



go
**FREEDOM and the
WELFARE STATE**

A SYMPOSIUM BY

OSCAR R. EWING

HERBERT H. LEHMAN

GEORGE MEANY

WALTER P. REUTHER

and others

HARRY W. LAIDLER, Editor

**On the Occasion of the
45th ANNIVERSARY - L. I. D.**

LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

112 East 19th St.

New York, N. Y.

Price 25 cents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	3
The L.I.D. and Social Welfare—Harry W. Laidler	4
Freedom and the General Welfare—Senator Herbert H. Lehman	7
Next Steps in Social Security—Hon. Oscar R. Ewing	12
Labor Looks at the Welfare State—George Meany	15
Social Welfare and Democracy in the Atomic Age— Walter P. Reuther	19
Democratic Controls Under the Welfare State	22
Corley Smith	22
Eveline M. Burns	23
Margaret Herbison	24
Charles Abrams	24
Sterling Spero	25
Murray Cross	26
Clarence Senior	26
John Roche	27
Human Rights and the Welfare State	27
Bryn J. Hovde	27
Israel Feinberg	28
Toni Sender	30
Norman Thomas	31
Anniversary Greetings to the L.I.D.	31
G.D.H. and Margaret Cole, Morgan Phillips, Minister- President William Drees, André Philip, Hon. Walter Nash M. J. Coldwell, M.P., Premier T. C. Douglas, Lady Dorothy Archibald, Louis de Brouckere, Premier Einar Gerhardsen, Eleanor Roosevelt, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Cong. Jacob K. Javits, Harry A. Overstreet, Robert Morss Lovett, John Haynes Holmes, Hugo Ernst, Vida D. Scudder	
List of Sponsors	37
Board of Directors, L.I.D.	39
Pamphlet List	40

Copyright, 1950
by the

LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY, INC.

FREEDOM and the WELFARE STATE

INTRODUCTION

It was indeed fitting that the 45th Anniversary Conference of the League for Industrial Democracy, held at the Hotel Commodore, New York, on April 15, 1950, should be devoted to a discussion of "Freedom and the Welfare State". For the L.I.D., during its four and a half decades of activity, has been one of America's foremost educational organizations committed to the steady enlargement of human freedom and of social welfare, while many of the young men and women whom it has influenced through the years have done valuable service in the cause of the common man.

At the Conference Luncheon, the L.I.D. presented a citation to Senator Herbert H. Lehman of New York, "for over a generation an outstanding leader in the battle for racial and religious equality and economic and social welfare here and abroad." It also presented its first John Dewey Alumni Award for Distinguished Public Service to Walter P. Reuther, President of the Auto Workers Union, organizer and chairman, while in college, of the S.L.I.D. Chapter at Wayne University, and, 'since his student days, a gallant, courageous and socially visioned crusader for labor's rights and a free and abundant world."

The conference throughout was an outstanding one, and its highlights are presented in the following pages, together with some congratulatory messages to the L.I.D., and something about its achievements and future possibilities.

Nathaniel M. Minkoff, President of the L.I.D., and Secretary-Treasurer of the N. Y. Joint Board, Dressmakers' Union, I.L.G.W.U., presided at the luncheon in the Grand Ballroom of the Hotel Commodore, and introduced the speakers. In the absence of President Reuther, who was detained by the negotiations in the Chrysler dispute, George F. Cranmore, Assistant Regional Director, U.A.W.-C.I.O., read President Reuther's address and received the Reuther scroll.

Original material library - 25 - 800
 OCT 23 1951

638710

THE L.I.D. and SOCIAL WELFARE

By HARRY W. LAIDLER

President Minkoff, honored guests, and members and friends of the L.I.D.: Forty-five years ago, Upton Sinclair, Morris Hillquit, Jack London and others issued a call for the formation of an organization to promote an intelligent understanding of socialism and of other social movements and problems of the day among college men and women.

The call was followed by an organization meeting in Fulton Street, New York, presided over by Sinclair, then a young man in his 27th year—now, by the way, a “young” man, with the same zeal and enthusiasm, in his 72nd year.

Many present at this first meeting—and I, then a junior in college, was among them—had high hopes of the rapid coming of a society where poverty, unemployment, and economic injustice would be things of the past, and where all would be cooperating together for the common good.

Changes During 45 Years

During the last 45 years, many changes in the march toward democracy in industry have indeed taken place. In 1905, the trade union movement was still fighting for a place in the sun. Attempts at organization were, in innumerable cases, met by hostile courts, hostile police and constabulary, by the employment of spy systems and blacklists. In the women's garment industry in New York, the outlook for organization seemed so discouraging that the New York members of the Executive Board of the I.L.G.W.U. recommended, at the 1905 convention, the closing of the union's general office.

The consumers' cooperative movement of the day had little vitality, and predictions were rife that it had no future in the United States.

Few labor and social laws were on the statute books. Child labor legislation was being opposed as interfering with the sacred right of children to dispose of their labor as they saw fit. The constitutionality of laws providing for maximum hours of labor for women had not as yet been established. Social insurance systems were being condemned as alien innovations which the rugged individualists in this country would never tolerate.

A decade before, in the nineties, the United States Supreme Court had listened to the plea of the Wall Street lawyer, Joseph Choate, that the income tax laws which imposed a tax of 2 per cent on incomes of \$40,000 or more, be declared unconstitutional. Such action, he asserted, would stop the “Communist march”. By a vote of 5 to 4, the Court, after a last hour switch, invalidated this law.

Enthusiastic editorials greeted this decision, the *New York Sun* declaring, “The wave of the socialist revolution had gone far, but it breaks at the foot of the ultimate bulwark set-up for the protection of our liberties. Five to four, the Court stands like a rock.” How split the rock was, the *Sun* editorial failed to say. The welfare state in 1905 had not as yet arrived.

It is unnecessary to recall to this audience the advances that have been made during the past forty-five years in the trade union and cooperative movements, in labor and social legislation. It is unnecessary to recall the growing concern of the community for the preservation and enrichment of our natural and human resources. Nor is it necessary to recount the growth of our national income with the coming of the machine and electrical age, and the rise in our living standards.

The L.I.D. and the Task Ahead

The League for Industrial Democracy is proud of the help, as a pioneer educational organization, it has been able to render toward this advance through its researches, its pamphlets and books, its lectures and conferences, its college and city discussion and action groups.

It is proud of the work of its officers, of its staff members, and of the brilliant and socially-minded men and women who received their first inspiration in L.I.D. college groups, and who have, to no small extent, influenced the economic and social thinking of our land.

We in the League are happy to record the social progress that has been made during the first half of this century. We are, however, conscious of the fact that the goals of full democracy and economic security have not as yet been reached. Millions of our people, especially in our Southland, still live a hand-to-mouth existence. Economic injustices in the distribution of the fruits of

industry are widespread. An inner circle of owners and executives of mammoth corporate groups still possesses vast power over the lives of our people.

Our natural resources are still being wantonly wasted. Recurrent periods of mass joblessness are still an unsolved problem. Race and religious discrimination, despite recent advances, still constitutes a blot on our democratic way of life. And the threat of increasing dictatorship abroad and of an atomic war, too tragic in its possible consequences to contemplate, is an ever present one.

The League, with its program of total democracy in industry, government and human relations, has surely a great educational task before it.

We are seeking to meet the social challenge in many ways. We are continuing to send distinguished lecturers from here and abroad to our colleges and cities. We have published more pamphlets on educational and social problems this year than in many years past. We are conducting a campaign for the organization of city chapters which is meeting with remarkable success. Our dinners and conferences during the last year or so, with Senator Humphrey, President David Dubinsky, John Dewey, Senator Lehman and Walter Reuther, among others, as honored guests, have been of historic significance. Such college conferences as the recent regional conference at Harvard, have been of a high order.

Our greatest educational task, is, however, before us. In the college world, the two and a half million young people on the campuses are today groping for light on problems of democratic social change. They are being propagandized by numerous reactionary organizations which have large sums of money at their disposal. They are being propagandized by totalitarian forces that receive their line not from hard, honest, independent thinking, but from a dictatorial government abroad. They are bewildered. Students are looking to democratic organizations like the League for enlightenment and guidance.

We are indeed happy that labor and learning are working together to help to provide such guidance. We thank the members of this audience for the fine cooperation they have given throughout the years to this pioneer educational venture. We are looking forward to a continuance of this cooperation in the great task of stimulating the hardest thinking and the most democratic, constructive action toward a society worthy of our noblest dreams.

FREEDOM AND THE GENERAL WELFARE

SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN OF NEW YORK *

I feel deeply honored today at this 45th Anniversary Luncheon of the League for Industrial Democracy to receive the League's citation for public service in behalf of a more democratic world. I particularly appreciate this citation because of your organization's long and consistent record of devotion to the ideals and the achievement of a more democratic nation and a more democratic world.

I cite the words of the Honorary President of this organization, that beloved philosopher, Dr. John Dewey, who defined the goal of the L.I.D. as the creation "of a democracy that shall be a living reality in every aspect and reach of our common life." And what do we mean by "democracy?" Another great contemporary of ours, the Reverend Harry Emerson Fosdick, put it this way. "Democracy", Dr. Fosdick said, "is based on the conviction that there are extraordinary possibilities in ordinary people." I know that your organization is dedicated to that conviction.

The title of my remarks today is "Freedom and the Welfare State." I can think of no more appropriate audience than this for such a discussion. The League for Industrial Democracy, in striving for almost half a century to promote industrial democracy, has been working at the same time in behalf of both freedom and the welfare state. Your ideal as well as mine is a nation conceived in freedom and dedicated to the welfare of all the people. But that ideal is no innovation of ours. We are not its original sponsors. 170 years ago the welfare state concept was translated into the basic law of this land by the founders of the republic. This concept was set forth in the Preamble of the American Constitution. The object of our federal union, the constitution states, is "to establish justice, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity." Hence, the founding fathers were the ones who really originated the welfare state. And in many lands, long before our nation was born, courageous champions of human liberty were working toward this same ideal.

