

I agreed to come here because I think that the topic of this conference (and there have been other conferences on this topic; one in New York, and one in Washington, D.C.) is a great area which has been neglected--and an area of very great importance.

Many writers, many labor leaders, and many others frequently go back to an image, in their minds, of a golden age for the labor movement, back in the 1930s--a time when they think of the labor movement as one having had a very close relationship with liberals and with intellectuals in a close alliance on all sorts of issues. There is some exaggeration to that history, as to what that alliance actually was; there's also an exaggeration in terms of saying that all of that has fallen apart. But that is the story that is written now, over and over again, in journals, and which is told in speeches about how once upon a time there was that close relationship and that relationship fell apart and does not exist anymore. And then these writers, and thinkers (and this has been going on for many years but it continues) try to give reasons why the labor movement and the liberal intellectual community, who used to be together, at least that's what they say, somehow fell apart.

One of the things that's usually stressed, (since around 1960, when a number of liberal thinkers went around the country making speeches to this effect) is that somewhere around 1956 or 1957, a basic change took place in the United States of America--that, for the first time, the majority of people who work in this country were white collar and were profes-

sionals and that the workers in blue collars became a minority; and that each year as we go on, the number represented by organized labor is declining, that workers in these skilled trades are declining, and that, therefore, there is much less importance in developing an alliance with labor as each year goes by.

The second thing that's very frequently said is that workers, especially those who are organized within the labor movement, have become pretty affluent; that they enjoy all the great things in our society; that as a result they no longer care about others; and that what it is that workers are now trying to get is just more for themselves. We get a very typical liberal and intellectual syndrome, which essentially says that "as long as you have a union which is not yet successful--and that while you are starving the totally unorganized or disorganized or oppressed--then there is some sort of value and virtue in supporting that union." In other words, as long as the hospital workers in New York City were making \$23 a week, there was a cause which liberals and intellectuals could support because the people were starving. But as soon as they made \$75 a week, and they wanted to go out on strike to get themselves up to the great amount of \$100 a week, then it became this power-hungry group of people who are causing people to die in hospitals.

I wish Cesar Chavez very well in his campaign. I know that he has a tough struggle, but you know that if he succeeds in getting a few of the things that he wants for the agricultural workers, a few years from now the picture of

him that will be painted by liberal intellectuals will be quite different. He will be pictured as a man who is capable of cutting off the ascorbic-acid supply of the United States of America, a dangerous character who has relations with all sorts of other people who have power, and so forth. We have in the minds of many who would do the thinking and writing about this the thought that there's great virtue in going for or supporting someone who is absolutely down and out and disorganized, but once you get a little bit of organization, somehow the moral quality of the movement changes--once you go from \$23 to \$50 or \$75 or something else.

Now I should point out that the place where that change takes place is not at the point of affluence, but it's still pretty much at a point of great poverty. No one can say today that anyone who earns \$75 or \$100 or \$125 a week can live in any sort of a comfortable way, and yet you cannot find among liberal intellectuals in this country people coming forward to help in a struggle where someone is trying to get from \$100 a week to \$110 or \$115 or something like that--so that's a second part of the problem.

Well, a third part relates to this whole question of affluence - that since workers have become affluent, they are now no longer a group or a class. The view holds that they are now very well integrated into a middle-class society, that they are merged and submerged, and that, therefore, developing an alliance with this group doesn't mean anything.

because workers don't really think of themselves as workers, but operate the same way that their neighbors in other fields do. And then, of course, along with all that, because they're affluent, they have "made it," and because they're integrated within the rest of society, that essentially the labor movement and workers have become a force for reaction--a force against social change. Since they are now part of the group that are the "haves," this argument goes, they really have become identified with an over-all establishment which fights against progress for those who do not have, to hold onto the relative gains which they made as an organized group within the recent past.

