

Boston: the poison of segregation

by JACK PLUNKETT

In 1965 Massachusetts enacted a statute, the first of its kind in the nation, to eliminate predominantly black public schools. The statute declared that any school with an enrollment of more than 50 percent non-white was "imbalanced" and that the imbalance would have to be corrected. The state Board of Education was empowered to direct any offending community to submit plans to correct the imbalance and to withhold state aid in case of noncompliance. At the time, Boston had 45 "imbalanced" schools.

The legislative fight against the Racial Imbalance Act has raged ever since. After almost 10 years of cynical dodging and court fights, the Boston School Committee had its back pushed to the wall: it was under a State Supreme Judicial Court order to correct imbalance in the schools. A state Board of Education plan was to be implemented in September, 1974. In 1974, the law was finally gutted. At the time, Boston had 61 imbalanced schools.

The struggle in the Legislature partially obscured the view of anti-busing forces to the progress of a case deliberately proceeding through the Boston Federal District Court which pitted the NAACP against the Boston School Committee. On June 21, 1974, shortly after the victory of anti-busing legislators in the State House, Judge W. Arthur Garrity delivered his opinion in the case. In 154 pages Garrity recreated the controversy and traced the School Committee's actions through almost 10 years of squirming on the hook of the Racial Imbalance Act. The opinion tracks the School Committee through its use of school facilities and construction, through districting and redistricting policies, feeder patterns, open enrollment and controlled transfer policies, through faculty and staff assignments and through policies governing vocational and examination schools. The judge examined hiring policies and teacher assignments and found a pattern which resulted in the staffing of black schools with the least experienced teachers.

"The court concludes," Garrity wrote, "that the defendants have knowingly carried out a systematic program of segregation affecting all of the city's students, teachers and school facilities and have intentionally brought about and maintained a dual school system. Therefore, the entire school system of Boston is unconstitutionally segregated."

He ordered the city to desegregate its schools, using first the Board of Education plan for September, 1974

to desegregate part of the system and following with complete desegregation in September, 1975.

Thousands of Bostonians reacted to the desegregation order and to the start of its enforcement in September in ways that have been widely publicized. Angry crowds, kept in check by hordes of police, crowded around South Boston High School. Buses carrying black pupils were stoned or attacked. A black man was beaten on the streets of South Boston; a white youth was stabbed by a black in South Boston High School. School attendance was kept down by a white boycott.

(Continued on page 4)

Socialists, soldiers mobilize for Portugal's election

by MICHAEL HARRINGTON

Will Portugal, less than one year removed from decades of fascism, go the way of Chile? Of Peru? Of Czechoslovakia? One will get the beginnings of an answer when the first real elections in a generation take place in that country on April 12th.

The ruling political party in Portugal is not a political party. It is the Movement of the Armed Forces (MFA)—but then even that title is inexact. In reality it is the Movement of the Officers of the Armed Forces. On very, very few occasions the ranks have been allowed to participate in the discussions, but basically this is an organization of the officers. It is led by an Assembly of 200 members and a Council of Twenty. The latter instructs the military members of the cabinet how to vote, i.e. it effectively determines policy for the nation.

The MFA contains a number of political currents. There are followers of the deposed General Spínola; another tendency, favorable to the President of the Republic, General Costa Gomes, is credited with insisting that the elections be held; and there are officers, generally young, who are sympathetic to the Communist Party. The latter are part of a change which took place in Portugal as a result of the colonial war. The upper class youth did not want careers in a shooting army and there was, therefore, an infusion of college-educated, middle class officers who had been influenced by the campus ferment of the 1960's.

The spokesman for this pro-Communist tendency

(Continued on page 2)

Portugal's election . . .

(Continued from page 1)

is Brigadier Otelo Saraiva de Carvalho, the military leader of the anti-fascist coup last April and the commander of Copcon, the Praetorian guard of the MFA. In January, Carvalho ominously remarked that "the party that might win the majority of the votes might not necessarily represent the real will and true interests of the Portuguese people."

The main ally of the Carvalho wing of the MFA (the "Peruvians" who want authoritarian modernization) is the Communist Party (PCP) and its front, the Portuguese Democratic Movement (MDP). The Communists were the only anti-fascists who maintained an underground organization throughout the Salazar-Caetano dictatorships. That record, with the torture and jail sentences that are part of it, has given them a certain moral authority in some sectors. Still, opinion polls have all showed that the PCP is the weakest of the major political currents (with support of between 8 and 15 percent of the population).

