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Text of a Radio Debate Between Senator Robert A. Taft and Walter P. Reuther, President, UAW-CIO, on "The American Standard of Living—How Can It Best Be Improved?"

MR. REUTHER—Fundamentally, our problem is not only to expand production but to expand purchasing power to balance that productive power. I think the fundamental difference between Mr. Taft and me is that he thinks you can build prosperity from the top down. I take the position that you have got to build it from the bottom up.

SENATOR TAFT (interrupting)—Now, I never said anything of the kind, Mr. Reuther. I never had any such idea at all.

Did he? Who's right? You be the judge.
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How Can The American Standard Of Living Best Be Improved?

This is the stenographic record of the "People's Platform" debate between Senator Robert A. Taft and Walter P. Reuther, President of the United Auto Workers Union of America-CIO, broadcast on the CBS network from Washington, D. C., at 12:30—1:00 p.m. Sunday, April 11, 1948.

THE QUESTION: "The American Standard of Living: How Can It Best Be Improved?"

Mr. Cooke: Senator Taft and Mr. Reuther, what can we do now to get more of the good things of life for us all?

Announcer: From Washington Columbia presents the People's Platform with Dwight Cooke. This broadcast marks the anniversary of the 500th program of Columbia's "People's Platform".

For almost ten years the People's Platform has brought to its microphone prominent and well-informed guests to present in spontaneous discussion their opposing views on the vital issues of our time; today, another timely debate, as Republican Presidential candidate Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio and Walter Reuther, President of the United Auto Workers—CIO, join Chairman Dwight Cooke to discuss the question: "How Can the American Standard of Living Best Be Improved?"

We hear first from Mr. Cooke.

Mr. Cooke: On this 500th broadcast it is a pleasure to see sitting around the table with me two Americans who represent important and powerful sections of thought about our future—a Presidential candidate and the President of the largest labor union in the U.S.A.

Gentlemen, if you are both willing, let's jump right past how incredibly better the American standard of living is than any enjoyed by any other people in the history of the world. It's typical of Americans, I hope, that we don't sit back on our overfluffed laurels.

Mr. Taft, what should we do to raise our standard of living and realize even better the potential in the American Way?

SENATOR TAFT'S 4-POINT FORMULA

Senator Taft: First, Mr. Cooke, of course the standard of living of any people depends on production. The more commodities and products of all kinds that are produced, the more things people have to eat, to wear, to use, homes to occupy; the greater the productivity of each workman, on the average—that is, the more he produces the more he has to enjoy, and the higher his standard of living.

The best way to increase his production is to give him better tools with which to work, better plant, and machinery. There can be no doubt that the great improvement which has occurred in this country in the past century is due to improvements in the tools of labor.

Therefore, the first answer to your question is: Encourage people and corporations to save and invest their money in productive enterprise.

Second, keep the market free from monopoly; keep collective bargaining free and equal. Competition is the best regulator of the distribution of the money after you get it, and of incentive rewards.

Third, run Government spending and tax policies and Government control of credit to keep the economic machinery running at full speed and thus prevent depressions which can reduce the standard of living more than anything else.

Fourth, reduce Government expenditures and taxation, particularly for armament, when possible, so our production of civilian goods can be increased, instead of military goods.

REUTHER—PRODUCTION IS NOT ENOUGH

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Reuther, what do you add to Mr. Taft's suggestion here of production, competition and the role of Government?

Mr. Reuther: We have got to do more than just expand production. Our basic job in America is to achieve a balance between purchasing power and productive power. We have got to get the purchasing power in the hands of the American people, the workers in the city, and the farmers on the farm, so that they can buy back the goods we turn out in the factories and on the farms.

In 1929 and the years before that, we had production. And under Mr. Hoover we got into an awful jam because 36,000 families at the top of our economic pyramid had more income in 1929 than 12,000,000 families at the bottom of the pyramid.

