

# The Second International plans radicalization of America

by Scott Thompson

Standing in the long queue outside the Dec. 5 plenary session of Michael Harrington's "Eurosocialism and America" conference was an experience not unlike being skipped back two decades in time to the anti-Vietnam War movement of the 1960s. The 2,000 participants appeared to be mainly bearded youths in imitation lumberjack dress sporting regulation backpacks, together with handfuls of tweedy professors and little old ladies.

What made this ragtag gathering of interest was the contrast between the raw material at hand and the tasks which our news service had picked up as the goal of the three-day conference. Among the many "leaks" we gathered, one of the best was obtained in the classic "conversation overheard in a bar." Two leaders of Michael Harrington's Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee were discussing how they would threaten the moderate wing of the Democrats with splitting the party in order to stop their turn toward more conservative policies.

"The idea is to present a really live threat that the left liberal wig of the party will walk out. The Europeans being here will help that a lot. Then O'Neill can force the conservatives to back off or to leave the party themselves. The moderates won't let the party split in two for the sake of a turn to more conservative policies. We can force them to adopt social democratic policies that way."

Later at a press conference of Capitol Hill one of our Washington correspondents asked: "Mr. Harrington, is it true that you have been threatening to split the Democratic Party during the closed-door sessions of the last few days? My sources indicate that the threat is really designed to force the conservatives out of the party." The appropriate part of Harrington's anatomy turned interesting colors at the discovery of his ruse.

## A peasants' revolt

This scenario for effecting an ideological takeover of the Democratic Party, after it had suffered one of the most resounding defeats in its history, was further uncovered in the plenary session, as were at least the outlines of how organized labor was to be brought into the gameplan.

Present on the dais, in addition to Harrington, were for the first time in history of the American socialist movement such Second International power-brokers as former German Chancellor Willy Brandt, former Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme, and British Labour Party Executive Council member Anthony ("Wedgie")

Wedgwood Benn. They were joined by *Ms.* magazine editor Gloria Steinem, International Association of Machinists President William Winpisinger, and Rep. Ron Dellums (D-Cal.), "the one-man socialist caucus on Capitol Hill."

Benn, who would work most closely with the young socialists throughout the conference (profiling them for later deployment), gave the broad outlines of why this unprecedented event was taking place. In his speech, Benn used the example of the economic chaos resulting from Conservative Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's monetarist policies to show the sweeping "radicalization" that could be catalyzed if the Reagan administration were backed into a corner and made to impose Nixonian wage-price controls as a result of the austerity measures of Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker. According to Benn, monetarism had already left as much as 60 percent of the population unemployed in key industrial cities in England.

"I am astounded," said Benn, "at how radicalized the population has become in just 18 months. A demonstration of 150,000 workers to protest unemployment has taken place in Liverpool, and we recently held the largest demonstration since the Trafalgar Square anti-bomb demo in London. . . . We are facing the same problem that occurred in the 1930s, which was solved then by rearmament and war."

What does socialism have to offer as an alternative to monetarism? Concretely, Benn admitted, nothing. Every other speaker during the conference would confirm the same conclusion, from proclaiming "the post-industrial society" to statements that "no growth will be possible in the foreseeable future." Ron Dellums, who preceded Benn, made a similar point. Under present economic conditions there could be no New Deal, Fair Deal, New Frontier, or Great Society. Instead of basic industrial and scientific growth, or traditional liberal handouts, Benn predicted that the Labour Party would ride to power in three to four years by offering labor "a new morality," "genuine internationalism," "enfranchisement," "a return to our socialist roots."

Throughout, Benn worked to shape the slogans and ideology that could be used to "create solidarity with labor, bringing it into direct coalition with the peace movement, the women's liberation movement, the ecology movement." Organized labor was too "nonpolitical," Benn told one *EIR* correspondent, and "it may be necessary to create a new form of trade unionism."

From the examples he cited, it became apparent that Benn and his Eurosociologist colleagues planned to use American labor against the Reagan administration.

Two European examples of what this new “direct coalition” with labor must become were given. The first was that of the Peasants’ Revolt of 1381. In 1981, Benn said, the British Labour Party would mount a year-long celebration of the 600th anniversary of the Peasants’ Revolt, “the origin of modern socialism,” according to Benn.

His second example was the “Solidarity” union of Lech Walesa in Poland. “Ironically,” he said, “it was trade unionism in Poland that liberalized communism.”

