

# DEMOCRATS

## Radicals Roar While Wallace Waits

Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University, is the author of several best-selling books, including *Communist Revolution In The Streets*; *Nixon's Palace Guard*; *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*; and, *Richard Nixon: The Man Behind The Mask*, the definitive study of the ambition and conspiratorial activities of our recent President. Mr. Allen, a former instructor of history and English, is active in numerous humanitarian, anti-Communist, and business enterprises. A film writer, author, and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to AMERICAN OPINION.

■ IT WAS five a.m. when your reporter got off T.W.A.'s red-eye special from Los Angeles to attend the Democrats' mini-convention in Kansas City. Only a misanthrope like the managing editor of this magazine would send a native of Southern California to cover a story in Kansas City in December. The editor hates me, I thought. He is seeking revenge for all the times I missed my deadline, and for the time I failed to get that interview with the little, green man from the flying saucer.

The sun had still not risen in Kansas City when I walked from the airport terminal, but things would soon get worse. Allowing for the "chill factor," the temperature was something like fifteen degrees. Even the birds had displayed the good sense to flee south for the winter. A delegate to the convention who was waiting for a taxi with me remarked through chattering teeth: "Leave it to the Democrats to go to Miami in August and to Kansas City in December." It was one of the most

intelligent complaints I was to hear for the next three days.

Except for the atrocious weather, Kansas City is an ideal spot for a convention. It is halfway from everywhere and the local hotels are clustered together so that you can stand in the middle of a four-block area and hit all of them with a rock. They vary from ultra-modern to early Pleistocene. I won't tell you at which one I stayed, but all I could get on my television set was "The Flintstones." And it wasn't a cartoon. My room was so musty that I sensed it had not been occupied for some time. This suspicion was confirmed when I discovered a match book bearing the message "Tippecanoe And Tyler Too!"

I had covered several Republican Conventions for AMERICAN OPINION, but this was my first experience with the Democrats. I set out for the convention hall with the trepidation of a maiden missionary from the Boston Bible Society about to begin a career in the Congo. Would I be boiled for dinner by the A.D.A.? Would my head wind up as an amulet around the neck of a Gay Militant? My imagination conjured up a hundred such dangers, some of which actually turned out to be exaggerations.

Probably at no time or place in history has there been a political party so (let us say) *diversified* as the current Democrats. The same party contains everything from antebellum Mississippi planters to certified Bolsheviks in search of an orphanage to burn to the ground. Still, about one-third of the delegates in Kansas City appeared to be absolutely normal. The convention floor was different from a



G.O.P. convention in that there were more blacks, many of them appearing sleekly middle-class, but others cloaked in pseudo-African garb and adorned with every jungle affectation short of bones in their noses. And of course there were the hippie types, and others who looked like Thomas Nast caricatures of immigrant bomb throwers. Naturally all of these motley Democrats were in a gleeful mood following the November death dance of the elephants. They knew that the only thing they have to fear is their fearsome selves.

As one expects of such partisan gatherings, the affair was a carnival of bunkum, a three-day orgy of baloney. There was more than the usual amount of gas about the saintliness of Democrats and the wickedness of Republicans, with great emphasis on the deposed President and his cronies. Political conventions are really great fun.

I guess that, like the rubbernecks who come from Haytown to Hollywood looking for movie stars, we all like to see famous people. I checked to make certain there was no straw in my cuffs as, an anti-monarchist, I wandered among the kings and would-be kings.\* The radical celebrities were everywhere and you could get close enough to them to smell the ambition on their breath. Some were quickly recognizable, others had the sort of familiar, grinning faces that keep you trying to remember the names. Last year's governor, a senator defeated in 1968, a McGovern campaign spokesman.

I stood near Senator "Scoop" Jackson as he shook hands with every two-legged being he could catch. On Saturday I almost ran into Hubert Humphrey as he and his retinue came trotting up the steps of the Kansas City Convention Center, which was constructed as a W.P.A. project in 1933. As usual, Hubert's mouth was running. Across the street at the

Holiday Inn I hopped into an elevator and looked up to find myself living out every Conservative's fondest daydream — I was face to face with Walter Cronkite. My mind began racing for the perfect cutting remark. At last one of us could talk back to Cronkite! But my mouth was just opening when he got off the elevator.

I was thinking that I would not be unprepared should such an opportunity arise again as I popped out of the press gallery and saw a line of people walking down the hall at a fast clip. There he was, Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Teddy Clothed, hero of Chappaquiddick.

The Senator was surrounded by three security officers and two dozen reporters yelping at his feet like starving dogs. They were all trying to ask questions, and all were doing it as if supplicants addressing the chief resident of Mount Olympus. Occasionally the grinning Senator would stop for a minute to answer the question of some devout sycophant from a major newspaper, pointedly ignoring the rest of the peasants. I tried to ask him whether he preferred the Australian crawl or the breast stroke, but he ignored the question. The other reporters looked at me as if I had just asked Billy Graham for the name of his bootlegger. At last we reached a partition closing off most of the hallway and Senator Kennedy slipped away, waving to us and smiling.

