

4170

INTERNAL INFORMATION BULLETIN

January 1970

No. 1 in 1970

REPORTS AND DISCUSSION:
1969 and 1970 SWP ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

40 cents

Published by

SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

873 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003

Table of Contents

	Page
REPORT ON ELECTION CAMPAIGNS PANEL [23rd National SWP Convention, 1969], by Jon Britton	3
SENATORIAL AND GUBERNATORIAL RACES IN 1970	7
REPORT ON THE 1969 SWP CAMPAIGN FOR MAYOR OF ATLANTA, by Dennis Edge	9
APPENDIX: 1969 Atlanta Mayoralty Campaign	12
REPORT ON PLANS FOR 1970 CALIFORNIA ELECTION CAMPAIGN, by Joel Britton	13
REPORT ON THE 1969 CLEVELAND ELECTION CAMPAIGN by Syd Stapleton	18
APPENDIX: 1969 Cleveland Campaign	21
REPORT ON THE 1969 SWP CAMPAIGN FOR MAYOR OF SEATTLE, by Bill Massey	22
APPENDIX: 1969 Seattle Equal-time Fight	26
REPORT ON PLANS FOR 1970 SEATTLE ELECTION CAMPAIGN, by Wendy Reissner	30
Toronto Campaign Brochure: "For Democracy in the Schools"	Back Cover

REPORT ON ELECTION CAMPAIGNS PANEL
(23rd National SWP Convention, 1969)

By Jon Britton

As the 1969 convention political and organizational reports reconfirmed, our election campaigns are a key party-building activity. Only in election campaigns, in this period, do we have the opportunity to directly counterpose the Socialist Workers Party and its program and perspective to the capitalist parties, in full view of masses of Americans. Our election campaigns provide a unique opportunity to link up, propagandistically and in action, current mass struggles around concrete issues with our perspective for independent mass political action by the working class and oppressed minorities.

Recent party campaigns, particularly the Halstead-Boutelle campaign, and the recruitment resulting from them illustrate the importance of our election campaigns in building the YSA and SWP and extending the influence of our movement.

An election campaign meeting was included in the convention schedule so that branch organizers and campaign directors from around the country could get together and discuss in detail our experiences with this year's local election campaigns, initial plans for the upcoming 1970 statewide campaigns, and the importance and realistic possibilities for launching a series of offensives aimed at getting rid of undemocratic and unconstitutional ballot laws and candidates' age and residency requirements that severely restrict minority party access to the ballot.

The following are edited versions of two presentations representative of the campaign meeting discussion. The first, by Atlanta organizer Doug Jenness, deals with the Atlanta mayoral campaign. The other presentation, by Los Angeles organizer Joel Britton, reflected some preliminary thinging on the 1970 California campaign and plans for challenging the highly restrictive election laws of that state.

Doug Jenness: One of the most noticeable things about the Atlanta election campaign is the amount of press and radio-t.v. publicity we've been able to get. Part of this can be attributed to the fact that this is the first time we've ever run a campaign in Atlanta -- the first time, I think, that anybody's run any kind of socialist campaign there. Also, the press is not familiar with what we're all about yet.

But we did a few things that made the campaign move along the way we wanted it to. In the very beginning, we outlined a strategy that ours is not just a protest campaign, it's not a student campaign. In the youth report today the perspective of having campus campaigns was outlined, which is a good perspective. But that's not what we're talking about for the party campaigns. What we're talking about are campaigns for the party based on our political perspective for the working class and the black community that address themselves to problems faced by the working class and the black community today. In our political resolution we talked about the growing crisis of American capitalism. This crisis manifests itself in specific, concrete problems we can address ourselves to and pose solutions to. Depending on the city, there are any number of struggles going on that we can relate to. This is the best way of having an impact on the radicalizing youth and student milieus.

And you project an image to win. You never get up before a t.v. or radio commentator and say that you expect to lose. Or, "Well, we can't win this time; this is just a protest campaign, an educational campaign to spread our ideas." You don't say you think you can win the election, either. You pose it in such a way that you're not lying about it and not giving any kinds of illusions, but at the same time leaving the door open. And you run the campaign seriously, as if this is a party that really has some solutions to problems and really has the perspective of taking power.

The second thing we did was to take our transitional program with the additions on the youth struggle and on the black struggle, particularly the black struggle, and make it pertinent to our own city problems and state problems. Every city has different things you will want to emphasize. Be very concrete and specific. Don't just talk about black control of black communities. Give concrete instances of what you mean.

In Atlanta large numbers of people live in public housing projects. The housing authority is run by the city, and these people have been complaining that the projects are run like concentration camps. The tenants came up with a tenants' bill of rights. It wasn't a real radical thing but it was something we could support. We added a transitional demand to it: tenant control of the housing

authority. And we added the concept that rent should be no more than 10 percent of income. Like the Cubans have. And we said that. In the leaflet we said, "If Cuba can do it, we can certainly do it in Atlanta."

We follow all the local protests closely, and get all the reports and information they come out with. For example, there was a group called Better Schools Atlanta, a liberal group, white and black citizens, that put out a report in great detail showing how racism has given inferior education to black students in Atlanta. It's an important document, and one we're going to use in a leaflet on education.

Another campaign leaflet we're going to put out will be addressed to the leaders of all the major trade unions in Atlanta, saying ours is the only program for the unions. We have a program to fight inflation. We have a program on taxes. The program on taxes coincides almost exactly with the program the AFL-CIO in Georgia came out with a couple of months ago. And we say, "We're the only ones who support your program." And the labor party and support to the black struggle have to be in there too. We're addressing it to the unions through the official leadership, not the united-front-from-below type of thing. Actually, this is designed not so much for the rank and file in the labor unions as for students. It will show students how we're trying to reach workers. Here's a serious way of doing it. Then also something like this is likely to be covered by the press.

Tied in with the whole area of research and publicity is actually participating in actions. The tenants' struggle in Atlanta involved various black community organizations and a lot of young people, radicalizing black and white students who work in the black community. So we participated in it with our signs, came down and said, "Vote Socialist Workers," or "Vote for Linda Jenness," and passed out our leaflet on housing at this rally called by Tenants United. A couple of black girls grabbed our campaign signs and started walking around with them. People knew we were there. And the press mentioned it, too.

Another thing -- we've had a lot of speaking engagements with other candidates, like where there's a panel and each candidate has two to ten minutes to speak. We try to work up a different speech for each meeting. Sometimes you are speaking to a community organization. In that case you want to direct yourself to the problems they're discussing at that community meeting. One dealt with the question of police protection, so we raised the idea of black control of police. Very concrete, and it dealt specif-

ically with that community. Other times, it's just meetings at the Kiwanis Club and it doesn't make much difference. However, the newsmen all come to these meetings and they pick up what you say. You can use it as a forum for the press and t.v.-radio. Every time you give a different speech you can get different things out for the press and radio. Then the press thinks you're running a lively, interesting campaign. It's not just a routine thing that you're doing.

If you want the press to give good coverage to a campaign speech you can mimeograph it up in advance and release it to the press. We did that with Linda's speech at an antiwar rally and gave it to all the reporters who came to the rally.

I think we need a lot of experimentation in this area of press relations. Also a lot of audacity. Every time you have a press conference, every time you have some statement you want to put out, you send out a press release. But that's not enough. And calling up the press and telling them about it is not enough, either. What you need to do is make friends with some of the newsmen. Of course it varies in different cities, but sometimes, if you have something to say, something comes up, some other candidate has said something and you think a newsman might be interested in your slant on the thing, call him up and tell him a little about it over the phone. Tell him that you want to be interviewed. Tell him you'd be willing to give an interview. Be audacious. Just assume that you should be interviewed -- you're very important. Take that approach.

A couple of months ago the main reporter for the Atlanta Constitution, Alex Coffin, wrote in his column, "the mayor's race is going very slow, and I haven't even met Linda Jenness yet." So Linda called him up two hours after she got the paper and said, "Here I am. I'll be glad to give you an interview any time." And she had an interview with him the next day. Now he comes to all the meetings and Linda addresses him on a first name basis. There are about six or seven reporters that Linda can talk to on a first name basis.

I don't know how it is in other cities, but almost all the reporters we have to deal with are under 35. They're influenced by the radicalization. That doesn't mean that they're socialists or that they support the campaign. But they're interested. The campaign is lively. It's got a little zip to it. And a lot of them sympathized totally with the fight on the qualifying fee.

If something breaks quickly and you don't have time to send out a release,

but you know you are going to a speaking engagement that night and there are likely to be some reporters there, get up a statement on what happened and give it to the reporters at the meeting. We haven't even done it systematically because the amount of press coverage we got took us a little by surprise. But I think a systematic campaign could be experimented with to make friends with the press. Go down to the office and walk in and say, "Hello, how are you? I'm a candidate for governor, or for senator, or for congress. Glad to meet you. I'd like to talk a little about my campaign." Give him some leaflets, and stuff like that.

On endorsers and opponent work. We tried to use our campaign as a weapon against SDS. There are two major SDS groups in Atlanta. Both of these are individually smaller than the YSA, but they have a certain influence. We got individual sponsors from a number of them but it wasn't putting pressure on them as an organization. So we decided to send them a letter asking them to discuss the campaign, endorse it, and send a speaker to a campaign rally. We also sent letters to Women's Liberation and a couple of other groups. Well, one of the SDS groups has endorsed the campaign. The other is going to refuse. We haven't gotten a written statement yet; they're still writing it up. But they told us they're going to refuse. We'll see when the statement comes, but whatever it is we're going to polemicize against it. We'll get their statement and get it published in the Great Speckled Bird, which has a circulation of 10,000, and have our answer published. And we can use it nationally. [Editor's note: see articles in the October 17, 1969 Militant.]

Asking SDS to endorse our campaign forces them to talk about us, about our program, our politics. They have to relate to us. They have to adapt to us. We never adapt to them; they're always adapting to us. And they're very uncomfortable about their statement on our campaign. I asked them whether they were going to release it publicly. They were talking about leafleting our rally which would have been great. And they said, "No, uh, we're not sure whether we're going to put it out publicly or not. We'll give you a copy of the statement." They're starting to back up a little because they feel the pressure.

Getting individual endorsements forces comrades to talk to people about the campaign. On the suggestion of the national office, we sent all the names of our endorsers in to The Militant. They're getting free sample copies of the paper, just like in the national campaign. This can be done for all our campaigns.

Now, the last thing is about drawing up an election platform. Before we put out the printed form of our platform, we put out a mimeoed version and circulated it to people we know in the radical movement and then got feedback from it. On the basis of that feedback we made some changes. We had omitted some things that should have been in there. As a result, the platform was sharpened up and it gave people we work with in the radical movement a sense of participation and involvement in the campaign.

Joel Britton: I think it's a little bit routine to say that our 1970 campaigns should start after the November 15 action. The thinking a number of leading comrades in California have done on the California campaign for 1970 is that if at all possible we should launch the campaign several weeks, if not a month, before November 15 so that we can have our literature out and have a big intervention at the time of the San Francisco action.

