

'Conservative' majority with radical potential

by JACK CLARK

As I write in late March, the liberal wing of the Democratic Party is in retreat and disarray. With each new Carter or Jackson victory, speculation increases that the country in general and Democratic voters in particular have moved to the Right.

Many analysts (including me) had expected the competition for the Democratic nomination to be primarily a competition among liberals. After all, McGovern, against long odds, took the nomination in 1972, and in 1973 and 1974 reformers held back and beat the ambitious and well-financed efforts to "purge" the McGovern influence and the Party reforms. Besides, the more conservative candidates seemed overrated in their tactical and political skills. As Jim Chapin and I pointed out in these pages a few months ago, Henry Jackson is not entered in enough delegate contests to win the nomination without making substantial convention deals.

What happened? Why did Carter and Jackson flourish while Bayh, Harris and Shriver folded? Is it true that the voters are moving to the Right?

It's much too early to write an obituary for the Democratic Party Left. Though Bayh and Harris have clearly collapsed, Udall is picking up some strength among their former supporters and may emerge as the leader in a candidate race skewed too far to the Right.

The polls

But the field of candidates is not skewed too far Right, some observers now argue. Rather, the electorate is moving in more conservative directions, rejecting the liberalism which a McGovern or a Udall represent. Early primary returns and extensive polling data have been marshalled to "prove" how rightward trending the

To our readers:

Events broke quickly in the last month. Michael Harrington wrote his article on Britain before Harold Wilson announced his resignation from the seat of power. Also, Harold Meyerson's thoughts on Jerry Brown predate the California Governor's stated intention to succeed to the center of power.

country is. I propose to turn some of the data around to raise serious questions about that premise.

Different pollsters have discerned a "new national mood" which rejects traditional liberal-Left programs. Peter Hart, Pat Caddell and Lou Harris have explained in fuzzy detail just how much the voters are ready for radical new departures. On closer examination, the radical new departures involve old conservative concepts like, "let us all sacrifice unequally" and the something startlingly new turns out to be Jimmy Carter or Jerry Brown. That, the soothsayers tell us, is the wave of the future.

They should read their own data more carefully, or stay out of ideological politics entirely. Hart puts the argument forward again in an article in the October/November *Democratic Review*. The new clichés are there as the analysis of the article. "What is called for," Hart tells us, "is leadership . . . the realization that more government is not the solution to all of man-

(Continued on page 3)

The British 'lesson' and American social policy

by MICHAEL HARRINGTON

Britain is in deep economic and social trouble. That is obvious to the most superficial reader of the American press.

Britain is in deep economic and social trouble because its Labor Government, following socialist priorities and procedures, irresponsibly spent the nation into bankruptcy. That is obvious to almost all of the editorialists in America and it will soon become an absolute staple of the folk wisdom. It was the theme of an outrageously biased CBS TV special by Morley Safer. It is not true.

I go into this matter in some detail because I have already encountered the "British question" in my trips around the country. In audience after audience, this example is used to reinforce American neo-conservatism: any serious government intervention into the economy is bound to create many more problems than it will solve.

First of all, if increased social and governmental

(Continued on page 2)

Britain . . .

(Continued from page 1)

spending in England were a specifically socialist, or Laborite, sin, then clearly the Tories, an explicitly conservative party, would not spend heavily. But the figures do not bear out this hypothesis. According to figures in the *Economist*—a bitterly anti-Labor publication hardly prone to provide alibis for socialists—the Heath Government increased public expenditures in the 1970's at a faster rate, in every year save one, than the Wilson Governments of the 1960's.

Indeed, the Tories followed a plan of cutting social services, freezing wages and rapidly increasing public investment to the point that the Government borrowed more than £4 billion in 1973. The conservatives then did not prove to be thrifty. Rather they took money away from working people and the poor and lavished it on spending designed to promote corporate growth. Among many, many other things, this rightist policy led to the miners' strike of 1974, vast working class protest and a shortened work week (with shortened paychecks!), dramatically wasting British resources. It brought the downfall of the Heath Government which had increased government outlays by more than £7 billion!

Figures on European expenditure trends show that the expenses of Labor Britain in the '60's were comparable to those of Gaullist France. However, it should be candidly noted that between 1974 and 1975, a period for which Labor is primarily responsible, there was indeed a sharp increase in the state share of GNP. In part, that was a result of the general capitalist economic crisis, and in part, it was the payment for the "social contract" which the Tory class struggle line against the workers had made all but inevitable.