It did seem ludicrous that the crowd at the convention treated Edward Kennedy with the reverence normally reserved for a saint even as Richard Nixon was attacked for immorality in virtually every speech. The very mention of the former President would send the crowd into paroxysms of hatred. But, bad as Nixon was, he never let anyone down. I repeatedly asked the delegates why the double standard, and the typical answer was that Kennedy came from a distinguished family which had endured much tragedy while Nixon was a cynical opportunist who tried to establish a dictatorship.

Well, they were half right.

\*My attempts to appear sophisticated are not always successful. From Kansas City I journeyed to New York, where my pocket was promptly picked. Somebody seen me comin'.





Senator George McGovern



Senator Gale McGee



Speaking of the last Democrat convention, Governor George Wallace said, "If I ever wanted to go insane I would have done it at Miami. Nobody would have noticed one more maniac." The Democrat mini-convention in Kansas City was equally a carnival of bunkum. The kooks that descended upon the frozen city at the foot of the plains, most as delegates, ranged from black militants to gay leafleteers (below). Senator George McGovern was naturally cheered wildly in such company and lectured the 2,000 delegates on economics. He told the convention that the enemy is business: "We cannot serve both the people and the exploiters," he declared. The *Wall Street Journal* said of the Democrat convention's eight-point economic program that it "could only have been conceived by a committee of party hacks sitting around trying to imagine what Franklin Roosevelt, John Maynard Keynes and Henry Wallace might have proposed." Senator Gale McGee of Wyoming presented the party's international policy, announcing that the Democrat consensus is that America's interests do not come first since "our true nationality is mankind." He proposed a sort of worldwide War on Poverty. This would be supplied, according to an official report, by "reducing consumption of energy and foods" in the United States.





## Practical Politics

The extravaganza taking place before my eyes was the largest political assembly ever held by a major party in a year between Presidential elections. It also marked the first time in nearly two hundred years of U.S. history that a major political body had moved to incorporate itself under a permanent constitution as a national party. The two thousand delegates had come to the "1974 Conference on Democratic Party Organization and Policy" to approve a Party Charter. And a number of Presidential hopefuls were there to do some politicking and delegate hunting for 1976.

The roots of the mini-convention went back to 1964, when repeated challenges to the credentials of whole delegations rocked the national nominating convention. In 1968, there were further disputes and the convention made a foolish concession to the "reformers" by creating a commission to set up new rules for delegate selection in 1972. The Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection was originally led by Senator George McGovern. The McGovern group drew up new rules which greatly strengthened the national Democratic Party at the expense of the state parties, and which (coincidentally) allowed McGovern to obtain the nomination. It established a quota system to be forced upon state delegations, in which each was to have so many blacks, so many women, so many homosexuals, so many violin players from Bratislava, *etc.*

These "reforms" produced the memorable Miami convention of 1972, which handed the election to Richard Nixon on a pink platter. Governor George Wallace cracked of that convention: "If I ever wanted to go insane, I would have done it at Miami. Nobody would have noticed one more maniac."

In 1968 the Democratic National Convention was thirteen percent women and six percent "minority." In 1972 it was forty percent women and twenty percent

"minority." Most of these new delegates were proponents of the so-called "New Politics," which was so radical it frightened even the labor union "Liberals." Nine out of ten delegates at Miami had never before attended a National Convention, and what they did there produced disaster.

After the monumental McGovern debacle, the Democrats set about writing a charter that their leaders believed would be fair. A special commission was well along with a draft for the mini-convention when it ran into trouble in August over the role of minorities. Charging that organized labor and party regulars were out to return control to the bosses, a contingent of blacks and white "Liberals" stormed out of a commission meeting. Willie Brown, a radical Assemblyman from San Francisco, declared: "This is the nail that closes the coffin on the charter commission."

To prevent a blowup in Kansas City, the Democratic leadership seized upon a compromise by approving a vaguely worded document that recommended abolishing mandatory quotas in favor of "Affirmative Action" intended "to encourage full participation by all Democrats, with particular concern for minority groups, native Americans [*Indians*], women and youth in the delegate selection process and in all party affairs."

So the Democrats congregated in Kansas City to approve a Charter, the chief issue being to define the deliberately cloudy term "Affirmative Action." Party Chairman Robert Strauss had sagaciously scheduled the convention after the 1974 mid-term elections, but though high on victory most Democrats came to Kansas City as if carrying nitroglycerin in their carpetbags. "Come to Kansas City," a top Democrat urged a political reporter. "You'll see all your old friends there . . . at each other's throats." As good as things looked for the party, its leaders were well aware that it could self-destruct at any moment.



"Come to Kansas City," a top Democrat urged a political reporter. "You'll see all your old friends . . . at each other's throats." The Gallup Poll showed Governor George Wallace (above chatting with Contributing Editor Gary Allen) leading all likely Democratic contenders for the Presidential nomination. But Senator Edward Kennedy (below) was keeping his oar in. He was idolized by a sycophantic press and hordes of the same delegates who repeatedly took pleasure in booing Richard Nixon for immorality. But the Wallace staff thinks 1976 may be their year. In 1972 they began building computer lists of Wallace supporters nationwide and now have the names and addresses of some three million Wallace workers and activists. The list will be a major factor in fund raising and getting partisans of the Alabama Governor to meetings for selection of national delegates.



