

Newsletter of

# THE DEMOCRATIC LEFT

January 1977—Vol. V, No. 1



Edited by MICHAEL HARRINGTON

## Socialist International Congress in Geneva

### *New vitality in move left, Third World focus*

by MICHAEL HARRINGTON

The 13th post-war Congress of the Socialist International, held in Geneva during the last week of November, saw European socialists (who make up the vast majority of the International's 8 million members of affiliated organizations) move to the Left.

I'm not suggesting that there was any abrupt, revolutionary shift in political strategy by the leaders of the mass Left parties in West Germany, France, Great Britain and other European nations. But there were definite moves toward a more aggressive political and organizational strategy. On detente, on the systemic nature of our current crisis, on feminism, on Eurocommunism, the assembled socialist leaders displayed at least an openness to the Left and sometimes a rather radical consensus. The most encouraging—and most perplexing—sign of the International's move leftward was the decision to break out of democratic socialism's "European ghetto" by reaching out to movements in the Third World.

Willy Brandt's election as the new president of the International, replacing the ailing Bruno Pitterman of Austria, was perhaps the most obvious single change which took place in Geneva. On the floor of the Congress, his nomination and election seemed absolutely routine; in fact a significant political process preceded Brandt's taking the job. German social democrats disagreed among themselves about whether SPD chair

should be leader of the International as well. Brandt and the International are to the Left of West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt. Therefore, Brandt's elevation could put him in the position of publicly disagreeing with Schmidt.

Secondly, Brandt was determined that he would not preside over a "club of gentlemen socialists." So he insisted that the International reach out to North America and the Third World. Before agreeing to assume the presidency of the International, he secured

*(Continued on page 5)*

### **Social Democratic women discuss equality and peace**

by PATRICIA CAYO SEXTON

Since I have long believed that the stronger the influence of democratic socialism in a country the more sexually egalitarian the society will be, it came as no surprise to me to learn, as I did recently, that about 40 percent of the representatives in the Stockholm City Council are women and about 27 percent of the representatives in the Swedish national parliament.

Few of us, even though we are socialists, recall that the only woman to achieve national leadership in a significant modern country — Golda Meir — was also a democratic socialist, leader of a labor party, and an executive of the Socialist International.

In any event the women assembled for the Geneva conference of the International Council of Social Democratic Women (ICS DW) were all socialists and active feminists, many of them with considerable influence in their parties and in the countries they represented. About 25 of the 37 affiliated member groups were present at the meetings, including, besides the European countries, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Venezuela from the Americas; Israel and Senegal from the Near East and Africa; and New Zealand from the Far East.

Women's status in these diverse nations is naturally varied, so glib generalities are not easy. By general consensus, the Swedes are out in front on women's issues. Partnership marriage is a lively issue in Sweden. To pro-

*(Continued on page 7)*

### **Convention's coming**

The Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee will hold its third convention on February 19, 20 and 21 at the Downtown Holiday Inn, 1 South Halstead Street, Chicago, Illinois. Delegates to the convention are now being elected from DSOC locals and from unorganized at-large areas. Observers will, of course, also be welcome to attend the convention. Details on the convention program and convention fees will appear in the next issue of the Newsletter.

To prepare for convention discussion and decision-making, DSOC is publishing a series of discussion bulletins. The discussion bulletin series is available to members and non-members at a cost of \$2.50 for the series.

# We're paying for 'free enterprise' ads

by JACK CLARK

Is capitalism in the United States entering its final crisis? Is business faced with immediate danger of expropriation by a socialist government?

No serious radical could answer yes to those questions in 1976, but a random look at television commercials or newspaper and magazine ads might give one the impression that we were only weeks away from the barricades in the streets and the doom of capitalism. Or at least that systemic alternatives, including mass socialization of major industries were being hotly debated in the Congress, in the media and among ordinary citizens. Why else would rational leaders of business gear up a massive—and expensive—propaganda campaign to save capitalism?