* This address was delivered by Senator Lehman following the presentation of a citation to him for distinguished service in behalf of social welfare. Secretary George Meany of the A.F.L., read the L.I.D. citation.

"Democracy", said one of the world's greatest men, "arose from men's thinking that if they are equal in any respect, they are equal absolutely." Those words were written more than 2,000 years ago by a Greek named Aristotle. Those words define the welfare state as much as any phrase of Franklin D. Roosevelt or Harry S. Truman.

Alarmists and Welfare Legislation

It has become fashionable in circles of political reaction to attack the concept of the welfare state as being prejudicial to individual liberty and freedom. These reactionaries view with fright and alarm the current and proposed activities of government in the fields of housing, health, and social security.

"These are steps on the road to Communism", the alarmists cry. But these same men uttered the same cries in the same tones of fear and outrage when President Roosevelt proposed the Securities and Exchange Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Holding Company Act, the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and many other pieces of legislation which even reactionaries would not dare to attack today. The same cries were raised when Woodrow Wilson proposed the Federal Trade Commission Act in 1913 and when the Railway Labor Act was first placed on the statute books in 1926. I could cite laws and programs by the score enacted over the violent opposition of the reactionaries—laws and programs which were assailed as communistic at the time—but which are now accepted even in the most conservative circles.

This cry of state tyranny has been raised during the last half century whenever the community has attempted to interfere with the right of a few to destroy forests, exploit little children, operate unsanitary and unsafe shops, indulge in racial or religious discrimination, and pursue other policies endangering the health, safety and welfare of the community. These few have completely ignored the fact that, when their license to exploit the community was restricted, the freedom of the many from ignorance, insecurity, and want—the freedom of the many to live the good life—was measurably enhanced.

Social Welfare vs. Special Privilege

I do not believe that our Federal government should seek to assume functions which properly belong to the individual or to

the family, to the local community, or to free organizations of individuals. But I do believe that our Federal government should and must perform those functions which, in this complex and interdependent society, the individual, the family, or the community cannot practicably perform for themselves.

Today we in America and in the entire freedom-loving world are confronted with a world-wide threat to that principle which we hold most dear, the principle of individual dignity and of individual freedom. For the preservation of that principle we are willing to dedicate our lives, if it should prove necessary. But while this is a threat which we face on the world front, we face another danger here at home. That is the threat to our freedom from those within our own country who would identify individual freedom with special privilege. Any move to diminish privilege, to stamp out discrimination and to bring security to our citizens is branded by these people as un-American.

Not so long ago an American political leader said that "the governments of the past could fairly be characterized as devices for maintaining in perpetuity the place and position of certain privileged classes. The government of the United States, on the other hand, is a device for maintaining in perpetuity the rights of the people, with the ultimate extinction of all privileged classes." Was it some Communist, some irresponsible radical or reformer, who made that statement? No, it was not. It was the late President Calvin Coolidge in a speech at Philadelphia in 1924.

It is my firm belief that the extinction of special privilege is an essential and basic program of the welfare state. Today the forces of special privilege provide the chief opposition and raise the wildest cries of alarm against economic security for all.

Welfare State a Foe of Totalitarianism

In addition to the forces of special privilege who are opposed, on principle, to all social legislation, there are some who, while paying lip service to liberalism, claim to be troubled by the expanding scope of government in its direct concern with the welfare of the individual citizen. These people, while conceding merit to the specific programs of the welfare state, and while approving the welfare state programs of the past, join with the forces of privilege in contending that if the government provides any further services, it is moving in the direction of totalitarianism.

In my opinion these men of little vision have lost sight of the most important—and to me the most obvious—truth of our times—that a government which has secured the greatest degree of welfare for its people is the government which stands most firmly against totalitarianism. The critics of the welfare state do not understand this simple fact. They spend their time looking for Communists in and out of government and at the same time attack those measures which would deprive Communists and would-be Communists of their ammunition—and of their audience. The measures which would provide for the welfare of the people are the surest weapons against totalitarianism.

The Communist international, its leaders, and their philosophy, have been responsible for many designs which we in the democratic world consider the quintessence of evil. Certainly the suppression of basic rights—the police state and the slave labor camp—constitutes the most repulsive and obnoxious way of life we can imagine.

But, as a liberal, I have a *special* resentment against the Communists. I feel that one of their greatest disservices to the cause of human progress has been their identification of economic security with the suppression of freedom. It is their claim that in order to achieve the solution of the economic needs of the many, it is necessary to curb the freedoms of all. They say, in effect, that you cannot have a full stomach and a free mind at the same time.

I reject this concept! I reject it as being the ultimate in reaction. This is but another demonstration of the basic affinity between Communists and reactionaries in their thinking about man and his problems. *Both* groups believe that a nation of free men cannot possibly conquer the scourges of hunger, disease, lack of shelter, intolerance and ignorance. And they *both* have much to gain if they convince enough people that freedom and security are incompatible.

Insecurity a Threat to Freedom

It is a strange paradox that the same conservatives and reactionaries who pose as champions of national security express the greatest antagonism toward individual security. Most of us readily acknowledge that the nations of the world cannot be free if they are not secure. It seems equally logical to me that *individuals* cannot be free if they are beset by fear and insecurity. To my

mind the welfare state is simply a state in which people are free to develop their individual capacities, to receive just awards for their talents and to engage in the pursuit of happiness, unburdened by fear of actual hunger, actual homelessness or oppression by reason of race, creed or color.

The fear of old age, the fear of sickness, the fear of unemployment, and the fear of homelessness are not—as some would have us believe—essential drives in a productive society. These fears are not necessary to make free competitive enterprise work. The fear of insecurity is rather a cancer upon free competitive enterprise. It is the greatest threat which confronts our economic system. I hasten to add that I believe in free competitive enterprise. I believe it is the best system yet devised by man. But it is not a goal in itself. It must always serve the public interest.

We have had twenty years of the New Deal and the Fair Deal. Who would say that the American worker, the American farmer and the ordinary American businessman is less free than he was twenty years ago? Actually, freedom in the true sense flourishes more generally and more widely today than ever before in our history. The worker, the farmer and the businessman have vastly more freedom than they ever had before. They are freer to enjoy the fruits and benefits of a productive economy and a full life. But they are not yet free enough.

We are still far from the goal we seek. Insecurity still haunts millions. Inadequate housing poisons the wells of family life in vast numbers of cases. Inadequate schooling handicaps a great segment of our people. And the fear of sickness and old age still clutches at the hearts of many if not most of our fellow citizens. Until we solve all these problems and quiet all these fears, our people will not be truly free.

NEXT STEPS IN SOCIAL SECURITY

By OSCAR R. EWING

*Administrator, Social Security Agency**Greetings from President Truman*

I am glad to join with you in celebrating the forty-fifth anniversary of the League for Industrial Democracy. I am here, not only in my own behalf, but as the representative of the President of the United States. President Truman has asked me to bring you his personal greetings and good wishes, and to express his congratulations on your forty-fifth birthday.

The President was especially happy to know that Senator Lehman is receiving your citation for his public services in behalf of democracy here and abroad. No one could deserve it more. Herbert Lehman is a great statesman and you honor yourselves in honoring him. The people of New York know and honor him.

[Administrator Ewing dealt with Senator Lehman's achievements as Colonel during World War I, as Governor and as Senator. He continued as below].

We need him in the Senate because he is a man who is able to drive to the heart of the problems that confront our country. He is not terrified by the shrieks and slogans of the irresponsible right. When he was accused of favoring the welfare state, he acknowledged it with pride.

Name Calling vs. Argument

Back in the days of the Revolution, the British had a term of contempt for the colonial Americans who presumed to set up their own independent nation. But the colonial Americans took the name to themselves. Sure they were Yankee Doodles, and they were dandy! I can remember, not so many month ago, when the Republicans were flinging the phrase "welfare state" at us as though it were an epithet of reproach. It has backfired in the same way that Yankee Doodle backfired on the British. Sure, we Democrats are for the welfare state—if by welfare state you mean better health for the American people, more education, greater social security, good jobs at good wages, protection against the hazards of unemployment and depression, civil rights, good housing at reasonable cost, and the whole broad program of President

Truman's Fair Deal. If that is the welfare state, then we are for it, and proud of it. The American people are for it, and proud of it. And the Republicans have dropped the subject, so that today it becomes the theme, not of a Republican box lunch wake, but of a serious, dignified, important gathering such as ours today.

So the Republicans have now gone back to worrying about socialism. A few weeks ago they said that 'liberty versus socialism' was the Number One issue before the country. Since nobody paid much attention, they have dropped its popularity to Number Ten on their latest list of abbreviated slogans. If it goes down any further, it will fall out of their ten-point platform entirely. . . .

A hundred years ago, those who opposed establishment of free public schools called them "socialism." In 1887, when Congress set up the Interstate Commerce Commission, the railroads all shouted "socialism." In 1913, the nation's bankers let out the same cry when the Federal Reserve Act became law. And remember how the Wall Street brokers bemoaned the end of free government when the Securities Act of 1933 was passed, and how insurance companies howled "socialism" when the Social Security Act was enacted.

I believe with all my heart that our American system is the best that man has so far devised. But that does not mean it is perfect. That does not mean it has no defects which we are seeking to correct. And we want to correct them with the least possible disturbance to our society and our economy.

The conservatives may yell "socialism" at any suggestion for improvement. They may feel the hot breath of revolution with every proposal for change. But the most dangerous enemies we have to our American way of life are those very people whose emblem is not the eagle but the ostrich—who refuse to recognize the defects that exist and who resist all efforts to take up these defects one by one and try to cure them. The surest way I know to encourage forms of government we do not like is to refuse to recognize and cure the imperfections in what we have.