My argument is not that there is no difference between Labor and the Tories (or the Gaullists), for there are manifestly different priorities underlying the social spending of these parties. Rather there is no fundamental argument about the necessity of massive governmental intervention and spending. The quarrel is over who will primarily benefit.

This leads to a second, crucial point, one which the pro-Labor *New Statesman* and the *Economist* share. It was not, John Vaizey wrote in the *Statesman*, that socialist planners, following their utopian blueprints, had spent Britain into penury. Rather, "there is in fact a complete lack of an overall strategy for determining the proper level [of spending] and the fundamental purposes for which it is undertaken. This more than anything has led to the verifiable fact that the growth of public expenditure in the past few years has been out of control." The high percentage of GNP absorbed by the government, Vaizey notes, is not "the planned outcome of a shift from the private sector to the public sector. In fact it represents the collapse of any hope of achieving the rate of growth which was in the early 1960's thought not only desirable but achievable. . . ."

The *Economist* reinforces this point, noting that "the British system of budgeting is now almost unique

in [deliberately] divorcing public spending decisions from tax decisions." Now these rather sharp criticisms of the Labor Party argue that it failed utterly to gain socialist control of the economy and the planning process. These criticisms are recognized, in one way or another, by all wings of the Party itself. Anthony Crosland, whose *Future of Socialism* was the theoretical rationale for the Gaitskill right wing in the late 1950's and early 1960's, has said that this failure to attain planned growth was the decisive limitation upon the Wilson Governments of 1964-1970; and the *Tribune* Left would agree, even though its analysis of why would differ fundamentally from Crosland's.

Let me put the point in its sharpest form. The basic priorities of the three Labor governments since 1964 have been determined by capitalist, not socialist, considerations: defending the pound in the 1960's, proving the nation's credit worthiness to the world's bankers, not overly frightening British business, and so on. Within the severe constraints imposed by that fact, Labor sought to favor the workers and the poor. Its success was considerable, but did not add up to a plan. The high hopes of 1964 were utterly disappointed—and the failures grew directly from capitalist conditions.

Dennis Healey, who introduced the Labor Budget projecting sharp welfare state cutbacks, made the capitalist basis of the Government's policies painfully clear in an interview with the *Guardian*. Profitability has declined, Healey said, throughout the Western world for the last 30 years. The current recession intensified this trend. "There is no question," Healey continued, "that if profitability remained at the present level, there would be little chance of getting the sort of investment we need. . . . I have already given the tax relief on stock appreciation which has helped British business more than anything many of my colleagues have done in other countries."

The Labor Party has been maneuvering around a dilemma. It has not followed bold socialist policies of structural change in the economy. Yet, as a working

Newsletter of

THE DEMOCRATIC LEFT

Michael Harrington, *Editor*
Jack Clark, *Managing Editor*
Gretchen Donart, *Production Manager*

Carol Drisko, Marjorie Gellermann, Selma Lenihan, Mark Schaeffer and Dan Warshaw also helped to put this issue out.

Signed articles express the views of the author.

Published ten times a year (monthly except July and August) by the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee, 853 Broadway, Room 617, New York, N.Y. 10003. Telephone (212) 260-3270

Subscription rates: Sustaining \$10 per year; Regular \$5 per year; Limited income \$2.50.

Application to mail at second class postage rates is pending at New York, New York.

class party it has been responsive to the demands of its basic industrial constituency. As Raymond Williams put it in the *Nation*, "the organized working class will not limit itself to the share of the product and of the available employment that a rational and profitable capitalist industry, in a structurally weak national economy, can give it. . . ." But when Labor stands up for its supporters, it then comes into conflict with the fundamental capitalist constraints which it has left undisturbed.

This analysis suggests many unhappy truths which hardly add up to cheerleading for the Labor Party. Yet it is not socialist innovation but capitalist structure which is the determining factor. And this does not lead to the conclusion that Labor acted too decisively, too socialistically, but that it was not radical enough. It would be foolish for an American socialist to try to specify exactly how that radicalism should be implemented in a tactical, political sense. It is, however, quite relevant to insist that Britain demonstrates the limitations upon nonstructural reform in a declining capitalist economy.

Available from *The Newsletter of the Democratic Left*
autographed copies of Irving Howe's bestseller
WORLD OF OUR FATHERS
\$14.95 postpaid.

