

Women's year in American politics

by ARVONNE FRASER

It's International Women's Year, and though that's a joke in some circles, in political terms women seem to be one of the few groups that have their act together. Observers at the regional Democratic candidates' meetings being held this fall have noted that it is women who have organized their questions and their priorities, and the candidates have learned to spout back the correct answers.

"Do you support the Equal Rights Amendment?"

"Will you uphold the Supreme Court decision on abortion?"

"How many women do you have in management on your campaign staff?"

"If elected, will you appoint a woman to the Supreme Court and to your cabinet?"

These are the basics. Candidates and politicians may not believe in women's equality but they are beginning to know the politically correct answers. Even a conservative President's wife supports the Equal Rights Amendment and speaks her mind on social issues, including abortion.

The Democratic National committee announced in September that Representative Lindy Boggs would be "chairperson" of the 1976 Democratic National Convention with former Representative Martha Griffiths as head of the Rules Committee and Representative Barhead of the Rules Committee, and Representative Bar-convention package.

Women campaign volunteers are harder to recruit and harder to please. Women are working outside the home, for pay, in record numbers. Both volunteerism and women's economic contribution in the household are being furiously debated.

A nation's consciousness is being raised and men in elected office are learning that it is politically unwise to vote no on women's issues.

But the issues of the women's movement—equal rights and abortion—are not yet equivalent to "motherhood and apple pie" in American political lingo. The danger that politicians will only pay lip service to women's issues is very real. The current easy answers on equal rights and abortion may be part of the same political problem: women and all things feminine are

Arvonne Fraser is legislative chair and former president of the Women's Equity Action League.

simply not considered to be directly involved in the important decisions or issues of the day.

Thus, women and the women's movement as a political force must operate on two levels, fight on two fronts. They must concentrate on women's issues at the same time that they are fighting to become participants at the middle and upper levels of all political bodies. This is the essence of the political process—the demand that government find solutions to problems at the same time that individuals and groups seek to gain power in that government in order to put forth their solutions. Together, women want to be involved collectively con-

(Continued on page 4)

Congressional notes

Leadership pushes special interests

by IZZY HIGGINS

"It could probably be shown by fact and figures that there is no distinctly American criminal class except Congress."

—MARK TWAIN

The Congressional Democratic leadership, despite its rhetoric of opposition to the Ford Administration, continues to live up to Mark Twain's estimate. Despite an overwhelming Congressional mandate provided mostly by working-class votes, the legislative leadership has subverted the democratic process to give favored treatment to special groups.

Two examples of the Congressional leadership's loyalty to the rich and powerful occurred in September. On September 11, the tobacco interests led by Rep. Walter B. Jones (D-N.C.) took advantage of a momentary absence of any liberals on the House floor to force a vote on their subsidy bill, although it had not been reported out of committee. To do this, Jones needed a unanimous vote of the House to have the bill considered. With the floor nearly deserted and the cooperation of the Speaker, their motion was recognized and passed before any Congressperson opposed to the giveaway could object.

Next tobacco representatives moved quickly in the Senate. On September 15, Yom Kippur, with Jesse

(Continued on page 3)

British Labor: natural party of government?

by CAROL DRISKO

The support of 190 Labor Members of Parliament, half the Cabinet, and the direct intervention of Prime Minister Wilson have not so far saved Reginald Prentice. The Labor MP for Newham North-East, a largely working-class dockside area in East London, and member of Harold Wilson's Cabinet, was dropped by his local Labor constituency as its candidate in the next general election.

He is the fourth Labor MP to be turned down by a local party organization in the past two years—and others feel threatened. Up to a dozen Labor backbenchers may be imperiled either by their constituency Labor organizations or their sponsoring unions.

Prentice, who has represented his district in the House of Commons since 1957, is currently Minister of Overseas Development and formerly Minister of Education. His solid working-class background and the staunch backing of the dockworkers union insured his political ascent. Over the years, though, the constituency has changed, and so perhaps has Prentice. Some of the older dockers have moved down river, to be replaced by younger, more militant working-class intellectuals and middle-class teachers and lecturers. Prentice is described as abrupt and aloof. And even his staunchest supporters contend that he has been perfunctory about constituency matters, and has let the control of local party machinery slip from his hands.