A Welfare Program

What does this mean if practiced? For one thing, it means that we have the obligation to ourselves to expand our social security program so that it covers the greater portion of our population—and to increase the benefits so that they are more in line

with the cost of living in this year 1950. I am confident that the Congress will make such amendments in the Social Security Act during the present session, and I think this will mark a great step forward. I do not have to explain the philosophy of social insurance to this audience. You understand the principle as well as I do—and you recognize it as the only way in which our complex society can manage to build a floor on which people can stand when old age or death comes.

We have as a nation accepted this principle of social insurance in one field. We have yet to accept it in another—the critical field of insuring ourselves against the costs of medical and hospital care. Too many Americans are compelled to worry about the costs of such care when illness strikes. Too many Americans cannot afford to pay for the care they need. The only way to remove such worries is by adopting President Truman's program for a nationwide insurance system in which employers and employees would contribute to a fund out of which doctors and hospitals would be paid for the service they render.

We have as a nation accepted the principle that education should be free, universal, and supported out of tax funds. Since we have, as we should have, a decentralized educational system, operated by the state, this has thrown a heavy burden on the poorer parts of the country—and we must somehow work out a way of mobilizing the resources of the nation to build and modernize school houses, to increase the number of teachers as well as increase the salaries of teachers and to raise the level of our educational standards.

In every field—housing, labor legislation, conservation, utilization of great new sources of energy—we must build strongly for the future. We must have the positive approach.

It is good to see that a valiant champion of this positive approach, a man without venom but with a full heart and a courageous mind, is recognized for his public service. Senator Lehman, and all of you who are here today, agree on the goal that lies before us—the goal of a better, a safer, a happier America in a better, a safer, a happier world—a well-faring world, if you want to call it so. Our paths toward that goal may vary. But all who seek it are joined in the common cause—and it is the cause that counts.

LABOR LOOKS AT THE WELFARE STATE

By GEORGE MEANY

Secretary-Treasurer, American Federation of Labor

Permit me to preface my remarks of "Freedom and the Welfare State" by admitting that I believe in both. More than that, I believe that both freedom and a state of welfare can and should be enjoyed by the American people at the same time. So, I am sure, does our special guest of today—Senator Lehman—because his whole public career has been aimed at the achievement of those goals. That is one of the chief reasons why the labor movement has always regarded him so highly.

Of course, there is no such thing as a welfare state, neither here in America nor anywhere else in the world. To liberals, the welfare state is an ideal worth working for and fighting for. To the reactionary politicians who have pounced upon the phrase for propaganda purposes, the term welfare state is merely something to frighten people into voting against their own interests.

Fortunately, the great majority of the American people do not get panicky that easily. . . . They have more common-sense.

After all, even the reactionary politicians have to concede that the Constitution is the charter of American freedom and liberty. And that very same Constitution states in its Preamble that one of the purposes of our government is 'to promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity'. What the founding fathers wedded solemnly in one eternal phrase, the Tafts and the Byrds, both on the Republican and Democratic side, will never be able to divorce.

Freedom Meaningless Without Security

Yet, they insist such a divorce must be handed down, on the ground that welfare of the people and freedom of the people are mutually incompatible and can not co-exist without destroying each other.

To me that is sheer nonsense. In fact, the opposite is true. Just as we all agree that there can be no real security without freedom, it is equally true that individual freedom is meaningless without solid security to keep it fruitful.

A free government like ours was established in the first place not to rule the people, but to serve them. We do not hear our opponents complaining about such accepted government services

as the police and fire departments and public schools. Yet, in a narrow sense, each of these services and the laws under which they operate involve a degree of compulsion and thus infringe upon individual liberty. You and I are forbidden by law to rob and murder and set fires and there are laws against playing hookey from school. But we do not charge our government with being a "police state" on those grounds.

Surely, the expansion of government services into economic fields involves a far lesser degree of compulsion. The government does not deprive us of any liberties by such services as workmen's compensation, bank deposit insurance, crop insurance and social security. The only compulsion in any of these programs is the payment of taxes for the insurance provided, and taxes always have and always will be with us.

I am convinced that the American people are willing to pay still higher taxes for more adequate protection against economic disasters and for new programs, such as health insurance.

"Handout State"

When the "Welfare State" slogan fell flat, the reactionaries hunted around for a new phrase and came up with the "Handout State". All of us who pay taxes for the extremely meager economic and social insurance which our government, as yet, affords us, realize quite clearly that we are not getting any handouts, but are paying our own way.

But, speaking of handouts, it is somewhat surprising to me that our reactionary friends never do refer to the very considerable handouts which our government has generously awarded to big business in the past and the heavy subsidies which it is still pouring out.

Was it a "Handout State" when the government spent millions to help the railroads build transcontinental transportation networks? Was it a "Handout State" when the government paid heavy subsidies to American shipping, so that an adequate merchant marine could be maintained against foreign competition? Is it a "Handout State" when the government subsidizes the airlines through higher airmail payments than are economically justified? Is it a "Hand-out State" when the government deliberately takes a loss on second-class mail in order to help publications circulate more widely? Do you ever hear the newspapers and their friends

in Congress complain about government largesse when big business is the direct beneficiary?

I cite these particular examples not because I am opposed to government assistance to worthwhile enterprises which need help and encouragement, but because the reactionary interests never mention them. The only thing that makes their blood boil is when the government occasionally and belatedly takes a step in the direction of providing something necessary to the little people of the country.

I, too, believe in private enterprise. The American Federation of Labor is, and has consistently been, a firm defender of our free enterprise system. As a general policy, we do not believe it wise or prudent for the government to invade the field of private business, wherever private enterprise is serving the public well. If any of the social-justice programs undertaken by the New Deal or the Fair Deal were actually damaging to private business, we would be among the first to object. But, has private business really suffered under the New Deal or the Fair Deal?

I am sure we can all remember back as far as 1933 when Franklin Roosevelt took office: our financial structure on the brink of complete disaster; agriculture prostrate, and the buying power of our people at the lowest point in forty years; small business failures at an all-time high.

We didn't hear any arguments about statism or socialism from the great leaders of industry in those days. No. On the contrary, they flocked to Washington by the thousands with all sorts of proposals by which they hoped the new administration would save them from disaster. That they were saved by the prompt actions of that administration is a matter of history.

Captains of Industry Under the New Deal

And how have the great captains of industry, the architects of our ruin back in the twenties, made out under the Fair Deal?

I am not going to bore you with any long-winded analysis of the present position of big business. Let me simply quote from a report just out by the U. S. News, which is edited by David Lawrence. This special report appeared in the March 24th issue of that publication. Here is the quotation:

"American corporations, as a group, are rolling in money. In four postwar years they have invested 60 billion

dollars in new plant and equipment; they have increased other assets by 11 billion dollars; they have added 21 billion dollars to reserves for depreciation, and they still have 40 billion dollars in cash and Government bonds on hand. Never before was the financial position of U. S. business so strong."

I think those figures tell the story. Today, the insurance companies, which so bitterly fought us every step of the way to prevent workmen's compensation and social security, are making more money than they know what to do with. Today, the utility interests, which tried every fair and foul means of blocking the rural electrification program, are silently splitting up huge dividends from increased sales of electric power and electric appliances.

In the same way, I venture to predict, the American Medical Association, which is so frantically campaigning against health insurance, will be forced to admit—after it is enacted—that it was the best break the doctors of this country ever got—to say nothing of their patients.

This controversy over the policies of the New Deal and the Fair Deal is nothing new. It goes back to our very beginning as a Nation. Simply stated it is—shall our political and economic policy be what the people want, or shall it be what some superior guiding group may think is best for the people? The present day Bourbons of our country talk about statism, socialism and the welfare state. To me labels—with the exception of the Union Label—are more or less without meaning. I am for the greater welfare and security of all the people of this Nation. I believe that it is a proper function of a democratic government to strive for a better life for all its people—including those who work for wages. Put any label you desire on this effort for a better day—statism, New Deal, socialism, Fair Deal or welfare state—I am for it.

In your time and in mine, I am confident that the American people, by their own decision in free election, will be able to achieve a greater degree of human welfare and security and will discover that their freedoms have been broadened, rather than curtailed, in the process.*

* Following his address, Secretary Meany presented the L.I.D. citation to Senator Lehman.

SOCIAL WELFARE and DEMOCRACY in the ATOMIC AGE

WALTER P. REUTHER *
President, U.A.W.-C.I.O.

I extend greetings and best wishes for continued success to the L.I.D. on the occasion of its 45th Anniversary. One of my first activities in the L.I.D. was to lead the Student L.I.D. Chapter of Wayne University of which I was chairman in the picket lines of the Briggs strike in 1932. Once again in the Chrysler strike we are involved in a struggle in Detroit further to extend industrial democracy. Negotiations in the Chrysler strike make it impossible for me to leave Detroit at this time. I am sure that all my friends in the L.I.D. and Senator Lehman understand my sincere personal regret in not being able to be with you today to celebrate the 45th anniversary of the L.I.D. and join with his many friends in paying honor to Senator Lehman.

The L.I.D. is again demonstrating its courage and vision by facing squarely the challenge and broad concepts of the welfare state. We have learned at great cost in two world wars that people and freedom are indivisible. We have yet fully to learn that economic security and material well-being for the great mass of people are inseparably tied together with the struggle to make freedom, security and peace lasting in the world.

Democratic Government Must Meet Human Needs

The selfish and socially irresponsible forces of reaction originally raised the question of the welfare state as a part of its scare campaign to block social progress in America. We can believe in the sovereignty of people over profits and must meet the challenge of reaction with a positive and practical program of social action which gives substance to the welfare state concept in terms of human and democratic values.