Once upon a time (at least according to some economic texts), the purpose of advertising was to inform the consumer public. If your company was selling wid-

## None of your business

All those charming oil company ads assuring us that the execs want us to know more about their business don't apply in certain situations. Thus, Standard Oil of California, and Exxon, while complaining about the possibility of a severe natural gas shortage in southern California by 1979, told a state legislative committee anxious to learn more that gas reserves are none of our business. The president of Socal, and Exxon's vice president in charge of drilling and exploration, were both invited to testify before Terry Groggins' energy subcommittee. They replied that the information the committee sought was "proprietary and irrelevant," so they refused to appear. Groggin countered with subjoenas, noting that a second failure to testify about known gas reserves may bring a contempt citation against the executives in court.

gets at a nickel less than your competition's widgets, you had to let the public know.

Then, partially in response to the anti-corporate moods of the late 1960's and tawdry revelations of the 1970's, Madison Avenue burst forth with a new genre, "image advertising." Selling the product is secondary; the ads are intended to convince us that XYZ Corporation possesses civic virtue and performs socially useful, indeed philanthropic, functions.

In the three years since the OPEC boycott and resulting energy crisis, advertising has moved beyond promoting the image of particular companies. Now the pitchmen (and pitchwomen, one would presume, if Madison Avenue is nearly as up-to-date as it claims) are out to sell the free enterprise system itself to us. Profit's not a dirty word; either enact the oil corporations' energy program or . . . or . . . face it . . . well, yes,

it's down to that . . . either subsidize Mobil or get socialism. And nobody wants that!

Perhaps the most tasteless of the new "save capitalism" ads was one that ran for a time on television last year. We were shown a newspaper delivery boy going through the routine of receiving his bundle of newspapers, sorting them out, folding them, etc. As he goes through these tasks a voice-over explains that this is a businessman; the voice recites all the business transactions involved in this young entrepreneur's work. Then, a conclusion: he earns more money than 50 percent of the people of the world—something for us to be really proud of.

It all seems rather bizarre. Anti-corporate sentiment certainly exists and is probably growing. But the shrill ads overstate the case by quite a bit. We're by no means (alas) on the verge of a choice between capitalism and socialism. This discontent is less focused than that, less ideological (certainly less ideological than the ads), not nearly so well-defined. It's irritating and frequently boring to see business touting itself so often, and it's another and a new reminder of the vast inequality of resources in this society and the consequences of that inequality. We all have the right of free speech; some of us can afford a quarter of the *New York Times* op-ed page to publicize our self-interested viewpoints. Still, for all the irritation, and even with the distortion of democratic debate, businesses certainly have the right to spend their money promoting a system that continues to produce their profits.

Of course, it's not entirely *their* money. Because advertising is deductible as a legitimate business expense on federal taxes, we're subsidizing these private ads. That is only one of the reasons the demand for equal time by a coalition of labor and consumer groups to respond to the oil companies' propaganda blitz makes so much sense. Some mechanism has to be worked out for response to the privately-financed, partially-subsidized business ads. Even if the business deduction were taken away for advertising not related to selling a product (which would make sense), allowing no free time to respond simply means turning the public policy debates

Newsletter of

## THE DEMOCRATIC LEFT

Michael Harrington, *Editor*  
Jack Clark, *Managing Editor*

Signed articles express the views of the author.

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

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

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

over to the highest commercial bidders.

But one of the most ambitious efforts to lecture us on capitalist virtue is socialistically financed. The American Advertising Council, in its most ambitious project to date, launched a campaign to "educate" the American public about economics. Start-up costs for the campaign totalled \$2.5 million; the total costs are expected to range up to \$20 million. But it's not private capital alone that's funding this effort. The United States Commerce Department kicked in \$239,000 from funds supposedly earmarked for jobs and minority business opportunities. Even more significant, "the effort is expected to involve at least \$150 million of free public service advertising," according to the *Wall Street Journal*. Radio and television stations are required by the Federal Communications Commission to devote a portion of their air time to public service announcements—you know, promotions for the Girl Scouts of America and the New York Stock Exchange—that kind of public service.

