OUT OF THE FRYING PAN, INTO THE FIRE
A POLITICAL ANALYSIS OF GEORGE WALLACE

The American political scene is in the midst of great upheaval and conflict. Many Americans have lost faith in the traditional two-party system. Some have given up on electoral politics altogether, but many of these dissatisfied citizens would support George Wallace as a third party presidential candidate.

In a three-way race for president, Harris survey of May 12, 1975 gave 23% of the vote to a Reagan-Wallace ticket, against Ford-Rockefeller and Kennedy-Connally tickets. In Harris' own words, such a three-way race could reverse modern political trends and leave the political party system in a shaky position. The survey goes on to point out that a "Reagan-Wallace ticket draws as much from Senator Kennedy's potential votes as it does from those of President Ford."

George Wallace has been growing in the cracks of national electoral politics for more than a decade. He has already run in the Democratic presidential primary races of 1964, 1968 and 1972. In 1968 he ran for president as the American Independent Party candidate, getting nine million votes and winning five southern states. Had the '72 Wallace campaign not been cut short by an assassination attempt, it would probably have had even greater impact than the '68 campaign.

What is the basis for Wallace's growing popularity? What are his economic and political programs? How would they affect the country and the world? To answer these questions, we must first look at the general state of the nation.

The United States is in the beginning stages of an economic crisis which shows every sign of getting worse. Rents and prices are still on the rise after skyrocketing for several years. In recent months, coupled with only a slowdown of inflation, has come skyrocketing unemployment, now over 9% nationally according to official figures (which exclude many who are jobless).

WALLACE'S POPULAR APPEAL

The American Dream of continually increasing prosperity is now failing to materialize for the small businessmen and the many white working people who believed in it. More and more, "just breaking even" becomes an impossible goal.

And with the declining economy has come a deterioration of public schools, declining public services and a growing crime rate (especially theft and theft-related crimes).

"We have worked hard all our lives," many people are saying, "but now we are losing everything we worked for. Why? Who is to blame? "People on one end are looking after people on the other end are looking after, but those in the middle are looking after everybody," Wallace answers. He speaks of "the great mass of middle-class America" that is being robbed by the very poor and the very rich. And he por- cont. p. 3
trays himself as the representative of this middle class—the average citizen, the farmer, the working man, the little businessman in his battle against ivory towers pointed heads, Federal bureaucrats, loafers and welfare cheats.

**Is Wallace Against Big Business?**

The Republican party has, since the Great Depression been considered a pro big-business party. In the past years, the Democrats have shown themselves to be hardly better than the Republicans. A major part of Wallace's appeal is his anti-big-business image. Is there any reason to believe that Wallace, whose campaign received $250,000 from the late billionaire, H. L. Hunt, is really opposed to big business? In fact, there is every reason to believe the opposite. In an April 29, 1972 interview with Business Week magazine, Wallace laid out his economic program in some detail.

Wallace says he is opposed to the growing Federal bureaucracy, yet he is opposed to any cuts in defense spending. The Department of Defense consumes over 60% of the Federal budget and in far and away the largest Federal bureau.

Wallace says he is for tax reform, yet he opposes a capital gains tax (a tax on profits).

Wallace says that perhaps the 23% oil depletion allowance should be lowered a little, at a time when many politicians are calling for it to be abolished.

Wallace says he is against foreign aid, supposedly to keep money in the country. Yet he favors more foreign investment. Only the tiniest part of money leaving the country is foreign aid. Mostly it is foreign investment and military spending.

Wallace says he supports Federal works programs to ease unemployment yet he is quick to stress that "the private sector can make better use of money and create more jobs with it than the government can." In other words, it is better to subsidize big business than to create Federal job programs.

Wallace says he is opposed to special tax breaks for the rich, yet he wants to keep the tax-free exemption for state and municipal bonds. These bonds are issued in very large denominations, and are held mostly by large banks, brokerage houses, and wealthy private investors. Interest on and repayment of these come off the top of tax revenues, making these bonds virtually risk-free as well as tax free.

Furthermore, Wallace says he is opposed to deficit spending, yet he supports the issuance of state and municipal bonds to raise public funds. But a bond is nothing but an IOU from the government. Issuing bonds is precisely the way a government borrows money and goes into debt.

In short, Wallace says he is for the average citizen and against the "establishment," but his own positions show him to be big business as Nixon, Ford, Humphrey or Jackson—only a bigger liar.

What about the other side of Wallace's program—opposition to the welfare cafes and loafers. If Wallace lies about being against big business, he not only is telling the truth about his opposition to the poor, but understating his position.

---

**There is a set of ideas current among many white working and middle class people that, taken as a whole, blame black people for the current breakdown in American society. This trend of thought depicts black people as lazy and immoral, as people who have rather a dozen kids and live off welfare than work for an honest living. It pictures blacks as the chief perpetrators of violent crime, the carriers of drug addiction and the main cause of decaying schools and neighborhoods.**

Wallace's answer assumes that many of the black youth do not want to work. While not so straightforward, it is clearly based on the view of society outlined above.

"So what is wrong with this outlook?" some may ask. "Who yet. But consider the following exchange between N.Y. Times columnist James Reston and Wallace.

**Let me ask you this:**

The President has said that we have abnormally high unemployment for at least three years in this country. Now, that carries us through the Bicentennial; it carries us through the election. At the same time, the Bureau of Labor Statistics put out the statistics that today 41.1 per cent of teenage blacks in this country are out of work. Now, I don't know about you—that's a scary statistic to me, and I guess my question is whether you think we can get through this period for three more years with this kind of unemployment without violence in the streets.