The PCP has an earned reputation of being among the most Stalinist of the European Communist parties. It was, for example, an enthusiastic supporter of the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia, which makes it more slavishly Muscovite than even the French CP. In the present situation, Alvaro Cunhal, the PCP's leader, has urged a distinctive policy: that the MFA should "institutionalize" itself as the central revolutionary movement after the elections. Its members would participate in the government on their own nomination without the need to submit their candidacies to the electorate.

The Communists, Mary Holland reports in *The New Statesman*, "have been rigorous in stamping out spontaneous protests among their natural supporters, in breaking strikes, for example, wherever they think they are dangerous to the public or the economy." This, Holland notes, is one aspect of the PCP which has favorably impressed the younger officers.

A number of Maoist and Trotskyist sects stand to the ultra-Left of the Communists. One of the largest, the Movement for the Reorganization of the Party of the Proletariat (MRRP) proclaims "Long live Stalin!" and regards Cunhal's PCP as "social fascist." Three of the ultra-Left groups merged in order to get 5,000 signatures to qualify as a ballot party. They will run as the Popular Democratic Union.

The Popular Democratic Union is not to be confused with the Popular Democratic Party (PPD). The latter is led by politicians who had been in the legal opposition to the Caetano dictatorship (which allowed rigged elections and limited criticism). The PPD defines itself as social democratic and unsuccessfully sought affiliation with the Socialist International last year. One must remember that, as Mario Soares, the Socialist leader put it, "Everyone now places himself within a socialist perspective—or almost." So the PPD is more a party of the Center than of the Left.

The Social Democratic Center Party (CDS) is as far Right as Portuguese politics go. Some 4,000 promi-

nent allies of the Caetano and Salazar regimes have been disenfranchised so there is no tendency which actually identifies with the old order. The CDS, with links to the Christian Democratic and conservative parties of Europe, is thus the effective party of the Right. Its congress in Oporto was broken up last January by ultra-Lefts.

Finally, there is the Socialist Party (PSP) led by Portugal's foreign minister—and the architect of decolonization—Mario Soares. Soares underwent jail and exile under the dictatorship. He leads a democratic socialist party, affiliated with the Socialist International; in the first month of this year it recruited 15,000 new members. It is the one party which presents an alternative to the Communist-MFA moves toward a military regime—a Portuguese Peru.

The critical problem faced by Soares and his party is economic. Portuguese capitalism is, some say, a "paleo-capitalism," the most backward in Europe. One third of the population is illiterate and at the end of 1974 there was an unemployment rate of 20 percent and an inflation rate of 35 percent. Salazar and Caetano so stagnated the economy that Portugal's main export in recent times has been its own poor, hundreds of thousands of whom are now a part of the "sub-proletariat" on the Continent.

Soares' program to deal with this incredible situation has two basic, and inter-related, elements: a plea for massive aid, particularly from socialist-led governments and the integration of Portugal into the Common Market, especially into its socialist "caucus." The analogy of the Marshall Plan is sometimes used on the first count but Soares is wary of it. He is very much aware of the "ideological" aspect of American aid. Such assistance, he told Jean-François Revel of *L'Express* "cannot mean the colonization of Portugal by the multi-nationals. It cannot signify the control of our economy by international capitalism."

Soares is sure to be attacked by the Portuguese Communists—and by their close friends in the French CP—as a reformist traitor for talking of integrating into the Common Market. The only problem is that this is also the policy of the most successful Communist Party in Western Europe, the Italian.

Soares is also in conflict with the PCP on the issue

Newsletter of

THE DEMOCRATIC LEFT

Michael Harrington, Editor

Jack Clark, Managing Editor

Gretchen Donart, Production Manager

People who helped to put this issue out:

Stephen Davis, Tilford Dudley, Selma Lenihan, Bonnie Potter, 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.

