

Continued from preceding page

The Democrats have a choice: They can propose a new foreign policy or hide behind old concepts. But if they slip into the White House without defining and arguing for a new foreign and military policy, however, they will be faced once again, as Jimmy Carter was, with a highly organized right-wing Cold War establishment that will block initiatives and press for a new arms race and intervention in the Third World. To win and succeed they must go in with an agenda and a mandate for leadership.

That agenda should build on the following:

- The primary sources of security are economic and social. The size of military budgets does not equal defense, much less security. It is time to stop throwing money at the military and defense contractors who fuel the arms race by interservice rivalry and greed. And it is time our developed allies in Europe and Japan define and pay for their own security needs.

- The military should be a tool of last resort for our government, which is charged with protecting the political, social, economic and geographical security of the nation.

- Military solutions to conflicts are increasingly dangerous and obsolete. The na-

ture of modern weapons, the global economy and the interdependence among nations creates a new political reality: no nation can achieve security unilaterally.

- Giving direction to a new international system at the end of the Cold War represents the single greatest opportunity and challenge for the next president. In the context of restructuring the U.S.-USSR relationship the U.S. should press an aggressive peace policy leading toward: 1. nuclear disarmament commencing with deep strategic cuts; 2. conventional reductions and restructuring of forces along the lines of non-provocative defense; 3. establishment of a non-intervention regime, and active reg-

ional conflict resolution; at ending violence in the through support for nation and economic deve

The next president will lead into the next century as a peaceful and at peace by emphasizing investment in America's future science and technology, in a competitive; in creating job stability and quality of life for families. An effective foreign policy one that genuinely serves the national interests.

Pam Solo is co-director of the Center for International Security in C

Environment

By Dick Russell

THE MOST FRIGHTENING OMISSION OF THE 1988 presidential campaign has been the low priority given to the environmental crisis. At a time when the ecological disaster facing the U.S.—and the entire planet—demands an unprecedented commitment of both budget and cooperative initiative, the candidates have ducked the implications and have failed to propose alternatives.

For this reason the Democratic Party should redefine national security—no longer in terms of nuclear weapons and military spending, but rather the state of our natural environment and the quality of our resources.

It should then call for an environmental summit, where world leaders can work out mutual strategies to deal with global warming, depletion of the ozone layer, destruction of tropical rainforests, loss of plant and animal species and overpopulation. That these dilemmas are as intrinsically linked as the global economy—and that in fact their impact will determine the economic future—must be seen as crucial.

A cabinet-level Department of the Environment should be created with the Environmental Protection Agency under its umbrella and a constant liaison maintained with the departments of Agriculture, Energy and Interior. The department should mandate policies devoted to massive research-and-development funding for alternative approaches in energy, agriculture, industry and waste management. It should be given powers to enforce existing laws such as the Clean Air, Clean Water and Safe Drinking Water acts.

The Democrats should also call for a multimillion-dollar reduction in military spending, and use the diverted tax dollars to pay for clean-up programs and alternative research. A fund ought to be established for a massive educational effort focusing not only on the cause-and-effect relationship

of the ecological holocaust we face, but also on how people's choices (what they buy, how consciously they live) can make a difference.

Specifically, we need:

- A national energy policy that calls for a phase-out of reliance on fossil fuels, and vastly expanded resources for solar and other forms of non-nuclear energy supplies. Besides the havoc caused by acid rain and localized air pollution, a June 1988 report by the World Meteorological Organization and United Nations Environment Program states that, with present pollution trends (largely from burning of fossil fuels), global temperatures will rise over the next century at a rate six times faster than humankind has ever experienced.

- A national food policy that advocates a cessation of chemical-intensive agriculture, with emphasis on integrated pest management and organic farming; that trains farmers in ways to reduce soil erosion; that cracks down on coastal pollution and over-harvest by commercial fishermen.

- A national toxics policy that forces industries to stop production of the worst pollutants and reduce hazardous waste at its source; acknowledges the vast number of contaminated areas and arranges for relocation of citizens where necessary; and initiates education about toxic household waste. Comprehensive testing of drinking water supplies and installation of modern treatment systems must also take place.

- Declaration of a national garbage emergency, with a de-emphasis on incineration and a World War II-style recycling of paper, bottles and cans, compost, plastic, etc.