Now, in a week or two, a new book will come out called "The Working Class Majority" by Andrew Levison. It was summarized three weeks ago in a very long article in the New Yorker magazine, which had about one quarter of the book. Levison's book is bound to create a certain stir because essentially he says that all of these liberal-intellectual notions about the labor movement and the working class are absolutely wrong. He points out the incorrectness in the figures which show that the number of workers in the workforce going down, and the number of professionals and white-collar people going up. Those who compiled the statistics used U.S. government figures which exclude from the blue-collar workforce janitors, building superintendents, cleaning women: all the people who do rather menial work of a service nature rather than an industrial or production

nature. And when you take all the cleaning men and women out, and all of the janitorial help, and all these people in that type of job, that that distorts the figures. He points out that the blue-collar-worker workforce in this country is still at about 60 percent, as against 40 percent for white-collar and professional, and then he discusses the rate of change and shows that the blue-collar majority, the working-class majority, will continue to be a majority at least until the year 2000. He adds that those who are writing and saying that you need a new strategy, that you can forget about labor, and that we've got to worry about or (and here we get into the changes within the Democratic Party) push the labor movement out, essentially, and to appeal to all sorts of other groups that are supposed to be forming the new majority, are absolutely wrong. The workers will continue to be a majority for the rest of this century, maybe beyond that, too.

Then he goes into the question of affluence, and shows that two-thirds of America's workers--and we're now talking about that 60 percent who are in the blue collar or less pleasant work--that two-thirds of that group is still in an area that might be defined as either poverty, or certainly very great deprivation, and below the Bureau of Labor Statistics' modest budget. And I don't know the last time you looked at that modest budget, but it talks about a man and wife going to the movies once every three months, or buying a refrigerator that will last 14 years. It's not an affluent standing of living. He also goes into the question of

whether workers really are integrated within our society in terms of their job discontents and their other problems, and also whether they (both workers and unions) are a conservative force. He cites various polls on questions of race, on all sorts of other questions, and then cites  $2\frac{1}{2}$  pages of legislation supported by the AFL-CIO, which I will not read to you, but it's a very, very impressive list, and it reaches the conclusion that the labor movement is the force for liberal social change within the country, and any of the people who are attacking the labor movement and workers for being a conservative force, just don't know what they're talking about.

. Now, the one place where he's bad, although he spends very little time on it, is the whole question of the relationship of the labor movement within international affairs. Here is a fellow who did a lot of homework. You'll all be using this book and his materials and his statistics and they're going to be cited for a long time. You'll be carrying it with you, and the one field that he just didn't bother to look into, but accepted what the critics say, and in which there are a few paragraphs about, is the role of the labor movement in international affairs, and in which his comments are extremely negative.

Now, the labor movement is very misunderstood, it's misunderstood on all these points that he raises, but there is no area in which the misunderstanding is greater than in the area of international relations. And that is the reason for this conference and other conferences, and the basis of

a program--for which I hope that this will be the beginning within your own unions and all across the country withing our various national and international unions.

In the first place, most of our members do not even have an awareness that the American labor movement is involved in international affairs. It takes just a few minutes to talk about at least two of the elements--the reasons why the labor movement is involved.

First, I think it's very obvious, and we all know that the first question when somebody wants to know--why are, well, teachers organized, or why are plumbers organized, or why is somebody else organized--the very first answer is obviously to take care of the interests of that particular group in terms of their wages, working conditions, and their job security. The origin, the basis, and the chief function of a union is in that area of economic self-interest. Now, I do not think that at a time in history like this that we have to spend a great deal of time talking about the impact of what it is that this country does in international affairs, and the impact that it has on our ability to function as unions and to represent our members.

Simple example number one--oil. We found out within just a very few weeks that everything that we negotiated in our contract doesn't mean anything if a bunch of people in white sheets some other place in the world decide that they're going to charge one amount for a barrel rather than another amount. It affects our standard of living, our whole rate of inflation, the whole question of unemployment, everything about our economy, everything about our society, and our whole style of life as to whether we can drive,

is nothing where control is not exercised, or which is affected by that whole question of whether oil and other sources of energy will be available.

By the way, our nation was relatively well off, relying on imports to a rather small extent--but when you consider a nation like Japan, which relies on 80 percent of its energy coming from outside, or most of the nations in the world, then you immediately see that precisely the same things that unions learned years ago, which is that what you win at the bargaining table can be taken away by your city council, by your mayor, by your state legislature, by the President of the United States, and that politics is union business, because if you don't get involved protecting yourselves at those particular levels, then what you have written down on a piece of paper doesn't last very long. It tends to disappear and evaporate and is meaningless. And that's precisely the same sort of reasoning--that unless we protect ourselves in international politics, then what is written into the contract (you know, your salary that you've got written in there) doesn't mean anything if there isn't any job. And there won't be a job if there's no source of energy. And there won't be a job if we continue exporting jobs through multinational corporations and giving favors in other ways so that you're at a point where now that you can't buy televisions and radios.