So you and I are paying for these lectures in the form of television, radio and subway and bus ads and a booklet entitled, "The American Economy and Your Part in It," printed and distributed at government expense. That has, understandably, provoked some controversy. The *National Review* and the American

---

### Capital quotes

“I don't consult anybody, if I want to lay people off. We just lay them off.” Indeed over the last year, Leyland has laid off 36,000 workers, few of whom are ever likely to return. . . . ‘I feel I'm still in free enterprise,’ Park said, ‘I look upon my funding, for example, no differently from how anybody else looks at his funding, except that I have a restricted source—the Government.’”

—New York Times August 7 story on Alexander Park's management at the nationalized British Leyland corporation

---

Economic Foundation have blasted the Ad Council booklet for condoning too much government interference in the economy. But most of the negative reaction has been from the Left, from people who object to the business and conservative economics bias and public funding of the campaign.

Rep. Benjamin Rosenthal (D-N.Y.) sharply criticized the Commerce Department's subsidy from their minority business fund. "This seems like one of the most outrageous things I've heard in the 13 years I've been in Congress," he told Commerce officials last summer. The staff director of Rosenthal's Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer and Monetary Affairs called the Commerce grant a "clear case of misappropriation of funds."

The Ad Council and Rep. Garry Brown (R.-MI.) have responded to these charges in several ways. The most insistent reply is that the campaign is a non-

## The right eye of CBS

by JIM CHAPIN

One network carried the burden last month of enlightening the American public on the dangers the Left poses for two of our European allies. First, on the program *60 Minutes*, the objective commentator on the "British disease" was Milton Friedman, who explained that England's problems were caused by an overgenerous government giving aid to the unproductive people in society, and warned that the United States, unless it reformed itself along "free-enterprise" lines, would follow England into decay. Then, the recent rise of the Italian Communist Party was capsuled into a one-hour-special, with the commentator, Luigi Barzini, warning of the totalitarian danger presented by the PCI's victory. Barzini, of course, is an active member of the Italian Liberal Party, a party to the right of the Christian Democrats. It is as if an Italian network used Barry Goldwater as its commentator on the reform Democrats.

The best response to Friedman's analysis of Britain's problems can be found, of all places, in the conservative British *Economist*: "The myth of Britain's uniquely generous welfare state has shown remarkable powers of survival." The figures it cites show that the United Kingdom spends a lower percentage of its national income on social security and medical care than any of the continental members of the European Economic Community (prosperous Germany, for example, spends the most: 28.9% to the U.K.'s 22.1%). Great Britain also ranks behind all these same European nations in the percentage (not to mention the raw amounts) of income allocated for pensions, family allowances, and sick pay. (*Economist*: April 12, 1975, p. 35.) But then England has been ruled by the Tories for 17 of the 31 years since World War II. Meanwhile, the Scandinavian nations of Sweden, Norway and Denmark, ruled almost continuously by Socialists in the same period, have more than doubled the growth rate of the U.S. and are now passing us in per capita GNP. But it's a safe bet you won't be hearing *that* on CBS.

partisan, non-political and unbiased effort to educate the American public (all of us ignoramus who don't understand how good business is) on the economy. Furthermore, Brown, who answered Rosenthal in a letter to the *Wall Street Journal*, pointed out the General Accounting Office had found the Commerce Department grant technically legal on the basis that "increased public awareness of the American economy may act to encourage the successful participation of minority business enterprises."

While the organizers of the Ad Council campaign have thus avoided a full-scale government scandal, they've been less successful in containing or responding

to various citizen efforts to rebut their ads and booklet. The People's Business Commission (formerly the People's Bicentennial Commission) has successfully engaged the Council in sort of a guerrilla war. When the Ad Council officially launched its campaign at a Washington press conference, PBC was there with a counterpress conference. When the Ad Council asked for and received free public service ads, PBC petitioned for free time to respond to the controversial material. Other groups did, too, including the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee. But the most comprehensive and best-publicized effort to counter the Ad Council is the Public Media Center's "Americans for a Working Economy" campaign. Using snappy slogans like "If you think the system is working, ask someone who isn't," the Public Media Center has drawn a great deal of attention to their demand for a debate on the American economy.