In California, we have four branches and five YSA locals, and a couple of at-large areas, so we have the problem of coordination. The 1970 campaign opens up the possibility for a fulltime state campaign director and some real statewide coordination for the first time.

We're going to be running against -- and I think think this point should be made about most of our 1970 campaigns -- some of the most prominent capitalist politicians around. In California, there has been speculation about Reagan, Hayakawa, Unruh, and Alioto -- people of that stature and reputation. This will definitely enhance our campaign.

The CP will have some kind of multi-pronged, class-collaborationist orientation that will probably include some kind of support for Unruh, the liberal Democrat, against Reagan. They'll probably intervene in the Peace and Freedom Party, which will have ballot status and I assume will be revitalized. Tim Leary is also running and has already launched his campaign. That's another reason to start our campaign early. There's a lot of stuff in the underground press about Leary running for governor. And it's such a fake kind of a thing that we have to launch our campaign and take it on.

The kind of candidates we choose is very important -- the Atlanta and Cleveland campaigns have been a couple of the best campaigns in 1969 on this. We plan to run young comrades who have been active in the antiwar movement, in the third world movement, so that we project the image of a young, activist organization.

I don't want to go into all the issues that we're thinking of zeroing in on in addition to the war and the black struggle. But the campus issue is a very big issue in California because of Reagan's policies. Taxes are a very big issue and I think we'll be able to take the cue from the Atlanta campaign on the tax thing, as well as on a whole number of other things. I think we can relate the campaign to the crisis of the cities and raise transitional demands that make the campaign concrete.

Parallel to our socialist election campaign, we want to run a legal campaign against the ballot restrictions. California has one of the most restrictive ballot laws of any state. We've got some lawyers gathering the legal information on this now. The general idea is to have a parallel campaign -- a separate sponsors list that will be broader than the kind of people who would support our election campaign, that will fight these restrictive signature re-

quirements and the residency and age requirements. We want to take on the five-year residency requirement for the state offices because very few of the candidates we'll want to run will meet that requirement.

There are also possibilities around the question of the 18-year-old vote. The most ambitious perspective would be an initiative effort to get a measure placed on the ballot, which would take a lot of work. That would be a third whole campaign. I don't think we're ready to do that, but I think we can make it a big issue, and it's a way of relating the campaign to GIs.

There will also be city elections. And the campus elections which YSAers will be involved in for student government will be considered part, as I view it, of our California statewide campaign.

So I think there are tremendous opportunities and openings for our 1970 election campaigns.

SENATORIAL AND GUBERNATORIAL RACES IN 1970

<u>State</u>	<u>Senatorial Incumbent</u>	<u>Gubernatorial Incumbent</u>	<u>On Ballot in 1968</u>	<u>Probable Grounds for Legal Challenge**</u>
Alabama		Albert P. Brewer		
Alaska		Keith Miller		X ^{1,2}
Arizona	Paul J. Fannin	John Williams	X	
Arkansas		Winthrop Rockefeller		X ³
California *	George Murphy	Ronald Reagan		X ³
Colorado		John A. Love	X	
Connecticut	Thomas Dodd	John Dempsey		
Delaware	John J. Williams			X ^{1,3}
Florida	Spencer Holland	Claude Kirk, Jr.		X ⁴
Georgia		Lester Maddox		X ³
Hawaii	Hiram L. Fong	John Burns		X ⁴
Idaho		Don Samuelson		(a)
Illinois	Ralph Smith			(b)
Indiana	Vance Hartke		X	
Iowa			X	
Kansas				X ^{1,3}
Kentucky			X	
Louisiana				X ⁴
Maine	Edmund Muskie	Kenneth Curtis		
Maryland	Joseph Tydings	Marvin Mandel		X ³
Massachusetts	Edward Kennedy	Francis Sargen		X ^{3,4}
Michigan	Philip A. Hart	William Milliken	X	(b)
Minnesota	Eugene McCarthy	Harold LeVander	X	
Mississippi	John Stennis			X ³
Missouri	Stuart Symington			X ⁴
Montana	Mike Mansfield		X	
Nebraska	Roman Hruska	Norbert Tiemann		X ¹
Nevada	Howard Cannon	Paul Laxalt		
New Hampshire			X	
New Jersey	H. A. Williams, Jr.		X	
New Mexico	Joseph M. Montoya		X	
New York*	Charles Goodell	Nelson Rockefeller	X	X ⁴
No. Carolina				X ³

<u>State</u>	<u>Senatorial Incumbent</u>	<u>Gubernatorial Incumbent</u>	<u>On Ballot in 1968</u>	<u>Probable Grounds for Legal Challenge**</u>
No. Dakota	Quentin Burdick		X	
Ohio	Stephen Young	James Rhodes		(c)
Oklahoma		Dewey Bartlett		
Oregon		Tom McCall		
Pennsylvania	Hugh Scott	Raymond Shafer	X	
Rhode Island	John Pastore		X	
So. Carolina		Robert McNair		X ³
So. Dakota				X ³
Tennessee	Albert Gore	Buford Ellington		X ^{3,4}
Texas	Ralph Yarborough	Preston Smith		X ³
Utah	Frank E. Moss		?	
Vermont	Winston L. Prouty		X	
Virginia	Harry F. Byrd, Jr.			X ⁴
Washington	Henry M. Jackson		X	
West Virginia	Robert C. Byrd			
Wisconsin	William Proxmire		X	X ⁴
Wyoming	Gale McGee	Stanley Hathaway		

Notes:

1. No procedure provided for independent candidates getting on ballot.
2. No procedure provided for minor parties getting on ballot.
3. Unreasonable signature requirements.
4. Distributive requirements for signatures or presidential electors.

- (a) In 1968 Wallace successfully challenged lack of provision for new political party getting on ballot. Ruling by state supreme court.
- (b) Distributive requirements ruled unconstitutional.
- (c) Ballot requirements ruled unconstitutionally restrictive by U.S. Supreme Court in 1968. New ballot legislation in the works.

* Legal challenges underway or definitely planned.

** This does not include the question of candidates' qualifications such as age and residency, and possible challenge of laws requiring petition signatures to be those of registered voters.

Note also that all House of Representative seats are up for re-election in 1970.

REPORT ON THE 1969 SWP CAMPAIGN FOR MAYOR OF ATLANTA

By Dennis Edge

October 28, 1969

The May 11 through October 7, 1969 SWP election campaign for mayor of Atlanta is viewed by Atlanta comrades as a tremendous success. The fight against the exorbitant qualifying fee, intervention in local issues, amount of news coverage and mushrooming antiwar sentiment are the major reasons for this success.

In early May, the Atlanta YSA, which had been in existence for two years, decided to simultaneously form the Atlanta SWP branch and announce Linda Jenness' candidacy for mayor. The campaign was launched at a press conference May 11 at Emory University at the First Southwide Young Socialist Conference and received both television and newspaper coverage. In the following weeks of May we mailed a preliminary platform, sponsor cards, fund letters to our mailing list and Linda spoke to a high school political science class and was interviewed for 30 minutes on a radio call-in program. Suggestions for the platform from friends outside of the YSA and SWP were incorporated into a final printed version.

The first intervention in a local issue came on June 9 when Linda appeared before the Board of Aldermen at City Hall and made a statement attacking a proposed park curfew aimed at young people in the Peachtree-14th Street area. This area is considered to be the hippy community in Atlanta and Linda won respect from people in this area as well as the local underground newspaper for her stand regarding the curfew.

On July 22, the second major intervention took place when Linda and other comrades participated in a demonstration called by Tenants United for Fairness to protest Atlanta Housing Authority regulations and public housing conditions. Our comrades distributed about 250 leaflets calling for "tenant control of the Atlanta Housing Authority" and "a rent ceiling of 10 percent of a tenant's income." On the following day, Linda attended a public hearing on the Atlanta Transit System's request for a bus fare increase and stated opposition to the increase while calling for public control of the bus company.

These actions were followed by a Cuban support meeting on July 27, and, on August 9, an antiwar rally where Linda spoke.

Throughout the campaign there were forty-three speaking engagements including garden clubs, church groups, Kiwanis clubs, etc. Significant among these were the all-black Kirkwood Community and

Atlanta Urban Corps meetings where Linda used the opportunities as educational on black control. However, what was important about most of these speaking engagements was not the immediate audience but the thousands of people reached by phenomenal TV, radio and newspaper coverage which reported Linda's opposition to the war, support of black control, and support of the Cuban revolution.

Qualifying Fee Fight

The fight against the qualifying fee more than any other development made the campaign successful. Combining the campaign with a popular civil liberties issue generated considerable support and sympathy.

On July 7, the Board of Aldermen, in one of their ho-hum meetings, voted unanimously to establish qualifying fees for the city elections as follows: \$5,000 for mayor, \$1,400 for vice-mayor, \$1,200 for alderman, and \$600 for Board of Education. Unknowingly, the Aldermaniacs handed to us on a silver platter a powerful weapon to use against them. We began work on it right away, putting out mailings and press releases condemning the fees, circulating support petitions and calling a press conference for July 17. The press conference, at which Linda announced our intentions of taking the city to court over the issue, was very successful, with coverage from WQXI-TV, WAGA-TV, WGST-Radio, WSB-Radio, the Atlanta Journal, The Great Speckled Bird, and WRNG-Radio. Following this two major TV stations editorialized against the qualifying fees, Julian Bond stated his support for the suit, the American Civil Liberties Union took the case, and two members of the National Welfare Rights Organization joined Linda as plaintiffs in the suit.

The suit was filed July 31 in Federal District court and on August 18 a federal three-judge panel invalidated the 1969 state election law and ordered the Aldermaniacs to reset fees at a "reasonable" amount. By this time we were off the second page of the Atlanta Constitution and onto the first. After haggling among themselves in emergency session on August 19, the Aldermen lowered the filing fee for mayor to a "reasonable" \$1,000. A few days later the same three-judge panel, in their democratic wisdom, upheld the \$1,000 fee as reasonable and our ACLU lawyer, feeling we should be satisfied, quit. Fred LeClercq, a lawyer from Emory University Legal Services, who

had been working with the ACLU on the case and who had contributed money to the campaign, agreed to take the case to the Supreme Court. September 9, one day from the qualifying deadline, Justice Hugo Black issued an opinion forcing the Atlanta government to open the election to all aspirants for office not able to pay the fees. This decision also forced the qualifying date to be extended to September 17 and 37 candidates qualified without paying a cent. This decision, plus the qualifying period extension, caused pandemonium at City Hall. There was talk that the October 7 election day would have to be extended also in order to have ballots printed, prepare voting machines, etc.

Linda went to City Hall on September 16 to qualify under the poverty clause and, as we expected, was not allowed to because of a two-year residency requirement to serve as mayor. The next night Linda announced a major write-in campaign. She had fifteen speaking engagements after being excluded from the ballot -- two of them on major radio stations and three on major TV stations.

The significance of the qualifying fee victory cannot be overstated. It is well known all over Atlanta who initiated, carried out and won the fight. It is especially known in the black community where most of the candidates who qualified under the poverty clause live. The fight

gave the SWP an identity in Atlanta. As indicated earlier, the Atlanta branch was formed at the same time that the campaign was launched, and outside of the radical movement and the FBI it was almost unknown. That clearly is not the case now.