I was part of an AFL-CIO delegation in Japan this summer. And you know when you go to these delegations, the Japanese especially are fond of bestowing all sorts of gifts on you as mementoes when you go there, and so before

you go you want to get something that you're going to give them as a memento from the United States. Well, believe it or not, it took the labor leaders about four days to find things that are manufactured in the United States that they could take to the Japanese. These are gut issues.

I should also point to something as simple as the wheat deal, which, at the time it occurred, I'm sure there were very, very few leaders or members who had any notion that it would have any relationship to what happens in terms of our functions as unions here. But the wheat deal had an awful lot to do with a whole series of spiralling increases in terms of prices. We negotiated salaries for our members at a time when 5.5 percent guidelines and ceilings were in effect, while at that very same time, that wheat deal created a situation which brought the national economy to a point where, while we were getting our workers and our members the 5.5 percent, they were facing increases in the cost of living of 10 percent and better, largely as a result of that which then reflected itself in all sorts of other things.

Now, the first point on the whole question of labor's involvement in international relations is that we cannot protect our members by just negotiating a contract and handling a grievance. If you don't get the right administration in a state, and if you don't get it in your town, and if you don't get it in Washington, you're not representing your members. In precisely the same way, if we do not involve ourselves in this whole question of the availability of natural resources and the availability of energy and the whole question of the export of jobs and all these

issues, if we don't involve ourselves in those issues, then we are not adequately representing our members.

Now, the second part of the involvement has to do with something that you learn--something that I've learned, that everyone here has as leaders in the labor movement, and, hopefully, over a period of time, the members learn that too--is a phrase that George Meany has repeated over and over again, and that is that the philosophy of the labor movement is, and we've learned that from experience, that what is good for the country turns out to be good for labor. If you create huge problems for the nation, generally the people at the bottom and the people that we represent are going to pay a much higher price for whatever mistakes are made than people of affluence. I came yesterday from Washington where I was present at the conference when the head of the President's Council on Economic Advisors, Alan Greenspan, answered to a group of labor leaders there, that if you want to know who's really suffering as a result of inflation it's Wall Street brokers.

Well, what do I mean when I repeat that phrase that what's good for the country is good for labor? Well, we generally find that we cannot solve our own problems--for instance, you go out and you negotiate a health plan and a welfare fund for your members. I have done it, your have done it, and what do you find. Eight years ago you had a fund, and you said to everyone of your members, "Well, we got you a terrific deal: everytime you go to a doctor, we're going to give you \$5." In those days, that \$5 paid

for the visit. Well, the doctor found out that the union was giving the worker \$5, and the next week he said, "Well, I'm glad that the union is giving you \$5, the rate is \$10 - so you pay \$5 and the union pays \$5." So you go back into negotiations, and next the union is going to pay \$10, and the doctor says, "Well, my fee is now \$20; you pay \$10," and so you find out that without some sort of comprehensive national plan for medical coverage, you are really on a treadmill going back into negotiations, doing absolutely nothing for your members, because everything that you get in the way of health insurance becomes a beginning of the fee that the doctor charges.

And then we see that in our involvement in something like minimum wage. Well, you know, minimum wage does not affect that many unionized workers. But it certainly affects us as unionists, because if we can't see to it that the nonunion competition has to pay at least a certain minimum, that then limits the amount that we can win in our own contracts without putting the union boss and the union worker out of work. And so, you can go through this in health and unemployment; you can go through this in a dozen different areas; and you go through it in international relations as well. I will get to that in just a few minutes.

Now, in spite of all the books and articles that have been written which concentrate on the labor movement and anti-communism, and which say that we're part of a government CIA operation and all of these other things, the tragic thing is not that the outside press--and we don't expect a

fair shake from them--or that the critics of the labor movement have written a lot of nasty stuff and falsehoods, but what is tragic is that most of us within the labor movement do not have an understanding of what we have done for workers in the rest of the world--both in their interest and in our interests. We haven't publicized it, we haven't gotten the message across--it's been just very fair.

