

Newsletter of

## THE DEMOCRATIC LEFT

September 1973—Vol. I, No. 5



Edited by MICHAEL HARRINGTON

### Crisis at Chrysler: Wildcat Wave Hits Detroit

By ROGER ROBINSON

"There are only thirteen unresolved grievances in that plant," said Doug Fraser, UAW vice president and head of the union's Chrysler Department. Reacting to the Chrysler walkout, Fraser admitted that he was "stunned," saying he "couldn't understand why our people do nothing about these conditions." Later, on a tour of the Chrysler Detroit Forge plant, Fraser said conditions were horrible and "I'm prepared to authorize a strike if these conditions are not corrected forthwith."

This followed the second of three separate work stoppages in Detroit area Chrysler plants. Each stoppage must be considered as a separate development; each stoppage was over real issues and points out that the old union-management safety valves do not work. There are three main players in these events: the Chrysler Corporation, the UAW, and the new radicals. The problems that caused the stoppages, i.e. outmoded, unsafe work places and around-the-clock overtime production, must be laid at the Corporation's doorstep.

The UAW leadership at least in these instances was not in touch with what was happening in the shop. The radicals, revolutionaries and "crazies" of various stripe, did exploit these conditions and issues in Chrysler plants. Their behavior in two of the three walkouts was completely irresponsible; that is, their basic anti-union, anti-UAW positions prevent them from having a significant base. This does not mean that they should be ignored. It does mean that they are bucking most workers' fundamental loyalty to their union. Still, the radicals did give leadership on issues that the union should have been out in front on.

In Local 7, a weak local union leadership was outflanked by two "socialist revolutionaries," who shut off the power to the line, demanding that a supervisor who used racial slurs be fired and that they receive complete amnesty, in writing, for their action. The foreman was fired, and the two men were back on the job the next day. It must be noted that prior to the shutdown, two hundred forty workers had signed a petition asking for the ouster of this supervisor.

The second walkout was at Local 47, Chrysler's Detroit Forge Plant. It was a true wildcat. Black and

white, young and old, many were anti-leadership, but they were *not* ideologically anti-union. The conditions were terrible; the local union, again, not very forceful. The void was filled by activists maintaining that they acted under union principles by refusing to work under hazardous circumstances. It took a week to get the Local 47 members back to work—and then only after Doug Fraser gave his personal commitment to authorize future strikes and requested a return to work so that the UAW could bargain to clean up the Detroit Forge Plant.

The third and last plant closing, the Mack stamping plant of UAW Local 212, was an all-around tragedy. Local 212 has a strong, good local trade union leadership. It also has a strong regional director. Yet there

*(Continued on page 2)*

#### Battle Lines Are Drawn

*"Voluntary overtime, an idea whose time has come."*  
—UAW official

*"Voluntary overtime would result in severe production disruptions."*—William Bavinger, industrial relations director, Chrysler Corporation

The battle lines are drawn, and a major auto strike appears likely. In its tradition of innovative and progressive collective bargaining, the United Auto Workers is demanding an end to forced overtime in the auto plants.

At a time when everyone is talking about "humanizing the workplace," the basic demand for voluntary overtime offers a real escape for the assembly-line worker: fewer hours on the job. If the UAW wins on this issue, voluntary overtime could, among other things, lead to a resolution of the conflict between the women's movement and some sections of the labor movement over protective labor legislation.

Besides the overtime issue, UAW and Chrysler negotiators are fighting over:

- **Wages.** Chrysler's first offer, a 3% wage increase was called "ludicrous" by UAW President Woodcock. 1973 has been a record year for sales and profits have been booming, but in the 1958 recession, Chrysler's first offer was better than that.

- **Cost-of-living escalator.** This is another UAW innovation whereby wages are tied to the cost-of-living index. When the index is up, wages are raised. But the formula has not allowed wages to rise as fast as the cost of living, and the union wants that rectified by adoption of a new formula.

Roger Robinson has been an organizer for the restaurant workers and AFSCME. He is a member and former committeeman in the United Auto Workers.