U.P.I.



The delegates broke down into roughly three categories. The first group was composed of the "New Politics" groups which had seized the party in 1972. Field marshal for these radical elements was Alan Baron of the Democratic Study Group. According to the *Kansas City Star*, Baron was bankrolled by "Beverly Hills and Manhattan millionaires."

The middle-of-the-road group (comparatively) was the Coalition for a Democratic Majority, composed of George Meany's A.F.L.-C.I.O. contingent and its allies. These are the party "regulars" from the eras of the New Deal, Fair Deal, Square Deal, New Frontier, and Great Society. At one time they represented the radical Left within the Democratic Party, but the farther shores of "Liberalism" have been explored and the avant-garde has gone into outer space. The radical of the Fifties is now considered part of the stodgy "Old Guard," and yesterday's "Liberals" are locked in a struggle with the "New Politics" people for control of the party.

Representing the broad middle of the political spectrum was the brave little band of Wallace supporters, said by the seers of the mass media to have numbered a miniscule two percent. There were more of them than that. The Wallace people discovered that they could count on about ten percent of the delegates, but the Governor's organization had not made a major move to send its people as delegates to the convention. One major reason was that the Charter being adopted would not take effect until 1980, the ground rules for 1976 having already been adopted.

It was difficult for your reporter personally to assess the Wallace strength at the mini-convention since the Wallace people were consciously maintaining a low profile. The "Liberals" expected the Wallace group to act as "spoilers" and try to disrupt the meeting; instead, they bit their tongues and watched a spectacle the

outcome of which they knew they could not alter.

Leader of the Wallace forces was Houston lawyer Hall Timanus. Asked what he didn't like about the proposed charter, he replied: "Practically everything." Attorney Timanus is especially concerned about centralized control. "The Democratic Party has been a loose confederation of state parties," he declared, "and that is what it should continue to be." Hall Timanus believes that what the militants want ultimately is a professional party controlled from Washington, complete with loyalty oaths and the ability to dominate local party affairs right down to the precinct level.

So the New Left had come to Kansas City to fight *for* quotas. The party regulars had come to fight *against* quotas because they weaken the influence of the A.F.L.-C.I.O. within the party. And the Wallace contingent had come with ear and nose plugs, not wishing to be there in the first place.

The party ideologues wanted to sink their fangs into the bloody issues of the day, but Chairman Robert Strauss was afraid that if issues were debated on the floor the convention would never get around to approval of a Charter. As a sop to the "activist reformers," it was decided to allow caucuses to meet and discuss issues throughout Friday, December sixth, and then permit them to report to the delegates on Sunday. This would allow Saturday for hammering out the Party Charter and avoid the bloodshed of a floor debate on issues. Under pressure, however, Mr. Strauss made one exception and allowed the entire convention formally to consider a solution to the problems of the economy.

### **Economic Profundities**

Before a report on the economy was read for consideration by the assembled multitudes on Saturday, the platform was turned over for an address on economic profundities by Senator George McGov-



ern. His reception was tumultuous. It was obvious that despite the catastrophe at the polls in November, 1972, the hearts of the Democratic activists still belong to George. To the "true believer" within the Democratic Party, Saint George is still a dragon killer, possessed of the same sort of loser charisma that causes many a Republican to yearn for a return to the days of AuH<sub>2</sub>O.

The Senator from the Ukraine had cooled his radical rhetoric long enough to get re-elected, but was now once again calling for everything short of throwing bombs. He implored his comrades to "take political risks and adopt unpopular positions" to solve the nation's economic problems. And he made it clear that the enemy is American business. "We cannot serve both the people and the exploiters," he ranted. "On this issue there can be no compromise," he trilled, calling for a fight "to return the economy to the people." You see, McGovern continued, "We must democratize our economy, so the buyer will not always have to beware of shoddy products and swollen prices. And beyond that we must democratize the workplace so those who labor will have a say in management and a share of the profits."

What McGovern was saying is that if you build up a business, and give me a job, I am entitled to tell you how to run your business and claim a share of your profits whether you wish to share them or not. Of course, you can read statements like that every day in the *Daily World*, but George McGovern is much prettier than Gus Hall.

This was the preparatory oratory to the report on the economy! And let me level with you. I've been around the block ideologically. I've read and heard many a Marxist diatribe. I even attended the "New Politics" convention in Chicago in 1966. But never have I had a more chilling experience than listening to the Democrats in Kansas City discuss the economy. Unlike the "New Politics"

zanies of 1966, the Democrats now are running the country with a veto-proof Congress. And in all sincerity I tell you that there is more collective economic expertise at the San Diego Zoo. Any chimpanzee knows more about economics than the leaders of the Democratic Party who spoke in Kansas City. Even a retarded chimpanzee.