We are dedicated to the proposition that the highest duty of democratic government is to serve and advance the general welfare of the total community. Democratic government is the advancement of all the people. It must be made into an effective

* President Reuther was presented at the Anniversary Luncheon with the John Dewey L.I.D. Alumni Award for Distinguished Public Service. In his absence, President Reuther's address and the reply to the award citation were delivered by George F. Crammore, Asst. Regional Director, U.A.W.-C.I.O.

instrument which reflects our will and meets our needs. The forces of reaction on the extreme right and the extreme left would corrupt the high purpose of democratic government. The communists would have us believe that economic security and the material well-being made possible by the welfare state cannot be achieved without sacrificing political and spiritual freedom. On the other hand, the socially irresponsible exponents of *laissez faire* economics would have us believe that human insecurity is the inevitable price that man must pay for freedom.

Those of us who believe in the welfare state must prove that both bread and freedom can live together in democracy's houses. American democracy will meet the challenge of the Cominform, not by an eloquent recitation of the pious virtues of democracy, but by a positive program of social action geared to the advancement of the welfare of the great mass of people. American democracy will be judged not by its noble promises, but by its practical performance in terms of people and their welfare.

Public Assistance for Whom?

Those reactionary forces who today use the term welfare state with contempt have ever been willing and eager to accept government assistance to advance their own interest. When the RFC spent billions to bail out big business, that was "the highest achievement of Americanism," but when the same government is called upon to use its authority to procure and accept responsibility for the welfare of people, to provide federal aid to education, to provide decent housing, to take positive steps to meet the problem of growing unemployment, to provide minimum legislation and other necessary government action to meet the problems of the people, such action is labeled un-American and destructive to our democratic way of life. The argument in America is not whether the welfare state is to be or not to be. We have always had a welfare state. The argument fundamentally is whose welfare does the welfare state serve?

In the atomic age, the state must necessarily be geared to the advancement of the welfare of the total people. This is not only a matter of economic and social justice. This is a matter of democratic survival. The cold war is a struggle for men's hearts and minds and their loyalties. The practical implementation of the broad humanitarian concept of the welfare state will provide us

with our most potent weapon against totalitarianism both of the right and the left. In those parts of Europe where there is a strong, free, democratic labor movement and where the state has accepted and carried out its broad social and moral responsibilities with respect to the welfare of the total people, the forces of democracy are strong and the forces of reaction and totalitarianism are weak. Where the state has been used as an instrument of special privilege and the welfare of the great mass of people has been disregarded, in those countries, democracy stands threatened by the growing power of reaction and totalitarianism.

Freedom and peace in the world will be made secure only to the extent that they rest on a broad foundation of economic and social justice. In the task of building that broad foundation the American economy is our strongest asset. Those blind forces of reaction in America who would lead us back down the road to so-called normalcy and commit the American economy to the economics of scarcity and special privilege, are the Cominform's most valuable allies. These same blind forces, if permitted to grow unchecked in America, will drive us again to depression and disaster as they did in 1929, and provide the Cominform with a weapon more devastating than a stock pile of H-Bombs. If we are to divert depression, war and disaster, we must prove that American democracy has the moral strength and the practical know-how to meet the threatening challenge of growing unemployment.

Mobilizing Our Resources for Abundance

We who believe in democracy must demonstrate the faith, the will and determination to mobilize our human and material resources to achieve abundance for the positive values of peace, freedom and human security as we mobilize our resources for the end of war and destruction. The H-Bomb has created a serious moral and political vacuum in the world. We must fill that vacuum by a positive program of social action geared to the advancement of basic human and democratic values. Failure on our part will permit the apostles of fear and hate to create an atmosphere of uncertainty and hysteria which will make war inevitable.

The H-Bomb did not create man's dilemma—it only served to dramatize it. Our dilemma is a reflection of the serious moral and cultural lag between man's progress in the physical sciences and his lack of comparable progress in the human and social

sciences. We have learned to split the atom but we have yet to learn to feed people when there is enough to eat in the world.

The broad humanitarian concept of the welfare state, translated into practical and tangible every day action, will create the social mechanism through which we can establish a moral balance between man's achievement in the physical and the social area. Such a welfare state government would reflect the democratic will and provide the common agency that would assure the translation of technical progress into human progress, human security and human freedom and dignity.

Both the L.I.D. and Senator Lehman have been in the forefront of the struggle to give tangible expression to the high ideals of the welfare state. I send you both my heartiest congratulations and best wishes.

DEMOCRATIC CONTROLS AND THE WELFARE STATE

The addresses appearing in the preceding pages were delivered at the 45th Anniversary Luncheon of the L.I.D. In the morning and afternoon, various aspects of the welfare state were explored by a brilliant group of speakers.

The morning Round Table discussion on "Democratic Controls under the Welfare State" presided over by Mark Starr, Chairman of the Board, L.I.D., and Educational Director of the I.L.G.W.U., was participated in by Corley Smith, Economic and Social Counsellor, U.K. Delegation to the U.N.; Dr. Eveline M. Burns of the N. Y. School of Social Work, and author of *American Social Security*; Margaret Herbison, Under-Secretary of State for Scotland; Charles Abrams, housing expert; Murray Gross, Assistant Manager, N. Y. Joint Board, Dressmakers' Unions; Professor Sterling Spero, of the Graduate Division for Training in Public Service, N.Y.U. and author of *Government As Employer*; Clarence Senior, Consultant, U.N. Latin American Economic Commission, and John Roche, Department of Political Science, Haverford College.

U. K. Representative Presents World Program for Preventing Severe Crisis

Mr. Smith, who was asked to give an outline of the proposals of the economic experts to the Social and Economic Council of the U.N., began by giving a graphic description of the chronic and heavy unemployment in his own city in Great Britain during the twenties and thirties, "where men suffered not only from insecurity and want, but led a frustrated existence in the humiliating knowledge that they were useless and unwanted."

Mr. Smith declared that Great Britain had a high level of employment

lately, but that its leaders realized that its continued full employment depended upon the world situation.

He analyzed the different types of unemployment existing in the world today— (1) "that arising from lack of resources, which is chiefly characteristic of under-developed countries, and which the United Nations is tackling under the heading of "Economic Development"; (2) "structural unemployment—seasonal and casual unemployment; local or regional unemployment due to insufficient mobility of labor from one industry to another, one place to another; and (3), and by far the most important, that which is due to the insufficiency and instability of effective demand and which leads to cyclical depressions."

To deal with the third type of joblessness, the committee of experts urged that each nation announce its full employment targets, its financial, investment, production, wage, price, and anti-inflation programs, and its procedures for implementing such policies. The committee likewise urged that the nations take international action to eliminate the present disequilibrium in world trade and to create a stable flow of international investment.

Dr. Burns Urges a Strengthened Social Security System

Dr. Eveline M. Burns, expert on social insurance, then dealt with next steps in the expansion of the social security system.

Discussing the system of social insurance, she declared that we have only begun to make use of what is a major social measure. To strengthen that measure, we must do several things:

First, we must extend the principle of social security to include additional risks. So far it covers the loss of income due to old age, to the death of a bread winner, and, to a limited extent, to unemployment. The principle should likewise be extended to the field of health insurance.

In the second place, the system of social insurance should be made available to all people. Even the old age pensions system covers only a part of those who should be covered.

Thirdly, benefits under social insurance schemes should be made adequate enough to make possible a minimum standard of living.

In the fourth place, we must give attention to our methods of financing the social insurance system. Do we wish to throw the cost entirely on employers or workers? In the future, a basic question is how far we want the private companies to participate in the financing of insurance.

Laborite Explains British Social Security System

Miss Margaret Herbison, Labor M.P., who had taken a flying trip to the United States, expressed her pleasure at being present at the conference, where she could learn a little more about the labor and social movements in this country.

She declared her agreement with Dr. Burns' insistence on the need for the government's taking the people into its confidence. "In our country, where we have what we might term a comprehensive social security system, we have learned that we cannot go further than the people are ready to go. Mr. Corley Smith spoke of full employment. I put full employment in social security at the head of the list."

Miss Herbison outlined British social security acts—the *Family Allowance Act*, which provides for the granting of 5 shillings a week to each child in the family after the first, and for certain free services; the *National Insurance Act*, which covers sickness, old age, death benefit and almost every contingency which renders the wage earner unable to earn a living; the act dealing with *Supplementary Allowances*, as in the case of the miners; the *National Assistance Act*, which covers all those that do not fall within the scope of the *National Insurance Act*, and the *National Health Act*.

Miss Herbison explained that the general insurance system was financed by workers, employers and government, and that almost all of the money spent in providing health service and family allowances came from taxation.

The speaker declared that the Labor government was seeking to make these allowances as democratic as possible. Those on hospital boards were appointed for a term of three years, one-third going off each year. The medical association and the nurses were asked to make nominations. Appointments were made by the Minister of Health from the nominees. "Every attempt is made to have all interests represented on these boards. We want to use all of the valuable information which doctors, nurses and other experts have in the running of the hospitals. Our executive councils are chosen in the same democratic way."

The British Laborite declared that in Great Britain the public health service takes care of everyone regardless of income. The middle classes, he declared, have received the greatest benefits, since they were not covered in time of sickness before. "The fact that we have to spend so much on eye glasses, dentures, etc., shows how badly off most people were before the introduction of the service."

The speaker concluded by declaring that freedom from fear in Great Britain had been greatly enhanced as a result of its social security system.

Abrams Warns of Attempts to Pervert Welfare Plans

Returning to welfare measures in this country, Charles Abrams, housing expert, and former counsel for the New York City Housing Authority, warned the audience that, unless social reformers were careful, social legislation initiated on behalf of the underprivileged might be diverted to serve the ends of special privilege groups. He cited as an example the public housing legislation. The public housers won a victory in 1949 in securing appropriations for public housing. The realty lobbyists, however, immediately got busy and are now attempting, in the first place, "to prevent the local authorities from proceeding with the public housing program," and, as a second step, "are attempting in the national arena to divert federal aid to housing to their own beneficiaries—the private speculators."

The result is that, in many cases, in the name of the public, "government is subsidizing the entrepreneurs, making it unnecessary for them to put up any equity capital, and guaranteeing them against risk."