# Chrysler...

(Continued from page 1)

everything came unglued. The crazies in this plant were members of the Progressive Labor Party. They shut the plant down, then staged a sit-in after leading two plant guards. The UAW leadership, in an incredible overreaction, organized a one thousand man flying squadron of union loyalists to open the plant, against a dozen or so pickets and pamphleteers. Ninety-five percent of the workers showed up for work, excluding the fifty who were fired for participation in the sit-in. The result: two injured plant guards, fifty unemployed auto workers, and a wave of anti-radical union loyalists popping up at various plants in the Detroit area to discourage the distribution of left-sectarian literature at plant gates.

Many have zeroed in on the antiquated facilities at Chrysler as an explanation for the recent unrest. There are other, more important factors: a workforce largely under thirty has less than five or six years seniority; the grievance procedure encumbered with red tape allows the company to hold the worker guilty until the union can establish innocence; rank and file leadership is devoid of union training and principles. There is a general deterioration of unions at the local levels. Self-proclaimed revolutionaries in the shops mislead the cream of the young working class activists into untenable situations where they will be easily picked off by the company. These student Lenins and Trotskys have the luxury of leaving the wreckage behind them.

The UAW leadership, by inaction and distance, allowed these crazies to take leadership on the day-to-day issues at these Chrysler plants. How is it that the Frasers, Mazeys and Bluestones, representatives of the best in the industrial labor movement, could let this happen? Why is it at Lordstown, at a new GM plant, that the UAW leadership was able to harmoniously move with the demands of young militant workers to the point where at times it seemed as if Bluestone was able to turn the strike on or off? The answer has to do with the rank-and-file leadership at Lordstown—an activist and young pro-union leadership decided to take the company on over basic issues. They organized for a fight and asked the UAW leadership for help. The problem is that most local rank-and-file union leaderships are not so militant or committed. This leaves it wide open for the crazies to give direction to the normal rank-and-file demands. Fundamental changes are needed in the UAW: an activist education program is called for, and mandatory training for all candidates running for union office.

Advocates of industrial democracy such as Fraser, Mazey and Bluestone must put more social content into their union's programs and take proper leadership over the militant and human demands that are developing in the rank and file. The UAW has clear alternatives. They can try to contain events, like those at Chrysler, or they can begin anew to build, department by department, plant by plant, a disciplined, militant rank-and-file which is capable of fighting the corporations like the activist trade unionists and socialists who built industrial unionism in America.

## Peter's Principle

By DAVID KUSNET

Reversing department policies, Labor Secretary Peter Brennan is challenging local anti-discrimination programs throughout the land in an apparent effort to reassure his former brothers in the building trades that his heart is in the wrong place.

Brennan issued a directive July 19 threatening to cut off construction assistance to local communities that attempt to supplement what he calls "viable and effective" minority hiring programs approved by the federal Office of Contract Compliance.

Housing, mass transit, anti-pollution, and school construction funds could be denied to scores of cities. Workers, black and white, would lose their jobs.

Moreover, the principle would be established that cities making an extra effort to fight discrimination should be disciplined by the federal government—just as if they were in violation of fair employment standards.

Brennan's immediate target is New York City, where Mayor Lindsay has ordered 20 per cent minority hiring in all publicly assisted construction projects. The plan replaces a "hometown" agreement between unions and contractors to hire minority "trainees." After two years of the plan, "viable and effective" by Brennan's standards, 22 Blacks had received union cards.

A city-sponsored court challenge to Brennan's directive seems likely to succeed. Earlier this year, a similar plan in Boston was upheld by the Supreme Court of Massachusetts.

The memo, after all, seeks to strike down hiring plans no stricter than the courts have ordered in several cities—and the Labor Department approved in Philadelphia.

Peter's principle may, however, be good politics—part of the Nixon-Rockefeller courtship of the building trades—particularly in New York. The memo is co-signed by Brennan's assistant, Bernard DeLury, son of the city sanitation-men's leader and a labor coordinator for Nixon's re-election.

As we go to press, seven building trades locals in New York are under indictment for discriminatory practices. These include affiliates of the operating engineers, elevator constructors, sheet-metal workers, ironworkers, and steamfitters.

Civil rights groups have rapped Brennan's new policy, but the AFL-CIO silence has lent credence to one veteran Meany-watcher's claim that "George has gone after Pete on every issue except civil rights." Don Slaiman, the federation's civil rights director, refused to comment on the issue when reached by phone.

