

Super Tuesday reshuffles the Democratic deck

By John B. Judis

WASHINGTON

SUPER TUESDAY RESHUFFLED THE DEMOCRATIC deck. It established Massachusetts Gov. Michael Dukakis as the front-runner and Rev. Jesse Jackson and Tennessee Sen. Albert Gore as his chief rivals. But Super Tuesday's results did not cast any light on this important question: can any of these Democrats defeat George Bush, the likely Republican nominee, next November?

Dukakis in Massachusetts—the untold story: Dukakis is winning the Democratic nomination through both superior organization and fund raising as well as a reputation as the successful governor of one of the nation's most prosperous states. Yet except for opposing Reaganomics and the contra war, Dukakis has not advanced a policy or program—even a theme—through which to draw in new supporters. His campaign ads promised “a president who can deal with tough times and win.”

The irony is that as Massachusetts' governor, Dukakis has operated according to principles that could provide his campaign with program, policy and theme. But as a candidate he appears incapable of generalizing from his own experience.

Dukakis was first elected governor in 1974, then defeated by Democrat Ed King in 1978. But he was elected again in 1982 and in 1986, capturing 69 percent of the vote. During his tenure as governor, Massachusetts went from the “new Appalachia” to a showplace of high-tech prosperity. Dukakis' critics point out that his policies had only a marginal effect on Massachusetts' growth, but governors, constrained by corporate whim and the federal budget, rarely affect state growth. Dukakis' policies did make a noticeable difference.

He used government to steer capital toward promising but ill-financed manufacturing and high-tech firms, and toward regions in Massachusetts that were suffering from high unemployment and industrial decline. Dukakis' role in aiding Lowell and Wang Laboratories—detailed in David Osborne's forthcoming book *Laboratories of Democracy*—is a case in point.

During his first term, Dukakis struck a deal with Massachusetts life insurance companies, agreeing to remove a tax penalty passed by the legislature if they would contribute \$100 million to the Massachusetts Capital Resource Company (MCRC) that would provide loans to businesses that otherwise could not get money. The bill setting up the MCRC also required that a percentage of loans go to businesses in distressed areas.

One of MCRC's first loans was to Wang Laboratories, then a fledgling firm in Lowell, a decaying former textile town. Because Wang sold computer products that quickly became obsolete, it had been unable to get a long-term bank loan. The Bank of Boston was also threatening to call in a major loan. At that point in 1978, MCRC gave Wang a “subordinated,” 10-year, \$5 million loan that, in case of bankruptcy, need only be repaid

after other loans had been repaid. The banks then volunteered \$20 million in long-term financing. Ten years later, Wang had \$2.83 billion in sales and was employing 11,000 workers in Massachusetts, nearly 8,000 in Lowell.

During his three terms as governor, Dukakis has set up other public and semi-private funds to target economic growth in areas like Lowell and Taunton. His rationale for these ventures contradicted the tenets of Reagan conservatism. Dukakis assumed that active government could create growth without reducing workers' wages and depopulating Northern cities.

Dukakis' approach to welfare has also been different from that of Reagan conservatives. Like Reagan, when he was governor of California, Dukakis stressed getting welfare recipients off the rolls and into jobs. But while Reagan did so in a punitive way—to win votes from disillusioned blue-collar Democrats who assumed the welfare rolls were filled with “lazy” blacks—Dukakis did so to benefit the Massachusetts economy and the welfare recipients themselves. And his program has been far more successful than Reagan's workfare experiment.

Dukakis based his Employment Training Choices (ET) on the assumption that most welfare recipients who were capable of working wanted to. Providing voluntary counselling and training, ET placed over 40,000 people in jobs during its first three years.

Dukakis' experience testifies to the creative power of public intervention in the private sector and to the possibility of achieving growth without sacrificing equity. He needs to find a way to communicate this not only to city planners in Arizona, but also to auto workers in Michigan and farm laborers in Alabama who have suffered from the administration's free-market economics.

Bloody Gore: Gore's strategy of bypassing the early primaries worked, but not without significant emendations. In the first Democratic debates in Miami and Washington, Gore positioned himself as the candidate of a strong military and American imperial power—even though his foreign policy record in Congress hardly differed from that of Sen. Paul Simon or Rep. Richard Gephardt. Gore assumed that by appearing to be to the right of his rivals on foreign policy, he could attract “Dixiecrat” votes in the South.

