

Newsletter of

## THE DEMOCRATIC LEFT

December 1974—Vol. II, No. 10

217

Edited by MICHAEL HARRINGTON

### The economic crisis

## Can Democrats meet the challenge?

by MICHAEL HARRINGTON

The automobile industry has laid off 200,000 workers, and national unemployment is heading toward 7 percent. The minorities and the poor, who spend a higher proportion of their income on food than other Americans do, are suffering a catastrophic drop in their already meager standard of living. In New York, a study shows, college graduates are competing with welfare recipients for low-level entry jobs.

Clearly, the United States faces the most severe economic and political crisis since the Great Depression. To respond to this crisis, the Democratic Party will have to be at least as imaginative and innovative as it was during the New Deal. Only now that the reforms and accomplishments of the New Deal are part of the status quo, we must be prepared to go beyond them—far beyond them.

Structural change is required: structural change to attack the power of giant corporations which have made the government itself the instrument of their priorities. One of the main reasons we are in a recession-inflation today is our system of "socialism for the rich." We live under a government which provides planning and multi-billion dollar subsidies geared to the needs of big business rather than the needs of the people. I wish I could say that the Democratic Party and the American people were ready for a genuine socialist program. But politically that is not the case, and America remains the only industrially advanced democracy with no mass socialist movement.

So, I will not urge the Democratic Party to embrace democratic socialism in 1974. That proposal is premature given current political realities and the views of most Americans. But I will show that radical reforms, transcending the New Deal and moving in a

socialist direction, offer the only pragmatic possibility of solving the crisis we find ourselves in. And I will not hide the fact that I am convinced that if the Democratic Party leads the American people in this direction, then it will become apparent that we need a systematic alternative to the economic and political domination of corporate power—that we need democratic socialism.

In making this analysis of the issues and problems before the Midterm Conference—before the nation—I agree with New York Governor-elect Carey that Kansas City must deal with bread-and-butter issues. We cannot simply debate procedures. At the same time, I think it is wrong to counterpose procedures to substantive political questions, as if the former were haggling over legalities and only the latter have content. For whether or not the Democratic Party will respond creatively to the unprecedented plight of America in the Seventies depends in great measure on what kind of a party it is. If it goes back to the old ways, which ruled before the civil rights challenges of 1964 and the anti-war mobilization of 1968, if it returns to political business-as-usual, then it will not come up with a program adequate to these incredible times.

So I will begin with two "procedural" issues which may well determine whether the Party is capable of confronting substantive questions. Then I will outline the kind of a program a truly open Democratic Party should adopt. And finally, these considerations about the structure and content of the Democratic Party will be subjected to the crucial political test: how they can help to bring to power in 1976, not simply a Democratic Administration, but a liberal Democratic Administration capable of actually beginning to solve the problems of depression and inflation which now torment the American people.

### An open Party

An open Democratic Party which retains the reform gains of the past decade could start to face up to our economic crisis. So the "procedural" battles at Kansas City bear mightily upon substantive programs, a fact which the reform delegates should stress over and over. Two of the most important issues in this area have to do with a mandatory mid-term Convention

*Editor of this NEWSLETTER and a prominent author, Michael Harrington is a delegate to the Charter Conference from the 17th Congressional District in New York. His books include: The Other America; Toward A Democratic Left; and Socialism. He also serves as national chairman of the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee, and he is not to be confused with the Congressman from Massachusetts.*

and affirmative action in every aspect of Party life.

Suppose there had been a mid-term conference in 1966 which was truly open to rank-and-file Democrats. It would have become the focus of a growing anti-war movement and provided a forum in which the alternatives to our unconscionable intervention in Indochina could have been debated. But then, this is exactly the situation which the opponents of such mandatory conferences fear. Wouldn't it be terribly embarrassing, they say, to have an incumbent Democratic President confronted by a rebellious Democratic Conference which opposes his policies? Here the 1966 example is instructive. If Lyndon Johnson had been required to defend his position on Vietnam before such a conference, perhaps both he, and the nation, would have been saved from the tragic consequences—at home as well as in Indochina—which flowed from the prosecution of that undeclared war.