Ignorance is one thing, hypocrisy another. What makes the Democrat stand on the economy so incredibly hypocritical is that it is the Democrat theories taken from John Maynard Keynes, the homosexual Socialist economist, that have dominated government policy for over three decades. The Republicans, ironically, are knee deep in economic disaster exactly to the extent that they adopted the Keynesian policies of the Democrats instead of repudiating them as they have repeatedly promised to do. The Democrats' program for curing the economy is a not-so-instant replay of F.D.R.'s 1930 crackpot theories for ending the Depression. And it is hard to forget that when they didn't work a war was engineered. It may not be just a coincidence that Henry Kissinger is, as I write, discussing the possibilities of American military intervention in the Middle East.

The *Wall Street Journal* of December 10, 1974, commented acidly on the Democrats' eight-point economic program:

*We assume that those who drafted the program intended for it to be taken seriously as a blueprint for national policy, by the economically literate as well as the economically illiterate. But we can find very little that anyone could take seriously, other than out of a sense of horror that a national party in 1974 would merely resurrect the discredited panaceas of the 1930s. The program could only have been conceived by a committee of party hacks sitting around trying to*



*imagine what Franklin Roosevelt, John Maynard Keynes and Henry Wallace might have proposed.*

Among the recommendations conceived in that economic séance is a public service jobs program in which the unemployed worker would not even have to look for a job in the private sector before becoming eligible for a government desk.

"To assist faltering business," the Democrats said they would revive the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to "the deserving" — getting the cash from the money markets, and thereby making scarce capital more scarce and forcing more and more companies to go broke or crawl to the new R.F.C.

Naturally, the Democrats want to close the wicked "tax loopholes" which still permit the entrepreneur to make a profit, providing what little incentive there is for investment in an overtaxed economy. And never mind that it is investment which buys the capital goods that create jobs and increase production.

To fight inflation, the Democrats reached back to World War II, with a few creative twists, declaring: "We support an across-the-board system of economic controls, including prices, wages, executive compensations, profits and rents. Provision should be made for wage catch-up and price rollbacks." And to insure that the controls are administered "equitably," the report says authority should not be given to the Republican President, but to a special council managed by Congress, which would vest it with "whatever monitoring and enforcement procedures are necessary." Many also advocated permanent wage, price, and profit controls, as well as the rationing of gasoline.

With the controls they advocate, we would soon have rationing of everything except bureaucrats.

The big Democrat push is going to be to celebrate the bicentennial by the passage of an "Economic Bill of Rights" which would certainly require repeal of

the first ten Amendments to the Constitution. This package is still in the discussion stage, but it makes George McGovern's proposal to give every American a thousand dollars look like a masterpiece of political economy. The Economic Bill of Rights would guarantee an annual income even to those who refuse to work; it would guarantee taxpayer-financed medical care, legal services, housing, food, and almost anything else you can think of that somebody might like. What the Democrats seriously proposed is the fusion of a total Welfare State on top of a totally controlled economy. If they get it, you can kiss both freedom and prosperity goodbye.

I asked a number of the delegates at the convention how their Economic Bill of Rights could be financed. Wouldn't these programs require an astronomical increase in government spending, greatly increasing our taxes? No problem, I was invariably informed, we would simply close the tax loopholes for the rich. I didn't have the heart to tell them that if you confiscated all of the income of all Americans earning over fifty thousand dollars a year, you would raise only enough money to run the government for about four days.

The only other alternative one heard for financing this greatly increased Socialism was to slash the Defense budget and apply the "savings" to "human needs." A delegate named Vince Copeland was passing out flyers denouncing the Defense budget as "the trillion-dollar rathole." If we hadn't wasted all that money on defending ourselves we "could have eliminated every slum in every city and town in the United States. It could have supplied a new \$15,000 home or apartment for each of half of all the families in the United States." Copeland went on to explain that we could have built a thousand new colleges and given free college educations to millions of students. He continued:

*(Continued on page sixty-five.)*



## DEMOCRATS

*We could build ten thousand youth centers throughout the country at a cost of a million apiece, where young people could play games, dance, and get away from their parents. This would come to another ten billion.*

*And we could schedule every band in the country to play in them for a couple of billion more.*

*Another twenty billion could depollute the Great Lakes and ten billion more would freshen up every river and stream on the continent. The birds would fly again and the fish would leap up at your line.*

*A billion trees could be planted along highways and byways in cities, towns, and countryside. New patches of woods could be planted in many places, with new homes for chipmunks, raccoons, rabbits, and deer.*

Delegate Copeland goes on and on and on, but you get the picture. All you have to do is eliminate the ninety billion dollars we spend for Defense and all kinds of wonderful things could be done. So big deal. If you didn't have to make your house payment every month you could drive a better car. Such is the world of reality among Democrat activists.

The Defense budget is everybody's favorite whipping boy because, as in everything run entirely by government, there is lots of waste. But most of the Defense budget is already pre-allocated to meet payrolls and veterans' benefits. The colonels won't take a pay cut, so the only effective way to slash the Defense budget is to cut out hardware. The usual result is that instead of paring fat the scalpel is taken to muscle and we lose research and development on vital weapons systems.