Finally, there is an important rejoinder to the editorialists who rejoice in the troubles of the British Left. In America, we spend almost twice as much of GNP on health as Britain does—in the late 1960's 6.4 percent as against 3.7 percent. Yet all the objective indices on the quality of health, like infant mortality, childhood morbidity and longevity, indicate that the British are better off than we are. British programs worked, and worked much better than anything we have in the United States. And indeed, the Healey budget preserves the health gains, making its reductions in other sectors.

So the British case is complex. Here is the ex-capital of an empire, with low growth rates throughout the entire post-War period (under Tories as well as Labor) in which moderate Labor governments have made significant and valuable reforms, many of them superior to anything to be found in America, but have not challenged the basic corporate capitalist structure of the economy. Attempting to promote egalitarian values into a system which requires the maximization of profit—which is to say, inequality—as a precondition of its existence is an impossible task. But then so is the imposition of forthright capitalist priorities on a country in which working people have an organized and political sense of the own worth. Former Prime Minister Edward Heath can testify to this last fact and, if she unfortunately comes to power, Margaret Thatcher will also discover the effective militance of the British working class. The lesson of the British situation, then, is not to sound retreat but to change the system at its very core. □

'76 politics . . .

(Continued from page 1)

kind's problems and the ability to admit that Americans will have to make some sacrifices if our nation is to deal with our present day problems." The data Hart cites to back his political thesis shows clearly that people are distrustful of government institutions and cynical about political alternatives.

What is absolutely startling is that Hart, like fellow liberal pollsters Harris and Caddell but also like the theorists of a new conservative majority, never analyzes the ideological question of why the people are distrustful and cynical. Fortunately, he and other pollsters *have* posed it in their polls. A 1974 survey by Market Opinion Research, for example, showed that 70 percent of the public believes that the government is run by a few big interests looking out for themselves. That's consistent with Hart's own survey, done last summer for the People's Bicentennial Commission, which revealed that 60 percent of all Americans believe that major corporations dominate federal decision-making. The same poll showed that 57 percent of Americans think that both parties favor big business over the average worker.

Those figures certainly indicate a high level of disaffection from the government. But they by no means indicate that the voters want the "new" alternatives of Jerry Brown or Jimmy Carter. In fact, those figures, indicating the reasons for people's unhappiness with government action, would seem to hold promise for genuinely radical alternatives, for campaigns based on curbing private power and making government a more effective instrument for meeting people's needs.

Has that majority constituency for radical change disappeared in the early primaries? I think not.

The *New York Times* and CBS have done extensive polling of voters as they left the booths to find out what attitudes lay behind their votes. If one looks at the information collected in Massachusetts, it becomes obvious that the voters are expressing themselves for social change.

For example, 63 percent of all Democratic voters in Massachusetts favored government guarantees of full employment. Jackson voters supported the right to a job even more strongly, with 73 percent in favor of full employment. Eighty-five percent of all Democrats in the Bay State opposed cutting government social services to balance the budget; 87 percent of Jackson voters opposed social service cuts. Most interesting, 84 percent of all Democratic voters favored using government to reduce the power of big business. Udall, Jackson and Wallace partisans all fell in the same range on that issue.

Jackson, then, and Wallace to only a slightly lesser extent, were perceived by those who voted for them as pro-full employment, anti-business candidates, who favored at least maintaining current social services.

That's quite consistent with the image Jackson has consistently tried to project as a traditional Democratic liberal and partisan of the "lunch bucket Democrats." It's also consistent with Wallace's oft-repeated boast to represent the "little man." It's *not* proof that the

voters in Massachusetts or elsewhere have moved to the Right. On the contrary, overwhelming majorities expressed in polls and in primaries want full employment and comprehensive national health care. Impressive pluralities can be marshalled for nationalizing the oil industry, and everyone favors tax reform. Hardly a conservative, or even moderate, agenda.

A dirty little secret revisited

Of course, there's more to the national mood than those radical demands and anti-corporate sentiments. The same CBS-*Times* poll which showed the Democrats reasonably united on full employment, social services and government action against business revealed deep splits over foreign policy, race and the environment.

The environmental issue could be particularly troublesome for Udall, since he is often perceived as a candidate who would favor pollution regulations over jobs. To the degree that Udall, or the liberal-Left generally allows the issue to be defined as clean air versus jobs, we lose. If Udall and other liberals can follow the lead of a promising new group called Environmentalists for Full Employment and trade unionists who have decried employer blackmail on environmental issues, that division can be bridged.

Foreign policy has been a fairly low intensity issue this year, and none of the Democratic candidates, including Jackson, has devoted a lot of time to it.