After all the Republicans are not the only people who have to learn from Watergate about the dangers of a secretive, imperial Presidency. Democrats who lived through the war years of 1964-1968 know something about that subject, too. And any "embarrassment" which mandatory conferences might cause incumbent Democratic Presidents is far outweighed by the gains for the nation and, most probably, for that Democratic President as well. If there had been effective channels of protest within the Democratic Party in 1966, perhaps the Vietnam agony would have ended years sooner than it did. Perhaps the Democratic Party would not have split in 1968 and 1972 and thereby prepared the way for the election and reelection of Richard Nixon.

---

***If the Party returns to the old ways,  
it will not come up with a program  
adequate to these incredible times.***

---

Consider the present. Suppose that we could spend this entire week-end at Kansas City debating the issues of recession and inflation. Suppose the American people could hear some delegates arguing for wage and price controls and others opposing them, some advocating Defense cuts, others tax reform, as means of damping down demand in the economy. That would do two things. It would help in the formulation of a program to extract us from our current catastrophes; it would present an appealing—vote-getting—reality to the American people. A candidate can be picked in a smoke-filled room but a program as imaginative, and responsive, as the one we need today cannot be written there. It requires wide-open, democratic debate.

The opponents of a mandatory conference say that such meetings are dominated by a minority of Democrats, by activists with grievances who do not truly represent the Party's voters. That is a serious argument and there is some truth to it. But what it really says is that we must adapt to the ominous trend of the 1974 elections, which had the lowest turn-out in

years, that the cure for voter apathy is less democracy, not more. And that, in turn, creates a situation in which the enormous discontents which are building up in America today have no way to express themselves, no possibility of energizing a rational program. This sets the stage for the emergence of a demagogue—or worse.

The American labor movement's experience illuminates this problem. Most union meetings are fairly sparsely attended, but there is almost always a huge turn-out at strike votes and contract ratifications. The reason is obvious: in these two cases, the rank and file feels they can really affect decisions which matter to them. Participation in non-Presidential elections is usually low because the electorate doesn't really believe that it matters; and cynicism among the voters today is high because they believe that the last two Presidents elected by landslides—Johnson in 1964 and Nixon in 1972—betrayed their mandate. If the Democratic Party now retreats back to the good old days, that will confirm the worst suspicions of the people and arguments about the dangers of democracy will be self-fulfilling prophecies. But if we mandate regular issues conventions, if the people have an opportunity to speak on—and do something about—the questions that really bother them, we can reverse the mood of anti-democratic apathy.

The same is true of affirmative action. Requiring such programs at every level of Party structure and life is not simply a recognition of the democratic rights of groups which have been excluded from the political process. It is also a means of bringing vast new strata into the Democratic Party and of thereby enabling us to confront the issues of inflation and recession by tapping the intelligence and will of every sector of the population. And the obvious fact of the matter is that if the Democratic Party does not *require* affirmative action, the old ways of political cronyism will reassert themselves at once. This Kansas City Conference itself, for example, will be only about 7 percent black, as compared to 15 percent at Miami Beach (while blacks comprise 20 percent of the Democratic electorate). In Illinois this year the voters failed to elect a half-way reasonable number of women delegates and the State Committee responded by naming an almost entirely male at-large delegation. The same thing hap-

*Newsletter of*

## **THE DEMOCRATIC LEFT**

**Michael Harrington, Editor  
Jack Clark, Managing Editor**

**The following people helped to put this issue out:  
Gretchen Donart, Mark Schaeffer.**

**Signed articles express the views of the author.**

**Published ten times a year (monthly except July  
and August) by the Democratic Socialist Organizing  
Committee, 31 Union Square West, Room 1112, New  
York, N.Y. 10003.**

pened to women and minorities in New York and is being vigorously fought by Lientenant Governor-elect Mary Ann Krupsak.

So first of all the Mid-term Conference must be decide a series of issues which seem to be "procedural" but which actually have to do with the very substantive issue of what kind of a Democratic Party—and therefore what program—we will have.

### Anatomy of a crisis

If the counsel of people like Hugh Carey and John Gilligan prevails, the Kansas City Conference will debate the issues. Indeed, it would be an affront to the American people if several thousand elected delegates convened in the midst of the most serious economic crisis in four decades and proceeded to have what seemed to be a debate over legalisms.