Now, there was an article in a magazine called "Encounter" a year or so ago, where a British journalist described a meeting that supposedly took place--I don't know if it took place. It's a meeting that supposedly took place between George Meany and George McGovern, and this British writer says that at that meeting, George McGovern said that he was wrong in the way he voted on 14-B and, he said, all right Mr. Meany if you'll forgive me on the way I voted on 14-B, I'll forgive you for the AFL-CIO's foreign-policy activities.

Now this writer, who is an Englishman, then went on to write a very brilliant article, talking about the fact that the labor movement in its international involvement was really at a point of and had engaged in activities of which the whole nation should be proud. At a time when the entire labor movement in Europe was destroyed at the end of World War II, the AFL-CIO went into Japan, into Germany, into Italy, into France, into every one of those countries to help rebuild a labor movement and to see to it that the labor movement was part of the rebuilding of democracies within those countries. It describes what we have, what the

labor movement has done, for instance, in places like Africa, where I've had the privilege of going three times, in terms of work that the AFL-CIO does there, and the fantastic role that was played by the AFL-CIO in building union leadership in each of these countries while they were still colonies, and those union leaders then played a major role in the liberation of their countries. This was the training grounds for people who are not part of the colonial aristocracy--for people to move in, to be able to conduct a meeting, to be able to give a speech, to be able to have some knowledge of how one operates politically. You couldn't get that in a colonial country where there weren't elections and there was no democracy.

The only place where that experience could be gotten was within the labor movement. And so, there was the rebuilding of unions throughout the world: there were the activities with the colonies, and now there are ongoing programs throughout the world. I was in Ethiopia several times, and if there is any hope for Ethiopia coming into democracy, it is through a very small labor movement developed by the AFL-CIO. We built the building for them, and we sent people in to train building representatives and shop stewards. That group so far has played an extremely constructive role in trying to develop a democratic constitution for that country.

This is a role which the AFL-CIO is playing throughout the world, and it is a very difficult one. There's no question that Ethiopia under Haile Sellaisie was no

democracy, but it's interesting that he felt enough pressure, even though there was no labor movement in his country, so that we were able to get access to build a building, and to start training workers. Slowly, the workers gained some rights, even though they were under great legal restrictions as to what they could do. But, if anything, the activities of the AFL-CIO can be seen as not only helping workers and groups and individuals but as helping even within totalitarian societies to build a future base of experience for the development of democracy within those nations.

Now, in these areas there is the same combination of self-interest and public-interest that the labor movement shows within the country. Not only are we helping workers in these countries, not only are we helping to develop other democracies, but we are also, in building strong labor movements in other countries, helping ourselves, because the stronger the workers are in those countries, and the more we can get away from their earning 60 cents a day, and a dollar a day, and \$2 a day, the better we are able to shore up and protect the standards of labor which we have developed in our own country. And it is one of those classic cases where we can be doing good for ourselves simultaneously with helping workers elsewhere. We help them to live and to get a decent standard of living, and we prevent the outflow of jobs from our own country, and the undermining of standards for our own workers, so that we can do something that's good for ourselves, and good for them at precisely the same time.

Now, that is the combination that one sees through all of the activities of the AFB-CIO in international affairs.

Now, I suppose, that the key issue, in terms of the AFL-CIO and international affairs, which runs through all of the activities and all of the programs in the AFL-CIO in these areas, is a very strong commitment to fight communism. And we are living through a period when it is extremely unpopular to be anti-communist. You come out of a different era; you're looking for communists under the bed; they are just people who have a slightly different point of view; they love the poor, or workers, or they love peace or something else. And to stand up these days in most places. (I see it at conventions of unions, where leadership that knows a lot better feels that it's going to be isolated if you get up today and speak freely and speak openly about why it is that the AFL-CIO is involved in an international war in terms of the question of communism is not common.)