Of the three divisive issues, the most troublesome continues to be race. In defining the problem with race in the campaign, there is a need for some fine distinctions. Race has been an issue of sharp conflict in American politics for more than a decade now. That does not mean that we are becoming a more racist society. On the contrary, as Andrew Levison has argued, the conflict over race means that blacks have been in movement in American society, and they're meeting some stiff resistance.

Some of that resistance has taken the form of ugly, racist direct mob actions, as in the Boston and Louisville busing controversies. But the major political focus of the resistance has centered around a set of public policy questions.

The specific question on race asked by the CBS-*Times* poll (and typically asked by public opinion surveys to determine racial attitudes) was whether the government had done too much for blacks.

Three-fourths of all Wallace voters thought the government had done too much for blacks, while 61 percent of Jackson voters thought the government had done too much for blacks. An overwhelming majority of Udall voters rejected that notion, but even among his suburban, liberal voters 27 percent agreed with the idea that blacks have gotten too much government largesse.

Viewed this way, the "race issue" becomes intertwined with the whole range of government activity. It's not so much that busing is irrelevant (it's not, but neither was it a cutting issue outside Boston); it's more that busing, affirmative action, welfare, anti-poverty programs are all lumped together as programs which benefit someone else, programs for shiftless people un-

like "us." In his book on the 1972 election, *The Future While It Happened*, Samuel Lubell describes interviews with voters who rejected welfare programs in the abstract because they believed in a work ethic. Yet, many of the same voters would describe with approval how Aid to Dependent Children or another of the controversial "welfare" programs they had described directly benefitted a (white) friend or relative.

If then, feelings about race are tied to feelings about government action on behalf of blacks and other minorities, then two conservative thrusts converge in vote-getting strategies: old fashioned racism and new styled, "lower our expectations" conservatism.

George Wallace is the most seasoned practitioner of the first, but Henry Jackson's a fast learner. Just before the Massachusetts primary, Jackson, despite pleas and warnings from civil rights activists to avoid inflaming racial feeling, ran an incredible full page ad in the Boston *Globe*. "Only two candidates in the March 2 Democratic Primary opposed forced busing," the ad proclaimed in large, bold type. "Only one candidate has a plan that can stop it." Searching for their real majority, Jackson and his strategists made and continue to make

Capital quotes

There is no contradiction between the ebullience of the stock market and the slow growth in the general economy. On the contrary, the first is a consequence of the second. . . .

Why does Wall Street like slow growth—however painful it may be for the unemployed?

For one thing, it means a continuing moderation of inflation. This has already helped bring down interest rates. Even if wage settlements in major union contracts run as high as 9 percent this year, persistent unemployment is likely to hold the average level of wage settlements well below that level.

Further, with the economy recovering and employers relatively slow to take on more hands, productivity promises to show faster than usual growth. . . .

With total demand strengthening the economy, costs held down and prices free to move upward, the profit outlook is extremely favorable.

After tax profits, which averaged some \$76 billion in 1975, are likely to climb to \$100 billion in 1976—an increase of 32 percent.

—New York Times
February 2, 1976

blatant appeals for the votes and sympathies of those who want the government to stop doing so much for minorities. That he makes such appeals while boasting a strong civil rights record is, of course, hypocritical. That he and his followers decry the "elitism" of Udall supporters ("wine and cheese Democrats," as the Jackson sneer would have it) while appealing to feelings even more reactionary than elitism is even more galling.

The Jackson strategy is also short-sighted. The electorate as a whole is unpoor and unblack, but blacks constitute a key constituency for the Democratic Party. Roughly, 20 percent of the Democratic Presidential vote in the last two elections came from the black community. In some of the large industrial states Jackson is planning to carry, blacks constitute even more of the Democratic vote; in the South, blacks are the new base of the modern Democratic Party. Without massive new disenfranchisement (which presumably Jackson will not be ready to support for a few more years), a Democratic President can not be nominated or elected over the unified objections of the black community. One sure way to guarantee those objections is to argue publicly that you're for the same things as George Wallace, but you're more effective.

Carter: both sides as usual

Jimmy Carter manages to benefit from the programmatic definition of the race issue from both sides. Since he has been George Wallace's chief nemesis and since he has the endorsement of a number of prominent blacks and a reputation (partly deserved) as a Southern moderate. Carter cashes in with black and liberal votes. Since he, more than any other candidate in the current field, is an advocate of less government (read "streamlining" and more "efficiency"), he has appeal among those who are concerned that government has done too much and might do even more to benefit blacks.