First of all, there must be an analysis of how we got into this unprecedented recession-inflation.

The conventional wisdom is, as usual, complacent. There is nothing wrong with the American system, it is said; we have just had some bad breaks. The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) has put together a successful cartel that has quadrupled the price of oil; and a combination of bad weather and growing affluence has bid up the price of American food. Therefore all we need to do is deal with this or that symptom of the crisis since it does not arise from any basic contradictions in the American economy.

I propose a counter-thesis. I suggest that our cur-

## Hidden unemployment

Our official unemployment figures are low estimates of the number of people actually out of work.

All unemployment percentages now released are based on a total American workforce of 85 million people. Yet, there are an additional 17 million potential workers, people who would enter the workforce in a full employment economy. These hidden and ignored unemployed include: 1 million "unemployables"; 5 million housewives; half a million men between the ages of 25 and 54; 4 million people over 55; .3 million people in job training programs; 2.7 million underemployed; .8 million discouraged and 3.6 million "encourageable." And there are 3 million students, who could be considered as disguised unemployed. With these 20 million added to the work force (as seeking work), our jobless rate shoots up to over 20 percent.

In World War II and again during the boom period of the 1960's, many of these people came into the workforce. They were mobilized to take the place of those in the armed services, or they were brought into full-time employment by a labor-scarce economy. People can and will work if there are jobs and the pay is decent. Think what full employment might do to lower the crime rate!

—FRANK WALLICK

rent problems are deeply rooted in the very nature of welfare capitalist society, and that a progressive and humane solution must involve structural change. Let me illustrate just how government policies, in following corporate priorities, brought us to this crisis.

**The Food Crisis.** The current food inflation and actual food shortages are driving down the living standards of all but the richest Americans. In the Nineteen Thirties, there were hungry people and desperate farmers, but we didn't put the latter to work feeding the former. Instead, we adopted a policy of planned, governmentally subsidized scarcity which helped drive the family farmers and tenant farmers off the land and contributed mightily to the growth of agribusiness. In 1972, the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress told us that we paid for this policy, not simply because the people had to pay enormous subsidies to big agricultural corporations so that they would not grow food, but also because that meant an additional \$4.5 billion in artificially high food prices! The total bill was \$10 billion a year!

For a generation, then, our farm output has not been determined by the fertility of the land or the vagaries of the weather. It has been set by government, acting according to the priorities of agribusiness. Even our food shipments overseas were not primarily humanitarian in character. "Food for Peace" is channeled primarily to the political and military clients of the State Department and the Pentagon; last year, 31 percent of it went to Vietnam and Cambodia. And when Earl Butz appeared at the international conference on food in Rome, he spoke out against any measures which would prevent agribusiness from making a killing in the market by speculation on hunger.

Note that the beneficiaries of these policies are not the hard-working family farmers of America, who deserve our support and respect. Instead, the benefits flow to the agricultural corporations, the packagers and the multi-billion dollar export companies which have grown fat at the taxpayer's and consumer's expense. We have deliberately wasted food production in a hungry world because Washington was more concerned with the profits of the companies and big exporters than with the farmers, the consumers or the hungry.

**The Energy Crisis.** The pattern of governmental subordination to business purposes is at the root of the energy, as well as the food, crisis. There is no doubt that the oil embargo had its effect in driving prices up, but how—and why—did the United States allow itself to become so vulnerable to foreign economic power in the first place?

The story goes back at least to 1943. In that year, Washington, acting out of a legitimate war-time fear about oil supplies, moved against the British to win a concession for Standard Oil of California and Texaco in Saudi Arabia. From that moment to the present the government has identified the common good with the private profit interest of the big companies with disastrous social consequences. In 1950, a secret tax arrangement designed to channel money to conservative Arab powers allowed the oil corporations to deduct 100 percent of the taxes they paid abroad from their

American taxes. In the same vein, these companies have been given a depletion allowance and a way of writing up their drilling expenses which is the equivalent of a 50 percent investment tax credit (other businessmen get 7 percent, and even that is unnecessary). Personnel flow freely between the oil giants and the public agencies which are supposed to regulate them. A multi-billion dollar Federal highway program, begun under Eisenhower, put the tax dollar behind the large private car and helped to destroy the railroads, deteriorate the central cities, isolate the poor and minorities, etc. From the late '50's until a year ago, there were import quotas on cheap Arab oil with no political strings; this "drain America first" program then made us dependent on expensive Arab oil with sinister political strings.

