

look into the lives and views of the hundreds of candidates from which one must choose on election day? The only sensible type of politics is one where a party program is sacrosanct, and all members of the party pledge to work for that program if elected. In that way the voter knows *what* he is voting for, rather than just *who*. He votes for ideas rather than names. The "vote for the man" type of politics offers the voter only little choice and great confusion. It does not really involve him in political decision; it is part of the "manipulative" democracy of our conformist era. An independent party of labor would not only have a consistently liberal or radical program, but would of necessity be a different kind of party as well: it would be a "responsible" party whose voters would know in advance what they were voting for.

## VI

The purpose of a labor union is to fight against injustice. At each period in history it must find new objectives and new organizational forms to fire its membership with an idealistic *elan*. To accomplish this the leadership of labor must be able to rise above its milieu, to chart a new course. Once this happens the old, conservative union forms are immediately on the defensive. The new course charted by Peter McGuire and Samuel Gompers in 1886 swept aside the Old Knights of Labor. The new course charted by Lewis, Hillman, and the radicals in 1935 forced the AFL seriously on the defensive, and for a time threatened to engulf it. It survived only because it bent sufficiently with the winds to ride out the storm. Now, as we enter the 1960's and a historical turning point for capitalism itself, a new course of political unionism can destroy

business unionism and rehabilitate the institutionalized social unionism. The point is that no simple structural changes, adoption of ethical codes, or mechanical attempts at infusing democracy into the undemocratic sectors of the movement are enough. Business unionism can be checked only to the extent that the rank and file is involved in union affairs to act as a real countervailing power. And the rank and file can be involved only if it receives an insurgent impulse.

In the process of forging a political unionism, the movement will inevitably change its structure and impose a new moral self-discipline. As the old behavior patterns are jettisoned, radically new ones will take their place. It is impossible to blueprint the forms of tomorrow's unions but we can—tentatively—outline some of the changes.

Until the AFL, the city central bodies were the power center of the movement. Then the national unions became the power center. The centralized structure of these unions today is a halter around labor's neck. The national unions are necessary to labor to match economic power with management. But their power must be checked by the countervailing power of other labor bodies and the rank and file. To make a new turn, labor will inevitably add new bodies and alter its structure. Side by side with the national union there will evolve, on the one hand, the political labor club, and on the other, the council of unions. Thus the members of ten or fifteen local unions in various internationals that deal with Montgomery Ward would form an autonomous council to deal with the same employer. The six or eight unions at Borg-Warner—in the United Auto Workers, Steelworkers, Machinists, Allied Industrial Workers—would form a Borg-Warner council. The Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO is already taking steps in this direction. In July,