In addition to the qualifying fee victory the campaign was successful because we used it as an educational example to the rest of the radical movement of how to run a working-class campaign. We didn't feel that this could be done by relating primarily to student issues or adapting either to the ultraleft rhetoric or the milieu around the local underground newspaper. Rather, we tried to address the campaign to the key questions facing the working class and black community. We tried to create the image that we were not simply a protest campaign but serious about taking power. We tried to relate to local struggles and issues by participating in them, raising our solutions and tying these issues to the central national problems of the Vietnam war and oppression of the black community.

We also used the campaign as a weapon against our major opponent in the radical movement -- RYM II. By asking them to support us and soliciting a public refusal, we were able to answer them publicly and make them look foolish. Informal reports since indicate some of their members feel they may have made an error.

Statistical Information

From the announcement of the campaign on May 11 to its end on October 7 there were 43 speaking engagements. Nine of these were either radio or TV programs. We had 3½ hours of radio time and 7 hours of TV time. (This time includes panels, etc. with other candidates). Approximately 6,200 people attended the 34 meeting-type speaking engagements for an average of 173 persons per meeting. About 4,000 pieces of campaign literature were distributed at these 34 meetings and by the end of the campaign about 10,000 pieces were distributed. Tens of thousands of people were reached by radio and TV. Speaking engagements by month are as follows: May - 3; June - 1; July - 3; August - 14; September - 17; October - 5. Twelve press releases were put out. Nine of the press releases were printed, as follows:

1. May 9 campaign announcement
2. Statement on arrests in Peachtree 14th Street area
3. Statement attacking proposed park curfew
4. Statement defending Ahmed Evans
5. Statement on 4th of July parade
6. Statement attacking qualifying fees
7. Statement supporting TUFF rally
8. Statement attacking bus fare

- increase
9. Campaign rally announcement in Piedmont Park

- There were three press conferences:
1. Announcement of campaign
 2. Initiation of fight against qualifying fee
 3. Qualifying fee victory

We received \$68 in donations and spent a total of \$90.

Number of sponsors: 106.

Linda participated in three actions: (1) August 9 antiwar action; (2) TUFF demonstration; (3) police brutality protest.

Newspaper articles - 71.

Literature

1. One sticker "Black Control of Black Communities" - 1,500
2. One poster "Bring All the GIs Home Now - Vote Socialist" - 200
3. Leaflets - 8 leaflets plus reprints as follows:

- a. Ahmed Evans - 300

- b. Tenant control - 300
- c. Education - 300
- d. Piedmont Park Rally - 300
- e. Bus fare - 300
- f. RYM letter - 100
- g. Reprints - 1,000
- h. Write-in - 600
- 4. Platform - 5,000

Campaign Speaking Engagements

<u>Date</u>	<u>Organization or Place</u>	<u>Attendance</u>
May 11	1st Southwide Young Socialist Conference	35
May 15	Political Science Class, Northside High	40
May 15	WRNG Radio (30 minutes)	--
June 9	Board of Aldermen (park curfew)	40
July 23	Atlanta Transit System (bus fare hearing)	100
July 27	Cuban Support Rally - Ausp. YSA-SWP	30
July 31	West End Kiwanis Club	100
Aug. 9	Antiwar action, Grant Park	200
Aug. 10	Unitarian Church, Ausp. NOW	350
Aug. 12	Grady High School	70
Aug. 12	Atlanta Press Club	70
Aug. 14	WRNG Radio (one-hour talk show)	--
Aug. 14	Kirkwood Community (all-black community)	100
Aug. 15	Atlanta Urban Corps	200
Aug. 15	Breakfast Exchange Club	20
Aug. 18	Atlanta Advertising Club	125
Aug. 23	Fulton Democratic Party	100
Aug. 24	SWP Campaign Rally, Piedmont Park	400
Aug. 25	WAGA-TV (one hour)	--
Aug. 26	Kiwanis Club of Atlanta	300
Sept. 4	Women's Chamber of Commerce (John V. spoke)	300
Sept. 4	Mayor's Committee on Housing Resources (John V. spoke)	25
Sept. 11	WSB-TV (90-minute panel)	30
Sept. 11	Mead Packaging Co.	75
Sept. 14	Progressive Club	150
Sept. 14	Pacers Club (John V. spoke)	35
Sept. 15	National Council of Jewish Women	500
Sept. 17	DeKalb Democratic Women	300
Sept. 20	WERD-Radio (one-hour talk show, black station)	50
Sept. 21	WAGA-TV (meet the wives - Doug - 90 minutes)	--
Sept. 23	Georgia State Political Science Forum	400
Sept. 24	Mount Holyoke Alumni Association	100
Sept. 24	WRNG-Radio (one-hour talk show)	--
Sept. 27	Mrs. Tom Brown's garden party	60
Sept. 28	WQXI-TV (90-minute panel)	50
Sept. 29	Bass Community Organization	250
Sept. 30	Macon Council of World Affairs, Mercer College	250
Oct. 1	Brown High School (John V. Spoke)	500
Oct. 1	Hungry Club	300
Oct. 2	WETV (90-minute panel) Ausp. League of Women Voters	30
Oct. 3	Plaza Park	250
Oct. 6	Georgia State Political Science Class	30
Total speaking engagements - 43		Total attendance
		6,175



APPENDIX: 1969 Atlanta Mayoralty Campaign

9 September 1969

THE RED SPECIAL

page 9

SOCIALIST WORKERS CAMPAIGN POSITION PAPER

FIRST ISSUED: At Tenants United For Fairness (TUFF) rally, July 21

SUBJECT: TENANT CONTROL OF HOUSING IN ATLANTA

The Atlanta Housing Authority consistently demonstrates its inability to meet the needs of more than 31,000 public housing tenants. High rent, poor maintenance, prison-type rules and penalties are the patterns set by the Housing Authority.

For example, the maximum income a family of ten persons can have to be eligible for public housing is \$5200 yearly. In addition, the Housing Authority charges 20% of this income for rent of \$1040 yearly. This leaves a family of ten with only \$4160 on which to live. Or put more dramatically it leaves \$8 per person per week for all necessities such as food, clothing, and medical expenses. Tenants are also charged for any damage to apartments regardless of how the damage was caused.

The squeeze is also put on many tenants who are receiving welfare payments. The Welfare Agency wants to know how much the public housing rent will be in order to determine the amount of payment to the tenant. On the other hand, the Housing Authority wants to know the welfare check amount in order to determine what rent they will charge the tenants. The results: if the welfare check is increased, the rent is increased; if the rent is decreased, the welfare check is decreased.

The housing bureaucrats say the Atlanta public housing program is helping to eliminate poverty. The above facts, however, prove that the opposite is true: that the housing program is actually perpetuating poverty! these are but a few of the criminal policies imposed on tenants.

My position for delaing with these problems is:

TENANT CONTROL OF THE ATLANTA HOUSING AUTHORITY !

If the appointment of commissioners were taken out of the hands of the mayor and his friends in the real estate industry and tenants were able to elect their own representatives to the Housing Authority, the needs of the tenants could be more satisfactorily met. This would mean that qualifications for public housing, establishment of rent, and allocation of federal, state, and city funds for housing would be in the hands of the tenants.

END RACIST WAR IN VIETNAM -- USE MONEY FOR DECENT HOUSING !

\$30 billion of our tax money this year is paying for the racist war in Vietnam. I urge that we bring all American men home and use the vast sums being spent there for improving living conditions here at home. We could build enough adequate new low-rent housing for every family in this country with only a fraction of this money.

RENT CEILING OF 10% OF TENANT'S INCOME !

When I visited Cuba in January I learned that despite its relative poverty compared to the U.S. and a severe economic blockade, it has reduced rents to a maximum of 10% of a tenant's income. They plan to abolish all rents by 1970. This is certainly not too much to demand in Atlanta !

REPORT ON PLANS FOR 1970 CALIFORNIA ELECTION CAMPAIGN

By Joel Britton

[The following is the text of a report by Joel Britton to the California branches and locals on the 1970 California state election campaign.

The slate of candidates and the general approach to the 1970 California elections proposed in the report have been approved by the California branches, and the campaign has been publicly launched (See The Militant, November 14, 1969.)]

* * *

Socialist Workers
California Campaign
Committee
Los Angeles
September 19, 1969

- Berkeley SWP
- Berkeley YSA
- San Francisco SWP
- San Francisco YSA
- Hayward YSA
- San Diego SWP
- San Diego YSA
- Los Angeles SWP
- Los Angeles YSA
- SWP National Office
- YSA National Office

Dear Comrades,

The following report was adopted by the Los Angeles branch as the general line of our orientation toward the 1970 elections in California. Most of the branches and youth locals have now had reports and discussions along the same lines.

Leading SWP and YSA comrades from Los Angeles, Berkeley and San Francisco met this week and agreed to propose the following to the California branches:

(1) Joel Britton will be relieved of all Los Angeles responsibilities and begin immediately to function as Acting State Campaign Director. Lew Jones will be relieved of all Berkeley and Bay Area responsibilities as soon after the November 15 action as possible so that he can become State Campaign Director. A state-wide campaign committee will be set up composed of the party and youth organizers.

(2) We will kick off the campaign on or about October 15, so that we will have about four weeks of the pre-November 15 period to take our campaign to the antiwar movement. A major literature distribution and sponsorship effort will be organized for the San Francisco action on November 15.

(3) The slate of candidates being proposed to the branches will be:

- U.S. Senator -- Diane Feeley
- Governor -- Herman Fagg
- Lt. Governor -- Dave Frankel
- Supt. of Public Instruction -- Tony Camejo (this office is "non-partisan")
- Secretary of State -- Patti Iiyama
- Controllor -- Terry Hardy
- Treasurer -- Phil Conner
- Attorney General -- Froben Lozada

This slate was chosen in line with the qualifications discussed in the following report and by taking into consideration personal situations, political development, etc. Included on the slate are antiwar leaders, campus activists and leaders, Third World comrades (5), women (3), and comrades in unions.

Diane Feeley was a leader of the San Francisco State College Strike Support Committee, was arrested during the strike, and is now on probation. She coordinated the legal defense of the hundreds of arrested students. She is currently a graduate student at San Francisco State.

Herman Fagg is a teacher in Marin County (AFT) and has been a student activist at San Francisco State and UC Berkeley. Herman is an Afro-American and speaks Spanish.

Dave Frankel was a leader of a struggle last spring at Cal. State LA over the firing of several radical professors. He is a student there this fall and is Los Angeles YSA organizer. He was the SMC coordinator for the demonstration at the Apollo 11 dinner.

Tony Camejo teaches at Merritt College in Oakland (AFT) and is a graduate student at UC Berkeley. He was arrested during the Third World struggle for a studies department at UC Berkeley last spring. He is well known among Chicano activists, having played a prominent role at the Denver Chicano Youth Conference.