The fundamentals of life are at stake here. This message must get across: We can either make conscious choices now or our children will reap the poisoned world that we are sowing.

Dick Russell writes on environmental issues for several national publications.

By Tom Bates

MICHAEL DUKAKIS WILL HAVE TO DO better than "Good jobs at good wages" to assemble the economically diverse post-Reagan coalition he needs to win in November. But the Massachusetts governor's meat-and-potatoes slogan would have more appeal if he advanced it as part of a comprehensive family policy agenda.

This was supposed to be the year that concern about families and children dominated political campaigns, from the presidential primaries on down. Instead, as in the past, family issues have so far been treated as separate agendas—women's issues, children's issues, labor issues, senior issues—the very concerns that attracted the unfair and unfortunate label "special interests" in the last election.

But if the Democrats link these issues in a practical family policy agenda, they can grab the allegiance of a broad coalition—the baby-boom generation, "new collar" workers, minorities, seniors, labor unions and the poor, as well as low-to-middle-income "cultural conservatives" who left the Democratic Party in recent years because Republicans claimed to be the "pro-family" party. All those constituencies are vitally concerned about the stability of their families in this era of change and insecurity.

The demographics are on our side. Current public policy is based on an image of the family that exists mostly in reruns of *Ozzie and Harriet* and *The Donna Reed Show*. Only one in 10 families conforms to the '50s norm of a breadwinner father and a stay-at-home mother ably managing the work and home fronts. Most adults today have jobs and children, at a time when we're in the middle of a new baby boom: the number of preschool-age children is higher today than it has been for decades. At the same time, our senior population is growing, with changing health and independence concerns. Some sloganeers are calling this generation of working adults the "sandwich" generation, squeezed between the demands of dependent children and dependent parents.

They need relief. For middle-income families, growing work and family conflicts are a matter of increasing stress and insecurity. For low-income families, these are questions of survival. Today poverty in the U.S. is a family issue—most poor adults are women, and most of them are poor because they are mothers who have sole re-

sponsibility for their children. One disturbing fact is that 40 percent of the poor today are children. They find a way to support their families.

A strong family agenda has what poor and middle-income families have in common. They all need:

- Access to affordable, quality child care.
- Job-protected parental leave.
- A tax system that furthers family burdens;

- Better schools for their children.
- Broadened access to health care.
- Flexible employment opportunities, balancing job and family needs.

This is where "Good jobs at good wages" come in. Appeals based on the family give the Democrats a chance to examine the security of the family raised by the Reagan economic policy. Family change in the '70s and '80s, at least partly driven by economic wage erosion meant more than two paychecks to stay afloat: a vast opportunity gap has been created. The Reagan years—between the loss of low-wage jobs that did not support a family and the loss of better-paying, high-opportunity jobs that require higher education—to bridge that gap today, a family policy must be a commitment to the wage, benefit and job security of that lower-income family. We will see more families in today's economy.

A strong family appeal is what Democrats hold the loyalty of voters, who currently favor George Bush by two to one. (Anxious Bush campaigner date will stress child care and women voters.) Most important, a family agenda allows the Democrats to revive their venerable themes of justice for a generation that is impatient, but anxious about the future of families in a time of social change. A family agenda lets the Democrats more inspiring, reassuring future, which is what they need.

Tom Bates, California Assessor (and), is co-chair of the California Joint Select Task Force on the Family. He was California Co-chair of the Jackson campaign.

Family

efforts aimed at Third World self-determinations. And the country nation prospering economic are: in peaceful making America; and in the for American policy will be the domestic na-

Institute for Peace
Cambridge, Mass.

n. Most distressed of the American. We have to these imperiled

can underscore income families and the follow-

ality child care; leave; her eases family

children; eath care; and policies for concerns.

at good wages" n strengtheningocrats a way to d equity issues omic "recovery." and '80s was at omic change, as families needed at. We know that emerged during en a growing tier on't pay enough an upper tier of rtunity jobs that Few ladders exist One goal of fam- nent to improve o-training expec- ployment tier, or unable to make

can also help the y of women vot- r Dukakis over e. (Significantly, s say their candi- re to win back portant, a familyocrats to update f equity and jus- s wary of govern- its children and al uncertainty. A emocrats offer a g vision of the is election is all

mblyman (D-Oak- nia State Legisla- on the Changing -Chair of the Jesse

Health Care

By Quentin Young

DESPITE EXPENDITURES IN EXCESS OF \$570 billion (more than \$2,000 per person), the U.S. health care system fails the American people in many ways: between 38 and 50 million of us (the "working poor") are unprotected against costs of illness. Those in poverty get third-class care; fewer than 40 percent of those below the official poverty level qualify for the patchwork of declining state programs. The excluded, ominously, are children and women.

