

Newsletter of

THE DEMOCRATIC LEFT

June 1973 Vol. I, No. 4



Edited by MICHAEL HARRINGTON

Watergate: Nixon's Vietnam

The Watergate, like another case of high level skulduggery, the Dreyfus affair, is a bolt of lightning which suddenly illuminates the entire political landscape. But the very dramatic intensity of the event may blind us to more prosaic truths about the power of money in politics. Since this event may well constitute Richard Nixon's "Vietnam"—effectively annulling the landslide of 1972 as the war vitiated Lyndon Johnson's triumph of 1964—this point has to be carefully understood.

In reacting to the criminal assaults on the democratic process and the Democratic Party, it is essential that we also recognize, and attack, the polite, everyday and perfectly legal subversion of democracy which takes place when corporate economic power influences government policy. John Connally is a case in point. Although Ralph Yarborough termed Connally's conversion to Republicanism "the first time a rat swam onto a sinking ship," a number of commentators saw the former Texas Governor's change of registration as a daring move to shore up public confidence in the Republican Party. When Nixon appointed Connally to the White House staff, many newsmen proclaimed that as evidence of Nixon's intention to do a thorough housecleaning.

Dollars and Sense

The statement of the AFL-CIO Executive Council is as good a summary as there is on Watergate. The statement issued May 9 reads:

"Corruption is no stranger to American politics. But what makes this case particularly outrageous is that the object was not the satisfaction of personal greed so much as the large-scale subversion of the democratic political process.

"It is indeed a subversion of political democracy when one party, because of its access to vast and excessive sums of money, can exercise the advantages of wealth and power to subvert the Justice Department and the White House itself to undermine its opposition and cement its grip on the reins of government. . . . Anything that subordinates voters to dollars, or the rights of the many to the manipulations of the few is against our interests."

That is well-said and especially appropriate since George Meany was apparently one of the objects of Nixon's Department of Dirty Tricks, the recipient of arrogant phone calls, purportedly from the McGovern staff, but really emanating from the Nixonites.

Yet, Connally retains his ties to a law firm which represents Gulf Resource and Chemical Corporation, a company under investigation for a secret \$100,000 contribution to the Nixon campaign—a contribution which may have been "laundered" through a Mexican bank and used to pay the Watergate gang. "Honest John" may have been part of the very mess he is supposed to clean up!

That sordid angle is not what concerns me here. Instead I want to focus on the more basic corruption of democracy that Connally-type wealth represents. When his appointment to the White House staff was first announced, it was said that Connally would serve the President as an unpaid consultant—and would therefore retain his ties to sundry business interests. Besides his work for Gulf Resources, Connally is involved in a consortium seeking to develop an international business in natural gas. A prime target in that venture is Siberia, possessor of the largest natural gas reserves in the world. The indicted chief fund raiser for the Committee to Re-Elect the President, Maurice Stans, went to Moscow last year as Secretary of Commerce to explore that deal. The figures involved are astronomical, as high as \$40 billion by some estimates. Obviously, any deal with the Soviet Union will have to be negotiated both by the United States government and by the companies involved. With close co-operation between the government negotiating team and the company's negotiators, there are mind-boggling possibilities for windfall profits—profits on a scale comparable to the sums harvested by those astute grain companies large enough to have advance notice of last year's Soviet wheat purchase.

Another area of Connally's responsibility on the President's staff will be the development of energy policy. That's certainly appropriate enough—especially since not too long ago, Connally was dealing with such matters in the Middle East, where he served the President of the United States as an unofficial emissary, and the oil interests as an official emissary.

When the press realized the fantastic conflict of interest in Connally's position, the new "Assistant President" announced that he had severed all those business connections. This begins to get to the core of the matter. Who can believe that Connally, a wheeler-dealer in the Texas tradition, is going to abandon his basic loyalties, or even his specific connections with certain companies trying to work out multi-billion dollar deals? Who can believe that Connally will not benefit in the future for the services and advantages he offers to his old business pals in the present?

In the Watergate case we see incredibly inept, amateur-

(Continued on page 3)

Walking the Picket Line

A YEAR LATER, the Farah strike and boycott continues. In May, 1972, Amalgamated Clothing Workers members walked off their jobs at the San Antonio plant because of low wages and unfair labor practices, including the firing of workers for union activity. Finally, the union seems to be making some progress toward winning decent contracts for the mostly Mexican-American workers employed by Farah.

