

Power and the Canadian Left

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

Regina, Saskatchewan—In Winnipeg airport, on my way to a socialist conference here, one of Canada's three provincial capitals ruled by a socialist government, I met a fellow conferee, T. C. (Tommy) Douglas, the New Democratic Party's parliamentary spokesman on energy policy. Douglas and the MP's with him were jubilant: they had just used their position as a balance of power in Ottawa to exert a major influence on Trudeau's position. The press—and the disgruntled Conservatives—were rightly saying that the Prime Minister had capitulated to the New Democrats.

I go into these events in some detail not simply because they concern the politics of the Canadian Left, but also because they shed light on the energy crisis in the United States—and how to resolve it.

If, as I believe, the oil companies in the United States have put their own profit ahead of the nation's needs, that is doubly true with regard to Canada. One can be even more brutal about exploiting someone else's country, and the oil corporations which have dominated Canadian energy are, of course, mainly American.

The oil companies long ago made a deal with the Canadian government. In the Western provinces, only Canadian crude could be sold; in the Eastern prov-

inces, Canadians, citizens of a nation able to provide for all its own energy needs, were forced to import their oil, primarily from Venezuela. The profits from the Western production were, in part, pumped out of the country along with much of the Canadian crude. In each case the policy criterion was not Canadian need, but the profit position of the companies.

Last spring, the New Democrats under the leadership of David Lewis and Tommy Douglas (Lewis' predecessor as Federal leader of the Party) hammered away at the government for not controlling the export of Canadian crude. Finally the socialist pressure forced Trudeau to set up export controls, including a tax aimed at capturing the difference between the wellhead price and the price on the Chicago market.

Recently, the NDP caucus decided that it would vote in favor of a no confidence motion on December 10th—and bring the government down—if Trudeau did not accede to three basic demands. First of all, fuel price controls had to be extended; secondly, the pipeline from the West would be extended all the way to the East and the artificial energy division of the nation would be brought to an end; thirdly, and most important, a national petroleum company would be created for the development of the country's energy resources.

Five days before the crucial vote, Trudeau capitulated to the New Democratic demands. The Liberal Prime Minister put on a bravura performance—he told his party faithful at a rally in Vancouver he had acted “to prevent an immense rip-off by the oil companies.” He did not, however, explain why he had only become aware of the rip-off, and reversed his policies, when the NDP threatened to turn him out of office. Tommy Douglas' answer, delivered with a grin, was to quote Samuel Johnson: “Knowing that you are going to be hanged in the morning concentrates the mind wonderfully well.”

After Trudeau's announcement, David Lewis went on to fill in the details of his party's proposal. The government, he said, should immediately nationalize

(Continued on page 7)

UMW insurgents become leaders

By BILL GOODE and JACK CLARK

We were only at the Mine Workers' forty-sixth Constitutional Convention for a few days, but what we saw there impressed us greatly. The United Mine Workers, under its new leadership, is an inspiring social movement on its way to becoming an enduring and effective labor union.

Just one year before the Convention, Arnold Miller, Mike Trbovich and Harry Patrick won their inspiring victory over the corrupt and despotic machine of UMW President Tony Boyle. The three rank-and-file activists appealed to the pride of the miners with their slogan, “Let's make the UMW great again.” They also benefited from the revulsion in the ranks to the excesses of Boyle's strong-arm leadership. The Miners for Democracy also, of course, had a base in the Black Lung Association which helped them as they stressed issues like mine safety and health. And the MFD had

(Continued on page 6)

INSIDE . . .

Women unionists confer — Donart	Page 2
Fall of Papadopoulos — Goldbloom	Page 3
Energy outlook	Page 4
Letters	Page 5

No more ladies' auxiliary!

By GRETCHEN DONART

"When you go to evening meetings, your husband will miss you, miss meals, miss your doing the laundry, but he will learn to take up the slack," Lillian Roberts of the State, County and Municipal Employees union told 300 women who gathered in Philadelphia last month for the East Coast organizing meeting of the Coalition of Labor Union Women.

She urged the women from 35 international unions to work to change attitudes in their unions and at home to accommodate working women who want to take an active role in their locals. Roberts said that active participation of women in union decision-making will expand labor's consciousness of issues such as child care and the quality of neighborhoods and education. This new consciousness will be felt both in new collective bargaining demands and in political action programs.

The Philadelphia conference was one of a series of meetings around the country preceding a national conference of the Coalition of Labor Union Women next March in Chicago. The regional conferences are part of a process of feeling out the potential, scope and direction of, and the need for, independent women's action in the labor movement.

