

Newsletter of

THE DEMOCRATIC LEFT

June 1975—Vol. III, No. 6

217

Edited by MICHAEL HARRINGTON

Is the New Right flipping its Whig?

by JIM CHAPIN

A large proportion (probably a majority) of the leaders of the American Right have concluded that the Republican Party, like its Whig predecessor, is doomed.

Indeed, the "Whig analogy," put forward most directly in recent books by Kevin Phillips (author of *The Emerging Republican Majority*) and William Rusher (publisher of the *National Review*) has become a cliché in conservative circles. But the seriousness and strength of the Right's determination to bring down the Republicans has been and is persistently underestimated by liberals, by the media and by most politicians. Yet the mass strength of the Right over the last dozen years is the most startling new fact in American politics.

Walter Dean Burnham, probably the most sophisticated expert on political realignment in the United States, repeatedly points out the significance of the Wallace phenomenon. In all our Presidential elections, only seven minor parties which were not merely split-offs from major parties have ever secured 5 percent or more of the vote. They were: the Anti-Masonic Party in 1832; the Free Soilers in 1848; the Greenback Party in 1878; the Populists in 1892; the Socialists in 1912; the (LaFollette) Progressive in 1924; and the (Wallace) American Independent Party in 1968. Given the institutional and ideological barriers to third party voting, Burnham argues, every such protest has im-

tion, after years of work and the Great Depression and with an electoral system that favored minor parties. Put in that light, Wallace's 13 percent of the vote in 1968 is very impressive. Also impressive, although completely unnoticed, was John Schmitz's million votes plus as the 1972 nominee of the American Party. These votes, solicited in what Phillips calls a "credibility and media vacuum," were collected despite the presence of an opponent who used the same sort of "lesser-evil" rhetoric that destroyed left parties in the 1930's. Polls now predict that Wallace will collect 20 percent of the vote next year; that would

(Continued on page 2)

Black and white together: strategies for a movement

by MICHAEL HARRINGTON

There was a nostalgic feeling in marching behind the DSOC banner at the May 17th demonstration called by the NAACP in Boston. It had been a long time since many of us had been part of an inter-racial throng singing "We Shall Overcome." I remembered the streets of Montgomery at the end of the Selma trek in 1965, or that silent, tragic day in Memphis in 1968 when we came to pay our last respects to Martin Luther King, Jr., who had been slain in that city while supporting the sanitationmen's strike.

But the issue which brought us to Boston was anything but nostalgic. We were there because of the bitter battle over busing in South Boston. This was, in short, a movement of the '70's facing new problems, above all, how to fight for racial justice in a time of deep depression.

The cause of black Boston is, as those who read Jack Plunkett's article in the March NEWSLETTER know, utterly righteous. That one time capital of American abolitionism has not simply tolerated the *de facto* segregation which arises out of housing patterns; its school board has, during the 21 years since the Supreme Court opinion against "separate but equal," increased the segregation in the city's educational system. We were not, alas, marching in solidarity with some bold and imaginative new plan for qual-

(Continued on page 4)

Your move?

As usual, the *Newsletter* will cease publishing for the summer. Our next issue will be in September.

To make sure you get it on time, send us your new address if you've moved or are planning to move.

pact beyond the number of votes it collects, and each of these protest movements has helped to reshape our major party system.

Burnham points out that the German Nazis, appealing to the same sort of radical middle constituency (S. M. Lipset's term for downwardly mobile or threatened middle class voters) as Wallace, scored 18 percent of the German vote in its breakthrough elec-

New Right...

(Continued from page 1)

make him the all time leader for splinter party Presidential candidates and make his party the first splinter party to collect more than one million votes in three successive elections. The polls conducted by Pat Caddell, McGovern's '72 pollster, show that while only 18 percent of the public considered voting for Wallace in 1972, 35 percent would consider voting for him now. The number who consider Wallace unacceptable has fallen from 62 percent of the population to 47 percent. In tandem with the change in mass opinion (or perhaps causing it) there has been a greater acceptance of Wallace among mainstream politicians who are responding to the size of his constituency. Despite such well-publicized events as Ted Kennedy's visit to Alabama, the most striking shift has been among the leaders of the Republican Right. They have come to realize that more than two-thirds of those Americans who call themselves conservatives are *not* in the Republican Party. Conservative politicians increasingly see their Republican connections with establishment liberals like Percy and Javits as an impediment to reaching the conservative masses.