The entry of huge venture capital corporations has transformed the traditional care and service premises of the system into a market-driven industry, already consolidating toward the abuses of monopoly. The results are huge corporate profits, further inflation of costs and new barriers to access. Universal standards of quality and enhancement of the nation's health status are the abandoned ideals.

Meanwhile, beginning in 1965, Canada has reformed its health service (which had closely resembled our own) through a federally financed, province administered universal insurance plan. Problems, insoluble here, are dramatically controlled. Health-care costs approach 12 percent of our gross national product (GNP). They are less than 9 percent of GNP in Canada.

Availability of care in Canada is now based exclusively on need, not wealth. The hospital, out-patient and nursing home services are high quality with community input.

Economics, urgent health-care needs and elementary commitment to human rights dictate that the U.S. health system be reformed, and thereby leave South Africa to be the only industrialized nation without a commitment to universal care of its people.

The elements of this reform would be:

- Federal sponsorship, financed by general revenues;
- Emphasis on prevention and early detection of disease;
- Analysis and confrontation of the social factors in our major contemporary health problems, e.g., tobacco and industrial pollution in cancer; diet in heart disease; alienation in substance abuse;
- De-emphasis on high technology and end-of-life intervention and emphasis on ambulatory health enhancing activities;
- Integrating the resources and facilities of the system in school, workplace and community to identify and correct sources of ill health; and

• Professional payment based (as in Canada) on fees negotiated by the state (or regional) governments and physicians.

With government already underwriting more than 50 percent of our health-care costs, the transfer of present expenditures (e.g., corporate health benefits for employees) would finance the new system with no additional burden.

Quentin Young, M.D., is president of the Health and Medicine Policy Research Group, based in Chicago.

Housing

By Chester Hartman

OUR NATION'S HOUSING CRISIS IS SEVERE and growing. It is rooted in the structural inability of the housing market to provide decent, affordable housing for tens of millions of Americans, due to the expanding gap between housing costs and people's incomes. The obscenity of outright homelessness is the most extreme and public manifestation of this failure. But the nation's declining homeownership rate and the widespread incidence of mortgage default and foreclosure, as well as the fact that well over 7 million households must pay more than half their income for housing and that doubling-up and other pre-homelessness situations abound, also illustrate the crisis. In truth, we still are a nation in which one-third (or more) are ill-housed, if by that term we mean not only decent but affordable housing.

Only government action can reverse these trends and cope with this crisis. Required are:

- Vastly expanded subsidies;
- Directing these subsidies solely to the production, rehabilitation and acquisition of housing permanently affordable to lower-income households;
- Steps to lower the cost of providing housing, so as to decrease the affordability gap and the amount of government subsidies needed; and
- Controls over the private housing market that will prevent the loss of lower-income housing.

A threshold step is to declare as a National Housing Goal a *right* to decent, affordable housing for all Americans, to be achieved by the year 2000. (In the 1949 and 1968 Housing Acts, Congress created and then reiterated a National Housing Goal of decent housing—with no mention of affordability—but did not proclaim it a right and established neither timetables nor programs to turn this rhetorical goal into reality.)

Government subsidies along the order of \$30-50 billion a year will be needed—several times what HUD and Farmers Home Administration now allocate for low-income housing. There is no way we can solve the nation's housing problem on the cheap.

Permanently affordable housing means housing outside the profit sector—the development, permanent ownership and management of housing by non-profit private and public entities: churches and synagogues, labor unions, neighborhood groups, community development corpora-

tions, limited-equity cooperatives, tenant organizations, local and state housing authorities. Unlike private developers, landlords and managers, whose aim is profit maximization, social sector bodies of this sort seek to provide the best housing at the lowest cost for the most people. They will need large amounts of technical assistance, much of which can be bought on a fee basis from competent actors in the private sector.

