



# the yankee radical

(617) 354-5078

March-April, 2013

## Democratic Socialists of America Forum:

# Generation Debt: Students and Communities Push Back

By Charles Brackett

**WHEN:** Thursday, March 28,  
3:30 PM—5:30 PM

**WHERE:** UMass Boston  
Campus Ctr., Rm. 3546,  
100 Morrissey Blvd., Boston  
**T STOP:** Red Line,  
UMass-JFK Stop

A recent study by the New York Federal Reserve found that total student debt has reached a staggering \$996 billion, and that nearly 20 percent of debt holders are unable to repay their loans—loans that have often been forced on them by corporatized universities and global financial institutions. Too often student debt is seen only as an individual problem, not a social one. But the amount of publically held debt, and the fact student loans are an absolute necessity for most young people to achieve any level of higher education, show that this is a social phenomenon as well.

In response, state and financial institutions have begun to address the issue. These institutions are limited, however, by the power of neoliberal ideology and Big Finance: courses on “financial management” and various “forgiveness” programs that maintain the illusion that debt is only a personal problem and not a social ill brought on by the excesses of capitalism.

Socialists see the problem differently: that the current explosion of student debt arises from the power of Big Finance and the transformation in recent decades of the university from a place of education to a corporate profit center. We believe education is a right that should be guaranteed by government and society. Around the world, social democratic societies recognize that right and subsidize education for their citizens to maintain universal access to universities, colleges, and technical schools.

Students and their allies are beginning to fight back. In Quebec last year, hundreds of thousands rose up in the “Maple Leaf Spring” to resist “reforms” designed to make education more expensive and universities function more like corporations.

Mobilization begins with education. On Thursday, March 28 Boston DSA along with the UMass Boston Economics Department will convene a panel discussion featuring **Jackie Sewell**, National Youth Organizer of Young Democratic Socialists, **Mike Konzal** of the Roosevelt Institute, and **Sara Bernardo** of the UMass Boston McCormack School of Public and Global Policy. There will be refreshments and plenty of time for Q & A. Join us!

*Charles Brackett is the newly elected Chair of Boston DSA*

---

## April DSA Meetings: Democratic Socialism and the Global Labor Movement

**WHEN:** April 4, 7:00 PM April 11, 8:00 PM (Board Meeting 7:00 PM)

**WHERE:** Encuentro 5, 9B Hamilton Place, Ste. 2A, Boston **T STOP:** Park Street

We are sponsoring a couple of informal get-togethers in early April open to all but geared especially to new or non-members.

On April 4 some of our local leadership will kick off a round table discussion with brief remarks on democratic socialist theory, history and political relevance today. How do DSA politics relate to the Occupiers and other social movements of recent years? Or labor unions? Or elections? What is this “democratic socialism” anyway? We don’t always

agree on every issue among ourselves, don’t pretend to any specialized expertise, and don’t believe we have all the answers—but then we haven’t yet heard from you!

Then on April 11 George Martens will speak on the international trade union movement, where before his recent retirement he spent more than three decades. George has worked in Africa for the AFL-CIO’s African American Labor Center, then later in Belgium as head of

the Department of Trade Union and Human Rights at the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. He celebrated his return to the US by joining DSA. (Before this 8:00 PM meeting the Exec Board will meet at 7:00 PM.).

Snacks will be served at both meetings, and we’ll also have brief updates on our work with Budget for All and the Campaign for Our Communities.

## SHORT TAKES

### Mass Alliance Notes

- Mass Alliance has endorsed **Rep. Linda Dorcena Forry** for State Senate in the special election in the First Essex district (South Boston, Dorchester, Mattapan). She supports progressive taxation and the CFOC revenue bill, locally owned small business, increasing and indexing the minimum wage, replacing toxic chemicals with safer substitutes, and increased funding for public higher education. The important election is the April 30 Democratic primary; the final is May 28: [www.LindaDorcenaForry.com](http://www.LindaDorcenaForry.com), 617-766-6149. Another Alliance backed candidate, Everett Alderman **Mike Mangan**, a 20-year member of Boston Carmen's Union #589, was defeated in the March 5 Democratic primary for State Rep.
- This year's **Progressive Legislators Breakfast** features Barney Frank and takes place Wednesday, April 10, 8:30 A.M. at Holland & Knight, 10 St. James Ave., Boston (Arlington T stop): 617-722-4320.
- **Grassroots Campaign Training** is an intensive two-day workshop to introduce future campaign leaders to the theory and practice behind successful campaigns: May 4 & 5, 9:00 A.M.-5:30 P.M., SEIU 1199, 150 Mt. Vernon St., Boston. Details: [Georgia@MassAlliance.org](mailto:Georgia@MassAlliance.org); 617-722-4320.