Patti Iiyama is a student at UC Berkeley where she has played a leading role in many campus struggles, including the Movement Against Political Suspensions and the June-July 1968 French solidarity campaign. Patti is Japanese-American and speaks Spanish.

Phil Conner is in the student

government at Cal. State Hayward where he was part of the team that won the student body presidents to a perspective of support to the fall antiwar offensive. Phil is an Afro-American.

Terry Hardy is Los Angeles coordinator of the SMC and was on the staff of the Peace Action Council during the work on the August 17 action in San Clemente. She will be one of the main organizers of the Los Angeles contingent for the November 15 action.

Froben Lozada is head of the Latin American Studies Department at Merritt College. He is well known as a Chicano activist and has been an SWP candidate in Berkeley.

The above information is not meant as a complete biographical background on the candidates, but simply to provide information to show what an attractive slate we will have. This is primarily for the branches and youth locals where some of the above might not be known.

IMPORTANT: All proposed candidates must write a thorough biography which should include: date and place of birth, how long resident in California, how radicalized, when joined SWP and YSA, what struggles involved in and in what role (include antiwar actions, civil liberties fights, campus and community struggles you helped build even if you didn't have an official post). Also, send pictures showing you in action: speaking, demonstrating, organizing (black and white glossy if possible).

Candidates should indicate what their personal situations will be this fall (job, school, etc.), when they can be full-time for the campaign, and what their financial situations are.

Photographs should be taken of candidates in action and if they are doing something really impressive (like speaking at large rallies), 16mm movie footage should be taken.

A meeting of candidates will be held the weekend of September 28 in the Bay Area. The biographies and photos should be brought to this meeting.

(4) Initial campaign material is being prepared for release when the campaign is announced in October. A poster will be silk-screened in Berkeley which will tie in with the fall antiwar offensive; a button will be produced in Los Angeles; two brochures will be prepared, one a candidates brochure, and the other on the war in Vietnam and the antiwar movement; a draft program and sponsor cards will be prepared.

(5) The legal fight will be launched as soon as we can assemble additional lawyers, finish the necessary research, prepare a brief, and initiate the suit. We will help build a broad committee to publicize this fight for a democratic ballot law, raise money and gather sponsors who will support our right to be on the ballot.

NOTE: Each branch and local should start compiling lists of potential sponsors and financial supporters for this civil liberties committee. Heads of law schools, professors, lawyers, preachers, student government people, "movement" leaders, etc. We will want to finance this effort from sources other than those that will come directly to our election campaign.

(6) Money in large sums is going to be necessary to ensure statewide coordination, attractive literature and posters, extensive trailblazing, full-time candidates, etc. A minimum financial base can be maintained if each party branch and youth local sends \$1.00 per member per month to the state campaign office (now located in Los Angeles, to be located in Berkeley after November 15). This concept should be discussed immediately and, if possible, payments should begin in September.

It should be stressed that the above measures will be only the bare minimum, just enough to pay a fulltime state campaign director. Other steps must be taken in each area to raise large sums of money. Los Angeles has raised \$600 for the state campaign fund from one sympathizer and others are being approached. It is important to explain fully the scope and goals of our campaign when talking to potential financial contributors, and to go after large contributions. Ours will be the only meaningful election campaign in 1970, and we can expect that our friends will be grateful and will pay accordingly.

A separate state campaign fund and checking account are being set up.

(7) Statewide mailing lists will be needed. We are getting the Militant, YS, ISR, and IP tapes from New York for the whole state and will send each area the subscribers it will have responsibility for. Send to Los Angeles any names and addresses you have from recent local campaigns, the Halstead-Boutelle campaign, etc.

(8) Research projects are going to be necessary so that we have the facts and figures and realistic solutions to the problems of this state. Much of this material is available in newspaper and

magazine articles or other sources. We will want this material for our speeches, campaign material, articles, and debates. This will help make it possible for us to concretize the transitional demands we will raise during the campaign.

Some of the areas we will want to research are: the relationships between the ruling class and the universities, agriculture and defense spending; the tax and inflation problems; the special oppression of Afro-Americans, Chicanos, Orientals and Indians; the welfare system; the destruction of natural resources; pollution; the real estate racket; and others, especially those around which struggles are developing.

Comrades and friends of our movement who have special knowledge in any of these areas should be urged to write short position papers and send them to Los Angeles, or to simply send articles that have appeared.

(9) As soon as our campaign begins, we will want to demand equal time and fair time from the media. Paul Montauk has agreed to head up this work on a state level, but each area will have to allocate forces and energies to this work.

(10) Some of the branches and locals have begun to assign campaign directors who will begin to lay the basis for starting the campaign in October. Leading party and youth comrades should be assigned to work on the campaign, and their names should be sent to Los Angeles now.

Venceremos!
s/Joel Britton
Acting State Campaign
Director

* * *

Proposal for 1970 California Election Campaign (September 1969)

The antiwar movement is gearing up for what will probably be the largest mass protest action in U.S. history, building on the deepening radicalization. This radicalization, which is strongest among the student youth and the oppressed national minorities, is beginning to affect other sectors of the population. The possibilities of involving thousands of GIs and, for the first time, significant numbers of trade unionists in the November action are signs of this. Another sigh is the developing women's liberation movement.

The social crisis of capitalism is deepening, especially in the cities, as more and more people are being confronted with the fact that capitalism cannot solve the problems of war, racial oppression, unemployment, pollution of our environment,

the breaking down of services, etc.

Despite this deepening crisis and the resultant radicalization, the capitalist politicians continue to hustle votes with two varieties of the same poison: Law and Order, and Law and Order "with Justice," with more black Democrats being offered as an alternative to black independent political action.

In California elections will take place in November 1970. The Republicans offer George Murphy for U.S. senator and Reagan for governor. The Democrats will offer "lesser evil" types like Unruh and Alioto (?).

The AIP's (American Independent Party - Wallaceites) will also contest for U.S. Senate and state offices.

Our opponents and competitors on the left offer nothing to the hundreds of thousands of Californians seeking solutions. The Communist Party is searching for a formula to "defeat Reagan at all costs." Their election strategy will probably have the usual multi-pronged characteristics of class collaboration a la Gus Hall. These are several possible variants: support to Jesse Unruh as the lesser evil Democrat; voter registration and "education" through the National Committees to Combat Fascism; participation in the Peace and Freedom Party; and possibly even a token CP campaign.

The various tendencies in SDS are confused and in disarray. Most tendencies and many independent radicals have been very critical of SDS politics and organizational methods. No consistent electoral policy is likely to emerge from any of them, but they will range from abstention to reform Democratic Party activity.

The PL-dominated wing of SDS continues to oppose the antiwar movement and movements for self-determination. Both wings are certain to splinter further when campuses open because of their sectarian, ultraleft, abstentionist orientation. PLP continues its policy of virtually no "open" work in its own name.

The Black Panther Party has proven incapable of building a mass black party that could challenge the political domination of the Democratic Party in the black community. They have substituted ultraleft, semi-Maoist rhetoric and a reformist bloc against "fascism" with the CP. While we must continue to defend the BPP, it is urgent that we accelerate our propaganda campaign for a mass black party with a transitional program.

The Socialist Labor Party will no doubt make the record with a ritual cam-

paign. We should take note of the recent splits in the SLP. In California, at least, a wing which wants to engage in action in the antiwar movement has split away and may want to relate to our campaign. Such elements could be a source of financial support and contact in certain areas.

The Peace and Freedom Party is entitled to ballot status in the 1970 elections and will probably be a factional battleground for most of the above groups. We will continue to oppose PFP-type politics: PFP had no clear anticapitalist program, and was an amalgam of political tendencies destined to disintegrate after the 1968 elections because of contradictory programs and perspectives.

The 1970 elections in California offer the SWP and YSA tremendous opportunities because of the deepening radicalization and the default of our opponents. We will continue to build the antiwar movement, consolidating the campus base and adult coalitions, and reaching out to GIs, Third World youth, and young workers. The Student Mobilization Committee's international student strike this fall and possibly next spring, the November 1969 action in San Francisco, and mass spring and fall actions in 1970 will probably be the high points of this work. These mass actions will be excellent examples of independent political action counterposed to the reformist electoral gimmicks our opponents will foster.

We must launch a socialist election campaign to give expression in the electoral arena to (1) the struggles to bring the troops home now; (2) the struggles for self-determination for oppressed national minorities, especially Afro-Americans and Chicanos, and (3) the struggles of the students, workers, women, and the elderly for control over their lives and environment. We will present our transitional program as concretely and energetically as possible, setting the example for future black and labor parties.

Our campaign will be the only one to support the struggles of colonized peoples for self-determination -- especially Vietnam, the Palestine Liberation Movement, and Cuba; the antiwar movement, the rights of GIs, Chicano control of the Chicano community, black control of the black community, the building of independent Chicano and black parties, the idea of an independent labor party based on the unions, the formation of black, brown, and leftwing caucuses in the unions, the campus struggles, women's liberation, a drastic overhaul of the tax structure that would spare the poor and soak the rich, other aspects of our program to solve the crisis of the cities, and a Socialist America.

A broad legal fight must be waged parallel to our election campaign for a change in the ballot laws. We will fight to have California's restrictive ballot laws declared unconstitutional, mobilizing support from others who will support our right to be on the ballot even though many of them will not support our election campaign. This legal fight must challenge the prohibitive requirements for signatures on petitions and the restrictive residency requirements.

This election campaign will be the most significant campaign we have ever run in California, advancing our ideas more broadly than ever before.

Our battle for hegemony on the left will be advanced by making the 1970 election campaign the central focus of our work. The radio, TV and newspaper coverage for our campaign will help to establish the SWP as the socialist party in the minds of millions. We will be able to organize trailblazing expeditions onto campuses in areas in California and the western region that have been untouched by Trotskyists. We will be hitting every significant campus in the state while interest in politics is heightened by the elections and the actions on campus against the war, for black studies programs, etc.

Our campaign must be used to qualitatively increase the distribution and subscription base of The Militant and the Young Socialist. Wherever the campaign goes, new openings will be found for distribution of Merit literature.

It was the Halstead-Boutelle campaign that began to put the YSA on the map as the major radical youth organization, opening up new areas where we now have locals or members-at-large. Our 1970 campaign in California can greatly increase our influence and add significant numbers to our ranks. We will start with four party branches, five YSA locals, and a few YSA members-at-large. We should come out of the campaign with a YSA group on every major campus. Young Socialists for _____, _____, & _____, etc. should be constituted as soon as the campaign is launched. On some campuses it will be possible for the YSA to contest for student government positions. These campus campaigns will complement our state campaign. An important aspect of the campaign will be the gathering of endorsers, drawing serious activists close to our movement.

This campaign and ballot fight must declare war on routinism. They must start early because the longer we have the better, both for the legal effort and for the propaganda campaign. Other oppon-

ent campaigns have started or will start soon. We must take advantage of the fall antiwar offensive, launching our campaign this fall so that we will be able to intervene with our campaign literature in the student strikes and San Francisco action. This will give us the fall 1969 and spring 1970 terms of school and part of the fall 1970 term. Our movement in other states is beginning to plan now for similar campaigns against Kennedy, Rockefeller, and other prominent capitalist politicians. We are in a position to help spearhead our work nationally in the 1970 elections.