One could go on building the case but the essentials of it are apparent. Washington spent tens of billions of dollars in following corporate priorities, and the private sector expanded the wasteful use of energy, profited by using money supposedly earmarked for oil exploration to buy companies like Montgomery Ward and the Ringling Brothers Circus, and neglected to develop the abundant alternate sources of energy within the United States. The corporate solution to the resultant crisis which they did so much to create was announced by Chase Manhattan last winter at the height of the shortage: double oil profits so as to guarantee a large enough investment fund so that the companies can meet "our" needs. And this windfall will, of course, be accompanied by further subsidies, since almost all the proposals for developing new energy—from former President Nixon's scheme to Senator Jackson's—envision the government paying the costs and the private sector reaping the benefits.

---

**Real wages hit a peak in October 1972,  
then fell for 19 consecutive months.**

**That was Nixon's economic Watergate.**

---

**Fiscal and Monetary Policy.** This is the third major source of the current inflation. During the New Deal, we discovered a solution to capitalism's worst scourge, depression. But in the process, we deprived capitalism of its traditional and effective method of controlling inflation—mass unemployment.

From 1945 until the mid-Sixties, we didn't face the issue, not the least because Eisenhower achieved price stability in the Fifties by tolerating chronic joblessness and three major recessions. But then the Kennedy-Johnson full employment policies began to take effect and America faced the unprecedented new problem of how to live with (relative) prosperity and avoid inflation. This difficulty was enormously exacerbated when Lyndon Johnson, refusing to ask for taxes and controls in order to prosecute an unpopular war, overstimulated the economy by more than \$10 billion. So Nixon inherited the lowest level of unemployment in a generation and a moderate inflation. He proceeded

## *Farm folly*

In October of this year, the National Farmers Union issued a study which described our agribusiness-oriented farm policy. "During the Nixon Administration's first five years," it noted, "nearly \$4 billion more was paid to farmers to prevent food production than it would have cost for the government to buy the same amount of food from farmers. Last year alone, the government paid \$1,163 million more to hold land out of production than the value of the lost production on the farm at market prices."

Perhaps the most shocking computation in this hungry world is this one from the NFU. "Assuming yields of only two-thirds of the actual national average for the grain best-suited to the various lands held out of production, the five-year total would have reached the equivalent of 8,609 million bushels of wheat. This is nearly a billion bushels more than the actual total harvests of 7,669 million bushels of wheat in the U.S. during those five years."

In short, we paid tens of billions of dollars to waste the equivalent of eight and a half billion bushels of wheat in five years. The hungry, at home and abroad, paid; family farmers paid; consumers paid; agribusiness literally made a killing.

to act according to the traditional theory: he increased joblessness and poverty in order to get prices down.

But the prices didn't go down because the American economy has little to do with the free enterprise model of the American myth. Giant corporations are able to administer prices, pass on cost increases to the consumers and wait out a down-turn of the kind Nixon initiated. It is only the worker, the family farmer and the small businessman—that is, the majority—who suffer from the nostrums of the old-time economic religion. By August, 1971, Nixon saw the handwriting on the wall. If he continued policies which were bringing the nation a simultaneous recession-inflation, he would not be re-elected in 1972. So he turned around, imposed controls and adopted a multi-billion dollar expansionary policy designed to heat up the economy in time for November, 1972. One is rightly outraged at the millions of dollars which Nixon took from the corporate rich to insure his triumph that year. But what of the billions in Federal funds he spent—managing the entire American economy so as to achieve, not prosperity and price stability, but the re-election of Richard Nixon? Was it an accident that real wages hit a peak in October 1972 and then began a sickening slide which has seen buying power fall for nineteen consecutive months? Nixon's anti-inflation program was an economic Watergate.