# Oiligopoly and the Energy Crisis

By MICHAEL HARRINGTON

The energy crisis offers an almost unparalleled opportunity to examine the anti-social behavior of the American corporation, and the structural tendency of our economy to put public power at the service of private interest, even when this has grave consequences for foreign policy.

The oil industry and the U.S. government have long been in collusion, but for our purposes we can begin a brief background sketch in 1959 when President Eisenhower proclaimed the Mandatory Oil Import Program by Executive Order. Foreign imports were limited to a small, fixed proportion of domestic production in order to maintain an artificially high price for the expensive domestic product. In 1970 alone that restriction cost the American people \$5 billion, according to President Nixon's Task Force on Oil Import Control. When Ike promulgated this bonanza for the industry, a 1973 Senate study said, he "treated national security as practically identical to the welfare of the domestic [oil] producing industry."

This identification was also the basis of multi-billion dollar tax expenditures for the oil men, a handout which was not only ethically indefensible, but also played a major role in misallocating energy resources. In 1971, the five major oil companies paid an average of 5% corporate taxes on profits while other corporations paid 40%. This one item amounted to a Treasury loss of \$2.6 billion in revenue. This legal evasion was pri-

---

***In 1971, the five major oil companies paid an average of 5% corporate taxes on profits.***

---

marily accomplished in two ways. The infamous depletion allowance permitted the oil giants to avoid roughly half of their taxes; three fourths of the remaining tax vanished in the form of tax credits for taxes paid to foreign governments.

The latter evasion is not as well known as the depletion allowance, but it is worth examining. Since their overseas taxes allow the corporations to escape American taxes, they have an interest in seeing to it that the money they pay Middle Eastern producers takes the form of taxes rather than royalties, which would be treated by the IRS as an ordinary business expense. So it is that taxes now account for \$1.50 of the \$2 a barrel oil fetches in the states belonging to the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) and that they have increased by 50 cents a barrel over the last three years. American law, thus, makes it advantageous for American companies to act as the tax collectors for shahs, sheikhs, and nationalist revolution-

## ***Good News and Bad News***

"The 'energy crisis'—the very real shortage of fuel plaguing consumers large and small—may be the best thing that's happened to the oil and gas business in a long time."

So states the August 14 *Wall Street Journal* in a frank article on the corporate "silver lining" of the energy crisis cloud. Among the benefits the *Journal* sees for the oil and gas industries are:

- higher and more stable profits (which are up 50% from the June quarter of last year)
- an end to price wars among oil and gas suppliers and retailers
- higher prices even under strict government controls.

That sums up what Chase Manhattan economist Gerald Gunning calls the "good news" about the energy crisis. The bad news, according to Gunning, is that by 1976, demand for oil in the United States may be outstripping both domestic and imported supplies by as much as 10%.

aries. Cost increases are then passed on to the American taxpayer, courtesy of the Internal Revenue Service, as well as to the gas consumer.

Not only is this tax structure unjust, it is one of the root causes of the current crisis, in particular, of the lack of American refining capacity. Despite the claims of the oil companies, refining capacity is low because the corporations run their refining and marketing operations at a book-keeping loss so that their profits would show up in the almost untaxed drilling end of the business. This dodge had a bonus, for it has kept independents from going into refining where profit rates are low. It is the basic reason why there has been practically no refinery building in the US since the mid-Sixties.

A phenomenon recently noted by Representative Les Aspin confirms this conclusion: refining capacity of the major American oil companies has been increasing in the Caribbean where there are tax breaks and the companies can avoid the Jones Act stipulation that U.S. products be carried on U.S. ships from one U.S. port to another.

The consequence of Federal largesse, the tax breaks and the inflated domestic prices, was that oil companies made super-profits of more than \$7 billion a year in the early 1970's.

Another consequence was that the oil companies got bigger and bigger. Arnold Miller, president of the United Mine Workers, testified before a Senate Committee that "the ownership of the majority of the coal industry" went to "oil interests and companies." That,



---

**The oil companies already own most of the "solutions" to the crisis they have done so much to create.**

---

in turn, Miller said, explained why the industry ignored coal until the energy crisis broke; it was maximizing more profitable operations. Of the 25 largest petroleum companies, 25 also deal in natural gas, 18 in oil shale, 11 in coal, 18 in uranium and 7 in tar sands. In short, they already own most of the potential "solutions" to the crisis they have done so much to create.