Like us, the New Right believes in realignment. An advertisement in the *National Review* gives us an idea of the rhetoric of Right Realignment: it will pit a coalition of "producers" against a "new and powerful coalition of non-producers comprised of a liberal verbalist elite and a semi-permanent welfare constituency, all co-existing happily in a state of mutually sustaining symbiosis." The center of the enemy coalition, according to Phillips and Rusher, is the liberal media and related institutions in the "educational-industrial complex." According to Phillips, the history of the United States has been a series of struggles between ever-changing Northeastern elites and the rest of the country. In the past, he argues, the elites have been conservative and the masses have wanted change. But now, with an elite centered in the knowledge industry, the elite depends on the creation and consumption of novelty, and the masses want stability. So, mass movements of protest, once found on the Left, rise now from the Right. And while FDR, like other "Left" Presidents before him, found his greatest

Conservatives organize caucus

The right wing Governor of New Hampshire and the man who spearheaded Nixon's effort to dismantle the Office of Economic Opportunity are working together to organize a Conservative Caucus nationally.

Only one of the efforts among right wing activists this year, the Caucus is stressing grass-roots organization and catch-all conservatism. It is actively headed up by Howard Phillips (no relation to Kevin), a founder of Young Americans for Freedom and the special Nixon appointee who ran afoul of the courts in his efforts to do away with anti-poverty programs. Meldrim Thomson, the conservative Governor of New Hampshire, has agreed to chair the caucus.

In a recent letter to a large national mailing list, Thomson appealed to those upset about the whole range of social issues (busing, prayer in the schools, crime, sexual permissiveness) and solicited membership and contributions for the Caucus. He also outlined an ambitious program to organize the Caucus where conservatives are strong, not in Washington, but "back in the home town." Among other things, the Caucus hopes to call together a national convention next year, and "if neither major political party intends to offer a Presidential ticket committed to freeing America from the control of the socialists, the delegates may decide to propose and endorse their own candidates."

—J.H.

support in the South and his strongest opposition in the Northeast, Massachusetts has now become the "Left" state and Mississippi the strongest Nixon bastion.

To Phillips, Gerald Ford resembled Millard Fillmore, the last Whig President. Just as the old Whigs found their greatest support in the border states that would be divided by a new alignment, so Ford, the representative of the Midwest, comes from a section that would be cut apart by a new sectional alignment (pitting Northeastern liberals against Southern and Western conservatives). Like the old Whig President, Ford is left straddling the cleavage, unable to respond to the needs of the country by any dramatic action lest he split his party without any foreseeable gain.

A third party of the Right poses a real threat for 1976. If Reagan and the Republican Right can team up with Wallace, combining the former's access to money and respectability with the latter's mass base, the new conservative party could, according to the two national polls, collect 23-25 percent of the vote. The party would draw evenly from all classes within the country and from self-identified Democrats, Republicans and Independents. Southerners, rural residents and those with a high school education (as opposed to those with either more or less) would support this party more. Union members would support

Newsletter of

THE DEMOCRATIC LEFT

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

People who helped put this issue out:

David Densman, Gretchen Donart, Carol Drisko, Marjorie Gellermann, Jimmy Higgins, Selma Lenihan, Donna McFarlane, Hubert Rodney, Cynthia Ward.

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.

it in the same percentage as the rest of the population.

Dean Burnham argues that: "The potential fracture lines around which a sixth party system would be organized are, unlike the New Deal realignment but very much like those of all the preceding ones, overwhelmingly horizontal: black against white; peripheral regions against the center; parochials against cosmopolitans; blue collar whites against both blacks and affluent liberals; the American 'great middle,' with its strong attachment to the values of the traditional these terms would have as large a civil war potential . . . as any critical realignment in our history. A sixth party system organized in such terms, and with the American political formula, against urban cosmopoli-