No, I don't think so, and I don't like to talk about it because I don't want to encourage it at all, but I think this country, the Government, will have to do something about the hard-core unemployed—maybe as an employer of last resort. But this matter has to be handled in the sense that the hard-core people must have
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**Subscribe now.**
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Nixon and Wallace: A Nixon-Wallace meeting in Alabama in May 1972, prompted speculation that Nixon had dropped a federal tax investigation of George and Gerald Wallace in return for a promise by Wallace not to run in 1972 on a third-party ticket.
Wallace—cont.

cares if it is racist? It’s the truth.

On the first place this picture is false. Most people who believe these ideas are ignoring facts on a national level, seven out of ten welfare recipients are white. And current government figures show that 80% of black workers work for a living (even with today’s generally high unemployment).

Crime and welfare problems that are ascribed to Blacks are actually more of a white man’s problem to poverty (an economic condition that includes more and more whites every day).

This brings us to the second and more important reason to oppose these views—the self-interest of working people as a whole.

Many Wallace supporters believe that cuts in welfare benefits for welfare recipients are aimed only or mainly at the Blacks. They believe in giving more leeway to the police to criminals who are mainly black.

As the economic crisis grows and conditions become more difficult, large numbers of working people are going to be out of work for long periods and in need of welfare. Many more workers will be forced to strike against speed-up, unequal working conditions, or for unionization. Inevitably the large majority of these workers will be white.

The Wallace supporter who votes today to cut welfare benefits is voting to cut his own welfare benefits tomorrow. He votes today to let the police handle criminals “in the proper manner.”

Tomorrow the police will thank him as they break up his picket-line and his head, “in the proper manner.” He votes for Wallace only to help himself, but actually he is voting to help big-business, middle-class people directly against the Blacks is that much less anger directed against the monopolists, the real criminals behind the economic crisis. And the more that Blacks and Whites argue with each other the better big-business likes it. It is the old game of divide and rule, a game which Wallace has made a whole political career out of playing.

Wallace’s Record in Alabama

Let us note, in passing, the results of these divide and rule politics in Alabama, where Wallace, King and his wife have been governor for ten of the last twelve years.

Sales tax was only the beginning of racialism (5 out of 1,556 gubernatorial appointees have been black) has covered up many other anti-popular measures. The sales tax hits working people the hardest; it means less for the poor to pay, which hit the rich the hardest are extremely low in Alabama. Racial and property taxes for Alabama big corporations are so low that a Federal court has ordered a sweeping review of assessments. During aluminum corporation’s one year of offi- cee the state debt has nearly doubled. At the same time there have been only slight increases in the state’s conscientious and unemployment insurance payments, Alabama still has a law—what prohibit the union shop and it remains one of nine states with no minimum wage law of its own.

All of these measures have been to the detriment of the majority of the people of Alabama. When Governor Wallace took office in 1963, Alabama was 49th among the 50 states in per-pupil expenditures for public education, 47th in the percent of draftees passing the armed forces mental test, 49th in per capita income, 47th in percent of residents living above the poverty line, 47th, in infant survival, and 48th in doctors per 100,000 people.

The latest statistics, for the same year show Alabama 50th in per-pupil expenditures, down two notches; 48th in percent passing the armed forces test, down one place; 49th in per capita income, down four; 48th in degree of poverty, down one down 45th in infant survival, and three places; and 48th in the number of doctors per 100,000, no change.

What is Wallace Leading Up to?

George Wallace’s accomplishments in Alabama serve only as an introduction to what we could expect under the Wallace presidency. Of course his policies would be pro big-business, anti-working-class and extremely racist. But the United States under Wallace would not simply be a repetition of Alabama.

Many people see Wallace as a new kind of political figure, another type of the kind of president he would make. But Wallace is far from an original.

In that’s so distant past, a certain country had a minor-party candidate for national office, this candidate’s popularity grew as public disenchantment with the major political parties grew. Like Wallace, this candidate posed as an anti-establishment candidate. Like Wallace, he claimed to represent the middle class, anti-working class monopolies and against the poor.

Also like Wallace, this candidate blamed his country’s problems on a minority group that was supposedly robbing the country blind. Adam-Whip Wallace, law and order and anti-communism were cornerstones of his program.

Wallace himself pretty much let the cat out of the bag when he declared that the United States was right on the wrong side in World War II. The country is Germany and the candidate was none other than Adolph Hitler.

There are differences, many people will say. Yes, there are, but if we examine them closely, Wallace’s racism of Black people for the countries problems, Hitler used the Jewish people as scapegoats. The Civil-rights movement is quite recent, so Wallace must keep his racism under the cloak of code words like welfare chiseler and ‘crime’. Hitler was able to be more open.

The democratic tradi- tions of the United States are long standing and must appear to be democratic, even as he would systematically destroy democracy. Germany had only a form of political democracy, so Hitler could dispense with it. It is sufficient for Wallace to come off an anti-establishment; Germany had the second largest left-wing (other than Russia) in the world and so Hitler had to call himself a Socialist.

The differences here are not fundamental, only tactical. They are no more than the reflection of the differences between Germany and the United States, Americans should remember that Germany was not the only country to become fascist. Italy, Japan, Finland, Hungary, Spain, part of France, Portugal, and today—the Philippines, Mexico, Chile and the Soviet Union have all succumbed to fascist dictatorships. These coun- tries may be one another as from the United States. There is nothing unique about the United States It can happen here.

Immigrants—cont.

menace to their jobs and livelihood. They were ostracized, discriminated against and segregated into ghettos to a certain extent; teeming slums of the Lower East Side, Little Italy, North End.

The fact that many of these immigrants were able to improve their lot was chiefly due to two circumstances, the first was that the immigrants were strong and the second was that the country’s struggles of labor. The second had to do with the fact that U.S. capital retained its foothold and began to expand rapidly. This enabled, as always, a percentage of the owner class ofsmall immigrants to move up and even out