First, the National Labor Relations Board has ordered Farah to reinstate the workers he fired, and pay them back wages plus 6% interest. Second, the consumer boycott, which caused Farah heavy losses for the last three quarters, is gaining in strength. At its winter meetings, the AFL-CIO Executive Council voted support for the boycott. In areas where the Amalgamated is weak, other interna-

Moving?...

This will be the last issue of the Newsletter published before the fall. If your address will be changing by September, try to notify us by early August, so that we can get your September issue to you promptly. Thank you, and have a good summer.

tional unions have been co-ordinating boycott activity. Five southwest Catholic dioceses are formally supporting the boycott and each of the five bishops has pledged to "use suitable means . . . to inform members of his diocese of the rights of strikers . . . and the need for social justice."

One place where the Farah workers' struggle is not gaining is within the councils of the national Democratic Party. When a motion to support the boycott was brought before the Democratic National Committee, Committeeman Robert McNair of South Carolina reportedly asked "But what will I wear on the golf course?" The motion was tabled.

DESPITE TEAMSTER RAIDS into the grape vineyards, the morale of the United Farm Workers seems high, especially after the strong support given *la causa* by George Meany and the AFL-CIO Executive Council. The UFW leadership plans to use the \$1.6 million contribution from the Federation to pay strike benefits. With such a large fund, the UFW hopes to pull at least half the workers from the fields, and with the harvest coming up in two weeks that could be devastating to the growers. Scott Singer, an occasional correspondent for the NEWSLETTER, described the scene in the fields on a recent visit to Coachella: "Teamster goons line up at the edge of the fields. . . . Anyone looking at the situation the day I was there would have a hard time believing that the Teamsters are really a union."

"Most of the workers on the field now support the UFW, but can't come out on strike because they have no money. But I saw dozens of them crossing the Teamster line to talk to Chavez, and even to hug him! The extent of the slow-down in the fields is remarkable."

Left Jobs

"POWER TO THE PEOPLE" was Richard Nixon's slogan when he proclaimed his no-strings-attached revenue sharing plan two years ago. The way things are turning out, his slogan should have been: "more power to the powerful." A Senate subcommittee, chaired by Sen. Edmund Muskie of Maine, recently surveyed 750 cities and towns to see how the federal money was being spent. They found out that it purchased lots of fire engines, rubbish collection, street repairs, and local tax reductions. Very few cities, as Muskie pointed out, "put these funds into improved health care, into anti-poverty programs, into equalizing opportunities for the less privileged." According to Muskie, revenue sharing funds will go "to the most powerful—and that means, by and large the most privileged—elements in every local structure." As the *Economist* of London pointed out this means that the poor, the sick and the hungry will come out on the bottom of the local priority lists.

MEANWHILE ON THE HOUSING FRONT—Governor Rockefeller has taken out a card in the cooperative movement. In a speech endorsing the large-scale mixed-income concept, Rocky's housing commissioner, Charles Urstadt also called for turning over slum housing to resident cooperatives. Sounds right on—but, on closer inspection, Rocky's co-ops look like the fast-buck plans that landlords of luxury housing try to palm off on their tenants. The low income tenants would have to pay their landlord for the market value of the building, then take out a long-term loan. There's something for everybody but the tenants, who have to bail out their landlords, then bind themselves to a mortgage.

Rocky's plan came on the heels of a less-publicized report by the United Neighborhood Houses on what low income tenants are actually doing. They go on rent strike under city ordinances lowering rents where there are serious code violations. They put their rents into a fund to repair the building. According to the UNH report, endorsed by Rep. Herman Badillo, the tenants effectively "expropriate" their landlords while setting up "de facto cooperatives."

Since the Great Society days when industry announced plans to rebuild the cities building-by-building, rehabilitation has been considered a shuck by the housing experts. A rehabilitated unit costs as much as a new one; the tenants still have to move out for a major "gut job"; and, when it's over the unit is still substandard. Co-oping by rent strike at least makes life more tolerable for tenants and eases family budgets. Rocky's scheme for longterm mortgages on housing that won't last seems like yet another effort to pass the maintenance costs deferred by years of slumlording onto the tenants. Or, in George Wiley's phrase, it's "repression masked as reform."

Watergate

(Continued from page 1)

ish and bungled examples of the power of money in politics. The incompetents involved in that case went around with brief cases filled with \$200,000, burgled psychiatrists' offices, and involved the CIA, the FBI, the Marines, Cabinet officials, and quite possibly the President himself in the criminal obstruction of justice. What bothers me is that we will become so fascinated by all of this blundered villainy that we will lose sight of the deeper level of corruption represented by John Connally, a Watergate winner, rather than a loser.