Participants ranged from young rank-and-filers to 30-year veterans of union staffs, from individual unionists eager to challenge sexist employers and insensitive union leadership, to some official representatives of local and central labor bodies "keeping an eye on the girls" for their male superiors.

The participants listened as attorney Ruth Weyand described the monumental AT&T settlement in which she represented the International Union of Electrical Workers. Audible gasps went up when she said that in cases where wage discrimination is found, up to twice the pay differential for the past three years may be awarded, as well as legal fees. She added that the courts have encouraged sex discrimination suits. Even in cases that were lost, the courts have ordered the employer to pay the legal fees of the union or individual that brought the suit.

The participants and speakers repeatedly emphasized issues like:

- the need to organize more women workers. Only 4 million of the 34 million working females in the U.S. have union representation, and as a proportion of male income, the average woman's income has decreased in the last ten years. Many felt that their unions could be doing more to organize and bargain effectively for women in their trades. Several expressed hope that a multi-union effort would be mounted to organize service workers such as clerks and secretaries.

- unemployment. Many fear that the energy crisis will cause massive unemployment, which will affect women disproportionately. Backlash against affirmative action for the promotion of women is increasing with every new layoff. Many suggested a shortened work week as a partial solution to both unemployment and the double burden of working mothers. Government

intervention was seen as imperative if women are to achieve full equality.

- access to union leadership positions. Casual mention of the need for women on executive boards brought unexpectedly sharp and prolonged applause. Rosemary Trump of the Service Employees said, "We must educate our daughters that they, too, can become president of the AFL-CIO." Emphasizing that working men and women have common goals, Evelyn Dubrow of the Ladies' Garment Workers said, "We have as little use for women who climb over the backs of men as for men who put down women."

In the closing session, Addie Wyatt, the articulate director of the Amalgamated Meatcutters' Women's Division emphasized that the same qualities of solidarity and common purpose that have made the labor movement strong are needed if the Coalition of Labor Union Women is to be an effective force for women's equality. "What we need and what we seek as women can be found in the labor movement if we only make it so. We must make the labor movement more meaningful than ever now that more people depend on it." □

Walking the Picket Line

The United Farm Workers, in the last six months, have faced disappointment, violence and failure. Yet the Farmworkers themselves, and especially President Cesar Chavez and Vice-President Dolores Huerta, seem indefatigable through it all. Chavez appeared in New York on November 29 at a rally typical of the boycott support spreading across the country.

He spoke with optimism about the Chicano revolution—the Farah strike and the struggle of the Farmworkers. "The strikers at Farah have been out since May, 1972. The company is in the red now, and the strike will be won next year. And the UFW is also going to win."

Right now, 1500 farmworkers are organizing boycotts around the country, picketing supermarkets, fruit stands and produce terminals. In Boston, the boycott has succeeded, and Dolores Huerta proudly proclaims that the stores there are all "clean". In some other places, the union faces injunctions against picketing (which will be met by civil disobedience) and mammoth food chains, which she explains are more cynical and more wealthy than they were in the '60's during the original grape boycott. But Chavez, Huerta, and other farmworkers are convinced that they can and will win.

"The supporters get discouraged, but farmworkers have more confidence," Huerta explains. "I guess getting discouraged is sort of a middle class luxury."

Beat Willie

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers' boycott of Farah slacks is taking a toll on the company. Company President Willie Farah blamed the union and "its church supporters" recently as he announced the closing of plants in Victoria, Texas and Las Cruces, New Mexico. Other plans are running only two days a week.

Greece: out of the frying pan . . .

By MAURICE GOLDBLOOM

The events which brought down the Papadopoulos regime began late in 1972, when the junta decided to demonstrate its "democratic" nature by holding elections to replace the appointed boards which had controlled student organizations since 1967. To make sure that the elections did not create a center of opposition, however, the Papadopoulos regime systematically falsified them. This led to student protests and demands for new elections, first in a few schools and then, in reaction to the government's repressive measures, in every institution of higher learning in Greece. Arrests, police brutality, and the large-scale drafting of student leaders resulted in an increase in the scale and intensity of student demonstrations, and a broadening of demands to include the restoration of democracy for all Greece, not only for the universities. The government then tried to forestall opposition by permitting the students to demonstrate and by agreeing to consider their academic demands; the students took advantage of the government's retreat to demonstrate more vigorously for the demands which the government had rejected—and which, of course, included the most important ones. Carrot and stick were repeatedly alternated by Papadopoulos; neither worked.

