

## Add crocodiles

SAN DIEGO—The U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) plans to dig a ditch. The five-foot-deep, 14-foot-wide trench would stretch along the Mexican border east of San Diego and Tijuana. Critics liken the 4.5-mile ditch to an inverted Berlin Wall. Proponents argue that the \$2-million trench will thwart alien and contraband smuggling.

INS representatives did not attend a March 22 hearing conducted by the California Senate Select Committee on Border Issues, Drug Trafficking and Contraband, where more than a dozen people testified against the plan. "I don't think they can defend [the ditch]," said Robert Martínez of the American Friends Service Committee in San Diego.

The INS had originally proposed the ditch as a solution to the contamination of Mexican drinking water by farm and construction runoff in the U.S. But according to environmentalists, the ditch could rob the nearby Otay Mesa of the natural rainwater pools it needs to sustain many species of plants and animals.

Mexican officials have denounced the project. They contend that the U.S., with a false show of concern for the Mexican environment, is deliberately misleading them as to the actual intent of the trench.

"We have to do something to take control of our own border," said Rep. Ron Packard (R-CA), "and a physical barrier is probably it."

Former U.S. Attorney Peter Nuñez of San Diego said the ditch is needed to stop vehicles carrying illegal immigrants and drugs. Nuñez is an advisory board member of the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), a xenophobic Washington, D.C.-based lobby that has released a 90-page study, "Ten Steps to Securing America's Borders." The group's report proposes fortification of U.S. borders with both Canada and Mexico.

FAIR spokesman Mark Krikorian says his group would go one step further than the government. FAIR is proposing a "sunken fence." Coming from Mexico, potential "border-hoppers" would encounter a downward slope that ends abruptly in a 12-foot vertical concrete wall. The obstacle

would be "invisible from a short distance away," says Krikorian.

According to Mexico's Foreign Minister Fernando Solana, "What interests Mexico is building bridges, not ditches." Krikorian dismisses such opposition as a ploy to co-opt Mexico's leftist opposition and thus prevent the National Democratic Front's Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas from making the ditch a political issue.

"Basically, when we build the ditch, the ditch is built and they have to live with it," adds Krikorian.

After Mexico protested the project through formal diplomatic channels last February, the State Department replied that "new options are being considered for drainage problems in the Otay Mesa area.... The matter has not been decided either way."

A House subcommittee will hold hearings on the issue this spring, but both FAIR and the INS expect the ditch to be completed this summer. FAIR hopes the construction of this trench will set a precedent. As Krikorian told *In These Times*, "You have to get your feet wet before jumping into the pool."

—Kevin O'Donnell

## Quayle's House seat captured by female Democrat

Ever since Dan Quayle was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1976, Indiana's 4th Congressional District has been a conservative Republican stronghold. But in a special election to fill the seat vacated when Quayle protégé Rep. Dan Coats was appointed to the Senate as the vice president's replacement, a Democrat bested her Republican opponent, Dan Heath, by 65,160 votes to 63,388.

Jill Long, the new Democratic representative, brings the number of women in Congress to 26 and increases the House Democratic majority to 259. Long's carefully crafted image of competence, moderation and business expertise attracted many voters who would not otherwise have voted for a woman. Eschewing feminist identification, Long projected herself as acceptable in mostly male terms to a largely conservative electorate.

But during the campaign she did develop a bond with women voters—a bond that was strengthened when a TV ad by Heath backfired. The spot featured a white motorcycle policeman hectoring candidate Long about alleged campaign misstatements. Her conservative stance apparently played well in the Hispanic communities, which gave her their votes. And the 4th District black community leadership was behind her from the beginning. However, neither constituency is numerically significant in the district.

A professor of business, statistics and finance at Ft. Wayne's Purdue University, Long also owns and operates an 80-acre farm. Voters saw Long's experience and expertise as applying not only to agriculture, but

also to industrial reconstruction. This was especially important in Ft. Wayne, which has been beset with major plant closings and economic downturns since the late '70s.

Republican opponent Heath had touted his government work experience in the prenomination caucuses, so Long held him accountable for the fact that Heath was chief of staff for Paul Helmke, Ft. Wayne's Republican mayor, who had promised no

tax raise and no new annexations to the city. Once in office Helmke raised taxes and was eager to annex a prosperous northern suburb.

Brad Senden, Long's political consultant and campaign director, describes his boss as a "a proud conservative Democrat with strong family ties." Her election, says Senden, validates his vision of a Democratic Party moving away from liberalism.

—George Fish

Democrat Jill Long will fill Dan Quayle's old House seat.



