

The last two weeks we've begun these pages talking about the international activities of the AFL-CIO. We do so again this week.

Word comes, in "News from the AFL-CIO", about the "training" program of AIFLD for labor leaders in Peru. This was the first indoctrination program for Latin labor leaders that was set up by AIFLD. It is reported by the AFL-CIO that "most of the members of the executive boards of the bank, textile, sugar and other leading unions of Peru are AIFLD graduates, and the same is true for the main city centrals."

Further, AFL-CIO reports that organizing efforts in Peru now are centered primarily on agricultural workers, whose leaders will be duly trained by the AIFLD--indoctrinated, that is, with the kind of labor philosophy which American corporations think they ought to have.

Is it difficult to understand why the AFL-CIO leadership, including George Meany and the AFL-CIO executive council, are just as slavish in their support of what Lyndon's doing in the Dominican Republic and Vietnam, as any of Lyndon's other lackeys?

Lyndon is offering the AFL-CIO leadership the money and the political and military support they need to take over the Latin American workers. The American "labor leaders" can then serve as labor contractors for American corporations in Latin America.

Thus will American "freedom and prosperity" come to the starving and oppressed people of Latin America.

Does anyone think it will stop there? Already the counterpart of AIFLD for African workers is being set up by Lyndon's labor leaders in the AFL-CIO.

Some say that Lyndon is crazy. We say he is crazy like a fox, remembering that while foxes are noted for their cleverness, they are frequently rabid. Could it be the proud destiny of the American people to fill the world with mad dogs?

*

*

*

There is a lesson to be learned from the activities of American corporations in the Republic of South Africa.

First of all the lesson teaches us something about American politics. Two of the leading exploiters of South Africa's mineral and industrial wealth are Charles W. Engelhard and C. Douglas Dillon. They do not, of course, operate alone. They have with them a very significant proportion of the corporate rulers of the American economy. The important thing about these two is that Engelhard is one of the larger contributors to the Democrat Party

and C. Douglas Dillon is one of the most prominent and wealthy members of the "liberal" wing of the Republican Party.

Therefore, the U.S. corporations (we've identified them many times in these pages) which operate so profitably in South Africa (25% profit on investment is the least they expect) are represented by the leadership of both American political parties. Furthermore the corporations and those who control them constitute the economic base from which Lyndon intends to rule the world. Those who think there is some fundamental difference between the Democrat and Republican parties need to examine these facts a bit more closely.

Now these two corporate-political leaders, Dillon and Engelhard, say they do not approve of the oppression of black people by the racist government of South Africa. That is what they say. Their objection to this oppression has not prevented their taking the enormous profits that can be made from the very fact of this oppression. But, still, they say they don't like it and would rather they could make their profits without people having to be oppressed in this way.

For about a year now American corporations have been trying to upgrade the black workers and give them some of the better jobs in the South African mines. They say they want to do this because they believe everyone should have equal opportunity in employment. They don't say when it was that they began believing this, but it must have been only recently.

One of the facts of life in South Africa, as in the U.S., is that Negroes, generally, receive less pay for doing a given job than whites receive for doing the same job. The difference between South Africa and the U.S. is that seldom do black workers in South Africa get a chance to do a "white" job. (In the U.S. they do get such a chance now and then.) For example, one report from South Africa says "The whites' work in the mines is already entirely supervisory. All physical labor has long been done by black workers."

Now, what the American corporations want to change is the white supervision. They know very well that the black workers are capable of mining the gold and other minerals without the supervision of the whites. And if the corporations can do away with the white supervisors, they can cut their payroll costs by a large amount. They also know that black workers are just as capable of doing such supervisory work as needs to be done, as are the whites, but that the black workers, because they are being paid so little now, would be willing to do the supervisory work for much less than the whites are now being paid.

Take the example of the black worker who is now doing labor in the mines, and has been doing so for some years. He knows enough to be a supervisor of others less experienced than he. He has been earning somewhere between \$15 and \$50 per month for the labor he does. His white supervisor is paid between \$319 and \$420 for supervising him. If the mining corporation can "upgrade" the black worker to a supervisory position, it can pay him from five to ten

times as much as it pays him as a laborer, and still not be paying him half as much as it presently pays the white supervisor. The corporations figure that, because the black workers are so desperate for an increase in wages, they will be willing to do the supervisory work for much less than the whites will do it now. And they also figure that in many cases they can eliminate the supervision all together and, with a very small increase in the black workers' wage, can get the same amount and quality of work done at less than half their present labor cost.

This, we believe, is the real explanation of the sudden liberality on the race issue of many U.S. corporations which for years have steadfastly maintained white supremacy in their hiring policies. We think it is true in the U.S. as well as in South Africa.

Employers have always pitted blacks against whites in order more profitably to exploit both. If this race tension among workers had not been so profitable, we think it would have long since disappeared. The institutions which have always perpetuated race prejudice are precisely those institutions which are more or less controlled and dominated by people with money--the churches, the schools, the law-making bodies, the courts, the public officials, the newspapers, etc.