The oil conspiracy defends its oligopoly as a great benefit to the American people. In an ad—the companies have spent over \$12 million in their three most recent publicity campaigns—Mobil Oil tells us that "recent upturns in petroleum industry earnings, dramatic as they seem, are badly needed if the oil industry is to make the huge investments the Free World needs." About four days before that ad ran in the *New York Times*, William E. Simon, Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, made the same point before the Senate Anti-Trust and Monopoly Committee. It is, as we will see, completely unpersuasive.

What are we to do about this crisis, created by gigantic misallocation of resources, encouraged by Federal import and tax policies and paid for twice over by the citizen? For the moment, I restrict myself to the domestic implications.

First, the various anti-trust proposals requiring the giants to divest themselves of at least some of their operations have obvious merit. The State of Connecticut brought a suit to divest the companies of all activities except refining and marketing. Florida has a similar suit, and six other states are waiting in line. The Federal Trade Commission asks divestiture only of refining; Senator Abourezk and Rep. Aspin would confine a company to only one function. Senator McIntyre wants to split off the marketing operations. The various state suits rightly call for damages, for a return of the monies the corporations have bilked from the public.

While I am in sympathy with this approach (and lean to the Abourezk-Aspin proposal), I see a danger in it. If it is thought that, simply by breaking up the giants and letting market forces work in a more competitive environment, we are going to solve the energy crisis, then we will not solve it. As Senator Jackson's "National Energy Research and Development Policy Act of 1973" recognizes with admirable candor, the needs for research, new forms of energy and the like cannot be met within the structure of American capitalism. "The degree of risk of loss of investment inherent in the research is high, and the availability of risk capital . . . limited."

There is apparent unanimity on the need for government action to stimulate research and development. Senator Jackson is for a Federal energy policy with

\$20 billion for research; President Nixon proposes \$10 billion for the same purpose; Arnold Miller of the UMW, the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO and the oil industry all agree. But the unanimity is more apparent than real—the small print, how one will carry out the research and development, looms very, very large.

The Jackson bill proposes a number of Federally-funded demonstration corporations to pioneer new energy technology: one for each goal: gassification, shale oil, advanced power cycle development, and geothermal energy. In each case, the President will nominate five members to the board of directors, the industry, four. Under the Nixon Administration, that would mean that the companies would certainly have a majority, and perhaps all nine members.

Moreover, the public corporations would be legally required to go out of business in ten years.

## Two Faces of Jackson

Senator Henry Jackson is hot on the trail to '76 with an investigation into the Soviet wheat deal, and righteous denunciation thereof. That's for public consumption. But he tends other fences too.

Jackson makes much of his conservation record and his authorship of the Environmental Policy Act. That act set requirements which probably would have blocked construction of the Alaska pipeline—until Congress passed an amendment exempting the Alaskan pipeline from legislative requirements and judicial review.

The loophole amendment never would have reached the Senate floor without a clever Jackson ruse. He had introduced a "purely technical" bill to permit the pipeline a wider right-of-way. It was not to be a vehicle for substantive discussion of the Alaskan or alternative routes. Thus disguised, the bill reached the floor, and the fatal amendment was attached. The White House and the oil lobbyists "put a blowtorch" to Congress, in one lobbyist's words, and the bill passed. Jackson voted against but did not work against the gutting of his own environmental protection legislation. To the public, his hands were clean. In private, one could see his hands were—oily.

Sen. Jackson also protects his military-industrial flank. Pentagon critics recently challenged a Nixon Administration attempt to accelerate production of the Trident missile submarine. As senior Democrat on the Senate Armed Services Committee, Jackson was able to give stalwart support to Navy lobbying for the extra \$.9 billion needed. In good nautical fashion, the Navy and the Senator brought the Committee about and, in a close vote, got it to signal Full Steam Ahead for the project.

—J. R.

So, companies which have misused the energy sources of the past and present would then co-opt publicly-funded research the better to misuse the energy sources of the future.

Arnold Miller was extremely perceptive on this count. He told the Senators that the energy corporations in the Jackson bill should "be organized so that they do not eventually become part and parcel of the energy companies who control such a vast part of our natural resources." And at the February, 1973, meeting of its Executive Council the AFL-CIO once again came out in favor of TVA-type development agencies in this area. The Jackson proposals do not meet either Miller's or the Federation's criteria.