From American history itself he chose such examples as Robert Owen’s utopian socialist schemes, the anarchist “Wobblies” (International Workers of the World), the Jesuit-spawned Catholic Social Action movement, and “liberation theology.”

Benn was precisely on the mark in citing the Peasants’ Revolt as the “mother” for such movements. The common thread through all of them was Jacobinism: the anarchist mob that transformed the republican revolution in France into bloody butchery.

### ‘Out of the closet’

William Winpisinger, international president of the machinists’ union, showed in his speech that he was in full agreement with this course. From his first ad lib on his prepared text (“Socialists rejoice, we’re out of the closets. . .”), Winpisinger made a call for building a labor-based socialist movement around the slogan: “The quickest way to progress is to self-destruct.”

Faced with the self-destruction of America, which he predicted a Reagan administration would bring, “Wimpy” (as he is known by his trade-union colleagues) stated: “The American trade-union movement and its left-of-center allies must fuse democratic values and a socialist vision of society into a viable economic and political movement that will defang the snarling corporate wolf and humanize his marketplace jungle.”

It was also left to Winpisinger to deliver the threat that if the Democratic Party, to correct for its smashing Nov. 4 defeat, continues to turn toward more conservative policies and program, Harrington’s Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee and allied radical elements “will take the high road, the Canadian route” to form a “New Democratic Party” splinter.

Walking back from the conference with Olof Palme, I asked him whether this threat was serious, and, if not, what he expected for the Democratic Party from the conference. In response, Palme said:

“I don’t think there is any possibility of splitting the party in the near future. Nor will Harrington’s group succeed in taking it over within the next decade. What we really want to do is hold the liberals. We can do this,

in part, by strengthening the radical wing of the party.”

As I later learned from top officials in the AFL-CIO, it was for this purpose—creating a radical wing that would ultimately move more and more into the mainstream—that the Socialist International made a unilateral decision at its Madrid conference to replace the more right-wing Social Democrats USA as its official U.S. representative with Harrington’s DSOC.

Buttonholed by an *EIR* correspondent at the Saturday reception, Harrington was even more explicit about what was behind the blackmail threat of a split:

“We are already the dominant socialist group in America, as I believe this conference makes clear. What we are doing here is ‘networking,’ building the basis so that we can radicalize the mainstream of the Democratic Party over the long run.

“Our immediate goal is to stop the party from being captured by the conservatives, the Democrats to the right of Kennedy and left of Reagan. We plan to get a lot more involved in primaries, to build up strength through them. Just like the New Right, we’ll work against conservative candidates we don’t support.”

When another *EIR* correspondent grilled Benn, whose many posts include being past chairman of the British Fabian Society, he made an astonishing admission. “Well, yes,” said Benn, “I guess our economic policies do converge with those of the monetarists.”

Benn, who claims to have coined the phrase “deindustrialization” to describe the effects of “monetarism,” went on to admit that several of his Labourite and Fabian Society colleagues were themselves working on “deindustrialization” schemes. One of his closer associates, Peter Hall, was, according to Benn, at work that very moment on a “free-enterprise zones” model of “building little Hong Kongs inside cities,” which had been picked up by the Heritage Foundation to feed into the Reagan administration.

### Convergence

These admissions from a shaken Tony Benn—namely, that Eurosociology was merely a “soft-cop” variant of monetarism—were confirmed in the statements of all the major speakers. This version of Schachtian economics was spelled out most explicitly by Joop den Uyl, former prime minister of Holland and chairman of the Federation of Socialist Policies.

In his speech, den Uyl stated that “structural problems” in the present world economy mean that “the normal rhythm of the fifties and sixties” cannot be resumed. As proof that economic growth must end, den Uyl cited the recent OECD report of Bertrand de Jouvenal’s Interfutures think tank in France. This futurologist body is linked to the circles in England around Geoffrey Vickers, a member of the Vickers armaments industry family, who has pushed a “Hundred Years

War" model of regional warfare throughout the Third World. Historically, it is not the least surprising that Vickers was a member of Britain's Ministry of Economic Warfare during World War II or that Bertrand de Jouvenal was linked to the fascist circles around Jacques Doriot in Vichy France. According to den Uyl:

"The rise of oil prices and other raw materials was an expression of the fundamental and continuing scarcity and of the newly won power of the oil-producing countries. Protection of the environment would mean that the cost of the industrial production would increase and growth would be permanently inhibited.