That meant that the few on top had more than they needed, while millions on the bottom didn't have enough. This production part of the problem...
is only half of the problem. The other half, and the more important half at the moment, is distribution, purchasing power. At the moment prices are too high and profits are too high, and purchasing power in the hands of the people, workers, farmers, white-collar groups, is too low.

Unfortunately, Mr. Cooke, most everything that Congress had done in the past six or eight months has moved in the direction of giving more to the people who already have too much and taking away from the people who need more. Take the tax bill, just as an example. The tax bill just passed by Mr. Taft and his group in Congress gives a man with four in the family, with a $250,000 income, a $69 tax reduction but gives a man with a $250,000 income a $34,700 tax reduction. This means more yachts and less bread and butter for the people.

TAFT—TOO MUCH PURCHASING POWER

Senator Taft: Mr. Cooke, as far as the tax bill is concerned, we took a hundred percent of the taxes off seven million people and of course we took $69 off, but he wasn't paying very much more than that. The percentage of increase to the reduction given is a far higher percentage than all the lower income groups.

According to Mr. Reuther, he doesn't want to give the top people anything. Of course, a man paying $100,000 gets a 5 percent reduction, that's more than any man can get who pays less than $5,000. But as a matter of fact, though, Mr. Reuther's whole thesis is wrong. The reason prices are going up today is that there is too much purchasing power, more purchasing power because of savings and other circumstances than we can get our production up to. Consequently, the natural economic demand-and-supply forces prices up. We may get to a point where we need more purchasing power, but we are not there yet.

Mr. Cooke: Let's get back to the tax question now.

Mr. Reuther: Senator Taft, people can't eat percentages; they need bread and butter. You gave, in your tax bill, a worker with four in the family with a $250,000 income—you gave him a 3 percent increase in his purchasing power. After he pays his taxes he will have 3 percent more purchasing power than he had last year. And you gave a fellow who makes $250,000 with four in the family a 59 percent increase in the purchasing power he has.

Senator Taft: Mr. Reuther, you say these percentages don't mean anything. A man with $250,000 and four in the family before this paid about a hundred dollars. Now he gets a $69 reduction and he pays about $30, according to your own figures.

Mr. Reuther: Why not give him more and take more away from the fellow who gets $250,000, because he can live on what he gets after he pays a high tax.

TAFT WANTS TO FORGET THE PAST

Senator Taft: Your theory would simply exempt 25,000,000 people altogether, no taxes; put all the taxes on people who save money and accumulate the various savings that are necessary if you ever want to invest in new plants to give people new jobs. Will that work?—of course not. I mean you can go on the principle of taking 100 percent of all profits; or you can go on the principle of taking 100 percent of all incomes over $25,000, but the trouble is that kind of theory would simply get you back to a state socialist plan in which nobody saves any money any more.

Mr. Reuther: Senator Taft, that is the same kind of economic theory that we practiced under Harding and under Coolidge and under Hoover. That is the Hoover-Taft economic theory, and what happened under that theory? America went down the road until the purchasing power became so low and the productive power so out of balance that we got into the worst economic jam in the history of the world. Mr. Hoover used to talk about prosperity being just around the corner; and we waited, because the American people were behind the eight ball. We never got around the corner. We never got around the corner until we started to put purchasing power through our economy.

If we practice your kind of economics, the Hoover-Taft economics, we will go right into another depression, because you have got to balance purchasing power with productive power.

Senator Taft: Mr. Reuther, you are just simply advancing a socialistic theory that nobody ought to be allowed to save anything. How about talking about the present instead of the past? The purchasing power theory was the theory of the New Deal; it was absolutely wrong. You pumped purchasing power for ten years and at the end of that time you had 10 million people still unemployed. In this whole theory that you want more consumer purchasing power, what happens to the product—the money that goes in? A certain amount of it has to be saved. In fact, the whole future of the increased standard of living depends on somebody saving—whether it is corporations, whether it is individuals. You want people to spend every cent they get, to give to people who spend it entirely
for consumer goods. Then you will have exactly what happened before and a depression continuing indefinitely in the United States.

