

1955

The Role of Labor in War

Victor G. Reuther

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review>

Recommended Citation

Reuther, Victor G. (1955) "The Role of Labor in War," *Naval War College Review*: Vol. 8 : No. 10 , Article 2.
Available at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol8/iss10/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Naval War College Review by an authorized editor of U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. For more information, please contact repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu.

SPECIAL ATTENTION TO THE READER

The material contained herein is furnished to the individual addressee for his private information and education only. The frank remarks and personal opinions of many Naval War College guest lecturers are presented with the understanding that they will not be quoted; you are enjoined to respect their privacy. Under no circumstances will this material be republished or quoted publicly, as a whole or in part, without specific clearance in each instance with both the author and the Naval War College.

NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW was established in 1948 by the Chief of Naval Personnel in order that officers of the service might receive some of the educational benefits of the resident students at the Naval War College. Distribution is in accordance with BUPERS Instruction 1552.5 of 23 June 1954. It must be kept in the possession of the subscriber, or other officers eligible for subscription, and should be destroyed by burning when no longer required.

The thoughts and opinions expressed in this publication are those of the author, and are not necessarily those of the Navy Department or of the Naval War College.

**NAVAL WAR COLLEGE
REVIEW**

**Issued Monthly
U. S. Naval War College
Newport, R. I.**

THE ROLE OF LABOR IN WAR

A lecture delivered
at the Naval War College
on 28 April 1955 by
Mr. Victor G. Reuther

Thank you, Admiral. Gentlemen :

I am very grateful to the officers on the staff of your College here for their kind invitation to me to participate in your program. I want to make it very clear that I pose in no sense as any expert in a matter as weighty as that of conducting war — that is, in the traditional sense of that term.

Of course, the world has changed a great deal, for warfare is not limited to the firing of guns from planes and battleships or from equipment on the ground. The kind of foe that confronts the free world today has little respect for traditional methods of warfare, as it has little respect for traditional methods of diplomacy. The whole nature of war and diplomacy have undergone very great changes, as you gentlemen know far better than I. But, in the limited area in which I have spent most of my adult life, I have a very strong and a very deep conviction that in the final analysis the victory of the free world will depend in far greater measure on what is done at the social, the economic and the political level — at the level where we seek to win the hearts, the minds and the souls of men and where we can mobilize our resources to do justice to the democratic cause in that area — than in the area of traditional warfare alone.

I would not be so presumptuous as to argue the point that it is one approach as against another. It is a combination of all approaches that we have at the various levels that will determine whether or not the free world will survive. I have a very strong feeling that in a realistic sense we have not even begun to mobilize

democracy's resources in this important strategic, economic and political area nearly as effectively as we have already demonstrated our might, our strength and our influence in the traditional military field.

It is in the economic and political areas that the Communists have been making their greatest gains. Their victories have not been military victories in recent years; they have been victories of infiltration, of penetration, of capitalizing on internal economic and political chaos, and of capturing from within. Coming out of the labor movement, I have had some personal experience with the skills which the Communists have demonstrated in this area of infiltration and penetration of economic and political organizations, and of using them as weapons in their larger strategy. I have some personal knowledge of the sacrifices that are being made around the world today by democratic non-Communist groups who are at grips with the Communists, who are locked in battle with them, and who are winning that battle in crucial areas at the very moment when the nations of the free world in the military and diplomatic fields are either suffering reverses or have been forced into a stalemate.

I come to you today with the plea that we need to take a long, hard look again at what the Communist strategy is, what its goals and objectives are and the weapons which it has at its disposal. We also need to take a long, hard look at whether or not we are trying to defend democracy with our strongest arm tied behind our back.

I think that American labor, when it put its own house in order by defeating the Communist forces inside of our own labor movement, made a significant contribution to our own internal security and thereby enhanced our strength in the world-wide struggle. There are few groups in our country or around the world that are singled out for attacks by communism as is the labor

movement. The trade union movement is at the very heart of Communist strategy; it is the vehicle which it hopes to capture and then to ride to power in country after country.