"There has also been a shift in values: people in the postindustrial society are more interested in the quality of their work and in having more leisure time than in the level of their income. Post-materialist requirements, Interfutures calls it. . . . [As a result] the Western economy will have to continue to reckon with a low growth of at the most two or two-and-a-half percent. That has enormous consequences for the future of the welfare state."

What are those consequences? Confronted by *EIR*, den Uyl admitted that the "gravest problem will be to get the European workforce to accept a much lower level of economic growth." His solutions amounted to more of the same social democratic programs which had helped create the present limits on growth.

Den Uyl called for a new World Environmentalist Conference similar to the one held in Stockholm in 1970

to impose controls upon the development of micro-electronics and other new technology, including fission-fusion technologies that would resolve the present energy shortage. And he called for the International Labor Organization to sponsor a New World Employment Plan (an adjunct to the genocidal "appropriate technologies" and "food control" policies of the Brandt Commission) to reorganize jobs in the advanced sector countries. To obtain full employment under "zero growth" conditions, den Uyl proposes a "six-hour day," more jobs in the service sector, and sharing of job opportunities equally between men and women.

Similar proposals were made by each of the other key speakers and panelists:

**Olof Palme** called for greater "co-participation" of the labor force in a tripartite arrangement bringing labor together with government and industry. "Co-participation" under conditions of "zero economic growth" such as Palme endorsed has been widely denounced in the past as a means to dupe workers into self-policing their own austerity.

Perhaps the most honest view of "co-participation" was given in a panel discussion by **Irving Bluestone**, a retired vice-president of the United Autoworkers. At a General Electric plant, Bluestone said, workers were bored with the tedious assembly of small electronic components. Management decided to let them have a greater role in the plant—e.g., the color of walls. "They still had the same boring assembly job after this," said

## El Salvador's 'just struggle'

In public speeches and in corridor discussions at last week's Second International conference in Washington, the world's social-democratic leaders stated that El Salvador—wracked by a bloody, no-win civil war—is the "model" for national liberation and independence struggles that must be encouraged throughout the Third World.

Months of battles in that country between left- and right-wing forces have left over 9,000 dead so far this year. The economic effects are so extreme that some observers are beginning to compare El Salvador to the devastation Cambodia underwent under Pol Pot's regime.

Yet the Socialist International has turned their support for armed struggle in El Salvador into their major cause célèbre internationally, as speeches by Anthony Wedgwood Benn, Olof Palme, Willy

Brandt, and others made clear. Second International Chairman Willy Brandt himself unabashedly admitted on national American TV Dec. 7 that the International is funding leftwing guerrillas operating in El Salvador, and defended that policy for other areas of the world as well.

Swedish socialist Olof Palme told the conference that support for struggles for "human rights" like in El Salvador is a necessity which he compared with support for the Polish solidarists.

Spanish Socialist Felipe Gonzalez, who personally coordinates many of the Socialist International's Latin American operations, spelled out this idea. According to Gonzalez, Poland and El Salvador both epitomize just struggles to establish a "Third Way" between East and West, which is necessary in order to destroy the "bipolar world." "The destiny of Latin America is being decided in Poland," Gonzalez argued, "because if in the current bipolar world the Soviet Union will continue to dominate in Poland, the United States will in El Salvador."

Bluestone, "but they were much happier."

François Mitterrand called for "a new, revitalized *autogestion*"—using the same catchphrase as the student radicals during the May 1968 Paris riots—to call for "decentralization of decisions to the level where they are implemented." Mitterrand further attacked the dirigist policies of the present government, which are similar to those of Alexander Hamilton and other U.S. Founding Fathers, by calling instead for "new spaces of freedom," including women's liberation.

The clearest example of what the Eurosocialists mean by "women's liberation" was spelled out by Gloria Steinem in the plenary session when she said: "One basis of the new morality must be that women control their bodies and reproductive processes." The expression on Winpisinger's face when she said this, said reams about the viability of the new "direct coalition with labor" that had been proposed.

## Backstage

As the conference drew on, the lack of labor representation outside the left-liberal UAW and IAM, was only one sign for me that DSOC and its band of 1960s radicals will have great difficulty in injecting "zero growth economics," "co-participation," greater "environmental controls on technology," into American politics. This seemed especially true after the defeat delivered those who adhered to such policies during the Nov. 4 election, in large measure due to the anger of organized labor at the economic setback it suffered under Carter and the "McGovern liberals."