How can we deal with the more profound problem of institutionalized and legal collusion between the public and private sectors? It is possible, now and in the immediate future, to attack some of the flagrant excesses revealed by Watergate. Even though such reforms may not go to the very heart of the trouble, they should be pursued with great vigor. We must recognize Nixon's proposal to set up a study commission on reform of the campaign process as an absolute dodge. Nixon has been fighting campaign reforms for some time now, precisely because they would limit the power of money, and therefore of the Republican Party. There has been ample discussion; what is needed now is quick legislative action. Three areas are particularly important:

- campaign financing should be largely federalized with allocations to be made on a democratic basis, with special protection (but not parity) for minority parties;
- all television and radio time in national campaigns should be provided free by the networks and stations as a condition of their licensing, and this time should also be parcelled out in a democratic fashion;
- the post-card system of voter registration should be enacted immediately.

A Democratic victory in 1974 and 1976 would also limit the power of money in politics somewhat, since the Democrats are more subject to popular pressure from progressive constituencies than the Republicans.

For the long range, action must be taken to curb the influence of a Connally or a Rockefeller. It is important that the perpetrators of the Watergate break-in be punished, but democracy is more threatened by the subtle pressure a Connally is capable of exerting on our national energy policy, for example, than it is by the ineptness of a Gordon Liddy. As a first step, public participation on the boards of large companies is required. Beyond that, we must demand open and democratic debate over energy policy.

But what are the political possibilities of making such a point? Some of the structural aspects of Watergate are involved in an answer.

It has been suggested—most notably by Kirkpatrick Sale in the *New York Review of Books*—that the Watergate outrage is related to a particular, and new, wing of the American powers that be. Haldeman, Ehrlichman—and Nixon—Sale argues, are the product of the "Sun Belt," of the new millionaires who have emerged in California, Texas and Florida and who are counterposed to the more established money of the Northeast.

There is obviously something to the thesis. The stylistic and cultural background of Watergate certainly involved the advertising and PR men who turned into fanatic, and simplistic Nixonians. The scandal is peculiarly the work of amateurs, new boys in the American ruling class. But even while agreeing to that observation, it must be handled somewhat gingerly. The Northeastern money establishment is much more liberal, internationalist, educated, than Nixon's chums from California and Florida. But those liberal, internationalist and educated corporation men also, in a much more subtle and sophisticated way, impose their priorities on the state. George Ball, an early opponent of the war in Vietnam from within the Johnson Administration, is also an outstanding spokesman for the self-interest of multinational companies.

But given that qualification, it is useful to pursue the theory of "sun-belt" conservatism for it bears very much on the possibilities for action in 1974 and 1976. Kevin Phillips, the author of *The Emerging Republican Majority* and the most brilliant proponent of the sun-belt theory, is quite helpful in this regard.

The Northern Establishment, Phillips argues, is "centered on the profits of social and welfare spending, the knowledge industry, conglomerate corporationism, dollar internationalism and an interlocking directorate with the like-concerned power structure of political liberalism." It is, he thinks, moving toward the liberal wing of the Democratic Party and away from the Republican Party.

The sun-belt conservatives thrive on "commerce, light industry, military preparedness, defense production and space age technology." This is the area of the country which draws "the pleasure seekers, the bored, the ambitious, the space-age technicians and the retired." These were the cadres of Goldwater's nomination and Reagan's election in 1964, the backbone of Phillips' emerging Republican majority.

This is why I think that Watergate may be—must be—turned into—Nixon's Vietnam.

In 1964, it seemed to many people, including astute observers like Samuel Lubell and James MacGregor Burns, that Lyndon Johnson had effectively realigned American politics and, in the process, all but destroyed the Republican Party.

After Johnson's victory, the war in Vietnam was escalated in 1965 and what had first seemed to be an impregnable new alignment was torn apart within a matter of three years. In 1972, Richard Nixon won a similar landslide. His coalition was almost as diverse as the Johnson movement of 1964: Goldwaterites, big businessmen, a significant contingent of workers and of youth. And in the spring after his triumph—the greatest scandal in American history exploded within his administration.

Those cadres of sun-belt conservatism are bound to be particularly demoralized. They are often religious, as well as political, fundamentalists. The revelations of the lying, cheating and fraud in the White House are bound to affect them deeply. As a result, there is a completely new setting in American politics, one conducive to an offensive of the democratic Left. Nixon's Vietnam, the Watergate affair, does not simply make it necessary for the democratic Left to attack the subversive power of money in a democracy; but also makes it possible.