Prosperity here depends upon a large percentage of the proceeds of our wealth being invested in new tools, new investments. It takes about 6 or 7 thousand dollars to create one new job at good wages today.

Mr. Reuther: Senator Taft, the difference between you and me is this: I am not opposed to people saving, excepting I want the little fellow to be able to save. You want the corporation to do all the saving; you want the people who have already got too much to go on saving and getting more and more and more. The basis of prosperity—

Senator Taft: No, no, I don’t care to say—

Mr. Reuther: Just wait a minute. This is not a Senate filibuster. Give me a minute, please. The trouble with America is that the people that you are supporting, economically and politically, are the people who have already got too much of the things, and you want them to have a monopoly not only on the good things of life but also a monopoly on the right to save.

I want the little fellow not only to be able to buy enough food for his kids, to give them a decent home, to give them proper clothing, decent medical care and educational opportunity. I want him to be able to do that and still have a little bit left over.

WHEN ARE PRICES COMING DOWN?

Mr. Cooke: I want to make a bit of a filibuster, gentlemen—in terms of the central point each of you has made. On the one hand the question is the necessity of increasing production. Senator Taft’s point is that there is more than enough money and more than enough purchasing power now to buy what we can produce. And on the other hand, Mr. Reuther’s point is that we need considerably more purchasing power now. How do they match up?

Senator Taft: Let me analyze Mr. Reuther’s argument. He has got two things: First he talks about more consumer purchasing power to buy the things that are made. That is a fair point—I don’t think it is material today, but certainly we have to keep consuming purchasing power in balance with saving. We don’t want to get too much saving; we don’t want to get too much consumer purchasing power.

His other point is just a plain socialistic point that he doesn’t like the present distribution of wealth and he wants to distribute it a different way. Most people will spend the money. I agree with him. I think the more you can distribute equally the income of this country, among different people, the better. But you can take all the corporation profits, for instance, that he has talked about, and add it to income. But it will add about 10 or 12 percent to the average man’s income. And of course, half the corporations will close up. There won’t be any jobs, and you will decrease the income again.

Mr. Reuther: Let’s look at two phases of the problem Senator Taft has raised. He raised first of all the profit question, and then the question of competition. Let’s take up the question of competition first.

Senator Taft has been saying repeatedly the past couple of years that free enterprise under competition will bring down prices. That is all a very lovely theory. But in practice, because American monopoly controls basic industries in this country, free enterprise and a free market are just a myth.

On February 21st, I was testifying before the Senate Committee. Senator Taft said at that time that prices were just about ready to come down. That was in February, 1947, more than a year ago. Since then they have continued to go up more than 10 percent. Now, here is what happened since they smashed price control: Price control ended in November, ‘46. From November, ‘46 to January, ‘18, production only increased 2 percent. Prices went up 17 percent. And the profits of 1500 manufacturing corporations, according to the report of the National City Bank, went up 54 percent more in 1947 than in 1946.

Let’s talk about competition for a second. Now, what happened—

WHO’S DEMAGOGING WHOM?

Mr. Cooke: Let’s let Mr. Taft talk for a second about profits.

Senator Taft: First, may I inform Mr. Reuther that there is some monopoly and the monopoly ought to be gone after and prevented. Of course, he says you can’t prevent it so he wants a socialistic plan by which the Government, in effect, will in fact rule all industry and shall certainly regulate all prices and wages. I prefer to say—and I believe very strongly—that competition can be enforced and that competition is bound to bring prices down.

These profits will take care of themselves in time. As a matter of fact, the report of the President’s Economic Advisors points out that profits up to date have been well used. They have been
reinvested. The principal savings have been invested in expansion of plants. I think it can go on too long. I think as a steady diet the present profits are much too high, but competition will bring them down.

Just go back to the years '32, '33, and '34 where for over five years there were no net corporation profits, and look what happened to employment. Look at the number—10 or 15 million people out of work because there were no corporation profits.