### Budgets, Taxes & War

Boston DSA's main focus this winter has

been in support of two coalitions we're members of—**Budget for All** ([www.Budget4Allmass.org](http://www.Budget4Allmass.org)) and the **Campaign for Our Communities** ([www.OurCommunities.Org](http://www.OurCommunities.Org)).

Through rallies, visibilities, letters to the editor and visits to elected officeholders, Budget for All has been getting the word out about the alternative federal budget proposed by the Congressional Progressive Caucus. On April 15, B4A is co-sponsoring the Boston part of the Stockholm-organized Global Day of Action Against Military Spending, which fits in nicely with the CPC's proposed Pentagon cuts. For details visit the Peace Action website at [www.masspeaceaction.org](http://www.masspeaceaction.org), or call Cole at 617-354-2169.

The CFOC coalition is mobilizing for a bill at the State House to fund essential public services through progressive taxation. Although House Speaker DeLeo has expressed skepticism at the tax proposals of both Governor Patrick and CFOC, many legislators are said to be still on the fence. Consult the CFOC website for more information, then call your Rep and Senator at the State House to express your views (617-722-2000). Forgot who they are? Visit [www.wheredoivote.org](http://www.wheredoivote.org), fill in your address and find out.

### Stan Sultan

Boston DSA Treasurer Stan Sultan died at his Roslindale home on February 4 after a long illness. He was a founding member of DSA, as well as our main predecessor group, the Democratic Socialist Organizing

Committee. Raised in Brooklyn, Stan first encountered radical politics at Cornell University in the late 1940s as a recruit to American Youth for Democracy through the Henry Wallace Presidential campaign. AYD was essentially the youth wing of the Communist Party, and as Stan would tell it 60 years later, he soon found himself caught up in an internal faction fight over the 1948 Stalinist coup in Czechoslovakia. Stan's position—against—was eventually supported by a minority of one: himself. After being invited to leave by AYD leadership, he eventually found his way to DSOC in the early 1970s, while participating in numerous movements for civil rights (he was a longtime NAACP member), unions, and other just causes.

A gregarious and unmistakable presence at DSA gatherings, some of us got in the habit of Saluting The Sultan upon his entrance, which usually involved bowing deeply, muttering darkly. Stan was happy to play along, accepting Tribute as his due. But it turns out many of us were unaware of some of his real achievements—several books of fiction and literary criticism, including a highly regarded work on James Joyce's *Ulysses*.

Our condolences go out to wife Betty and family. A memorial service is scheduled for April 4, 4:30-6:00 PM at Dana Commons—Clark University, where Stan taught English since 1959.

—Mike Pattberg

# Ed Markey for Senate

The Boston chapter of Democratic Socialists of America endorses Rep. Ed Markey for U.S. Senate. He is contesting Rep. Stephen Lynch in the April 30 Democratic primary election to succeed John Kerry; the general election is June 25.

Although their records overlap on many issues, and each has sometimes taken positions different from DSA, we believe Markey is the clear progressive choice, especially on foreign policy, abortion choice and the environment. He is a member of the Congressional Progressive Caucus and in 2011 voted for its Budget for All amendment; last year he supported the Budget for All nonbinding question which passed in 91 Massachusetts cities and

towns. In the 1980s he was a Congressional leader of the Nuclear Freeze movement, and he remains an important voice on nuclear disarmament, as well as tax giveaways to Big Oil and climate change. It's not surprising he is endorsed by Peace Action, MoveOn.org, NARAL and the League of Conservation Voters.

Markey is a good candidate, not a great one. Lynch has rightly criticized him on his vote for NAFTA and similar trade deals, even if Lynch has supported some of them himself. While he has a labor voting record in the mid-90% range, unions representing telephone workers—IBEW and CWA—haven't always felt

Markey was on their side in conflicts with Verizon and de-regulation. And on a democratic resolution of the Israel-Palestine conflict or heading off a new war with Iran he often sides with AIPAC and the neo-conservatives—but then so do most Democrats and almost all Republicans.