Where do we go from here?

"Mr. Udall is effective in his attacks on Senator Jackson's big stick opinions on defense expenditures and on Mr. Carter's equivocal attitudes toward old Democratic Party dogma. But his assertion that these men are ideologically 'out of step' with the liberal Democratic consensus does not make Mr. Udall, a small state Southwesterner and a lapsed Mormon, seem to be a close fit in a personal sense to the big state Northern Democratic pattern."

That's how the New York *Times* correspondent, Charles Mohr, described Morris Udall's difficulty in defining his position among the remaining Democratic candidates. It represents more than the difficulties of the Udall organization. What's been lacking for the self-identified liberal candidates this year has been an issue or set of issues that defines their politics and differentiates them from Carter, Jackson and Ford in the eyes of the mass electorate. Vietnam is no longer an issue, nor is a foreign policy debate generally well defined in 1976 politics. Race is still an issue, but, given the form racial debates (e.g. busing) have taken in recent years, the Left has been on the defensive. The issues which have defined liberalism for almost two decades are past us or confused. Liberal activists of various shades know that Morris Udall is different from and better than Henry Jackson or Jimmy Carter, but somehow it's difficult to explain why or how that's so in comprehensible terms. Door bell ringing cadre (not that there are so many!) can't go out promoting their liberal candidate because he's for _____.

No one knows quite how to fill in the blank.

To return to where this article began, I'd suggest that the voters have pointed the way for the liberals to begin filling in the blank. But only if the liberals are willing to move in the direction of radical, new alternatives other than Jerry Brown.

The issues which the Democratic voters for Jackson, Udall and Wallace agreed on in Massachusetts provide the basis for filling in the blank, for defining the new liberal cutting issues. All three groups of voters favored government guarantees of a job, maintenance (nobody asked, but they probably favored extension of) government social services, and the use of government to curb the power of big business.

That poses the beginning for an agenda George Wallace, Henry Jackson and Jimmy Carter are not quite ready to embrace. Though demagoguery and evasion, all three of them may convince the public that they're anti-business and pro-full employment. That demagoguery will not be so easy if the liberal-Left takes those goals and those campaign promises seriously.

George Wallace, for example, has not endorsed even the basic concept behind the Humphrey-Hawkins full employment bill. How can he pose as the candidate of working people? Scoop Jackson is on record (before large television audiences) as being against "obscene profits." Fine, but is he willing to encroach on more respectable profits in the name of national planning for full employment? Is Jimmy Carter willing to stand for maintenance and extension of government services to meet human needs?

Are any of the current candidates committed to beginning a thorough revision of the internal revenue code so that we begin using our tax structure to even out our extremely skewed distribution of wealth? Will Carter, Jackson or Wallace propose how they plan to curb the power of big business? How about consumer representation on the boards of all corporations? Or federal chartering of all corporations? Beyond that, will any of them offend their wealthy friends enough to propose some level of public controls on investment decision? Or, since everyone is unhappy with the oil companies, which of them will stand up first for Senator Stevenson's proposal to create a federal energy corporation? That might be improved with the Canadian New Democratic formula of creating that public corporation where Exxon, the largest of the multinational energy conglomerates, stands now. How about the railroads? Any of our anti-business candidates for nationalizing the profitable freight sector along with the losing passenger service?

The list of questions could go on endlessly. The point is that such hard scrutiny is overdue and without it, the liberal Democrats will have great difficulty finding or presenting an identity. With the political thrust implied by these questions, they may be able to turn 1976 politics around, and they could certainly define the cutting issues for the next several years.

This leaves us with just one question: can the Democratic liberals look beyond the pessimism of the new conservative majority arguments and find the political will to begin again? □

Jerry Brown among the liberals

by HAROLD MEYERSON

The California Democratic Council convention February 28-29 was absolutely amazing. It endorsed Tom Hayden overwhelmingly (an endorsement takes 60 percent) and, for the first time in its history, endorsed a Presidential candidate, Fred Harris, on the second ballot, with 67 percent. Morris Udall received a little over 20 percent, with a smattering for Frank Church and uncommitted.