The Democrat program presented in Kansas City is Socialism, pure and simple. But because it stops short of outright seizure of business, choosing instead to tax it and regulate it to death, some of the delegates were unhappy. Michael Harrington, a delegate from New York and national chairman of the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee, declared:

*... I wish I could say that the Democratic Party and the American people were ready for a genuine socialist program. But politically that is not the case, and America remains the only industrially advanced democracy with no mass socialist movement.*

*So, I will not urge the Democratic Party to embrace democratic socialism in 1974. That proposal is premature given current political realities and the view of most Americans. But I will show that radical reforms transcending the New Deal and moving in a socialist direction, offer the only pragmatic possibility of solving the crisis we find ourselves in. And I will not hide the fact that I am convinced that if the Democratic Party leads the American people in this direction, then it will become apparent that we need a systematic alternative to the economic and political domination of corporate power — that we need democratic socialism.*

The Democrat hierarchy is nonetheless moving toward Socialism at a vigorous pace. Which is why it decided to break inflation by passing laws against it. Wage, price, and profit controls (combined with energy and other forms of rationing) are being counted upon by the Democrat leadership as the best means to corral the inflation monster. None who spoke at Kansas City advocated reducing government spending or balancing the Budget. Quite the opposite. The Democrats de-



clared in their formal report called "Managing The National Economy" that "the inflation with which we are saddled is not due primarily to government expenditures. It is obviously not caused by excess demand for goods and services. Our present inflation was set off by rapid increases in oil prices, by crop failures that drove food prices up and by other international developments largely beyond our control."

One blushes at such naked nonsense. Anyone who knows a supply and demand curve from a rainbow can tell you that the current wage-price spiral was kicked off by Lyndon Johnson's "guns and butter" policies during the Vietnam War, in which both the welfare and warfare states were expanded without raising taxes to pay for the huge increases in spending. The Johnson Budgets were soon awash in red ink. The borrowings were largely financed by selling government bonds to banking institutions which in turn deposited them in their reserve accounts with the Federal Reserve System as the base for making additional loans. Thus was our money supply inflated to serious proportions.

When Richard Nixon succeeded Lyndon Johnson, there was a lot of lip service about balancing the Budget and putting the economy back on a normal course, but it was only talk. There was no way to cure the distortions caused by President Johnson's "guns and butter" policy without bringing on a politically disastrous recession and economic readjustment . . . which would have jeopardized Richard Nixon's chances for reelection in 1972. So the Wizard of Watergate declared himself a Keynesian and began running Budget deficits himself — deficits which made those of the Johnson years look puny by comparison. Among the legacies of Richard Nixon is the fact that government expenditures jumped from \$179 billion to \$300+ billion during his abbreviated tenure, and the National Debt was escalated by \$120 billion.

Yet the Democrats formally reported that "the inflation with which we are saddled is not due primarily to government expenditures."

Sure, and floods are not caused by too much water.

The huge government deficits started under the Democrats in 1965 and were continued under the Republicans. The carefully contrived oil crisis did not arrive until 1973. The energy crunch, massive export of our crops, and greatly increased federal regulation have simply made a bad situation worse.

### The New World Order

The Democrat policy reports from the other convention committees came on Sunday. One of the most important was presented by Senator Gale McGee of Wyoming concerning "America's Role In The International System." McGee is a superb orator whose towering forensic style guards a mind of pure putty. Perhaps that is unfair. After all, he was presenting the formal foreign policy proposals of the great Democrat Party. The Senator began as follows:

*Long ago, H.G. Wells observed that "our true nationality is mankind." There isn't a simpler statement which could more adequately summarize the consensus of both the delegates and panelists who participated in the hearings on the American role in the international system. Never before in the history of mankind has the interdependence of people and nations been so obvious.*

I stifled a wave of nausea as McGee continued. It seems that our problems with the Communists, which were probably our own fault, have been driven away by *détente*. The Senator reported:

*The focal point of our foreign policy, up until now, has been on*



the political and diplomatic fronts of the Cold War. Yet, the newer international economic issues of energy, poverty, and inflation have replaced the older Cold War issues and approaches in world priorities. There was agreement that while it is necessary to hold the power-political structure of the world together, this structure cannot be maintained if we do not respond effectively to human needs and aspirations.

The Cold War was epitomized by the use of geopolitical tools of the diplomat. With economic issues, there must be large-scale institutional cooperation and international collaboration . . . . Thus, as the Democratic Party continues the process of formulating viable policies to deal with inflation, unemployment, environmental pollution, urban and rural problems, this exercise becomes totally irrelevant if not taken within a global context. The domestic problems, and their resolution, are directly tied to the vagaries of an international economic system which is presently undergoing rapid and, oftentimes, frightening changes.