The Communists have not really tried to capture the lawyers, or the businessmen, or the churches in a serious way. But the Communists, as part of their world-wide strategy, have sought to penetrate and capture the labor movement. So it is no great credit to the business community if the Communists have not captured it, although in many countries there has occurred something just as bad: the ultra-extremism of nationalism and of fascism has captured the mentality of some employer groups. But it is to the credit of the labor movement that it has been able to see this strategy of the Communists, recognize it for what it is, and lick them at their own game. It is to the credit of the American labor movement that in this day and age the Communists enjoy no significant strength whatsoever in any of the basic unions across the length and breadth of this country of ours.

I think that we can look back with considerable pride on the role which American labor played in helping to mobilize America's great resources and great strength in the last war. This mobilization reflected itself not only in the Armed Forces, to which industrial labor contributed a very large percentage of the personnel of the Armed Services. It was also reflected in the flexibility of the American labor movement in making whatever adjustments were required in its own practices and policies to facilitate the greatest degree of mobility. As a result of these adjustments the labor force could be shifted from one industry to another to keep pace with the shift from peacetime to wartime production. This is a tribute to American labor.

Long before the Selective Service Act incorporated provisions to protect the reemployment rights of individuals who were inducted into the Armed Service, the American labor movement, on its own initiative, wrote into its collective bargaining agreement

the following guarantees: that when men were inducted into Service their reemployment rights continued to build up and accumulate; that their service credits were equal to any credits in the factory itself; and that they were guaranteed reemployment with accrued seniority rights. But, most of all, the greatest contribution of the American labor movement to the preservation of our free institutions grows out of its determination to make our democratic way of life not just a slogan to be repeated on national occasions, not just the subject for oratory, but something which every factory worker, farmer, and housewife can live, can enjoy, can feel, and with which he can identify himself.

Why have the Communists won no significant influence in the American trade union? Because American democracy has been made to function in the labor movement. It has brought real and genuine benefits to ordinary people; it has not been built along class lines which helps the owners of industry alone to amass great profits, with a vast number of industrial workers living at pitifully low living standards — as is the case in many countries around the world. If we in America are so naive as to think that in those poverty-stricken areas, we can defend the *status quo* or hold onto the established institutions of wealth by mere military defense measures while the population in no sense identify themselves with democracy and feel that they have little or no stake in it, we are naive indeed.

The contribution of the American labor movement during the last war effort was not limited alone to industrial mobilization, for out of the labor movement came significant ideas on increasing industrial mobilization and production for war purposes at a time when it was desperately needed. But, unfortunately, many of those ideas were not welcomed. Some industrialists considered these proposals as though they were suggestions from a partisan segment of the community which had no right to put forward proposals on industrial mobilization.

There was a proposal that came out of the United Auto Workers Union — CIO to build 500 planes a day in the automobile industry. The initial reaction of the industry was: "This is nonsense and it is impossible; 85%-90% of the industrial equipment of the automobile industry is single-purpose equipment which cannot be converted to the manufacturing of parts for airplanes." That was the argument and, as a result, the conversion of the automobile industry was delayed for at least eighteen months because of that attitude. The industrialists finally did convert their plants for war production and, at the end of the war, the owners of the automobile industry pointed with pride to the fact that 80%-90% of their facilities were converted to such production.

I had an experience some years prior to World War II which made me feel especially sad when I saw the leaders of a tremendous industry, like the automobile industry with its great technical know-how and engineering genius, arguing against the simple suggestion that its machinery and its equipment could not be converted to war production. I spent two years working in the Ford factory in the Soviet Union in 1933-34. Technicians were recruited out of the Ford plant in Detroit and sent there to help equip that factory. The Soviet government had purchased the tools, the dies, the jigs and fixtures from the Rouge plant in order to manufacture the Model "A" Ford automobile. I went there as a technician and I worked with young peasant lads out of the Volga country who had never seen anything more complicated than a wheelbarrow or a pitchfork. They built a factory, uncrated equipment shipped from abroad, and began to manufacture cars.