"Curiously, the strongest advocate of the socialization process is that great enemy of communism and socialism, Senator McCarthy who, in 1948, proposed a vast program under which the federal government would insure yields in housing, grant vast income tax exemptions, federal guarantees of risk and other

subsidies to real estate speculators. He proposed that private enterprise take over the government's social function.

"The real 'socialization in housing' is taking place today not from the left but from the right. And it is taking place in the name of social reform. This 'socialization' has occurred through the Federal Housing Administration under which practically all of the rental housing is built with no investment by the entrepreneur through the guarantee of mortgages by the federal government. The speculator no longer has to have the stake nor the risk that lies at the foundation of the private enterprise system.

"There are several important lessons that liberals may learn from the public housing program to date. Social reforms are not always carried out in accordance with the wishes of their well-meaning advocates. An instance of this is the urban redevelopment and slum clearance programs under which thousands of minority families throughout the country are being shifted, hemmed in, shunted about, crowded in with others, ousted from slums and pushed about like pariahs under the popular labels of "slum clearance," 'public works', and 'urban redevelopment.'"

"Precedents established by social reformers are too often perverted to divert the original purpose of the reform and often become instruments of oppression. The whole impact of housing today should be to build on vacant land, expand the housing supply and postpone slum clearance. Instead, the housing program in many cities is being used to tear down houses occupied by members of minorities and intensify the housing famine.

"What is needed today is not only a group to proffer better housing but to protect the program once it has been attained. Unless the social reformers are prepared to guard the program against perversion, they may awaken to find that what they have produced is not a social reform but another opportunity for private ventures to cash in on the public purse in the name of social reform."

Spero Discusses Labor Under Public Ownership

Coming to the question of democratic labor relations under public ownership and control, Sterling Spero of N. Y. University set forth certain dangers that must be avoided. He declared that today there were more than 6 million men and women, one-tenth of the nation's labor force, who earned their livings in the service of the state. "This is a number equal to all the railroad employees, all the coal miners, all the auto workers, and all the steel workers in the land with all the doctors, lawyers, dentists and engineers thrown in for full measure.

"Since 1930 the number of government employees has nearly doubled. Today the City of New York alone employs half again as many persons as did the entire federal government when the civil service system was organized less than one life-time ago."

Many public administrators take the view that the state's position as a holder of ultimate authority in the community leads it to claim special consideration as an employer. "In practice these special considerations add up to limitations on the state's employees to exercise rights both as workers and as citizens which the state itself guarantees to the rest of the community. These

restrictions affect the right to affiliate with outside labor organizations, the right to strike, and the right to engage in political activity."

"That some justification can be found for the restrictions on public workers is undeniable. That these restrictions create a serious threat to liberty is equally true. The dilemma admits of no simple solution. The problem is a phase of the perennial conflict between liberty and authority in a free society. The very existence of such a society depends upon the maintenance of freedom and authority in delicate balance. The preservation of this balance depends in turn upon mutual restraint on the part of government as an employer, on the one hand, and its employees, on the other, so as to create employer-employee relationships such as those which exist in T.V.A. rather than those which exist in the N. Y. Transit System."

Gross Urges Enlightened Labor Relations in Welfare State

Murray Gross, of the L.L.G.W.U., continuing the discussion of labor aspects of the Welfare State, urged that rights of labor be preserved and strengthened in the welfare state.

"Industrial relations within the welfare state [he declared], must be on the highest level. There must be no infringement on the right to strike. Collective bargaining must be free and voluntary, the government helping out as an interested mediator rather than a coercer. It is understood that industry in the United States has reached a very high level of production. We are no longer a pioneering country. A worker no longer looks forward to a few years of employment for the purpose of saving up a few dollars and buying a little business for himself, nor does the present day worker look to the West as a place where a "Gold Rush" will soon open up new vistas for him.

"The modern worker knows that he is employed in an industry that is to yield him a livelihood and he is interested in protecting that livelihood, securing his position as much as possible, and when he is no longer able to work, he wants to be able to look forward to some security in the form of pensions and health benefits.

"To acquire this security the modern worker turns more and more to his union for guidance and through his union for political action so that we may look forward now to a unionism that will battle for the security of the worker on the industrial field through collective bargaining and, at the same time, branch out into the political field more and more to guarantee that the gains obtained via the collective bargaining process are not nullified by big business spokesman in the form of a Taft-Hartley Act. In other words, the welfare state pre-supposes a labor relations built upon confidence, mutuality and understanding. The Taft-Hartley law is a sample of the opposite and a forerunner of a police state."

Senior Emphasizes Democratic Participation

Clarence Senior drew attention to the need for democratic participation in determination of policies in organizations functioning in the welfare state.

"I want to address myself to the same question that has just been discussed by Mr. Spero, in a way that it is not approached in such meetings [he declared]. There has been in the general Socialist movement since the

beginning, a split in the middle between those who believe in doing something *to or for* people, and those who believe in *letting people do it for themselves*. Most of the people who believe in doing something *to* people have become Communists, and the rest continue in the Socialist tradition.

"We believe in people's organizations—trade unions, cooperatives, etc. There are some things that man needs besides security. He must feel he belongs to something and is an important part of it; that he is participating in something—is the well-rounded human being. We need a democratic will infusing these people's organizations, and we might start with the trade unions, the family, the schools, the churches."

Need for Studying Types of Public Administration Stressed

That it is necessary for us to give a great deal of thought to the best type of control under public ownership, with a view of rendering it democratic in its nature, was emphasized by John Roche of Haverford, the next Round Table participant.

Mr. Roche declared that, in his viewpoint, the old conception of workers' control has not usually worked out, and runs counter to our conception of planning. The setting up of "non-political" public corporations has merits, but its danger lies in the fact that, once men are appointed to the Board for a given term of service, they can usually only be dismissed as a result of extreme charges, and when the President attempts to establish a policy, he finds it difficult to do so if they oppose him.

Then there are the political controls with clear lines of responsibility. The development in public organizations of such clear lines of responsibility constitutes the best method of reconciling democracy and highly complex economic controls and mechanisms.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE WELFARE STATE

The final panel of the 45th Anniversary Conference of the League dealt with "Human Rights and the Welfare State". Murray Baron, public relations consultant, and chairman of the Manhattan Liberal party, presided.

Mr. Baron, after giving an excellent survey of the present situation, introduced Dr. Bryn J. Hovde, President of the New School for Social Research, and Vice-President of the League for Industrial Democracy, to speak on Human Rights and Education.

Bryn Hovde on Social Education

Dr. Hovde declared that education, human rights and the welfare state were all parts of the same thing. "We need education for its own sake and as a tool with which we can develop the spiritual aspects, as well as the material aspects of our lives. It is both an end and a means to an end."

Dr. Hovde declared that, for one thing, we had to establish equality of opportunity in education. Hence it is necessary to provide Federal aid, "so as to assure equal opportunity at the levels of elementary and secondary schools, the most basic kind of education, the kind referred to in the Declaration of Human Rights.

"We also have the problem of equality of opportunity in our colleges and universities. Society must decide how many will have the advantage of a four year college education."

The speaker, referring to private education, declared that it also was a human right, but must justify its expense and its right to support. "That does not mean state support. Private education should get no public support. It must appeal to private sources only.

"The other great task in education is that relating to the ideology of education in the democratic welfare state. There should, of course, be diversity in education. However, it is essential that we strive to agree upon certain basic and positive objectives. The democratic ideology must be a positive, conscious ideology. It must not be nihilism or cynicism.

"It need not be repeated that, in our educational process, there must be respect for the individual as a person, without distinction as to race or religion or national origin. Educators must accept changes as one of the modes of life's rational and orderly change. Educators must emphasize also both individual and social responsibility, and responsibility toward the world. And we should not measure success in terms of dollars."

Dr. Hovde concluded by declaring that democratic education has nothing to do with "cultural imperialism." It should recognize that other peoples have their contributions to make. And one of the best ways of helping in democratic world education is by supporting UNESCO, which is dedicated to the advancement of world culture and science.

Feinberg on Labor's Rights

Israel Feinberg, Vice-President of the I.L.G.W.U., and a member of the Board of the L.L.D., began his address by a definition of human rights.

"Human rights [he declared] embrace civil liberties—freedom of speech, press and religion. But human rights also include those measures that insure the dignity and worth of the individual—his ability to hold up his head, unafraid that approaching old age, sickness or unemployment will reduce him to a pauper dependent on public or private charity. It should include his right to leisure in which to enjoy the spiritual and cultural aspects of life.

"Thus, the welfare state, by making democracy effective for all, advances human rights. Security in old age is a right of all human beings and should not be limited to a few wealthy people. The right to work, when one wants to, is a fundamental human right which the state can advance by taking the necessary actions to promote full employment. The welfare state should mean the use of society's power with a view of securing a loftier life for all the individuals who comprise society.

"Some fear that the advancement of welfare threatens human rights by concentrating too much power in the hands of the state. But history hardly agrees with their analysis. The failure of democracy to act swiftly and force-

fully enough to promote the general welfare has led to the triumph of totalitarianism. Among the causes of Hitler's capture of state power was the failure of the Weimar Republic to take effective action against economic difficulties that beset the German people.

"Still, the notion persists that the welfare state is a halfway house to dictatorship. But have you lost any liberty because the United States adopted the Social Security Act in 1936? Do you feel less free because you can collect unemployment compensation if you are laid off the job?

"There are threats to human rights, but they come from the warfare, not the welfare, state. Inadequate pensions, with their denial of dignity to the aged—that is a threat to human rights. Rising unemployment—that is a threat to human rights. The measures we take to correct these denials of the basic human rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are the tests of democracy.

"It is the labor movement which can and must lead this struggle. Our history is resplendent with dramatic incidents of how labor has led the fight to advance liberty. The Workingmen's parties of a century and a quarter ago fought for free schools for all children. The battles for shorter hours, abolition of imprisonment for debt, and the preservation of the rights of free speech, press and assembly, have always found labor at the forefront.