Democratic Infighting — 'Anti-Elitists' Want

By Jack Clark

"Scrap the quotas."

"Maintain affirmative action."

Behind the slogans and the sometimes technical details there is a debate over the procedures which transformed the Democratic Party Convention in 1972. The issue now is—what shape will the 1974 (issues) and 1976 (nominating) Conventions take?

The debate focuses around these questions:

Should elected officials be automatically seated as Convention delegates? Or should state Democratic committees be allotted ten percent of their delegations to be filled by appointment by the state committee? Are the present affirmative action provisions of the Party rules too much like quotas? Or is the present affirmative language too weak? Are "participatory democrats," mostly the rank-and-file middle class reformers, over-represented in the Party at the expense of the less affluent, less active but more numerous working class Democrats?

While these are far from the sexiest political issues in the world, the relatively obscure Party rules and delegate selection procedures will determine the political composition of the delegates to the 1976 Convention, and therefore, in part, whom the Democrats nominate in 1976. Also at stake are the Party charter (making the Democrats an ongoing membership party) and the leadership of the Democratic Party for most of the next decade. In the longer run, the fate of a future Democratic insurgency, like the McCarthy and Kennedy candidacies in 1968, or perhaps like the Wallace run in 1972, may hinge on the decisions set by Party Commissions this year.

In the period following the 1968 Convention and Humphrey's loss, the reform Democrats were in the ascendancy, and their proposals for changing the Party seemed to dominate the debate. That situation has certainly changed, and internal Party debate now centers on a document prepared by a Coalition for a Democratic Majority task force and presented to the Mikulski Commission on Delegate Selection. Unlike earlier public statements by CDM, this report is exceedingly conciliatory in tone. There are no threats to read anyone out of the Party, no bluster about putting the reformers or "New Politics elitists" in their place. CDM Director Penn Kemble may have co-authored a *Commentary* article last December in which he accused the reformers of stealing the nomination by manipulating reforms, but he's now signing a report saying: "we join the vast majority of our fellow Democrats in supporting much of the Reform Commission's original work."

Such mildness of tone is welcome. It indicates that the hard line anti-McGovern stalwarts have realized, or had the realization forced upon them, that they can not be both head-hunters after the McGovern forces and influential figures in the Party with ties to prestigious leaders like Congressman James O'Hara.

Defending and trying to extend the reforms of 1972 are diverse individual reformers and reform groups. Alan Baron, the co-ordinator of the Democratic Planning Group, is publishing a newsletter on internal Democratic Party matters to keep the reform elements informed and mobilized. He and others have also tried to pull together an

alliance on the Democratic National Committee and the Commissions of those committed to maintaining and strengthening the McGovern-Fraser reforms. At its recent convention, ADA reaffirmed its support of the McGovern-Fraser guidelines. Finally, the trade unionists who supported McGovern seem to be banding together as critical supporters of the reforms. The reform wing of the Party is, then, composed of those who actively campaigned for McGovern last fall. As McGovern's recent pronouncements show, there is no one "liberal" position on the current intra-Party issues, and the reformers are, to varying degrees, willing to compromise on some issues which were divisive in 1972.

But there *are* differences, particularly on two issues: the present affirmative action language of the delegate selection guidelines and the proportion of elected officials and ex officio delegates which the Convention should seat.

CDM charges that the present language directing that women, minority groups and youth be represented in reasonable relationship to their numbers in the population created virtual quotas at the last Convention, and demands that the language be scrapped. The reformers counter that such a step would move the Party back to 1968 when discrimination was outlawed and deplored but practiced.

The other contested issue is more complex. It deals with the question of how many delegates should be elected by the primary or caucus systems and how many should be chosen by the state committee or serve *ex officio*. Since there is a higher participation in Congressional, gubernatorial and Senatorial elections than in delegate elections or Party caucuses, CDM argues that it is more democratic to seat officials as *ex officio* delegates than it is to have a minority of the voters choosing all the delegates. Pointing to 1968, the reformers counter that the seating of a large number of *ex officio* delegates means that the Convention will be loaded with people chosen before the primary contests begin. Besides, the reformers argue, the Convention should be geared toward electing activists as delegates.