Some, including Prentice, have posed his case as a classic battle between Labor's "Marxist" and "moderate" wings. Says Prentice: "This is a struggle about the future of the Labor Party. If little groups of militant extremists are going to capture local parties and expel experienced members of Parliament . . . then we will cease to be a political party that can seriously represent the British people."

One of Prentice's opponents accuses the Labor MP of "betraying socialist principles." Another of his critics says, "His form of socialism is a washed-out pink with a tinge of blue." Prentice calls himself a social democrat.

Other observers feel that the Prentice case embodies the issue of "who runs British politics?" and the way candidates are selected for Parliament. Two-thirds of the members holding "safe" seats—those tending to be the property of one party—are chosen by a small group of party workers.

Left and Right at Blackpool

Prentice's career is not over. He retains his Cabinet Post and his seat in Parliament—at least until the next election. Even then, a "safer" constituency might be found for him. He can also appeal his case to the Labor Party's National Executive Committee. The 29-member NEC is, however, said to be controlled by left-wingers, whose ranks were strengthened at the Labor Party's annual conference last month at the seaside resort of Blackpool. There Chancellor of the Exchequer, Denis Healey, was replaced by Eric Heffer.

Healey was an architect of the government's policy of wage restraint, which restricts increases to £6 (about \$13) a week. Heffer is a Marxist from Liverpool, who was ousted this summer as Junior Minister of Industry because of his open support of an anti-Common Market position. Heffer saw his NEC victory as an indicator that the party as a whole wished to see "further movement toward a more socialist policy."

Despite Heffer's victory, Wilson emerged from Blackpool, as Robert B. Semple, Jr., of the *New York Times*, put it, with "his power intact and his policies unchanged."

At the conference, Wilson took swipes at both the right- and left-wings of his party. Warning against "extremists of the so-called left and, in a few cases, the extreme so-called moderates." The "so-called moderates" he referred to were the group called the Social Democratic Alliance, which had been vociferously supporting Prentice. The Alliance had accused 11 members of the NEC of showing "excessive" sympathy for the Communist Party and the Soviet Union. To Wilson's embarrassment, among those the Alliance named were Michael Foot, his Secretary for Employment, Judith Hart, a former Minister for Overseas Development, and Ian Mikardo, a former party chairman.

Foot, a leader of Labor's left-wing Tribune Group, reluctantly but decisively supported the government's incomes policy in the name of party unity, in apparent belief that Labor would be thrown out of office if it failed to make moves to contain inflation.

So, though the delegates cheered Energy Minister Anthony Wedgewood Benn, a left-winger, when he wound up a speech with a quote from former Prime Minister Clement Atlee (the cause of the most misery is "the private ownership of the means of life; the remedy is public ownership"), they backed Wilson.

Wilson declared the Labor Party "no longer the party of protest . . . [but] the natural party of government." Judith Hart, however, was not so euphoric. "I think that most of us are probably prepared to give Harold's policies a year of grace," she commented. "But if these policies do not work, next year's conference ought to be very interesting." □

Newsletter of

THE DEMOCRATIC LEFT

Michael Harrington, *Editor*

Jack Clark, *Managing Editor*

Gretchen Donart, *Production Manager*

Editorial Committee: Carol Drisko, *convener*, David Bensman, Gretchen Donart, Marjorie Gellermann and Peter Steinfelds. Larry Magarik also helped to put this issue out.

Signed articles express the views of the author.

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

Congressional leadership . . .

(Continued from page 1)

Helms (R-N.C.) acting as Presiding Officer and four Senators on the floor, the Democratic Whip, Robert Byrd of West Virginia, moved to pass the subsidy. The three other Senators present (Huddelston of Kentucky, Griffin of Michigan and Thurmond of South Carolina) passed the bill in an unrecorded voice vote. Fortunately, President Ford vetoed this bill since it exceeded his

Capital quotes

“The President will not take action to prevent a New York City default. . . . [New York is like] a wayward daughter hooked on heroin. You don't give her \$100 a day to support her habit. You make her go cold turkey to break the habit.”