"Today we must supplement inadequate old age pensions by securing through collective bargaining retirement funds, which make industry responsible for its superannuated workers. In the absence of governmental responsibility, labor must gain health funds for its members. Labor, in effect, must become the vanguard of the welfare state.

"But welfare measures alone don't go to the heart of the problem. Labor must lead an attack on the private monopoly power of the giant corporations. It must seek a redistribution of income so that the working people have sufficient purchasing power to halt the drift to depression. All this would require further government interventions into our economic life. To see to it that the necessary programs are carried out democratically, labor should insist on a voice in formulating and administering them. Labor should be represented on management councils, whether the ownership be private or public—that would be real industrial democracy.

"Scanning the world horizon, we see that welfare states are being built in Britain, Scandinavia, and Israel under Labor and Socialist regimes. Would anyone contend that the Swedes have lost their freedom, or the British, theirs? No. Scandinavia, Britain, Israel are the living proof that the state apparatus can be used democratically to achieve democratic ends.

"American labor would do well to study the achievements of its comrades abroad in the fight for democracy. It should, at all times, practice as well as preach democracy, for an institution that tolerates undemocratic practices within its own house cannot be very effective in promoting democracy outside. Of paramount importance is the fact that American labor must unite! The prospects for this now seem the brightest in the past decade and a half, and we can't afford to allow the opportunity to fade away.

"Working together, American labor has already made great strides in uniting with the free trade unions of every country to promote democracy

throughout the world. The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, representing 50,000,000 workers from Bombay to Brussels to Boston, seeks to promote the human rights of Bread, Freedom, and Peace.

"We in the United States must aid our brethren to resist the totalitarianism that denies that human beings have rights. At the same time, we must lead our own people in an independent movement which will be concerned with expanding human rights and social welfare and not with shouting hosannas for the largely nonexistent private enterprise, while preserving the economic privileges of the few. It is our task to unite the American people—workers, farmers, and small businessmen—to march forward to freedom and security."

Totalitarianism vs. Welfare State

Toni Sender, Representative of the World Confederation of Free Trade Unions to the U.N. Economic and Social Council, took G.D.H. Cole's definition of the welfare state as a "society in which an assured minimum standard of living and of opportunity becomes the possession of everyone." She declared that no group objects to all kinds of interference by the state. The question is, what groups should receive benefits as a result of such interference, and what kind of benefits should they be? Without public intervention, our society would have no way of guarding against collapse, waste, inefficiency and human suffering.

"There is much evidence to show that economic insecurity is the strongest factor which endangers our freedom; it may lead to an urge to seek a totalitarianism—as an 'escape from freedom.'"

Miss Sender scouted the idea that *laissez faire* and *free-enterprise* systems were necessarily synonyms of a democratic order. Countries like Portugal or Argentina possess to a large extent a "free enterprise" system, but that does not mean that they have a free democracy. "All totalitarian regimes place the stress on production at any price, while the free world places the emphasis on the human being—on the dignity of man as applied to all groups in society, while also recognizing the need for the expansion of production.

"The argument that the welfare state is inefficient and destroys freedom [she declared] is contradicted by facts. The clearest example is Sweden. The high prices charged by private industry led to the setting up of consumers and producers cooperatives, with the result that, in competition with the so-called Free Enterprise sector, the prices were brought down substantially. Enterprise does not always require the stimulus of the profit motive. State-owned utilities can produce considerable revenues. The profits from the Telephone and Telegraph industries in Sweden go a long way toward maintaining the State's social services.

"While it is true that the mentality of our generation is still influenced by incentives of the competitive Free Enterprise order (which is based on pecuniary returns), there are signs in Sweden, in England and even here in the USA that new incentives are developing. They are such as the satisfaction that comes from one's best contribution to the welfare of society, the esteem that the citizens hold for those who work for the common good. That men—even in USA capitalist society—are moved by other motives than monetary returns, is shown by the fact that leading government officials stay in govern-

ment service, although they can obtain much higher monetary rewards in private enterprise.

"In recognition of the intimate connection of maintenance of freedom and increasing welfare of the people, the United Nations' Charter, in its Article 55, stresses the duty for the nations to promote:

"a. Higher standards of living, full employment and conditions of economic and social progress and development;

"b. Solutions of international economic, social, health and related problems and international cultural and educational cooperation; and

"c. Universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.

"This idea has also found expression in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. However, in the draft Covenant of Human Rights as it now stands (it is still under discussion at this moment before the Human Rights Commission), no mention is made of the most essential economic and social rights. This is a setback which should not be permitted to be accepted. Freedom and social progress stand or fall together—the welfare state is in truth a most efficient means of avoiding the police state."

Thomas on Civil Liberties

The final speaker of the afternoon session was Norman Thomas, Socialist leader and Chairman of the Post War World Council, who dealt with "Civil Liberties and the Welfare State."

Mr. Thomas declared that progress had been made in the field of civil liberties, but that there had been disquieting signs in the last few months. He referred to the refusal by the student court at the University of Texas to allow students to vote on a referendum to secure student opinion on admitting qualified Negroes to graduate schools. Within the trade unions, in the growth of which he rejoiced, there was "grave danger that, under cover of a fight against Communism—which, properly conducted, is legitimate and necessary in our unions—certain leaders may attempt to fasten a kind of fascist dictatorship of their own on the unions."

"At Washington and in some of the state capitals, we suffer from a rash of stupid and reactionary proposals," such as the Mundt-Ferguson-Nixon bill, which would, if enacted, "jeopardize all of our liberty while doing nothing important to stop Communism."

The set backs in civil liberties Mr. Thomas blamed on "the whole Communist technique of conspiratorial deceit," on the reactionaries who exploit the situation caused by Communists, "partly to cover their own bad records by a boisterous patriotism," and on the Republican party, which is trying to find itself an issue in "socialism vs. liberty."

In opposition to the present hysteria, Mr. Thomas declared, "there has been a singular and deplorable lack of liberal leadership in the Administration, or from able liberals who sit in the Senate." He called attention to the dangerous language which the liberals in the Senate scarcely objected to, under which a person who "advocates and follows the principles of any political and economic system of philosophy directed toward the destruction of free competitive enter-

prise and the revolutionary overthrow of representative government will be barred from the country."

In conclusion, Mr. Thomas declared: "When all is said and done, I am inclined to think that we shall continue to fight a losing battle for civil liberties unless and until we can make a beginning of getting out from under the shadow of the cold war and the grip of the army economy. The psychology of the arms race is not the psychology of freedom. Liberty as well as peace and plenty require us to appeal for universal disarmament under the supervision and enforcement of a strengthened United Nations."

ANNIVERSARY GREETINGS TO THE L.I.D.

Greetings From Abroad

From the Fabian Society of Great Britain:

Heartiest congratulations to the League for Industrial Democracy on its Forty-fifth Birthday. The work that it has done, particularly in encouraging students in the many Universities of the United States to take an intelligent and active interest in the democratic solution of social problems, has been invaluable. Today it is more urgent than ever that the idea of academic freedom should be preserved and strengthened and that the youth on both sides of the Atlantic should be encouraged and trained to play their part in the coming welfare state.

We send our best wishes for the health and long life of the League, and particularly of its Executive Director, our friend, Harry Laidler.

C. D. H. and Margaret Cole

From the British Labor Party:

It is with very great pleasure that we take this opportunity of sending a message of goodwill and congratulations to the League for Industrial Democracy upon the completion of forty-five years of fruitful pioneering work in the cause of social justice and true democracy.

We should like on this occasion to place on record our warm appreciation of what progressive democracy everywhere owes to the work of the United States labor unions in forming the American attitude to the outside world, as expressed in the recent enlightened and generous aid programmes.

Best wishes for the continued success of your great work of social and democratic education.

Morgan Phillips, *Secretary*

From Dr. William Drees, Minister-President of the Netherlands:

On the occasion of the 45th Anniversary of the L.I.D., may I congratulate you on the great aim of your society, "Education for increasing democracy in our economic, political and cultural life", and on the accomplishment of your League during so many years. I express my best wishes for your discussion on "Freedom and the Welfare State", and on the future of your work.

William Drees

From André Philip, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, France:

The L.I.D. has been one of the foremost educational institutions in America engaged in the promotion of an understanding of the social problems of the day, and in the task of inspiring the country's youth to engage in genuinely democratic and social action.

André Philip

From Hon. Walter Nash,

former Deputy Prime Minister, New Zealand; former Chairman, I.L.O.:

May I congratulate the League on its Forty-fifth Anniversary and commend its splendid work. An educated democracy alone can solve the problems of the years ahead.

I am pleased that you plan to consider the subject of "Freedom and the Welfare State". Whatever our individual views may be as to the particular form government must take to achieve democratic freedom, all thinking citizens will agree that freedom is indivisible and that poverty anywhere menaces prosperity everywhere.

It was a great American who said that government cannot endure half slave and half free. Neither can a world of people half hungry and half well-fed be permanent. New Zealand has over many years built up a welfare state where none are hungry and all are free. As one of its citizens, I congratulate the United States on its magnificent contribution in goods, energy, goodwill and inspiration (particularly during the past decade) to the objective of a united world in which all men and women may live in democratic freedom and in which a first charge on all the wealth created shall be the care of the aged, the children, the ailing and all those engaged in the production of essential utilities.

I join with you in honoring Senator Lehman for his outstanding work for American democracy and the underprivileged people of the world.

Walter Nash

From M. J. Coldwell, M.P., National President of the C.C.F. of Canada:

The League for Industrial Democracy, in its forty-five years of service to the workers in the United States, has been an inspiration to those of us who are not citizens of your great country. We have indeed, from time to time, endeavored to establish organizations with similar aims. My own political Party—The Co-operative Commonwealth Federation of Canada—owes much to the League for Social Reconstruction which assisted us so notably in formulating the Regina Manifesto, which is still the basic document of our movement. The inspiration for our League for Social Reconstruction came very largely from the League for Industrial Democracy and the Fabian Society, whose aims were similar in so many respects. May I couple with this my deep appreciation of the advice, encouragement and aid which your Executive Director, Dr. Harry W. Laidler, has given us during the past twenty years.