What the Democrats said they want is a sort of worldwide War on Poverty paid for by the United States. It is a scheme which adds up to wrecking and looting our economy as a means of achieving parity with our brothers of the New World Order. According to Senator McGee's report:

*It was evident the delegates were cognizant of the world's problems and eager to participate in their resolution. It was equally evident that while there may be a growing isolationism within the United States as a whole, this attitude certainly was not reflected in the desires of the grassroots Democrats*

*represented at the hearing. However, what was emphasized by these delegates was the need for a strong U.S. commitment to the world's poor in both economic development and food assistance. In assessing past U.S. policies, the delegates expressed their concern that the spread between the proportion of our resources allocated to military and non-military economic assistance activities be narrowed.*

From discussing foreign policy with the delegates it is very clear to your reporter that they wanted to keep America from being entangled in any more foreign wars like Vietnam. That is, they wanted to keep us out of *most* foreign wars. Delegates regularly grimaced when we asked if we should commit troops to protect Israel and keep it from being overrun by the Arabs. It was almost like pushing a button on a tape recorder as they offered nearly identical answers. First, they would become very grave and tell me how much they object to sending American soldiers into foreign wars. Then would come the but . . . and the explanation that after all (cough, cough) Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East and we must defend it at all cost. When your reporter asked why, they became very flustered. Asked if the survival of the United States should be laid on the line to save Israel, delegates often began to stand first on one leg and then on the other.

The one thing for which the Democrats hailed the Republicans was their establishment of a "friendly" relationship with the Communists. Under the heading of "Détente" Senator McGee reported: "There was unanimous support for détente with the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, following as it did the many confrontations and crises of the post-war years. The delegates called for closer ties and broader international cooperation with both nations on a wide range of questions."



## Other Formal Positions

The reports soon moved on to "Law Observance And Law Enforcement." That committee got down to the nitty-gritty of the *real* causes of crime, contending "that to maintain the fundamental order of our society, we must address equally with the criminal justice issue, the issues of unemployment, poverty, racism, poor housing, and the lack of meaningful educational opportunity." And while petting the criminals, we must disarm the honest citizenry. Here the formal policy of the Democratic Party declares:

*We must give major attention to the relationship of incidence of crime and the prevalence of hand guns in society; and greater consideration must be given through national and state legislation to the control of hand guns.*

There were more fun and games ahead with the report on "Federal Power And State And Local Government." The cry was for more money, and the report begins:

*Although there was naturally some disagreement among the various levels of local government — cities, counties and suburban communities — with respect to the distribution of financial resources, there was an overwhelming consensus that the local governments were like hungry dogs fighting over bare bones while the Pentagon was living high on the hog.*

*There was general agreement that our social defense is as important to the national security as our military defense. If the fourteen billion dollars in annual appropriations is gold plating and can be squeezed out of the Pentagon budget, there would be adequate financing to meet the domestic service programs of our local government.*

Got that? First we abolish our Armed Forces, and then with the money we save . . . .

And, as one would expect, there was a formal demand for more centralization of authority and a reduction of local control through Metro Government. Quoth the Democrats:

*We also agreed that we needed a more rational method of determining which level of government could deal most effectively with such programs as transportation, pollution control and land use. Furthermore, there are too many units of local government, and regional solutions are required in many instances.*

No policy meeting of the radicals who have been dominating the Democrat Party would be complete without a few hundred well chosen words about ecology. What it all boils down to is that we have too high a standard of living. But don't worry, the Democrats will take care of that! According to their official policy statement:

*Quality of life in America does not depend on opulent over-consumption. In fact, as we over-consume, we threaten the integrity of our natural environment, an important element in our quality of life. We must immediately revise our values in this regard . . . .*

*An energy resources policy board should be created at a national level with strong participation by the States to develop details of future energy policy. By reducing consumption of energy and foods, this policy should enable America to avoid periodic crises and, at the same time, assure our people of a continued high quality of life but not a wasteful standard of living.*



Did you read that carefully? The great Democratic Party is calling on government to *reduce* the fuel and food we use. It is openly declaring that government should reduce our standard of living. So much for the way those currently in control of the Democratic Party think. Their positions are instructive and should give us a clue to which way the Congress will go in the next two years.

### Control Of The Party

As you will recall, the primary reason for the meeting of the clan at Kansas City was to write a Party Charter. It was all pretty much of a lovefest so far as the image presented to the public was concerned. All the excitement was contained behind the scenes. As Chairman Robert Strauss sent the Democrats waltzing home he proclaimed a new-found "unity" and "harmony" within the Party. But it was only a facade. We were told as the convention terminated that the McGovernites of the "New Politics" movement and the bosses of Big Labor had buried their hatchets. This was true, but they buried them in each other's backs.

The pivotal issue, as expected, was over "Affirmative Action," otherwise known as "quotas." As you will recall, the "Affirmative Action" clause of the Charter had been suggested as a compromise between those who wanted specific quotas and those who opposed quotas altogether. "Affirmative Action" was just nebulous enough so that both sides could save face and go back to their supporters claiming a victory. But, once the convention began, black leaders demanded that the new language forbidding quotas be dropped from the "Affirmative Action" clause of the Charter.

The argument was not just academic as the wording affected whether state delegations to Presidential nominating conventions could be challenged because of their racial or sexual composition. The phrase the radicals wanted to eliminate stated: "... composition alone shall not

constitute *prima facie* evidence of discrimination, nor shall it shift the burden of proof to the challenged party."

