with time and existing social forces the proletariat in America will increase in its militancy and political understanding.

The growth and entrenchment of trusts in industry and agriculture, both, if anything, makes for more stratified class groups, right here in America,