Capital quotes

☉☉ Stop. Go. Pump the gas, hit the brakes. It's bad for your car engine, and your economy. First we have recession, then inflation, now recession. Shortages, then surpluses. High interest rates, low interest rates. We seem to be lurching from one economic ditch to another in an accelerating way that Britain has known ever since World War II. They call it "Stop-Go." Such an erratic economic climate erodes the strength of our system. Businessmen and consumers find it difficult to plan. Production and investment declines. The public, confused and fearful, increases the cry for more Government control, for more wage and price controls, for intervention. Why is this happening? Are we now in some kind of economic spasm that requires a new kind of system? My answer is a strong no. We must understand that some kind of economic swings are desirable. New ideas and inventions come along. Wasteful products, firms and services need to be discarded, and a cycle flushes them out and restores the system. What we've done, though, is to slowly limit this essential flexibility by years of increasing restrictions to protect us against risks, maintain profits, guarantee jobs and wages and prevent losses. But these same actions that seek to protect us in the name of stability can actually generate instability; overcorrecting a swing in one direction can lead to even wider swings in the opposite direction. Can we stop this? Yes, somewhat. Congress should remove regulations that over-protect business and labor. We should demand less drastic swings in spending and money supply, and promote productivity, not protection. Today, we have recession, unemployment and surpluses. Let's not make the mistake of pumping the gas so hard that we wind up in the other ditch. If we do this, we shall surely stop the capitalistic system, and go the other direction. The next boom you hear may be the bust of capitalism. ☉☉

—C. Jackson Grayson,
former chairperson of
Nixon's Price Stabilization
Commission

tans, intellectuals and students who have largely left that credo behind. . . . Whatever the specific configuration, a political realignment organized around issues that would have to be bound up in its organization, would have the most sinister overtones."

The effect of economic distress on the country, far from reviving the New Deal coalition, would, according to both Burnham and Phillips, simply speed the move toward such a realignment (as it did in Germany). Given the shallow roots of the existing party system in the mass electorate, its survival has been more the result of lack of serious challenge than of positive affirmation. The realignment has already begun. Class issues are being displaced by sectional-cultural issues. The Democratic Party has lost its Southern base and has become a party with its strongest roots in traditional Republican areas (the upper Midwest and the Northeast). This leaves the Democrats with only about two-fifths of the electorate. Put another way: Humphrey got 43 percent of the vote; McGovern got 37 percent; and the Harris poll shows Kennedy getting 38 percent in a three way race.

That doesn't mean that the right wingers have it made. The conservatives are held together only by opposition to liberal policy goals; they can't agree on a positive program. The Right includes three incompatible groups: a hard core of middle class conservative ideologues, strongest in the Sun Belt of the military-industrial complex; a traditional middle class strata of economic conservatives; and, another essentially working class constituency to whom conservatism means social and cultural conservatism. These latter two groups (both of which far outnumber the Sun Belt conservatives) disagree on almost every specific issue.

One can reach a curious conclusion that the working out of this Right realignment depends on the victory of a liberal Democrat in 1976. Just as Johnson's activist Presidency led to the events of 1968, a new Democratic Administration could pave the way for a Republican victory in—1984? But there is an encouraging fact hidden in the Harris poll. A new party of the Right, unlike Wallace's 1968 effort, would do best among the voters over 50 and worst among the voters under 30.

Without quite intending it, Phillips might get his "Bryan" realignment with the West and the South uniting into a Populist minority but the Northeastern liberal elite winning the electoral majority. □

SPECIAL OFFER

18 issues of the *Newsletter of the Democratic Left*: Volume One number one through Volume Two number ten; March 1973-December 1974. Bound in one volume with Table of Contents and a special introduction by Michael Harrington.

Pre-publication price: \$17.50

Post-publication price: \$25.00

Pre-publication orders accepted until July 31, 1975
Limited Edition. Delivery September 15.
Newsletter, 31 Union Square, Rm. 1112, NYC 10003

Boston march...

(Continued from page 1)

ity integrated education. We were joining in a battle against the mobilized and determined forces of Northern Jim Crow.

Clearly, the march was a success. It was under the leadership of Tom Atkins, the head of the Boston NAACP, and it had the support of Roy Wilkins and the national NAACP. The youth contingent was sparked by the National Student Committee Against Racism (NSCAR), a broad front of students whose organizational energy came primarily from the Trotskyists of the Young Socialist Alliance. For all the sectarianism and other inadequacies of their politics, the latter acted, as they had in the anti-war movement, as a force for intelligent moderation.