I worked in the tool room. It took three months before one single die was built which would operate to stamp out a part. Each part in that die had to be made six and seven times because somewhere along the line it would be scrapped. Out of this peasant background, nevertheless, they learned how to do this work. Along side the company engineers were Red Army officers who supervised the tooling for tank production. The factory, back in 1933-34,

when it got into its first stage of production, was tooled not only for Model "A" production but for light tank manufacturing as well. No one argued about single-purpose equipment. The Russians knew what they wanted — and they tooled their plant for it.

It was tragic for me to return to my own country and have to argue with the heads of the industry that this equipment was not "single-purpose." America had a great car market that year and it was quite profitable to exploit that market. Car production got priority at a moment when tooling for defense production should have been given top-level consideration. I mention that not out of any sense of bitterness but as an illustration of the fact that out of the labor movement came a genuine, deep-seated desire to make its contribution to the total mobilization of our country for meeting the forces of aggression around the world. That sense of dedication to the national interest has grown ever stronger in the ranks of the labor movement.

I dare say that it will come somewhat of a surprise to you gentlemen to know that at this very moment around the world are stationed trade unionists from the shop, the mines, and the mills whose wages and living expenses are paid out of the voluntary contributions of American workers. These trade unionists are being sent to distant parts of the world to help advise and strengthen the democratic non-Communist trade union groups who are locked in battle against activities and forces of the Communist trade unions seeking to capture or to keep control of the labor movement.

Why is this matter crucial to the world-wide struggle which is going on at the present time? Let me say that where there is a country that has strong and democratic trade unions, there you have no internal Communist problem. Look at the map of the world, country by country.

There is no internal problem in Britain as far as the Communist threat is concerned. There is a strong free trade union

movement there which is active at the workshop level and down in the pits, doing battle with the Communists when they seek to get a foothold.

Is anyone concerned about an internal Communist threat in the Scandinavian countries? Of course not.

Even in Germany — physically divided, with a third of the country occupied by Red Army troops — is the Communist Party itself strong and does it constitute an internal threat in that area? It does not.

In little Austria, an island cut off from the rest of Free Europe, where there is also one-third of it occupied by Soviet forces (but with a unified government that has unified elections), the Communist Party gets no more than 30%-40% of the votes in their elections.

We have strong trade union movements in those countries which work hard at the grass-roots level to give the people not only the feeling, but the substance of the democratic way of life; to identify the people with the institutions of democracy and to give them a feeling that there is something worth defending there — not just slogans.

Step across into France and Italy, where the Communist Party captured the labor movement at the end of World War II and tried to forge the trade union movements into instruments of political aggression. They remain in power in France and Italy as the dominant forces in the trade union movement for only one reason — and one reason alone. It is not because of the skill and ingenuity of the Communist forces at the labor movement and worker levels, but because the social and political climate in those countries are ideal for planting the seeds of Communist ideology. There are miserably low living standards and great exploitation in France and in Italy. No amount of military alliances alone which we can make with those countries will give us any degree of security.

I lived for nearly three years in a little village on the outskirts of Paris. Working out of the little office, an old dilapidated building some 400 years old, I moved across Europe making contact with non-Communist trade unionists, counseling with them and advising them. I put through a lot of demonstrations in France, where the Communists mobilized their forces to try to block every single effort which the West tried to put into operation.

At the end of the war, the Communists did not want any ships unloaded with any military equipment. It was not a meeting of military minds, gentlemen, that made it possible to land the arms in Marseille. There were trade unionists down there who broke the hold of the Communists over the dock workers in Marseille and permitted the ships to unload the military supplies.