Meanwhile other parts of the population were drawn into what had started as a student movement. In some cases, the relatives of students were activated by the mistreatment which students suffered at the hands of the police; in others, people who had only been waiting for a sign that effective resistance was possible were drawn in by the students' example. But the greatest single factor in arousing those groups which had previously tolerated the regime was the galloping inflation. Prices rose approximately 15 percent in the first half of 1973; then they rose even faster, so that the total rise in 1973 may reach 40 percent. (In October alone, the official consumer price index rose 4.7 percent.)

Papadopoulos was, at the same time, under pressure from Europe to restore democracy; the relationship of Greece to the European Economic Community was frozen as long as the dictatorship lasted. Even the United States urged him to hold elections to disarm the Congressional critics of U.S. aid to the junta. During the summer—when the students were dispersed—he attempted to give the appearance of democratization, while at the same time consolidating his power, by announcing that Greece would henceforth be a "Presidential Republic" under his leadership. (The charge that Constantine was responsible for a naval mutiny served as a pretext for ending the monarchy.) A new Constitution, establishing a parliamentary regime—in which all power over defense, security, and foreign affairs was reserved to the President, along with the right to appoint a tenth of the members of Parliament—was announced and submitted to a referendum. A vote for the Constitution was also a vote to name Papadopoulos as President for the next eight years;

no other candidate was permitted. The Constitution and Papadopoulos were duly approved in a blatantly falsified plebiscite.

Papadopoulos then appointed Spyros Markezinis, the only politician to collaborate with the junta from the beginning, as Prime Minister, with the task of preparing elections. The military members of the old cabinet were removed—some of the most important of them objected strenuously and publicly—but a number of the civilian nonentities were kept on. Amnesty was proclaimed, and most of the remaining political prisoners were released. (But new arrests and prosecutions simultaneously took place.) Martial law was ended, but the legal framework of repression remained. The result was that, while Papadopoulos failed to win over any section of the opposition, or persuade it to take part in elections for a parliament whose role seemed bound to be a farcical one, he alienated many of his own military supporters.

Violence in the streets

When the students returned in the fall, demonstrations intensified. They became overtly political, and students were joined by large numbers of workers and middle-class Greeks. A police attack on people leaving a memorial service for George Papandreou was followed by a series of conflicts between demonstrators and police, in which the latter found they could no longer control the streets. Students of the Polytechnic occupied it, established their own broadcasting station, and called for the overthrow of the regime. A desperate Papadopoulos turned to the Army which attacked the students with machine guns and tanks. There were mass arrests and mass killings; we do not yet know how many of either, but the official figures for both are far below the true ones.

The issue was joined; only true democracy would satisfy the Greek people, and Papadopoulos's pseudo-democratization was in ashes. At this point, the Army, unwilling to front any longer for a dictator who had failed, removed Papadopoulos in a bloodless coup. While all branches of the armed services participated, the lead was taken by General Ioannides, head of the Military Police. Known for his cruelty (as well as for the fact that he was one of the few junta members who had not enriched himself), he was the leader of the junta's hard-liners. He also had the support of many elements, both royalist and republican, that wanted the restoration of democracy and believed the removal of Papadopoulos to be a necessary first step. The first reaction of most of the Greek public was euphoric: since the tyrant was overthrown, people were anxious to believe the best. It was not long before caution and then opposition returned, as the regime demonstrated in various ways that it would not bring an end to repression. The expected release of the hundreds of arrested students did not take place; only a few were freed, and the regime refused to disclose the names of those it held. Many believed that this refusal

(Continued on page 4)

Maurice Goldbloom is Editor of News of Greece.

Energy outlook: freeze with honor

NIXON'S TEN BILLION DOLLAR energy program is as phony as the rest of his administration. Unfortunately, Carl Albert's critique of it was given cursory attention by the press. Only \$3.5 billion of that sum is new money "and the rest is simply a result of re-shuffling existing budget titles to place activities only vaguely connected with energy research and development under this heading." The program is not slated to take effect until fiscal 1975 and most of the money is assigned to breeder reaction, "a program which may help us by 1990, but certainly not before that time." There are not sufficient funds for coal gassification and liquefaction that might work in the '70's. Finally, Albert figures that the "\$10 billion" will yield \$55 million in hard cash this year.

BELT TIGHTENING is the watchword of the day, as we are told to conserve scarce energy resources. But let's look at this in perspective. Oil has been our energy

Greece . . .

(Continued from page 3)

was motivated by a desire to conceal the number killed; many parents did not know their children were dead, thinking them under arrest or in hiding.