These differing approaches to the problem of delegate selection reflect differing approaches to Party structure. In part the differences between the two wings go beyond the scope of the Mikulski Commission, and fall more in the range of the Sanford Commission on the Party Charter. CDM clearly outlines its approach to Party structure:

"The major elected officials whom we propose to include as *ex officio* convention delegates constitute only one portion, however, of the representative Democratic leaders who should be assured roles at national conventions. Every state delegation, in our view, should include a strong complement of Democratic mayors, state legislative leaders, state Party officials, fundraisers, and labor, minority and community leaders . . ."

The CDM is proposing, essentially, a leadership party, a party which operates by having its base represented by established leaders of ongoing institutions. It is an approach which Alan Baron has called, "letting Tony Boyle speak for the mineworkers."

While I would not go so far as that, the CDM approach does raise problems. It is basically the Muskie approach of running a general election campaign in the primaries, of

Leadership to Dominate

relying on the reputations and the vote-getting capacity of well-known figures to carry the party through to the convention. This is an approach which was discredited in state after state last year by a broad section of the electorate. My home state of Massachusetts is perhaps the keenest example; the mayor of Boston, most of the state's Congressional delegation, the head of the NAACP, UAW and AFL-CIO officials were defeated in a relatively high turnout primary while virtually unknown McGovern delegates were elected. The "established leaders" were not in tune with—or could not mobilize—their constituencies.

Yet CDM is at least partially correct in asserting that the McGovern delegates represented a new stratum of the Democratic elite: affluent, highly educated and highly motivated. If CDM's proposal would, conceivably, let Tony Boyle speak for the mineworkers, perhaps the current reform arrangements allow Joe Rauh to speak for the mineworkers. The problem is, how do we get the mineworkers—or the Democratic electorate—to speak for themselves?

Neither side in the Democratic Party is currently addressing that question. CDM assumes, in effect, that it is impossible to get anyone but New Left students and affluent suburban housewives involved in the Democratic Party. Try as they might, those established leaders just can't get their constituents politically active. So, it is "necessary" to stack the deck a little, in the name of representative democracy. Nowhere is this clearer than in CDM's proposal on the affirmative action language; following their lead, the Party would place the burden of proof on the insurgents in every case. If a delegation from New York was 90% white and male, any group of blacks or women would have to prove that the state committee practiced discrimination. That, of course, establishes a means test for political participation: affluent women or middle-class blacks can muster the resources to pose such a challenge, ghetto residents or working women would be unable to.

Unfortunately, the reform movement makes the blithe and incorrect assumption that since the procedures have been opened, anyone is free to participate. While the reform Democrats recognize the dulling effects of racial discrimination and sexual discrimination in socializing non-participation, they tend to overlook one of the most pervasive disincentives to political activism: social class and its attendant bias. In the absence of a strong labor party or socialist tradition, there has been a tendency among American workers to leave the business of government to the better-educated, professional strata. Even in urban machines with strong working class bases, it was and is the lawyers—sons of workers, perhaps, but themselves well-educated—who dominate.

With the rise of the ethnic organizations and the increasing political activism of the unions, some of that may change. Perhaps, working people themselves and not simply their "established leaders" can be brought into active participation in the Democratic Party. For that to happen, the channels of participation will certainly have to remain open. But more than that is necessary. At the very least, the reformers will have to complete their rediscovery of the working class and the white ethnic.

Support Grows for Industrial Safety

By Frank Wallick

The environmental upsurge of the 70's awakened a feeling in many workers that noise, untested chemicals and bad ventilation on the job need not persist. Many hoped that the Occupational Health and Safety Act of 1971 would bring an end to environmental horrors. But the law has proved too complicated and unreliable in the hands of government bureaucrats who quickly routinized a revolutionary document.

But some new alliances around the issue of job safety offer a basis for hope. Scientists and health activists are finding common ground with working people on this issue, and are providing the technical competence which is essential if worker mobilization is to be effective.