But elsewhere in France and in Italy there is not the feeling on the part of ordinary people that there is something worth defending. The average French worker and the average Italian worker draws a weekly wage of one-quarter of what American workers earn. But when he buys the necessities of life for himself and his family he will pay as much, or more, than what we have to pay in the United States. Yet, the earnings of industrialists in Britain and in France, in terms of their capital investment, is greater than what American employers enjoy. There is this great gap between the "have's" and the "have not's." Democracy will remain but a slogan in France and Italy unless there is economic democracy, unless there is a feeling on the part of the people that they share in the benefits of what is produced in their economy. As long there is this great gap, or this great division, there is fertile soil for the Communists to plant their seeds of totalitarianism. It will grow and will be nourished in that kind of climate of insecurity and inequality, where there is a feeling of discrimination — a feeling that if this is democracy, there is little worth defending.

It is our feeling that people have to be given a stake in the democratic way of life if they will fight to defend it, and if they will make any significant contribution to a common defense. Of what real value is there to squeeze through a vote in the French Parliament of a 51% majority to commit French divisions to a European Defense Pact if there remain 5 million voting Communists in that country, and if those divisions that are recruited and armed are representative of those 5 million voters? A logical question to ask is: How many of the guns will point in what direction?

What we have to do is to begin working at the heart of the problem, of winning people to the cause of democracy, and not being content only with having a majority vote of a given government which may not be in power tomorrow. People remain; if people are given a stake, a share, and an investment in the democratic way of life then come what may, by way of cabinet shifts and changes at the parliamentary and legislative level, there is a strong foundation on which one can build. In this regard, I believe that at the workshop level the democratic free trade unionists around this world are making a contribution to the cause of democracy second to none.

On my first visit to Berlin, after the war, I remember something which General Clay said. I thought it was quite significant. We were talking about the efforts which the Communists were making to capture the trade union movement in Berlin by the use of a phony united front which they had put up; how the Berlin trade unionists had successfully resisted it—even in the Soviet sector of Berlin—and what a terrific boost this victory had given to the morale of the beleaguered city of Berlin, which was going through the seige of a blockade and was living only by the air lift. General Clay said that he doubted very much that the Allied forces could have stayed on in Berlin if the trade unionists had not won that victory. At that time, there was no real democratic political machinery established and the free labor

movement was therefore the most representative single group which spoke for the people in that beleaguered city. To give the Communists that kind of resounding defeat in their own back yard, to strike them a blow in such a vulnerable point, was a significant contribution.

In the crucial post-war years, the trade union movement around the world, with its own limited funds (and they were limited, indeed), have been pulling together the framework of a free trade union movement — a democratic, non-Communist movement called for the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) — which, today, represents 54 million people around the world in 57 different national trade union centers. This non-Communist trade union movement now enjoys personal contacts with democratic workers in practically every part of the world, including some that are under Communist control, where it maintains its connections through exiled groups who have liaison with groups behind the Iron Curtain.

Japanese trade unions, trade unions from Indonesia, from India, from Burma, from all of the underdeveloped countries of the Middle East, trade unions from dozens of countries in Central and Latin America, and, of course, all of the significant European trade union movements as well as those in the Northern Hemisphere, are members of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, which has operational headquarters in Brussels, Belgium. There is a staff of some seventy (70) experts and five(5) main regional offices around the world — in the Western Hemisphere, in the Middle East, in Southeast Asia, in the Far East, and in Europe — with a corps of trained labor experts who are practical trade unionists and who know how to organize a democratic trade union to give expression to the hopes and aspirations of people — experts, in other words, who know how to outmaneuver the Communists at their own game. In my opinion, these people are hard at work in various areas of the world making a very vital and significant contribution to the cause of the free world.

You cannot separate work at this level from what is done by the labor movement at the national and government level in terms of providing the kind of broad economic and political policies that tend to encourage the development and growth of democratic institutions of this nature. That is the reason why American labor has been so deeply concerned that the United States Government take the bold initiative in developing the economic policies and programs in the underdeveloped countries of the world that will remove the possibility of exploitation by Communists by creating the kind of wholesome economic climate that will encourage the growth and development of democratic trade unionism and democratic institutions.