So the critical points made in what follows are not directed against the march, which achieved its goal of focusing sympathetic and nationwide attention on the Boston situation. Rather, they aim at probing how the movement can go beyond this new beginning, and specifically, how it can simultaneously fight for minority rights *and* against the Depression.

The Boston march differed from the great outpour-

ings of the '60's in that the trade union component in it was small and weak. It had been Martin Luther King's genius, among many other things, to reach out to organized working people. The 1963 March on Washington was thus dedicated to the slogan of Freedom and Jobs; Walter Reuther and the UAW were on the road at Selma-Montgomery; the State, County and Municipal Employees helped organize the Memphis demonstration after King's murder; and so on.

In part that alliance was strained by the tensions of the anti-war movement. When King rightly took up the cause of peace in Vietnam, he lost support from the Meany wing of the AFL-CIO. Still, he and his movement retained the backing of the anti-war unions, which organized more than 4 million members. And yet, there was not a massive participation from them in the Boston march. Why?

There are two obvious reasons. First, this is a political period in which every union has assigned its first priority to the struggle for full employment and against the Depression. And the anti-war unions were precisely the ones which had taken the lead in putting together that impressive Washington turn-out in April. With a scant three weeks separating the two demonstrations, it was simply not reasonable to think that both would receive the same emphasis from labor's mass left wing.

Secondly, and more importantly, there are conflicts which could break out between white and black workers over scarce jobs. That makes it doubly difficult to unite them on the question of racial justice. The Massachusetts AFL-CIO, for instance, has a rather good official position on the school crisis in Boston and it is for quality integrated education. But it has real problems with its conservative wing, a good number of whom have ethnic and personal ties with the "Southies" and other Boston whites fighting integration.

Given this situation, there was an important lack in the speeches at the Boston march. Everyone said that "racism" was the explanation for South Boston's white resistance to busing. This is an individual psychological explanation that overlooks the deep social roots of this hostility. South Boston, as Jack Plunkett pointed out in his article, is sociologically similar to black Boston, not to the liberal suburbs. And in part, what one encounters here is a classic battle between two groups at the bottom of the social pyramid. In the case of the South Boston Irish, the immediate factors moving them in their reactionary direction are reinforced by an ethnic memory of the time, not too long ago, when they were treated by Protestant Boston much as they would now treat black Boston. Only Protestant Boston had power; South Boston does not.

It seems to me that the movement has to insist upon this point and, even while carrying out the defense of black rights against South Boston in the most militant and effective manner possible, to look for full employment demands which will link the two communities which are now at war with one another. I wish someone at the march had spoken out against the outrageous social structure which incites people to objectively racist behavior, and then poisons their

Government largesse

Suppose Congress passed the following law:

It is the public policy of the United States that the .2% of the taxpayers with incomes of more than \$100,000 a year shall receive a subsidy of \$7.3 billion. The 46.9% of taxpayers who receive less than \$10,000 a year will receive \$9 billion. However, this \$9 billion will take the form of welfare payments, pensions for which people have worked, and other grudgingly given and politically vulnerable payments. The subsidy for the 1.2% will be conferred upon them primarily as recipients of unearned income and in the form of disguised giveaways. Further, the 1.2% of the taxpayers who have incomes over \$50,000 a year will be granted a total subsidy of \$13.5 billion, almost double that granted to the bottom 46.9%.

As part of this program, the \$50,000 and up category will receive 73% of the subsidies for housing rehabilitation, 44.8% of the retirement subsidy, 88% of the advantages from state and local debt, 66% of the benefits conferred by the Government upon capital gains and 41.7% of the gain from untaxed capital gains at death.

This "fantasy" (with apologies to Phillip Stern who supplied the concept and Senator Walter Mondale who provided the figures) took place in the United States Budget during 1974; it is now taking place in the 1976 Budget.

—M.H.

very minds with a racist psychology. The enemy in Boston is not the individual racist so much as it is the institutional structure which turns people into despairing haters who are unaware of the real sources of their own emotions.

In Detroit, to take another example, this issue is now posed in explosive fashion. Black and white police have scuffled with one another and guns have been drawn by the forces of law and order over whether there will be "affirmative action" in layoffs. As in every potentially tragic situation, there is justice on both sides. Black Detroit—black America—cannot be required to submit to an incredibly disproportionate portion of the misery so abundant in this unhappy land today (and neither can female America). We know that ghetto youth joblessness is now approaching 50 percent—double the national average in the worst years of the Great Depression. That will blight hundreds of thousands of lives; it will increase the number of junkies and the "criminal" population.

