EDITORIAL

THE LOGIC OF THE “LABOR LEADER.”

By DANIEL DE LEON

THERE is one principle, above all others, on which the pure and simple labor leader lays especial emphasis. It is the principle declaring the interests of employer and employe identical. “Enlightened employers of labor,” he will tell his victims when addressing them on the relations of Capital and Labor, “acting in accordance with this great principle, have granted their employes the shorter workday. They recognize that labor can produce as much in the eight hour day as was formerly produced in that of ten and twelve hours. The eight hour day confers greater leisure and recreation on the working class. The employers secure more contented and willing workers, the employee more time for self-improvement. Both are benefited and a great principle is vindicated, to the painful discomfiture of the fanatics who would array capital and labor against each other in destructive conflict.”

Hardly has the pure and simple labor leader delivered this eulogy on the mutual interests of employer and employe, when behold! we see “the contented and willing workers” at loggerheads—on strike or locked out—with the “enlightened employers.”

What is the trouble? Hasn’t a great principle been triumphantly vindicated? Are not capital and labor enjoying the peace and concord that flow from mutual interests, to the deep chagrin of their common “enemies”? Decidedly not.

If the workingmen who are not the victims of the pure and simple labor leader draw nearer and look close, they will, without any difficulty, learn that the trouble is due to “the restriction of output.” The employers will be found demanding that employes labor to the full capacity of themselves and the machines at their disposal. The employes, on the other hand, will be found resenting this demand either openly or secretly. Why? Listen to the labor faker who waxes so eloquently on the mutual interests of capital and labor:
“Unscrupulous and greedy employers,” he emphatically declares, “having been forced to grant a shorter workday as a relief from intolerable conditions, have resorted to despicable methods to extort more product from labor. In order to do this they have created in the workshops of this country an institution called ‘The Rusher.’ The Rusher is a young, virile, selfish, ambitious mechanic of exceptional abilities, who endeavors to succeed at the expense of his less favorably endowed and more scrupulous shopmates. The Rusher is given the best tools, material and opportunities. He rushes work and sets the pace for all the other employes, regardless of their age, their strength and their desire to execute their work conscientiously. The Rusher intensifies labor abnormally. He lowers the age limit of labor and drives the working class into premature graves, while piling up the profits of avaricious and arrogant employers. We must therefore limit output, if we would save the workers from physical deterioration and early graves. It is either restriction or destruction.”

In order to keep his dupes in line, the pure and simple labor leader varies his logic to suit his purpose. Were not its results so tragic, that logic would be side-splitting. It is the logic of the swindler and the knave, who, in order to do the dirty work of his capitalist generals—the Mark Hannas, et al.—must place himself in such ridiculous positions that honest men perforce must laugh.

There are no mutual interests between capital and labor. One takes profits, the other receives wages. To give more wages means to take less profit; to yield more profit, means to accept less wages. Where is the “mutuality” of such an arrangement? As the labor faker’s logic shows, it is dishonest to declare that mutuality is possible, much less a fact.

There being no mutual interests between capital and labor—i.e., employer and employe—there can be no peace between the capitalist class and the working class—one or the other must go. History decrees that the class to go is the capitalist class.

On then with the working class.