The "black caucus" contingency, led by radical California Assemblyman Willie L. Brown, argued that this phrasing would make it extremely difficult for blacks to challenge convention delegations they believed discriminated in favor of whites. But, countered the party regulars, to strike that language would be to reestablish a *de facto* quota system. During the past ten years militants have learned how you deal with sticky wickets: They simply threatened to take the fight out of the back rooms — in this case a trailer just off the convention floor — and stage a walkout in front of the television cameras. Now Bob Strauss really had his nose in a crack. He was in the unhappy position of trying to keep Big Labor happy and at the same time appease the black and white militants.

According to a Strauss aide, the threat of a walkout came up at a meeting between the chairman and black leaders on Friday night. The aide said Strauss talked tough. He reportedly told the blacks that they did not have the votes to win on the issue and added: "If you want to walk, you can go out the same way you came in." The chairman's aide contended that Strauss later softened his position because some of the Democratic governors were unwilling to back him up in resisting the black demands. So Bob Strauss did what any good "Liberal" does when he is challenged. He surrendered to the most vociferous bully. It was the Bolsheviks versus the Mensheviks, and the Bolsheviks won.

Organized labor was aghast. Ben Watenberg, head of the Coalition for a Democratic Majority, declared: "First Strauss insists it's impossible to change one word of what was originally agreed on without it falling apart. Then all of a sudden it turns out he can largely rewrite that agreement for these rambunctious 'new politics' elements. This abrupt shift



is very strange and disturbing." Congressman Frank Annunzio of Illinois observed sarcastically:

*The blacks have a caucus; the Latinos have a caucus; everybody has a caucus. But what about an Irish caucus; an Italian caucus; a Jewish caucus? You never hear of those. So let's cut out this caucus \*\*\*\*\* What about being just Democrats? I say if anyone wants to walk out, let 'em go and to hell with 'em.*

One state chairman, who had been deeply involved in the Charter drafting, pounded his fist against a railing in frustration: "It's awful. It means that a minority — and I mean a numerical minority — has bludgeoned the party into doing something against its own interest." The man was crimson. "We've been screwed," he told the New York State Chairman-elect Patrick Cunningham. Pat looked over the change and declared: "Yeah, you're right, we've been screwed."

The long-term implications of the great Kansas City surrender are important. It means that the most radical elements within the Democratic Party have, at the minimum, a veto over party policy and actions. At the Democrat National Convention in 1976 the tail will wag the dog, just as it did in Miami. The power and influence of organized labor within the party is diminished. There is a delegation quota for everyone except the unions. It is doubtful that the C.O.P.E. gang has any objection to the extremism of the "New Politics" brigade, but they have to be concerned about keeping their own power over the millions of middle-class, white workmen who make up the rank and file of union membership. With the Democratic Party in the hands of

black militants and white radicals, the great middle class that is the party backbone could defect by the millions.

### The Wallace Factor

And the man to whom they would be most likely to defect is George Wallace. Governor Wallace is the unknown factor; the big question mark. His philosophy is known to be very close to that of the rank-and-file voters and virtually the antithesis of the party activists at Kansas City. Both the "New Politics" radicals and the Big Labor regulars wish that George Wallace were just a figment of their imagination, a bad dream that would disappear with the dawn. But Wallace is not *about* to disappear.

Governor Wallace was at Kansas City, encamped with his staff on the twenty-seventh floor of the Holiday Inn, across the street from the convention hall. While other Presidential hopefuls were throwing extravagant cocktail parties and doing everything but put on clown suits to attract attention, the dignified Governor of Alabama remained in his room greeting the constant stream of well wishers and media men. I kidded him that he was in the West Berlin Suite, an island of freedom in a sea of Socialists.

Heightening the Governor's impact at Kansas City was the fact that the Gallup Poll released that week showed he was the first choice of Democrat voters over all thirty-one potential candidates. Since Wallace would also run well with independents, he is a near certain winner if he can get his own party's nomination.\*

Governor Wallace has a number of things going for him in 1976 that he did not previously have. One of the most important is "respectability," something the media moguls finally granted at an incredible price. As the *Miami Herald* observes:

*Several factors outside Wallace's control have worked in his favor. First was McGovern's crushing de-*

\*Isn't it strange that this argument has been used by the Left to sell Rockefeller since 1960, but is never voiced by the mass media about Wallace?



feat. Shortly after the 1972 presidential election, Democratic leaders began to show up in Montgomery, pleading with Wallace to keep his conservative following in the Party.

Next, Wallace began to take on a new shade of "respectability" that he had never been able to command before. He appeared with Senator Edward Kennedy, Democratic Party Chairman Robert Strauss, then the President and the Vice President.

But, more importantly, the attempt on his life in 1972 that ended Wallace's third presidential campaign and took away his ability to walk softened Wallace's image.

He is no longer the radical red-neck from South Alabama, but instead, he has taken on, to many, the proportions of a heroic figure.