And the Working Economy effort has won support from consumer, labor, liberal, and radical groups. Included among the sponsoring groups for the counter-campaign are: the UAW, AFSCME, the Machinists, the Consumer Federation of America, the US Conference of Mayors, Environmental Action, Friends of the Earth, the Exploratory Project on Economic Alternatives and the DSOC. As part of the effort to establish that the Ad Council's campaign is biased, the Americans for a Working Economy coalition has solicited critical evaluations of "The American Economy and Your Part in It" from moderate and liberal economists. At a fall conference officially announcing the coalition, several representatives criticized the Commerce Department and the Ad Council. Poking fun at the use of Charles Schultze's cartoon characters to illustrate the American Economy booklet, Carol Tucker Foreman, the executive director of the Consumer Federation of America, humorously — and effectively — summed up objections to the Ad Council effort:

"Good grief, Charlie Brown, who expected to find you teaching an economics course designed by those good

people who've brought us Edsels and Pringles and corporate bribes . . . it is a great idea to increase knowledge about our economic system but we're a little shocked to find that Peanuts has sold out to the corporate giants and more than a little upset to find our tax dollars going to support such a one-sided view. "The American Economic System and Your Part in It" has a pretty fuzzy view of that system and lots of gaps."

The upshot of all this has been harmful to the Advertising Council's plans. Fearful that the ads promoting the Ad Council booklet would result (as some early ads did) in requests for free equal time, two of the three major networks have refused to run the Ad Council spots. In response to the numerous economists who have objected to its booklet, the Ad Council has trotted out that paragon of economic objectivity, Herbert Stein, to recite official blessings over the document.

But through it all, the Ad Council campaign goes on. NBC has rejected requests for equal time and is running the Ad Council spots; the campaign has also spurred individual businesses and local chambers of commerce to produce their own materials, sponsor "free enterprise" chairs at various universities and establish speakers' bureaus to promote capitalism. Much of the propaganda is clumsy and bureaucratic; some of it is sophisticated; all of it is well-financed.

And why not? As a Michigan letter writer to the *Wall Street Journal* pointed out the same day Rep. Brown's letter appeared, capitalism is not generally a hotly contested issue in our social and political debates. "Since when has free enterprise become a 'controversial question' in the United States of America?" Of course, he's right. It isn't really. And for all of us who are objecting to the Ad Council blitz, it's too bad. Once again, we find ourselves in a debate stuck to the right of center because alternatives to capitalism, systematic criticism of capitalism is so clearly beyond the pale.

In some ways, the whole controversy is unimportant. At least, it's less important than the debates over full employment or national health care. But we're hemmed into a center-right confrontation on those issues, too, partially because "free enterprise" is so far from being a controversial question. It's not a matter of whether we'll involve private insurers in a national health care system; rather it's a matter of whether we'll subsidize them to run the whole show.

To the degree that large numbers of people are beginning to question those basic assumptions that the private sector, the corporate sector must always be supreme, the Ad Council campaign is instructive. Faced with an economic crisis and a loss of confidence in business as an institution, business leaders have been dropping the much vaunted pragmatism of American capitalism and becoming intensely ideological. In response, the democratic Left needs more than "pragmatic" answers. We need more than assertions that we too believe in the "free enterprise system."

Until "free enterprise" becomes at least a somewhat controversial question, the democratic Left, for all its good efforts, will have no answer either to the Ad Council propaganda blitz nor to the larger ideological offensive by business. □

## Do the trains run on time?

In a full page travel article on Delhi, the *New York Times* found some consolation in what it euphemistically called "a new course for India's Government."

"As in Washington, the talk of Delhi is always politics, although some of it has grown cautious since June of last year when Prime Minister Indira Gandhi charted a new course for India's Government. With a rigidly censored press, thousands of political prisoners and civil liberties suspended, India is no longer generally referred to as the world's most populous democracy.

"But the change does not affect the foreign visitor in any negative way. In fact, the authoritarian measures have made the country an easier place to visit: cleaner streets, more punctual flights and a greater sense of public order."

## Socialist International...

(Continued from page 1)

promises from the prospective vice chairs, thirteen of the most important party leaders in the International and the leader of the International Conference of Social Democratic Women, that they would actively participate in the International's work.