The regime announced the end of censorship but actually tightened it. The conservative opposition newspaper *Vradyni* was suppressed for a mild editorial criticizing the policy statement of the new Prime Minister, Adamantios Androutopoulos, for its vagueness on the government's political plans. (Androutopoulos, who had come to Greece shortly before the 1967 coup after living in Chicago for ten years, served in every junta cabinet prior to the one headed by Markezinis. He is widely suspected of being a CIA agent.) The English-language *Athens News*, which for the last couple of years has been the most outspokenly anti-junta newspaper in Greece, was unable to carry a report of *Vradyni's* suppression; its pages became almost devoid of Greek political news. New arrests occurred daily; there are almost certainly more people locked up than there were last year. Yet, some members of the cabinet continued to give public assurances that power would be returned to the people in a matter of "months rather than years." The new regime is not yet monolithic, but for the moment ultra-repressive elements seem to be in control.

But the new regime must face the same factors which undermined Papadopoulos. The economy is tottering, and the mass demand for freedom which found its voice and took organized form during the year has not disappeared. At the same time, Ioannides has a narrower base of support than Papadopoulos; certainly not all of the latter's supporters in the Army are reconciled to his overthrow. The divisions among democracy's enemies could still speed its return, if its supporters can retain the unity of action they began to develop in the fight against Papadopoulos. □

mainstay; about half our energy comes from oil. Before the Arab oil embargo, we were using 17 million barrels of oil daily. Eleven million barrels of that were domestically produced, and 3 million were imported from other places than the Middle East.

THAT LEAVES A DEFICIT of 3 million barrels of oil daily. Since both the government and the oil industry have been short-sighted about developing new technology and increasing refinery capacity, we will have to economize for a while.

THAT BRINGS US TO POLITICS. The Nixon plan for conserving energy has been "rationing" through higher prices. Quite simply, as Congressman Wright Patman has pointed out, it is a system of "rationing" which favors the wealthy and discriminates against the poor. Paul Samuelson compared the higher prices solution to the energy crisis to "the capitalistic solution" the British offered in the Irish potato famine of 1845-49 in which millions of men, women and children starved.

"RIOTS AT THE GAS STATION" are foreseen by Arthur Okun, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, if a combination of higher prices and "congestion rationing" is used to allocate fuel. Maybe the truckers' highway blockades are the prelude to Okun's nightmare. The only alternative seems to be direct rationing. If we hobble along without it, there's a danger that money and political clout will determine energy allocation. Recently, for example, President Nixon increased fuel allocations for general aviation—small aircraft used for pleasure flying and corporate transportation.

MISALLOCATION OF FUEL is only the beginning of the public's worries in this crisis. Unemployment will shoot up. It could be a serious recession when the ripple effect is considered. Unlike old recessions, the price level is unlikely to drop. In fact, Administration spokesmen are suggesting that the rate of inflation will also be climbing in 1974. When Nixon first brought us this miracle of an economic slump along with rising prices, it was christened "stagflation." *The Wall Street Journal* suggests that with the dropping of environmental standards added to the old Nixonomics, 1974 might be the year of "stinkflation."

THERE ARE ALTERNATIVES in both the short run and the long run to the Nixon program. Immediately, since we have to save energy this winter, we could start by cutting down on industrial energy waste. One British authority on the subject has suggested that when it comes to industrial energy use, "you Americans aren't fat, you're obese." And a DuPont study estimates that more efficient use of industrial energy could save us more than one and a half million barrels of oil daily.

FOR THE LONG RANGE, there are possibilities, but there are also dangers, particularly if the oil consortiums are left free to manipulate the supplies of oil, coal and uranium (which they also control) to maximize

profits. And questions remain about nuclear fission (safety, radioactive wastes), while research on nuclear fusion, inadequately funded, proceeds very slowly.

KING COAL may return to previous glory under the current energy pinch. There's certainly a lot of it, and some new technologies, like gassification, make coal even more promising as a resource. The problem is getting to the coal and getting the coal to the users. Vast amounts of low sulfur coal exist in Montana, Wyoming and North Dakota but the best way to reach it is by strip-mining. Existing technology makes it possible to reclaim strip-mined land, but that, of course, adds to the costs and eats into the profits. Under those conditions, it will not be done by the private companies. Their alternative plan is to use the public pressure caused by the shortage to gut the federal regulations requiring reclamation of the strip-mined land. Without strict enforcement on reclamation, these lands could become dust bowls by the 1980's.