Two "leaks" during press conferences, however, soon made clear that all the important work was actually going on backstage from the Eurosocialism sideshow. Asked by a journalist whether he had met with former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, Palme admitted that he had not only met secretly with Kissinger, but he had also had a series of one-hour Washington meetings with, among others, Warren Christopher of the State Department and Georgi Arbatov of the KGB-IMEMO crowd.

A further window opened on these backstage maneuvers when Harrington admitted that the Eurosocialist leaders had met privately on Saturday, Dec. 6 with Sen. Ted Kennedy, Sen. George McGovern, Rep. Ron Dellums, and others. What made this especially interesting is that Kennedy, who has adopted conservative rhetoric since the election, had publicly refused to attend the conference.

And, finally, on Monday, I learned that Willy Brandt and Horst Ehmke had scheduled a luncheon with AFL-CIO head Lane Kirkland to discuss the conference. Harrington had stated publicly that Kirkland was irate over the event and had pulled out labor support.

---

## Documentation

---

### Brandt on population



*Excerpts from West German Social Democratic Party Chairman Willy Brandt's address at the Second International conference, titled "A Program for Survival":*

... "A Program for Survival"—that is the subtitle of the report published by the Independent Commission on International Development Issues [the World Bank's Brandt Commission] at the beginning of this year. Our intention there was to make it clear that North-South tensions represent a dangerous time bomb—a time bomb destined to call into question our very existence. . . .

A reduction in population growth forms one of the first priorities if we are to prevent the disastrous depletion of the world's natural resources. Naturally that alone does not suffice. But it poses a real challenge to our sense of anticipation and imagination to find fast-working, comprehensive and peaceful solutions for overcoming mass poverty. . . .

Moreover, the holders of political office—especially those who derive from the areas of social democracy—should remain receptive to fresh ideas—whether they themselves are able to develop them or not. In my view, the search for alternative life-styles, whether for the individual or for a group, must not be simply dismissed without further ado as idle fancy or as a sinister attack on an established political order. . . . Present-day conditions leave us no other choice than to seek more actively for solutions which correspond to the economic and ecological requirements of our time in order to establish, wherever possible, a stable equilibrium.

### Den Uyl on economics



*The following is an excerpted version of the speech given by Joop den Uyl at the conference of the Socialist International held in Washington, D.C. Dec. 6, 1980. Den Uyl is the leader of the Dutch Labor Party, and was premier of Holland from 1973 to 1977.*

*He is currently the president of the Confederation of Socialist Parties of the European Community. The speech was entitled "Democratizing the Social Structure."*

Social democrats from Europe who come to the U.S. have often the feeling that they come to preach the social gospel to a paganist, unwilling and resistant people. That is particularly true, since in these Reagan days, the gospel seems to be the defense of the establishment.

Let me assure you how encouraging it was for me to experience last night, and this morning, that there is another America, an America which does not accept the inequalities and the short-sightedness of an unjust society, an America that wants to give adequate answers to the rising problems before us.

We need such another America in the defense of the welfare state and on behalf of the democratic ideas of the social structure. . . .

One of the points I would like to make is how much we in Europe need a firm and strong position of the democratic left in this country. It is not only good for the U.S., we need it in Europe as well. Then it cannot be denied that in Europe today, the welfare state is under attack, and not only in the Britain of Thatcher, the Milton Friedmans are among us. The attack on the welfare state has much to do with the impact of the world economic crisis in Western European economies. The welfare state has been the creation of a period with rapid economic growth. The decline of economic growth during the seventies poses new questions to be answered by socialists . . . .

Fortunately . . . [in 1979] a new OECD study was published, "Interfutures." This displayed a considerably better understanding [than the earlier optimistic McCracken OECD report] of the structural nature of the slowdown in growth and the changed relations in the world economy.

The rise of new industrial centers in Third World countries would exercise a lasting constraint on the Western economies' capacity for growth. The rise of oil prices and other raw materials was an expression of the fundamental and continuing scarcity of oil, and of the newly won power of the oil-producing countries. Protection of the environment would mean that the cost of industrial production would increase and growth would be permanently inhibited.

There has also been a shift of values: people in the postindustrial society are more interested in the quality of their work and in having more leisure time than in the level of their income. Postmaterialist requirements, "Interfutures" calls it. . . .

[T]he western economy will have to continue to reckon with a low growth of at the most two to two-and-a-half percent. That has enormous consequences for the future of the welfare state.

In the first place, we have to choose for or against the concept of a society in which few people work and earn a lot of money, while many are excluded from working life.