—Ron Nessen, Presidential press secretary
October 17, 1975 news briefing

“New York City, it appears, finally is taking the kind of extreme measures necessary to get its financial house into some semblance of order. For the long range, this is very good. . . .

But there can be no doubt that basic changes will have to be made in the way New York City Hall operates. Federal health subsidies have made at least some of the 18 hospitals unneeded. Serious thought must be given to contracting out certain services to private businesses. The more than generous wage, benefit, and pension levels for city employees must be cut back.”

—*The Christian Science Monitor*
October 17, 1975

budgetary guidelines. Fearing exposure, the Democratic leadership did not attempt to override, for that would have required a recorded vote.

Only a week later, the House Democratic leadership provided a second example of favor for special interests, pushing through an amendment to exempt “independent” oil companies from the price rollback provision of its oil price control bill.

The amendment was senseless and made the bill internally inconsistent. It allowed “independents” to charge more for all their oil than it permitted other oil companies to charge for their hard-to-find oil. No one, including the sponsors of the amendment, knew how much oil the exemption would affect.

Knowing the weakness of their amendment, the “independents” did not introduce it until the very last moment, thus preventing public interest and labor groups from explaining the amendment's drawbacks to the many members of Congress who remain ignorant about any complex question like oil pricing. While not publicizing their amendment, the “independents” conducted an intense behind-the-scenes lobbying effort to assemble an impressive roster of sponsors which span-

ned the ideological spectrum. On the sponsors' list were Gillis Long (D-La.), the main agent of the “independents” in the House; Pat Schroeder (D-Col.) and Tim Wirth (D-Col.), who despite their liberal national images have consistently shilled for the “independents”; and Andy Young (D-Ga.), an otherwise excellent Congressman who was sold a bill of goods by the sophisticated multimillion dollar oil companies who have cultivated their image as Ma and Pa stores.

With such a formidable list of co-sponsors and the opposition unorganized, the “independents” clearly had the votes. However, the House Democratic leadership blocked a recorded roll call vote, fearing political backlash from Congresspersons who voted for the bill only to later find out its effects. During a lull in the proceedings, ex-liberal Richard Bolling (D-Mo.), sitting in the chair, brought up the amendment and pushed it through on a voice vote. But the leadership's plans may go awry again. The bill is now in conference and the President, insisting on complete price decontrol, may veto it.

While both efforts may have gone for naught, the leadership's actions should convince people on the Democratic Left that we not only have to replace Gerald Ford with a liberal Democrat in 1976, but also remove Mansfield, Byrd and Albert as well. If the Democratic leadership in Congress is not changed we may find ourselves in a situation similar to the early 1960's, when a Democratic President's domestic program was bottled up by a conservative Democratic Congress. □

Again, poor schools are cut

Both predictions made in last month's NEWSLETTER regarding the impact of the contract signed by the UFT to end the New York City teachers' strike turned out to be true—in spades! The strike led to no rehiring and in fact added to the problems in all districts where the most economically disadvantaged live. The settlement led to a reallocation of funds in such a way as to take money from Title I eligible schools in favor of the more affluent. As usual, it was a settlement made on the backs of the worst-off segments of the city!

Second, it has indeed pitted parents against the union. The agreement to cut the school day for kids (everyone must suffer, says Shanker) has been obeyed by only half the school boards; rebel boards may even have the support of local teachers. Meanwhile, those who really run New York say the whole contract is unacceptable and no one in fact has yet signed or ratified it! Meanwhile, class sizes are large, non-classroom services to children are almost non-existent, and safety and clerical services are minimal. With a threatened new round of cuts, it may soon make sense to agree to eliminate the whole budget rather than pretend that this is an educational system.

—DEBORAH MEIER

Neo-fascismo, si—comunismo, no

"Not one of the people we talked to asked us whether we were Fascists," said Giorgio Almirante, leader of Italy's neo-Fascist party. "Witch-hunts toward people like us do not exist in the United States as they do in Italy!"

Almirante met last month with several members of Congress and with two staff members of the National Security Council. One of the Security Council staffers was Denis Clift, who has traveled to Italy with Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. Almirante, head of the Italian Social Movement-National Right Wing, was under investigation in Italy for attempting to reconstruct the Fascist party.