I suspect this may be a crucial battle of the future. Everyone, Left, Right and Center, is now for an energy policy. The crucial question is, who will control it? The Jackson bill's demonstration corporations would assure industry dominance. Therefore the democratic Left should take a stand for public power of a TVA-type rather than for publicly-financed research for private, and usually anti-social, corporations.

That means a bitter fight. Consider the recent battle over the Alaska pipe-line, a clear victory for the companies, a blow against the environment.

Oil was discovered in Alaska by Atlantic-Richfield, whose chairman is Robert O. Anderson, a Nixon Republican and National Committeeman from New Mexico. In 1969, Atlantic and other corporations decided on a trans-Alaska pipeline (Alyeska, it was called). They did not, according to Senators sympathetic to them, even consider the possibility of a trans-Canada pipe because they regarded a feasibility study as too expensive. As soon as the companies decided, the Nixon Administration joined them with what the *New York Times* called "a fierce commitment."

Then, Senator Jackson sponsored legislation which would have removed one barrier to Alyeska by giving it a right-of-way over Federal lands. The companies, the administration and some Democrats from oil states, like Albert of Oklahoma and Gravel of Alaska, then backed an amendment which exempted the whole project from the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). An environmental impact statement defending Alyeska came from the Department of the Interior, an ally of the oil industry, and probably would not have survived close scrutiny in court. Jackson voted against the amendment, but though an author of NEPA, did not fight its emasculation. In this crucial case, oil won.

In addition to striking a major blow against the environment, this was also an attack on the Canadians. The Canadians, and especially the British Columbians whose provincial beaches are menaced by Alyeska's predicted annual spillage of 140,000 gallons into Puget Sound, are against the Alaska route with its tankers and its dangerous water link. The New Democrats, Canada's social democratic party (which governs Brit-

ish Columbia) are opposed to both Alyeska and a trans-Canada pipeline which would be designed to maximize US corporate interests.

Note that in all of this it was corporate decision-making that was decisive and that the companies did not even consider alternatives, much less the needs of Canada. How then do we respond to Mobil Oil which tells us that "in the next 15 years, the Free World oil industry will have to make capital outlays of more than \$500 billion—nearly \$100 million a day"? Alyeska makes it clear that the companies will spend those sums against the environment, sovereign foreign states, social purposes, for the maximization of profit. They should not be allowed to do so.

The case for the democratic socialization of the oil industry is thus quite obvious. Such social decisions cannot be left to profit makers in private board rooms. The first skirmish on this issue has been lost to the Alyeska promoters; the second battle is going to be over industry dominance of those Jackson-sponsored development corporations. On that issue, the democratic Left should begin to mobilize now on behalf of the public power of the future.

The crisis does not, however, stop at the water's edge. It has profound implications for foreign policy and could commit America to another Vietnam.

For decades, the consortium of Western governments and oil companies were the imperial lords of the Persian Gulf. They determined how much oil would

---

***Companies which have misused  
the energy sources of the past and present  
would then . . . misuse the energy  
sources of the future.***

---

be pumped, set the prices, paid skimpy royalties and favored corrupt reactionaries in Arab politics. They also fought tooth and nail against recognition of Israel in 1947. Then in 1959 and 1960 the corporations arbitrarily slashed posted prices, on which royalties and taxes were based. Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and Venezuela formed OPEC in response to that steal. The OPEC cartel was thus a defensive move against the oil cartel.

How should America respond? Senator Jackson has a remarkably candid answer. "The problem in the Middle East," he said last June, "is the have-not Arab countries against the haves." The Jackson strategy, shared by Nixon, is to build a bloc composed of Iran, Saudi Arabia and Israel. In pursuit of this goal, the United States is already supplying military hardware to Iran and Saudi Arabia. Our arms, Secretary Rogers said, are "a stabilizing influence for peace in the rich oil-producing area"; the Soviet arms are an "invitation to trouble." Reality is not quite as stable as the Secretary's Orwellian remark suggests.