Please accept, therefore, my best wishes for your future service to the nation, and an expression of hope that the association we have had in the past may be continued and strengthened in the future.

M. J. Coldwell

From Premier Thomas C. Douglas, Saskatchewan, Canada:

May I take this opportunity to congratulate the League for Industrial Democracy on the occasion of its 45th Anniversary. Since 1905, when Jack London, Upton Sinclair and a few friends founded the League, it has, through its stimulating efforts, been a profound influence on modern political development. Through its researches, lectures, broadcasts and publications, the League has helped to build a stronger democracy by bringing the modern social and economic problems before the people and before potential leaders of the people.

Democracy can only be government of, by and for the people when it is based on a firm foundation of education. Although modern government is a complicated mechanism, it should be directed toward the goal of welfare for all the people. For that goal to be properly attained, the voice of the people must be an intelligent voice and their vote must be a considered vote.

Education and democracy are then the inseparable pillars of our civilization. May I convey my congratulations for your present achievement and my sincere best wishes for your future success.

Thomas C. Douglas

From Lady Dorothy Archibald, Labor Member, London County Council:

I was greatly pleased to receive the letter of your President and Hon. President, giving news of the forthcoming celebrations of your Forty-fifth Anniversary. At a time like this when the forces of reaction are so strong in so many parts of the world, it is all the more important to know that the work of the League for Industrial Democracy goes on. I have come to the conclusion that there are no short cuts to progress; but that the long and arduous road of education is the only certain way. This is the road you have followed for forty-five years and, knowing your country a little, I feel that your work is as necessary as is the work of the Fabian Society in this country.

When I was directing a Fabian Summer School this last year, I had the great pleasure of having several young Americans as students. Their contribution to the School was outstanding and I was happy to discover that they were members of the L.I.D.

It is my profound hope that the field of your work may extend every year so that the younger generation in America may receive an education in real democracy. Every good wish for the future.

Dorothy Archibald

Professor Louis de Brouckere, Brussels, Belgium:

May I congratulate the League on its magnificent accomplishments during the last 45 years.

We are living in a dangerous and difficult epoch and each day it becomes increasingly evident that we will escape the perils that menace our civilization only by marching forward toward an ever more progressive and integrated democracy. One of the great tasks before us is to help to coordinate the work of the growing army of trade unionists, cooperators, political and cultural leaders who are devoting themselves to the task of planning for increasing abundance and democracy. A comprehensive inquiry should be made of what

is being accomplished everywhere in behalf of economic democracy by these various groups. The results of such an inquiry would greatly increase the effectiveness of the movement for social change. I know of no institution in the world better able to initiate this inquiry than the L.I.D.

Louis de Brouckere

From Einar Gerhardsen, Prime Minister of Norway:

Please accept from Norway our heartiest congratulations on work well done and best wishes for continued progress in the vital field of democratic development.

Einar Gerhardsen

Greetings From Home

From Eleanor Roosevelt:

I hope you will have a successful conference and will stress the need for making democracy work for all people as a form of government and a way of life.

Eleanor Roosevelt

From U. S. Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, from Minnesota:

I have already publicly and on many occasions expressed my high admiration and respect for the educational activities of the League for Industrial Democracy. I have since my days as a student known of its energetic activities in behalf of economic, political and cultural democracy. Its effect throughout all phases of American life is pronounced. To you, to your associates, to your membership, and to that humble and yet profound captain, Harry Laidler, my greetings and best wishes for a successful Anniversary luncheon. My greetings also to George Meaney and to Walter Reuther.

I also wish to pay my respects to the League for Industrial Democracy for its wisdom in paying tribute in the citation of my new colleague but your old friend, Senator Herbert Lehman. Herbert Lehman is one of the great men in American public life—a humanitarian, a keen intellect and a truly wise man, who has enriched the Congress of the United States by his presence and by his service. It is always with a warm feeling of friendship and deep respect that I think of the gift which the people of the State of New York have given the nation by sending Herbert Lehman to the Senate of the United States.

Hubert H. Humphrey

From Congressman Jacob K. Javits, N. Y. :

During all its history, the L.I.D. has been a mighty force fighting for fundamental human and ethical values in economic and social affairs and inspired through the years by Harry Laidler's love of the best in man. Congratulations to Senator Lehman, the recipient of your citation. Best wishes for a long future of fruitful service as distinguished as the past.

Jacob K. Javits

From Dr. Harry A. Overstreet, Philosopher; author of "The Mature Mind":

I have known and been associated with the League for Industrial Democracy to these many years. In all those years my admiration has been high and my confidence steadfast. The work the League has done—particularly in the colleges—has been deeply needed and grandly done. May I salute the League on this, its Forty-fifth anniversary and wish it more years of fine courage and wisdom.

Harry A. Overstreet

From Upton Sinclair, Founder of the I.S.S., predecessor of L.I.D.:

Great oaks from little acorns grow! Little did I dream, early in 1905, that the small chap from Wesleyan University, barely of age, was going to stick on the precarious job for forty-five years—and how many brands he was going to snatch from the burning! All you friends of Harry Laidler, give him a cheer; and then take out your fountain pens and write a check for the L.I.D. to save some more of the bright young minds in American colleges.

Upton Sinclair

From Dr. Robert Morss Lovett, former President, L.I.D.:

I recall my own close connection with the organization with unalloyed satisfaction. I particularly would note the happy fortune of the League in securing the services of Harry Laidler as Executive Director early in its history, and the firmness with which it has held to its original function of education, never more necessary than now. I send my best wishes for the future of the League and its wise Director.

Robert Morss Lovett

From Rev. John Haynes Holmes,

Minister Emeritus, Community Church, N. Y., Vice-President, L.I.D.:

I regret my absence from the Forty-fifth Anniversary celebration of the League for Industrial Democracy. Few organizations deserve such whole-hearted acclaim as the League has so richly earned. It has led the way and kept the faith. What a record it has written!

Many good friends and comrades have contributed to the League's achievements through the years. Above them all stands Harry Laidler. If this man were not so confoundedly modest, we would have hailed him long since as one of the great public leaders and beneficent public servants of our time. May the years still awaiting him be many and happy.

John Haynes Holmes

From Hugo Ernst, President, Hotel and Union Restaurant

Employees International:

The L.I.D. has accomplished much good in promoting social and economic justice for the American people. It is my hope that it will be able to continue in its role of leadership for many years to come.

Hugo Ernst

From Vida D. Scudder,

Professor Emeritus, Wellesley College; Vice-President, L.I.D.:

From the early days of the L.I.D.—indeed, if I am not mistaken, from the time of its foundation as the I.S.S.—I have been a member. Among the many organizations to which I belong, none has given me more satisfaction. It has been steadily marked by the (alas) unusual union of sanity and illumined foresight. May it long continue, especially in educational circles and activities, to serve the cause of enlightened social justice to which it is pledged.

Vida D. Scudder

OTHERS SENDING GREETINGS
and
SERVING AS SPONSORS

Among others sending greetings or serving as sponsors, in addition to the L.I.D. Board of Directors were: Premier Einar Gerhardsen of Norway, Norman Angell, Stuart Chase, Helen Gahagan Douglas, Senator Paul H. Douglas, David Dubinsky, William Green, Quincy Howe, William H. Kilpatrick, Henry Morganthau, Jr., Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., Kurt Schumacker, Mary K. Simkhovitch, Channing H. Tobias, Jerry Voorhis, Frank Zeidler.

Partial List of Luncheon Sponsors
(in addition to Board of Directors and those above)

Leonard D. Abbott	Joseph Breslaw	Michael M. Davis
Charles Abrams	Leonard Bright	Robert Delson
Mrs. I. S. Adlerblum	Philip Bradley	Elcanor Deming
Luigi Antonini	Paul F. Brissenden	M. Desenberg
Willard E. Atkins	Ernest W. Burgess	George B. De Silver
George E. Axtelle	John P. Burke	Mary A. Dingham
Hope S. Bagger	Gertrude C. Bussey	Babette Deutsch
Elizabeth F. Baker	Mrs. Henry W. Cannon	Charles T. Douds
Roger Baldwin	Maurice S. Calman	Arnold Dresden
Nicholas Balint	Harry J. Carman	Evelyn Dubrow
Benj. W. Barkas	Warren B. Catlin	John F. Duffy, Jr.
Marion P. Bassett	Miles E. Carey	Louis Dworkin
Joseph Baskin	N. Chanin	Sherwood Eddy
Helen Marston Beardsley	August Claessens	Ethan E. Edloff
Hubert Park Beck	Evans Clark	Annie M. Elish
Abraham Beckerman	Clara Clayman	Christopher Emmett
Arnold Beichman	Felix S. Cohen	Ethel S. Epstein
John C. Bennett	Fannia M. Cohen	Henriette C. Epstein
Sam Berger	Marti Cohen	Hugo Ernst
Simon Berlin	Max Cohen	Charles W. Ervin
Charles Bernstein	Eleanor G. Coit	Harold U. Faulkner
Mary McLeod Bethune	William Collins	Martin Feldman
Andrew J. Biemiller	John D. Connors	George Field
Alfred M. Bingham	Cara Cook	John A. Fitch
Jonathan B. Bingham	Lillian Casper	Irving H. Flamm
Algernon Black	Flora J. Cooke	Harry Fleischman
Elinore Black	Lewis Corey	Walter Frank
Brand Blanshard	George S. Counts	Zachary L. Freedman
Jacob Blaustein	Philip W. V. Cox	Esther Friedman
William E. Bohn	Frank H. Crosswaith	Isabelle B. Friedman
Hyman H. Bookbinder	Muriel J. Cumberbatch	Samuel H. Friedman
C. E. Boyd	Max D. Danish	Mabel Durham Fuller
Rae Brandstein	Ben Davidson	David Gingold

LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY, INC.
112 East 19th Street, New York 3, N. Y.

