DSOC Convention: New Goals Set, Anti-Carter Mood

By David Hoffman

SIGNIFICANT TURN TOWARDS building a stronger Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee—with nearly twice the present membership in 1980 and a renewed effort to form a broad coalition of the democratic left in America—came last month at the DSOC Fourth National Convention.

Elected to top DSOC leadership positions were the president of the International Association of Machinists (IAM) and a leader in the American Hispanic community.

Major organizational initiatives were also adopted. These included beginning to explore merger possibilities with the 800-member New American Movement (NAM); local recruitment and a direct mail drive to reach 5000 members by 1980; a major Democratic Agenda conference next fall around the theme of "A Program in Search of a Democratic Candidate"; and both before and after that conference a nationally coordinated multi-city speaking tour by DSOC and other democratic left leaders.

Also discussed by the convention was a possible presidential race in a few Democratic primaries by Harrington if the elements for at least a "minimally serious" issues campaign could be assembled and if no other stronger candidate such as Kennedy has entered the race by summer. In Harrington's words, "it remains an open question and I leave the way open.

"...the 'New Foundations' of Jimmy Carter are being constructed solely on empty rhetoric and phoney promises."

Ronald Dellums
Icies. Everybody on the Left is disgusted with the specific policies to deal with inflation—aided by an energetic local chapter—in one of the capital cities of the oil-and-gas Sunbelt, Houston, Texas, where the convention heard the words of California Democratic Congressman Ron Dellums, “This is now a new historical moment, and we must emerge.

“The American welfare state is indeed at a point of bankruptcy, and the ‘New Foundations’ of Jimmy Carter are being constructed solely on empty rhetoric and phoney promises,” thundered Dellums, the first avowed socialist to sit in the U.S. Congress since 1926 and a leading voice for black Americans as well as a member of DSOC.

“As people who have courage and integrity, we must now pick up our own banner and go to the American people with new alternatives,” said Dellums, “to recapture the economic wealth of the nation as a whole.”

Throughout the Motel-Modern tackiness of the Holiday Inn—whose roadside sign prominently announced “Welcome Democratic Socialists”—delegates and observers actively joined both in plenary sessions and informal caucuses to thrash out crucial issues governing the direction of DSOC during the next two years.

The national officers and at-large national board seats were decided. Michael Harrington remains national chair. Re-named vice-chairs are Deborah Meier, a New York City educator and activist, UAW International Representative Carl Shier of Chicago, and Ruth Jordan of Washington, D.C., a leader in the Coalition of Labor Union Women.
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Winpisinger Is Vice-Chair

Newly elected vice-chairs are Atlanta theologian Michael Rivas, who chairs the DSOC Hispanic Commission, and IAM President William Winpisinger, who said—from the AFL-CIO meeting in Florida that same weekend—“Sure, it’s unusual for the president of a major national union to accept a leadership role within a socialist organization. But these are not ordinary times. DSOC is working for an economic system that puts human needs above corporate profits, and I’m with them all the way.”

Following a convention decision to expand the number of at-large seats on the national board and to elect eight men and eight women to those seats, a serious political campaign to win those seats took place. Harrington termed this development “a sign of the growing political strength of DSOC.” The at-large members of the new board will form its executive committee, which also includes DSOC’s national officers.

Elected to at-large seats were: (men) Greg Akili (San Diego), Harry Boyte (Minneapolis), Jim Chapin, Jack Clark and Frank Lugoviña (New York City), Roger Robinson (Detroit), Jim Wallace (Washington, D.C.), and George Wood (Champaign-Urbana); (women) Jeanne Kettelson and Mary Roodkowsky (Boston), Nancy Kleniewski (Philadelphia), Nancy Lieber (Sacramento-Davis), Marjorie Phye (New York City), Trudy Robideau (San Diego), Nancy Shier (Chicago) and Cynthia Ward (Stony Brook, Long Island).

Five of the new board members—Boyle, Robinson, Kettelson and Robideau—joined in pre-balloting sessions with at least one quarter of the convention delegates, all seeking to promote stronger emphasis within DSOC on explicitly “socialist” work. All their meetings were completely open and no specific “left-slate” emerged from what was first dubbed the “left-socialist cau-
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Referring to an earlier conversation with Harrington, sociologist Bogdan Denitch noted that "Michael doesn't think we need caucuses, but he told me this is the nicest caucus he's ever had to deal with. If we were an unfriendly caucus," joked Denitch, "we would have demanded the dissolution of all committees, denounced the central office, called for its removal to Chicago and the payment to bureaucrats of workers' wages." To this last point someone rejoined, "They should be so lucky."

Said Ruth Spitz (New York City): "It's time DSOC had more than one central tendency. It's time we were strong enough to show that we're not fearful of admitting we don't represent consensus on every point. But in no way does this reduce our singlemindedness in being in this organization."

In a statement of "left orientation" within DSOC, the group declared its intention to help create "a broad multitenability socialist movement" which includes the DSOC coalition activities through Democratic Agenda work within the Democratic Party.

"We propose to move from an almost exclusive emphasis on coalition politics, emphasizing as it does work with notables, to a greater involvement of our membership in working as a distinct socialist current within such a coalition."

Resolution Charts Directions

On the convention's final day, an organizational perspective resolution, mapping the direction of DSOC until the next convention, was put before the delegates. Contained within this resolution were strands of what had begun as three separate resolutions. They were: first, the "left-socialist" proposal; second, one focusing on stronger DSOC activities at the local level, backed by a large number of delegates including Ben Ross (Boston) and Carl Shier (Chicago) as well as chapters such as Philadelphia and the San Francisco Bay Area, the latter concerned about what it called the "over-centralization" of DSOC; and third, a proposal drafted by National Secretary Jack Clark and Deborah Meier.

After the three resolutions were merged—in what appeared to be, on balance, a truly dialectical process of absorption and synthesis—the document was thoroughly debated before being amended and then adopted by the convention.

Speaking for the resolutions committee, Ron Bloom (Boston) declared, "This document is just a beginning. It cannot say everything about DSOC, because DSOC is what we all do when we do our work. This is simply a place to hang our hats when we do that work."