OIL SHALE might be another solution to the crisis. Right now, it is federally owned, but the Interior Dept. is planning to divest itself of the oil shale lands in a series of bargain leases to private companies. Commercial oil shale reduction is pegged to begin in 1978, and to get into full swing a decade later. The technical costs will be high; environmental costs will be monumental. To produce two barrels of oil from oil shale, a strip-mining operation for three tons of rock is required. To obtain as much energy from oil shale as from coal, ten times as much bulk must be mined and processed. The reduction process requires temperatures of 900° Fahrenheit plus large supplies of water (in a water-short area).

SELF-SUFFICIENCY in energy is Nixon's proclaimed goal, and he wants it by 1980. Since the lead time for developing new techniques and new energy sources will

be about ten years, that's probably unrealistic. But there is also a disturbing undertone. The "Project Independence" scheme raises an ugly spectre of economic nationalism—one critic has called it a "Darwinian nightmare." The United States, with 6% of the world population, already consumes 35% of the world's energy. And Nixon is calling on us to shut down our oil exports, to ignore the calculus of human need beyond our borders. There are real possibilities there for intense international competition—the strong vs. the weak or the petroleum rich vs. the petroleum poor.

THE ARAB OIL BOYCOTT may hurt the Third World countries more than the United States. The London *Economist* reports that the rise in oil prices for the Third World has already left those countries \$5 billion poorer, a sum equal to 25% of the foreign aid they now receive from the advanced economies. If, as is expected, oil prices double within the next two or three years, so will the problems of the developing nations. India's costs have already gone up by 6%; even Moslem Pakistan has had to pay out an extra 15 million pounds. This catastrophe occurs, ironically, at a moment when the terms of trade are better for the poor lands than at any time since the Korean War. The value of their commodity exports is up by 30% and their currency reserve has increased twofold. If, however, there is an international "oil" recession, their improved position will be destroyed as demand in the advanced countries slackens. The Arabs have talked about, but not instituted, a "two-tier" pricing arrangement which would sell fuel to the Third World at bargain rates. Strongly opposed to this policy are Nigeria and Indonesia, two oil-rich developing countries. In December Nigeria told Ghana and other West African states that they must pay cash on the barrelhead. In short, the poor, as usual, are the prime victims of trade policy. □

Our readers write

To the editor:

Mike Harrington's argument for the defense of Israel, outlined in the November NEWSLETTER, is fallacious. The "basic political and moral commitment" to Israel's right to exist in peace does not, and must not stem from her being a democratic or social-democratic society, but from the principle of the right of any community to life, a right that is independent of the political form of such a community. Is Algeria a social democracy? Bangladesh? Pakistan? They are not, but their right to life, to independence and self-determination cannot be argued. Whether Israel has a contribution to make to the welfare of her neighbors remains to be seen; she has not done so hitherto. But this is irrelevant to the more basic question of her right to exist.

Of course, one has hardly any choice but to second Avineri's position on the Palestinians. All "solutions" in the Middle East will be historically unjust solutions. Israel's rights unavoidably clash with the rights of the displaced Palestinians who in the early forties still accounted for roughly two thirds of the population of pre-1967 Israeli territory. In the scale of justice, if there be one, little weight attaches to such factors as that Israel has become the home of some of the survivors of the Holocaust; the majority of Israelis immigrated from oriental countries where their position had become untenable as a consequence of

the establishment of Israel by Ashkenazi Jews. I do not think we should pretend that there is a "socialist" or even a "democratic" solution to the problem. —Horst Brand

To the editor:

Although I can't disagree with any of the specifics in Mike Harrington's article (November NEWSLETTER, "The Middle East: Is Peace Possible"), I wasn't very happy with the emphasis. The article seems to fall into the trap of criticizing the Israelis because they are reasonable, but not bothering to criticize the Arabs because they are unreasonable. Besides, we should state our own support for the Palestinians' right to a state of their own, without criticizing the Israeli position—after all there has to be some trade-off for Hussein not fighting.

I also think the criticism of Jackson is out of place. After all, if the United States plays the role of "even-handed honest broker" while the Soviet Union is solidly committed to the Arabs, Israel gets left out in the cold. Jackson is right to criticize Nixon on this score.

Finally, I think we are going to have to junk the idea of reducing the defense budget—not because we have any more need for the strategic weapons systems which the Left has opposed, but because we are going to have to spend a lot more money on developing and stockpiling tactical weapons. The Russians have completely outclassed us in surface-to-air and sea-to-sea missiles. —Ben Ross

Mine Workers...

(Continued from page 1)

the help of socially-minded lawyers (Joe Rauh and Joseph Yablonski's sons), former VISTA workers and scores of young activist volunteers.