Mr. Reuther: Senator Taft, you see it is a very convenient excuse. Everytime you start talking about helping the little fellow you conveniently put a socialist tag on it. That is what Mr. Hoover did and—

Senator Taft: Now look, Mr. Reuther, suppose you get rid of the demagoguery and all this political stuff and talk economics.

(Editor's Note: Where is the "demagoguery"? Is it the mention of former President Herbert Hoover?)

Mr. Reuther: I am going to talk economics. I am trying to say that everytime someone proposes something for the little fellow in the world, whether it is the worker or the small farmer, you get out a socialistic tag, but when the RFC gives billions and helps to bail out big corporatons, subsidizes the railroads and the shipping interests, that, of course, is good American practice.

What I am advocating is no more socialistic than these other things, excepting it is an attempt by the people of America to try to have their Government help the little fellow instead of the big corporation. Now, getting back to this—

Senator Taft: Mr. Reuther, I want to help the little fellow. Now, just let's—

Mr. Reuther: How do you want to help the little fellow?

Senator Taft: I want to help the little fellow, and I say the only way you can help the little fellow is to improve the plant, the machinery that he has, to increase the production in the United States, and not by a lot of Government bureau regulation. It has never helped the little fellow yet, and never will.

HOW TO HELP THE LITTLE FELLOW

Mr. Cooke: All right, gentlemen, since you are both agreed you want to help the little fellow, let's go into three specific areas and see what kind of action both of you recommend so as to help the little fellow.

First of all, in the area of Government, which Senator Taft has just been discussing. What do you want the Government to do, Mr. Reuther?

Mr. Reuther: First of all, I think the Government has got to take positive action with respect to price control. It has got to roll back the prices of basic commodities and take that roll-back out of the profits of American industry, because those profits are scandalously high and they can afford to give up some of those profits in the way either of a wage increase or a price decrease.

Second, I think the Government has got to break certain serious materials bottlenecks in order to release the productive power of the American economy.

The steel situation is very critical. We need about 10,000,000 more tons of steel production.

In Detroit, we have been suffering with a shortage of gas. 200,000 workers were on the streets for three weeks, and we are threatened with another shortage.

We need 40,000 tons of steel to get a new pipeline in Detroit, to get gas in there. The Government has to get into these things.

I say let free enterprise do all it can, but where free enterprise puts the selfish interests of private corporations above the welfare of the people, the Government, as a democratic agency of all the people, has to move into protect the public welfare. And I say in this case the Government has not done it. It has strengthened monopoly and made it possible for people who have got too much to get more at the expense of the great mass of the people.

TAFT—PRICE CONTROLS WON'T WORK

Mr. Cooke: All right, now, Mr. Taft, will you argue Mr. Reuther's two points and then go on with yours?

Senator Taft: In the first place, you can take all the corporation profits and distribute them back to prices and you get a 10 per cent reduction in prices. You would close up half the corporations in the country; you would throw millions of people out of jobs; you would interfere with the whole operation of the economic machine; competition would bring down the profits, but the total profits—that's the point I am trying to make—the total profits are only, I think, about 12 per cent, or something of the kind, of the wages the people get. That is an inmaterial factor.

What can the Government do? The Government, I think, can put its own house in order, can reduce the taxes, and the Government spending,
because that simply adds to the prices and in the long run those taxes are passed right on to the consumer.

The Government, I think, is interested in seeing that the saving and spending is in balance, that agricultural production is in balance with industrial production.

Wages are in balance with prices, but the wages have increased more than prices in the last seven years, and the actual conditions under the Government’s operation has been that today the actual net income of workmen in the United States has increased about 42 percent over what it was in 1939. According to the per capita disposable income, in real income that is, allowing for the higher prices, has gone up from $858 a person to $1390 a person in ’47.

“NOW YOU CAN BUY ANYTHING—”

Mr. Cooke: How about the whole area of price controls in the situation, Senator Taft?

Senator Taft: Well, on price controls, in my opinion nobody can do it right. The thing is bound to break down in time of peace. If it is successful in holding prices down, it discourages people from going ahead with new plants and new investments and more production.