Our campaign should take advantage of the fact that a growing number of our comrades are playing leadership roles in the mass movement. We will want to select as candidates for U.S. senator, governor and the other state and local offices as many of these young, activist comrades as possible, from the campuses, the antiwar movement, the Third World movement, and trade unions. We will want to work out a full slate with the other branches, with at least one candidate from each branch.

We must produce attractive posters, stickers, buttons, and literature early in the campaign. Truth kits dealing with our opponents should be put out. A film should be produced showing our candidates in action, speaking, demonstrating, organizing.

Such an ambitious campaign as that

outlined above would require statewide coordination that was lacking for the most part during the 1968 campaign. A state campaign coordinating committee will be necessary, composed of the branch organizers and campaign directors at the beginning.

Such a campaign requires fulltime staff: a fulltime state campaign director, candidates on fulltime all the time, touring and trailblazing, appearing on radio and TV, etc.

"Red Special" cars or campers should be acquired for the campaign to be kept on the road as much as possible from the beginning of the campaign. The campaign should be the vehicle through which we carry out serious, ongoing regional organizing.

This kind of election campaign will be a big step forward for our California movement. But it can be carried out only if we begin now to discuss it out, drawing all our comrades into the "thinking out" of our prospects and how to be most effective. Then we must allocate forces, select candidates (hopefully from every branch and youth local in the state), project a budget and plan how we're going to raise the money, and get started on the literature.

Each branch should investigate local (municipal, county and campus) elections that could be contested for during the state campaign.

REPORT ON THE 1969 CLEVELAND ELECTION CAMPAIGN

By Syd Stapleton

November 4, 1969

When discussion was begun on the mayoralty campaign here there were feelings that the Stokes campaign would be a little too difficult to take on in the situation where the branch had little or no contact with the black community. The petitioning was seen as an arduous and drawn-out task that would not be able to contribute much to the influence of the Trotskyist movement in the area.

Experience in the campaign proved exactly the opposite. The critical political issues raised by the Stokes campaign made the impact of our campaign very sharp, and the degree of attention in the city focused on the race made the campaign of public importance in almost every segment of the population. To outline this experience I will list the major areas of work or importance for the campaign, and list the most important lessons. There will be some overlap, but I'll also try to list some of what we think are the most important general conclusions at the end.

(1) Use of the media. The most important single area of the campaign was the use of the media. In addition to heavy newspaper coverage, including three front-page stories, the news coverage in the electronic media was excellent. The major news, rock and TV stations normally carried campaign releases on the news, and press conferences received good coverage.

A fairly good estimate of the amount of TV and radio time is 25 hours (7 or 8 of which were TV), and the estimate may be low in instances where tapes were played more than once. Also included in that time are 30 one-minute spot ads on the only rock station in the town, and 18 minutes of prime time in the last week of the campaign played as part of a three-part presentation on the candidates.

We held five press conferences during the course of the campaign but found them to be the least productive of any press-oriented activity. The best results came from almost daily press releases in the last part of the campaign, in the form of attacks on what the other candidates said, applying transitional demands to public transportation, strikes, crime, etc. Another important factor was keeping the press informed of public meetings. The newspapers refused to cover the campaign for a period of time until we demanded meetings with the city editors and got reporters assigned to the campaign. Newspaper coverage again deteriorated in the last three or four days of the cam-

paigned, but after we had gotten two weeks of almost daily coverage. When we were given TV time to explain our own programs we did everything possible to carry the youth and audacity of the campaign into those areas. Professional-style work with films, tapes, skits, photos, etc. made the spots and program have terrific impact in the radical movement, and did not at all cut us off from working people or high school students.

Needless to say, the impression of the campaign as a serious, innovative, and reasonable alternative created by our use of the media had an impact in every other area of our work. High school students set up meetings because they had seen things they liked on TV; liberals gave us money because of the issues that we were able to raise, etc. People thought of the Socialist Workers Party as a big operation.

(2) The black community. Going into the campaign the situation in terms of leadership in the black community was as bad or worse than any city in the country.

An example is in the case of the railroading of Ahmed Evans. The astrologer-reformist-cultural nationalist leadership of the black community has effectively prevented the formation of a united-front type defense committee. The overall situation, of course, has not changed radically, but the campaign was generally seen as the only consistent and public defense that Ahmed Evans has had.

In the last month three young black people have been recruited to the YSA as a result of the campaign, which is the most important gain in the movement in that area in a long time. These young people will serve as the basis for forming a Third World Committee for Solidarity with Vietnam.

We were not able, however, to have any visible impact in the black high schools. Meetings that we organized in the schools were either not attended or packed by the "cultural nationalists," in spite of the fact that they were organized around Malcolm X tapes in addition to campaign speakers.

The Harris campaign, the endorsement of us by independent black school board candidate Gloria Gould, and the political points raised and publicized in the mayoral campaign have created a reservoir of sympathy for our movement in the black community which we expect to have further dividends. One example of

that which may not be entirely accurate is a newspaper poll which indicated that Stapleton would get .5 percent of the vote in the black community, which is 500 to 1,000 people.

(3) College campuses. On the two college campuses of the area that we have had no contact with, meetings set up by the student newspapers led to five students on one and six on the other signing up to join the YSA. There can be the perspective for functioning fractions on these campuses within a couple of weeks. On the two campuses where we have people the fact that we were not a novelty, that there was an enormous volume of antiwar work, and that our own people were over-extended already, reduced the amount of possible gain. However, on the major campus, Case Western Reserve, we were able to organize three large forums, to get 50 votes in a mock election, to set up dorm meetings, and towards the end of the campaign to begin the recruitment of the people who had worked on the campaign without joining the YSA.

(4) High Schools. High School meetings, speeches to "urban problems" classes, etc. were set up in one of two ways. Either a YSAer or campaign supporter in the school wangled the meeting, or the school set it up as part of three presentations, one each by the major mayoral candidates (the SLP ran a write-in campaign). The campaign was seen by a whole layer of students as the logical expression of their antiwar, generally alienated feelings, and the only limitation on the number of kids that we can recruit is our own level of organization. At the meeting for which we were most organized Stapleton spoke to 400 girls, held a seminar with 50 of them afterwards, and signed up 18 to join the YSA. That experience could and should be repeated at almost every high school in the area.

(5) The campaign forums. Our own public meetings were organized around the idea of relating the campaign and its momentum to specific issues in the radical or black liberation movements. Close to 200 people attended one of the largest forums in the history of our movement here, which was a debate with the Weathermen by the two candidates. A forum on black control held in a predominantly black high school was the second most successful. However, they were no substitute for party or YSA activities involving people who became supporters of the campaign.

(6) Trade unions. Probably the single least successful area of campaign work. Not one union gave the candidates an opportunity to speak, but the use of transitional demands did evoke a favorable response from plants where we have comrades, with the central question being the

war in Vietnam. The fact that Stokes came out for immediate withdrawal didn't impress older people or young people who saw the importance of building the movement against the war, since it was possible to raise proposal after proposal for ways that Stokes could make his opposition to the war real. Of course, he declined to accept any of them.

(7) General impact of the campaign on the antiwar movement, older ex-radicals, and active liberals. The clarity of the campaign around the war and black control, and the discussion that it was able to generate around those questions were generally seen as very valuable, even by those who have in the past been hostile to the party. We were able to raise contributions from older ex-party trade union officials, people who had not functioned in the radical movement, and in one case from an official of local SANE who had withdrawn from the antiwar movement to work on pollution. Wearing his Stokes button he wrote out a check for \$20 on the basis that the campaign obviously had the allegiance of all radical young people (!) and was doing the things that he would like to do. The Socialist Workers Party is now generally seen as a major independent force in the movement, and as one that makes it embarrassingly difficult to be against the war and at the same time to support the Democratic Party. The campaign was received in a friendly way by the Ethical Culture Society, for example.

(8) Some general statistics. Syd and James spoke to 7,100 people at at least 40 public meetings. Only six of those were campaign forums, although high school and dorm meetings organized by our efforts made up another 10 of the meetings. The figure is somewhat inflated by the fact that one of the meetings was the Kent State University meeting with 3,000 at it, but then the City Club debate, with only 150 actually there, was carried live by five radio stations and was listened to by an enormous number. Only forty-five endorser cards were collected during the campaign, but that flowed from a general lack of consciousness on the question, rather than any difficulty in getting endorsers. Once we began circulating "I would like to join the YSA" lists at meetings where a big pitch was made to join, 48 people signed up to join in the last four days of the campaign. That process is not at all concluded since there is little overlap between the "I want to join" lists and the endorser list -- which is predominantly young people.

Some general conclusions

Getting on the ballot, combined

with the fact that the campaign was one in which there was a lot of general interest because of Stokes, was the single most important factor in making the campaign a success. It compelled stations to give us equal time, compelled the media generally to take us seriously because of the 20,000 signatures we had collected to get on the ballot, and once those things had given us an opportunity to develop our ideas, the other things tended to fall into place.

Second, there is no reason for our campaigns not to project the kind of identification with the youth radicalization that our publications do. Transitional demands can be presented in such a way as to identify with the humanitarian inclinations of young people, while not making them offensive (unnecessarily) to other sections of the population.

Third, it is very important to not limit the application of transitional demands to formulas. We run in elections because people have illusions about elections. People also have illusions that the issues that other candidates raise are real issues. Application of a transitional approach to statements by the other candidates, specific proposals they make, attacks they make on one another, and so on are very important in developing the view of the socialist program as a serious contender for power on all questions -- not just "ours." Some

of the best responses that we got came from an attack on a big charity drive in town that had previously been looked on like motherhood. We exposed the phony participation of the corporations, did a muckraking job on the thing, and then let out with a series of proposals for creation of real solutions for public health. Another example is a statement on art and culture in this society which was printed by the biggest entertainment weekly in the city -- and was read by thousands of young people -- tying the problem to the war, the subjugation of art to advertising, etc.

Last, we had some problems during the campaign. They came from the fact that we were simply not prepared to recruit the young people who came to agree with us during the campaign. Had we been more conscious of the opportunities that would be presented by the campaign we could have literally signed up 200-300 young people wanting to join the YSA. Another problem was that the campaign became largely a branch activity, not involving larger numbers of people in actions.

Finally, this local campaign has built up a very good momentum which will be continued on a statewide basis by the 1970 campaign. The announcement will come on election night, at our victory celebration.

APPENDIX: 1969 Cleveland Campaign

FOR MORE INFORMATION:

Contact Dave Wulp,
249-8250

FOR RELEASE: September 5, 1969

STAPLETON SUPPORTS WELFARE MOTHERS

The demonstrations held by the welfare mothers expose for the nation to see the total inadequacy of our present welfare system. Before the welfare mothers took their fight to the streets and the public, their families were only allocated \$5 per year to clothe each child. Now the Welfare Department has found it necessary to grant them \$24 more for clothing. No child can be properly clothed for \$29. Emergency action has to be taken now to clothe these children.