For one thing, King Faisal of Saudi Arabia, a sworn

enemy of welfareism for his people and the bankroller of most Arab foes of Israel, has been talking about blocking Saudi oil for America because of its stand on Israel. That is one reason why the Israelis oppose the arms shipment to Faisal and reject the bloc which Senator Jackson has designed for them. (The other is the fear of being attacked by those peace-loving weapons.) And the Shah, that very model of a responsible American ally, is speculating in an alliance with the Pakistanis which would be both anti-Israel and anti-Indian. In June, the Chinese foreign minister appeared in Tehran to suggest a China-Iran-Pakistan alliance. He also disavowed the guerrillas fighting the Sultan of Oman, an Iranian ally, a sure sign that the Maoists are dead serious.

These instabilities are going to grow. At Vienna in June OPEC voted to link oil exports to industrial development in their own countries. Japan, for instance, is already going into Saudi Arabia and Abu Dhabi. As this trend develops, modernization is sure to set off revolutionary movements; the Shah is already worried about "extremists" in the emirates on the Gulf.

In this setting, Nixon and Jackson propose that the United States identify with the conservative Iranian and reactionary Saudi Arabian "haves" against the "have-nots," i.e. that we play our usual role of conceding, or driving the revolutionary movement to the Communists. In Vietnam, China, and Cuba this has had disastrous consequences. It is not only stupid, but wrong.

This is particularly true for those of us concerned with the fate of Israel. The Nixon-Jackson line is based on the same premises that animated Standard Oil of California to come out for "the aspirations of the Arab people," for its own deal with whatever regime presides over an oil well. Currently Standard is competing with Occidental Petroleum, the chosen Soviet-American instrument for the multi-billion dollar Russian gas deal, for the favors of Qaddafi in Libya. Its anti-Israel posture is thus the kind of "smart business" oil has

### **Democratic Socialist Convention**

The founding Convention of a new American socialist organization will be held October 13 and 14 in New York City at the McAlpin Hotel. David Lewis, parliamentary leader of Canada's New Democratic Party, will address a pre-convention meeting on Friday, October 12 at 8 p.m. at the Loeb Center of New York University.

For details on the Convention, which will be non-delegated and open to all who subscribe to the principles of the call, write to:

Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee  
125 West 77 Street  
New York, N.Y. 10024

*Newsletter of*

## **THE DEMOCRATIC LEFT**

**Michael Harrington, Editor**

**Jack Clark, Managing Editor**

The following people helped to put out this issue: Peter Abbott, David Bensman, Henry Bayer, Gretchen Donart, David Kusnet, Jon Ratner, Ronnie Steinberg Ratner, Mark Schaeffer, Nancy Shier, Paul Stone.

Signed articles express the views of the author.

Published ten times a year (monthly except July and August). Office: 125 West 77th St., New York 10024.

been playing since 1947. But the Nixon-Jackson logic, if not their present policies, points in exactly that direction.

The options, to be sure, are not simple; the oil industry has been running the Middle East for several generations. But whatever the United States does, it is both a moral and pragmatic outrage if we line up with the Arab "haves" and become an avowedly counter-revolutionary and imperialist power. That will not help us, it will harm Israel, and it will help either the Russians or the Chinese or perhaps both.

More broadly, the domestic and international implications of the energy crisis which I have only outlined

---

***Nixon and Jackson propose that the United States identify with the conservative Iranian and reactionary Saudi Arabian "haves" against the "have-nots."***

---

here make a compelling case for an assertion of planned democratic control over the oil industry. This dominant, private and usually anti-social force cannot be allowed to run either our domestic or our international energy policy. I do not put this as a socialist generalization, as a case in point of the historic necessity of transforming all decisive corporate power into social property. I think that, of course; but that is not the basis of the analysis I make here.

Whether one is a socialist or not, the very specific and immediate case for democratically socializing the power of the empire of oil is quite compelling. So it is that in the immediate future, liberals, trade unionists, peace activists and the minorities must join together to fight a Manhattan Project which will develop the fuels of the future and turn them over, cheap or gratis, to the malefactors of the past. We must demand an energy policy with social priorities, both at home and abroad, first of all through TVA-type demonstration of the fuels of the future. The fight is on; we have already lost the first round.



# Weicker's Watergate

A *New York Times* survey rates Lowell Weicker as the least popular member of the Senate Watergate Committee.

It's a minor Watergate irony that Weicker's public disfavor is almost certainly for the wrong reasons.