In its preamble, the merged resolution notes that "our real strength lies in the grass roots." Early debate within the national board on the issue of subsidizing local chapters is pledged. The resolution encourages explicitly socialist critiques to be issued publicly by DSOC and through internal education, including the circulation of a regular discussion bulletin of socialist ideas.

The document also authorizes the hiring of full-time national staff to coordinate DSOC's youth section organizing and directs the board to create a Feminist Commission—on the model of the Hispanic Commission—at its next meeting.

Finally, in a dialectical show of the resolution's extended reach, delegates approved sections committing DSOC to continue its coalition work within the Democratic Party while also appointing a committee to explore merger with NAM, whose national political secretary Richard Healey attended the convention as a special guest. Alex Spinrad (Washington, D.C.) criticized the prospect of a NAM merger, saying, "It's no secret that NAM considers itself to our left both in style and rhetoric," but the delegates voted 91 to 10 to support steps towards possible merger.

Throughout the convention, many other notes were struck—sadness, eloquence and practicality.

Sadness, with the fond farewells extended to DSOC staffers Jack Clark and Marjorie Phyfe. Clark was appointed acting national director by a post-convention meeting of the new national board, but—with Phyfe—will leave the staff shortly. Both will serve on the new board's executive committee.

Eloquence, with a major convention address by Rubén Berrios Martínez, President of the Puerto Rican Independence Party, who declared that "Puerto Rico is the acid test in America for anti-imperialism."
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Practicality, when the political action director of the IAM, William Holayter, told delegates that the Machinists hoped to establish a national model on Long Island for joint discussions between unionists and DSOC activists. "I want to be part of setting up a coalition between the Machinists' Union and our friends in the socialist movement. I want to put it together with you. The mechanics of it are simple. Give me a call. My number is 202-857-5295."

All these notes—and many others, too—were sounded again by Houston lawyer and activist Ben Levy, chair of the local DSOC chapter of about 45 members. "This convention has been exhilarating for us all. It relieves our sense of isolation. It will help us grow. It establishes us as a serious movement."

Ben Levy wasn't kidding. Already in the works in the wake of the convention is a possible regional DSOC meeting in Austin, Texas in April and talk of a regional newsletter.

From "organizing committee to more nearly a movement," to paraphrase Deborah Meier. After Houston, it seems even more possible.

David Hoffman is a member of the Washington, D.C. local and is a legislative staff member in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Independence Leader Issues Call for Unity

By Ricardo Otheguy

"a patria grande de la humanidad" was the phrase used by Rubén Berrios to describe the goals of world democratic socialism during a rousing address to DSOC convention attendees and local activists in the Church of the Guadalupe in Houston. The president of the Partido Independentista Puertoriqueño (PIP) keynoted the Sunday night Rally of Latin Unity organized by the Houston and Austin DSOC locals and the Hispanic Commission of DSOC.

Others speakers from Chicano, Cuban, black and Puerto Rican communities stressed the need for organized labor to concern itself with Hispanics and emphasized the need for unity. Sharing the podium with Berrios were: UAW organizer Pancho Medrano; Juan M. Rodríguez, president of the National Union of Cuban Americans; Joe Marks, chair of the Houston UAW; and Frank Lugoviña of New York City.

Colonial Mentality a Danger

Berrios' enthusiastically received speech drew a parallel between the status of Puerto Rico as a United States colony dominated by multinational corporations and the internal colonial domination of working people and minorities in the U.S. by those same companies. Just as he urges Puerto Ricans to build national pride to counteract their colonial mentality, he counseled democratic socialists to shake off feelings of powerlessness and marginality in order to accomplish the task of bringing socialism and democracy to the United States. It is, he said, a task as central to the survival of Latin America and the world as it is to the future of North America.

Berrios headed the PIP delegation to the Fourth National DSOC Convention. Once again expressing its solidarity with the struggle for Puerto Rican independence and the PIP, DSOC passed a resolution calling for the unconditional release—on humanitarian grounds—of the four Puerto Rican nationalists imprisoned in the U.S. for more than 25 years.

The rally, where a blend of mariachi music, speakers and guests from the surrounding neighborhood illustrated the theme of unity, ended with Berrios' call for support for nationalist movements. Although nationalism may be suspect in other countries or circumstances, he said, in Puerto Rico and in other emerging nations, it is a force for progressivism and a step towards world unity—"la patria grande de la humanidad."

Ricardo Otheguy is a member of the Hispanic Commission of DSOC. For more information about the Commission, write to: Michael Germain Rivas, Chair, Hispanic Commission, P.O. Box 1803, Decatur, Ga. 30031.
"No Fat" Budget Challenges Activists

By Cushing N. Dolbeare

The federal budget, for 1980 or any other year, is an economic document shaped by political forces. President Carter's 1980 proposals are a declaration of support for a private sector economy and a government that tries, but not too hard, to blunt the impact of this economy on those who are excluded from an adequate share of its fruits.

The President himself described the budget as "lean and austere," incorporating a policy of restraint intended to overcome accelerating inflation. Strenuous efforts were made to keep the deficit below $30 billion—a symbolic figure of political rather than economic significance. Perhaps as important as the 1980 figures are the President's renewed declarations of intent to reduce federal spending as a proportion of gross national product and, if possible, to find room for tax reductions in the future.

There are four major features of the budget. First, taxes are to be held level, with no substantial increases or decreases, except for the "real wage insurance" proposal, estimated to cost $2.5 billion. Second, the deficit shows as $29 billion, although few economists share the administration's optimistic economic forecast. The general consensus is that a downturn will result in a substantially increased deficit, both because of a shortfall in federal revenue and because of increases in federal spending, including possible economic stimulus measures. Third, there is a real increase in defense spending of $3.3 billion above the "current services" level ("current services" is the level of budget authority or outlays required to maintain the same program level without policy changes). Fourth, there is a real cut in domestic spending of $6 billion in budget authority and $13 billion in outlays, after adjusting for inflation. Within the nondefense sector, some efforts are made to preserve at present levels, or even expand, a number of programs which the administration feels are effectively helping disadvantaged people.