Life is full of imperfect choices, but this one is clear enough. The Markey campaign can be reached at 617-286-4147, [www.edmarkey.com](http://www.edmarkey.com). See you on the campaign trail!

*Paid for by Boston DSA; not authorized by any candidate or candidate's committee.*



# Let's Support Public Higher Education!

By Gillian Mason

On Tuesday, March 5th, over 600 public college and university students, faculty, staff, and allies flooded the State House for a student-led day of advocacy to call for robust funding for public higher education in Massachusetts.

The group made three demands of legislators:

- Support Governor Patrick's budget plan, which includes much-needed money earmarked for public colleges and universities, as well as a significant increase to the MASSGrant program, which provides need-based aid to

students at both public and private colleges.

- Fund the collective bargaining agreements already in place for workers in the public higher education system, which would mean adding \$70 million to the Governor's proposal.
- Continue to make public higher education a long-term priority for Massachusetts!

The Public Higher Education Network of Massachusetts (PHENOM) is collaborating with the student-organizers of Tuesday's event to keep this fight alive until the budget

vote this summer. Over the coming months, we will be hosting public forums and call-in days across the state. If you would like to get involved in the campaign to support the schools that educate the working class of Massachusetts, visit the PHENOM website ([www.phenomonline.org](http://www.phenomonline.org)) and click on "Support Us" to sign up for email alerts, or contact organizing director Alex Kulenovic ([alex.kulenovic@gmail.com](mailto:alex.kulenovic@gmail.com)).

*Gillian Mason is on the Executive Board of PHENOM and an organizer with Massachusetts Jobs with Justice.*

# Organizing Against Climate Change



By Sophie Robinson

Climate change is the biggest threat to civilization that humans have ever faced. In the next 20 years alone, about 100 million people will die from the burning and green house gas effects of fossil fuels, according to a recent report commissioned by the governments of 20 developing countries. By the end of the century, if we continue "business as usual," we will heat the earth between 4-6 degrees Celsius, and on the low end of that prediction, at 4 degrees, there is "no guarantee of adaptation," says the World Bank. In order for our kids and their kids to have a habitable planet, we need to act. And fast.

Local group 350MA is doing just that: mobilizing social action in Massachusetts to stop the burning of fossil fuels. 350MA has bi-weekly meetings in Harvard Square (and soon in Jamaica Plain) during which members break out into working groups to discuss and act on

what they see as their campaign goals. Current working groups include Tar Sands, No Gas Mass (natural gas/fracking), Community Divestment, Solutions, and Political Accountability.

The group kicked off in June of 2012 and is growing so fast that meetings now rarely have fewer than 70 people. 350MA is staffed by the Better Futures Project, which partners with 350.org to borrow the name 350MA, but the group is not lead by 350.org. Instead, we rely on the participation of volunteers to help move America and the world to a more sustainable future. Check out our website at [350ma.org](http://350ma.org) for upcoming events and meetings. To get more information or to sign up, email Sophie at [sophie@350ma.org](mailto:sophie@350ma.org).

*Sophie Robinson is Operations Coordinator for the Better Futures Project.*

## Write Us:



P.O. Box 51356  
Boston, MA 02205

e-mail:

[yankeeradical@dsaboston.org](mailto:yankeeradical@dsaboston.org)

Web: <http://www.dsaboston.org>  
Editor: M. Pattberg



# The Transit Justice Movement in Boston

By Karen Narefsky

“Fix it, fund it, make it fair!” “Up with the riders; down with the cuts!” Boston’s streets have been ringing with these and similar cries over the last year as the depth of the city’s public transportation problems became apparent to the general public. Being \$160 million dollars in the hole just for FY13 operating costs, last year the MBTA increased fares by an average of 23 percent. The burden fell particularly hard on working-class riders, who experienced no corresponding increase in wages, and on seniors, many of whom were priced out of The Ride’s para-transit service. Though the transit justice movement has been building in Boston for years, 2012 saw increased consciousness and collaboration among its members.