Well, let's spend a few minutes just talking about why that's so. In the first place, there's something that is very obvious. When you're a union, and you engage in collective bargaining, and you engage in strikes, and you do all these other things, and you know that the ability of workers to have unions is every bit as important, and maybe more important for the worker, than the right of free speech or free assembly or a whole bunch of other things, because, basically, a person who has to work and live in poverty and everything else isn't going to exercise his political rights very much.

As a matter of fact, workers exercise their political rights almost exclusively through their unions and not outside of them, so all of the things guaranteed in the Constitution don't mean very much if you are starving, if you don't have the money, if you don't have the time and if you don't have the mechanism for getting together, so that when you look at communist countries and other dictatorships, the very simple difference that you see, is that those countries don't have unions. And so, there is an automatic predisposition on the part of a democratic labor movement to say that we favor those ideologies, those philosophies, those countries who allow workers to behave in a free and democratic way, just as our workers do.

And we are just as indignant when other countries prevent people from unionizing and bargaining collectively, engaging in strikes, or expressing their free opinion. We are just as indignant when that happens there as if it were to happen in California or New York or somewhere else because you know there is a kind of a world-wide public opinion on this thing. When compulsory arbitration is tried in Australia, people start talking about it in the Congress of the United States of America. And when totalitarian societies contend that productivity goes up because there are no strikes, people start talking here about limiting the rights of workers and whether our country is going to be destroyed because workers are engaged in free collective bargaining.

Our very right to organize and to exist is threatened by societies that operate on a kind of slave-labor basis within the world. And so there is that predisposition, but

there's a second aspect of it also, and that is that most people who have been in the labor movement for some time went through conflicts and struggles with communist groups within their own unions and they learned something from that experience.

Now, I can speak from experience here because within New York City, up until 1965, there was a separate group called the Teachers Union of New York City. It was a group that crossed our picket lines, opposed collective bargaining, urged teachers not to be affiliated with the AFL-CIO. It was a group that was not interested in representing teachers or in winning higher salaries, or in winning decent conditions in the schools or anything else. It was a group to try to organize teachers, and this was the experience in all unions: that communists within unions, when push came to shove, were not there to help the union or to help the workers, but only whatever had to be done to further the interest at that particular time of the Soviet Union or of their foreign policy or of their domestic policy.

And it was the same experience that led Bayard Rustin, for instance, to break with the communists when they decided the minute that the Germans and Russians started fighting that there was no longer any need for the civil-rights struggle in the United States, because it would endanger this; see, they didn't mind having a civil-rights struggle here, as long as the United States was just supporting Britain and France, but as soon as Russia got into the war, the civil-rights struggle had to be called off--and he has written of that experience.

The second reason is that experience within the labor movement shows there is an effort to control, manipulate, and use the labor movement, and labor unions, for purposes other than those for which we have been striving and for which our members joined the union.

Now, a third aspect I believe, is the interest of the labor movement in world peace and the experience that the labor movement learned and has not yet un-learned; maybe the only segment in our society that did not un-learn the experience between World War I and World War II. That experience, it seems to me, we have to share with those people who weren't around and weren't alive then, and it's only maybe a half a lecture in some classroom teacher's lessons in social studies, but the idea that there were very small and funny looking dictators, who said all sorts of nasty and hostile things--like they were going to kill a million people, millions of people--and they were going to conquer the world.

No one took them very seriously. We were involved in a massive world conflagration because we were not tough enough, early enough. The entire discussion--as millions of people were killed on the battlefield and in concentration camps and otherwise were--if only we acted in 1933, '34, '35, '36, there is absolutely no question that all of this could have been stopped; but, we wanted peace, we wanted peace at any price, we didn't believe what they were saying, we didn't see the danger, and then finally it became obvious that a few democratic nations in the world were becoming totally encircled.

And so the question is, can that happen again? Did it start happening after World War II? You get all these guys writing these books about the "cold war" and how unnecessary it was and how America provoked it and everything else, but take a look at what did happen at the end of World War II, and which countries and who were occupying and who started encircling.

Well, I talk about dangers. We're in a period of great danger for a number of reasons. One, I already mentioned. You can't talk about these things outside without a certain amount of danger and risk. We live in a period of time, where there is great diversity of lifestyles in our country, and the greatest freedom that has probably ever existed in any nation in the the history of the earth at the present time, there is a certain type of intellectual oppressiveness which exists. There are certain things that you just don't talk about because all intellectuals have decided in advance to agree.