Annual Chicago Eugene V. Debs-Norman Thomas Dinner

Honoring Alderman Leon M. Despres

SUNDAY, MAY 4 — MIDLAND HOTEL

Guest speaker: Joseph Rauh

Toastmaster: Ralph Helstein

For details, write: P.O. Box 59422, Chicago, Ill. 60659

First New York Debs-Thomas Dinner

Honoring Bernard Rifkin

STATLER HILTON HOTEL — SATURDAY, MAY 10

Guest speaker: David Barrett

socialist premier of British Columbia

For details, write DSOC, 31 Union Square—Room 1112

New York, N.Y. 10003 (212) 255-7315

of democracy. He wants everyone to declare openly how they see the relationship between the army and the government; he also thinks that officers who want to be in politics should run for office rather than appoint themselves to it. Cunhal's friends in France (they are part of the "hard," or more Stalinist, wing of the CP) have already expressed outrage on this score. Jean Kanapa, a member of the central Committee of the PCF, has denounced "the German socialist Willy Brandt, the Swedish socialist Olof Palme, and the socialist, Mario Soares, who feed anti-Communist propaganda to the press and television." Apparently it is red-baiting to comment on the fact that the PCP is in favor of a law-and-order military regime.

The April elections will not resolve all of these issues. Indeed, for a while it seemed that the elections might be cancelled, something the PCP and its allies in the MFA would have welcomed. But in February Costa Gomes apparently intervened quite strongly in the MFA and convinced its Assembly to honor its original commitment to holding elections within a year. This is further evidence that the military is not monolithic. (So is the fate of the law to recognize only one trade union federation, Intersindical, which is currently under Communist control. Instructed by the Council of Twenty, the officers of the Cabinet voted for the measure; but they then turned around and helped to weaken it by a series of amendments which were never reported in the American press.)

The voters will elect the members of a Constituent Assembly, but the real power will remain in the hands of the present government, which is to say the MFA. However this poll will obviously strengthen the existing parties which get the highest vote. That could turn the government in a more democratic direction—or it might incite Carvalho and his troops in Copcon to make a second coup d'état.

Soares counts on the support of socialists and trade unionists outside of Portugal, particularly in Europe. He declares, "We are for a Europe of workers, not a Europe of the trusts. We want, then, to contribute to the development of this political Europe which will move towards a socialism in freedom." □

The 'unwelcome majority'

by STEVEN KELMAN

In what ranks as one of the most brazen advertising campaigns in recent memory, a consortium of magazines including *Forbes* (which proudly dubs itself a "capitalist tool"), *Business Week*, *U.S. News and World Report*, *Time*, and *Newsweek*, has been running a series of ads in *Business Week*, urging corporate execs to advertise in their publications rather than on television. The target of the *Business Week* ads is the growth in recent years of televised "institutional advertising," where a corporation touts, not its product, but its virtues as an institution in society. The problem with television advertising, it seems, is that too many people watch it—including millions of the "wrong kind" of people.

One ad directed at the execs pictures an irate-looking woman, lips pursed, with the headline: "I saw on TV where your profits are up. So, when are your prices coming down?" The ad continues:

When you put your corporate advertising on TV you reach a lot of financial analysts, investors, businessmen, politicians, and other key targets.

You also reach Mrs. Jones. And millions like her. She's impressed. But not the way you want her to be. . . . All she knows is that a lot of big companies have been bragging how successful they are right there on her TV screen.

Instead of wanting to buy your stock and get in on your profits, she wants to control your prices and raise your taxes. . . .

If Cal Coolidge were alive today and could see how corporate giants try to explain themselves to the vast, mixed-up TV audience, he'd undoubtedly paraphrase himself something like this. "The business of business isn't everybody's business."

So, when you buy this unwelcome, unavoidable majority on TV . . . it puts you in the questionable position of talking to millions of the very people you don't want to talk to when you're talking business.

Another ad in the series shows a cigar-chomping worker saying, "I saw all those new automatic machines on your company's TV commercial. What happened to the jobs?" The ad goes on to report that TV pictures of "shiny new automated, computerized production lines" are "exactly what a company's white-collar prospects like to hear. It's sweet music to the ears of security analysts, fund managers, customers, future customers, and prospective junior executives." But, alas, such groups are not the only television viewers. And, the ad reminds its business readers, "The white-collar community is for cost-cutting technology. The blue-collar community is for jobs."

The moral of the story: advertise in elite publications which the "unwelcome, unavoidable majority" doesn't read.

Makes sense for America, doesn't it? □

Boston . . .

(Continued from page 1)

How could a city which had voted for McGovern, which had voted to put the only black in the U.S. Senate, react like some '60's southern backwater town?

If the nation was surprised, Bostonians were not. The stubborn fight for the neighborhood schools had been going on since 1965 and to say so, necessarily brings up terms that need some explanation.