The problem here, as in the case of energy and food, is structural. At the height of a traditional capitalist boom, a number of things happened: wages went up because of relative full employment; profit margins went down; the most inefficient plants and producers

were able to thrive. Normally, the system "corrected" these disturbances by a crisis which drove down wages, weeded out the inefficient and restored the conditions of profitability for the big corporations. But now this vicious mechanism, thanks to the genuine triumphs of the New Deal, no longer is politically acceptable. In its absence, is inflation inevitable within the reformed capitalist system? I think not.

The American people cannot wait for a solution to this crisis until we have fundamentally overhauled the structure of the economy. They need help here and now. Therefore the response to the crisis which has just been analyzed must proceed on two different, but related levels: There must be an immediate program which deals with the walking wounded of this social disaster right now; and that program must point the way toward a much more fundamental attack on the deep-lying structural causes of our plight.

The Kansas City Conference of the Democratic Party should endorse measures like:

- the principle of a right to a job for every citizen, as urged by Franklin Roosevelt in the campaign of 1944, embodied in a public employment program which will take all of the jobless in the private sector and put them to work meeting urgent human needs in the public sector;

- immediate tax reform aimed, not at people making \$15,000 a year or even \$25,000, but at the corporate rich and carried out by closing at least \$25 billion of the more than \$80 billion in tax deductions contained in America's welfare program for the wealthy, the Internal Revenue Code;

- a fiscal policy which takes the problem of recession as primary and understands that an increase of \$10 billion in spending could have an appreciable effect upon unemployment but that a cut of \$10 billion will not bring price stability;

---

***Controls should not be used simply to fight inflation but to correct the maldistribution of wealth.***

---

- a crash program for the development of new energy sources under the permanent control of a public oil and gas corporation, and the immediate closing of outrageous tax loopholes enjoyed by the private oil sector;

- a farm program designed to achieve maximum production, a decent income for family farmers, lower prices for consumers and aid for the starving in the world to replace the current policy of planned scarcity and artificially high prices and include anti-trust action against agribusiness as well as the establishment of a Federal company in the export sector;

- Federal monetary policy requiring that significant credit be assigned to socially useful undertakings,

like housing or mass transit, and not rationed by the purse to speculators and big business;

- a cut in the Defense budget (which the Brookings Institute tells us is being escalated again this year despite Pentagon denials) with the savings devoted to meeting social priorities;

- passage of the original Kennedy-Griffiths health security bill, the only health legislation with serious cost-control mechanisms;

- support for the trade union action of workers fighting, through contract negotiations, to keep up with the soaring cost of living.

### **Controls?**

It is obvious that one of the most widely discussed remedies has been omitted from my list: price and wage controls.

I did not list controls because the subject is so complex that it cannot be encapsulated in a summary statement like the other proposals. First of all, it has to be understood that one's attitude toward controls is determined, in considerable measure, by the fact of who is administering them. Arnold Weber, who ran Nixon's Cost of Living Council, recently said that the point of that program was "to zap labor, and we did." Under the Nixon controls, wages were held down, but prices and profits were not. That is the corporate program for "fighting" inflation and it asks the great mass of Americans to accept a lower living standard, while the rich live it up.

Gerald Ford's Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, Alan Greenspan, is a disciple of Ayn Rand, the rightwing economic visionary who wants to repeal the Twentieth Century. If Greenspan is in charge of controls, they are guaranteed to be unfair to working people and the nation. Therefore in debating controls, one must remember that they are not inherently good or bad, that one's estimation of them is political and depends upon who will be in charge of them. That certainly means that Gerald Ford cannot be given stand-by authority to initiate any system of controls he desires. If controls seem to be necessary, then a Democratic Congress must control the design and oversee their execution.

Secondly, controls are not a magical solution to all our problems, which is what far too many people think. If the government sits idly by while the recession deepens into a depression; if the corporate domination of our energy and food priorities continues to make us vulnerable to shifts on the world market and the cartels of foreign powers; if the structural flaws which abound in our economy are not corrected, then the very best controls administered by the most progressive people will not work. Controls, in short, are a device—and sometimes an excellent one—to buy some time, to damp down an inflationary psychology—but they are not a substitute for full employment policy, for planning in energy and food, and the like.