At a Washington news conference, an obviously-pleased Almirante announced that he had reported to Clift on the threat of Communism and that Clift had "expressed esteem for our type of mission and appreciated the information we brought him."

Almirante's U.S. visit came as an embarrassment to the U.S. Embassy in Rome. The Embassy there had cut off contacts with the neo-fascists shortly after the arrival of Ambassador John A. Volpe. Embassy officials said they had warned Washington to steer clear of Almirante because of possible political repercussions in Italy.

Bad timing compounded the embarrassment. Within the same month, the State Department had indicated it would refuse a visa to an Italian Communist Party official, Sergio Segre. He had been invited to New York to participate in a conference organized by the Council on Foreign Relations. The Council decided to cancel the conference because of Segre's difficulties in getting a visa.

The juxtaposition of Washington's apparent warm

welcome to Almirante and cold shoulder to Segre set off a series of indignant news reports and editorials in the Italian press charging a U.S. insult to Italy's "anti-Fascist consciousness."

A member of the Rome diplomatic community commented:

"What happened in Washington was a real setback for your government's policy. It undercuts American credibility in many Italian eyes. And it provides some valuable ammunition to the Left, which likes to charge that Washington basically is friendly with old-fashioned Fascists."

Another possible repercussion, according to some Italian politicians: Francesco de Martino, Socialist Party leader who was invited to Washington, may have second thoughts about following in Almirante's footsteps.

POSCRITTO: Segre may be coming to the U.S. this month after all—as a member of a visiting parliamentary delegation. Segre, director of the foreign section of the Italian Communist Party, is also a member of the Chamber of Deputies. Members of the U.S. Congress invited a group of Italian parliamentarians, which will include delegates of all parties, including neo-Fascists and be headed by a Christian Democrat, to reciprocate for a U.S. Congressional visit to Italy three years ago.

Washington is apparently trying to save face *one*, by differentiating between Segre's role as CP official and parliamentarian, and *two*, by denying knowledge of his original visa application. A State Department spokesperson claimed to be "unaware" of it.

—C. D.

Women & politics . . .

(Continued from page 1)

trolling their own as well as other's destinies.

So they have organized. The National Women's Political Caucus, despite constant underfinancing, lack of sustained direction and continuity of leadership, and some disagreement on purposes, survives and has impact. As many Caucus members leave to become active in a political party, new members move forward in the Caucus. They may propose new directions for the Caucus and they frequently are no help at all on fund raising. There is a constant argument over membership dues which revolves around the two poles of if-you-raise-dues-you-keep-poor-women-out and you-can't-run-an-organization-without-money.

Yet the Caucus serves as an effective voice for political women everywhere. It can say things party women can't. It can rally support for a position that may be new or unpopular with both political parties. It has served as hair shirt at both the 1968 and 1972 conventions of both parties. With headquarters in Washington, it serves as watchdog on both national committees

and on the federal government. It gives women members of Congress backing and support—moral if not financial.

Statewide and local women's political caucuses serve somewhat the same function. Small and ineffective in many states, there are enough exceptions to give some nationwide support and presence to the National Women's Political Caucus. Also, statewide caucuses and coalitions for the Equal Rights Amendments have politicized many traditional women's groups.

The other two nationwide feminist groups—the National Organization for Women (NOW) and Women's Equity Action League (WEAL)—also run extensive lobbying programs and mobilize more traditional groups for assistance. The recent battle over funding women's sports is illustrative.

In 1972 Congress added an anti-sex-discrimination amendment to the Higher Education amendments bill. Title IX forbade sex discrimination of most kinds in any educational institution receiving federal funds (except the military academies). WEAL and NOW worked for two years to get regulations adopted by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and found

most resistance to Title IX centering on sports and athletics—a traditionally all-male preserve. When HEW finally issued proposed regulations in 1974, the battle was joined.