But white workers did not, for the most part, create the structures which oppress blacks and other minorities. The mass industrial unions have never had control over hiring and most craft unions lost it some time ago. Moreover, the seniority principle is absolutely essential if the bosses are to be kept from picking off the militant unionists one by one.

The blacks and browns and women are right; the white workers are right; and all could be on a collision course which will destroy the possibility of an effective political coalition of the mass democratic Left at precisely that moment when it is most urgently needed. The Boston march could not answer that problem, of course, but it should have, yet it did not even raise it. It is the key to black-white unity, not only in Boston, but throughout America.

In the future, any movement for minority freedom must raise the demand for a guaranteed Federal right to a job. The focus of that demand is now the Hawkins-Humphrey bill which, though it has its flaws (a hostility to public employment being one of them), is the framework around which we can unite. Hawkins-Humphrey, I believe, has implications which are far more radical—in the best sense of the word—than many of its sponsors realize. Guaranteeing a right to a job requires massive economic planning; funding those jobs without inflation demands a shifting of tax burdens to the rich; but income redistribution then means that the government must move to socialize that investment which has traditionally come from the profits of the rich.

Hawkins-Humphrey, then, is an immediate demand with a potential to lead to structural transformation, and it meets the needs of both black and white workers. But what about the interim? The Ford Administration will not give us full employment and even if the liberal Democrats are elected in 1976, they cannot turn the Depression around over night. How does one deal with black-white conflicts here and now?

One suggestion which originated with the IUE in New Jersey has been noted in these pages: cut the work week to four days and pay the worker unemploy-

Escaping problems

As we all know, multinational corporations prefer to invest in countries where labor is cheap, independent unions are non-existent, and the strong hand of the government assures stability (with force if necessary).

It hasn't taken multinational corporations too long to discover that Communist countries fill the bill perfectly. Recently, *The Economist* of London (April 26, 1975) wrote about deals which the West German Krupp empire and the Hoechst Chemical Corporation had clinched with East Germany for building plants there. As *The Economist* noted: "For the firms these deals are a shot in the arm—and an opportunity to escape all the environmental, labor, and other problems" of West Germany.

—STEVE KELMAN

ment comp for the fifth day. Instead of cutting the work force by twenty percent—whether on the equally unacceptable principles of "last-hired/first-fired" or of destroying seniority—share the work but maintain the workers' income.

This idea, it must be stressed, is not a panacea. It does not, for instance, apply to public employment. A decision to cut back public services by 20 percent is not simply a work-saving, or sharing, device; it is a political decision to deprive the people of the service to which they have a right. In the public sector, then, the demand for work sharing has a completely different meaning than in the private sector. But even in the private sector, one must proceed with care. It must be a democratic decision of the union membership to re-open their contract in this area, and one which is pegged to a prior political delivery of change in the unemployment compensation laws.

The point is that the corporate rich in America want to force the working people to pay the social cost of the "readjustments" in the capitalist system which a depression effects. The labor movement must be against that idea and fight first of all to place the immediate burden on the shoulders of those best able to bear it, i.e. the corporate rich, and secondly to create a genuine full employment economy. The idea of work-sharing and supplemental unemployment compensation is a temporary technique which workers might use to deal with pressing problems. In this limited, but important, context, it has a possible contribution to make to the integrated movement of the black and white working class.

Under conditions of a depression, then, the fight for minority rights has to go beyond the limited sphere true even in terms of the movement's immediate tactic of civil rights; it must be socialized. This holds true even in terms of the movement's immediate tactics.

Busing is an indispensable tool—one tool—in the struggle for integrated, quality education. It is most

certainly not *the* tool and, were there decent, interracial housing for all, it might not even be required. Similarly, the use of the police power is certainly necessary in Boston—but that is an unfortunate necessity. One of the most enthusiastic responses of the day in Boston came when Maceo Dixon, the NSCAR speaker, said that if President Ford could send troops to Cambodia in the Mayaguez crisis, he should send them to Boston in the school dispute.