I reject this model, because, in fact, it would mean legitimizing a terrible inequality. Socialism must choose for a society in which nobody who wants to work is deprived of the opportunity to do so. That means that jobs have to be created in the services sector, in the non-market sector, and there has to be a large scale redistribution of the available work among more people. The consequences of this are a reduction in the income of those employed and a greater emphasis on the total income and purchasing power of the social unit.

There are still more consequences. In a period in which capitalism has lost its driving force of uninhibited expansion, it is more crucial than ever for the safeguarding of employment not to be left to the market mechanism. If the economic process is not ordered and controlled, we have the prospect of mass unemployment.



*Peter G. Peterson  
of Lehman  
Brothers Kuhn  
Loeb.*

## **Brandt's World Bank Commission**

The Independent Commission on International Development Issues, generally known as the Brandt Commission, was established in the autumn of 1977 by World Bank President Robert S. McNamara, following the collapse of the negotiations in Paris between two dozen industrialized and underdeveloped nations on "North-South" economic cooperation.

In February 1980, the Brandt Commission released its first report, titled "North-South: A Program for Survival." Its principal recommendations:

- National sovereignty over economic and energy policy should be subordinated to global institutions;
- "Appropriate technologies" should be the focus of Third World development strategy, e.g., primitive agricultural equipment and cottage industries;
- "Renewable" energy sources should be emphasized, and nuclear energy de-emphasized, but non-OPEC oil as well as mineral resources should be

One of the factors responsible [is] the inevitable march of scientific progress. . . .

When it was realized in the course of the sixties that a deliberate policy was needed to protect the environment, the World Environmental Conference in Stockholm, in 1970, convened by the United Nations, led to some standardization of the requirements to be set for industry and transport to combat environmental pollution. It has been a blessing in numerous respects. I think it is high time that, at the U.N.'s initiative, and with the International Labor Organization as the implementary body, a number of common standards and measures be agreed upon as to the way in which new and existing technologies should be applied, and at what pace. We need to gain control of these technologies before they get the upper hand and lead us into a new slavery.

extracted in the Third World;

- The World Bank/International Monetary Fund should be expanded through creation of a World Development Fund and promotion of the IMF's Special Drawing Rights as an international payments and reserve medium.

Members of the Commission, chaired by West German Social Democratic Party chief Willy Brandt, include: Dragoslav Avramovic of Yugoslavia, former senior World Bank official and Unctad official; Eduardo Frei Montalva, former president of Chile and Christian Democratic supporter of the current Pinochet regime; Edward Heath, British Conservative leader and former prime minister; Amir Jamal, prominent Tanzanian politician; Joe Morris of Canada, former chairman of the International Labor Organization; Olof Palme, former Social Democratic prime minister of Sweden; Peter G. Peterson, chairman of the board of Lehman Brothers, Kuhn Loeb, and former U.S. Commerce Secretary; Layachi Yaker, Algerian ambassador to the U.S.S.R.; Katharine Graham, publisher of *Newsweek* and the *Washington Post*; Shridath Ramphal, a Guyanese associate of Henry Kissinger; and Jan P. Pronk, a Dutch Social Democrat associated with the Club of Rome.

While Brandt and other social-democratic members of the commission have focused on calls for population control and an end to "cultural imperialism," i.e., transfer of advanced technology, Edward Heath and Peter Peterson have emphasized the necessity for the World Bank and related institutions to control petrodollar flows and thus international credit flows.

## Palme on protecting nature



*The following is an excerpt of the speech given by Olof Palme at the conference of the Socialist International held in Washington, D.C. Dec. 6, 1980. Since 1969, Palme has been the chairman of the Swedish Social Democratic Party. He was premier of Sweden from 1969 to 1976. Emphasis is in the original.*

Planning includes *controlling technological development*. Technological progress changes the structure of the economy and the conditions of working life. We must control technological development and focus it on the safeguarding and improvement of the living environment and popular health. Accordingly the evaluation, steering and encouragement of technological progress has become a public task of increasing importance.

We must aim at a *responsible management of raw materials and energy*. Continued economic growth implies severe strains on raw materials. Through long-term planning, we must prevent the exhaustion of these assets. As for energy, planning concerns not only how energy is to be produced but, just as much, our use of energy. Saving and economizing is a prerequisite. . . .