The budget proposes $531.6 billion in outlays and receipts of $502.6 billion. Total budget authority, including commitments to spend in future years, is $615.5 billion. The table shows the major differences between the administration proposals and "current services."

Because the current service levels, except for defense, are not adjusted for inflation, the actual changes are somewhat different. The $8 billion which the Office of Management and Budget estimates as the impact of allowing for inflation in current services levels is distributed proportionately over the nondefense sector.

Housing, primarily housing for lower income families, accounts for more than one-third of the total cut in budget authority.

No picture of the budget is complete without looking at the tax expenditure side. Tax expenditures are the cost to federal government of the tax preferences, deductions, and credits in the Internal Revenue Code. Tax expenditures in 1978 totaled $133.9 billion. They are...
estimated at $149.9 billion for 1979 and $165.5 billion for 1980. Thus, the increase between 1979 and 1980 is $15.6 billion, or 10.4 percent, far greater than the increase in any other component of the budget.

Before examining the political implications of the budget, I quote directly the major points of an analysis prepared by Americans for Democratic Action:

The deficit is rooted more in economic slowdown than in a large growth in federal outlays. Each 1 percent increase in employment adds approximately $20 billion to the federal coffers. Federal costs are cut by about $5 billion (i.e., through reductions in unemployment benefits, medicaid, food stamps and other expenditures related to unemployment). In addition, federal revenues rise approximately $15 billion, leading to a net gain of about $20 billion. Using this measure, a $30 billion deficit would be eliminated by reducing unemployment by 1 1/2 percent (from 6 percent to 4 1/2 percent).

With sizable underutilization of human and physical resources (6 percent unemployment and approximately 15 percent of plant capacity), there is substantial room for expansion of demand without threatening sharp price inflation.

Maintaining current services levels of federal outlays has minimal impact on inflation. Were outlays in fiscal 1980 at current services levels, the inflationary effect would be a mere 3/10 of 1 percent.

Federal spending when viewed in perspective has little effect on inflation. In a $2.5 trillion economy, withholding $10-14 billion from the economy through reduced federal spending has an insignificant impact on prices.

There is little historical evidence that a federal budget deficit or surplus has any effect on price stability. In both 1950 and 1951 prices rose rapidly (5.8 percent and 5.9 percent respectively) despite a small deficit in 1950 ($5.1 billion) and a surplus in 1951 ($6.1 billion).

The size of the federal budget vis-a-vis GNP has little effect on prices. The fiscal 1980 estimated federal share of GNP is 21.7 percent and prices are expected to rise, by the administration’s own conservative estimate, 6.3 percent. In contrast, in 1962 federal expenditures were 19.5 percent of the GNP while prices rose 1.2 percent; in 1959, with the federal share 19.5 percent, prices rose 1.5 percent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function or program</th>
<th>1980 Current Service</th>
<th>1980 Request</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian education</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact aid</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>-302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for the handicapped</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>+35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational, vocation, and adult</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child development</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>+64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>5,549</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>-349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and general education aids</td>
<td>1,436</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and employment</td>
<td>11,998</td>
<td>10,623</td>
<td>-1,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary employment assistance</td>
<td>2,990</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>-800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and training assistance</td>
<td>7,508</td>
<td>6,964</td>
<td>-544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other labor services</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social services</td>
<td>5,004</td>
<td>5,414</td>
<td>+410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to states (Title XX)</td>
<td>2,676</td>
<td>3,066</td>
<td>+390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for disabled, elderly, others</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>+18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service programs</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic volunteer programs</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>+49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care services</td>
<td>58,522</td>
<td>57,627</td>
<td>-895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>53,276</td>
<td>52,660</td>
<td>-616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>36,410</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>-599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>12,922</td>
<td>12,696</td>
<td>-226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public assistance, other income supps</td>
<td>3,944</td>
<td>4,153</td>
<td>+209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other health services</td>
<td>3,404</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td>+36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health research</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>-298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care education and training</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer and occupational health and safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME SECURITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General retirement and disability insurance</td>
<td>222,187</td>
<td>214,460</td>
<td>-7,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social security (OASDI)</td>
<td>123,690</td>
<td>121,816</td>
<td>-1,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal employee retirement, disability</td>
<td>117,688</td>
<td>115,754</td>
<td>-1,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment compensation</td>
<td>23,406</td>
<td>23,024</td>
<td>-382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public assistance, other income supps</td>
<td>19,794</td>
<td>19,594</td>
<td>-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppemental security income</td>
<td>6,024</td>
<td>6,096</td>
<td>+72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>5,917</td>
<td>5,894</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFDC and other</td>
<td>7,199</td>
<td>6,868</td>
<td>-331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food stamps</td>
<td>1,573</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School lunch and other nutrition</td>
<td>4,744</td>
<td>4,680</td>
<td>-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing assistance</td>
<td>32,325</td>
<td>27,445</td>
<td>-4,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee assistance</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real wage assistance (proposed)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>+200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VETERANS BENEFITS AND SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income security</td>
<td>21,361</td>
<td>21,024</td>
<td>-337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, training, rehabilitation</td>
<td>11,951</td>
<td>12,251</td>
<td>+300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital and medical care</td>
<td>2,317</td>
<td>2,278</td>
<td>-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal law enforcement activities</td>
<td>4,356</td>
<td>4,304</td>
<td>-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal litigation and judicial activities</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>2,087</td>
<td>-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal correctional activities</td>
<td>1,199</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>+147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal justice assistance</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL GOVERNMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>4,423</td>
<td>4,528</td>
<td>+105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Gets Most Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom has pointed out that the proportions frequently cited, showing a major increase in the proportion of the budget going for "human resources" as compared to military, is misleading. A substantial portion of these human resources funds consists of social security and other retirement trust funds. If trust funds are subtracted from total funds, current military authority accounts for 31.5 percent of the budget, and human resources drops to 32.1 percent. However, if one adds past military-related expenses, including veterans' pensions and two-thirds of the interest on the national debt, 46 percent of every tax dollar goes to the military, while only 28 goes to human resources.