Another of the most visible changes in Geneva, particularly to one who has attended previous conferences of the International, was the role of the French party. During most of the post-war period, French socialism was represented by Guy Mollet's SFIO (the initials ironically stood for French Section of the Workers' International). Throughout those years, Mollet's party not only suffered electoral defeats and organizational decline; it also supported France's savage repression of the Algerian national movement. Among Mollet's critics then were François Mitterrand, now leader of the renamed French Socialist Party, and Michel Rocard, one-time head of the Unified Socialist Party (PSU), a Marxist-oriented, anti-Algerian war movement. At Geneva this time, Mitterrand led the French delegation, and Rocard spoke for the French socialists on Third World policy.

Mario Soares led the Portuguese delegation which this time represented not an illegal and exiled party but the governing party of Portugal; their strength and presence was a direct reminder of how effective the solidarity of the International could be. The Spanish socialists, who held their first above ground conference in 40 years right after the Congress, were there under the leadership of Felipe Gonzales. And this Congress admitted the first African party to the International, the Progressive Union of Senegal led by President Leopold Senghor. In a speech to the Congress, Senghor addressed the need for an "African re-reading of Marx and Engels" and cited facts and figures on the international economy describing how the world market facilitated a transfer of "the surplus value of labor" from the poor countries to the rich. Joop den Uyl, the prime minister of the Netherlands, took up this theme. Free trade, he said, was a doctrine which rationalized the domination of the world market by the wealthy.

The Third World issue was the centerpiece of the discussion at Geneva, but a few other issues should be at least noted before returning to it. On Eurocommunism, there was a cautious openness. Brandt declared himself somewhat skeptical about the transformation of the Communist parties, yet *Le Nouvel Observateur* reported his "private" comment that he would not be surprised if the French or Italian Communists asked for membership in the International in five or six years. Almost everyone kept their distance on this subject; almost everyone saw at least the possibility of the Communists' moving toward democratic socialism.

On a related question, there was near unanimity that detente should be pursued without illusions. The International will try to coordinate the socialist parties' preparation for this summer's conference in Belgrade, the follow-up meeting to Helsinki. Everyone opposed a

## DSOC admitted to S.I.

by JACK CLARK

On November 26, the Congress of the Socialist International formally affiliated the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee.

We thus achieved a goal set at our founding convention in October 1973: to secure a formal relationship through the Socialist International to mass socialist and labor movements of Western Europe, Israel, Australia, New Zealand and Latin America. As both Michael Harrington's and Patricia Cayo Sexton's articles indicate, our admission came at an opportune time. The International is entering a new, more aggressive phase of spreading the democratic socialist ideal. Willy Brandt, in his inaugural speech as the new president of the International, referred specifically to social democratic tendencies in the United States and announced that the next Congress of the International, which will be held in Canada, will focus on spreading socialism in North America.

All DSOC members are now entitled to subscribe to the journal of the International, *Socialist Affairs*, at the members' discount rate of \$10 per year. The magazine contains regular reports on the progress of socialist movements all over the world and political articles by internationally known figures like Willy Brandt, Olof Palme and François Mitterrand. It's available from the Socialist International, 88a St. John's Wood High St., London NW 8 5J, England.

return to the Cold War. That, said Austrian Chancellor Bruno Kreisky, would drive Austria back into the shadow of a "cruel line of demarcation."

And there was movement on the issue of women's rights. At a special meeting of the Congress titled "Socialism and the Sexes" one feminist delegate bluntly told the audience that the movement had produced "kilos of resolutions" for sexual equality but little real equality. The selection of the fourteen vice chairs of the International underlined that fact. Only one of the fourteen was a woman, and her nomination required a certain amount of pressure. To be sure, the vice chairs automatically represent the most prestigious leaders of the member parties and were not selected from the floor. Still, their composition tells something revealing about the various national leaderships: they remain dominantly male. What was different—and positive—at this Congress was that the issue was being raised.

While important and interesting, none of these discussions was central to the Congress' deliberations; what was central was the International's determination to reach out to Asia, Africa and Latin America. As the discussion made clear, that is going to be quite difficult.