Weicker's staff has completed invaluable investigative work, including the first linkage of H. R. Halde- man to the "White House horrors" and documenta- tion of the constraints placed upon the FBI probe last year. Yet, Weicker's aggressive questioning, as well as his genuine moral outrage, probably turned off many in the television audience.

Meanwhile, a recently published account of the 1970 campaign in which Weicker won his seat reveals that the junior senator from Connecticut was elected as a result of Nixon-inspired politicization of federal agencies and the smearing of his rival. It was a preview of Watergate, more chilling for the absence of bungled burglaries and practical jokes.

Eric Rennie reports in *A Campaign Album* (Pilgrim Press, Philadelphia, 1973) that Nixon aide Pat Bu- chanan boasted to an audience at the Kennedy Insti- tute that the late Senator Tom Dodd's tax difficulties were exploited to ensure that he would run as an inde- pendent. IRS charges were dropped against Dodd only after he announced the third-party race that allowed Weicker to win with a minority of the total vote.

Meanwhile, Weicker's Democratic rival, Joe Duffey, was the target of charges that made last year's attacks on George McGovern sound like VFW Americanism awards. Vice President Agnew called Duffey the proto- typical "radical liberal" and said he "has described himself as a revisionist Marxist." Citing Duffey's arrest in a civil rights demonstration, Weicker charged that his rival "advocated dissent, protest, walkouts, viola- tion of the law, arrest and criticism of the democratic system."

For those of us who unashamedly "advocate dis- sent," Watergate is merely the irrational extension of the traditional conservative campaign tactic of sti- fling opposition by bullying it with government power or labelling it with code words. There's a hollow ring to Weicker's declaration that Republicans don't smear, threaten or distrust their fellow Americans. Just as a study of Richard Nixon's political history could have cured the illusions of 1972, remembering the 1970 campaign should dispel admiration for the Lowell Weickers and Howard Bakers.

The political survival of Nixon and Agnew is not, after all, the last hope of the American Right.

—D. K.

## The Knave Was Wild

To the democratic Left, the 1972 Presidential con- test was between money and the vote. Money won.

To Nixon's majority, it seemed a choice between a knave and a fool. They preferred the knave.

But to the President's inner circle, America's future was either leftist revolution or palace coup. They chose the palace coup.

And Watergate became the story of a foolish knave, financed by the megabucks and seemingly ratified by the millions.

Nixon's desire for a massive mandate moved full circle from previous conservative approaches which relied on monied interests and control of Congres- sional committees to stymie even moderate progress. His goal of The New Republican Majority paralleled the Roosevelt and Johnson strategies: the use of a large electoral majority to overpower resistance to Presidential programs from other branches of govern- ment.

But his attempt to shift the institutional balance of power toward the Presidency was not a simple case of seeking to use the liberals' instrument—a strong executive—for conservative ends. It was more than that: Nixon tried to cut off the Executive branch from accountability to the legislature, the judiciary, and ultimately, the public. (His most recent appeal to separation-of-powers transforms that doctrine from part of governmental checks and balances to an asser- tion of presidential autonomy.) A less accountable Executive would ensure the extension of present trends: the change (from bad to worse) in the course of social programs; and the further infusion of cor- porate priorities into policy. Consider the role oil- ophile John Connally has played in formulating energy policy.

Ironically, Watergate unmasked Nixon's strategy and program. The day-to-day unfolding of "White House horrors" has proved the single most important impetus to Congress' renewed efforts at severing the tie of money to politics. If Nixon refuses to wipe the old slate clean, the legislature is at least trying to provide a clean new one.

The Senate has agreed upon a series of amendments to the 18 month old Federal Election Campaign Act:

- A fund raising limit of \$3000 from any one per- son to any one candidate in any election cycle, and \$25,000 in the aggregate from any single donor to all candidates and party causes.
- A ceiling on candidate expenditures: \$34.8 million for the Presidency and a formula of no more than 25 cents per voting citizen for a House of Repre- sentatives race.
- Creation of a seven member bi-partisan Federal Election Commission which will include an inde- pendent agency with powers of subpoena, inves- tigation, and prosecution.

Watergate, thus, symbolizes an attempt to consoli- date and render unaccountable government power in the interests of the rich. Yet, paradoxically, the pas- sage and strict enforcement (by a *legislative* commis- sion) of the amended Federal Election Campaign Act may prove that the 1972 Republican majority was a constituency just on loan.