CDC seems to be getting smaller and further left. Membership is down to around 15,000—a long decline from maybe 100,000 in the Stevenson days of the late 1950's. Udall's and Church's strength came from the affluent clubs of West Los Angeles-Beverly Hills. (Indeed, I know a number of rich Beverly Hills liberals who have pledged their shirts to Frank Church if he comes in late. Presumably, if Udall emerges as the frontrunner, though, they will hang on to their shirts.) John Tunney spoke and was received with formal politeness. Hayden was warmly received. Tunney was clobbered at the 1970 CDC convention for his waffling on the farmworkers and the war, and George Brown was endorsed. This time, George Brown, antiwar congressman of yore, now a fiscal conservative, endorsed Tunney, but with little influence.

Just 24 hours before Hayden and Harris were endorsed, Jerry Brown appeared and gave a masterful demagogic sham-populist performance. The crowd loved it. The Los Angeles *Times* account the next day varied in tone from amazement to contempt for the

intelligence of CDC members—a reasonable reaction.

Brown gave a very clever defense of governmental inaction: when Harry Truman took office, everyone said hurry up, hurry up, you've got to drop the bomb. When John Kennedy took office, everybody told him, hurry up, you've got to land at the Bay of Pigs. When Johnson took office, everyone said you've got to get into Vietnam right away. In contradistinction to this, Brown defended the contemplative approach, defended leaving vacancies in judgeships, bureaucracies. And since no one loves a bureaucrat, that went over big.

He listed the counterculture conservatives he had appointed to office, the minorities, etc. He made a big point of his proposal for across the board flat fee cost of living wage hikes rather than by percentage, which favors the higher brackets: Brown, the economic populist. Look, he recalled telling the wealthy regents of the University of California at a meeting held in an office building near the San Francisco slum Fillmore district, look, get out there and you see people whose problem isn't a cost of living raise from \$30,000 to \$32,000, it's getting a job at all: Brown, the foe of the rich. Cheers. The fact that he has no employment program for the Fillmore district is ignored.

And of course he waxes rhapsodic about his one achievement, the now defunct farm labor relations board, whose demise, in all fairness, is not his fault. And so it went, Brown, the iconoclast, foe of the rich, friend of man, etc. "I'm not conservative," he said, and, then, in a stage whisper. "I'm just cheap." Hoo-rahs. Interrupted 30 times for applause. Good grief. □

DEMOCRACY '76

As the Democracy '76 statement of purpose is circulated by the DSOC national office, local activists and local Democracy '76 coalitions, more names are coming in every day. As we go to press, new signers of the statement include Senator George McGovern, Georgia State Senator Julian Bond, *Village Voice* editor Jack Newfield, and labor leaders Lillian Roberts, Sol Stetin and Patrick Gorman.

Copies of the statement are available from Democracy '76 co-ordinator, Marjorie Gellermann, 853 Broadway, Suite 617, New York, N.Y. 10003.

The Democracy '76 coalition is also preparing for its first major effort to directly influence the Democratic Party platform. Our goal is to enunciate the Democracy '76 program at each regional platform hearing. Local Democracy '76 coalitions are contacting other progressives (in the labor movement, in women's and minority organizations, in community, environmental and other special interest groups) to encourage them to present testimony on full employment, redistribution of wealth, democratic control over investment decisions.

The schedule for the regional Democratic Party

Platform hearings is:

Date	Place	Morning Session
April 3	Providence	The Economy, Full Employment and Balanced Growth
April 17	Atlanta	The Government and Human Needs
April 24	Kansas City	Federal Budget and Government Reform
May 1	Denver	States, Counties, Cities: Problems and Prospects
May 17, 18, 19	Wash. D.C.	National Issues

The afternoon sessions will be open for testimony on any issue, but speakers are being encouraged to discuss topics of particular importance to the region in which each hearing is held. Persons who wish to testify should write to the Platform Committee, Democratic National Committee, 1625 Mass. Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20036. Written testimony will be received through May 31. □

Socialist notes

BREAKING INTO PRINT . . . *Socialist Woman*, a publication of the Feminist Caucus, was initiated at the Washington Conference in January. Editor Gretchen Donart says that it will be mailed out soon and will include reports from DSOC feminists around the country . . . The Youth Caucus, led by Cynthia Ward, has started a Communications Network to circulate news among young DSOC members.

CONGRATULATIONS, belatedly, to DSOC member Ruben Levin who received the 1975 Eugene V. Debs Award from the Debs Foundation in Terre Haute, Ind. Rube edits *Labor*, the newspaper of the railway unions, and the Foundation honored him for his distinguished career as a trade union editor.