• **Boston.** For many persons looking from a distance, Boston seems charming, urbane, educated, and liberal, a mix of Harvard and the magnificent architecture of Boston City Hall. But to Bostonians, Boston is a small city, 18 percent of whose population is nonwhite, a series of neighborhoods, most of them hard pressed, some of them badly hollowed out by massive white flight to the suburbs.

While the city constructed its grand Government Center, people in the poorer sections watched their neighborhoods decay. While downtown planners counted Logan Airport as one of the most valuable assets of the city, people in East Boston watched runway extensions eat away at their neighborhoods. Highway builders ripped a swath through several neighborhoods to construct a road to ease suburban entrance into the city, a road that was stopped only when neighborhood groups combined and were at the point of militant action.

Capital quotes

“There is a surprising amount of ‘seat of the pants’ speculation about whether a sustained period of high unemployment might bring a real change for the better in American work habits.

Might not absenteeism decline, for example, if employers can always find someone else eager to take the job. . . .

This whole ‘happy’ side of sustained unemployment is not to say that many here view the unplanned experiment in joblessness as a good thing.

As Mr. Perry put it, ‘Econometricians will learn a lot. But I suppose doctors probably learned something about medicine in the Great Plague, too.’”

—The New York Times
February 16, 1975

Boston's local political leadership during this period has been, on the whole, lackluster. On the mayoral level, elections have revolved around the twin stars: the vapid but politically canny Louise Day Hicks; and Kevin White, a machine politician whose lust for higher office must disturb his sleep. The School Committee has been dominated by people like Hicks or John Kerrigan, a tragedian whose single role of St. Sebastian

pierced by a Federal District Court decision wears after a time. The City Council has been emptied of power by White's avid monopoly of patronage and by second-raters like Albert “Dapper” O’Neil, a gun-toting neanderthal.

• **The suburbs.** In the minds of Bostonians, the pejorative terms “the suburbs” and “suburban liberals” refer to a relatively small group of suburbs largely to the west of Boston. Older industrial suburbs, as well as the South Shore where former Bostonians, predominantly Irish, have fled, are not included. It does include places like Newton, Wellesley, Lexington, Lincoln and Concord which contain the residences of the executives for whom Bostonians work. The definition gets so discrete that it excludes working class sections of Cambridge but includes Harvard. Neighboring Bostonians have always blamed “the suburban liberals” for many of their problems and see the liberal Boston *Globe* as a suburban forum.

• **Forced busing.** Bostonians don't object to busing or even to public transport required for school attendance. The direction of the bus is the problem. About a third of Boston's students, including some 3,000 elementary pupils, were bused or used public transportation to go to school before the court decision. As Judge Garrity pointed out, the underlying purpose of the existing transportation patterns was to get away from black areas and black schools and busing was freely used to preserve a segregated system.

• **Neighborhood schools.** Upon examination, this term too turns out to be largely a slogan for a return to segregation. Boston has not had a neighborhood school system for years, except in largely black or largely white areas. As Garrity pointed out, “The neighborhood school has been a reality only where residential segregation is firmly entrenched.”

The ruckus that broke out in September was mainly in white South Boston which had been joined under the desegregation plan with adjacent black Roxbury. Rocked by the furious crowds, politicians were pushed into demagoguery or hiding. The state Building Trade Council and the Firefighters Union sided with the demonstrators against forced busing. The State Labor Council, AFL-CIO, issued a statement in favor of quality integrated education only after industrial unionists dug in their heels.

Psychiatrist Robert Coles, in a long interview in the *Globe*, made a case for the protesters. The interview pointed out the class aspect of the protest—the beleaguered city ethnics vs. suburbanites who have bought safety. Coles is a resident of one of the suburbs, Concord, and the piece quietly drummed with breast beating. While it failed to emphasize the deprivation of at least a generation of black children, it did strike some valid points of grievance.

What is the case for South Boston? After all, these people vote as basic working class, bread-and-butter liberals. South Boston voted for McGovern and against Nixon. Although President Ford sided with the demonstrators, it is safe to say that South Boston would never vote for Ford. Yet, it protested furiously

against a court decision based on elementary notions of human rights.

Bordered on three sides by water, South Boston is a distinct neighborhood, varied enough to encompass class distinctions of its own. Although South Boston is 98 percent white and Roxbury, 70 percent black, in some respects South Boston is more like Roxbury than it is like, say, West Roxbury, another white neighborhood on the outskirts of the city before the western suburbs begin, far enough away from the center of racial controversy to have increased its population during the last decade.