First, there is an ideological problem. The parties of the International are all committed to democratic socialism. But movements calling themselves "socialist"

in the Third World are, with a few exceptions, not democratic. So they do not meet the criteria for membership in the International. At the same time, these movements exist in countries which, if they lack political freedom, are in the process of rapid change. The International can not afford to stand aloof from such an epochal transformation; neither can it betray its democratic principles. The decision taken at Geneva accepts the ambiguity of this situation and does not try to force it to a resolution. Authoritarian "socialist" movements will be sought out for dialogue, discussion and exchange; they will not be invited to join.

Secondly, there is a profound political problem in relating to Third World "socialists." The Middle East is one of the areas of the world which abounds in authoritarians calling themselves socialist. Most, perhaps all, of these groups are publicly committed to the destruction of the homeland of one of the member parties of the International, the Israeli Labor Party. That is totally unacceptable at all times in all places; it was particularly intolerable at this Congress where, in the opinion of many delegates, myself included, the Israelis made it clear that they were willing to make significant concessions to get serious peace negotiations going.

A Mediterranean socialist conference met in Barcelona the same weekend as the Geneva Congress. Organized by two Spanish groups, the Maltese Labor Party (represented in Geneva by its leader, Dom Mintoff) and the Arab Socialist Union of Libya, the Barcelona conference seated a representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

The PLO leader in Barcelona was a member of the minority "Libyan" faction of his organization, but even taking that hard-line bias into account, his words were chilling. As *Le Nouvel Observateur* reported his comment: "We must repatriate all the Jews now living in Palestine to the country of their origin." Clearly, there can be no compromise with such murderous madness—and just as clearly, the International's turn toward

the Third World requires gains in peace negotiations which would give Israel a secure existence guaranteed against such fanaticism.

In a remarkable and well-publicized speech, Helmut Schmidt posed one of the few genuine controversies of the Congress, touching on issues of importance to both developed nations and the Third World. He began with an unassailable point: that only if the Western economies solve their internal problems will they be able—politically and materially—to give aid to the world's poor. But then he added that the current crisis is not at all capitalist in nature since it afflicts Communist, capitalist, social democratic and military dictatorial regimes. The real cause of the world's plight, argued Schmidt, has been inflationary spending—often inflationary spending for public, social purposes.

Schmidt's denial of the capitalist character of the current crisis was, I think, naive. The entire world, including the Communist countries, is part of the capitalist world market. Even more to the point, there is abundant evidence in the United States—it comes from Charles Schultze and Walter Heller, hardly a pair of ultra-leftists—that the impact of federal fiscal policy just prior to all but one post-war recession has been negative and deflationary.

Schmidt's intervention had the excellent effect of stimulating a whole series of criticisms. Bruno Kreisky offered one of the most vigorous. The Austrian Chancellor noted that while he was no left winger in the Congress, he had no hesitation in denouncing the capitalist nature of the current world crisis. One of the most thoughtful responses to Schmidt came from Yarom Peri of the Israeli Labor Party. We are experiencing a breakdown of a mass illusion, Peri said: that effortless growth without any structural redistribution can yield permanent and continuing increases in living standards for everyone. When people discover this is not true any longer, they turn against the party in power and vote for the outs—against the socialists and for the bour-

## Steelworkers' leadership race heats up; Sadlowski may win in upset

by DAVID BENSMAN

Ed Sadlowski, the insurgent, and Lloyd McBride, the administration favorite, are waging a hot contest for the presidency of the Steelworkers union. I. W. Abel, the retiring president stoked the campaign's fire in mid-December when he announced that he would view a Sadlowski victory on February 8 as a repudiation of his own leadership.

Sadlowski's challenge appears serious. Nominations for his slate are pouring in from almost all Big Steel locals from Sparrow Point, Maryland, to Sudbury, Canada. Were the election confined to basic steel, Sadlowski would win.

But McBride enjoys heavy advantages. Most of the International staff is working hard for him gathering hundreds of nominations from small fabricating plants where Sadlowski is unknown. McBride also has strong support in Canada, especially in Quebec,

where loyalty to Director Gran-Lejeune is a major factor, and in the South.