But consider that analogy for a moment. It is deeply flawed on the face of it since Ford never should have intervened as he did—precipitously, without pausing for a Cambodian response, and in a mood of wounded, post-Vietnam *machismo*. But why, then, argue from such an indefensible use of force in favor of a positive policy in Boston? More deeply, one should favor Federal troops in Boston—as we did in Selma-Montgomery, for instance—if that is the only

way to protect the lives and rights of black children and their parents. But a school system cannot be run by armed troops and if that demand has to be posed, it is a sad admission of the failure of the movement to find a non-violent and political solution to the issue.

We knew in the '60's that the civil rights fight could not be carried out in a social and economic vacuum—or worse, on the social and economic terrain of an American society which makes blacks three times poorer than whites. It was part of the greatness of Martin Luther King, Jr., that he insisted on this proposition over and over again. Now in the '70's, under conditions of economic collapse, that is doubly and triply true. The Boston march on May 17th was a beginning. Now we must go beyond it toward a unity of the black and white working people based on their common stake in the radical measures required to achieve a full employment economy. □

Socialist notes

Dinners: The Debs-Thomas dinners in New York and Chicago were tremendous successes. Carl Shier reports that Chicago broke all previous records for attendance, with over four hundred people coming to the dinner honoring retired reform Alderman Leon Despres. Joe Rauh kept the proceedings lively with a controversial speech praising some aspects of the Landrum-Griffin Act. . . . In New York, three hundred people watched Bernie Rifkin really take the honors in. In addition to the Debs-Thomas award, he received the Walter P. Reuther Award from the UAW, and the education department of District Council 37 (AFSCME) presented him with a plaque. To top it all off, the College of New Rochelle conferred an honorary doctorate upon him last month. The dinner itself went quite well, with strong speeches from David Barrett, Bernie and Mike Harrington. . . .

Songbook: We now have a "Movement Songbook." The effort by Jone Johnson and Bob Breving includes traditional labor and socialist songs as well as some feminist, anti-war and civil rights songs of more recent vintage. It's available for \$2 from Contemporary Problems, Box 59422, Chicago, Ill. 60659. . . .

Congratulations: To Debbie Meier and to Doris Kolvoord. Debbie was elected to the Community School Board in New York's District 3. And Doris was elected chairwoman of the Democratic Party of Davenport, Iowa. . . .

Growth: New surges of DSOC membership in Los Angeles, Houston and Chapel Hill, N.C. and in the Ohio cities of Akron, Toledo and Youngstown. . . . Irving Howe's trip to Los Angeles last month combined well with Deena Rosenberg's energetic organizing. Our LA group is now requesting a local charter. Same for our Chapel Hill group. Gerry Cohen organized several meetings and signed up a number of peo-

ple after Mike Harrington's April visit to North Carolina. Steve Davis has been working on recruiting down in Texas, and Houston is now in a position to request a charter. . . .

Getting around: The national office has a hard time keeping up with Tim Greene, the literature agent for the Boston local, as he mobilizes Massachusetts socialists to sell and distribute material at all manner of public meetings. . . . Harlan Baker and Mike Schippani made an impressive banner for our DSOC contingent to march under, at the May 17 march for integrated education in Boston. . . . The *Public Employee Press*, newspaper of District Council 37, AFSCME, reprinted the May NEWSLETTER article on the march on Washington. . . .

Coming up: A DSOC organizers' training conference in the Midwest June 13, 14 and 15. Future leaders of our organization will gather that weekend in Ottawa, Ill. . . . October will be a busy month with a youth conference in Boston October 4 and 5, and a Bay Area conference October 18 and 19. The West Coast conference will center on the theme of public ownership and will be our first major California effort. . . .

Last minute notes: The Boston and Bay Area locals have each sponsored demonstrations in support of Mario Soares and the Portuguese Socialists. In Boston, a delegation of socialists went to visit the Consul while Bay Area comrades held a vigil outside the San Francisco consulate. . . . Some New York members joined with thousands of municipal workers in a June 4 rally at First National City Bank's international headquarters on Wall Street. The rally protested the bank's role in creating the city's crisis and the bankers' proposals to "solve" the crisis at the city employees' expense. . . . Over one hundred DSOC members met at the Hudson Guild Farm over the weekend of May 30 for a lively discussion at the DSOC's second Socialist Weekend. □

Can our social services survive?

by JOHN P. WHITE

Most social welfare programs such as income maintenance, food stamps, unemployment insurance, social services and the like began during the Depression. They represented both the New Deal's liberal political consensus approach to social problems systemic to America's political economy and the application of one aspect of Keynesian theory, namely increased governmental spending, to the American capitalist economy. Social spending has been used ever since to create economic stability by modulating capitalism's cyclical tendency toward depression by varying the amount and focus of such spending.