This movement comprises many groups. The T Riders Union, based in Roxbury and Chelsea, organizes bus riders and last year convened a citywide coalition to protest the fare hikes. Massachusetts Senior Action Council calls attention to the burden faced by seniors when para-transit is not adequately funded. The Youth Affordabili(T) Coalition is fighting for a low-cost transit pass for young people. On March 2 these groups and others came together at a summit convened by On the Move: Greater Boston Transportation Justice Coalition.

As part of the summit, I helped lead a workshop about the impact that transit projects have on surrounding communities. Creating new and better transit can be a way to create jobs and improve quality of life, but it can also be a catalyst for gentrification, spurring rising rents and displacing local businesses and longtime residents. Both the Somerville Community Corporation (where I work) and the Greater Four Corners Action Coalition in Dorchester have worked to bring about the former outcome in developing transit corridors.

Our workshop was an opportunity for participants to discuss ways that Dorchester and Somerville have fought to make transit a community benefit, rather than an instrument of displacement. After years of struggle, GFCAC has gotten the MA Department of Transportation to create urban stations on a commuter rail line that previously bypassed working-class communities of color on its way to the suburbs. Residents who live near the stations have been given priority for construction jobs, and the coalition is working on a fare structure that will allow residents easy access to service.

In Somerville the question is no longer whether the Green Line will be built, but whether there will be massive displacement like what happened when the Red Line came to Davis Square in 1986. SCC is working to

prevent that displacement; in addition to building affordable housing along the corridor, it is working to increase access to jobs for Somerville residents, both on the construction of the line and in surrounding businesses. Community members have led design workshops for proposed stations as well as for housing developments nearby, implementing them into actual plans.

This year the movement is gearing up for another struggle, as the MBTA considers additional fare increases to cover this year’s deficit. Without a sustainable funding plan, the T will continue to shortchange the riders who depend on it most. In January, Governor Patrick put forth a proposal that would allocate increased income tax revenue to transportation. While there are some good elements to his plan, we must make sure that young, elderly, disabled, and working-class riders are not disproportionately burdened. The Public Transit Public Good campaign is asking people to call their legislators and ask them to support bills that would improve affordability and transparency in our system. Visit their website [publictransitpublicgood.org](http://publictransitpublicgood.org) for more information.

*DSA member Karen Narefsky is active with pro-public transit groups.*

## THANK YOU!

Thanks to those of you who so generously responded to our annual Boston DSA fundraising letter to help keep us going for another year. But perhaps some of the rest of you misplaced the letter, or have just forgotten? (Happens to us all the time). Just make out a check to Boston DSA and send to the address below.

\$25  \$50  \$100  \$250  \$500  \$1000  Other

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ St. \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Phone (h) \_\_\_\_\_ (w) \_\_\_\_\_

Email\* \_\_\_\_\_

Return to:

Democratic Socialists of America  
P. O. Box 51356  
Boston, MA 02205

<http://dsaboston.org>



Please let me know how I can be more active in DSA

*\*In this era of rising mailing costs, your email address will help us keep you informed of DSA events and actions, and other important news.*

# After the UN Vote: Support a Two State Solution

*Statement of the National Political Committee of Democratic Socialists of America*

*December 7, 2012*

Democratic Socialists of America endorses the decision of the United Nations to grant Palestine Non-Member Observer State status. We regard the U.N.'s recognition of a Palestinian state as a vital step forward towards a durable, just, comprehensive, negotiated two-state peace. We regret that Israel and the United States actively opposed the Palestinian application. As we stated in our 2009 Statement on the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict and Winning Peace with Justice in the Middle East:

Peace in the Middle East and justice for both the Palestinian and Israeli people can only be achieved through mutual recognition by each side of the right of each people to viable and secure states of their own, in which the rights of minorities are also guaranteed.

We strongly oppose retaliatory measures against the PLO or the Palestinian Authority (PA)—in particular, Congressional

efforts to cut funding—which could lead to the collapse of the PA and jeopardize the important progress it has made in recent years. We call on President Obama to swiftly adopt serious and vigorous efforts that promote Israeli-Palestinian peace.