Beyond shifting from a profit-maximizing to a social sector system for providing housing to the non-rich—which in itself will significantly lower the cost of the final product—the central reason housing costs so much—the cost of money borrowed to produce or purchase it—must be attacked. Repayment of debt is in effect a permanent burden attached to virtually all housing, and the cost to consumers—renters indirectly, owners directly—accounts for roughly two out of every three housing consumption dollars. Substituting one-time government capital grants to social sector housing producers for mortgages and bonds to build and rehabilitate housing can cut ongoing housing costs to consumers by two-thirds. Voluntary assignment of mortgage debt and title to social sector housing entities on the part of lower-income and elderly homeowners can effect a similar reduction in housing costs (and, in the case of the low-income elderly, such a program should be accompanied by a decent lifetime annuity). Government subsidies would then be used to retire the existing debt over time, and once it was retired the housing would remain permanently debt-free, with occupants required to pay only utilities, property taxes, maintenance, insurance and other occupancy costs. Those with income too low to afford even these costs would receive supplementary subsidies.

Effective controls over rent increases, evictions, conversion of rental housing to condominiums and loss of lower-rent housing through undermaintenance, abandonment, demolition and conversion to other uses should be instituted, treating the lower-rent housing stock as an endangered species requiring strict government protections. Where private owners are unwilling or unable to operate their housing under such protections, provisions should be made for the rapid transfer of these units to the tenants or other social sector organizations.

Chester Hartman is a fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies. He is co-editor, with Marcus Raskin, of *Winning America: Ideas and Leadership for the '90s*, to be published in July.

EDITORIAL

IN THESE TIMES

"...with liberty and justice for all"

Editor: James Weinstein
 Managing Editor: Sheryl Larson
 Senior Editors: Patricia Aufderheide, John B. Judis, David Moberg
 Assistant Managing Editor: Miles Harvey
 Culture Editor: Jeff Reid
 Associate Editor: Salim Muwakkil
 European Editor: Diana Johnstone
 In Short Editor: Joel Bleifuss
 Copy Editor: Frieda Gordon Landau
 Staff Writer: Jim Naureckas
 Editorial Promotions: Maggie Garb
 Researcher: Joan McGrath
 Intern: Leslie H. Cole
 California correspondent: Kathryn Phillips

Art Director: Miles DeCoster
 Associate Art Director: Peter Hannan
 Assistant Art Director: Lisa Weinstein
 Photo Editor: Paul Comstock
 Typesetter: Jim Rinnert

Publisher: James Weinstein
 Assistant Publisher: Carol E.A. Gams
 Co-Business Managers:
 Louis Hirsch, Finance
 Donna Thomas, Data Processing Accounting
 Advertising Director: Bruce Embrey
 Office Manager: Theresa Nutall

Circulation Director: Chris D'Arpa
 Assistant Director: Greg Kilbane

Concert Typographers: Sheryl Hybert

In These Times believes that to guarantee our life, liberty and pursuit of happiness, Americans must take greater control over our nation's basic economic and foreign policy decisions. We believe in a socialism that fulfills rather than subverts the promise of American democracy, where social needs and rationality, not corporate profit and greed, are the operative principles. Our pages are open to a wide range of views, socialist and non-socialist, liberal and conservative. Except for editorial statements appearing on the editorial page, opinions expressed in columns and in feature or news stories are those of the authors and are not necessarily those of the editors. We welcome comments and opinion pieces from our readers.