Coaches and athletic department managers at colleges and universities around the country reacted as if the tax dollar was theirs by a divine right or because they won the games. They hired a Washington law firm to represent them at HEW and lobby on Capitol Hill. They mailed appeals and instruction to each other through their National Collegiate Athletic Association and the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics. Secretaries in colleges and universities mailed copies of these appeals to NOW and WEAL. The women's underground was operating effectively.

Meanwhile, WEAL, NOW and traditional educational and women's groups with offices in Washington organized an ad hoc lobbying group. Letters were sent around; women walked the halls of Congress and made calls. Women buttonholed their Representatives when they were home in their districts and wrote them letters in Washington.

The issue was simple. Girls ought to get their fair share of the sports dollar when that dollar comes from taxes or when public institutions sponsor sports education classes and competitive sports events. Stories of the wide discrepancies between amounts spent on boys' and girls' sports were circulated and became good newspaper copy. Little League officials helped by refusing to admit girls into their program even when they should have seen the handwriting on the outfield fence. And when Billie Jean King testified before a Senate subcommittee on Education, Senators who couldn't care less about girls' phys. ed. turned out to have their picture taken with the new star. Though the battling was long and strenuous, amendments to delete the sports section or substantially alter the guidelines were defeated.

Organizing for participation

Meanwhile, the National Women's Education Fund and the Women's Campaign Fund were organized in Washington. The NWEF qualified as a tax-deductible group which could, and did, obtain foundation funding to run campaign training workshops on a non-partisan basis. One midwestern and one southern conference have been held and materials for women candidates and campaign managers at all political levels have been gathered and distributed. The Women's Campaign

Fund ran a direct-mail fund-raising operation to support women candidates in the 1974 elections. Both groups are expanding.

To reach out and inform under-represented groups about opportunities for political participation, the Democratic Party adopted affirmative action rules for 1972. The so-called quotas caused a great debate within the party. In the post-1972 rewrite, the rules clearly stated that quotas were not to be used. Instead, emphasis was placed on the affirmative action programs which are to include publicity, education and training. Each state is required to develop a plan to be submitted to a Democratic Party review commission. Barbara Mikulski chaired the committee that rewrote the rules, and Democratic women from all over the country worked hard to keep as much reform in the revised rules as possible. Many Democratic National Committeewomen and other women officers were radicalized during the reform fights in the Democratic Party.

The issues ahead

But the women's movement faces tough and sophisticated questions generally ranging around economics and family structure. The women's movement is disturbing a system that has flourished almost without exception throughout history. Women have always been the reserve labor force and we are now in a recession with high unemployment. Who gets the jobs? Are women to be the last hired and first fired? And who is going to take care of the kids? That's considered women's work and therefore of low value and status—not worthy of pay or other tangible rewards. Many believe women ought to be home taking care of their kids—unless they are welfare mothers in which case they ought to be out earning a living for their families. But if women's work is low paid, how can welfare mothers support their families and where can they find jobs in a high unemployment era?

Just as basic civil rights legislation didn't automatically change people's emotional views or habits, so legislation giving equality to women is not enforced adequately. Habits and practices are changing only slowly. Even women deep in the movement are unsure as to how to raise their boys and girls. The divorce rate is at an all-time high and there is resistance to the Equal Rights Amendment among middle class women who fear loss of economic security.

This women's movement is deeply political. It has raised the consciousness of a nation—and is working on the World. The World Plan of Action produced at the United Nations' International Women's Year Conference in Mexico City is a responsible yet radical document. It calls for education and training for women, for the right to choose the number and spacing of one's children, for increased political participation especially in the decision-making process, and for employment and legal rights of women.

Women's expectations and their confidence in themselves is increasing individually and collectively. Women's insistence on sharing power will intensify and political mechanisms will respond—albeit slowly and with increasing resistance. □

Save the date!

DSOC National Issues Conference
Washington DC
January 31-February 1

A meeting to discuss a program of far-reaching structural change to put before the American people during the 1976 presidential political debate. DSOC members and friends invited.

'I see signs daily . . .'

"The revolutionary process in Portugal is being attacked by the guardians of capitalist countries' interests, of which the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency is the most notorious and powerful. I see the signs daily. These counterrevolutionary activities are similar to what I did in the CIA for more than 10 years during the 1950's and 1960's. . . ."