McBride is concentrating on three issues—Sadlowski's alleged radicalism, inexperience, and his support from outsiders like Joe Rauh of the ADA. Syndicated columnists Evans and Novak devoted an entire story to charges that some Sadlowski supporters are Communists. The red-baiting will hurt Sadlowski, especially in small plants where he has little initial support. He is countering with attacks on the Abel record on layoffs, productivity, union democracy, health and safety, grievance handling, and dues.

Aiding the rebel slate is a general swelling of insurgent spirit within the union—more contests for district director are being waged this year than ever before. Thus, while McBride remains the favorite, Sadlowski has a fighting chance.

geois coalition in Sweden, against the Right and for the Union of the Left in France. What the loss of this illusion requires for socialists, Peri concluded, is a rethinking of program, a shift toward more basic and structural transformations of the economy and society.

This brief report does not cover all that went on in Geneva. I hope it does communicate the essentials. There is a new vitality, both organizational and political, in democratic socialism around the world. Our movement faces enormous problems, like the lack of democracy in the Third World and the crisis of capitalism. At Geneva, no one was so foolish as to pretend that we have all the solutions. But almost everyone showed a determination to strike out in new directions. It was, I think, a new beginning for a 112-year-old organization. □

## Socialist women . . .

*(Continued from page 1)*

note sharing of home responsibilities, the Swedes have changed maternity benefits insurance into parenthood benefits insurance. Seven months of benefits, at 90 percent of earnings, are now provided to either parent, and the leave and benefits may be divided between parents if they wish. Working fathers, as well as mothers, also receive benefits when they need to stay home to care for sick children.

Swedish delegates urged women not to put too much faith in the efficacy of laws against inequalities. Instead, they want to organize and politicize women, and apply pressure in the job market, in politics, and in the home.

The conference stressed three main themes, including Peace and Development along with Equality. It was reported that of the 800 million illiterates in the world, 500 million are women, and that in developing areas, especially Asia and Africa, women are far more vulnerable to poverty and starvation than are men.

Economic development by itself, many said, does not result in greater equality; therefore, the problems of poverty and inequality need to be attacked directly. Leopold Senghor, Senegalese President, insisted that the issue of sex equality was more cultural than economic, and that it should be approached through education. Sex equality, several asserted, aids development by permitting women to add their share to cultural and economic progress.

Peace, it would seem, is an issue that mobilizes women as few other issues can. This was confirmed by Maria Soares, wife of the Socialist prime minister and an activist in her own right, who claimed that 80 percent of Portuguese women voted socialist, mainly out of despair with colonial wars and the desire for peace at home and safety for their families.

Participating in the conference and in the International Socialist Congress was a moving experience for me, comparable in its impact to my first encounters with Norman Thomas and with the United Auto Workers. What the Congress did was confirm for me what I had learned from early mentors, that democratic socialism is not only a great idea but a working reality in virtually every free society in the world. □

## Capital quotes

“Several major banks and multinationals are quietly reducing their exposure in France because they fear that a Socialist-Communist coalition may gain control of the French legislature in the elections of 1978. The companies, most of which are on the Left's much-publicized list of nationalization prospects, are moving cash, patents and other assets to foreign subsidiaries and are selling equity in the subsidiaries to foreigners and French citizens living abroad. . . . 'This will make it harder' for the left to carry out nationalization, a top official of the privately held Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas (Paribas) says of the sale of 20 percent of its wholly owned subsidiary in Geneva to Swiss nationals.”

*Business Week*, November 22, 1976

“The expropriation decrees, [Luis Echeverria's expropriation of 74 big farms in his last days as President] confirmed the suspicions of the upper class that the President wanted to push the country decisively into socialism only eleven days before his term ended. In taxis and planes, the Mexican rich brought their money to the safe USA. 'Every day there were hundreds of people coming over the border with plastic bags, suitcases and trunks filled with pesos,' reported Victor M. Rubio, a stockbroker in the border city of Tijuana. In Mexico's great cities, there were long lines in front of the foreign exchange windows at the banks. White collar workers, technicians and small businessmen changed their savings into dollars. 'Something like \$150 million flowed in this way into private pockets,' estimated an American foreign exchange expert in Mexico City, 'and that in only three days.'”