MORE DINNERS COMING . . . Carl Shier predicts that this year's Chicago Debs-Thomas Dinner will be "the best ever." United Farm Workers Vice President Dolores Huerta will receive the award, and Mike Harrington will be the featured speaker. The dinner will be held on the evening of May 16 . . . New York DSOC will hold its second Debs-Thomas Dinner in May also, honoring Thomas Flavell of Amalgamated Clothing Workers Local 169 and the dean of the progressive labor movement in the New York City area.

SOARES . . . Portuguese Socialist leader, Mario Soares, had quite a bit of contact with DSOC while in the United States . . . New Haven DSOC officially welcomed him to that city . . . Larry Magarik, who visited Portugal and met Soares last summer, greeted him at the Newark airport and attended a public meeting in Newark with Soares . . . When Soares spoke at the National Press Club in Washington, Mike Harrington introduced him. And several DSOC members spoke with Soares and persuaded him to miss an appointed interview with the union-busting *Washington Post*.

PERIPATETIC CLARK . . . National Secretary Jack Clark keeps up his travels . . . In January, he spent five days touring New England . . . among other things, he spoke to a breakfast meeting of the Bangor, Maine Democratic Party, drew a record crowd, was covered by radio, TV and newspapers . . . also helped New Bedford, Mass. DSOC do some recruiting after a meeting there . . . In February, Jack spoke in Rochester, Ithaca, Schenectady and Albany, New York.

CHASE MANHATTAN BANK has agreed to publicly "discuss" the capital shortage with a DSOC representative. As part of an ad campaign pleading the poverty of the investment community and urging a seven point program for tax breaks to the rich, Chase offered to discuss the point "anytime, anywhere." When DSOC took up the challenge, Chase responded with evasions and bureaucratic shuffling. Finally, they agreed, and the "discussion" has been set for June 9 in New York.

FULL EMPLOYMENT . . . Michael Harrington joined the Joint Economic Committee of Congress for a day on March 19. The JEC invited Mike and other discussants to sit in and question Administration officials,

like Alan Greenspan and Arthur Burns, on the state of the economy and full employment plans . . . It was part of a two day full employment conference, sponsored by the JEC. Marjorie Gellermann was invited to attend the conference as a representative of Democracy '76.

SUCCESSFUL CAMPAIGN . . . South Side Chicago DSOC'ers were active in Ralph Metcalfe's campaign to hold on to his Congressional seat. Metcalfe faced an all-out challenge from the Daley machine this year (because he had been critical of police brutality in the ghetto) and rallied black activists, liberal and labor support successfully to turn back the challenge.

HEAR YE, HEAR YE . . . DSOC speakers and DSOC audiences have had some interesting meetings lately. . . . For example, Nat Weinberg spoke at an economics symposium at the University of Chicago where he shared a podium with Milton Friedman. The audience of more than 300 people reacted "as if a heretic were testifying in church," according to Alex Spinrad, when Nat challenged Friedman . . . Fifty people came to a meeting sponsored by MIT DSOC where Lester Thurow expounded on income and wealth distribution . . . Ithaca DSOC is sponsoring a Labor Forum on the Cornell campus. They have invited local labor leaders to speak on trade union and political issues . . . H. L. Mitchell continues his active stumping for DSOC nationally. In March, he visited Houston and spoke at the University, where there is an active DSOC local.

DEMOCRACY '76 . . . New England activists will be well prepared with left wing input for regional hearings of the Democratic platform committee in Providence, R.I. on April 3. They're concentrating their research and testimony on full employment, but they'll cover income and wealth redistribution and social control of investment, too . . . New Bedford DSOC member, Harry Dunham of the UAW, won a delegate slot in the Massachusetts primary . . . A March 20 Democracy '76 conference was held in Charlottesville for Virginia activists . . . As we go to press, final touches are being put on Nassau County N.Y. Democracy '76 conference on full employment . . . More Democracy '76 conferences planned for Los Angeles on April 24, Chicago in June . . . Washington D.C., Maryland and New York City Democracy '76 coalitions are drafting questionnaires and polling delegate candidates on Democracy '76 issues.

NATIONAL BOARD HIGHLIGHTS . . . A very productive meeting of the DSOC National Board March 13 and 14, among other things: gave Michael Harrington permission to endorse a Presidential candidate (he intends to endorse Morris Udall); chose a date (Presidents' birthday weekend 1977) and a place (Chicago) for the next DSOC Convention; and participated in spirited political discussions on American foreign policy and the changing Communist parties of Europe (discussion led by Bodgan Denitch and Sandy Gottlieb) and socialization of investment (discussion led by Nat Weinberg).