Mr. Reuther: You see, that is the whole point. Senator Taft keeps talking about price control discouraging production. In the shoe industry—let’s talk about specific industries. Shoes are things all the people need. After Senator Taft and Congress destroyed price control, the shoe industry had its highest monthly production in July of 1946.

Now, assuming Senator Taft is correct, having gotten rid of price control, production should go soaring and ultimately prices should come dropping down. What happened? Since July of ’46 the shoe industry has averaged 16 percent less production per month, and prices have gone up 50 percent.

Just look at the cotton goods industry. Their production was the highest in November ’46. It has come down 12 percent, and prices have gone up 23 percent.

Now why?

Because here you have got monopoly control, where these monopoly groups arbitrarily decide at what level of production they are going to operate, based upon how they can get the highest prices and greatest profits; not based upon the needs of the people.

If your theory is correct, having eliminated price control, production will go soaring and prices will come tumbling down, then how do you account for the fact that in the shoe industry and the cotton goods industry they have cut production and increased prices since you killed price control?

Senator Taft: In the first place, I deny the fact.1 In the second place, when we had price control on shoes and cotton goods, nobody could buy a white shirt, nobody could buy the shoes they wanted, you couldn’t get any of the things you wanted. Today, you can buy anything you want in shoes or white shirts,—

Mr. Reuther: If you have the money.2

Senator Taft: If you have the money — and wages have increased 102 percent where the cost of living (shoes and cotton goods) has only gone up 70 percent.

The workman is actually better off today than he was eight years ago. Now I think he ought to be still better off, surely. I think the way to do that is to get this cost down, and if the Government is permitting monopoly to go on, then the Government is highly to be condemned. I can assure you, Mr. Reuther, if there is one thing that I think is absolutely essential, it is the whole theory of free enterprise and free competition. And I am willing to go the limit in seeing that that competition is produced.

What happened is that there has been this very high purchasing power, wages outran prices. I am glad to see high wages, but they outran prices so that they produced a demand. Inevitably a larger demand for the supply is going to raise prices. That condition will come to an end within a reasonable time, I think.

LOWER PRICES OR HIGHER WAGES

Mr. Cooke: Now you come into the area of what business should do about this problem. You want business to reduce prices—high profits in business—

Mr. Reuther: I want business to take the 29 billion dollars profits which they made in 1947,

1—See Mr. Reuther’s citation of source on Page 6.

2—On May 5, 1946 the New York Times reported that April shoe production was estimated at between 35 and 38 million pairs, as compared with 45 million pairs in March, because of “reduced retail unit turnover” and “rise in inventories.” On April 15, 1948, four days after the Taft-Reuther debate, the Times reported Lee Longston, vice-president of the National Shoe Retailers Association, as saying reported pending manufacturers’ price increases were “unwarranted and unjustified,” and did not reflect “known facts in the shoe business, where curtailed unit sales volume has been clearly evident.” Wholesale shoe prices rose more than 9 per cent between October, 1947 and February, 1948, dropped about one half of one per cent in March but by early May had been increased to a level 10.3 per cent higher than October 1947.
which was an all-time record—they had $17\frac{1}{2}$ billion dollars left over after they paid their taxes—I want them to get some of that money back to the people in the form of purchasing power either by reducing prices or by holding prices and increasing wages.

In industry last year, according to the National City Bank, the manufacturing industry made 17 percent net return on its investment. In the auto industry, for example, the automobile industry, eight companies, made 38 percent return on their investment in one year, in '47, and after they paid their taxes they still made 22\% per cent. I say that is a scandalous profit, and the American people are entitled to participate in that wealth either in lower prices—and I would prefer lower prices to wage increase, but if prices are not rolled back, then wage increases are justified.

Senator Taft: Well, now in the first place the corporation net profits for '47 were about 17 billion dollars. Wages were 128 billion dollars. So that actually is about 13 percent. If you take half of it away you might increase wages 6 percent.