*Der Spiegel*, December 6, 1976

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

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

I'd like to join the DSOC. Enclosed find my dues. (\$50 sustaining; \$15 regular; \$8 limited income. Dues include \$5 for Newsletter.)

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

Name .....

Address .....

City/State ..... Zip .....

# *Jimmy Higgins reports . . .*

**NO WOODCOCK-CARTER RIFT**—UAW President Leonard Woodcock surprised many observers last month when he announced that he would not accept a position in the Carter Administration before his term as UAW president ran out in May. Inevitably, there was speculation of some kind of disagreement between the President-elect and Woodcock, an early Carter supporter. In fact, Woodcock told a friend that there was no question about his getting the appointment as Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, if he wanted it. But he decided to continue in his current post until the UAW convention in May where he faces mandatory retirement. At the same press conference where he announced that he would not accept an appointment before May, Woodcock also announced that he and UAW Secretary-Treasurer Emil Mazey would be meeting with their counterparts in the AFL-CIO, George Meany and Lane Kirkland. Some labor observers speculate that Woodcock, who publicly favors UAW reaffiliation with the AFL-CIO, is staying on to work for that unity. Reaffiliation remains a controversial issue with the Auto Workers. Mazey is on record against re-entry; his position is that nothing has changed since 1968 when Walter Reuther led the union out of the federation. Vice President Irv Bluestone of the powerful General Motors Division shares Mazey's position. In the Woodstock-Mazey-Meany-Kirkland meetings, changes in federation structure and policy were discussed. The UAW executive board will discuss reaffiliation at its next meeting.

**LATE HOLIDAY SHOPPERS** may be interested in a gift suggested by a Dallas department store. For a mere \$2 million an acre, you can have Disney designers construct an amusement park to your specifications.

**COURTING THE RIGHT**—The so-called U.S. Labor Party, always identified in the daily press as a "Marxist" group, has been up to its usual bizarre antics. After delivering

over \$90,000 cash (in paper bags) to NBC for an eleventh hour electoral appeal blatantly supporting the election of Gerald Ford, the group made some unusual alliances to attempt to overturn the election results. In Ohio, the Labor Party joined the Republicans and the racist American Independent Party in a court suit to overturn the election; in New York, the Labor Party and the Conservatives filed; in Wisconsin, the Labor Party was the only group to file on time for a suit overturning the results, so the Republican National Committee voted to support that effort financially. How do these "Marxists" finance all this activity? Where does \$90,000 in paper bags come from? Very good, unanswered questions.

**IN CASE YOU WERE CURIOUS**, Eugene McCarthy polled 745,042 votes in the Presidential election; in four states he played a "spoiler" role, garnering more votes in states Ford carried than the difference between the two major party candidates (the states: Iowa, Maine, Oklahoma and Oregon). Counting McCarthy as a left-wing candidate (and whatever his own gyrations toward the Right since the election, most of his voters were undoubtedly liberal), minor candidates of the Left outpolled minor candidates of the Right for the first time since 1952. Other Left candidates and their totals: Peter Camejo of the Socialist Workers Party collected 90,109 votes; Gus Hall, the Communist candidate, received 58,689; Margaret Wright of the People's Party got 48,981; Julius Levin of the Socialist Labor Party 9,265; Frank Zeidler of the Socialist Party 5,991. The leading splinter parties of the Right did better: Roger McBride of the Libertarian Party won 183,187 votes; Lester Maddox as the American Party candidate got 170,673 and American Independent Party candidate Anderson got 153,009. The Prohibitionists got 16,228 votes, and Lyndon Larouche, candidate of the right wing U.S. Labor Party got 40,008.

---

**NEWSLETTER OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEFT**  
853 Broadway, Room 617  
New York, N.Y. 10003

**APPLICATION TO MAIL AT SECOND CLASS POSTAGE  
RATES PENDING AT NEW YORK, NEW YORK.**