Conservative as the budget document is, reactions to it indicate that Carter may still be slightly to the left of the prevailing conventional wisdom about the mood of the American people. A number of coalitions have been formed or are forming to fight against the cuts in specific social programs and against increases in the military budget. However, these discussions are at the margin. In part because the Congressional budget process has made prisoners of us all, there is little serious discussion of the budget levels that would be needed if we were to fulfill our historic commitments to ending poverty, hunger, unemployment, inadequate health care, and bad housing. Political discussion, by and large, does not mention these objectives. Instead, discussion has been focused by the budget on changes—for better or for worse—that are of relatively little significance compared to what would be needed if we took our national goals seriously.

Pennies for Programs

For example, the budget calls for a substantial drop in the number of lower income housing units assisted by the Department of Housing and Urban Development—from 400,000 requested in 1979 to 300,000 for 1980. Predictably, proponents of more adequate housing programs are outraged (myself among them), and are now pressing for restora-
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tion of the 400,000-unit level. (It is worth noting that this level was established after the ending of the housing moratorium, by a Republican administration, which came far closer to achieving it than the Democrats have.) But the argument over whether we should be assisting 300,000 units or 400,000 units for lower income people misses two basic points: first, that the number of low income people in need of housing assistance can be conservatively estimated as at least 5 million households; and second, that the housing programs on which we rely are not particularly well targeted to meeting lower income housing needs.

Similarly, public service employment programs have been cut drastically. The administration argues that the cuts have come in areas where the need for public service employment is questionable, because those employed should be able to obtain jobs in the private sector. Ignored completely is the question of how many jobs should be provided, and by what means, in order to reduce unemployment to the 4 percent level envisaged by the Humphrey-Hawkins Act. Let purists be tempted to point out that Humphrey-Hawkins calls for achieving this objective in 1983, I note that the original objective, with a much shorter time frame, was 3 percent.

Need for Public Sector Jobs

We should not, in my view, be arguing over whether to provide the same level of jobs as last year—perhaps adjusted for the increase in unemployment—but over how to provide all of the jobs which will be necessary to reduce unemployment in every major sector to acceptable levels. In December 1978, the unemployment rate for white men over 21 was 3.5 percent. Total unemployment was at a rate of 5.9 percent, or six million jobless people. Provision of an additional 2.5 million jobs would reduce the overall unemployment rate to 3.5 percent—surely not an impossible feat, given the unmet needs of our economy in the public sector.

It is clear, however, that a Keynesian approach, even if the economy could be stimulated without causing further inflation, is inadequate to the task at hand. Youth unemployment, for example, stood at 16.5 percent, with 1.6 million young people seeking work. Half of the additional jobs needed to reduce unemployment to 3.5 percent should go to youth, if youth unemployment is to be reduced to 3.5 percent. Yet the 1978 budget proposes to curb the increase in youth employment programs, leveling them off at the 1978 figure. Almost three-quarters of the 1.2 million jobs required for adults, to bring unemployment down to 3.5 percent, should be provided for women. Clearly, relying on the private sector to provide jobs for youth and women in the numbers needed is fatuous. Jobs for young people and jobs for women will not be supplied by stimulating the economy. They can be provided only by conscious intervention of the public sector.

Politically, the budget is a reflection of a "Proposition 13" mentality. It assumes that there is no support for expanded "public programs" and that people are rebelling against expanded efforts to meet human needs. There is a protest, to be sure. But this protest is fueled by misperceptions of human needs and public programs. Human needs are underestimated, remaining largely hidden from the sight of most Americans. Public programs provide too many examples of waste and inefficiency for people not to conclude that they are generally badly handled.

Our agenda for dealing with the budget should be a positive and aggressive one. We should join, to be sure, in the efforts to improve it at the margin. More important, however, we should take the offensive. I propose that we set ourselves the objective of raising federal expenditures by 1 percent of the GNP each year until our basic human needs are met.

Close Tax Loopholes

Moreover, I propose that these increases be financed from tax revenues, rather than by increasing the deficit. Part of this could be done by closing the more egregious loopholes and part by increasing tax rates, particularly corporate tax rates. In 1980, corporate income taxes are anticipated to be 14 percent of federal receipts. There has been a steady decline since the middle 1950s. In 1970, they were 17 percent of all receipts; in 1965, 22 percent; in 1960, 25 percent; and in the Eisenhower year of 1955, 27 percent. In 1955, corporate profits taxes amounted to 4.5 percent of the gross national product. In 1980, they are anticipated to be 2.8 percent of the gross national product. We could increase the budget by $44 billion if we reverted to the 1955 level.

Finally, we need to recognize and confront head-on the need to readjust our standards of private economic consumption. It is a moral and economic outrage that a nation with 6 percent of the world's population consumes something like 40 percent of its nonrenewable resources. Simply addressing the inequities in our own society, without considering the gross inequities between nations, is a politically, economically and morally untenable position. Financing increased social expenditures by increasing the deficit begs the more basic question of how we begin to limit private consumption and move toward a more equitable distribution of income and wealth. Fundamentally, we need to engage the issues raised by the budget at this level.

DSOC member Cushing N. Dolbeare is a consultant in housing policy and programs and, among other activities, chairs the national executive committee of the Americans for Democratic Action.
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Fighting Spirit Prevails Amid South Bronx Despair

By Maxine Phillips

It’s been called a wasteland, an armed camp. Newspaper headlines scream of brutal murders committed for 25 cents, of packs of wild dogs and abandoned youngsters terrorizing the streets.

"The South Bronx has nowhere to go but up," says DSOC member and Bronx activist Frank Lugoviña. "The people here are sick of being used and ignored. We’re on our way to finding some solutions."

Lugoviña and the people he works with—in the Democratic Party, in housing rehabilitation projects, in the arts, in job training—intend to be part of those solutions.

The South Bronx, a symbol of urban decay, received widespread publicity when President Carter toured it in October of 1977. He promised aid, which has been slow in coming.

"The Bronx is a classic example of how inner city neighborhoods collapse," says city planner Paul DuBrul, co-author of The Abuse of Power: The Permanent Government and the Fall of New York, and a DSOC member.

DuBrul traces the decline of what was once a thriving, working-class Jewish neighborhood to deliberate political and economic policies.