DSA also condemns the recent Israeli military attacks on Gaza that led to disproportionate civilian deaths. These arose in response to Hamas's unjustifiable rocket attacks on Israeli civilians. Israel, however, is the hegemonic military and occupying power in the region; therefore, DSA believes Israel has the primary responsibility to create pre-conditions for peace—such as a unilateral withdrawal of illegal West Bank settlements and an end to the embargo of civilian goods entering Gaza. Israel should be willing to negotiate with representatives of the Palestinian people, while such representatives should promote the peace process by ending attacks on Israeli civilians.

At this crucial juncture, it is the obligation of the international community, including especially the United States of America, to make sure that the strategy of coexistence and moderation is rewarded, and that the Palestinian people are offered a horizon in which they are able to realize a viable, contiguous, independent state alongside Israel (including a Palestinian capital in East Jerusalem) not through guns and bombs, but via the tools of statecraft and diplomacy.

DSA will work, along with other pro-peace forces in the American Jewish, Palestinian, Arab, and broader progressive community to pressure the United States to adopt a balanced Middle East approach, including an end to military aid to Israel that is used for occupation purposes, and to support movements in Israel and Palestine that are committed to a two-state solution.

---

## 60 Years with the Third Camp Socialists

*By Dan Gallin*

*Part one of this memoir ran in the November YR. It was originally posted on the website of the UK Alliance for Workers' Liberty (www.workersliberty.org), and is reprinted here in much shortened form. The Workers Party—Independent Socialist League was an early political home for Mike Harrington and many other founding leaders of the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee (DSOC), a forerunner of DSA. Dan Gallin has been General Secretary of the International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant and Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers' Associations (IUF) from 1970 until 2007, and is currently Chair of the Global Labour Institute.*

### PART II

In 1960 my life had taken another turn. In 1956 I had been sent by the Sociology Department of the University of Geneva to participate in a conference of the European Productivity Agency in Rome, a technocratic exercise, boring in the extreme. There I met another bored and rebellious participant, Charles Levinson, then Assistant General Secretary of the International Metalworkers Federation (IMF). We remained friends, and in 1960 Levinson told me that Juul Poulsen, the general secretary of the food workers'

international, the IUF, was looking for an assistant.

I jumped at it. My job at the UN was well-paid and convenient, with plenty of free time for political work, but it was a dead-end. Meanwhile I had also decided that between the political and trade union wings of the labour movement, the last one was my preferred option. I had no interest in a political career and I saw the trade unions as the first and last line of resistance of the working class under attack, and that's where I

wanted to be. In fact, not long before Julie Jacobson had darkly accused me of syndicalist deviations, not without reason. So in August 1960 I started work in the secretariat of the IUF as chief cook and bottle washer.

All went well for a while. At that time the IUF, like most other International Trade Secretariats, was little more than a contact point of the leadership of the affiliated unions and its main function was organizing the

*(continued on page 6)*

(Gallin: continued from page 5)

exchange of information. Juul Poulsen, the general secretary, thought that an international trade union federation could do better than that. He was a solid social-democrat and, even though this was the heyday of social partnership in the industrialized capitalist world, he sensed that future trade union struggles would inevitably be international, and that therefore building the International had to be a priority. Such skills and experience I had acquired by this time proved useful. Through research and correspondence I started the expansion of the IUF into Asia and the Pacific, edited a monthly bulletin, etc.

In 1962 I was contacted by Dan Benedict, who had been appointed Assistant General Secretary of the IMF and moved to Geneva. Benedict had been a member of the Workers' Party, then of the ISL. In the IMF, his field of activity encompassed mainly Latin America and the Mediterranean Region. We soon became close friends and comrades.

The following year Benedict warned me that we had been infiltrated by the CIA in Latin America. What had happened was that in 1959 the IUF Managing Committee had accepted an offer by the AFL-CIO to provide an Inter-American regional representative free of charge, to help build IUF presence in Latin America. This regional representative, who took control of IUF Latin American activities in 1960, turned out to be Andrew McLellan, an operator without a serious trade union background who co-operated closely with American government agencies (the CIA and perhaps military intelligence) and used the IUF as a cover to build a network of agents, mostly in Central America, who were reporting to him, not to the IUF secretariat.

Poulsen and I did not immediately realize what was happening; we only noticed increasing difficulties in relations with the Inter-American Office. Its activities and priorities did not reflect IUF policies, queries and instructions from the general secretary were ignored, activities were initiated that made no trade union sense, etc. There were also Latin American reactions. The Mexican Sugar Workers' Union, our major Latin American affiliate, had stopped co-operating with the IUF. When Poulsen inquired what the problem was, the answer came: it's either that lot, or us, you can't have both.