(ISSN 0160-5992)

Published 41 times a year: weekly except the first week of January, first week of March, last week of November, last week of December; bi-weekly in June through the first week in September by Institute for Public Affairs, 1300 W. Belmont, Chicago, IL 60657, (312) 472-5700

Member: Alternative Press Syndicate

The entire contents of *In These Times* are copyright © 1988 by Institute for Public Affairs, and may not be reproduced in any manner, either in whole or in part, without permission of the publisher. Copies of *In These Times* contract with the National Writers Union are available upon request. Complete issues of *In These Times* are available from University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, MI. Selected articles are available on 4-track cassette from Freedom Ideas International, 640 Bayside, Detroit, MI 48217. All rights reserved. *In These Times* is indexed in the Alternative Press Index. Publisher does not assume liability for unsolicited manuscripts or material. Manuscripts or material unaccompanied by stamped, self-addressed envelope will not be returned. All correspondence should be sent to: *In These Times*, 1300 W. Belmont Ave., Chicago, IL 60657. Subscriptions are \$34.95 a year (\$59 for institutions; \$47.95 outside the U.S. and its possessions). Advertising rates sent on request. Back issues \$3; specify volume and number. All letters received by *In These Times* become property of the newspaper. We reserve the right to print letters in condensed form. Second-class postage paid at Chicago, IL and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes to *In These Times*, 1912 Debs. Ave., Mt. Morris, IL 61054.

This issue (Vol. 12, No. 29) published July 6, 1988, for newsstand sales July 6-19, 1988.



Jackson campaign is a step in a long journey

With the primary elections over and Michael Dukakis assured of the Democratic nomination, it's time to begin assessing Jesse Jackson's campaign—both what he has accomplished and what that means to the left in the years ahead. The accomplishments are of historic proportions. When Jackson entered the 1984 primaries, few black leaders and fewer whites took him seriously. Among black politicians Jackson was widely seen as a showboater, or as a threat to their own positions of influence in the party's white ruling circles. But despite a poorly organized and grossly underfunded campaign, Jackson galvanized the black electorate, winning such large majorities that he forced even the more conservative black politicians into his corner early on in 1988.

Getting respect: Four years ago Jackson proved that blacks would give solid support to an attempt at the presidency by one of their own—and that they would come out to vote for such a candidate in unprecedented numbers. This year Jackson proved that whites, too, would vote for a black if what he said made more sense to them than the appeals of other candidates. In 1984 Jackson received about 3.25 million votes, the great bulk of it from blacks. This year he won almost 7 million votes, again mostly from blacks, but with a large increase in support from Hispanics and whites—especially in the later primaries when his campaign was better organized and began to receive more coverage in the media. As had happened in many cities where blacks have been elected mayor in recent years, on the national scene Jackson has given blacks a new sense of confidence and pride and has won for himself and for his community a real, if often grudging, respect among whites.

If Jackson has been important in validating and strengthening the black community, he has been equally so for the left. His primary constituency, of course, is the most consistently left in American political life. Virtually all black politicians are on the left, if only to be able to remain in office. Thus, for example, the Black Congress-

sional Caucus has the highest rating of any group in Congress in the Americans for Democratic Action liberal quotient voting survey—with an average score of 92 percent on 25 key House votes. Similarly, Jackson's other target constituents—Hispanics, union labor and women—tend to be on the left. (Democratic Hispanic and women House members had ADA liberal quotients of 82 and 75 percent.)

But Jackson is the first politician on the national scene to run in major party primaries on an unabashedly left platform. In doing so he has proven not only that there is a vast potential constituency for the left, but also—and more important—that an intelligently articulated left politics is capable of overcoming popular cynicism and indifference and of bringing large numbers of new voters into the electoral arena.

Jackson has shown the left that it can bring its message to the people within the mainstream of American political life—and that it is most effective to do so within the two-party system. For those on the left who have defined themselves as outsiders, dreaming of third parties challenging the Democrats and Republicans, the 1988 elections should be a watershed. For Jackson has done more than gain a hearing for his ideas and enhancement of his prestige. He has also begun to change the nature of the debates within the party. And in doing so he has created the potential for a continuing process in which programs based on a different set of principles could gain enough popular support so that other party leaders will be unable to ignore them.

On the road again: If this is so, then the Democratic Party convention this month is not the end of the Jackson campaign, but only the second milestone on a long road to the transformation of American politics. It is a road on which there is room for many travellers, and many ideas. We hope to provide a forum for some of these ideas, which is why we have assembled the programmatic suggestions on pages 11-13. Few, if any, of the ideas presented here or by Jackson in the primaries will be adopted by the Democratic convention or by the Dukakis campaign. But they are beginning to gain a hearing in many forums around the country.

In that process lies the best hope for a new politics in the years ahead.

Lionel Delvingne