been too successful." The jobs he mentions are those of organizing the workers in the Southern United States, and of electing congressmen (again the right leaders) to office.

We should like to go further, and raise the question from a broader viewpoint, as it looms in the minds of many workers.

A united labor movement, they argue, will mean that labor will be able to accomplish much more in the form of higher wages, shorter hours, eliminating depressions, and some even go so far as to say unity will help prevent the Third World War.

Let's get the record straight. The union movement not only supports capitalism but defends it. It is not a matter of whether 14, 16, or even 25 million workers are organized into one union, but whether capitalism itself can bring further gains to the workers, and abolish depressions and wars. The socialist answer is that it cannot, and the volumes of **The Western Socialist** are filled with reasons, for those who care to find out.

Look abroad. The British workers have been organized into one union, the British Trade Union Council (BTUC) for years, but this did not prevent the unemployment of the 1920's and 1930's nor the war (and full employment!) of the 1940's, and perhaps of the 1950's. In France, up to a few years ago when the Force Ouvriere (Workers Force) dominated by the Social-Democrats broke away from the Confederation Generale du Travail (General Federation of Labor, the CGT) controlled by the Stalinists, the workers have not been able to avoid unemployment, wars, or the miseries of post-war inflation.

When the market at home and abroad has been "saturated"—and only the present war situation prevents this today — then under the profit system, the capitalists will lay off the workers. And there isn't a damned thing the unions can do about it. When world markets and colonies are threatened, the capitalists will go to war, and the workers will carry bayonets instead of lunch boxes. And there isn't a damned thing the union can do about this either.

THERE ARE DANGERS

What is more a united labor movement can even work the opposite. It can mean more dangers to organized workers and to workers everywhere. These dangers cannot be seen by well-meaning advocates of trade union unity because their thinking is obstructed by the narrowness of trade union limits.

For example, by co-mingling all organized workers into one trade union center under one set of leaders and one leader at top, this will make it easier for the labor bureaucrats to control the rank and file. Instead of several men wielding several whips, one man will wield one whip and more effectively. Nero reasoned the same when he once wished all the Christians to have one head so that he could lop them all off at one blow.

Even more dangerous would be a united labor movement which would go into (capitalist) politics on any large scale, such as the British Trade Union Council has done in England where it formed the financial and electoral support for the Labor Government. A united labor movement can more easily rally the workers to support the machinery of the capitalist state, and more quickly line up the workers to fight wars. Let us recall how John L. Lewis, United Mine Workers leader, broke with the union movement (even resigning from head of the CIO) and refused to support Roosevelt for a third term because he accused him of leading the country into the Second World War.

A divided labor movement permits a division of opinion, permits workers to take advantage of rivalries among the leaders of the various unions, whereas a united movement makes for centralization of action and of opinion.

NOT OPPOSED TO UNITY

This does not mean that the World Socialist Party is opposed to the unification of the trade union movement. As a socialist organization we do not interfere in the trade union movement. Our task is to make socialists of the workers by educating them as to the nature of capitalist society and the need for socialism. In the end the trade union millions will decide this issue, either by passively accepting the wishes of their leaders or by making their own desires known, irrespective of the leaders' will in the matter.

Whether such a united labor movement will bring fewer or greater benefits to the organized workers cannot be decided here, nor must it be. In any case, such a united movement will be limited in its efforts to defend and improve the living standards of the workers by the developments in capitalist economy not only in this country but internationally. It will be completely stymied in its efforts to eliminate wars and depressions by its continued support of the capitalist system. Indeed, as pointed out above, a united movement can become even more effective a prop of the capitalist system than it is today.

A UNITED SOCIALIST MOVEMENT

When the workers break away from support of capitalism, then it will not be a case of a united trade union movement, but of a united socialist movement. This socialist movement will for all time eliminate leadership, because workers who know and understand what they want will need no "guiding geniuses" to tell them what to do. They will **know.**

KARL FREDERICK

The Human Resources of the United States

Numerous studies have been undertaken which have revealed the wastes that have and are taking place. The conservation of such resources as forests, soil, iron ore, petroleum, etc. has been of considerable concern these many years.

Now, it has become necessary to "assess our human resources." The Sept., 1951 issue of the **Scientific American** is solely devoted to such a survey. It delves into the population resources, the labor force, the intellectual resources, the situation in engineering, science and medicine, the demands and effects of mobilization, and the future facing youth.

Running through all the articles is the same theme: "Our" human resources have been "squandered foolishly" instead of being "husbanded and spent wisely." Even though never using the term "property" to designate the "labor force" of the United States, underlying the entire series is the unwitting recognition that human resources are propertied possession of the owners of industry. The various reports allude to the "nation's soundest investments" in human beings. The division of the nation into property owners and propertyless workers is taken for granted as being "democratic" and "natural." In this detailed study, there is no concept of a common interest of ALL members of society in a joint community where the interests of each individual harmonizes with the collective interest of all society because of the absence of a conflict of economic interests. Such thinking is foreign to these writers and necessitates their use of such social apologetics as "Western Democracy" and "American Way of Life."

POPULATION RESOURCES

What bothers these investigators, primarily, is the need of having an

[Continued on page 17]