The IUF was lucky, its two largest American affiliates were left-wing unions: the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen were headed by Pat Gorman, an old-time socialist who despised AFL-CIO

president George Meany and his policies; the United Packinghouse Workers' president was Ralph Helstein, a knowledgeable and tough radical trade unionist without a specific affiliation, mainly to be able to arbitrate between factions. Both unions had executive committees with strong radical representation, ranging from the Communist Party to the IWW. So at least we had the backing of our two largest US affiliates for what we had to do.

When Poulsen made a quick trip to Chicago to explain the situation to Gorman and Helstein and to ask for their advice, their reaction was immediate and unanimous: kill that operation! The next question we had to deal with was how to continue. We had to find a way to rebuild our activities in Latin America in a way that would guarantee that it could never again be hijacked by an outside operation. The solution to this problem was simple: give democracy a chance! Poulsen convened a regional conference in 1966 with a proposal: the IUF would create a Latin American region (no more "Inter-American" with North American domination, no more pro-consuls appointed from Washington or Geneva or anywhere else).

This regional organization became the model of all other regional organizations of the IUF. In Latin America it fought several labor opponents: the CIA and its trade union fronts, the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) and CPs, also the Catholic-funded CLAT/WCL. And of course the transnationals, and worse than anyone could have imagined, the military dictatorships in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Uruguay. The regional organization resisted, fought and ultimately prevailed in every one of these trials, because it was and remains rooted democratically in its affiliates, much deeper than the leadership level.

But of course the Empire would strike back. The drastic action the IUF had taken to terminate a program previously agreed with the AFL-CIO had stunned their International Department, headed at the time by Jay Lovestone and his main enforcer Irving Brown. How could something like this happen? (This was before the exposure of CIA operations in civil society organizations by *Ramparts* and the *NY Times* in 1966 and 1967). There had to be an enemy at work. Eventually they found my FBI file and then knew who it was.

The crunch came in 1967, at the IUF congress held in Dublin. Poulsen had reached retirement age and a successor had to be elected. I was at that point the natural

successor and was a candidate. But at the congress, Max Greenberg, president of the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union, speaking for the American unions and popping tranquillizer pills as he spoke, declared that I was unacceptable and if I was elected the American unions would disaffiliate.

Congress had a problem. After Greenberg's statement, a German and a Swiss candidate appeared, but Congress would not have them. The Scottish Bakers' Union advised me to fight; the Turkish Food Workers came to me and said: "Fear not, the Turks are with you." I took a gamble, and to the disappointment of my supporters, I agreed that the decision should be taken out of Congress and referred back to the Executive Committee.

Meanwhile, Pat Gorman had woken up to what was going on, so when the Executive Committee met in 1968 they had before them a lengthy telex stating that if I was not going to be elected, the Amalgamated would disaffiliate. The Europeans got the message and the Executive elected me as Acting General Secretary with only Greenberg dissenting.

The next IUF congress met in Zurich in 1970. At that point I was the only candidate for general secretary, but the candidate for president was Dan Conway, the president of the American Bakers' Union. Before the congress, Conway invited me for lunch in Geneva and said: "You will probably be elected general secretary and I might be elected president, we will have to work together. What have you got against the CIA?" I knew he had been organizer for his union in the Western States and I asked him: "When you get to a new town to organize a bakery, what is your first obstacle?" and he said: "The sheriff". I said: "Exactly. The CIA is the world sheriff." After that, we got along perfectly.

The 1970 IUF congress unanimously confirmed my election as general secretary and the election of Dan Conway as president, but the AFL-CIO International Department and its allies continued to make war on the IUF in Latin America.

I have not said much so far about the WFTU and the WCL, except to say that in Latin America the IUF had to fight on three fronts, of which these were two. There is not much to say. The WFTU regional organization, CPUTAL, with Cuba as its main affiliate, and its food workers' department functioned as an amplifier of

(continued on page 7)

(Gallin: continued from page 6)

international Stalinist policies but was totally incompetent as a trade union organization, not to be seen on the ground, much less in any conflict with a transnational company. They were never a serious competitor or even a potential ally, just a time-waster. Much the same can be said of the WCL and its regional organization CLAT, which had plenty of money from European Catholic institutions, but no members.