The social programs established were never anything more than stop-gap measures principally intended to quell the political discontent fostered by widespread unemployment and hunger. However, subsequent liberal economic theory has assumed that continued American economic growth would raise the standard of living for even the poorest of Americans, promote both economic and political stability, and over time eliminate the most serious social problems.

Today we are witnessing the discrediting of this Keynesian-liberal approach. American international economic dominance has been eroded. Economic growth is unable to keep pace with growth in the labor force. Both factors have forced unemployment levels up at a rate too high for increased governmental spending to curb. Further, tax cuts designed to stimulate spending and investment are reducing the amount of money available for social spending. Continued budget deficits, with the borrowing they have required, have pushed interest rates up, reinforcing both recessionary and inflationary tendencies in the economy.

The impact of the present Depression upon social programs has been pronounced. In New York State, people living on public assistance and supplementary security income (aid to the aged, blind and disabled) have had inflation reduce their purchasing power. Public assistance recipients are currently living on \$258 plus rent per month for a family of four, over 40 percent below New York State's standard. Any hope for an increase in benefits is dim indeed because of the additional spending involved (nearly \$200 million to increase public assistance \$10 per person per month and SSI \$25 per person per month).

National and state ceilings on funds for social services such as day care, foster care, senior citizen centers have been imposed. As increased costs erode the value of fixed dollars available for services, even fewer people will receive such services.

State unemployment insurance funds around the country are being bankrupted by the increased drain on reserves created by persistently high levels of unemployment and only intervention by the Federal government has kept the program viable thus far.

Increased charges for food stamps have both re-

duced the number of persons benefitting and the value of the benefit received. Together with the already inadequate levels of public assistance, increasing malnutrition, with the health problems and learning impairments it fosters, is certain to occur.

Work-relief programs in which public assistance recipients are forced to "work-off" their welfare checks are the true welfare fraud in America. As unemployment increases, and as regular public employees are laid off to close governmental budget deficits, work-relief participants lose all hope of moving into the real labor force and of breaking out of welfare dependency. The few public service jobs created under C.E.T.A. (Comprehensive Employment Training Act) only serve to heighten tensions between public employees, work relief participants, and the unemployed.

Finally, the revenue sharing approach to federal-state financing serves to reduce funds available for social spending and, by decentralizing the political decision making with respect to such funds, prevents the exercise of concerted national pressure for spending on what are clearly national social problems.

The liberal solution of expanded social spending on public service jobs, housing construction, health security, and the like—however laudable its goals—holds out little real hope for the future. Further increases in governmental deficits or increased taxes would be necessary to finance such programs, and neither is politically or economically possible. Any attempt to increase governmental debt would only force interest rates up and reinforces the downward economic spiral.

Only a democratic socialist program involving income redistribution, socialization of banks and other forms of investment, and controls over profits, dividends, prices and wages can curb the Depression.

Unfortunately, the prospects for such fundamental changes are dim. More likely we will see increasing pressures to reduce social spending. Continual erosion of the standards of living of low-income persons will provide the capital necessary for the corporate rich to maintain their standard of living and also to attempt to break out of the Depression through increased corporate investment. Governmental domestic policy will increasingly seek to spur such investment while foreign policy will seek to restore American international economic dominance. High levels of unemployment will be tolerated in order to enforce discipline upon workers and to reduce consumer demand and thereby inflationary pressures in the economy. To accomplish this, some will attempt to forge a majority coalition to protect themselves from inflation at the expense of minorities, women, unionists, youth and the elderly.

By anticipating this development a left-liberal coalition can be formed similar to that which created the New Deal social welfare system. But, more importantly, perhaps we will have learned enough from history to insure that this time the social welfare system is not merely a political pacifier, but is an integral part of a restructuring of the American political economy. □

Jimmy Higgins reports . . .