His foreign policy stand did attract numerous endorsements from Southern officials, climaxed by those of former Virginia Gov. Chuck Robb and Georgia Sen. Sam Nunn, but it didn't get him anywhere in the pre-Super Tuesday polls. Two weeks before March 8 he was running well behind Gephardt, and opinion soundings were showing Southern Democrats with little interest in foreign policy. At that point, Gore, educated at Washington's posh St. Albans and Harvard, became a cracker populist who “fought for working men and women.” In the end, however, what counted the most, according to exit polls, was Gore's identity as a Southerner.

As Gore heads north to industrial states like Michigan, Ohio and Pennsylvania, he

risks a political identity crisis. The morning after Super Tuesday, Gore was trying on identities the way someone might try on hats. He is the candidate of “working men and women” and the “grass roots” (Gephardt). He is the candidate of “the future” who promises “fundamental change” (former Sen. Gary Hart). He stands for a “strong America” (Nunn). He can reach out to “the independently minded voter” (Sen. John Glenn). Gore looks like a collection of images superimposed on each other. It will be hard for Northern voters to focus on him.

Gore will probably not defeat Dukakis for the party's nomination, but he may damage Dukakis' chances in the fall. Prior to Super Tuesday, he portrayed the rest of the Democrats as soft on defense, a charge that will undoubtedly be echoed by Vice President George Bush in the fall. And now, if his imitation of Hart is any indication, he will try to “Mondale-ize” Dukakis as the candidate of the Northern-liberal ethnic-New Deal “past.” Programmatically, the charge is untrue, but Dukakis may have trouble proving it.

Jackson's triumph and tragedy: During the 1984 presidential primary, reporter Marvin Kalb asked Rev. Jesse Jackson this question: “Are you a black man running for the presidency...or...an American who happens to be black running for the presidency?” There was an element of race-baiting in Kalb's question, but it nonetheless expressed the misgiving that many white voters felt about Jackson. They saw him not as a typical presidential candidate, attempting to bring together a majority coalition, but as the representative of black interests, seeking through presidential politics to enhance blacks' social and economic position at the expense of whites'.

But this year, because Jackson campaigned widely among whites and framed his issues in terms of economic rather than

The role of money in Richard Gephardt's apparent downfall has broad implications for the Democrats.

racial justice, many whites no longer see him as the “black candidate.” Former Mississippi Gov. William Winter says, “I think Jackson is regarded more as a mainline political figure now than in '84. He came in '84 saying our time has come. That translated to many whites, we're going to take over the political process. That frightened a lot of white people.”

Yet Super Tuesday was not only a boon to Jackson's candidacy but also a potential curse. In 1984 he won only Louisiana, while last week he captured five states. He won primarily because this time he got almost unanimous support from Southern blacks. In 1984, for instance, Jackson got 55 percent of the black vote in Georgia and 57 percent in Alabama; in 1988, he got 96 percent of the black vote across the South.

Jackson's success unwittingly recreates the impression that he is the black candidate. University of South Carolina political scientist Earl Black, the co-author of *Politics and Society in the South*, thinks that Jackson's success will inevitably encourage a backlash vote in November. “To the extent that

Jackson is viewed as a leader of the party, it will allow Republicans to put together another big majority,” Black says. “They don't have to do anything, just let the image go out that Jesse Jackson is the leader of the Democrats.” Jackson can counter this by the way he conducts the rest of his campaign, but it won't be easy.

Whatever the case, Jackson can already claim two important accomplishments. First, he has placed economic populism on the Democratic agenda. And second, he has established a new paradigm for minority politicians. In 1983 Jackson narrowed the definition of Harold Washington's mayoral campaign in Chicago to a bid for black power.

CAMPAIGN 88

Now Jackson is contending, in effect, that in the political arena black objectives must be subordinated to the larger goal of economic democracy.

Decline and fall of Richard Gephardt: Gephardt's fourth place finish in the South probably dooms his candidacy. Many Republican strategists and uncommitted Democrats, including Virginia Lt. Gov. Doug Wilder, believe that Gephardt's message of economic populism and nationalism was the Democrats' best hope of winning the South and the election in 1988. Gore will try the message on, but it may fit even less comfortably than it did on Gephardt.

Some columnists and TV commentators argue that Gephardt failed because Southerners rejected his call to get tough with America's trading partners, but evidence does not support this assertion. He did not have the money or organization to get his message across in the South, and he was further bedeviled by negative ads from Gore and Dukakis.