Another major factor is that the Wallace team has learned a great deal from past campaigns and is now a shrewd and experienced unit. At the beginning of 1974, they made a risky decision which has paid big dividends. In debt \$250,000 from the 1972 campaign, the Wallace forces decided to launch a major mailing campaign to raise funds and at the same time gather great lists of supporters. If the response had not been good, the Wallace Campaign would have been finished. Wallace headquarters mailed more than nine million pieces of campaign literature and raised two million dollars. The money was used to pay off past debts and to make more mailings. The Wallace team ended the year with a list of three million committed supporters — two million more than the famous list that was compiled for the McGovern campaign in 1972.

This list is incredibly valuable for several reasons. First, none of the other aspirants for the Democrat nomination have anything like it. Second, with the new federal laws on campaign spending

and fund raising which went into effect January 1, 1975, no other candidate can afford to spend the necessary money to develop such a list of supporters. Since the "fat cats" are now prohibited from making contributions of more than one thousand dollars, the candidates must raise funds from small donors. Historically, only Barry Goldwater and George Wallace have been able to attract large numbers of two-dollar bettors. So the Governor is in a more favorable position to raise campaign money for 1976 than any other potential candidate. He has that list of three million supporters.

The supporter list is valuable for things other than raising campaign funds. About half the states do not have Presidential primaries. In these states delegates to the national Presidential nominating convention are chosen at local party meetings, which means that in the past Wallace has been wiped out because, outside the South, the Wallace supporter is not usually a Democratic Party activist. The Party has been controlled more often by anti-Wallace people simply because the Governor's supporters had no local leadership, or what leadership existed had no way of contacting large numbers of local sympathizers and getting them to party meetings. Now Montgomery has the list of three million supporters computerized by zip code. When the Democratic Party, say, of East Elephant Breath, Wyoming, is ready to meet to pick delegates, Wallace headquarters can mail instructions to all supporters in that area to go to the V.F.W. Hall in East Elephant Breath on Tuesday, May ninth, at eight p.m.

This time around, the Wallace supporters will have an equal chance at controlling the party machinery at the local level.

Governor Wallace is also a major beneficiary of the abolition of the winner-take-all primary system which was long employed in many states. Under the winner-take-all system, if Candidate A polled one more vote than Candidate B,



he walked away with all of the delegates. Now a candidate will get delegates in proportion to his percentage of the vote. This means that Wallace cannot be shut out in any primary.

And George Wallace is a prolific vote getter. He won thirty-five percent of the popular vote in the fourteen Presidential primaries he entered in 1972. He carried fifty percent of the vote, and eighty-two of the eighty-three counties, in Michigan — usually regarded as a "Liberal" state. Michigan was one non-Southern state where the Wallace supporters were well organized. Labor columnist Victor Riesel noted that George Wallace took Michigan "right under the nose of the highly politicized United Auto Workers. Taking Michigan from organized labor in a primary fight is quite a feat." The Wallace supporters hope to repeat this episode in a dozen Big Labor states in 1976.

These changes virtually assure that Governor George Wallace will go to the 1976 Democrat National Convention with more pledged delegates than any other candidate, since the others will divide up the anti-Wallace vote among a large number of candidates.

Also, the Wallace people intend to make sure that the Wallace delegates are really pledged to the Governor. In some instances in 1972, the delegates simply ignored the will of the voters in the primaries and refused to vote for Wallace at Miami. A better-organized Wallace Campaign vows this will not happen in 1976.

So what is going to happen at the Democrat National Convention in 1976? It could produce the biggest explosion since Hiroshima. In Kansas City I asked Governor Wallace's campaign manager, Charles Snider, how the Leftists who

were across the street in convention would react to a strong drive by the Wallace supporters. I told him that it looked to me as if about ten percent of the mini-convention delegates were for Wallace, another thirty percent would tolerate his candidacy, and the other sixty percent would burn down the party before surrendering the nomination to the Alabama Governor. Snider replied:

*You are probably right, Gary, if the nominating convention were made up of the same people who are here [at Kansas City]. But, I don't believe that thirty percent of these people will be delegates to the nominating convention. Almost anyone who wanted to could become a delegate to this convention, and so it is dominated by the most "Liberal" party activists. For the most part, our people aren't here, and except for our home state delegation we made no attempt to get Wallace supporters here. We didn't think this was the time or place to wage our battle.*

When that battle is finally waged it is going to be pretty exciting. Because it looks from here as if a strong third party candidate will be emerging from inside the Democrat Party in 1976 — either from the Wallace people or from the Far Left fringe of the party. One group will not stay unequally yoked with the other through the 1976 Presidential campaign. And right now it looks very much as if the kooks who wrote those radical position papers at Kansas City could be on their way out. Those who know and love the traditions of the great Democratic Party must certainly hope so. ■ ■

## CRACKER BARREL

■ "Any housewife knows," said Ralph Hendershot, "that to increase the amount of soup available for the family dinner it is necessary only to add more water. But she also knows that as the water is added the quality of the soup is reduced. The value of money is affected very much in the same manner, with inflation playing the role of water in the currency soup."