He notes that in the ’50s New York City began to channel large numbers of Hispanics displaced by urban renewal into the South Bronx. It did not increase any of the public services necessary to sustain this new population, such as housing, health care and education.

At the same time that this population shift was taking place, industries in the area were leaving to look for low-wage labor in the South or in other countries such as Taiwan or Korea.

As services deteriorated and unemployment grew, the banks decided to write off the area. Landlords could not get mortgages or resell their property.

Many finally took to hiring arsonists to burn their buildings so that they could collect the insurance money.

Although hopes were raised by some of the poverty programs of the ’60s, they never attacked the problems of attracting new industry or changing investment policies. In fact, misuse of poverty money often kept even minimal programs from helping the people for whom they were supposedly designed.

No-Growth Policies for Area

"It doesn’t have to be this way. We have great potential as an industrial community," says Lugoviña.

Indeed, the Bronx, with more railyards than Chicago, located close to two major airports, surrounded by highways and waterways, with large amounts of land available for industrial use, would seem to have a lot going for it.

But, DuBrul points out, neither national nor local policies have encouraged growth. He cites one example, "The Port Authority has been mandated for decades to build a rail freight tunnel under the Hudson. It hasn’t done it. As a result, freight cars either have to go all the way north to Albany and then cross the river and come back to the city, or they are unloaded in New Jersey and trucked into the city. This adds $200 million a year to the cost of doing business in New York. Until the city is linked into the national rail system, we can’t attract much new industry."

The combination of lack of services, massive shifts of population, runaway plants and disinvestment by banks has made much of the Bronx a horror story of urban life.

Its infant mortality rate of 19.3 per 1,000 live births in 1977 was higher than New York City’s overall rate of 17.8 or the national average of 14.2. Welfare recipients make up a quarter to a third of the population in half the community districts.

Are the problems insurmountable? Lugoviña refuses to believe they are. His outlook is summed up by an example he gives.

"When I first came here from Puerto Rico 31 years ago, one of my most vivid impressions was of being surrounded by tall buildings. You couldn’t see beyond them. It was so limiting. Later, I thought of how that can affect our thinking about problems.

"I wanted to make a better life and do something to help the community," he recalls. "So I majored in business in college because that seemed like the thing for a poor kid from the Bronx to do."

Linking the skills of the business world to a talent for bringing people together has led him into many activities.

One of his earliest efforts was forming the Young Puerto Rican Confrontation Committee, which helped young people learn confrontation politics to deal with local issues. Stints with a bank,
the poverty program and manpower programs led him to form the Association of Community Trainers, now Mobicentrics, which organizes and trains community people. With his associates, Sal Ferraioli and Teresa Rivera, Lugoviiia has branched into several areas crucial to the South Bronx.

The company puts together housing development packages for new construction and rehabilitation under the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. He describes the company's approach.

"We look for community sponsors such as the local planning board or a church organization. They become involved in the process and set up an application and interviewing process for tenants and help develop tenant managers."

Although this legislation encourages developers to take risks in the private market to expand housing stock, he questions whether the programs that make direct federal loans and rent subsidies would not be less inflationary. Such programs, however, would require more federal funding.

He praises the efforts of the many community groups that have started working on "sweat equity" projects in abandoned buildings. Local people do most of the work to rehabilitate housing that they can live in.

Recent changes in legislation now allow the city to take over a building one year after a landlord has defaulted on taxes. Under the old law, the waiting period was three years and buildings were usually beyond repair by the time the city claimed them. The city is now the major landlord in the South Bronx.

DuBrul, who worked for seven years as special assistant to the Bronx Borough President, finds this one of the few bright spots in an otherwise grim picture. "This could be a positive beginning if the city is willing to work with people in upgrading and maintaining buildings," he notes.

In an office building near the Mobicentrics headquarters, a group of young men and one woman listen intently as an electrician draws a diagram on the blackboard. Pictures on the bulletin board show students putting theory into practice as they work in an abandoned building. They are part of a program to train building superintendents.

Down the block, other classes work in simulated banks and offices to learn skills that lead to jobs as bank tellers, secretaries and office workers. In the last five years Mobicentrics has trained more than 1,600 people in this CETA-funded program (Community Employment and Training Act) and has had a placement rate of about 70 percent.

Jobs and housing are vital, but neither can exist without national and local policies that encourage them.

**Need to Consolidate Power**

The power to change that situation must come from a united political effort. Although one congressman, two state senators and several state assembly members are Hispanic, minorities have not built up political muscle. With 54 percent of the population, blacks and Hispanics account for 23 percent of the primary vote. In this Democratic county, that is the only election that matters.

"We've spent too much energy fighting each other," says Lugoviiia. "As long as we continue doing that, we can't mobilize the energy we need."

DuBrul echoes that dilemma, which he sees as a citywide problem. "It's shameful that a county with such a sizable minority population couldn't get a minority borough president appointed by the City Council earlier this year," he says.

Like many observers, he blames the Democratic machine's stranglehold for much of the county's inability to make progress.

"But even if everyone got their act together, who would they link up with in the city?" he asks. "The reform movement is not a major force in city politics."

"We've spent too much energy fighting each other."

"Even though the situation is almost hopeless without changes in federal and city policies, there are still pockets of resistance. You really have to admire those who have stayed to fight."

Lugoviiia believes that the fighting spirit is on the upswing.

Part of what Lugoviiia considers the most important part of his work is putting people in touch with each other to make changes and opening doors for young people.

A recent example includes a meeting he helped arrange between the head of a tenants organization and the chairman of her local planning board, whom she didn't know.

This type of "networking" needs to go on at a national level, too, and there Lugoviiia has found DSOC helpful.

"I could never have been elected to the Committee on Cities at the Democratic Mid-term Conference in Memphis without help from Jose LaLuz of Connecticut, whom I met through the Hispanic Commission, and others."

Lugoviiia joined DSOC after being invited to attend the youth conference two years ago. Last year he brought several South Bronx young people to the West Virginia conference.

"We need to expose young people to a different point of view, to let them see other ways of dealing with problems."

**Hopeful Signs Emerging**

The Bronx has been, until now, a glaring example of the decay affecting so many American cities. In the midst of a bleak situation, Lugoviiia sees three positive forces.