On the other hand, if you take half of it away or take all of it away you are not going to have many corporations continue in business at all and give jobs. I think profits are too high, but also profits go up and down. For five years in the '30's there wasn't a single dollar of profits for corporation, and as many of them closed up, we had 10 or 15 million men unemployed. Those profits will come down as far as that is concerned.

Mr. Reuther: When will they come down, Senator Taft?

Senator Taft: Sure, they will come down, they will come down just as fast as the competition brings them down, and in many fields today they are coming down. They were no higher in the beginning of '48 than they were in '47. And in many fields they are less than in '47.

Mr. Reuther: You challenge, Senator Taft, the figures I gave on the shoe industry and the cotton goods industry. Both sets of figures came from Federal Reserve Board reports, the most authentic Government report in this field. These are facts that nobody can dispute. And you—

Senator Taft: The point is everybody is getting shoes, everybody is getting all the shirts they want; they have more income than enough to buy them. Of course I think prices should still come down. I think profits should come down.

Mr. Reuther: You should try living on a work-

er's family income and feed and clothe and shoe a lot of kids.

Senator Taft: I want to steadily increase that income, Mr. Reuther, and in the last eight years the net condition of all workers on the average has increased 40 percent. If we can do another 40 percent in the next eight years no one could be more pleased than I. That is the purpose of our policy.

TAFT APPROVES WAGE INCREASES

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Reuther and Mr. Taft, you have made it clear how you think business should act. Let's finish this and talk about what you think labor unions should do. Mr. Taft, let's hear you first.

Senator Taft: I think labor unions—I have no criticism of labor unions. I think they are entitled to get the wages that is justified in the industry in which they are, a return equal to the productivity of the things they are producing in that industry.

I am in favor of higher wages. I do say on third round of wage increases—we can't lay down a flat rule, but there isn't any doubt that in many industries the wage earner is entitled to more and ought to get more. Certainly up to the cost of living, but rather in accordance with the increased productivity. That is the best guide.

Mr. Reuther: I have always taken the policy that labor has to make progress with the community, and not at the expense of the community. That is why two years ago we advocated that we wanted to get wage increases out of the profits of those corporations and not out of consumers' profits. We are not fighting for more dollars, Mr. Cooke, but we are fighting for more purchasing power. If we get a wage on one hand, and it is taken away by a higher price increase on the other, we have made no progress. We have merely accelerated the speed of the economic merry-go-round. Our basic fight is for basic purchasing power; dollars that will buy things.

The farmer needs those purchasing-power dollars, the city workers need them. So, we are trying to make progress, not at the expense of the community and our neighbors—we are trying to make progress with them because we know the only way we can solve problems in a democratic society is for all the people to be pulling together, to try to make progress together.

Senator Taft: Now, on that statement, Mr. Cooke, I agree 100 percent with Mr. Reuther. We can close with at least an agreement.
TAFT AND REUTHER SUM UP

Mr. Cooke: Gentlemen, if I can give you a back-handed compliment—important as the things are you are saying today, there is something even more important here. I think: the fact that you said these things here, the fact that two responsible Americans, a leading Presidential candidate and a leading Labor spokesman, are willing to face each other and defend your convictions here on the People's Platform honestly, directly, and without any script but with plenty of figures. I might say it is out of such stuff that real freedom of speech is built, and it would be better for all of us if we had more Americans of your caliber, willing to be this frank and honest with your fellow-citizens.

Mr. Taft, how about a quick summing up of the points you made?

Senator Taft: My statement is still the same. The Government is interested in keeping a balance between these different economic factors. People can't have a higher standard of living than the goods that are produced. The big thing is to produce the goods. The best way to do that is to see there are enough savings, whether it is through corporate profits or through individual savings, to put money into machinery and plant, to increase productivity and increase production. That is the big way in which we can improve the conditions of all the people and particularly the people on the lower-income level.

Mr. Cooke: Mr. Reuther.

Mr. Reuther: Mr. Cooke, I think that fundamentally our problem is not only to expand production but to expand purchasing power to balance that expanded productive power. I think the fundamental difference between Mr. Taft and me is that he thinks you can build prosperity from the top down. Now, I take the position you have got to build it from the bottom up.