To be able to guarantee everybody a *good external environment*, we must formulate nationwide environmental policy objectives and acquire the means of achieving these objectives. Otherwise we cannot protect nature, preserve our land and water resources, fight pollution and contamination.

## Winpisinger: 'The way to progress is to self-destruct'



*Taken from a speech to the Second International conference by William W. Winpisinger, international president, International Association of Machinists (IAM), and member, Executive Council, AFL-CIO:*

We congratulate Brother Harrington, the Democratic Socialist Institute and the German-Marshall Fund for sponsoring this historic conference.

Let America take note: We're out of the closet and in

lame-duck proceedings and waddle over here to join us in this, the new politics of enlightenment and hope.

But, as someone suggested, Congress is playing a role not unlike that of eunuchs in a harem: its members are extremely observant, they see many things others do not see, and it is not their fault if they do not quite grasp the essence of what is really going on.

And we note, too, the glaring absence of so many officials, from other great American trade unions, whose members surely are our kindred spirits in this quest for economic and social justice. . . .

But at this point, we can only advise our missing friends to either lead or follow, but get the hell out of the way, because the times do not permit, nor do our members have the patience, to wait on the niceties of behind-the-scenes power arrangements in a declining political economy.

The wolf of corporate hegemony is beating at the door!

And that's the grim reality we must face, as we open the door onto the 1980s.

We must start where we are at, and lead beyond.

The American trade-union movement and its left-of-center allies must fuse democratic values and a socialist vision of society into a viable economic and political movement, that will defang the snarling corporate wolf and humanize his marketplace jungle.

Using the radical's language to achieve conservative goals will no longer suffice. It never worked anyhow.

Liberal reforms and social and economic programs have provided semblances of solutions to age-old problems, but they are incessantly compromised and starved of public funding to the point of unworkability. Meantime, the fundamental structural causes, which created the problems in the first place, have not been altered in the public interest—in the common interest of the people, if you please.

Those fundamental structures have been radically changed, all right—but by the forces of the private few at the expense of the public many.

The corporate animus has become the corporate state.

And as this government changes guard next month, we are left with the naked truth: we will be living with a government literally bid for and bought on the corporate exchange.

It is a government founded on the will of a distinct minority—only 26 percent of the electorate put the Reagan administration in business.

It is an electoral system that has excluded the real majority in this country.

Ben Wattenberg, wherever you are—the real majority in this country is not comprised of that 45 percent of *eligible* voters who went to the polls and pulled the lever for either Carter or Reagan.

The real majority in this country is that 55 percent who either didn't vote or voted for a presidential candidate other than those provided by the two major parties.

And it is *this* real majority that can constitute the swing bloc as we forge a democratic socialist movement across the country in the coming decade.

All we have to do is talk to them, give them an alternative program with hope, rather than the oral nugacity of the politics of sameness.

The quickest way to progress often is to self-destruct. Unfortunate. Sad. But true.

And this is the path we're on in this country.

So when more of the same flops once again; when supply-side economics fails to trickle down and put Americans back to work; when monetary maniacs over at the Federal Reserve Board fail to curb inflation; when the deregulators have dismantled the federal government and producers control the prices of everything produced; when our interventionist foreign policy, backed up by war capitalism, fails to produce either peace or prosperity or provide for the national security; when the pyramids of income and wealth have been leveled by the holy trinity of free enterprise. . . .

Then America will recognize its cruel irony: The quickest way to progress is to self-destruct; then we can start building our policy of economic and social justice.

For we are talking about the end of the deindustrialization of America.

And as it happens—when it happens—we must have our democratic socialist programs developed and ready to shove into place—like modular units in a computerized control room.

Now we are talking about beginning our economic reconstruction.

Not reindustrialization but reconstruction. Everybody is talking about reindustrialization. That's what supply-side economics is all about. That's what the monetarists are all about. That's what the AFL-CIO's industrial revitalization program is all about.

That's what the corporate state is all about. . . .

We don't need corporate America's brand of reindustrialization.

We need democratic economic reconstruction.

Economic reconstruction means a restructuring of the way decisions are made about investment, technology and what is going to be produced and with what priority.

Economic reconstruction means taking control and ownership of our basic natural resources out of the hands of private monopolists and putting it under the direction of the public interest. The poorest child in the South Bronx has more right to a return on investment in the oil shales of Western public lands than does Exxon, Gulf or Mobil.

Economic reconstruction means integrated economic planning to replace the absurdities of the market place

and the excesses of private, profit-motivated behavior.