They had a serious drawback in seeking the leadership of an international union: utter lack of union leadership experience. Like John L. Lewis before him, Tony Boyle controlled every level of the Mine Workers' union. District leaders were appointed by him, a number of locals were virtual "rotten boroughs" without a single active miner and dependent for their pension checks on remaining in Boyle's good graces. The locals which had active miners were easily persuaded of the wisdom of going along with the Boyle leadership. The threat Joseph Yablonski posed was that he had been part of the leadership and had the experience to put another administration together.

An open Convention

Miller, Trbovich and Patrick had none of that. And considering that fact, the recent Convention was all the more impressive. Not that you'd have to go too far to have a better Convention than Tony Boyle and the gang used to put on. A couple of comparisons illustrate the change in the UMW:

- under Boyle, in 1969, the Convention cost \$6.5 million. This year's Convention in Pittsburgh cost the union \$500,000.

- in 1969, Boyle's goon squads roamed the Convention hall, keeping dissidents in line. Some Yablonski supporters were assaulted for attempting to speak on the floor. The only violence this year involved some delegates from Alabama who knocked down a union staffer. Delegates were encouraged to take to the floor mikes with their views, and many of them did; some were very critical of the union leadership.

- the '69 Convention, like other Boyle extravaganzas, was packed by the administration. Union staffers went as voting delegates automatically, and Boyle loyalists were brought in several weeks to a month early to serve on Convention committees and live on the union expense accounts. This time staffers had votes only if elected as delegates from their locals, and everybody came to the Convention at the same time.

- at the 1969 Convention, most of the floor votes were ritualistic; the work and the decisions had been taken care of in committee (a procedure typical even of far more democratic unions, and the greatest contributor to the deadly dullness of most union conclaves). The delegates vigorously debated committee recommendations this time, rejected some of them and sent others back for further study.

After the shameful leadership of a Tony Boyle, the Miller leadership needed an open and democratic Convention to prove its good faith to the miners and the public. They had the most open and democratic union convention since the '30's. But they had more. They had a Convention which stressed reconciliation. The Miners for Democracy were only partially successful in winning control of the union, and many former Boyle

supporters still hold their positions in local or District leadership and on the union executive board. The first Convention would have been an ideal opportunity to whip the union into line behind the new leadership. The spectre of the Yablonski murders could have been raised; the ugly memories of Boyle's leadership could have been used. They weren't. Instead, Miller and his fellow officers chose to stress that the union was truly a united mine workers' union. The delegates responded in kind. One local officer explained that he knew some miners who had voted against Miller, but they weren't calling themselves Boyle men. "He (Miller) is president now, and they'll be loyal to him, just like they were loyal to Tony Boyle."

Institutionalizing reform

Collective bargaining demands were formulated at the Convention. The delegates seemed to agree with the comment Miller made in his keynote address: "Coal miners have a lot of lost ground to make up, and we intend to recover a good piece of it in November" (when the new contract is negotiated). Miners used to be among the highest paid blue collar workers in the country, but they've lost ground in recent years. And as their wages fell behind, their fringe benefits, once the envy of organized labor, just about atrophied.

The delegates were pushing hard for a wage boost; the leadership was stressing new benefits, an improved grievance procedure, adequate mine safety and a six-hour day. A number of delegates expressed a hope that the welfare fund could be freed from the "royalty" system which ties industry contributions to miners' productivity. Miller put the operators on notice that the union is ready to go through a strike to win on these demands.

More than militance is needed. With only 52% of the mines organized, the operators, whether conglomerate or independent, might choose union-busting resistance over sophisticated and modern collective bargaining.

To overcome that, the UMW will need to organize at least some of the 50,000 non-union miners.

And if the UMW is able to bargain effectively with the operators, it will need to develop district and local leaders who have the sophistication to take on the corporate negotiators. Once they win a decent contract, the Mine Workers will need to deploy hundreds of stewards and grievance committeemen capable of enforcing the safety and working conditions clauses.

That means the mineworkers need to set up organizing drives and education programs. They need increased staff (to supplement the excellent people they already have). The officers have to consolidate their power and exercise leadership while maintaining democracy. The union has to create enough discipline so that the constant wildcats can be supplanted by more effective long range strategies against the companies.

Yes, the Miners for Democracy are, as they must be, in the process of becoming an institution, even a bureaucracy. As the process continues, they will part company with some of their more romantic well-wishers. But if the process continues successfully, it could be even more exciting — and significant — than the victory over Tony Boyle. □

New Democrats...