Thirdly, if we do adopt controls they should be frankly redistributive. We should not ask everyone to make the same contribution to the struggle against in-

flation. Instead, we must implement a principle which is universally affirmed, and universally ignored, in this country: those most able to bear the burden must take their proper share of it. We should not, for instance, freeze the wages of the heads of one-third of the families of the poor who work long, hard hours and still live under the poverty line. We should not codify and legitimate the outrageous disparities in income which afflict not simply the poor, but the working people and a good section of the middle class as well. Wage controls, in short, should not be used simply as an anti-inflationary device but as a means of correcting the maldistribution of income in the United States as well.

Fourthly, corporations will complain that such a policy will deprive them of the profits they need for future investment. Our immediate answer to that should be to place public and employee representatives on the boards of directors of all major companies, charging them to make public the truth about such matters.

---

***We need democratic social planning as the only plausible long-range response to our current inflation-recession.***

---

So controls may be a good idea—and they may be a bad idea. If this Conference advocates them, as the Democratic Governors have, it must spell out some details which will guarantee that they not be used to “zap” the American people and which will place them in a context of an over-all program to deal with the basic problems of this society.

**The longer run**

These immediate proposals could go a long way toward dealing with the Great Inflation-Recession of 1974. But they do not begin to deal with the fundamental structural flaws which are the root of our crisis.

It should by now be abundantly clear that we cannot trust the basic allocation decisions in the American economy to the corporate profit seekers who have utilized that power to bring us to our present miserable estate. It is absurd to describe the decisions of oil men which have made this entire nation vulnerable economically and politically as “private.” They have had greater public consequence than all the laws of the state legislatures combined; indeed, they have affected our lives more than most Federal statutes. Such enormous social power in the hands of private profiteers is a fundamental threat to the people of the United States. It must be democratically socialized.

This does not mean, as some people think, that socialists like myself propose to put the entire economy under centralized Federal control. The economic failures of Communist totalitarianism, which is one of the many costs of the lack of democratic freedoms in those societies, is ample proof of how counter-productive that can be. But what we do need to do is to move intelligently, through a variety of forms of social prop-

erty, including cooperatives, and government regulation, to democratize corporate power in America and ultimately to transform the very nature of the corporation itself. Experiments which have been carried out in West Germany and Scandinavia, for instance, show that the workers themselves can, if given the chance, make creative contributions to organizing the very process of production.

Some steps to move in the direction of this democratization of economic power are:

- a change in corporate structure, with employee and public members of boards of directors and worker participation in all decision-making;

- the establishment of an Office of the Future as part of the Presidency which would submit a projection of basic priorities—in transportation, energy use, food production and the like—to a Joint Congressional Committee on the Future, which would, after hearing from all interested citizens and groups, then refer the revised plan to the Congress for a vote;

- the utilization of the Internal Revenue Code as a means of redistributing wealth in America; substituting a single, highly progressive Federal income and inheritance tax for all other taxes in the nation and providing for a portion of these revenues to be returned to state and local government;

- the expansion of the publicly owned sector in America in those areas where bigness is a precondition of efficiency, like energy, and governmental support for cooperative enterprise wherever economically feasible.

We need, then, democratic planning for popularly determined social priorities instead of state-subsidized corporate planning for private profit. And this, as we have seen, is not a debate over the best form of society in an ideal world; it is the only plausible long-range response which deals with the forces which brought us our current inflation-recession.

**And 1976?**

How does this analysis and immediate program bear on the crucial question of winning the White House in 1976?

The Democratic Party—and the American people—have profound international responsibilities. In Asia and Africa there are food shortages and famine; in the Middle East, there is an imminent danger of a new war which tragically threatens the very existence of Israel and yet will not solve any of the legitimate problems of the Palestinians; and the nuclear detente of recent years has only seen the first tentative steps

---

**Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee**

**Second Convention**

**January 24-26, 1975**

**Commodore Hotel, New York City**

away from a brink from which humanity might well never return. But the election of 1976 will not be determined by these issues, important as they are. If the Democratic Party can provide an effective program to deal with the national crisis, it can win the right to lead the nation in its foreign affairs. But the domestic problems are now critical.