This and the other excerpts on this page come from Phillip Agee's "open letter to the Portuguese people," which he wrote after a visit to Portugal in late summer. Agee's work as a CIA operative in Ecuador, Uruguay, and Mexico lead to his eposé *CIA Diary: Inside the Company*. In it he describes secret operations and names names of hundreds of undercover agents. Agee's experiences in Latin America led him from the traditional anti-Communism of his undergraduate days at Notre Dame to the other end of the spectrum, to what he characterizes as "revolutionary socialism." What is interesting about Agee is not his crude political analysis, often a kind of "vulgar Marxism." Rather it is his intimate knowledge of the CIA. Agee still appears to think like a CIA agent; thus his observations may give

indicators of the CIA's probable views and possible courses of action.

What signs does he see?

"The size of the overall U.S. government mission in Portugal . . . totals 280 persons, of whom 160 are Americans. . . . Of the Americans, 105 are military personnel.

" . . . Of the approximately 50 American civilians, . . . about 10, I believe, are employees of the CIA. No less than 10 additional CIA functionaries are probably working in Lisbon and other cities, having been assigned ostensibly for temporary duties so that their presence is not included on embassy personnel lists, nor reported to the Portuguese foreign ministry. . . .

"Without doubt, the CIA officers in other U.S. embassies, most likely in Madrid, Paris and London, have personnel assigned to Portuguese operations. . . . The most sensitive operations of the CIA probably are occurring [there] rather than in Lisbon. . . .

"I strongly suspect that Kissinger many months ago urged the leaders of Western European governments to intervene directly to reverse the Portuguese revolutionary process, arguing that the problem is essentially

'CIA "help" worst possible thing . . .'

There are a number of puzzling, and even suspicious, aspects to last month's New York *Times* story, based on State Department sources, that the CIA channelled money to the Portuguese Socialist Party of Mario Soares.

First of all, Washington seemed almost eager to reveal its cloak and daggery. The leak was confirmed almost immediately, which is not usually the case when CIA operations are involved. Was President Ford looking for another Mayagüez to make him look like a tough anti-Communist? Was the CIA trying to salvage something of its tarnished reputation by associating itself with what the American public would regard as a successful venture? The peculiar circumstances of the way in which the story broke makes one wonder.

Secondly, Senator George McGovern and some of his associates were in Portugal up until two or three days before the *Times* dispatch. They report that Soares and other PSP leaders regarded CIA "help" as the worst possible thing the United States could do. This report from the McGovern party confirms a talk I had with the Socialist International in late spring in which I learned that the Portuguese Socialists were adamantly opposed to any U.S. government intervention on their behalf.

Thirdly, the denials of the Socialist International, Willy Brandt, and, above all, of Olof Palme of Sweden regarding the transfer of funds are quite convincing. To think that the CIA would use Palme, perhaps the most outspoken European critic of the U.S. role in Vietnam, as a conduit is absurd, whether viewed from Washington or Stockholm.

Is it possible, nevertheless, that some CIA money was sent into Portugal, without the knowledge and assistance of Soares, the Socialist International and Palme (who headed the European Socialist solidarity effort on behalf of the Portuguese Socialists)? Of course, it is possible. The CIA could have sent money via friends from the old Jay Lovestone days, "laundering" it so that no one knew where it came from. But if that was the case, the act was criminal as well as stupid and it in no ways makes Soares and his comrades, who stand at the head of a mighty mass movement, into agents or dupes. It shows once again how American intelligence puts its own bureaucratic self-interest ahead of the needs of the democratic forces in a revolution.

After his return from Portugal, Senator McGovern proposed that the U.S. give overt economic aid to Portugal. He also submitted an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Authorization Bill, banning funds for covert activities in Portugal. He rightly pointed out that any money sent by the CIA to Portuguese Socialists should be addressed to Cunhal, the leader of the Communist Party, who would benefit more than anyone else from such a tactic.

If the CIA did indeed act in this way, it was a reprehensible and outrageous action and, in any case, McGovern's proposal to put an end to the very possibility deserves wide support. If the CIA—or President Ford—are leaking this story to bolster their tarnished reputations, a full Senate investigation is very much in order.