Dean Musser, Journal Gazette

foreign policy." But are there other uses for arms, besides fighting wars? Jean Cobb and John Zindar write in *Common Cause Magazine* that some people in the defense industry believe that "foreign policy concerns soon may be overshadowed by arguments about the role arms exports can play in reducing the trade deficit and in shoring up America's defense industry during an era of stagnating domestic military budgets." Joel Johnson is one such person. He is the vice president of the American League for Export and Security Assistance, the organization that lobbies Congress for the 24 largest U.S. defense exporters. Johnson told *Common Cause*, "As defense procurement drops, it will become more apparent to the military that the only way to maintain an efficient rate of production will be to have exports fill part of that gap." That is, exports funded by the U.S. government.

**Death merchants:** According to U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency statistics, between 1973 and 1986 the U.S. military-industrial complex provided Third-World nations with more than 25,000 tanks, 12,000 surface-to-air missiles, 10,000 artillery pieces, 6,000 military aircraft and 400 armed boats. The countries paid for much of this military hardware with low-interest loans from the U.S. government. As a result, some 37 countries now owe the U.S. more than \$23 billion. Many of the countries that received the loans are now having trouble repaying. Consequently, in its 1990 budget the Bush administration is proposing (as the Reagan administration did during the 1989 budget process) that Congress approve, and then forgive, \$5 billion in loans to foreign nations for the purchase of military equipment from the U.S. defense industry. In effect, the loans will be grants. The administration argues that by giving away \$5 billion in arms, the U.S. will help "ease the [recipient] countries' debt burden." The administration does not mention that this in turn will ease the bad loan burden of American banks and fill the coffers of military contractors. As a congressional aide told *Common Cause Magazine*, "[T]he taxpayer is getting screwed."

## Red-baited professor sees green

On Jan. 10, 1987, the *Bangor Daily News* published an article that described Howard Schonberger as a "self-proclaimed Marxist-Leninist Communist who has worked against the U.S. for the past 25 years." Schonberger, a University of Maine history professor who was active in Central American solidarity work, wrote the paper protesting this description, as did 10 of his 14 department colleagues. The *Daily News* responded to the letters, saying that it stood by the story. Later that month, John Day, the paper's Washington correspondent, wrote in an opinion piece that if Schonberger was a "Marxist-Leninist Communist who has worked against the U.S. for the past 25 years," then he was guilty of treason. Day suggested that an investigation of Marxist influence at the University of Maine might be in order. At that point Schonberger decided to sue. Last month his case went to trial. He described the experience to *In These Times*.

**Taking a stand:** "When I was on the witness stand, the lawyer for the newspaper tried to red bait me, suggesting that the scholarly articles and newspaper opinion pieces I had written were like those of Communists and people who worked against the U.S. My lawyer and I had decided that I would talk about my being a democratic socialist... I explained what that meant, speaking in terms of cooperation and concern for the public welfare, and said that this sense of public well-being was undermined by the military-industrial complex.... The newspaper's lawyer tried to trick me up, asking what was the difference between a 'big c' and a 'small c' communist. He pulled out two posters, each containing statements from my deposition. One was one labeled "democratic socialist" and the other "communist," and he compared them. He had also gotten my personnel files from the school. The chairman of the department had written in one report that I was the adviser to such offbeat organizations as Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). So the paper's lawyer started grilling me about SDS. I pointed out that this had been written in 1973-74, when SDS didn't even exist, and that my department chair was a historian, but he wasn't very accurate and what he probably had done was gotten SDS mixed up with Maine Peace Action Committee. The lawyer then took out the comic book *Marx for Beginners* and read from that book. He tried to fluster me, but it didn't work. In the end the jury voted in my favor, unanimously awarding me \$50,000 in personal damages and \$450,000 in punitive damages. If that judgment stands through the appeal to the Maine Supreme Court I will give the bulk of it to Nicaraguan hurricane relief."





Chicago Mayor-elect Richard M. Daley and daughters celebrate a sweeping victory after a carefully managed campaign.

## The rich get Richie, the poor get poorer

By David Moberg

CHICAGO

**R**ICHARD M. DALEY'S OVERWHELMING VICTORY in the April 4 mayoral race resurrected the remnants of old machine politics in a new guise and shattered the black-dominated reform coalition that had elected Harold Washington mayor in 1983 and 1987.

Daley won with 55.7 percent of the vote, compared to 40.8 percent for black Alderman Timothy Evans, an important Washington ally who formed the Harold Washington Party especially for the election. Republican Ed Vrdolyak, a wayward Democrat and bitter rival of the late black mayor, finished with a pathetic 3.5 percent of the vote. Daley ran a tactically astute campaign fueled by more than \$6.5 million raised primarily from establishment lawyers, businessmen and developers.

**Teflon boss:** Daley campaigned as the candidate above the fray, constantly eschewing "the name-calling and bickering" of local politics and repeatedly dismissed all attacks as "just political charges." He studiously avoided community forums and skipped the general election's one televised debate, relying on tightly controlled campaign appearances throughout the city and at least \$2.5 million in TV advertising. The old machine apparatus of precinct captains in the working-class and lower-middle-class "white ethnic" wards delivered votes more efficiently than usual.