In 1968, there was a split in the Democratic Party because of the war. It was, I believe, necessary, for that was the only way in which a monstrous error could be righted (although I should personally note that after campaigning for both Robert Kennedy and Eugene McCarthy, I supported Hubert Humphrey in the general election, believing him to be infinitely preferable to Richard Nixon, a judgment I have never regretted). In that split, the majority of the American trade union movement and some of their allies from the traditional Rooseveltian coalition stood on one side; a significant minority of labor—counting unions enrolling over four million members—and new strata of activists from the civil rights, anti-war and women's movements stood on the other side. In 1972, that split was repeated, only this time the question of contrasting life-styles and social attitudes was perhaps as important as Vietnam.

If this split is perpetuated at Kansas City—above all, if it wrecks the Democratic Party in 1976—the Republicans, after eight years of catastrophic misleadership, might still win the Presidency. But how, then, are these divisions to be healed?

Vietnam is not now an issue and it is probably true that America has learned a lesson from that bitter experience. Domestic issues are, as we have seen, paramount. And in this area, the two sides of the split are much closer than they think. In 1972, George McGovern rightly campaigned against the outrageous tax breaks which the corporate rich get on their unearned income and called for plugging up more than \$20 billion of loopholes. Shortly after the election, George Meany, who had refused to back McGovern, went before Congress and testified for almost the identical tax program. In 1974, Meany and the AFL-CIO rightly supported McGovern for re-election to the U.S. Senate.

There is, I believe, broad programmatic agreement on questions like taxes, public employment, anti-recession spending and the like. For that consensus to become a political program, both sides of the fights in 1968 and 1972 are going to have to abandon the notion that they can go it alone. For neither is capable of organizing a political majority.

The Democratic Party cannot win without America's blue collar workers. The ignorant theory that trade unionists are affluent and conservative is nonsense. Most American workers don't have enough money to live a comfortable life and they have less buying power today than a year ago. The unions have been a crucial force in pushing for domestic social legislation, more so by far than the churches or the students or other groups which sometimes seem to look down upon workers. For instance, it is because of the efforts of the United Auto Workers and the AFL-CIO that national health security is on the agenda.

The Democratic Party cannot win without the mi-

norities. In 1972, 20 percent of the Democratic vote was black. But for blacks to continue their allegiance to the Party of Roosevelt, it must go beyond Roosevelt; it must find solutions to new problems, to the double-digit unemployment and intolerable conditions of the ghetto.

The Democratic Party cannot win without the huge new constituencies which mobilized in the anti-war movement and the campaigns of 1968 and 1972. This predominantly youthful, college-educated and issue-oriented population is a vital new force in American politics, which is one crucial reason why the procedural reforms of the past decade must be kept completely intact. A resurgent women's movement is one of the most important elements in this new constituency and it now includes organizations of both trade union and black women.

A last, personal word. I have been a democratic socialist all of my adult life; I have been a registered Democrat for some fifteen or so years. I worked with Martin Luther King, Jr., and participated in Lyndon Johnson's Task Force on Poverty; I am a member of the American Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO) and I have worked to build support for every major strike of the last twenty years. I campaigned for Lyndon Johnson in 1964, for Kennedy, McCarthy and Humphrey in 1968, for Muskie and McGovern in 1972, and for a host of candidates at the Congressional and local levels.

---

***The New Deal enacted much of  
Eugene Debs' immediate program of  
the 1912 socialist campaign.***

---

My socialism is not a foreign importation. It is rooted in the Indiana soil which gave this country Eugene V. Debs, in the Ohio of Norman Thomas and the California of Upton Sinclair. Once democratic socialists stood outside of the Democratic Party as its opponents but even then we made our contribution. The New Deal of the Thirties legislated into existence much—but not all—of the immediate program of Debs in the campaign of 1912. Now, for a variety of reasons, many of us believe that our place is within the Democratic Party, and we have acted on that conviction.

We do not demand that the Democrats adopt our complete program. Neither our Party nor the nation, alas, is ready for that. But we do not hide that program; we are not "boring from within"; we proudly say who we are. Here and now we think we have a contribution to make to meeting this unprecedented challenge of the Seventies. We ask that our ideas be judged not according to stereotypes, but on their merits.