We have met with success and we have met with disappointing failures as well. Some of the successes and some of the failures have been rather close at home here in our own Western Hemisphere. Last week, in Costa Rica, a large body of labor delegates from all over North, South and Central America gathered, meeting as a Western Hemispheric unit of our World Confederation of Free Trade Unions. They took stock of the situation in Latin America and one of the incidents which came up for discussion was the developments in Guatemala. I would like to spend just a few minutes in talking about that incident because it is close at home and because America has been so heavily identified with events there.

I need not go into the history of that incident. You know that what started out as a democratic revolution — probably as democratic as was our own Revolution in the early days — was distorted, was twisted and was captured by the Communists in Guatemala. But there were certain things which were set in motion during the early days of the democratic upheaval of Guatemala that were legitimate and should have enjoyed our support. One of these was that there should be a program of land reform.

How much loyalty do you think the American farmers would have for our democratic way of life if they were peons

working on vast tracts of land owned by tremendous landlords, or, worse yet, by firms from other countries who came in and made investments here and bought huge tracts of land? This is the background and this is the mentality of many, many people in Latin America who are quite suspicious of American firms that come in and buy out huge parts of their country to exploit their natural resources.

Here there was a system of land reform set in motion, for which the Communists later took credit and out of which they made political capital. There was a code of labor legislation which gave workers — whether they were plantation workers on the United Fruit plantations, whether they were railroad workers on the railroad lines owned by United Fruit, whether they worked in telephone and communications, or whatever — the right to unionize. It gave them the right to meet together and discuss their common problems and the right to petition for redress of grievances, a very fundamental right in a democracy.

The Communist regime is out and the so-called “democratic regime” is in with America’s official blessing. But one of the first acts of this new democratic regime was to wipe out the land reform program and to destroy the labor code. We have been meeting with workers down there who had the courage to fight underground the Communists while they were in power — and who say today: “We want the right to unionize.” You cannot fight the Communists who capture the labor movement or who capture the land reform program by substituting a vacuum in its place. The answer to Communist demagoguery is not inaction — it is positive democratic action. The great tragedy is that the military victory that was won in Guatemala may be lost and may go “down the drain” because of our failure to implement it at the social, the economic and the political levels; by our neglecting to provide the opportunity for indigenous organizations, democratic in character, to establish their own roots so that democracy has

a staying power, and so it can continue to challenge the threat of communism as it raises its ugly head.

Not far from Guatemala is the little country of Costa Rica. The man who was tapped on the shoulder to be Minister of Labor chose, instead, to become General Secretary of our Western Hemispheric unit of the ICF TU — an able young man by the name of Molcha. He has helped us to establish very significant trade union contacts south of the border in democratic countries and in countries of dictatorship (and the majority south of the border and in our backyard fall in the latter category). In Costa Rica, a model democracy has been established in this Hemisphere. You can search the length and breadth south of the border and you will find no government more genuinely dedicated to democratic practices and principles than Costa Rica.

Three months ago, I had the privilege of leading a delegation from CIO to visit the State Department. We informed the State Department officials that we had received information from our contacts in Costa Rica and Honduras, as well as in Mexico, that there was a military build-up on the private plantations across the border in Nicaragua and that this build-up was formed for the purposes of a military invasion. We cautioned the State Department that if this democratic government of Costa Rica were threatened or overthrown by military acts of aggression and if the Western Hemisphere organization, of which the United States was a part, did not quickly intervene, this refusal to act would serve notice on every friend of democracy south of the border that America was not on their side. It would also raise and revive the old fears of gringo intervention in Latin America.

We didn't think at the time that our advice to the State Department was taken too seriously. Perhaps the officials were being coy. But I was proud a few weeks later when the American government moved quickly; proud that it took the initiative — not alone in a unilateral action, which some could accuse as

being "Yankee intervention," but moved quickly as part of the Hemisphere team. It pledged military support to the country of Costa Rica that was threatened with open aggression and that incident did a great deal to clarify the issues south of the border — issues that were not too clear in the case of Guatemala.