South Boston and Roxbury are economically similar neighborhoods competing for the same jobs.

Statistics from the 1970 census show that Roxbury's median income was \$6,588, while South Boston's was \$8,704. In West Roxbury, the median income was \$12,306. Moreover, 16 percent of West Roxbury's people were college graduates and 41 percent had completed high school. Only 5 percent of South Boston's population and 7 percent of Roxbury's population had completed college. High school graduates comprised 34 percent of South Boston's and 30 percent of Roxbury's population. In both South Boston and Roxbury, the highest percentage of workers were in clerical jobs. In West Roxbury, 21 percent of the workers were listed as professional. Comparing South Boston with Roxbury, one has the impression of two adjoining, economically similar neighborhoods essentially in competition for the same jobs.

But in the controversy, South Boston does not point to its similarities with Roxbury (although many residents are aware of them) but to its differences. This means crime. In the first seven months of 1974, Roxbury had 13 murders, 63 rapes, 921 armed robberies, 377 cases of aggravated assault, 1,196 cases of breaking and entering and 457 purse snatchings. The figures for South Boston were considerably lower: seven murders, eight rapes, 50 armed robberies, 59 cases of aggravated assault, 246 cases of breaking and entering and 12 purse snatchings. Roxbury's population was 62,856, according to 1970 census figures, and South Boston's 38,488.

Although the fear of crime is a predominant force behind the protest, there is also a lively fear of lowering educational levels in South Boston, already low enough. The differential in reading scores is not well documented. The Boston School Department has become reluctant over the past several years to release results. However, it is axiomatic in the city that black educational levels are lower than white levels, not a surprising notion given years of staffing black schools with the least experienced teachers.

Now it is difficult to maintain that the fears of crime and lowered educational attainment are not rational

fears. Crime is certainly real to urban dwellers. It is the main engine of white flight throughout the country. About 15 years ago, Mattapan, another neighborhood adjacent to Roxbury, contained a population of nearly 80,000 Jews. Boston banks in the late 1960's, fast in the grip of a short-lived fad among businessmen for social consciousness, released the banking red line from Mattapan and encouraged blacks to take out FHA-insured mortgages. In an operation that fueled the blockbuster, unsettled the community and spurred crime, Mattapan swiftly tipped. A recent survey shows about 2,600 Jews left in Mattapan.

It is true that poverty and the incidence of crime are as closely related now as they were when the Irish crowded into Boston tenements. And it is true that the lagging educational attainment of black children is the fruit of deliberate segregation. Nevertheless, the school situation is here now and the South Boston parents feel betrayed by the court's action dissolving the buffer between the education of the two races. They are afraid for their own children, their own neighborhood and the survival of the city. The group they formed is called ROAR, Restore Our Alienated Rights. They call for justice and point to the suburbs.

They feel what they have done to protect themselves is really not different from what the suburbs have done. The pattern of inner city-suburban differences is well known. Inevitably, like cream from milk,

Hobson's choice of the month

At a seminar entitled "Can We Afford the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970" sponsored by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, William L. White had the audience shedding crocodile tears for his poor employer. U.S. Steel, he claimed, cannot afford even the meager compliance requirements of OSHA. White neglected to mention the 90 percent increase in profits which his employer just reported and the similarly excessive increases reported by Bethlehem and Republic Steel.

Tony Mazzocchi, legislative director of the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers, a most militant union on occupational health issues, put the situation in perspective. Mazzocchi pointed out that the U.S. spends over \$100 billion for defense every year, ostensibly to protect 210 million Americans, but only \$150 million to protect the health of 57 million workers.

Meanwhile, more American workers die every year from chronic occupational diseases than were killed in Vietnam. The silent slaughter in the workplace continues. And as the recession deepens into depression, industry is demanding the lowering of OSHA standards.

Thus American workers have their Hobson's choice—your job or your life.

—HOWARD GOLDMAN

the separation occurs according to income and, therefore, race. But the demarcation point for white flight is not just the city's borders. It is deep in the city at the racial-tipping point. Judge Garrity included in his decision a sketch of school districts graphically showing the line between black and white schools. The white school line looked like a string of frontier forts.