"First, we are developing new leadership. The planning boards, the people involved in urban frontier (farming), sweat equity and other community development projects offer a pool of potential leaders committed to life here."

The churches, particularly Catholic churches, are playing an increasingly active role in housing and health.

"Third, there is a growing sense that the time has come for us to iron out our political differences, to end the turf fights between blacks and Puerto Ricans and get on with the business of building a healthy community."

"If we succeed, we can be a model for other cities. We can't afford to fail."

Maxine Phillips is the managing editor of Democratic Left.
Health Care Legislation Prospects Seem Gloomy

By Tim Smart

With the challenge of 1980 looming closer than the memory of 1976, Jimmy Carter appears likely to end his first term without any hope of passing a comprehensive national health insurance plan.

If that happens, and most observers expect nothing more, the American people can expect continued high costs for medical services, costs that are now running close to $200 billion a year.

There is a sense around the country that the time has come and gone for national health insurance, the last unfinished piece of social legislation inherited from the New Deal.

Fragmented political alliances, lack of presidential leadership and the power of the medical lobby have all combined to leave America the only industrialized democracy without a national health insurance program.

The most vocal proponent of national health insurance is Senator Edward Kennedy. From his protected pulpit in the United States Senate, Kennedy waxes eloquent about the need for comprehensive health care for all Americans.

"If national health insurance is good enough for the wealthy and good enough for Congress, then it is good enough for every American citizen in every city, town and village and on every farm throughout this land," Kennedy told an audience at the Democratic Mid-term Conference in Memphis.

The call to arms in Memphis signalled the beginning of a split between Kennedy and Carter on the issue of national health insurance. Carter's professed desire to "trigger" legislation to the state of the economy leaves Kennedy angered. Carter would have the plan introduced through a variety of bills submitted when the economy permits. Kennedy reasons that one bill will face enough trouble in Congress.

Since last year's split, both Carter and Kennedy have announced plans for proposals to be introduced sometime this spring. However, Kennedy is wise at the game of compromise and he has now moved closer to the Carter position on national health than he publicly admits.

Major Role for Private Industry

Last July, in a directive to HEW Secretary Joe Califano, Carter called for a phased-in plan, one that would allow for "a significant role for the private insurance industry, with appropriate government regulation."

That 'significant role' and the idea of tying introduction of legislation to the state of the nation's economy angered Kennedy and his labor alliance, gathered under the umbrella Committee for National Health Insurance (CNHI).

Working closely with CNHI Executive Director Max Fine, Kennedy outlined the broad guidelines of his new plan. Surprisingly, the latest CNHI-Kennedy plan calls for "a significant role for a publicly regulated private insurance system."

In this central way, the plan differs from the earlier Kennedy-Corman Health Security Act. Along the way, James Corman, a Democratic representative from California, split with Kennedy, charging the Massachusetts senator with selling out to the insurance companies. The Kennedy people are now shopping for a House sponsor for their bill, to be known as "Health Care For All Americans."

Possible sponsors in the House include two newly-elected subcommittee chairs whose subcommittees will have a major say in the passage of health legislation: Charles Rangel of New York and Henry Waxman of California. Although liberals were pleased when Waxman won a hard fight to gain the chair of the Commerce Subcommittee on Health and Environment, they were piqued when he told The Washington Post he did not think national health insurance would pass in this Congress.

Corman, who re-introduced the Health Security Act in January, has lost the organized labor backing viewed as essential to passage of any national health insurance bill. In a stinging letter to CNHI...
The time has come and gone for national health insurance, the last unfinished piece of social legislation inherited from the New Deal.

"Private insurance, a major contributor to our nation's health care problems, cannot now be employed as part of the solution, even with the imposition of Federal regulation," Corman wrote in the letter to CNHI members.

One representative whose plan has no room at all for the private sector is DSOO member Ron Dellums of California. Dellums has called for a complete federalized national health service plan to be financed by a combination of payroll and income taxes.

Dellums knows his plan, to be reintroduced this spring, will be submitted to the tortuous route of overlapping committee jurisdiction that many see as the largest obstacle to passage of any national health insurance plan. When his plan was introduced last April, it was referred to no less than eight committees in the House. Dellums is aware that his bill has no chance of being enacted into law.

"I introduced this bill, H.R. 11879, not because I think the country is prepared to enact it today or tomorrow or even next year. But because it opens up a critically important debate in this country," Dellums told his colleagues when he introduced the bill.

As Dellums can attest, the maze of committees through which any bill must pass offers little hope that a bill can even retain a vestige of its original shape. In the House, the two pivotal committees are the health subcommittees of the Commerce and Ways and Means committees. In the Senate, Kennedy is given an even chance of moving his bill through the Senate Human Resources Committee, where he chairs the Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research. But the bill will probably be killed in the Finance Committee, where Chair Russell Long is already hawking his own plan to cover catastrophic health expenses.

**Labor vs. Administration**

What Kennedy staffers and health insurance advocates feel would be essential to passage of a national health insurance plan is administration support and labor backing. Labor is ready, but the "new realities" guiding the White House leave little room for whatever small interest the Carter team had for national health insurance. Back in 1978, everything seemed possible between Carter, labor and Kennedy. Labor backed Carter in 1976, in part, because of his stand on national health insurance. Since then labor groups have discovered what other interest groups who backed Carter have found out—that for Carter, taking a stand often means nothing more than introducing legislation, making speeches and then forgetting the issue. After all, labor reasons, if the administration cannot even succeed in pushing a hospital cost containment plan through Congress, how can it expect to pass a national health insurance plan?

The Carter proposal is promised for this spring. But there have been promises before. Then when legislation appeared imminent, the administration hesitated.

With Kennedy and labor going it alone, the Carter team must now decide whether it is good politics to build a national health platform upon their "new foundation" in 1979.

Tim Smart, a journalist based in Florida, is currently working as a Congressional intern in Washington.