Senator Taft: Now I never said anything of the kind, Mr. Reuther. I never had any such idea at all.

Mr. Reuther: You have got to broaden the purchasing power base of the American people. If you try to build prosperity from the top down it gets top-heavy and it topples over, just as it did in 1929.

I want to build it this time on a solid basis. The American people fought a war, not to go back to something—they fought a war to go forward to something better and finer than they ever had before.

Mr. Cooke: Thank you, gentlemen. Although we could go forward for another hour, as Mr. Taft has just indicated, I have to go forward with a bit of closing.

As we finish this 500th program, I want to take a second to thank my colleagues on the People's Platform. Its producer, Leon Levine, has been associated with it since its first broadcast, and Bob Allison, the youngster of the setup, has only been director some five years.

With their help I think it is safe to promise you—all many more forceful and stimulating debates here on the People's Platform.

Thank you, gentlemen, for joining me today.
For A Genuine Progressive Political Party

(From a resolution on political action adopted by the UAW-CIO International Executive Board, March 3, 1948, at Chicago, Illinois.)

BE IT RESOLVED: That the UAW-CIO International Executive Board fully supports the position of the national CIO in rejecting and repudiating the 1948 presidential candidacy of Henry Wallace and the third party he represents as a political maneuver contrary to the best interests of labor and the nation and as an obstacle in the way of the establishment of a successful and genuine progressive political party in the United States; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the UAW-CIO International Executive Board adopts as its official political objective the formation after the 1948 National elections of a genuine progressive political party built upon the following principles:

1. It shall welcome into its ranks industrial and white collar workers, working farmers, small business men, professionals and every individual and every group honestly committed to winning economic security and abundance without surrendering fundamental freedoms.

2. It shall not serve as the mouth-piece or errand boy for any other political party or movement and it shall oppose all forms of totalitarianism, both the Communist variety on the left and the Fascist variety on the right.

3. It shall be dedicated to fair play and equality of treatment for all groups and individuals, and shall fight against all forms of discrimination and for full civil rights for all people everywhere.

4. It shall place human rights above property rights and shall advocate a program of full production and full employment based on democratic controls in every area of our economic life where the public interest is directly and vitally at stake.

5. It shall be a popular movement built from the grass-roots upward, encouraging the maximum degrees of activity at the ward and precinct levels, with final authority resting in the rank-and-file members, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the UAW-CIO persist in seeking a practical, day-to-day, working unity of the CIO, AFL,

(Continued on next page)
For A Genuine Progressive Political Party

(Continued from preceding page)

Railroad Brotherhoods, and bona fide independent unions, farm, small business, white collar and professional and other progressive non-labor groups whose mutual cooperation is essential to the success of a forward-looking independent political movement, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the UAW-CIO shall initiate an educational program for the purpose of advancing such an independent political action program looking forward to the time when its practical implementation is possible, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that we shall mobilize the full strength of our union and its membership in support of the National CIO-PAC program with particular emphasis on:

1. Maximum collection of $1 PAC voluntary contributions.

2. Mobilization of maximum votes in support of candidates whose programs are acceptable to CIO-PAC.

3. Mobilization of all resources for the defeat of reactionaries in Congress, for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, and for enactment of a positive legislative program to halt the drift toward depression and war and to implement the Economic Bill of Rights as advocated by Franklin D. Roosevelt.
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BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the UAW-CIO shall initiate an educational program for the purpose of advancing such an independent political action program looking forward to the time when its practical implementation is possible, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that we shall mobilize the full strength of our union and its membership in support of the National CIO-PAC program with particular emphasis on:

1. Maximum collection of $1 PAC voluntary contributions.

2. Mobilization of maximum votes in support of candidates whose programs are acceptable to CIO-PAC.

3. Mobilization of all resources for the defeat of reactionaries in Congress, for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, and for enactment of a positive legislative program to halt the drift toward depression and war and to implement the Economic Bill of Rights as advocated by Franklin D. Roosevelt.