Economic reconstruction means working toward the goals of full employment, progressive distribution of wealth and income, the guaranteed right to trade unions to grow and prosper, and an end to the madness of the arms race.

Economic reconstruction means that this nation begin importing the economic checks and balances of Eurosocialism, and stop exporting our jobs, our livelihoods, and corporate free enterprise.

After all, European democratic socialists look at us over here and wonder why we provide the bad example that tugs at their own standards of economic and social justice.

They aren't looking for the Americanization of Europe.

Meantime, we will not run in place.

We will take first things first, and see if our economic reconstruction program and *all* its components, will be accepted by the Democratic Party.

For that party is at a crossroads, Either it is going to return to its natural constituency and champion the causes of economic reconstruction, along with those individual rights and civil liberties we all hold dear, or it is going to continue to attempt to co-opt the Republican Party's conservatism.

If it does the former, and we'll try to help it do so, we probably can walk with it a mile or two more.

If it continues as it has for the past several years, however, then we better prepare to go the Canadian route.

That's democratic socialism with a trade-union core constituency—Eurosocialism on the North American continent.

It may be a contradiction in current trends of history, but it is not a contradiction on the long road to peace and prosperity.

Thank you.

## Benn on radicalization and 'the Warsaw experience'



*Taken from comments by British Labour Party spokesman Anthony Wedgwood Benn at a Second International conference workshop titled "Why No Mass Movement in the United States?":*

If you think you don't need a mass socialist movement in the United States, let me

make one thing clear, we need it. You have here an elected president of a Western power who will dictate International Monetary Fund policy and tell the European Community how much taxes have to be raised, how much they can spend; he will have the multinationals tell our industry what to do; he will push the cruise missiles and dictate foreign and defense policy. . . . We are the silent constituency of Reagan. But we are going to reverse the old saying, "No taxation without representation," into "No annihilation without representation." Ex-imperial Britain is now accepting the status of a colony. . . . If the Labour Party appears a bit to you like a "liberation" party, well, we are!

I can't help stressing how ripe conditions are right now to build a mass movement. If now is not the time, then it will never be. If you can't mobilize an opposition to Reagan, then you are not the kind of people you are. . . .

Let me begin by telling you something about the Labour Party. The British Labour Party read into its defeat a victory of the right and our own failure. . . . What Thatcher did is radicalize the Labour Party, the mainstream of the party; the party has gone back to its roots, radicalized by its struggle, and Reagan will radicalize the Democratic Party. You have a good antiwar-movement history; Europe looked up to you then. . . .

Socialism in Great Britain goes back over many centuries. In fact, we will celebrate next year the six hundredth anniversary of the Peasants' Revolt in 1381 [following the Black Death]. We are building for a big event, and just in time for the next election. The roots go back to the socialist Levellers and Diggers in 1649, Tom Paine, the Chartists, Robert Owen, the Webbs, Bernard Shaw. . . . We have to understand our history. Capitalism is much younger, and has proved to be an unsuccessful experiment. We root our tradition on the human brotherhood which has given birth to *solidarity*. Solidarity is part of the American heritage . . . Eugene Debs, Norman Thomas, the Wobblies [applause]. . . .

You should learn from the Warsaw experience. Poland shows that it can be done. Who would have thought a year ago that trade unionists would engage in a struggle to change the bureaucratic structure? Now, in El Salvador we have an opening.

The agenda for building an American mass movement involves uniting in defense against attacks by the right; support for public services; support for women, blacks, trade unions, and others; safeguard workplaces; openly advocate socialism—if black is beautiful, socialism is beautiful! Have dialogue without sectarianism; I want a mosaic and not a monolith of socialism. Let's rehabilitate Trotsky as the first Soviet dissident! We must clarify for people what they are fighting for—we want a consensus where all accept democratic socialism. Permeate the different way.



## The Labour Party: a top-down operation

The history of the British Labour Party shows very clearly that the current radicalization of the party under the monetarist Tory administration of Margaret Thatcher is not a localized sociological response to the rapid economic collapse of the country which that government has been so fiercely administering. Labour Party National Executive Committee leader Anthony Wedgwood Benn spoke truthfully enough at the Eurosocialist conference when he traced the ideological roots of his movement to the Dark Ages period of European history.

Like its predecessor parties, such as the English Whigs, the Labour Party was created to function as the left-wing side of a classical left-right political organization of Britain. What both the left and the right—in present day Britain, Labour and the Tories—have always shared is an ideological conviction that an American-style capitalist economy based on continuously applied technological development must be avoided at all costs.