Daley carefully avoided racial appeals in his campaign, thus making many white liberals feel comfortable about voting for him.

He didn't need to mention race to his core supporters, many of whom had one simple desire: a white mayor. Daley's association with his father, the late Mayor Richard J. Daley, only deepened their commitment.

Likewise, leaders of the downtown business establishment yearned for the stability that they thought a long reign by the 46-year-old Daley could bring. They also hoped for an end to pressure from community groups and

### CHICAGO

for a return to the elder Daley's devotion of city resources to downtown financial interests.

For the sake of the campaign Daley made himself a moderate—reversing himself on issues such as gay rights and abortion. And he chose improving education—a widely popular goal—as his primary campaign issue, even though he presented virtually no program beyond appointing a deputy mayor for education. While studiously avoiding clear commitments about what he would do as mayor, Daley constantly talked of his concern about schools, jobs, housing, crime and drugs.

Daley's strategy "reduced the size of the target," according to Evans adviser Don Rose. While obviously gaining great support from identification with his father and the Democratic machine remnants, he did nothing to cultivate that connection, making it more difficult for his opponents to attack him as a reincarnation of Richard J. Daley. He also tried to transcend politics as the good manager who

was not involved in the fractious "council wars" of the Washington era.

The campaign belied Daley's own record. Vrdolyak, for example, said recently that Daley backed him throughout his battles with Washington, but "he was just hiding behind a tree." In 1987 Daley openly backed a third-party candidate against Democratic nominee Washington. But that didn't stop Daley Democrats from attacking Jesse Jackson for backing Evans' third-party bid.

**Divide and conquer:** But neither Evans nor Acting Mayor Eugene Sawyer—who failed in a Democratic primary effort—was able to hit the carefully shrunk Daley, target or to present a compelling message on his own behalf. Both their fates may have been sealed a week after Washington's Nov. 25, 1987, death, when a few black aldermen joined the white opponents of the late mayor to install Sawyer, a black alderman who had previously been part of the Washington bloc. Evans, the favorite of most Washington allies, lost out in the power play. It was a deliberate, successful ploy to divide the blacks and the Washington coalition and to

**Daley carefully avoided racial appeals in his mayoral campaign, thus making many white liberals feel comfortable about voting for him.**

set up a weak opponent for the next election.

Washington, through the force of his own personality and his reform message, had been able to unite blacks and to muster a substantial minority of Hispanics and around 15 percent of whites to win both his elections narrowly. But the vast majority of whites had rejected Washington at the polls, even though they overwhelmingly now claim to see him as a good mayor—just as most whites claimed to like Sawyer but only about 7 percent voted for him, and all the white council members who put him in office abandoned him for Daley.

When Sawyer was placed in power on Dec. 2, 1987, some white liberals fearfully saw a huge but peaceful protest outside the council chambers as a "mob." Then last year, in the single most damaging event to black-white relations, Sawyer vacillated about firing Steve Cokely, an aide given to anti-Semitic conspiracy theories. When Cokely was finally ousted, many blacks defended him or tried to excuse his statements. That incident heightened Jewish distrust of blacks, creating "the tidal change in that portion of the Chicago electorate that made liberalism possible," Rose argued. Shortly after the Cokely firing, black aldermen stormed the Art Institute of Chicago to remove an unflattering painting of Washington by a white student.

Black-white relations were further frayed during the campaign, as various black community and political leaders stridently declared that "race is the only issue" in the campaign, attacked Sawyer as "an Uncle Tom" and derided Daley as a "born-and-bred racist."

**Strategy blackfires:** Race and racism remain serious issues in the city. Daley's reluctance to talk about race—or even to speak out forcefully against the recent attempted beating of a black postal worker by whites in his neighborhood—does not mean he will be free of prejudice or responsive to black needs. But the attempt by many black leaders to mobilize blacks on the basis of race—even if done obliquely—and to attack opponents as racists increased the already elevated level of distrust.

During the campaign many Hispanics and whites from the Washington coalition saw blacks as arrogating exclusive power to determine the direction of the coalition. Non-black Washington allies also worried that blacks were denying the relevance or desirability of coalition politics. Even though Evans was one of the more moderate black voices and had spoken out early against Cokely, he was tarred with the strident comments of some supporters.

Wild paranoid theories about white conspiracies flourished, but black paranoia is well grounded in the long history of abuse of blacks by big city government, the police, the Chicago Housing Authority, the parks department and other institutions on the losing end of many lawsuits over the years. But whatever moral or historical grounds blacks might have for suspicion, many black "movement" leaders were strategically blind to what it took to build a coalition. It was unclear to many Washington voters what their movement was now either for or against—but many whites became convinced it was against them.

Evans won only 5 percent of the white vote, even doing worse than Sawyer in some northwest side, largely white wards and los-

*Continued on page 22*