They all\*agreed in 1968 that community control of schools was the answer. Now, maybe it is the answer and maybe it isn't the answer, but I know that certainly it is a subject that ought to be debated, that there ought to be at least five people who are willing to take the other side. When you can't find a single person who is willing to debate the other side of it, something is wrong.

And there ought to be people who come forth and are willing to debate the question as to whether the policies we are following, or have been following, are right or wrong. But there is very little of that debate. Then, of course, we have large numbers of young people, and here's the

problem, which we have in all of our unions: the teachers' union is relatively young in terms of success, and, yet, right now, in New York City, the majority of teachers who are teaching there came in after all of our strikes. And they don't remember what happened before, what the struggles were. It's what are you doing for me today, tomorrow--and that 1968 was the last strike. I'm not talking about ancient history.

So, the majority is really people who came in after that. And then they look at those who were there prior to 1968 who sit and say, "Do you know what things were like before?" They look at them like 1776. Where did you come from? Well, you see, because of a lot of things, there's been no serious Communist Party or communist movement operating within unions for a long period of time. Therefore, most members of trade unions have not had the experience that unions had in the '20s and the '30s and the '40s and the '50s, and that some teachers had even in the early '60s. And when you start talking about a danger, a menace, that this person shouldn't be elected to a given position because his commitments are not to the union, a tremendous problem arises of how do we reach some of the younger people who did not have that experience? How can they learn without being taken in? They then go through a fight sometime later to recapture their own unions.

Then of course, at the very same time, we have the tremendous pressures of business, and what we found out very recently is that business really isn't anti-communist or conservative at all--as long as Pepsi Cola can be sold in the Soviet Union--we should have detente--and, that George

Farm when they look at the pigs and they looked at the men; they looked from one to the other and couldn't tell which was which, precisely the same thing is happening with American business at this particular time. There are admissions of the problems of the dangers, which I'll talk about in a minute, but you've got this tremendous thing of every major corporation in America coming back and talking about what a nice society it is and what the prospects are for trade and for developing business--and all the things that they said five or six years ago about the nature of these societies and the threat that's presented no longer there.

Then, of course, at the top to this whole thing is detente--that if our own government--because it says that we have now developed a friendly relationship and we mustn't spoil that friendly relationship in any way by criticizing anything that goes on within a communist nation--then it makes it much more difficult for individual citizens. After all, if the government doesn't know its own self-interest in international politics and international conflict, how can individual citizens know that. So it becomes almost unpatriotic to question some of the things that are happening. Well, we have to do a job, very, very tough, but we've got to go out there--somebody has to go around and point out that China and the Soviet Union are still totalitarian societies. The workers can't organize. You look at the Soviet Union just last week at the art show and the breaking up of it and people being arrested. Now what if that happened in South Viet Nam, suppose that Thieu had broken up an art show? There would be massive demonstrations on the mall in Central Park! There would be marchers down Washington to

cut off aid; there would be people with the Viet Cong flag, they wouldn't ask whether you could have an art show in the north--but they would do that.

But, who has spoken out, and who has said anything--and where are the protestors and where are the demonstrations? A writer in the New York Times some months ago said the United States is just as bad to writers as the Soviet Union. Why should Solzhenitsyn complain? In the United States, a guy that is not popular with the publishers finds it very difficult to get his book published! That's what he said. Unbelievable; absolutely unbelievable!

Well, we're still engaged, then we've got these, I think it's also obvious and something that has to be pointed out: Russians know it even if we don't, and that is that we are still engaged in war, and if you look at what happened in the Middle East, and if you look at what is happening today in terms of the likelihood of war breaking out again; of the re-armament of the Arab countries by the Soviet Union and that war is very closely related, not only to ideological and certain idealistic principles that we have, but is certainly related to our ability to carry on our economy, the whole oil situation, and many other things along those lines.