(Continued from page 1)

one of the existing Canadian oil corporations and use the structure as the basis of its own effort. And, Lewis continued, the NDP will make further demands, including joint Federal-provincial development of the Athabasca tar sands and a uniform national price for crude oil attained by having the national petroleum corporation control all imports.

Clearly, the ideas put forth by Lewis and Douglas are similar to—though well in advance of—proposals for the public development of energy in the United States. How could Canadian socialists have such an impact? During the Regina conference, I met Al Blakeney, the Premier of Saskatchewan, Ed Schreyer, the Premier of Manitoba, about ten members of the Federal parliament, and leaders and rank-and-filers from the NDP, particularly in the Western provinces. My co-panelists, Gunnar and Alva Myrdal, were as impressed as I was with the NDP's quality, and what follows might explain why.

In the West, the NDP has given socialist content to the old populist tradition (which flourished in the United States, but was lost to the socialist movement because of the socialists' sectarianism). In 1933 the prairie Leftists created the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation and within ten years had won the provincial government in Saskatchewan. Now the NDP, the CCF's successor, is in power in British Columbia and Manitoba as well as in Saskatchewan. In the Sixties, Saskatchewan was the site of a fierce struggle over medical care, with the doctors striking against the NDP's public health program. The socialists persevered and the principles they trailblazed in one province now extend to all Canada.

It is an extraordinary experience for an American socialist to meet Saskatchewan socialists. Most of them are farmers who look like their U.S. counterparts. On social and cultural questions, they are fairly conservative. And yet, out of their own experience—in the struggles against bank foreclosures and for co-ops, in the battles for medical care in the Sixties, and now in their fight to gain Canadian, and social, control of their own resources—they are socialists.

In the mid-Forties, it even seemed that the movement which had begun in the west would sweep to power in all of Canada. But the momentum peaked and in the Fifties the CCF seemed doomed to minor-

Labor and the Left

On Saturday, February 16 and Sunday, February 17, the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee will hold a conference on "A Left Perspective on the Labor Movement" in Chicago.

Organizing women, labor and politics, and a labor program for the energy crisis will be among the topics discussed, and speakers and panelists will include Victor Reuther, Michael Harrington and Heather Booth.

For more information on the conference, write to conference co-ordinator Nancy Shier, 400 West Deming St., Chicago, Ill. 60614.

ity status. In the late Fifties, however, the Canadian labor movement unified, and turned to the CCF for a joint venture in organizing a new political party. Out of that effort came the New Democratic Party in 1961. Its Eastern base is urban trade unionists; on the prairies, it is still primarily composed of farmers; and on the Pacific coast it has both rural and urban support.

Quebec nationalism

One enormous problem which the Party, like the nation, faces is the nationalism of French Canada. In Quebec, the NDP has very little strength, not least because most of the separatist parties—including the most successful of them, the Parti Quebecois—have a socialist ideology. In the immediate future, the NDP's hopes are focused on making a major breakthrough in Ontario province. In the more distant future, there are possibilities of a larger realignment with the Liberal Left and some who are now in the separatist political movement.

The trade unionists who support the NDP are, for the most part (the Public Employees Union is an exception) affiliated to the AFL-CIO or the UAW. In ethnic and class terms, the workers and farmers who participate in this socialist movement (the NDP is the Canadian affiliate of the Socialist International) are very much like their brothers and sisters in this country. There are, of course, major differences between the two countries: for one, the parliamentary system in Canada allows a third party to play the kind of creative role the NDP is now effecting.

Some of my NDP friends in Regina were worried that Trudeau would get the political credit for actions socialists forced upon him. That is possible, but perhaps the Canadians will react like the Germans in the 1880's and 1890's, who responded to Bismark's "left" turn by voting for the socialists who forced him to make it.

So there are problems for the NDP. But its magnificent success in shaping Canadian energy policy is an omen of how powerful and important the movement already is. I told the audience that we Americans dreamed of the day when we could have their kind of difficulties—the difficulties of working out the tactics of exerting power in the name of socialist principle—in the United States. □

Newsletter of

THE DEMOCRATIC LEFT

Michael Harrington, Editor

Jack Clark, Managing Editor

The following people helped to put out this issue:

Liz Bass, David Bensman, Gretchen Donart, Carol Drisko, David Kusnet, David Lindorff, Alex Spinrad, Mark Schaeffer.

Signed articles express the views of the author.

Published ten times a year (monthly except July and August). Office: 125 West 77th St., New York 10024.

Jimmy Higgins reports...