These incidents have a very direct relationship to the kind of military alliances which we build around the world and to the kind of real and meaningful strength that is breathed into these pacts if these pacts are to be something more than paper documents, if they are to carry with them and behind them — as a powerful backstop — the will and determination of people to fight for freedom and free institutions. You do not build that kind of feeling and that kind of understanding by action at the diplomatic level alone. That kind of understanding by action at the diplomatic level alone. That kind of understanding can be built by people-to-people contacts, or the kind of relationships that can be established between farmers in this country meeting with farmers in other countries, between factory workers from here meeting with factory workers in other countries.

When the people around the world are generally concerned about defending free institutions, when they get to know us as we really are, when they get to understand what our own hopes and aspirations are, when they get the feeling that we are interested in them as people and are concerned with their problems — not just looking upon them as so many potential mercenary forces that might be thrown into some grand military strategy — then, and only then, will we build meaningful alliances. In order to do that, we have to put the kind of resources behind our economic and our political strategy that in the past have been part of our military strategy. I am not suggesting — and I want to make this very clear — any tearing-down of our military defenses; I am for keeping them strong and at whatever level is required to meet the threat of aggression. But that is but one arm — and the job cannot be done unless the other arm is put at work as well.

How much will this kind of economic program cost us? Well, the total cost of Marshall aid from the end of World War II up to now has been slightly more than 30 billion dollars. World War II cost us 30 billion dollars per month for forty-four (44) consecutive months. So the relative cost of building the kind of economic climate that will encourage democracy is "peanuts" compared to the resources that we put into military defense alone.

This year, the Soviet Union is investing 2 billion dollars in economic aid, technical assistance, and technical personnel in Red China. That is ten times the economic aid which we are making available to India and twenty-five times the number of technicians. Now I ask you whether or not—in terms of the great struggle that faces the free world—India is as important to us as Red China is to Russia? Is the Soviet Union—with its limited industrial power compared to ours, with its far weaker economy, and with its far smaller supply of reserves and surpluses—in a better position to extend economic aid of this kind than we are? We have been most unrealistic; we have been penny-wise and pound-foolish in thinking that we can put all of our eggs into one basket and still fight a Communist strategy.

I think that the time has come when the free world has to mobilize all of its resources and match the real challenge of Communist aggression at every level with a superiority of reserves and resources. There are a billion and a half people in Southeast Asia, the Far East, and Africa who have not made up their minds yet which side of the fence they are on in this struggle. Whichever way these people throw their weight can be quite decisive. If we win them to the cause of freedom, we will have to work at an entirely different level than that at which we have been working.

In India, the average annual wage or income is less than fifty dollars a year and there are some 80 million people either completely out of work or only partially employed. The living

standards are pitifully low, with the vast majority of the people going to bed every night feeling hungry and having no great anticipation that the morning will bring them any greater degree of satisfaction. Of what significance does the signing of a military pact have to them? Or, perhaps they are suddenly dismissed as being "neutralists." They are not neutral in the choice between having food and not having food. When the free world goes to them with an offer of cooperation (I am not saying a "hand-out") to make young technicians available to help them develop their own economy, when the free world shows practical demonstrations of concern in their problems as human beings — we shall bridge the gap that divides us from them; we shall win them to the cause of the free world; we shall wrest the initiative from the Russians and their satellites by that kind of bold leadership in an area which up until now we have, to too large an extent, left to the Soviets alone to exploit. The pattern of the great successes of the Marshall Aid Program in Europe — and these successes have been tremendous and not been costly when weighed against other expenditures in our national economy — if applied with the new lessons we have learned as a result of that experience, we can win the Middle East, Southeast Asia and the Far East to our cause.