---

**European Poll: Left Could Win**

By Bogdan Denitch

The coming direct elections to the European Parliament, the political arm of the nine-member European Community (EC), may well produce a political earthquake. The London Economist, not known for its softness towards socialist and labor parties, has a startling piece of news in its January 27th issue on the prospects of the European Community and its parliament. A series of election polls taken throughout Europe this fall comes up with the following results: the socialists would have gotten 38.5 percent of the vote throughout the nine countries, which is nearly twice as much as the next largest group, the Christian Democrats, who would have gotten 22.1 percent. The remaining parties split the vote as follows: conservatives, 20 percent; liberals, 9.9 percent; communists, 7.5 percent; European progressive democrats (U.S.-style liberals), 3.6 percent; extreme left, 1.6 percent; regional and nationalist groups, 0.8 percent; and others, 5.9 percent. What this means is that the Left would have 47.6 percent of the votes, dwarfing the other parties and potential coalitions. The figures do not include Spain, Greece and Portugal, which, if they do join the Community, might well tilt the balance even further to the Left. They also, of course, do not include the non-EC countries of Sweden and Finland, where the Left has electoral hegemony.

There are other interesting features of the poll. The socialists are the most powerful force on the Left. Within a European context, the Eurocommunists' influence is reduced to that of being a potential ally of a European socialist plurality. They may provide the edge for a Left majority which could organize the European Parliament.

The second significant fact about the poll is that the socialists tend to do better

Continued on page 14
WHAT'S LEFT TO READ

By Ronald Radosh

Telos c/o Sociology Dept., Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. 63130. $3.50 per issue; $12.00 per year by subscription.

For many years, Telos has been an important, if sometimes abstruse, journal of radical thought. Its emphasis has been on critical theory (Adorno, Horkheimer), the renaissance of Western Marxism (Lukács, Korsch, Luxemburg), and the current neo-Marxism (Habermas, Offe, Castoriadis, etc.). With the Fall 1978 issue, no. 37, its editors have produced a number indispensable for those concerned with understanding the possibilities of a socialist revival.

Highlighting the issue is an English translation of Evelyn Tschirhart's essay "On Chinese Asexuality," which appeared originally in Les Temps Modernes. The piece ranks in reportage and insight with the best work of Simon Leys.

Tschirhart, formerly a French Maoist, was shocked into accepting reality by a recent trip of several months to China. The social manipulation of sex, she reports, was used by the Party during the epoch of the Gang of Four (and Mao makes Five) to exercise social control. "Another way of approaching sexuality in China," she comments, "is to pretend that what appears to us as repressive is not so for the Chinese, still underdeveloped and subsisting on a daily bowl of rice."

This is a rationale that hides the truth of the ugly reality: murder of homosexuals; five-year prison terms for women who engage in extra- and pre-marital affairs; ten-year sentences for men who seduce married women, etc. She cites many cases of forced separation of spouses and couples who have fallen in love before marriage, and of forced marriages and legal prohibition of divorce, as well as of tolerance of wife-beating if the husband in the case is a good and productive Party member.

Chinese policy, she writes, has but one purpose: "The Party, unifier of thought, wishes to expropriate the people's morality, sensibility, and values . . . in order to install the absolute authority of its Norm." The Women's Federation cannot represent the real needs of women. It is only "an instrument of the Party to control women." Its desire is to dissolve the family, which might function as an arena of resistance to the totalitarian state.

Telos no. 37 also contains a fascinating report on a recent Eurocommunism conference held in Rochester, New York, in which Maxy Beml writes that C.P. intellectual Jean Ellenstein, "refused to come to grips with the central question regarding the French Communist Party: how could a Party which is essentially authoritarian in structure be at the same time an emancipatory agent?" Italian socialist Massimo Salvadori, Beml notes, pointed to a major contradiction in the Eurocommunist position: they have adopted "typically social-democratic principles and means," yet seek to differentiate themselves by "preserving a Leninist legacy." Yet, Salvadori argued, Eurocommunists "have programmatically relinquished all the Leninist means" they used to invoke as necessary for the liquidation of capitalism. The stress on continuity with the Leninist tradition is dictated only by the need to legitimate their new line to a rank-and-file bred on Leninism.

Finally, author Pedro Cavalcanti offers an important discussion of the Socialist International's (SI) effort to break out of the First World ghetto. Cavalcanti sees prospects for socialist growth in Latin America, since "the absence of radical parties of the European variety will facilitate the recruiting of lay masses unimpeached by competition."

The Christian Democrats, he observes, are unlikely to succeed in Latin America, where they are even more conservative than progressive Catholics. Hence, he sees the SI operating in "a kind of 'virgin' continent in terms of the ideals it advocates." Separating the parties which belong to the SI "into social-democrats and democratic socialists," Cavalcanti argues that if the democratic socialists grow, "it will be an event of major proportions resulting in a change in the balance of forces in the continent."

Stressing that Western socialists have a heritage of paternalism and racism to overcome, he notes that the SI today is "a very flexible organization," with a conservative wing functioning as a surrogate for new Western capitalist interests. His conclusion is optimistic: "Democratic socialism seems to have a better chance than social-democracy in Latin America. But only future internal struggles within these parties will decide the issue."


This exciting, readable one-volume assessment of the Cold War years is an unashamed radical treatment of the collapse of the Cold War consensus. Provocative chapters have such titles as "The Rulers and the Ruled" and "The Poverty of Progress": American Society, 1960-1977.

Wittner's Cold War America is also the first mass market history text, geared for the college market, to conclude with a discussion of both Democratic Agenda and DSOC. Wittner, a professor of history at the State University of New York/Albany, writes about the challenge brought by DSOC activists "within the Democratic Party." He notes that "by 1976, DSOC had signed up more than 2,000 members," and he proceeds to sum up the program of Democracy '76. Emerging beyond the limited vision of the mass media, Wittner comments, are "harbingers of revolt," and a "demand to transcend the limits of Cold War conservatism." His main example is the 1977 convention of DSOC which, he notes, included the participation of "labor leaders and community activists." Quoting Michael Harrington's speech at that convention, he comments that "the gathering crisis of Cold War America had not gone unchallenged." His new book is itself proof of that contention.