- The Nader Health Research Group has a team of physicians, toxicologists and lawyers assisting unions and union members in grappling with the complexities of occupationally-caused illness and death.
- In Boston, a group of young health activists, calling themselves the industrial health project of Urban Planning Aid, are working on an about to be lost OEO grant. They've done research and prepared educational materials which rank among the best currently available in the U.S. Their health hazard sheets and booklets on noise, chemicals, etc., are precisely what the federal government ought to produce under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1971.
- The Medical Committee for Human Rights, with Dan Berman as an organizer, has 15,000 health activists, and is making some inroads in enlisting medical students in the effort to clean up the workplace.
- Richard Ginnold, of the University of Wisconsin's School for Workers, has prepared some of the best training material in worker safety and health.
- The Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers (OCAW) has a staff scientist, Dr. Jeanne Stellman, fresh out of New York University, who runs training courses, battles the scientific establishment, and relates easily with working people on life-and-death matters at the workplace. Dr. Stellman and Dr. Susan Daum of the Mount Sinai School of Medicine, have finished a book called *Work Is Dangerous to Your Health*, (Random House, 1973) which is the first technical book designed for ordinary readers.
- There is an emerging group of local union specialists in health and safety who are picking up some of the leads which the experts are supplying. Among them is Ed Glowacki, health and safety chairman of the big Parma, Ohio General Motors local. His reports on shop working conditions are based on independent studies he has made, trips on his own time to medical libraries, and hard work plowing through dense jargon on the health hazards of the chemicals used in his shop.

Now we have the Shell strike, the first action in which workers were willing to put their jobs on the line to guarantee that their union has influence on health conditions in the work environment. The OCAW has enlisted an impressive roster of scientists in support of the strike. Perhaps intellectuals and trade unionists can work together.

The Journey of Ten Thousand Miles

A new, nationwide socialist organization will be launched on October 12th in New York City.

The call to the founding convention was issued by the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee, the group which publishes this NEWSLETTER, at a meeting of its National Board last month.

Why do we socialists, who issue a Newsletter that is not exclusively socialist, desire to create a new socialist organization?

We believe, of course, in the urgency of a socialist solution to current, and future, social problems. Our society is becoming more collectivist every day. It is utterly obvious that the "invisible hand" of the free market is not going to provide a rational and progressive solution to the energy crisis or create full employment and price stability at the same time. The government is going to intervene and the only question is how—whether there will be a socialism for the rich, a corporate collectivism, or whether there will be democratic collectivism, a socialism for the majority.

But even that compelling case for socialism does not prove that America needs a new socialist organization. It can even be argued that, since there is no serious prospect for the political triumph of an avowedly socialist movement in America, establishing such a group will only isolate socialists from the real work at hand, the creation of a democratic Left majority. We disagree.

First, it is crucial to have people thinking through the implications, and details, of long-range, structural change. When Lyndon Johnson declared war on poverty in 1964, one problem was that the Left had simply not developed a penetrating analysis of what had to be done. The Fifties had given us a deficit in social spending—and in social thinking.

In saying this, we do not propose a socialist organization which will blue-print a plan for pie in the sky. We must take socialist insights and apply them to transform the limits of the possible. We argue for tax reform to change the distribution of wealth, and national health care available solely on the basis of need. "Utopian" programs become practical, even necessary.

Secondly, the thousands, and even tens of thousands, of socialists now a part of the democratic Left, need a vehicle of communication with one another. At the same time we talk of the necessity of a socialist program, we will be active in the Democratic Party, in trade unions, in tenant organizations, etc. In a socialist organization we can com-

dissent

quarterly intellectual journal of the democratic left

Spring 1973

The New Conservatives: Intellectuals in Retreat
by Joseph Epstein

The Politics of Tightrope by Michael Harrington

Freedom Victory in the United Mine Workers
by H. W. Benson

Higher Reaches of the Lower Orders: On B. F. Skinner
by David Spitz

Women's Liberation and Women Critics
by Rose Laub Coser

individual issues \$1.75, subscriptions \$7/year,
\$12/two years, \$5/year for students

Dissent, 509 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017

pare our experiences and improve our strategies.

Thirdly, the many young people who are socialist, but confused, especially since the dissolution of the New Left, need education and a place where they can meet with the older generation of the Left. It was precisely the absence of such communication which contributed to the weakness and eventual collapse of the New Left in the Sixties.

Fourth, we see a hopeful ferment in the labor movement. The forces which rallied to McGovern in 1972 have a new sense of their vitality and identity; those who took the "neutrality" line may well be reconsidering that decision in the light of Watergate. As socialists we are principled partisans of the unions. We are not a clique, nor an employment agency for the labor establishment. We are a part of the working class movement and our greatest contribution is our honest and independent commitment to its struggles. In the process, we can provide a center in which trade unionists and the newer generation of activists can learn from one another.

It is necessary, says the Chinese proverb, to take the first step on the journey of ten thousand miles. For us, that first step is the creation of a democratic Left majority, and a liberal Democratic victory, in 1974 and 1976—and the journey of ten thousand miles is the socialist task itself. As an organized association of those who see the need for the journey of ten thousand miles, we think we can better help our non-socialist friends on the democratic Left to take the first step.