PETE McCLOSKEY, the anti-war California Congressman who challenged Nixon in the '72 Presidential primaries, had a falling out with the Party faithful in early 1973, but the rift has been healed. Disillusioned with Nixon, McCloskey left the GOP shortly after his re-election to Congress. He's back in the fold now because he's found that his faith in "free enterprise" coincides with the GOP's philosophy. Despite his reputation as a liberal (and his contacts with genuine liberals like Allard Lowenstein), and his own description of himself (before a college audience) as a "radical," McCloskey in most ways fits right into the Republican mainstream. He's against the Kennedy-Griffiths health security bill, for instance, because he considers it "socialized medicine." And at home in California, McCloskey's winning coalition is a strange mix of anti-Nixon liberals and college students (Stanford University is in McCloskey's district) and out and out reactionaries who have nowhere else to go. With Jerry Ford now installed as Vice President, a part of that Republican mainstream may be swinging over to McCloskey's stand on impeachment: he wants it now more than ever.

THE PUNDITS WERE AT IT after President Nixon's recent financial disclosures. The best crack we heard: "for two years, Nixon paid the same taxes as a person with a family of four who's making \$8000/year. Never since Andrew Jackson has a President been so close to the working people." But Nixon's own "working man," former New York building trades official and present Secretary of Labor Peter Brennan, jumped to his chief's defense. Workers "probably wish they had the same deal," Brennan told a Washington press conference. And any worker who was as successful as Nixon would deserve the deductions. "I hope I can make it and take the same deductions," said Brennan enviously.

THE "EVEN HAND" OF GOVERNMENT controls on wages and prices has been in evidence lately as Cost of Living Council Director John Dunlop slaps down wage hikes and pats business price boosters on the back. UAW negotiators complained that they were "bargaining under a shadow" as they took on the Big Three automakers and the COLC's 5.5% guideline for wage increases. Shortly after the pacts were ratified, and wages for the industry were set for the next three years, the Council lifted controls for the industry price fixers. And this followed on the heels of massive "energy crisis" lay-offs by the automakers (lay-offs which hit hardest at production in the medium-sized field but left the lines churning out the big gas-eaters). The Cost of Living Council decision on auto spurred speculation that the government is about to lift controls from other industries, most notably steel. Less than two weeks before the COLC decision on auto, U.S. Steel had said that its scheduled price increase on January 1 would exceed the 6.5% guideline laid down months ago by the Cost of Living Council.

OPERATION MOP-UP was a two bit reign of terror waged by a weird radical grouplet, the National Caucus of Labor Committees. The original target was the Communist Party, but soon the NCLC "truth squads" were out "confronting" almost every other group on the Left.

Now they're after a new—and bigger—target. The December 7 edition of *New Solidarity*, the NCLC's publication, announced that Operation Mop-Up will be pressed "against the Woodcock-Reuther leadership of the United Auto Workers." In classical sectarian fashion, the NCLC accused the "bureaucracy" of "leading the entire American labor movement to accept . . . the Second Great Depression." It was not clear whether the "working class organizers" of the NCLC intend to resort to the same violent tactics they used against the Communists, but *New Solidarity* estimates that it will take two years to "get rid of these criminals."

FOOD ACTION is a consumer group which has recently been protesting the concentration of ownership in the food industry. Testifying before the Senate Subcommittee on Monopolies, Jim Hightower, who is a coordinator for Food Action, warned that "monopolistic food corporations are taking charge of the food supply." He cited a Federal Trade Commission study showing that 80% of the profits in the cannery business fall to four companies. In an earlier letter to the United Nations Panel on Multinational Corporations, Food Action noted that food production and distribution "is the largest industry in the world." And both old familiar food conglomerates like Nestle's and Del Monte, and relative newcomers like ITT, Tenneco and Dow, are "affecting all of us with little accountability to anyone," according to Food Action.

PUBLIC-MINDED CORPORATION WATCHERS have found an unlikely ally in the Securities and Exchange Commission. The SEC has ruled that starting December 28, companies which pay at least 5% less than the statutory rate of 48% in corporate taxes must submit reports detailing which tax breaks enabled them to save money. Corporate executives are muttering that anti-corporation types like Ralph Nader will be helped by this ruling, and indeed, tax reformers and public interest advocates will be aided in deciding just how much the corporations are getting away with in the great treasury raid.

Please enter my subscription to the Newsletter of the Democratic Left

Regular Subscription \$5 Student rate \$2.50

Sustaining Subscription \$10

Name.....

Address.....

City..... Zip.....

Send to Newsletter of the Democratic Left
125 West 77th Street, New York, N.Y. 10024

From each according to his ability . . .