The Democratic and Republican party politicians try to make us believe that there is not enough money to clothe welfare children. They parrot these statements while the U.S. spends billions on a genocidal war in Vietnam, a country smaller than Ohio. Instead of educating people to the fact that the war is not to our benefit and that it only serves to drain money from our cities. If America cannot feed its children why should we be spending billions to send three men to

the Moon?

The Socialist Workers Party Campaign supports unconditionally independent action by the poor to better their condition and we encourage any candidate who truly supports the struggles of people for human rights to do the same.

The welfare rights workers had to go into the streets to even get their demands noticed by our present capitalist politicians. Instead of supporting the action these politicians allowed over 100 demonstrators to be arrested. The politicians can never be the representatives of the people because they have allowed themselves to become tied to the very system which creates the intolerable conditions suffered by the people.

The Socialist Workers Party Campaign for Mayor of Cleveland puts forth the demands: 1) That the adequate clothing standards demanded by the welfare mothers be met. All children should be clothed according to their needs and not according to what some bureaucrat feels like allowing them to have. 2) That those jailed should be released and charges against them dropped immediately.

REPORT ON THE 1969 SWP CAMPAIGN FOR MAYOR OF SEATTLE

By Bill Massey

November 18, 1969

In April 1969 the branch executive committee, in going over its tasks and perspectives for the coming period, set out an election campaign for the office of mayor of Seattle. Seattle is one of those cities which runs "non-partisan" primaries for the office of mayor -- anyone who pays a \$262.50 fee (one percent of the mayor's yearly salary) and meets the age and residency requirements can run in the primary. The primary vote decides which two candidates run in the November election.

At the end of July the branch selected Tom Leonard as its mayoralty candidate.

There were questions in the minds of some comrades as to whether the expenses of the campaign were too much for us to undertake considering the other activities we had. We discussed the idea of just running a write-in campaign. However, the branch decided that the importance of our confronting the ruling class in the electoral arena and doing it in the most serious manner overrode the financial problems. So we paid the fee and entered Tom's name as one of the ten candidates in the "non-partisan" primary.

The key issues in the campaign in Seattle were the same as those around the country -- Vietnam, black liberation, the youth rebellion, and "law and order." These issues remained our main issues throughout the campaign, while different aspects of them became the main focus for the introduction of our transitional demands. For example, in the beginning of the campaign our slogans on black control focused around the Seattle Community College Black Student Union demands for a black trustee at that school to be named by the black students. Later in the campaign our focus became the demand for jobs for black workers in the construction field. We were able to introduce the concept of 30 for 40 in this regard.

We began by pointing out the local as well as national and international aspects of the war in Vietnam -- the 1000 local residents who had been killed in the war, the tax drain which cut local budgets as well as federal spending in such fields as construction, welfare, transportation, air pollution, etc. We did the same with black control of the black community in regard to defense of the Black Panther Party against police and governmental harassment, etc.

During the early part of the campaign we got a good amount of newspaper coverage by commenting on and attacking

proposals of the other candidates. This was focused around the issue of "law and order" in particular. This coincided with police attacks on youth at rock festivals and in the University district. Tom sent out press releases which demanded investigations, setting up community committees elected by the community (black-student-trade union, etc.) and firing the chief of police. Tom was present in the University district during the "disturbances" and we got some TV and radio time because of this.

One example of such intervention was when one of the other candidates called for a police hotline to fight crime in the streets. Tom issued a statement calling for a job and social welfare hotline. This was picked up along with the police hotline story. Tom also put out a release promising to bring charges against the city and police officials for their illegal acts against the black community, particularly the Black Panther Party. This, too, was picked up by the press.

In addition to the press coverage which we received as a result of releases, we had large articles in each of the two major daily newspapers on Tom as one of the candidates. This was part of a series on all ten mayoralty candidates. In addition, on the Sunday before the primary elections both papers ran a short summary of the issues elucidated by each of the candidates in which our positions on Vietnam, black liberation, and "law and order" were printed. This was printed again in the election-day issues of the papers. In addition, the League of Women Voters also printed up and gave wide distribution to a fact sheet by each of the candidates on the issues.

The TV and radio time during the primary part of the campaign was scarce. We got good coverage of our initial press conference, and we got more time by going around to TV studios and setting up interviews there. On Saturdays, in particular, news departments are hungry for copy, so we helped by making Tom available to them. It is a fact of media life that the demand for TV news has resulted in longer news shows that, on the weekends, are in need of copy.

We had one 30-minute interview on the local underground radio station and a good-sized article in the local underground newspaper. Also, we got a couple of articles in the neighborhood shopping newspapers.

We had a couple of public meetings at high schools and college campuses. We publicized the November antiwar actions with these, and in one case sent a good many high schoolers to the local SMC.

The largest meeting of the campaign was one of 300 people sponsored by the League of Women Voters. Tom received tremendous applause for his stand on Vietnam, black control, and law and order. The audience responded well in the question and answer period to Tom's confronting the other candidates on these issues.

Tom was interviewed by a couple of business-oriented groups as well as the King County Labor Council. In the past these kinds of interviews (by the members in closed session) would tend to be very petty and baiting. In this instance, however, the tone was respectful and dour. Tom and I agree that this is because these people are feeling the squeeze of the war on their businesses and, on a municipal level, they are aware of the rise in the consciousness of both the black community and the youth. They are no longer so smug in their assumption that this is the best of all possible worlds, and therefore the confidence we express in proposing alternatives to the present has its effect with them. This reaction from them only increased our confidence.

We lost the primary. The branch decided to immediately announce a write-in campaign. We now were running against the two top winners of the "non-partisan" primary. One, Wes Uhlman, was a Democrat who posed as a Kennedy-Lindsay type, but said nothing except that he was young. The other, R. Mort Frayn, was a Republican and said nothing except that he was old.

The main issue in the run-off campaign was black jobs. We issued a leaflet that was distributed at the demonstrations of the black workers giving support to their demands and raising the concept of a shorter work week at no cut in pay. Since these demonstrations were led by a group of black contractors, our intervention became very important. It was also important on the campus level where a number of our opponents (SDS, the Labor Committee, the ISC, etc.) were trying to come to grips with this issue. With Tom as our main spokesman we intervened in a campus meeting to decide the student reaction to the demands of the blacks for jobs. Our intervention carried the day against both the "racist" sounding Marcuse Labor Committee as well as the "pardon us oh Lord for we are white" SDSers.

At the major demonstration, which closed down the Seattle-Tacoma airport by

taking people out onto the landing field (one of whom was Tom) our leaflet calling for support of jobs for blacks and 30 for 40 was the only one handed out, and was well received.

A week later the white construction workers held their own demonstration in opposition to the black demands, also noting the heavy unemployment in the field of construction effecting white workers too. We intervened in this demonstration by handing out a leaflet in Tom's name calling for 30 for 40 and showing the connection between unemployment and the war in Vietnam and the Nixon cutback of 75 percent of government construction. We called on the white workers to fight for a shorter work week at no cut in pay and we reiterated our support of jobs for black as well as white construction workers. This was met with mixed feelings. On the one hand, our comrades were needled by some of the white workers as "nigger lovers" and asked whether they "slept with niggers," etc. However the 30 for 40 demand got some approval.

Tom spoke at the University of Washington campus on this question and drew a large and very friendly audience. At a meeting in the black community sponsored by the Seattle Social Welfare Action Group, Tom received the loudest applause of the candidates present for his stand on this issue as well as on Vietnam. After the meeting the head of the black contractors group expressed his support of Tom's remarks.

The biggest breakthrough of the run-off campaign came in the area of TV and radio. At first the TV and radio people did not take our write-in campaign seriously. However, when we sent them copies of the FCC regulations on equal time, a list of things that showed the seriousness of Tom's campaign, and the pertinent Washington State election laws regarding the validity of write-in votes, they changed their minds. [see appendix for copies] The CBS affiliate (KIRO-TV) went all the way to the FCC for a ruling. They had their Washington DC lawyers work on it. They lost. As one TV executive said, "You guys (the SWP) really do your homework." For doing our homework we were rewarded with ten hours of TV and radio time in which we pushed the issues of Vietnam and the November 14-15 events, support for the black construction workers, the explanation of 30 for 40, the concept of black control, the phoniness of "law and order," and the socialist alternative.

Included in the media time were three debates with the other candidates. One was sponsored by the League of Women Voters (who again distributed our stands on the various issues.) This was

30 minutes long. Another was a two-hour radio debate on the most-listened-to interview shop in the Northwest. The last was an hour-long color TV debate taped at a meeting on the University of Washington campus, sponsored by the Political Affairs Committee. It was shown at prime time on a major station (NBC).

There is a lesson to be learned here. Originally only the two ballot candidates were to be the participants. However, after about eight phone calls, in which we used both the carrot and the stick ("If you don't have Leonard I think that the demonstration protesting this act of political exclusion will dwarf your debate in news coverage."), we were invited. As a result Tom stole the show. The Republican spent part of his presentation attacking Tom for flouting tradition and not accepting his defeat in the primary contest. In this debate and on the radio debate Tom forced the Democrat to give support to the Moratorium demonstrations and acknowledge that Vietnam was an issue in the campaign.

During the campaign the police were involved in a gambling scandal, the police chief was fired, and the two ballot candidates received a briefing from the incumbent mayor. We called the mayor's office and demanded a briefing. We got it. Then we organized a press conference outside on the steps of City Hall following the briefing. We demanded the mayor open the police books on the violence used against the black community, and the Panthers in particular, and that he declare a holiday for city employees for the October 15 Moratorium. He refused both demands, but we made the press and TV with our conference.

Our last publicity was the night of the elections when Tom went on the round-up programs to announce that we would be running candidates in the 1970 elections and to proclaim that the political points we made during the campaign would continue

to be in evidence after the new mayor had taken office.

We had four hours of radio interview shows, during which the questions were not of the Kronstadt variety but dealt with pertinent issues like Vietnam, taxes, law and order, black jobs, etc.

Tom is now a known person in this town. So is the SWP. Several strangers have come up to him in several places during the last couple of weeks to tell him how much they liked what he had to say. I feel that this campaign, as well as our work in the antiwar movement, have put the SWP on the map in Seattle and will help us greatly in the 1970 campaign. We are now considered a serious and legitimate political party, particularly by the media.

In the 124 of 1093 precincts where votes for us were recorded, we got 93 write-in votes. There are no records of the remaining 969 precincts. The 124 range from very right wing areas to black and student areas, a good cross-section. From this I assume that we could have gotten as many as 800 to 900 votes citywide.

Of course, the campaign had some shortcomings. Among these were lack of funds (we spent less than \$400, including the \$262.50 filing fee and we did not raise much money); we did not have enough good literature; we were not able to work on the campus campaigning as much as we would have liked; we did not recruit from the campaign as much as we could have; we did not use sponsor cards at all. We recognize these errors and are determined to correct them in the 1970 election and start right in the beginning to use the professionalism characteristic of our movement. We see the campaign as an overall victory and are determined to continue what was good in it and broaden out and correct the shortcomings, which means a very successful 1970 campaign.