—Ronnie S. and Jon Ratner

# Jimmy Higgins Reports...

**MAYOR MAIER'S MIRE.** Time was when Henry Maier, the conservative but popular mayor of Milwaukee, seemed unbeatable. He won 85% of the vote in his last election, and Chicago Mayor Richard Daley even suggested him as a running mate for McGovern after the Eagleton fiasco. But Milwaukee politics have become murky, and neither Maier's politics nor his invincibility seems quite so clear. On urban issues, Maier has become, from experience rather than ideology, a converted "progressive." Once an enthusiastic highway builder, tearing down good low and middle income housing to finance the flight of the city's middle class to the suburbs, the mayor has now called for a moratorium on all new highway building in favor of an expanded mass transit system. This has earned him the enmity—for the wrong reasons—of his former allies in the conservative business community and in the building trades. They are coalescing around Lieutenant Governor Martin Scheiber to oppose Maier in the next election.

That doesn't mean that the city's liberal forces will be rallying around Maier, though. While he now bills himself as an "urbanist" and progressive, Maier has some strange notions about building an urban machine akin to the Daley organization, in Milwaukee, a city with a strong anti-boss heritage. Like many urban officials, Maier has used the Model Cities agency as a patronage resource. Unlike other mayors, Maier has gone to ludicrous Watergate-like lengths to have his Model Cities cronies check on real, potential and fancied enemies of his administration. Even Milwaukee Public Library officials believe their phones are tapped. In a move that would make G. Gordon Liddy look competent, Maier loyalists directed one Model Cities employee to "investigate" an independent anti-poverty staffer whose community organizing was perceived as a threat. The "enemy" and the "investigator" turned out to be good friends . . . and the joke made the rounds of all concerned. The "intelligence" reports have been rather incomplete, but the "machine" seems satisfied.

**A FARMER-LABOR MISALLIANCE** recently won legislation raising the minimum wage. But the price of passage may well keep decent living standards beyond the means of those low wage workers the bill supposedly helped. To get the minimum wage bill through, liberals in Congress and their labor backers agreed to support a farm bill which will guarantee handsome profits to already rich farmers. The new



farm bill sets "target prices" at inflation-swollen levels and it guarantees ever rising food bills by tying future price increases to higher production costs. When market prices fall below the "target," the government will pump subsidies into the afflicted agribusiness.

**WOMEN'S LIBERATION** is taking root in the labor movement. Over 200 women unionists attended a June Midwestern conference in Chicago. The conference was the first in a series of regional conclaves leading up to a national conference of labor movement women sometime next year. The women included rank-and-file activists and officials from twenty-five international unions. Speakers at the conference emphasized that they seek to improve the position of women within the movement but also stressed loyalty to the existing labor movement. They also seek to make collective bargaining more attuned to the special needs of women workers. The unionists also plan to take an active role in the women's movement; one speaker noted that for too long the women unionists had left the leadership of the women's movement to others. "It is time to take our rightful place" she noted.

**THE FALL OF ROY EVANS** came in mid-summer. The Texas AFL-CIO, at its July 11 through 14 Convention, voted to replace the liberal Evans with the apparently more liberal Henry Hubbard. According to one close observer of the Texas labor movement, the question which divided the national labor movement last year was no issue in this contest. Both sides and all factions in the Texas labor movement were solidly pro-McGovern after the Democratic Convention. The apparent cause of Evans' downfall was his opposition to Sissy Farenthold in her bid for the Democratic Gubernatorial nomination last year. While Hubbard was far enough away from the primary battles to win support from both pro and anti-Farenthold elements, he did support Farenthold publicly in her primary race against Dolph Briscoe and Ben Barnes, Evans' favorite for the nomination. While Evans' forces expected a close race for the state labor council leadership, Hubbard won by a lopsided 70-30 margin.

**Please enter my subscription to the Newsletter of the Democratic Left**

**Regular Subscription \$5      Student rate \$2.50**

**Sustaining Subscription \$10**

**Name** .....

**Address** .....

**City** ..... **Zip** .....

**Send to Newsletter of the Democratic Left**  
**125 West 77th Street, New York, N.Y. 10024**

**From each according to his ability**