If you agree, join us.

Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee

125 West 77th Street, New York, N.Y. 10024

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

CITY/STATE.....ZIP.....

Minimal Dues: Student \$3.50 Regular \$7.00 (until Jan. 1, 1974)

Dues include a subscription to Newsletter of the Democratic Left

Were the Sixties Really a Failure?

By Frank Reissman

Today it is fashionable to attack the 1960's as a boondoggling, romantic period when nothing was accomplished. Recent studies, such as those of the Brookings Institute, Jencks, and Jensen suggest that nothing was achieved during the '60's in such basic areas as elementary education. The effect of these studies has been to support the Nixon Administration's strategy for a large-scale cut in services rationalized with cost-effectiveness techniques and aimed at weakening both the professional education establishment and the poor. This approach appeals to both middle class taxpayers and poor blacks, because of the past inadequacies of so many social programs.

Let us take a more careful look at the 60's to see what really happened and what did not.

The learning of poor children did not improve, nor did their health. People did not move out of poverty. There was neither a major redistribution of wealth, nor any significant occupational mobility. But there *was* a recognition of the need for social reorganization, for a change in priorities. The movements of the 60's have led to positive developments through the extension of rights to ethnic minorities, to women, to prisoners, to the elderly, the young, consumers, homosexuals, welfare recipients, patients, etc.

Russia: Notes from Underground

Soviet Union watchers have noted with interest the appearance of a relatively new publication from the Russian opposition. *Seyatel* (the Sower) first appeared in the Russian Samizdat in 1971, but the first two issues did not reach the West until last Summer. According to the editors, their goal is "the establishment of a social democratic party in the Soviet Union." The first two issues criticize the present liberal freedom movement for its failure to involve itself in politics and for its tendency toward "individualistic morality." Quoting Marx, Lenin, and Djilas, the *Seyatel* writers call the Soviet Union a system of "state-monopolistic capitalism," rather than socialist or communist.

Seyatel proposes a program to unite all those in opposition — both activists and sympathizers. The very core of its proposal is the call for a "party." Obviously, this does not mean handing out membership cards and keeping mailing lists (which would be suicidal), but the adoption of a program and a recognition by all elements of the Opposition that the struggle is basically political. "If you have a party and a program, there are two alternatives rather than one" is how the authors of the publication put it. That second alternative is worth a lot to them.

"Social Resonance" is the term *Seyatel* uses to describe the various individualistic, liberal protests against Soviet authority. Many of these acts are expressly anti-political and symbolic. To this form of protest *Seyatel* counterposes a political party, "scientific socialism," and the "class struggle."

Newsletter of

THE DEMOCRATIC LEFT

Michael Harrington, Editor

Jack Clark, Managing Editor

David Bensman, Steve Kelman, David Kusnet,
Jon Ratner, Ronnie Steinberg Ratner, Mark
Schaeffer

Signed articles express the views of the author.

125 West 77th Street, New York, N.Y. 10024

Let us look for a moment at the main target of the critics of the 60's, the Office of Economic Opportunity. For all its failings, the OEO was in fact the leading force in developing legal rights for the poor. Besides many direct and immediate benefits to the poor, OEO lawyers began a number of significant class-action suits. Beyond legal aid, the OEO helped expand family planning services for the poor and introduced the concept of maximum feasible participation. Watered down versions of community participation took root in Model Cities programs, education programs and in "Head Start." The participatory ethos spread to all kinds of institutions (including political parties), making them more democratic and more sensitive to human needs.

In the 70's we now see a broader conception of social problems revealed in a new concern for universal health care, the demand for a right to a job (as evidenced by the clamor for expanded public employment), the right of the handicapped to an education, the right of the mentally ill to rehabilitation, and the right to a guaranteed income. There is the long range possibility of a new progressive majority. That possibility is rooted in the equality revolution of the 60's, which spread from blacks to women and youth, and which may spread in the 70's to the workplace.

While the concerns of the 60's were characterized by consumer-related issues, the concerns of the 70's seem to be shifting toward issues related to work: Lordstown, equal pay for women workers, worker participation and control, and public service employment. For example, a concern with environmental issues may be reflected in new interest in health and working conditions in the factory. Demands for participation are being expressed by demands for workers' voice in decisions affecting production. The broad alienation and malaise which have characterized much of American life in the last decade may be translated into specific debate about the nature and meaning of work.