Historian Ronald Radosh is a member of the DSOC Board.
EUROPEAN POLL, from p. 12

in the European elections than they do in the national elections, while the opposite is true for the communists. Thus, for example, in France, the socialist vote for the European Parliament is 39.7 percent against the 23 percent they got in the national elections, as part of a united Left, while the communists drop to almost half of the national vote, obtaining no more than 10.9 percent in the poll. In Italy, the PCI manages to hold 22 percent of the votes for the European Parliament, making it by far the largest of the European communist parties. The Italian socialists more than double their national vote with 23.8 percent in the European poll.

There are a number of ways that these figures could be read, but what I would choose to stress is the fact that the socialists are seen as the party of good Europeans. On a European level, the existence of a Socialist International is helpful in consolidating and increasing the socialist plurality. The European communist parties, on the other hand, while maintaining a hold on sections of the electorate, are very much more on their own. Eurocommunism, if it means anything, means that there is no international movement with a European platform, but rather a series of national communist parties.

These findings are important in a number of ways. They imply that a unified Europe and its institutions, far from acting as a barrier against the expansion of the Left on a European level, will be the arena to which the Left, a democratic socialist Left, can post its claims as the natural governing party of an advanced industrial Europe. It means, too, that the U.S. government will have to do some drastic re-thinking about the political nature of its European and NATO partners. It will, at the very least, put into question the comfortable assumption that the Europe Washington has to deal with is a Europe of the center and right parties.

Finally, it places the debate about Eurocommunism and its relationship to Europe and the problem of Europeans' defense and security in a more realistic context. These parties have been rewarded and/or punished by the voters in good part in proportion to their commitment to a unified Europe. The French communists, with their neo-Gaullism, thus suffer a political defeat while the PCI remains a major party of the Italian working class.

The prospect of a unified Europe becoming a socialist Europe, thus posing an independent alternative to the two colossi, looks rosier than it has since the Second World War.

"The prospect of a unified Europe being a socialist Europe, thus posing an independent alternative to the two colossi, looks rosier than it has since the Second World War."
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CAPITAL QUOTES

"In fact, a recession often performs an unavoidable function by forcing business managers to improve efficiency, by enabling interest rates to come down, and by wringing some of the inflation out of the economic system. Recessions are passing developments in the life of a nation, and a government that becomes obsessed with such phenomena cannot develop the sustained policies that are needed to assure a better economic future for its people."


We've got a new look and a new title, as well as new features and articles. Now we're counting on you, our readers, to help us make sure that Democratic Left is read by everyone who is anyone on the democratic left. Democratic Left is published ten times a year by the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee. It is available by subscription or by membership in the DSOC. If you liked what you read, don't miss our next issue.
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SOCIAL DEMOCRACY:
A Bibliography

Fist and Rose Publishers, who puts out The New International Review, has just published a 16-page bibliography of social democratic books, pamphlets and articles that covers topics from political economy to the question of women and the family.

Copies can be ordered in bulk at 50 cents for three or more, or $1 per copy. Order from: The New International Review, P.O. Box 156, Jackson Heights, N.Y. 11372.
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TALE OF TWO BOYCOTTS—In January the AFL-CIO turned around on two boycotts. In the first case, George Meany gave a big boost to the women’s movement and the effort to pass the ERA; in the second, he let down the hopes of the Chilean democratic movement. On January 7, Meany announced that the 1979 AFL-CIO convention, which had been planned for Miami, was being moved to Washington. He acted at the request of Joyce Miller, a vice president of the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers and president of the Coalition of Labor Union Women (CLUW). In a December 27 letter, Miller, a DSOC member, thanked Meany for the support the federation has extended to the women’s movement and to CLUW and asked that he take the next step of backing the ERA supporters’ boycott of non-ratified states, including Florida. Meany’s agreement signified new importance within organized labor for Miller and for CLUW. The second case has a less happy end. The AFL-CIO, along with other Western Hemisphere union federations, had agreed to participate in a boycott of all cargoes to and from Chile. The unions were protesting the repressive labor policies of the Pinochet regime. Supporters of the Chilean democratic movement welcomed the proposed boycott because it would frustrate the Chilean government’s plans to improve its balance of payments internationally by exporting badly needed domestically produced foods. After a mid-January meeting with J. Peter Grace, a major investor in Latin America, and chairman of the board of the controversial American Institute for Free Labor Development, Meany postponed the boycott plans.

THE STEELWORKERS’ STRIKE at Newport News, Va. could turn American politics around. Like last year’s coal strike, it pits a key industrial union with a militant rank-and-file against a wealthy and powerful corporation, in this case Houston-based multinational Tenneco. Also as with last year’s miner’s strike, this dramatic confrontation contains the possibility of federal intervention. But the real drama of this strike rests with its location. This is the largest industrial dispute in the South in decades. A USW win in this uphill battle will provide a great boost to the UAW, the Clothing and Textile Workers, the Furniture Workers and other unions trying to organize the South.

REALIGNMENT POLITICS. Is organization of state legislatures along ideological rather than party lines a new trend? Early this year, in the New Hampshire State Senate, where Democrats held a one-vote majority, four conservative Democrats from the Manchester area joined with eight conservative Republicans to defeat eight Democrats and three Republicans and elect Republican conservative Bob Monier as Senate President. Monier was quoted by Kevin Phillips as saying, “This was an election of philosophies. We no longer have a minority party and a majority party. We have a majority coalition and a minority coalition.” Six weeks later, 11 conservative Democrats in the New Mexico House joined with 26 Republicans to replace the incumbent liberal Democratic Speaker of the House, Walter Martinez, with conservative Democrat C. Gene Samberson. Immediately after the election Samberson appointed conservatives as heads of all the major House committees. The new coalition is expected to redraw the legislative lines to favor conservatives, and to pass a right-to-work law in the state.

The particular significance these changes have is the erosion of the only functions left to political parties: their organizational and electoral roles. If such political elites as state legislators are now willing to organize on other than party lines, the party system is in deep trouble. For the Left, the immediate news is bad: as usual, the Right seems to be carrying the ball. Longer-run, it might not be so bad. In New Mexico, the Democratic majority voted to expel the conservative minority from the legislative caucus. Any chance for a decent liberal party depends on getting rid of some of the “Democrats” we now have.