Coverage by the Media of the 1969 Socialist Mayoral Campaign in Seattle

PRESS:

- a.) A full page article on Tom and the campaign issues in both of the major dailies.
- b.) Both major dailies featured Tom's campaign and the issues he raised in roundup article on the primary in their Sunday editions.
- c.) This was repeated on their election day issues.
- d.) Three articles appeared in the University of Washington campus daily on Tom's speaking engagements; included in these was their front page article on the debate on campus between the two ballot candidates and Tom.
- e.) A large article in the main underground newspaper, the Helix, on the socialist campaign for mayor.
- f.) Two articles of good size in two of the shopping weeklies.
- g.) No less than thirty articles in the daily press gave mention or coverage of our campaign in regard to the living issues of the campaign. These were prompted either by our press releases, or participation in the following events: BSU demands; Black workers demands and demonstrations; Vietnam and the October 15 Moratorium; Black control of the police; defense of the Panthers; defense of the youth from police attacks; attacks on "law and order" type campaigns; the fight for equal time for a write-in candidate.

TELEVISION AND RADIO:

- a.) Three news conferences that we held received coverage by radio and the three TV stations.
- b.) We got nine spot interviews by visiting TV studios on Saturdays and helping fill up their news shows. We also called in several interviews to the main rock radio station.
- c.) Sept. 14 10 minutes interview on KCTS-TV (NET station)
- d.) Sept. 15 30 minutes interview on KRAB radio (an underground station)
- e.) Sept. 17 2 hours interview on KING radio (Irving Clark phone-in show)
- f.) Oct. 17 15 minutes interview on KIRO-TV (CBS; prime time)
- g.) Oct. 19 30 minutes on KOMO-TV (ABC) in 3-way debate with the 2 ballot candidates; sponsored by League of Women Voters
- h.) Oct. 20 30 minutes on KOMO radio (League of Women Voters' debate; prime time)
- i.) Oct. 23 15 minutes on KING-TV (NBC) main morning interview show
- j.) Oct. 25 15 minute interview on KTNT-TV (main Tacoma TV station)
- k.) Oct. 26 KCTS-TV interview show at prime time (NET station) for 30 minutes
- l.) Oct. 27 KING radio 2 hour debate with 2 ballot candidates on Irving Clark call-in show
- m.) Oct. 28 KING-TV 1 hour debate with 2 ballot candidates on campus. Prime time
- n.) Oct. 28 15 minutes on KCTS-TV (NET) interview - prime time
- o.) Oct. 30 1 hour interview and call-in show on KIRO radio (CBS) prime time
- p.) Nov. 1 15 minute interview on KOMO-TV (ABC) prime time
- q.) Nov. 1 15 minute interview on KOMO radio prime time
- r.) Nov. 2 30 minute interview on KOL radio (rock station) prime time

Total: 10 hours 10 minutes. All but 40 minutes of this was gotten as a write-in candidate. Special attention should be given to the F.C.C. wording on equal time for write-in candidates and the substantial showing evidence that we issued in demanding equal time. See the following appendix.

APPENDIX: 1969 Seattle Equal-time Fight

[The following letters, etc. were used in the Seattle equal-time campaign for write-in candidate Tom Leonard. They are included for the information of comrades who may be conducting similar campaigns in the future.]

Federal Communications Comm.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Leon T. Knauer, Esq.
Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker
1616 H. Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Mr. Knauer:

This refers to your letter of October 8, 1969, requesting the Commission's opinion regarding the obligation of Station KIRO-TV, Seattle, Washington, under Section 315, to make time available to a write-in candidate in the election for Mayor of Seattle.

You state that Mr. Tom Leonard contends he is a write-in candidate for Mayor and is a legally qualified candidate under Section 315; that Washington state law provides that only two candidates for each elective position receiving the greatest number of votes cast in a city primary election shall become the "official candidates" for the final election; that Mr. Frayn and Mr. Uhlman received the greatest number of votes in the primary election and that they will appear on a debate over your station on October 8, 1969; and that Mr. Leonard, through his campaign manager, demanded that he be permitted to participate in the debate. You further state that you sought the opinion of the Secretary of State of Washington, who is the "Ex Officio Chief Elections Officer"; that it was the opinion of the Secretary (a copy of which you enclosed) that write-in candidates are not "official candidates" because the primary election procedure is the exclusive method to determine "official candidates" for final election; that, therefore, write-in candidates have no "official status" and there is no statutory provision whereby a person can be "officially" identified as a write-in candidate; that write-in voting is strictly a prerogative of the voter; and that "only the candidates whose names are printed upon the ballot can qualify as the official candidates" and are the only ones entitled to "equal time" under Section 315. You acknowledge that the Commission has stated that legally qualified candidates are not restricted to persons whose names appear on the printed ballot; that the term may embrace persons not listed on the ballot if they are making a bona fide race for the office involved and the names of such persons under applicable law may be written in by the

voters; and that Mr. Leonard is a legally qualified candidate in the sense that he meets the requirements of the laws of the state of Washington to hold office and can be written into the ballot if any voter desires to do so.

You declare that you are uncertain as to whether the Commission would concur in the opinion of the Secretary of State that write-in candidates do not have "official status" and therefore are not entitled to equal time.

Although you state in your letter to the Commission that "the state officer in charge of elections has concluded that write-in candidates do not qualify for equal time under Section 315 and that only candidates whose names appear on the printed ballot are legally qualified candidates," it appears that the Secretary of State's opinion states only that write-in candidates are not "official candidates," and does not state that they are not "legally qualified candidates"

As you know, Section 73.657(a) states that a legally qualified candidate is inter alia one who "meets the qualifications prescribed by the applicable law to hold the office for which he is a candidate, so that he may be voted for by the electorate..." and "...is eligible under the applicable law to be voted for ...by writing in his name on the ballot..." Since you acknowledge that Mr. Leonard "meets the requirements of the laws of the state of Washington to hold office and to be written into the ballot if any voter desires to write in his name," Mr. Leonard may be a legally qualified candidate under our rules if he makes a substantial showing that he is a bona fide candidate for the office of mayor. In this connection we note that you submitted material with your request for a ruling including a letter from Mr. Leonard's campaign director which states that Mr. Leonard can "make a substantial showing that he is a bona fide candidate."

It is hoped that the foregoing will afford you general guidance on these matters.

Sincerely yours,

William B. Ray, Chief
Complaints and Compliance
Division for Chief,
Broadcast Bureau

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION RULES AND REGULATIONS (ED. 3-68)

PART 73 -- POLITICAL BROADCASTS

73.120* Definition (a) A "legally qualified candidate" means any person who has publically announced that he is a candidate for nomination by a convention of a political party or for nomination or election in a primary, special or general election, municipal, county, state or national, and who meets the qualifications prescribed by the applicable laws to hold the office for which he is a candidate so that he may be voted for by the electorate directly or by means of delegates or electors and who

(1) has qualified for a position on the ballot or

(2) is eligible under the applicable laws to be voted by sticker, by writing in his name on the ballot or other method and

(1) has been duly nominated by a political party which is commonly known and regarded as such or (2) makes a substantial showing that he is a bona fide candidate for nomination or office as the case may be.

*Also see Parts 73.290 and 73.657 or 1969 Broadcasting Yearbook Pg. C-71

REVISED CODE OF WASHINGTON 29.51.170

At any election or primary, any voter may write in on the ballot the name of any person for whom he desires to vote for any office and such vote shall be counted the same as if the name had been printed on the ballot and marked by the voter....

See also 29-51.100 Marking Ballot at Final Election.

29.04.080 Secretary of state to make rules and regulations.

The secretary of state shall make rules and regulations not inconsistent with the federal, state, county, city, town and district election laws to facilitate the execution of their provisions in an orderly manner and to that end shall assist local election officers by devising uniform forms and procedures.

* * *

A SUBSTANTIAL SHOWING THAT TOM LEONARD IS A BONA FIDE CANDIDATE FOR THE OFFICE OF MAYOR OF SEATTLE (AS A WRITE-IN CANDIDATE).

1. Tom Leonard ran in the non-partisan primary campaign and was deemed eligible for ballot status in that primary. During that campaign through meetings, press coverage etc. he showed himself as a serious candidate for the office of mayor.

2. Leonard on September 17th, the day after the primary, announced through a press release, his intentions to continue his campaign for the office of mayor as a write-in candidate. There is no law, federal, state, county or municipal, that would bar a losing candidate in the primary from conducting a write-in type campaign.

3. Leonard on September 17th, at a publicly announced press conference held at his campaign headquarters, announced his intentions to continue his campaign for Mayor of Seattle as a write-in candidate.

4. This announcement was transmitted to the public in the pages of the Seattle Post Intelligencer of September 18th.

5. On September 17th on the Irving Clark interview show, (a show that claims the largest listener audience in Seattle) Leonard announced his intentions to run for the office of Mayor of Seattle as a write-in candidate.

6. A major campaign leaflet detailing Leonard's positions on the main questions in the election and asking for voter support to his candidacy for Seattle mayor, has received mass distribution in Seattle. That distribution has continued consistently since September 17th.

7. A special "WRITE-IN TOM LEONARD FOR MAYOR..." poster has been made up since September 17th and is receiving mass display in Seattle.

8. Leonard has spoken at approximately ten public meetings since the primary, two of these were on the University of Washington campus, three were at public High Schools, (Garfield, Roosevelt, Queen Anne) two were publicly advertised talks at the Militant Labor Forum. The remaining three were held at community groups which were open to members and friends.

9. Three major press releases on political issues germane to the Mayoralty race have been issued by Leonard since September 17th.

10. A separate account has been set up to record expenses and contributions. It has been set up for the write-in campaign as opposed to the primary campaign which it of course is a continuation of. A major fund raising mailing has been made to raise contributions so as to be better able to wage a more widespread and effective campaign.

11. Some one hundred organizations have been contacted via the mails inviting them to have Leonard speak on his campaign before their group.

12. Leonard maintains a campaign commit-

tee, which functions in the running of his campaign.

13. Leonard is a member of the Socialist Workers Party and is the endorsed candidate of said party for Mayor of Seattle. The Socialist Workers Party was on the ballot in the State of Washington in 1968 when they ran candidates for President, Vice President and United States Senator. The Socialist Workers Party is a national organization which has been involved in electoral politics for the past thirty years. It has had ballot status in the U.S. in the last six Presidential elections and has run candidates for local and state offices for the past thirty years. Its name is commonly known as a political party and its members and spokesmen as politically serious people. In the year 1969 the Socialist Workers Party has engaged or is now engaged in local campaigns in New York, Cleveland, Boston, Philadelphia, Detroit, Atlanta, Seattle, and other places.

14. The campaign committee of Tom Leonard maintains a headquarters open to the public on a daily basis. This headquarters is publicly advertised as such and is located at 5257 University Way N.E., Seattle, Washington, 98115.

This report has been compiled and written by William Massey, Campaign Director of the "Tom Leonard for Mayor Committee."