Now, what we have is not a real big problem. We have a phony detente, but, it's worked to do a number of things. We've had visits of American labor leaders, not so many, but British labor leaders, German labor leaders, all over the world, and I might say that there was an unofficial delegation of the California Federation of Teachers that went to

China. I came here one year ago. I went to Ventura. I spoke to the building representatives of United Teachers of Los Angeles. Before me was the speaker, Don Morrison, the former president of the National Education Association. He had just been on a visit to China with the NEA. He stood up before all these hundreds of leaders of the teachers in Los Angeles and told them what a marvelous place China was, and how you go from school to school, and how the teachers are trying to teach children, and how the children smile, and how cute they are, and what a wonderful country it is.

Well, he didn't say anything about what happened to the last teacher who tried to organize a union in China, or what their collective-bargaining agreements are like, or the fact that hundreds of thousands of people are wiped out if they've got the wrong relationship to Confucius, or somebody else, or what the great cultural revolution was about. I mean look, we are dealing with a nation in which mass atrocities have taken place within the last couple of years, and people who consider themselves as liberals or intellectuals go over there and come back and say the children were smiling. Well, children smile everywhere. And what we have is a repeat of delegations that went to Germany and said, oh it's wonderful, the streets are clean, or in Italy, the railroads are running on time, and people are smiling and everything else, and totally ignoring what is going on within these countries, that they are still totalitarian, that there are fascist atrocities that take place, and that by these visitations--I just got an invitation from the U.S. government to visit the Soviet Union--just what are they

for?

Well, the visit is so that I can stand next to somebody who is supposed to be the head of a Russian Teachers Union and they can take a picture of me and circulate it through Africa and Asia and elsewhere, and that gives credence to the Soviet Union having a labor movement headed by Alexander \_\_\_\_\_, the former head of the Secret Police. No collective bargaining, no strikes. This is what Americans today are allowing themselves to do. To have their picture snapped with someone who is essentially an oppressor of workers. Of course, this is very flattering to be invited. It is very nice to go on a trip and be treated, but when you come back it is very difficult saying you quit. You're a guest when you're there, so you're not going to ask questions of where the camps are and what's happened on the rioting--it isn't a nice thing to do, and the Americans aren't trained the way Communists are. They can come into a place and start talking about all the problems of our society and how we mistreat and everything else and they know a \_\_\_\_\_ what our problems are, but our visitors find that they literally cannot do that.

Well, detente means that criticism is now, the things that our Government used to do, the radio broadcasts--and our Government no longer broadcasts it in Russia, criticizing what goes on there, cause how can you do that to a friend!! Well, a recent issue of a not well known magazine, but very good one called "Survey," which for quite a period of time comes out of England, for quite a period of time has analyzed the relationship between East and West, points out

some of the problems that come out of this detente situation.

In the first place, it means that nice democratic unionists from the Western world go over there and actually help the Russians to oppress their own people because if I go over there and get my picture taken with the head of the Russian teachers, I can assure you that the Russians will not have to do anything for their teachers. I can do much more for them if I refuse to go because of the way teachers are treated there, than in not being critical, as if I go over there and give them some recognition. The second thing that has obviously happened is that if the rights are now nice and we're nice and we're all getting together and holding hands and we're all smiling at each other, then there's obviously no longer any need for the Western Alliance. So that we have accepted the fact that they're good people and there isn't going to be any conflict anymore and therefore the Western Alliance should break up all of our other alliances. Why should other countries be in alliance with us if we have this close relationship with somebody who was supposed to be the heavy?

The other thing, the third item, is the tremendous pressure that will now emanate within our own country to make massive reductions in defense commitments. I don't like to spend money on defense--I would much prefer it be spend on schools, but I'm sure that money won't be spent on schools if we don't have much of a country left. And given a world with which there are other countries that have alternates, and where war is possible, I'll tell you I really

was frightened in the Arab-Israeli War when the Arabs--using Russian weapons--and the Israelis using American weapons, when the Israelis had the tough time they did. I don't know how well we would do in a war at this particular time. But, certainly if we're friends, there's no need for any depression.

Now, the fourth item deals with what's happening with the trade legislation, as they're our friends. So we are developing a program for financial and technical help to the Soviet Union and that may be followed by the same thing to China, and I wonder if at this time--because we're approaching a time when many of our friends have said we were very, very strong on the notion that we should pull back on trade with the Soviet Union are now