And if asked what we ultimately want, we would answer: something as utterly American as democracy, but democracy in a fullness America has never known, democracy in the economy and society as well as at the ballot box. □

# Jimmy Higgins reports . . .

**LITTLE NOTED** but significant results from the recent election: nationwide there are now 553 women in state legislatures, up more than 100; the number of black legislators in the South jumped from 60 to 93. Neither blacks nor women gained appreciably in Congress, though. There'll be just one more woman and one more black in the House.

**TOO FAR RIGHT FROM THE START**—With Mondale and Kennedy out, the early contenders for the 1976 nomination cover a broad ideological spectrum from mild conservatives to racist reactionaries. Militant moderate Scoop Jackson (with his "we've never had it so good" speechwriter-adviser Ben Wattenberg) may have an early lead, but he'll be pressed from the Right, most obviously by the "new" George Wallace. But other conservative candidates are lining up. Former Klansman and present Senate Whip, Robert Byrd, is thinking about running. Texas Senator Lloyd Bentsen and newly-elected Ohio Senator John Glenn, both likely candidates, are chasing the same Right-Center vote as Jackson and yes, Wallace.

**WHAT ABOUT THE PARTY'S LEFT?** Well, most of the early candidates are just ignoring us, or planning to campaign against us. That doesn't mean that Arizona Congressman Morris Udall has all the McGovern-Muskie voters to himself. For one thing, McGovern is definitely planning to run again. That's why his speech acknowledging his Senate re-election sounded so much like Presidential campaign oratory. McGovern has already approached several of the big Democratic fund-raisers who helped him last time. Their reaction was, at best, unenthusiastic. Another former Presidential candidate who knows a lot about fund-raising problems is also trying again—former Oklahoma Senator and national Party chairman Fred Harris whose fund-raising problems ended his 1972 campaign before it got started; he's projecting a low budget populist appeal. Georgia legislator Julian Bond will also enter some primaries, less in hope of winning than with a strategy of advancing black interests at the convention.

**QUOTE WITHOUT COMMENT**—"Nelson Rockefeller is not only a generous friend . . . he is one of the few class leaders in America."—Oregon Governor Tom McCall, November 1, 1974.

**ED SADLOWSKI'S VICTORY** in the Steelworkers' largest district (District 31, Chicago-Gary) will have more impact on union democracy and on the shape of the labor movement than the 1972 Miners for Democracy victory. More workers are involved; District 31 has 130,000 members to 120,000 for the entire U.M.W. And Sadlowski wasn't up against a corrupt, felonious administration which had completely divorced itself from the rank-and-file. Rather he took on the most powerful district organization in the AFL-CIO's largest union; a leadership which has delivered reasonable contracts in years past and is bragging about the current pact; ingrained bureaucratic ways of doing things, like having a retiring district director anoint his successor and steal the election for him. Sadlowski took all of them on and won the rerun (ordered by the Labor Department) 2-1. Remember, too, that Sadlowski at age 36 will have a continuing impact. He's being mentioned as a possible successor to I. W. Abel.

**SADLOWSKI WILL** shake up politics a bit, too. The cozy relationship between the Chicago Steelworkers and the Daley machine will end. And national politicians are busily courting the new director's favor. Rumor has it that one U.S. Senator personally called to congratulate Sadlowski.

**FOR ALL THE PREDICTABLE** reasons, we can look forward to a more liberal Congress. For the first time since 1966, Democratic liberals (this time with help from new Southern moderates) outnumber the Republican-Dixiecrats. Within the Democratic ranks, there is a restive mood. Wilbur Mills, who defied the Democratic Caucus this sessions, will be reined in by the enlargement of Ways and Means. The Democratic Study Group is exploring ways to strengthen liberals on key committees. Newly-elected Democrats are acting "uppity" in organizing, setting up an office.

*The Newsletter of the Democratic Left* is published ten times a year by the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee. It is available by subscription or by membership in the DSOC. If you liked what you read, don't miss our next issue.

I want to subscribe. Enclosed find my check or money order. (\$10 for a sustaining subscription; \$5 for a regular subscription; \$2.50 for a limited income subscription).

I'd like to join the DSOC. Enclosed find my dues. (\$15 regular dues; \$8 limited income).

Send me more information about democratic socialism and the DSOC.

Send to: Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee, 31 Union Square, Room 1112B, New York, N.Y. 10003

Name .....

Address .....

City/State ..... Zip .....

Signature .....