—MICHAEL HARRINGTON

European and that the CIA has been limited in its capabilities by recent revelations. . . .”

What specifically is the CIA trying to do in Portugal? Agee asks, then lists:

- *penetrate the Armed Forces Movement*: “The U.S. military schools have trained over 3,000 Portuguese military personnel since 1950. Detailed files have been accumulated on every one of them. . . . Many of these already will have been selected as contacts to be developed within the Portuguese military establishment. . . .”
- *assist “moderate” elements*: “James Lawler, the CIA deputy chief of station in Lisbon engaged in just such operations in Brazil (in 1962) and in Chile (in 1964), where many millions of dollars were spent . . . to promote the election of U.S.-approved ‘moderates.’”
- *infiltrate exile groups* in Brazil, where Spinoza is, and Spain.
- *get a foothold in the trade union movement* “by establishing an affiliate of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. . . . Michael Boggs and Irving Brown, both officials of the AFL-CIO with notorious ties to the CIA, visited Portugal last year.”
- *channel money to the Portuguese Catholic Church*.
- *foment fear, uncertainty, hostility* through propaganda campaigns using public information media, wall posters, fly sheets, and various false documents.

Agee claims that the “campaign to discredit” the revolution outside Portugal utilizes such themes as: “The AFM has failed to follow the will of most Portuguese. . . . The Portuguese people have sadly ‘lost’ their freedom with the diminishing importance of the elected assembly. . . . The press has ‘lost’ its freedom. . . . Portugal needs ‘stability’ to solve its social and economic problems. . . . The revolutionary leadership is inept and unable to stop the economic downturn. . . .” Agee says these themes “are preparing U.S. and Western public opinion for acceptance of intervention and a strong right-wing military government.”

Agee, like many others of differing political stripes, sees “economic warfare [as] the key for cutting away public support from the revolutionary leadership. . . . Private investment credits can be frozen, trading contracts delayed and cancelled, while imperialist propaganda will place the blame on workers’ demands and the government’s weakness rather than on lending institutions and their deliberate policies of credit retention. The effects of these programs in Chile during the Allende administration are known to all.”

What can we expect from the CIA in Portugal in coming months? According to Agee: “political assassinations . . . along with bombings that can be ‘attributed’ to the revolutionary left. [John] Morgan, head of the CIA in Lisbon, learned these kinds of operations when he served in Brazil (1966-1969) and in Uruguay (1970-1973).” Agee also looks for “greater militancy by reactionary elements in the Catholic Church” and the promotion of the separatist movement in the Azores, “as a last resort for preserving U.S. military bases there.” In Angola, he says, “the FNLA is likely being supported by the CIA through Zaire. . . .”

—C.D. & L.M.

Confusing us with ‘facts’



© 1933, 1961 James Thurber, from *My Life and Hard Times*, published by Harper & Row

Forbes, the magazine that considers itself a willing “capitalist tool,” has taken a broadside at the anti-nuclear lobby in a recent article entitled, “Don’t Confuse Us with Facts.” *Forbes* claims that the nuclear power industry has “long since managed to meet most of the genuine objections that have been raised by the anti-nuclear propagandists.” But the “antinukes,” as *Forbes* calls them, are “sharp propagandists.” On Hiroshima Day this year, 2,300 scientists petitioned the government to reduce construction of nuclear reactors.

So, *Forbes*, feeling a need for some propaganda of its own, pulled out the big guns of ridicule and sarcasm. Not least among its weapons was the James Thurber cartoon above. *Forbes* writes: “At the turn of the century, James Thurber’s grandmother suspected this new-fangled electricity of leaking all over the house. Such irrational fears—if less wittily expressed—lie behind much of today’s anti-nuclear sentiment.”

Forbes again turns to history for another “parallel” to ridicule “antinukes.” The nuclear controversy reminds *Forbes* of the passage of the 18th (Prohibition) Amendment and the Volstead Act. “Here,” says *Forbes*, “was a clear case of an extremist pressure group, driven not by the urge for gain but out of conviction, foisting its views on the American people.” They compare the Anti-Saloon League’s Wayne Wheeler with the Union of Concerned Scientists’ Ralph Nader. Wheeler, his biographer wrote, had “a passionate sincerity that bordered on unscrupulousness.” That, in *Forbes*’ opinion, is what the nuclear power industry is up against today—sincerity bordering on unscrupulousness. □

Jimmy Higgins reports . . .