Jimmy Higgins reports . . .

FREEDOM, SOCIALISM AND SIMON—The Treasury Secretary is at it again, and again he's finding a struggle between "freedom and socialism." In a speech before the Public Relations Society of America, Simon identified socialist faculty members as a major threat. He went on to suggest that the ad executives "counsel your bosses and clients to take a close look at the teaching policies of those schools and foundations being considered for corporate gifts. Find out if the subjects of that generosity are really assisting in the fight to maintain our freedom, or if they're working to erode them, and urge that judgments be made accordingly . . . there are those institutions that just teach the socialistic side, if you will, rather than the total freedom side that I have espoused." When the *New York Times* editorially chided Simon for this attack on academic freedom, he responded with bewilderment. "I believe that an educational institution must present a broad spectrum of philosophies," the Treasury Secretary wrote in a March 18 letter. Will he advocate delaying federal grants until the University of Chicago Economics Department hires members of the Union of Radical Political Economists?

BUSINESS WEEK AND THE AFL-CIO AGREE that the current, much heralded economic upturn has been overstated. When January unemployment figures were announced, Administration economists hailed the .5 percent drop in unemployment (from 8.3 percent in December to 7.8 percent) as a sign of the health of the economy. The AFL-CIO charged statistical "gimmickry" on the extent of unemployment's decline. And *Business Week* saw "statistical gremlins" which led many to "overstate the strength of the recovery." The confusion resulted from inclusion of seasonal factors in figuring out the jobless rate. Since many temporary workers are laid off after the Christmas season and out of doors work which depends on pleasant weather

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. (\$50 sustaining; \$15 regular; \$8 limited income. Dues include \$5 for *Newsletter*.)

Send to: Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee, 853 Broadway, Room 617, New York, N.Y. 10003.

Name

Address

City/State Zip

is suspended in January, the Bureau of Labor Standards discounts some jobless in computing the unemployment rate each January. This year, though, an additional "seasonal" factor was added—the sharp downturn in employment for January 1975, which had more to do with the depth of the depression than the time of the year. So, projections for January 1976 seasonal job losses were so high that when "only" 1 million jobs were lost, that was translated into an employment gain of 800,000. Presto: unemployment is down. Now, if the Administration can project enough lost jobs over the summer, through "seasonal" adjustments, of course, we're sure to have full employment by November.

INDIAN OPINION is a fortnightly newsletter published by some courageous Indian nationals living in the United States and dedicated to continuing the struggle for democracy in India. Recent issues have included an interview with Jayaprakash Narayan and various reports from India on conditions under the "Emergency." Subscriptions to the twice monthly newsletter are available for \$10 from Indian Opinion, 600 River Street, Hoboken, N.J. 07030.

"**THE COMMUNISTS OF THE 1930's and the New Left**" is the title of an intelligent exchange between Max Gordon and James Weinstein in the January-March *Socialist Revolution*. Gordon, a former Communist leader who left the Party in the late '50's because of its "bureaucratic rigidity and distorted concept of proletarian internationalism," argues for the tactics of the 1930's—alliance with liberal elements and leadership in mass struggles such as organizing the C.I.O. Weinstein, a New Left historian, points to the weaknesses of the "Popular Front" and argues for building an independent socialist party. They agree that a major cause of the Old Left's decline was the Communists' "uncritical backing of Stalin's course," and Gordon and Weinstein share a concern with rebuilding an American socialist movement. As the editors of *Socialist Revolution* suggest, the exchange is a classic illustration of the tension between immediate demands and socialist transformation. The article is available from *Socialist Revolution*, 396 Sanchez Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94114.

LONG HOURS, LOW PAY AND MANY FRUSTRATIONS are guaranteed for anyone wishing to work full time for social change. One organization, the National Association for the Southern Poor, is offering just such a bargain to people interested in working as full time community organizers. Anyone interested should contact Marc Breslow, National Association for the Southern Poor, Box 1834, Petersburg, Va. 23803.

THE UFW IS ALSO LOOKING for organizers—students or other young people who could take some time out to work full time building the Farm Workers' boycott. The Second East Coast Mobilization for UFW will be held April 29-30 in New York City. \$10 registration fee includes ticket to benefit concert with Melanie. For more information, contact Irv Hershenbaum, 331 West 84 Street, New York, N.Y. 10024, (212) 799-5800. A ...