In the resulting periods of economic depression, the Labour Party, like its predecessors, becomes the vehicle for channeling the rising discontent of the population into a managed, self-defeating radicalization devoid of constructive economic program. This is exactly what is happening in Britain today under the staggeringly rapid collapse of industry and employment the Thatcher government is generating through its implementation of Friedmanite monetarism.

Consequently, in last fall's Labour Party congress, the left-wing extremists under Tony Benn were allowed to consolidate their hold over the party, dictating also its overall policy platform. This situation was further consolidated with last month's election to party chief of left-winger Michael Foot. It should surprise no one, however, that left-wing radical Foot is a nobleman and the brother of the famous Lord Caradon who runs British Middle East policy; the Labour/Tory or common people/aristocracy parties relationship, is orchestrated from above.



*Labour founders Sidney and Beatrice Webb.*

The economic policy platform adopted at the Labour conference demonstrated this again. With the emphasis on full employment and workers' control of production, the platform called for the expansion of the service sector—not industry—as the vehicle for employment increases, and a “small is beautiful” alternative to dirigist economic development.

When required, the Labour Party has been the seedling ground for spinoff “right-wing” radicalism. Exemplary of this is the famous case of the World War II British fascist party leader, the aristocrat Oswald Mosley.

As documented by his biographer Robert Skidelsky, for Mosley “socialism was the modern expression of the feudal idea of community,” a view he maintained when he changed his party tag from Labour Party socialist to nationalist in founding the British Union of Fascists in the 1930s.

Members of the Heritage Foundation, closely tied to the present Tory government, have noted recently that it is on the issue of local-control economics that the left and right can converge. It is certainly true that Tony Benn, the Labour left radical, put forward the same local-control idea as well as the return to the feudalist period of fourteenth-century England as the essence of his view of socialism. Benn would have no fundamental quarrel with Mosley.

Mosley began his career in the Labour Party under the tutelage of the Fabian Society and the allied London School of Economics. He was one of the original members of the Coefficients dining/discussion club created by Fabians Beatrice and Sidney Webb. His economics were fed by the liberal Maynard Keynes, whom he studied under the tutelage of his Labour sponsors. When it became appropriate to launch a British fascist movement, Mosley did so with the blessing of the King and the continued support of the Fabians, his London School of Economics friends, and others.



**“The environmentalist-terrorist groups are merely infantry divisions deployed by some of the most powerful political forces in the United States.”**

—Robert Greenberg  
Editor, Investigative Leads

Over the last decade, the United States and other industrialized countries have been under all-out attack by the forces of the so-called environmentalist movement. Radicalized youth, “social-activist” lawyers of the Ralph Nader variety, and “expert studies” have all been combined to convince many that growth and prosperity are things of the past.

Now, *Executive Intelligence Review* is making available a comprehensive study on the environmentalist movement, showing how the movement is controlled from top to bottom by some of the most prestigious power centers in the United States: New York-based foundations and law firms, and federal agencies, under the umbrella of the Council on Foreign Relations.

## Who Controls Environmentalism?

A special report prepared by *Investigative Leads*, a research arm of *Executive Intelligence Review*.

Available December 1, 1980. **\$50.**

For ongoing domestic and international intelligence, subscribe to the 64-page weekly journal, the *EIR*. For ongoing intelligence on the environmentalist movement, subscribe to *EIR*'s bi-weekly newsletter, *Investigative Leads*.

You can't make decisions if you don't have intelligence.

**EIR**  
Executive Intelligence Review

- Enclosed  \$50 *Who Controls Environmentalism*. Bill me   
 Enclosed  \$65 3 month introductory *EIR* subscription. Bill me   
 Enclosed  \$99 3 month *EIR* subscription, plus *Environmentalism*. Bill me   
 Enclosed  \$396 Full-year *EIR* subscription, plus free copy *Environmentalism*. Bill me   
 Enclosed  \$50 Full-year subscription, *Investigative Leads*. Bill me

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Title \_\_\_\_\_ Company/Org. \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone (\_\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_  
area code

Charge my subscription to:  Visa  Mastercharge  
 Card No. \_\_\_\_\_ Interbank# \_\_\_\_\_ Expiration Date \_\_\_\_\_

Make checks payable to: **Executive Intelligence Review**, Dept. M, 304 W. 58th Street, 5th  
 Flr. New York, New York 10019