"SQUAWK!" screams Chase Manhattan's full-page newspaper ads presenting the bank's view on the capital short-fall debate. "What if we told you one out of six American workers would be out of a job ten years from now? Possibly you." Chase goes on to explain that this misfortune would come "not because you couldn't or didn't want to work, but because American industry would be starved for capital. There would be no tools for you to work with. No materials to work on." Chase advises us to "squawk, and scream, get fighting mad, and do something"—like adopt the Chase "seven-point action program," which includes establishing "more realistic depreciation allowances"; giving "preferential tax treatment for retained corporate earnings re-invested"; and easing our "harsh treatment of capital gains." Chase concludes the ad with an offer to "argue the point, anytime, anywhere."

MICHAEL HARRINGTON, national chairman of the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee, accepted the challenge and offered to debate Chase's president, David Rockefeller (or his second). Harrington even offered to provide a "broad audience of trade unionists, intellectuals and social activists," if Rockefeller would bring some bankers and executives. DSOC would rent the hall.

\$3 BILLION DOLLAR 'NEW' IMAGE is in the works for the U.S. Employment Service. A three-year promotional campaign is planned by the U.S. Labor Department to change the image of the employment service from that of an unemployment check disburser to a place where people can find jobs. The government plans to assist the states in placing radio and TV ads portraying the agency as the "Job Service." Says agency director William B. Lewis, "The idea is to educate people that we have jobs and that we're not just a place to go for a check." Part of the campaign will focus on employers to encourage them to list more openings with the 2,400 offices operated by the federal-state employment system. The Employment Service recently came under heavy criticism from a public



advisory committee for its lack of personalized service, referral of unqualified applicants, and improper screening of employers for job openings.

SIMON SAYS MORE—Congress and the country are facing "a classic choice between freedom and socialism—ultimately that is what is involved here." Treasury Secretary William E. Simon was speaking at a news conference last month about Ford's new tax and budget proposals. The major political issue of '76, as both Ford and Simon see it, will be cutting back the growth of federal spending. Simon declared, "It is the most important political choice of my lifetime."

SEMINAR ON WALL STREET: The New York Stock Exchange sponsored a conference examining the worldwide implications of the so-called capital shortage in the U.S. The exchange has estimated a domestic "capital gap" of \$650 billion over the next 10 years. Internationally such a shortfall could impede U.S. investment abroad, cut back U.S. imports, and divert investment capital from developing nations, according to James J. Needham, chairman of the Stock Exchange and keynote speaker. Topics under discussion included multinational corporations, inflation, unemployment, the budget deficit, the \$100-billion Ford-Rockefeller energy plan. Commenting on the latter, Jack F. Bennett, director of the Exxon Corporation, said, "It sounds to me like an effort to throw money at a problem." Robert V. Roosa, a partner of Brown Brothers, Harriman & Co., when asked about the availability of capital to underdeveloped countries, responded that "the major source for some time may [have to] be the multinational corporation." That wouldn't be so bad, opined George W. Ball, managing director of Lehman Brothers and former Under-Secretary of State. He spoke of the multinationals as "countervailing forces" to nation states. "I think it's a healthy development," he said. "It has demonstrated the total inadequacy of the nation state as an arena in which business should be confined." Attending the seminar were representatives of 55 countries, and officials from the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the securities industry. One embassy representative from an underdeveloped country was asked for his reaction. "I enjoyed the lecture," he replied.

The Newsletter of the Democratic Left is published ten times a year by the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee. It is available by subscription or by membership in the DSOC.

I want to subscribe. Enclosed find my check or money order. (\$10 for a sustaining subscription; \$5 for a regular subscription; \$2.50 for a limited income subscription.)

I'd like to join the DSOC. Enclosed find my dues. (\$15 regular dues; \$8 limited income; \$50 sustaining dues.)

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

Name

Address

City/State Zip