The South Boston parents protest that they must take the burden of desegregation, even though they have continued to maintain an urban neighborhood in great difficulty, they live close to the black community, they share and even compete in a limited job market with blacks, ride the same transportation system with blacks, and compete for neighborhood development funds and municipal patronage with Roxbury. They blame the suburbanites for the racial imbalance bill and smell hypocrisy in the clucking of suburban tongues over their protest. A poll of suburbanites, printed in the *Globe*, indicated that wealthy suburbs were willing to open some limited number of school seats to blacks from the city—but not willing to have their children bused to schools in Boston. Who is to say that South Boston isn't correct in its perceptions?

But once the case is made for South Boston, something else must be said: the Bostonians who now protest have been so intent on freezing the status quo in education by relying on second-rate political actors

that they cannot escape responsibility for cruel and stupid deprivation in the education of all the children in the city. While Louise Day Hicks was making a plaster icon of the neighborhood school, school standards were declining—and not just for blacks.

Blacks graduating from all but a very few high schools have little chance of entering college. But it is no secret to white high school seniors in South Boston that they also have little chance. Michael Ansara, a teacher at the Boston Community School, noted in the *Globe* last September that citywide dropout rates are as high as 20 percent.

"Of the entire citywide graduating class," Ansara noted, "at most 29 percent go on to any form of higher education. Of 10 cities with roughly equivalent school populations, Boston sends the smallest percentage of its students on to college. . . . South Boston High graduated 418 kids last year. Fifteen of them went on to private four-year colleges; 70 went on to state colleges; 285 went directly to work."

The real fruits of the long battle to maintain segregation are black children deprived of an education equal to whites and all children deprived of educational quality. It is a lesson that various groups, particularly trade unionists, seem to have to learn, forget and relearn: *the poison of injustice sickens the poisoner too.*

Judge Garrity's ruling means that segregation is

May 17 Boston march planned

by KENNY SCHAEFFER

The civil rights movement is alive and well and living in Boston.

Over the weekend of February 14-16, over 2,000 participants from 30 states, plus Canada and Mexico, gathered at Boston University to hold a conference on racism. At the conclusion of the weekend, following speeches Friday night by Dick Gregory, Benjamin Spock, and Tom Atkins (head of the Boston chapter of the NAACP), and workshops all day Saturday, a new organization was formed: the National Student Conference Against Racism.

At this point, NSCAR is focusing its energies on two projects: mobilizing public support for the desegregation plan ordered by Federal Judge Garrity for the Boston school system, and promoting a massive demonstration this spring to put pressure on the Ford Administration to enforce equal protection. The demonstration, which was proposed by Atkins, is set for May 17, the twenty-first anniversary of the Supreme Court's *Brown* decision.

Everyone knows that the Boston public schools, like those in every major city in the North, are ethnically and racially segregated. It is likewise common knowledge that, since the *Brown* decision, this society has officially been committed to eliminating this dual school system on the grounds that separate schools are institutions of racism in America. But while the NAACP's battery of lawyers has worked ceaselessly over the years to challenge the school systems of over a dozen Northern cities in the federal courts, there has

been no federal effort to enforce its position. Nor has there been a *movement* pushing for desegregation north of the Mason-Dixon line at all comparable to the movement in the South in the '50's and '60's. The conference in Boston was an indication that at least this might change.

The conference was primarily organized by the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance, but a wide political spectrum was represented. Black Student Unions from 50 campuses were represented, as were many student governments; NAACP officers played a major role both in setting up and in running the conference; and the endorsers included Black Muslims, Representatives Schroeder, Chisholm, Dellums and Rangel, Nat Hentoff, Julian Bond, the Native American Student Movement, Jesse Jackson's Chicago Operation PUSH, Coretta King, the Chicano Youth Council, officials from the AFT, United Electrical Workers, AFSCME, and the Communication Workers, and a host of other prominent leaders and organizations. There were many independents present, most of whom were politicized by the Vietnam War and Nixon's domestic assault. Significantly, with the exception of a small contingent of Maoists who came with the idea of "exposing" the conference as a bourgeois ploy, there was an inspiring sense of unity of purpose and will. To use a phrase heard frequently at the conference, the formation of the NSCAR on February 16 marked the crystalization of a "multi-racial anti-racist coalition." Where it goes from here will be seen in the months ahead. □

now to end. Either Boston will vastly improve its educational system or it will be hopelessly ruined. All the plans that have been proposed for September 1975 hinge on educational improvement, although that aspect is hidden by the glare of busing. The current recession-inflation freezes white opposition to desegregation within the city. Real estate costs in the suburbs are too high to afford easy flight. Humberto Cardinal Medeiros has closed off the escape route into the parochial schools. Apparently the thing has to be faced at last. An answer may be formed in the crucible of dislike for suburban superiority, shared by blacks and whites in the city.