Another battle, not in the IUF this time, was looming in the 1970s. At the 1974 IMF Congress in Stockholm, Benedict was a candidate to succeed Ivar Norén as General Secretary. He was opposed by Herman Rebhan, an official of the United Automobile Workers (UAW) in Chicago, who had done a stint in the IMF as coordinator of world councils in the auto industry before returning to the US. Rebhan, like Benedict, had been a member of the ISL, but by that time had gone much further right than even Shachtman, becoming a co-opted member of the Lovestone/Brown team. I very publicly took Benedict's side.

Rebhan had the active support of President Meany and Jay Lovestone, who organized a campaign without precedent in the international trade union movement, combining threats, blandishments and flattery to get him elected. The fight between Benedict and Rebhan was a fight between two ex-ISLers: a socialist who was acting on the principles of what the ISL had always stood for, and a cynical renegade. The sense of the Rebhan campaign was to line up the IMF in the US Cold War camp, but mostly and principally to prevent Benedict becoming general secretary and moving the IMF towards a radical agenda, perhaps in alliance with the IUF. In the event, Rebhan was not able to do his worst: the IMF remained basically honest through organizational inertia. What he was able to do was to create a culture of political conformism which continued after his retirement. Neutralizing the IMF as a progressive force was no mean achievement. Benedict was unable to function under the Rebhan regime and in 1977 left the IMF to join the Canadian UAW education department.

Charles Levinson, my other ally, became general secretary of the International Chemical Workers (ICF) in 1964, fought memorable and pioneering battles with transnationals, and wrote several books about international trade unionism. One of his historical merits was to help destroy the International Federation of Petroleum and

Chemical Workers (IFPCW). Unlike nearly all other ITs which had a social-democratic identity and a history going back to the 19th century—some of which had been infiltrated by the CIA—the IFPCW was a total creation of the CIA from its inception. Founded in 1954, it established its headquarters in Denver, with the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers' Union (OCAW) of the AFL-CIO. Its first president (O.A. Knight) and its general secretary (Lloyd A. Haskins) were OCAW officials.

Any trade union activity it was able to develop until its demise in 1975 was incidental to its true mission: to line up oil workers' unions, mainly in the Middle East and in Latin America, with the US bloc in the Cold War. The disclosures in 1967 about the covert CIA funding of civil society organizations blew the IFPCW's cover: several of the CIA conduits appeared in the IFPCW's public audit records and it became clear that the organization was entirely dependent on these subsidies for its existence.

However, in July 1974 Ernest Lee had replaced Lovestone as director of the International Department and the AFL-CIO on its own initiative stopped supporting the IFPCW. The same month the OCAW, under a new leadership, disaffiliated and ceased funding the IFPCW, which shortly dissolved.

Meanwhile in 1980 the IUF had become involved in one of its major battles, getting Coca-Cola to use its enormous influence to stop its Guatemalan franchise from assassinating labor organizers and to recognize the union. No one believed we could do it, but we did. By 1984, the plant had a new owner, a new contract and union recognition. This story has been told elsewhere (see GLI website: [www.global-labour.org](http://www.global-labour.org)) and need not be told again here. Suffice it to say that beyond and aside from the ideological and political battles internal to the international trade union movement, the IUF was of course principally focused on building an effective fighting machine to take on even the biggest transnational corporations. The two-stage campaign against Coca-Cola in 1980 and 1982 proved that we had in fact reached that point.

There was, however, one more defining political battle which started in the 1970s, this time in Europe. The obvious issue was European separatism, but the fundamental one was no different from what we had to deal with in Latin America: the independence and the integrity of the trade union movement. The creation of the European

Economic Community (the Common Market) in 1957 led to the establishment of committees of trade unions from the six EEC member States, also in the IUF. Thus, the European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC) was created in 1973.

The ETUC defined itself from the outset as independent of any international trade union organization. It included all European affiliates of the ICFTU and of the WCL. It was not, however, to be independent of the EU: on the contrary, rather than being a trade union lobby in the EU, it quickly became an EU lobby in the labour movement, with 70 percent of its budget coming from EU subsidies.