As Thomas Edsall has written in *The New Politics of Inequality* and Robert Kuttner in *The Life of the Party*, the Democrats have become increasingly dependent upon the eccentric and not-so-eccentric rich for campaign financing. Hollywood moguls and Wall Street liberals don't like the MX missile, the contra or Rev. Pat Robertson, but they also don't like trade bills and attacks on multinational corporations. While Iowa farmers liked Gephardt's message, Democratic fat cats didn't. As a House Ways and Means Committee member, he raised a lot of money in 1987 from business political action committees and Wall Street, but this winter his fund-raising lagged. In one Rockville, Md. fund-raiser, Gephardt was quizzed repeatedly about what he meant by “the establishment.”

He might have been able to raise money from unions, but when the AFL-CIO ruled out an early endorsement, it also ruled out union contributions to candidates.

The role of money in Gephardt's defeat has broad implications for the Democrats. In the primaries, the voters make the final choice, but the rich have an inordinate say about which candidates voters can choose from.

In this nomination battle, Wall Street Democrats will probably get a candidate they are comfortable with. And it won't be Richard Gephardt. □

By Joel Bleifuss

Deregulation EPA/FDA style

The Reagan administration has begun to let one segment of the food industry regulate itself—California's grape growers. The regulation in question involves sulfite, a highly allergenic food preservative that prevents grapes from getting moldy for months. At one time sulfites also kept salad bars looking fresh. But when a few salad eaters died, most of whom were asthmatic, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) stepped in and banned its use. Since September 1987, the Environmental Protection Agency has required growers to label grapes that test positive for significant sulfite residues. Now the United Farm Workers' magazine *Food and Justice* reports that the FDA, the agency responsible for enforcing this regulation, has quietly allowed two grape growers in California's San Joaquin valley to test the sulfite levels on their own grapes. The growers, Marko Zaninovich, Inc. and Pandol and Sons, are also responsible for verifying their own test results. Dr. Marion Moses, an authority on environmental disease who works with the Farm Workers, condemns the move. "It's a very dangerous trend to allow industry to set up labs when even the FDA labs have been shown to be inadequate," Moses told *In These Times*. "It portends really bad things for the American consumer." The growers, however, view themselves as trendsetters. "The ground has been broken," said a Zaninovich spokesman. "We now have a program that can serve as an example for the rest of the industry."

Dogmanitarians

Astrid Lindgren, creator of Pippi Longstocking, has long supported animal rights. Several years ago the Swedish children's author campaigned against artificial insemination on the grounds it deprived cows of a normal sex life. Her efforts have since culminated in an animal protection law that Sweden's parliament is soon expected to pass. The legislation is based on the belief that husbandry technology should be adapted to the animal and not vice versa. The Swedish Embassy's Irene Noby told *In These Times* that the bill of animal rights includes these sections: "Docking of dogs' tails shall be forbidden"; "Cattle shall have the right to graze outdoors"; "Hens shall be let out of cramped cages (which fail to meet their basic needs)"; "Sows will be freed from farrowing pens (and provided separate feeding, sleeping and toilet areas)." It looks like pigs in Sweden will soon be enjoying a higher standard of living than the American homeless.

Dimensions of the rathole

During Reagan's presidency, the U.S. has spent \$2 trillion (\$2,000,000,000,000) preparing for war. According to the Washington D.C.-based Center for Defense Information, this averages out to \$21,000 for each U.S. household.

The disinheritors

Last month Wells Fargo Bank sent 7,000 of its California customers a billing statement that read: "You owe your soul to the company store. Why not owe your home to Wells Fargo? An Equity Advantage account can help you spend what would have been your children's inheritance." This was not the message the bankers had meant to send out. "The bank was appalled," a Wells Fargo spokeswoman told the *San Francisco Examiner*. "We're not laughing." The company has yet to collar the computer programmer "whose sense of humor was somewhat misplaced."

Bull's-eye

Truth in advertising is probably not what the Israeli National Tourist Bureau had in mind when it began running a promo in Dutch newspapers explaining just how close Israel's major tourist sites are to each other. The ad read: "The distance between Tel Aviv and Jerusalem? About a stone's throw."