Object:

"Education for Increasing Democracy in Our Economic,
Political and Cultural Life."

NATIONAL OFFICERS AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Honorary President
JOHN DEWEY

President
NATHANIEL M. MINKOFF

M. J. COLOWELL
ELISABETH GILMAN
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Vice Presidents
BRYN J. HOVDE
FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL
ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN

VIDA D. SCUDDER
BERTHA POOLE WEYL

Executive Director
HARRY W. LAIDLER

Treasurer
JOSEPH SCHLOSSBERG

Chairman of Board
MARK STARR

Field Secretary
JOHN K. BENEDICT

Student Secretary
MILDRED PERLMAN

Student Field Secretary
JAMES FARMER

Board of Directors

Fern Babcock
Jack Barbash
Murray Baron
Arnold Beichman
Daniel Bell
Robert Bendiner
Nelson Bengston
Leroy Bowman
Bjarne Braatoy
Wallace J. Campbell
J. Henry Carpenter
John L. Childs
Albert Sprague Coolidge
George F. Cranmore
Maurice P. Davidson
Max Delson
Samuel Dewitt
Kermit Eby
Samuel Eubanks
Israel Feinberg
Louis Fischer
Isabelle Friedman

Ephraim Frisch
Benjamin A. Gebiner
Louis P. Goldberg
J. King Gordon
Murray Gross
Charles Grossman
Adolph Held
Sidney Hertzberg
John Paul Jones
Loula D. Lasker
Abraham Lefkowitz
Alfred Baker Lewis
Marx Lewis
Abraham Miller
Broadus Mitchell
Benjamin Naumoff
S. L. Newman
Morris Novik
Jacob Panken
Herbert W. Payne
Orlie Pell
Eliot Pratt

Carl Rachlin
Carl Raushenbush
Victor G. Reuther
John Roche
George Ross
Harry Rubin
Stanley Rutenberg
Clarence Senior
Theodore Shapiro
Max Sherover
Boris Shishkin
Sterling Spero
George Sireator
Louis Stulberg
Norman Thomas
Ashley L. Totten
Frank N. Trager
L. Metcalfe Walling
Pearl Willen
Norman Williams, Jr.
William Withers
Theresa Wolfson

Clara Goldman
Patrick E. Gorman
Samuel Gottlieb
Harry Greenberg
Benjamin B. Greenberg
Arthur Greenstciu
William Haber
Robert L. Hale
Robert Halpern
Franklin P. Hall
Robert Halpern
Samuel L. Hamilton
S. Ralph Harlow
Donald Harrington
Shelby M. Harrison
E. A. Havelock
Eduard Heimmann
James Henle
Daniel W. Hoan
Julius Hochman
Loris Hollander
Sidney Hollander
Sidney Hook
Pryns Hopkins
Harry Paxton Howard
B. W. Huebsch
Louis Hyman
F. Ernest Johnson
Samuel Guy Inman
Stanley M. Isaacs
Mrs. Henry Itleson
Gaudner Jackson
Anthony Jakubiszyn
William Jansen
J. K. Javits
Ephim H. Jeshurim
Alexander Kahn
H. M. Kallen
H. V. Kaltenborn
Benj. Kaplan
Fritz Kaufmann
Dorothy Kenyon
Charles H. Kerrigan
Emil Kesselring
Joseph Kessler
Anthony H. King
Isadore Korta
Charles Kreindler
Nicholas Kurtzman
Lucy Robins Lang
Layle Lane
Louis E. Langer
John A. Lapp
Joseph P. Lash
Harold D. Lasswell
John Howland Lathrop
Albert Lauterbach
Algernon Lee
Sol Levitas
Matthew M. Levy
John L. Lewine
Richard A. Lindblad
Johanna M. Lindlof

James Lipsig
Sara Lowe
John Lyons
Charles A. Madison
Elizabeth S. Magee
Julius Manson
Gabriel R. Mason
Mrs. Edgar Mayer
Arthur G. McDowell
Ernest O. Melby
Grace Mendelsohn
Darwin J. Meserole
Annie Nathan Meyer
Etta Meyer
Frieda S. Miller
Copal Mintz
E. Molisani
William P. Moutague
Mrs. John F. Moors
R. Morgan
Russell M. Moss
Amicus Most
Abraham J. Multer
Alonzo F. Myers
James Myers
Ernest Nagel
Isidore Nagler
Jerome Nathanson
Louis Nelson
Henry Neumann
Reinhold Niebuhr
Daniel Nisnavitz
Herbert R. Northrup
Mervin E. Oakes
Samuel Orr
H. A. Overstreet
Ira J. Palestine
Nathaniel Peffer
Norman Perelman
Frances Perry
Rose Pesotta
William Pickens
Louis H. Pink
Alice K. Pollitzer
Joseph M. Pomarlen
Paul R. Porter
Adam C. Powell, Jr.
George D. Pratt, Jr.
A. Philip Randolph
Victor Reisel
Louis Reiss
George Rifkin
Luigi Rhea
Leonora C. Rosenfield
George Rubin
Harry Rubin
Harold S. Rugg
Helen Sahler
Irving Salert
John Nevin Sayre
Theodore Schapiro
Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.
Emil Schlesinger
Rose Schneiderman

Adelaide Schulkind
Sam Schwartz
B. M. Selekman
Bert Seidman
Joel Seidman
Isidore Shiffman
David Sigman
Mary K. Simkhovitch
Hans Simons
Rebecca C. Simonson
Upton Sinclair
J. J. Singh
John Slawson
Albert Lee Smallheiser
Matthew Smith
Winifred Smith
Abraham Snyder
Edward J. Sparling
Frank W. Spencer
Hans Staudinger
Fred M. Stein
Marvin Stelman
William Stern
Estelle M. Sternberger
N. L. Stone
Rex Stout
Ina Sugihara
Monroe Sweetland
Philip Taft
Edward Timmes
Harrison C. Thomas
Willard S. Townsend
W. N. Trainer
Leo Turbow
Joseph Tuvin
Gus Tyler
Mrs. Jerome I. Udell
F. F. Umhey
Samuel Verne
Stephen C. Vladeck
John R. Voris
Robert F. Wagner, Jr.
Morris Waldman
Richard J. Walsh
Harry Wander
Kate M. Ward
Goodwin Watson
Sam Webber
Morris Weisz
Frank H. White
Walter White
Joseph Willen
Norman Williams, Jr.
Harold P. Winchester
Anna Strunsky Walling
Noah C. A. Walter
Norman Williams, Jr.
Bertram D. Wolfe
William Wolpert
Max Zaritsky
Phil E. Zeigler
Gertrude Folks Zimand
Charles Zimmerman

The League for Industrial Democracy is a non-profit, educational organization committed to a program of "education in behalf of increasing democracy in our economic, political and cultural life."

The yearly L.I.D. dues are: Active members, \$3; Contributing members, \$5-\$10; Sustaining members, \$10 to \$100; Life members, \$100 or more. College Undergraduates, \$1

I wish to become a.....member of the L.I.D.

I hereby pledge.....toward the educational work of the League.

Name Address

SOME PAMPHLETS OF THE L. I. D.

Freedom and the Welfare State—Oscar R. Ewing, Herbert H. Lehman, George Meany, Walter Reuther, Israel Feinberg, Margaret Herbison, Norman Thomas and others	\$.25
British Labor in Government and Opposition—Harry W. Laidler25
John Dewey at Ninety25
Toward Nationalization of Industry—Harry W. Laidler25
Education and the Social Order—John Dewey15
Our Changing Industrial Incentives—Harry W. Laidler25
Canadians Find Security With Freedom—Prime Minister T. C. Douglas of Saskatchewan. Foreword by M. J. Caldwell, M.P.20
Labor Politics in U. S. A.—Mark Starr75
Labor Governments at Work—Harry W. Laidler20
Sweden's Labor Program—Tage Lindbom35
The Forward March of American Labor—Theresa Wolfson and Joseph Glazer15
A Housing Program for America—Charles Abrams25
The Atomic Age—Suicide, Slavery or Social Planning—Aaron Levinstein15
Labor Looks at Education (Inglis Harvard Lecture)—Mark Starr50
A Program for Labor and Progressives—Stuart Chase, M. J. Caldwell and others25
Canadian Progressives on the March—M. J. Caldwell, M.P.15
Recent Trends in British Trade Unions—N. Baron, and British Trade Union Congress' Interim Report on Postwar Reconstruction—A Summary15
Public Debt and Taxation in the Postwar World—William Withers15
The Third Freedom: Freedom From Want—A Symposium contributed to by Carter Goodrich, Eveline M. Burns, Nathaniel M. Minkoff, and others25
The L.I.D.—Forty Years of Education Upton Sinclair, Harry W. Laidler and many others25
Caribbean: Laboratory of World Cooperation—Devere Allen15
British Labor on Reconstruction in War and Peace15
Maximum Production: Warfare and Welfare—A Symposium15
Liberalism and Sovietism—Alfred Baker Lewis25
Labor Parties of Latin America—Robert Alexander15
What Price Telephones?—Norman Perelman15
Immigration and National Welfare—Felix S. Cohen15
New Zealand's Labor Government at Work—W. B. Sutch15
Russia—Democracy or Dictatorship?—Norman Thomas and Joel Seidman25
Mexico in Transition—Clarence Senior15
Democracy vs. Dictatorship—Norman Thomas15
Democratic Socialism—Roger Payne and Geo. W. HartmannCloth, \$1.50; Paper 1.00	
The Case for Socialism—Fred Henderson35
America's Struggle for Electric Power—John Bauer10
Toward a Farmer-Labor Party—Harry W. Laidler15
The Road Ahead—A Primer of Capitalism and a Cooperative Order Harry W. Laidler	Cloth, \$1.00; Paper .50

LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY, Inc.

112 EAST 19th STREET, NEW YORK 3, N. Y.