Since the CIA operation in the 1960s, the IUF had not faced such a fundamental threat. Fortunately not all European affiliates subscribed to this new wisdom of EU-funded trade unionism. What followed was a seven-year IUF civil war in Europe, with shifting line-ups. Because this was largely bureaucratic infighting, we were able to keep it at the margins. It came eventually to an end by a change in the leadership of the German union. That was pretty much the end of the story in Europe, although traces of European separatism linger on: the organization changed its name once again and continues to work in a bureaucratic style, heavily influenced by a "social partnership" ideology that the IUF does not share. However, these are now irrelevancies. That story is over.

My final years in the IUF were dominated by the need to deal with the fall-out from the collapse of the Soviet empire, for which we were theoretically well prepared, but practically not at all. That is another story.

So what about Third Camp Socialism?

I do not know whether, had I not joined the ISL, absorbed its political culture and understood its insights and its specific brand of socialism, I would have been able to contribute to the international labour movement in the way I did for over fifty years. What I do know is that I was able to do this thanks to comrades like Hal and Ann Draper, Julius and Phyllis Jacobson, others like Max Shachtman, Al Glotzer, Herman Benson, Gordon Haskell, Ernest Rice McKinney, Saul Mendelson, Debbie Meier, Don Chenoweth, Sam Bottone, and yet others I hardly knew, like Joe Friedman (Carter), Paul Bernick, Jack Rader, Carl Shier, or knew only through their writings, like Lewis Coser, Ernest Erber, Stanley Plastrik, Irving Howe, B.J. Widick—and many others.

(continued on page 8)

*the yankee radical*

Democratic Socialists of America  
P. O. Box 51356  
Boston, MA 02205

Presorted  
First Class  
U.S. Postage  
P A I D  
Boston, MA  
Permit No. 1141

### INSIDE

<i>Student Debt Forum</i>	<i>p. 1</i>
<i>April DSA Meetings</i>	<i>p. 1</i>
<i>Short Takes</i>	<i>p. 2</i>
<i>Ed Markey</i>	<i>p. 2</i>
<i>Public Higher Education</i>	<i>p. 3</i>
<i>Climate Change</i>	<i>p. 3</i>
<i>Transit Justice</i>	<i>p. 4</i>
<i>Israel-Palestine Resolution</i>	<i>p. 5</i>
<i>Sixty Years with the Third Camp</i>	<i>p. 6</i>

(Gallin: continued from page 7)

To all of them, I owe many hours of conversations, correspondence and reading. What I learned was that the “Third Camp” was really another name for the world’s working class in the broadest sense of the term, including the informal workers, mostly women, the landless peasants of the “Third World,” itself another outmoded term since the two other worlds have gone the way of the two other camps. In contemporary terms, what was our “Third Camp” is now the 99 percent of the Occupy movement.

As I see it, the core of the 99 percent is the organized working class, and our duty, overriding all other considerations, has to be to defend the integrity and the independence of the trade union movement or, more generally, the labour movement, against all threats, from anywhere, regardless of their many guises. At any rate, that’s what I

thought it meant to be an independent socialist in the labour movement in the last half century. Or, the way Marx put it in his time: “The emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves ...”

The ISL’s brand of socialism also provided me with a very useful theoretical framework to help me understand my hatred of Stalinism and, for that matter, of any brand of authoritarianism, including those which were not actual criminal conspiracies like Stalin’s operation. The ISL was not blind to the dangers of the various brands of Third World authoritarianism, and none of us ever went on those ridiculous quests for a promised land which would proclaim any tin-pot dictator with a radical discourse as the latest shining beacon of socialism.

Nor was the ISL blind to the bureaucratic and authoritarian traditions in social-

democracy which, combined with opportunism, cowardice and obtuse stupidity—never to be underestimated—would inflict enormous damage on the labour movement, leading to its worst historical defeats. Even at the best of times, those traditions would cultivate conformity and passivity, wear down the activists, and lead the movement into blind alleys. The ISL taught me, and others, to resist all this.

Finally, the ISL taught me to take the long view. It never proclaimed a terminal crisis of capitalism, nor declared a revolutionary situation every five or ten years. Most of us knew we were in for the long haul, and that we would not live to see our long-term goals. All we can ever do is the best we can, where we are, while we are there.