I think there is a kind of practical know-how in the ranks of the labor movement about doing battle with the Communists which grows out of the experience we have had. It has not been learned out of textbooks — we have had to rub elbows with the Communists who tried to capture our movement. We recognize these Communists to be of the same breed and the same stripe as the Communists we ran into in France, Italy, Japan and Guatemala. It is as though they were all trained in the same "little *Red* schoolhouse"; they all rely upon the same technique of forging poverty, insecurity and misery into a weapon of aggression. They have no right to that weapon — that weapon should never be in their hands! If we would rob them of that potent weapon, then we must offer more than just a vacuum.

We must offer a counterproposal far more dramatic in its appeal and far more potent in terms of its effect. We have the resources. We are, in fact, so glutted with agricultural and farm surpluses that they cause national worry and concern.

In a recent meeting of the Foreign Operations Administration, Governor Stassen was talking about his own plans for using these surpluses as part of our total aid program in order to gear it in with our total strategy to win people. I made this comment: "Suppose the Soviets were worried with this kind of a problem. Suppose the Soviets had these tremendous surpluses of wheat, butter, and all of the rest. They would not sit around, hanging their heads. They would forge all of this into a weapon of aggression! We ought to forge our advantages into a weapon for real, world-wide understanding — a weapon in the defense of democratic rights, democratic concepts, and democratic institutions."

That is what labor is interested in doing. We do not pretend to be military strategists. Labor makes its contribution as enlistees and as drafted people in the Armed Forces. But in this area of winning the hearts and minds of men, in this struggle at the ideological level, labor has had some experience which to this date is not reflected in the policy levels of either our government or the other governments of the free world.

In conclusion, I wish to remind you that America has natural allies around the world — 54 million trade union members who have demonstrated their loyalty to the democratic way by booting the Communists out in their own movement; people who have made their dedication and their commitments to the free world; people who are daily making sacrifices to demonstrate their faith in free trade unions and free institutions. These are natural allies which the free world would do well to enlist in its cause.

I thank you for this very great opportunity to share the thoughts and thinking of trade unions in this very important matter. Thank you very much!

BIOGRAPHIC SKETCH

Mr. Victor G. Reuther

Mr. Victor G. Reuther, the youngest of three brothers who have become important figures in the American labor movement, was born in Wheeling, West Virginia, in 1912. He attended West Virginia University and Wayne University in Detroit.

In 1933, he and Walter Reuther visited abroad, traveling to several European countries, and then went on to Russia where they worked sixteen months as machinists in the Gorki auto plant. From Russia, they visited Siberia, India and Japan.

In 1935, Mr. Reuther went to work for the Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Company in Detroit. He was leader of the first sit-down strike in the Detroit area, in 1936, which resulted in winning union recognition and a wage increase at that company. His activities were then transferred to Flint, Michigan, where a crucial struggle broke out between the United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers Union (U. A. W.) and General Motors. He assisted in mapping the strategy for the Flint strikers, which resulted in General Motors signing a union agreement with U. A. W. During the next four years, he played important parts in a series of organizing drives which culminated with the unionization of the Ford Company.

During the war, he served as a labor member on the War Manpower Commission. He was also co-director of the War Policy Division of the U. A. W.

The factional disputes within the U. A. W., between the Communist wing and left wing supporters and the anti-Communist wing led by Walter Reuther, was climaxed at the U. A. W. Convention in 1946 — when Walter Reuther was elected President of the U. A. W., and Victor Reuther became Educational Director.

Mr. Reuther served as fraternal delegate of the C. I. O. at the London meetings in 1948 of the Trade Union Advisory Committee of the European Recovery Program and as the representative of American Labor and Co-Chairman of the Anglo-American Committee on Productivity of E. C. A. He was one of a committee of three sent by the C. I. O. to study the trade union and economic conditions in Europe in 1951, which finally led to the establishment of the C. I. O. European Office and to his appointment as representative. In this position, he worked closely with the anti-Communist International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

In September, 1953, Mr. Reuther was assigned to National C. I. O. Headquarters as Administrative Assistant to Walter Reuther, and, more recently, as Assistant to George Meany, the present Director of C. I. O.