OFFICIAL LABOR REACTION to the April 26 Mobilization for Jobs in Washington has been remarkably favorable. The rally, which ended in disruption, was immediately termed a success by Jacob Clayman, the secretary-treasurer of the sponsoring Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO. So, the first official labor response, printed in the next day's papers, emphasized that more than 60,000 people attended and that workers showed anger and frustration over the mismanagement of the economy. Other labor leaders involved in the march and rally concurred with Clayman's assessment privately and publicly. Some national IUD leaders privately conceded that the "security" precautions were both excessive and counter-productive, a point sponsors of the march had made earlier. A number of labor leaders, including some in the national IUD leadership, want to try another mobilization with more chance for rank and file participation and staged on one of the more usual rally sites in the Capital (like the Mall or the Lincoln Memorial). So far, the only harsh attacks on the left wing splinter groups which participated in the disruption have come from the Communist Party, the Socialist Workers Party and Social Democrats, U.S.A. Even George Meany, who opposed the rally and virtually vetoed an IUD march, conceded that it was a "very, very impressive demonstration." And he wisecracked, "the fact that they [the audience] didn't listen to Hubert Humphrey—I'm not so disturbed about that—I get tired of listening to Hubert myself sometimes."

PRESIDENTIAL POLITICKING—The Democratic field gets more crowded and more confusing by the day. Fred Harris, who recently claimed to be the only liberal candidate for President, is, in fact, gaining momentum on the Party's Left. But the Kennedy-McCarthy-McGovern veterans are scattered. Some are waiting for McGovern to run again. More are waiting for Teddy Kennedy. A num-

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.

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

Name.....

Address.....

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

ber have signed up with Mo Udall, and still others, in an effort to stop Wallace, are looking South. Former North Carolina Governor Terry Sanford has enlisted support from Phil Hoff (former Governor of Vermont and an outspoken Johnson critic in '68) and Jean Westwood (former chairperson of the Democratic Party). And former Georgia Governor Jimmy Carter is polishing up his liberal rhetoric and liberal image in a moderately successful effort to recruit from the Left. Some old faces will be seeking comebacks: Muskie is openly hoping that a deadlocked convention will draft him, and Hubert Humphrey has decided not to run, but, he recently announced, events may force him to reconsider. An almost-candidate last time, Birch Bayh is definitely in the race for '76. An old trick is resurfacing, too: the favorite son candidacy. In New York, Gov. Hugh Carey is toying with the idea. It will be easier on him if the primary for Congressional and Senatorial candidates is separated from the Presidential primary. That's o.k. with Republicans who fear a GOP bloodbath upstate if there's a Reagan-Ford contest. So, unless there's sudden action, New York will choose its convention delegates in April and its candidates for party nominations in September. In direct expenditures alone, that will cost the state six and a half million dollars.

RADICAL CHIC MEETS WALL STREET—The New York City budget crisis is provoking some strange reactions. Ken Auletta, famed for his part in the Howard Samuels for Governor campaign, recently took on "New York's political midgets" who, according to Auletta, are destroying the city. The main problem Auletta identified in his *Village Voice* article is that New York liberals aren't courageous enough to cut budgets and stand up to municipal unions. Ken the midget killer has no such problems. He advocates, presuming a yearly 9 percent inflation rate, 4 percent annual pay increases for city employees. Tuition should be established at the City University; the Police Civilian Review Board should be abolished, and class size in the public schools should be raised from the present 26 to 32 pupils per class. All of this drew some very favorable response. "In its politics, the [Village] Voice may be radical," said *Barron's*, the Dow Jones financial weekly, "but its economics are sound as a dollar."

"THE UNITED STATES IS IN MANY WAYS pursuing a course of unilateral disarmament." At least according to a recent report, "For An Adequate Defense," issued by the Coalition for a Democratic Majority. The document makes fascinating reading: it calls for development of every weapons system the Pentagon has requested and more; it criticizes Ford, Kissinger and Schlesinger for being too soft on the defense budget; it harkens back to the good old days when Democrats were hawks, and foreign policy was bi-partisan. Development of both strategic (i.e. nuclear) and conventional weapons on a vastly increased scale is also favored in the report. It is available from the Coalition for a Democratic Majority, 1823 Jefferson Place NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.