A basic human relations revolution took place in the 60's, bringing a new understanding of social, cultural and interpersonal issues. While this change is not sufficient in itself, we should not lose sight of it as we attempt to move forward in the 70's. The positive trends of the 60's need to be transformed at a higher level of consciousness and integrated into everyday life, particularly at the workplace. This can reverse the swing to the right which has so far characterized the 70's and obscured the healthy trends of the last decade.

Frank Reissman is editor of Social Policy magazine.

Jimmy Higgins Reports...

LEARNING TO COPE—Communications Workers President Joe Beirne has decided that his union needs a permanent political action apparatus, which will replace the AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education (COPE) for the 550,000 CWA members. With the launching of the new organization, financial support from the Communications Workers to COPE will end. As noted here before, Beirne was noticeably unhappy with the AFL-CIO "neutrality" decision in last year's Presidential election. He has also labelled COPE "inept" in its maneuverings within the Democratic Party before the 1972 Convention. And Beirne was not pleased when he had to fight his way onto the Democratic National Committee recently over the objections of COPE Director Al Barkan.

In an intra-Party struggle, Beirne succeeded in thwarting Barkan's designated nominee, S. Frank Raftery of the Painters' Union for the DNC, and won a place on the Executive Committee for fellow McGovern trade unionist, Floyd Smith of the Machinists. Beirne, who faced a public dressing-down from George Meany at the winter meeting of the AFL-CIO Executive Council, say's he's been keeping a box score on his contests with Meany and Barkan. "So far," Beirne says, "I'm winning."

THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT IS ALIVE AND WELL in Chicago. A new group, Women Employed, was formed in March 1973 to work on wages, job promotion opportunities, benefits and general respect for women working in downtown Chicago. Included in the membership of WE are individual women, women of the Loop YWCA, Chicago Women in Publishing, National Organization for Women, DARE (Direct Action for Rights in Employment), American Federation of State, County and Municipal Workers, Communications Workers of America, and American Federation of Teachers.

One of WE's first projects was an investigation of working conditions of women employed in the Loop. Armed with statistics from that study, WE demanded that the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry call a meeting of major downtown employers where women could present their grievances. The meeting is scheduled for June 6.

IN THE "DON'T BLAME ME" STATE of Massachusetts, liberal Democrat Michael Dukakis, the sponsor of



the nation's first and most effective no-fault insurance law is taking an early and impressive lead in the race for next year's Democratic gubernatorial nomination. Dukakis, who has lined up grass roots support with over 100 meetings across the state, has already scared Congressman Michael Harrington (no relation) out of the race. Dukakis backers are now hoping that Robert Quinn, the state's Attorney General and candidate of the more conservative regulars, will also decide to forego the contest, leaving Dukakis free to build toward the difficult task of unseating liberal Republican incumbent Gov. Francis Sargent. If Quinn does leave the path clear for Dukakis, it will be a first for Bay State Democrats who are noted for their fratricidal primary battles.

That fratricide helped elect John Volpe Governor in 1966 and helped Francis Sargent remain in the State House in 1970. But if there is a Democrat capable of ending the Republican control of the governorship, it is probably the highly respected Dukakis. While he has a very strong liberal base (Evans and Novak predicted last fall that his liberal, McGovernite following would be Dukakis' undoing) the former state legislator seems to have his strongest support among the working class reformers who have entered politics in many Massachusetts cities in recent years.

TEXAS AFL-CIO PRESIDENT Roy Evans is a man alone. He has managed to isolate himself politically by standing on the very solid principle of Democratic Party unity. Of course such Party loyalty led him to campaign actively last fall for the national McGovern-Shriver ticket. George Meany and the national AFL-CIO leadership were less than enamored of Evans for that. It also led him to support Texas gubernatorial nominee Dolph Briscoe last fall, and supporters of liberal Sissy Farenthold (who lost the nomination to Briscoe) did not particularly like that. The Farenthold supporters were also the chief McGovern constituency in the state. To top that off, Briscoe forces aren't very fond of Evans either. He didn't support Briscoe strongly enough in the primary fight, they feel, and his support for McGovern clashed with their distinct coolness toward the national ticket. It's tough to be honest.

Please enter my subscription to the *Newsletter of the Democratic Left*
Regular Subscription \$5 Student rate \$2.50
Sustaining Subscription \$10
Name
Address
City Zip
Send to *Newsletter of the Democratic Left*
125 West 77th Street, New York, N.Y. 10024
From each according to his ability