Neo-tripe

These days the best place to catch the wisdom of Peter Collier and David Horowitz, former editors of the left-leaning *Ramparts*, is in *Commentary*. The two "frumpies"—formerly radical, upwardly mobile politicians—recently exposed the dark deeds "today's radicals" are now plotting. "The '80s left invokes democratic principles and America's interests only to promote its covert agendas, which are anti-American and anti-democratic."



Out of Eastern Europe: Private Photography: "Chimney Sweep 1986" by Gundula Schulze of East Germany is one of more than 200 photographs by Eastern European artists that will be exhibited at Chicago's Randolph Street Gallery. The show, which runs from March 26 through April 23, features the work of 30 photographers from Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary and Poland. Through their work the artists grapple with issues such as national and cultural history, mythology and identity; private memory and imagination; the presence of the state and power of the individual; and life's simple pleasures. This exhibit is the first public showing for most of these photographs. In Eastern Europe exhibition opportunities and commissions are made available only to official artists who work through the state artists' unions. The photos in this exhibit were not obtained through official channels, but rather as personal gifts to the show's curator, John Jacob of New York. Galleries interested in booking this exhibit should contact the List Visual Arts Center in Cambridge, Mass., (617) 253-4400.

Salvadoran elections met by apathy

SAN SALVADOR—A corruption scandal involving a prominent Christian Democrat candidate will further hurt the electoral prospects of President Jose Napoleon Duarte's Christian Democratic Party (PDC) in the March 20 elections. The PDC is expected to lose its majority in the assembly because of widespread disenchantment with the party.

Even former supporters are disillusioned with the PDC, which promised but never delivered peace and economic reactivation. "Many people are going to vote against the Christian Democrats," says one San Salvador cab driver. "People thought things would get better with [the Christian Democrats], but now they're disillusioned. People are saying, 'They've tricked us once and we're not going to let them trick us again.'"

The recent scandal is expected to deepen the popular perception that the U.S.-backed Christian Democrats are just as corrupt as the military-backed regimes they criticized for 20 years when it was the opposition party. PDC candidate Luis Mejia Miranda is accused of misappropriating up to \$2 million of funds destined to U.S.-financed counterin-

surgency development projects coordinated by the agency he headed until three months ago, the National Commission for the Reconstruction of Areas. Mejia Miranda is an associate of Duarte's son Alejandro.

But disillusionment with Duarte's party cuts much deeper, translating to a generalized disenchantment with available political alternatives and elections themselves. More than two-thirds of those polled by the Jesuit University consistently say that none of the existing parties represent them.

"The average person doesn't have confidence that any of the politicians can take the country forward," says newspaper editor Christobal Iglesias.

This is a blow to the Reagan administration, which has presented El Salvador as its model of democracy and made elections the proof of its claims. But diplomats and analysts caution against equating democracy and elections. They say the upswing in human rights abuses, widespread fear of the military, and the de facto rule by military authorities in much of the countryside contradict the U.S. Embassy's optimistic picture of an emerging democracy.

Anti-communism has become the Christian Democrats' ideology, just as becoming the military's partner in the U.S. counterinsurgency strat-

egy has supplanted the party's traditional reformist rhetoric. Where the right-wing Arena Party once promised to exterminate the "reds," it is now the Christian Democrats whose radio and TV ads claim to have "prevented the communists from coming to power."

Not surprisingly, campaign rallies have been sparsely attended and people tune out the incessant radio ads that saturate the airwaves.

The FMLN guerrillas call the elections a "farce" and have said they won't allow them to take place in areas they control. The Salvadoran Army promises to "protect" the voting by securing polling sites across the country. One local TV correspondent comments, "The army is launching an operation to protect the elections even though the people don't seem to care about them at all."

While the Arena Party will increase its number of seats, the Christian Democrats hope to retain enough seats to maintain control of the assembly if they can cut a deal with the small, opportunistic Party of National Conciliation (PCN), the former military party that now calls itself "social democratic."

One 70-year-old woman said, "Sure I'll go to vote, but I'm going to do just like I always do." Drawing a big "X" in the air, she demonstrated how she plans to nullify her ballot.

—Chris Norton

Socialist mayor to run for Congress

On March 10 Vermont's leading progressive politician, Burlington

Mayor Bernard Sanders, entered the crowded race for that state's lone congressional seat. Sanders, who will run as an independent, promises to "work for radical change in national priorities."

In an interview with *In These Times* the day before announcing his candidacy, Sanders said his campaign will focus on "an increasing dominance of the wealthiest individuals and multinational corpora-