Thus the lesson we can learn from what the American corporations are doing in South Africa is, first of all, their activities have the support of the leadership of both the Republican and the Democrat parties. Secondly, whatever the corporations say about wanting to promote equal job opportunity, we know that they are first of all interested in profits, and we know that they have always perpetuated and used race prejudice in this country for the purpose of increasing their profits, just as they have done in South Africa. Thus, when they suddenly change their minds about equal opportunity, it must be because they see more profits in changing their attitudes; not because they've suddenly seen the light.

We must remember this always. For if it becomes profitable for them to begin playing off the whites against the blacks, with a kind of reverse english, then that's exactly what they'll do. They are primarily interested in profits and they'll do anything to increase them. Anything.

This is the attitude, on the part of the business and financial elite, which produced the gas chambers and the coke ovens in Nazi Germany. If you think it can't happen here, then you need to look again at Lyndon and his friends.

*

*

*

Let's look at another aspect of the quest for profits by U.S. corporations. This one involves the Chrysler Corporation (which, incidentally, is presently building an enormous plant for increased production in South Africa).

The Chairman of Chrysler, George H. Love, was one of Lyndon's big business supporters in 1964.

A Chrysler official, Harry E. Chesebrough, was testifying last week before a Senate committee which is holding hearings on auto safety devices. One of the Senators mentioned that certain 1965 Chryslers, Dodges and Plymouths were turned out and sold with a defect in the steering mechanism. The defect was such that the steering wheel could, at any time, become disconnected from the front wheels, thus causing the driver to lose control of the car.

Chesebrough admitted this was true, but he said he could'nt say how many of the cars were produced and sold with this defect in them. He said that as soon as Chrysler found out about the defect, they took steps to correct the manufacturing process so that no more would be turned out.

But they did not attempt to notify the persons who had already bought Chryslers, Dodges and Plymouths, that the cars had this defect. They never even bothered to find out how many accidents had been caused by the defect, and how many people had been killed and maimed as a result of these accidents. This was not because they just didn't care.

But, you see, if they had sent a notice to every one who had bought one of their cars, the word inevitably would have gotten around to the general public, and car buyers would have been afraid to buy Chryslers, Dodges and Plymouths. Furthermore, people who had been in accidents resulting from steering failures would have sued Chrysler for causing the accidents, and Chrysler would have had to pay out a lot of money to them.

Chesebrough did a lot of bragging at the hearing about how concerned Chrysler is for the safety of its cars. The bragging was pretty empty when it came out that Chrysler had let an unknown number of people drive cars around with a defect which could easily be the cause of a fatal accident.

This is just another example of what happens in a society when it is run by profit-hungry businessmen who will do anything to preserve and increase their profit-making deals.

*

*

*

Another Senate committee is holding hearings on the use of wiretaps by Lyndon's government agencies. During one recent session Cresson O. Davis, chief of the intelligence division of the Internal Revenue Service (Lyndon's tax collectors), testified that Lyndon's tax officials approved of the use of wiretaps and actually trained agents of the Internal Revenue Service in how to use them.

Of course, Lyndon did not authorize the use of wiretaps against honest respectable businessmen like those Chrysler officials. The wiretaps were to be used only against "racketeers". Davis testified that the Washington office of the Internal Revenue Service provided funds for the purchase of a truck disguised as a telephone company

page five

vehicle, for use in installing wiretaps in the homes of unsuspecting taxpayers. The revenue agents present themselves at the door of the person being investigated and tell him that something is wrong with his phone. On the pretext of fixing something about the telephone, they install the wiretap.

Davis was not asked if he ever got the cooperation of the telephone company in installing wiretaps but, considering the close connections between American Telephone and Telegraph, and Lyndon's government, it seems likely Lyndon's agents would have secured the cooperation of the company rather than take a chance on exposure by having someone suspect the phoney "telephone workers" and check with the phone company about their credentials.

Of course, Lyndon was advised in advance what Davis's testimony at the hearings would be, so he made another of those pious statements of his about how he didn't approve of wiretapping and just absolutely would not put up with it.

We're reminded of a novel recently written by a Washington newspaperman. In the novel, the fictional President of the U.S.A. orders the FBI to tap every telephone in the country, so he'll know what's going on. The fictional president was nutty as a fruitcake.

*

*

*

We commented some weeks ago on the Bobby Baker investigation, mentioning how convenient it was for Lyndon and some of his Texas millionaire friends, that Kennedy got killed when he did. The killing seems to have been a factor in avoiding some pretty nasty disclosures about how Lyndon got rich, and about how some of his friends got even richer.

We think we didn't mention it before, but the Justice Department was conducting an investigation of the Baker case at the same time that the Senate committee was holding its hearings. It appears that Kennedy was figuring to be ready seriously to prosecute some of the principals for their various illegal activities. Those principals might even have included Lyndon.

So it is really interesting to find that Kennedy's death had an immediate effect on the conduct of the Justice Department investigation. The New York Times last Sunday ran a story on the effect of the disclosures of wiretapping on the investigations of organized crime by the Justice Department. It's not at all clear why this information was included in such a story, but the Times quotes a Justice Department lawyer as saying that the day after Kennedy died "We stopped getting information from the FBI on the Bobby Baker investigation."

Whatever that tidbit of information may have to do with organized crime, it certainly could have a great deal to do with why Kennedy was killed. And with who killed him...Jack Minnis, July 22, 1965

*