A metropolitan solution in Boston's case could be a good one. It is complicated by New England's tradi-

tion of local home rule. Boston's metropolitan area contains more than 100 separate municipalities with no unincorporated areas. There are more than 20 cities and towns within a 15-mile radius of downtown Boston. But the city line, at which the Supreme Court stopped in the Detroit desegregation case, is a shaky boundary in assessing white flight in Boston and other cities. The close Supreme Court decision in the Detroit case left the matter still in the throat of the nation. The decision did not rule out state-imposed metropolitan programs to desegregate city schools, and there will be pressure in the Massachusetts Legislature to act this year. Perhaps the metropolitanization of Boston's schools could take the city's politics away at last from the myth of the neighborhood school. □

FOGCO reincarnated

by TILFORD E. DUDLEY

Senator Stevenson's FOGCO (Federal Oil & Gas Corp.) bill died with the last Congress but its ghosts are coming to life all over Capitol Hill. In the House, Democratic Whip John McFall, Representative from California's Sacramento District, has introduced a bill to create a National Energy and Conservation Corporation, which he calls AMPOWER, after AMTRACK. In the Senate, Stevenson has introduced the Consumer Energy Act of 1975 which would, among other things, create a National Energy Supply Corporation and roll back prices for newly discovered oil. Ambitious Senator Henry Jackson is preparing a bill to create a National Energy Production Board, which would be a super-agency establishing priorities, letting contracts and mobilizing both public and private agencies for a dramatic increase in production "like we did in World War II."

Rep. McFall says he is concerned by the failure of the private corporations to move, both in offshore production and in development of shale. "The big companies are capping their wells, waiting for higher prices," he says. Thus his AMPOWER Corporation would team its risk capital with the know-how of the independent experts and smaller companies to spur immediate development and marketing from offshore sources.

For the long term, AMPOWER would explore, develop and market at wholesale levels, oil, gas and coal gas from onshore shale locations, as in Wyoming and Colorado. McFall complains that the private companies with leases have not even started, although "there is enough oil shale out there to power our country for hundreds of years." His corporation would have the authority to issue \$30 billion in bonds, to acquire property, to explore, develop, market and/or conserve energy deposits. Any "profits" would go to the U.S. Treasury.

Sen. Stevenson's NESCO (National Energy Supply Corporation) would operate in the public domain. It would first explore and inventory oil and

gas resources to see if values justify environmental risks and to determine fair returns on leases given to private companies. The Corporation could, if it wishes, develop and produce the crude oil and natural gas itself, supplying it if possible to independent refineries. It would strengthen the independent refineries and develop a yardstick of costs to measure the performance of the private producing companies. However, the Corporation could also operate its own refineries, thus assuring private producers of crude oil of available refinery operations and also getting oil and gasoline into the market at cost-related prices. In addition, the Corporation could develop synthetic process for converting shale, tar sand and coal to oil and gas. Finally, it would be in charge of our reserves, including the huge Naval Petroleum Reserves.

Sen. Stevenson would give his Corporation the authority to negotiate with the oil-producing countries in concert with other oil-consuming nations. The Stevenson bill would also freeze the price of "old" oil at the current level of \$5.25 per barrel and roll the price of new oil back to 70 percent of the world price on January 1, 1975. It would require the Federal Power Commission to set natural gas prices every five years to provide stability, with the first rate to be set within six months in the range of 40 to 60 cents. The Senator says that deregulation of gas would cause prices to rise to about \$2 per thousand cubic feet. In unregulated intrastate markets it is as high as \$2.40 now. Stevenson would also transfer regulation of pipelines from the Interstate Commerce Commission to the FPC with explicit authority to compel hook-ups and make the pipelines genuine common carriers.

The private oil barons are naturally opposing all of these proposals. They prefer no competition, no regulation, no government "interference." The issue is between their money-bought influence and the political influence of the millions of oil-gas-gasoline users. Votes count in the long run, but only vocaloters count in the short run. □

Jimmy Higgins reports . . .

A LABOR MARCH ON WASHINGTON is being planned by a group of progressive New York area trade unionists. Their demands include: reduced working hours with no loss of pay; absolute full employment; a public approach to develop energy; tax cuts, tax reform and a reduction of interest rates; higher rates for unemployment compensation; massive federal aid to municipalities; national health security; and an end to American funding for dictatorships in Southeast Asia. Right now, a modest march of New York trade unionists, unemployed and supporters is planned for late April. With District Council 37 of AFSCME, District 3 of the IUE, Region 9 of the UAW, Local 1199 of the hospital workers, District 65 of the Distributive Workers and some New York City locals working on the march, the organizers hope to at least double the 10,000 the UAW drew for its January march. And they're hoping that a strong turnout from New York will spark further efforts, including a national labor mobilization to bring perhaps as many as a quarter of a million to the capital.

PRESIDENTIAL POLITICKING is already underway for 1976, and some interesting developments are afoot . . . Henry Jackson is clearly *not* running as "labor's" candidate this time. Liberal unions were never big on the Senator from Boeing, anyway, but now George Meany has publicly divorced himself—and the AFL-CIO—from the Jackson candidacy. In December, the AFL-CIO *News* ran a front page editorial condemning the Senate-endorsed trade agreement with the Soviet Union. Jackson was criticized there, but the real fire came on the February 9 "Face the Nation." After assuring the press that he was not as enthusiastic about Jackson as he was in 1972, Meany said, "I just don't like deception, even from a fellow who claims to be a friend." . . . In Texas, supporters of Senator Lloyd Bentsen are busy trying to sew up the state's delegation a year in advance. The Speaker of the State House of Representatives, Billy Clayton, is pushing what he calls "a Bentsen bill" for a statewide primary. Contrary to the recent reforms enacted by the Democratic

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

Regular Subscription \$5 Student rate \$2.50

Sustaining Subscription \$10

Name

Address

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

Send to *Newsletter of the Democratic Left*
31 Union Square West, Room 1112, New York,
N.Y. 10003.

From each according to his/her ability . . .

Party nationally (which won't be in effect for 1976), the primary bill would establish a winner take all primary down to the state senatorial district level. Texas Democratic National Committee members Hall Timanus (who leads the state's Wallace forces) and Billie Carr (prominent in the women's and reform caucuses at the Kansas City mini-convention) have joined forces publicly to oppose the bill. . . . Fred Harris is stumping the country with fairly impressive populist speeches. A recent invitation meeting in New York drew a surprising number of important liberal political figures, but there is still a question about how serious Harris' candidacy can become. He's getting some good press, and some reports indicate that he has good grass roots support in New Hampshire and Massachusetts.

PUBLIC POWER will become a reality in Massachusetts if a bill introduced by petition passes the state legislature. Congressman Michael Harrington (no relation) started the initiative petition campaign for a public power authority to force a vote before the state House and Senate. Public power bills have been kicking around Beacon Hill for more than ten years, and Harrington introduced one of his own while still a state legislator. Because of the enormous weight that Boston Edison and the other utilities carry in the state house, the bills never made it out of committee. But any legislation can reach the floor of both houses if it carries the signatures of 50,000 voters. Groups of consumers, trade unionists (including the largest IUE local in the state) and community activists collected more than 100,000 signatures, 90,000 of which were ruled valid, for the Harrington petition. Organizers don't expect the petition to pass. The utilities are spending heavily (and despite a law requiring Massachusetts lobbies to disclose their finances, the utilities will avoid the political backlash because the vote on the petition comes before the disclosure deadline). The proposed Massachusetts Power Authority is painted as another inefficient, unresponsive state bureaucracy, like the Welfare Department or the Transit Authority. Proponents counter that the public power approach will save consumers money, an estimated 15-20 percent on their current electricity bills. If the legislature defeats the bill, which is likely (Senate President Kevin Harrington, the Congressman's cousin, will side with the utilities), the petition campaign will begin again, this time with the goal of collecting the 10,000 additional signatures needed to put the issue on the 1976 ballot.

SO, WHO'S HURTING?—Sales of Cadillacs in Michigan were up 18 percent in January over 1974 figures, and sales for the Mark IV Lincoln were up by about as much. Rolls-Royce claims that sales to impatient U.S. customers were up 18 percent for 1974 over 1973. In Los Angeles, Tiffany's has been mobbed with customers for the Christmas rush, and other luxury stores like Gucci's and Van Cleef & Arpels have had long lines and higher sales receipts. "The best selling item in the store," according to Van Cleef & Arpels, "has been a ring banded with 6 rows of diamonds at \$5,000."