* * *

October 2, 1969
Contact: William Massey
Tel: LA 3-2555

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Attention: News Editor

MAYORAL CANDIDATE ASKS FEDERAL INVESTIGATION OF LOCAL "EQUAL TIME" SITUATION.

SOCIALIST WRITE-IN CANDIDATE TERMS KRAMER'S STATEMENT ON "OFFICIAL CANDIDATES" LEGAL GOBBELDYGOOK WITHOUT ANY BASIS IN FACT.

ANTIWAR CANDIDATE TO GO TO COURT IF NECESSARY TO SECURE POLITICAL RIGHTS.

(Enclosed are copies of [1] The Federal Communications definition of a legally qualified candidate in reference to "equal time." [2] The portion of the Revised Code of Washington pertaining to the validity of write-in ballots. [3] A list of Tom Leonard's campaign activities establishing his basis as a "bona fide" candidate for mayor and therefore due "equal time" to the other candidates.)

William Massey, campaign director of Tom Leonard's write-in campaign for Mayor of Seattle, today issued the following statement on behalf of Leonard, a member of the Socialist Workers Party:

"Three television stations, possibly

four, are planning to feature debates between two of the candidates for Mayor of Seattle. The three definite ones are KIRO, Seattle; KOMO, Seattle; and KTNT, Tacoma-Seattle; KING may also do a debate between Mort Frayn and Wes Uhlman. On behalf of Tom Leonard, who has conducted a serious write-in campaign for that office, I have gotten in touch with all of these stations and asked that they comply with the provisions of the Federal Communications Commissions Rules and Regulations regarding political broadcasts. To date they have made no reply that indicates whether they will do so. Therefore, we are taking this to the F.C.C. for an investigation and a ruling. I think that this will straighten the matter out, but we are prepared to go to the courts in that this is a basic constitutional matter that affects the political rights not only of Tom Leonard but every citizen of Washington.

The state and local laws provide for write-in votes and state quite clearly that such a vote is equal to a printed ballot vote and must be counted as such. Further the law states that a write-in vote may be cast in any election or primary held in the state of Washington. There is no law that states that write-in candidates are forbidden to run in any race for office, be it municipal, state or national, held in this state. Therefore Tom Leonard has the right to run as a write-in candidate and to have the votes he receives counted. In other words, they will be "official" votes.

Now the F.C.C., a federal body, states that write-in candidates, if they are qualified to hold the office they are running for, and if they are connected with what is a commonly known political party and/or if they can make substantial showing that they are "bona fide" candidates for the office they are running, are due equal time to the other candidates for the same office whether they are on the ballot or not.

I have sent the above stations and the F.C.C. 14 reasons why Tom Leonard's campaign is a serious and bona fide campaign. I expect that Leonard will be given his time.

I would like to state that the statement reported in the press by Secretary of State Ludlow Kramer which states that only officially designated ballot candidates are official candidates and therefore the only ones due equal time is without legal basis. Furthermore it is pure bureaucratic gobbeldygook. The State of Washington says anyone can write-in any name for any office in any election and the votes will be counted as equal to the balloted votes. How is one "official" and the others "more official?" According to Kramer, maybe,

according to the State laws no. Now the Federal Government's body, the F.C.C., says that bona fide write-in candidates are due equal time, and Lud Kramer says no, they are not. Well, now I understand why Kramer is talking about retiring. What Kramer means when he states that it would be chaotic if every man could run for office is that it would be chaos to people like Kramer, Frayn and Uhlman who because of their personal wealth or the wealth of their backers in the Democratic and Republican Parties are trying to buy away the right of the people to a free and choice in an election. Tom Leonard with his campaign for an immediate withdrawal of American GI's from Vietnam, his support for the black liberation struggle and his demand that profits not wages be cut, is chaos to Kramer and Co. but not to the needs of the majority of Americans. So in that situation Kramer seeks to deny Leonard his right to speak to the voters who might vote for him, if they could hear him as they will Uhlman or Frayn. I say that Kramer does this to protect those who profit from the war in Vietnam, who profit from black people's misery and who profit from having such docile office-holders as Kramer-Uhlman and Frayn.

Further Kramer's job is spelled out with regard to elections and he can make no ruling that conflicts with a federal-state or local law. I submit that the F.C.C. rules and the Code of the State of Washington are "official" and that Lud Kramer is irrelevant and should resign.

* * *

LEONARD FOR MAYOR HEADQUARTERS
5257 University Way N.E.
Seattle, Washington 98115
October 5, 1969

Dear Sirs;

I write you at this time to inform you of the fact that Tom Leonard who is campaigning for the position of Mayor of Seattle, is also available for appearances on your station. He is, due to the election process in Washington, conducting a write-in type campaign.

Mr. Leonard will be glad to appear for interviews, debates or panel discussions. The main issues in his campaign are: (1) opposition to the Vietnam war and to call for the withdrawal of all U.S. troops now; (2) support of the struggle for black

liberation; (3) opposition to the law and order campaigns. These issues while national and international in scope are also local issues and vital to the lives of all Seattle residents. When you consider that over 900 Washington residents have died in Vietnam, most of them from Seattle, Vietnam is too local an issue. Also, the bulk of our tax dollars are going to fund that war and thus cutting down drastically on the needs of our urban center. The black liberation struggle is as local as the construction-jobs dispute, the Black Student Union dispute, or the police harassment of the Black Panther Party. Law and Order has been a byword on the lips of all the mayoralty candidates. Leonard is the only one to oppose it and give a reasonable explanation and solution to all of its ramifications.

Mr. Leonard, a member of the Socialist Workers Party, an active trade unionist, is well qualified to present positions on the above and other questions related to the mayoralty race, that while they are not represented by the other candidates, reflect a growing tendency in society in general. This would seem to coincide with your needs to present a balanced public affairs program on your station.

Also, I remind you that the Federal Communications Commission is very clear as to Mr. Leonard's rights to equal time. Enclosed are the F.C.C. rules and regulations on political broadcasts and their definition of a bona fide candidate, Mr. Leonard's qualifications in meeting this description and a copy of the law of the state of Washington vis à vis write-in votes. We will expect your cooperation in seeing that these laws are obeyed, but should you disagree we will go through the F.C.C. and the courts to guarantee Mr. Leonard's civil liberties. We ask that you abide by the equal time provisions of the F.C.C. in regard to Tom Leonard's write-in campaign for Mayor of Seattle. I thank you for your cooperation in this regard.

Very truly yours,

William Massey
Campaign Director

Encl: (2)
Copy to: F.C.C.

REPORT ON PLANS FOR 1970 SEATTLE ELECTION CAMPAIGN

By Wendy Reissner

November 19, 1969

The Leonard-for-mayor campaign really laid the groundwork for us to run a successful 1970 campaign. It was very successful in terms of publicizing our program. It got out the name and ideas of the party in a much bigger way than ever before, and in general greatly facilitated our perspective of placing a premium on the party moving out in a dynamic way in its own name.

The combination of the campaign and our antiwar work won us five new recruits to the YSA. In addition, we learned some lessons about how to organize ourselves so that the 1970 campaign will reap the maximum benefits in terms of recruitment.

Perhaps the key lesson of the Leonard campaign was that learned nationally from the whole series of campaigns we ran -- we can't in any way underestimate the potential these campaigns have. We were continually astounded by the tremendous amount of publicity we got and the tremendous receptivity to our ideas. Our campaign was taken very seriously by wide segments of the population. This was brought home to us during the TV coverage of the election returns. There was Tom Leonard's name up there on the board with Frayn and Ulman, with a continuing tabulation of his write-in vote, and regular commentary from the announcer as to his program and what the vote meant.

The report to the branch on the 1970 campaign stressed the lessons of the Leonard campaign and went over the indications (even more clear now than at the time of the party convention) that there is no abatement of the radicalization in sight, and what this means for us in the next period. In addition, it stressed the importance of seeing our electoral work and antiwar work as a two-pronged offensive -- both essential elements for our further growth -- the building of a mass movement around the single issue of the war on the one hand, and on the other hand the use of electoral campaigns to publicize our transitional program and fundamental solution to all of the ills of capitalist society. Our success with the Leonard campaign combined with the success in constructing a very powerful and large SMC offers a graphic demonstration of this dynamic at work.

We announced our initial slate for 1970 on November 13. We received coverage on two TV stations and small articles in both newspapers. At the massive November

14 demonstration here we distributed our first campaign leaflet.

We are running Bill Massey for senator. We felt that it was important to have a legally qualified candidate so we could actually get on the ballot and be entitled to media time. We see his campaign as a trailblazing campaign. Bill Perdue is the campaign manager and will accompany Massey all over the state. We already have a number of comrades in eastern Washington, and quite a few contacts. In addition, we have contacts in central and western Washington. We are also writing to all college and high school student governments and political groups to request that they set up meetings. The trailblazing will start in earnest right after the first of the year, when school is back in session. We see the real possibility of locals and nuclei of locals all over the state.

As a vehicle to involve people in the campaign we will set up Young Socialist Campaign Committees (YSCC) wherever we go. Among other campaign activities we will try to get the YSCCs to sell our press, the Transitional Program for Black Liberation, etc.

Russell Block will run for U.S. Congress in Brock Adams' district. Adams is a liberal who supported and spoke at the October 15 Moratorium. Russell is an officer of the SMC and very well known in Seattle in that capacity, through numerous press conferences and radio shows. Rick Congress will run for U.S. Congress against Pelley, a Republican. Rick is also a leader of the citywide SMC, and is known at Seattle Community College, which he attends.

Russell and Rick will also do some statewide trailblazing, but they will concentrate their fire around the Seattle-Tacoma area -- an area rich in colleges and high schools. We have made real breakthroughs in developing high school and junior college contacts through the citywide SMC network. Now we can really move in with our campaign.

We are running two women comrades for state offices in the University district. Harriet Ashton is running for state senate. She is very well known at the University of Washington as an antiwar activist and a spokesman for the YSA. Susan Shinn is running for state representative. She, too, is known as an antiwar activist. Before she joined the YSA

she headed up the McCarthy campaign in a nearby area.

We plan a dynamic campaign in the University district concentrating on the question of women's liberation and the concept of the Red University. We plan to set up meetings in every dorm on campus and, if we attract enough forces, to hit all the student houses in the community with our literature.

We see this as an initial slate at this time. We would like to add to it as we go along. For one thing, we would like to be able to put up a woman candidate for a U.S. congressional post to give us more opportunity to raise the question of women's liberation. We would like to run someone in the Central District (black). We would like to run some more comrades for state offices in other areas of the city where there are a lot of high schools. These possibilities depend primarily on the availability of comrades in the districts we are concerned with.

Our program will of course concentrate on the questions of the war and the black struggle. In addition, we will stress our program for women's liberation, student power, support to labor's demands, the need for independent political action, etc.

As a result of the work we did through the Leonard campaign around jobs for blacks and 30-for-40, we received a request yesterday from the Black Student Union at the University of Washington that the YSA initiate a meeting to get white support for a struggle they are waging on campus. We feel that we can continue to make gains in this area with our new campaign also.

In addition to the pleasant task of getting massive publicity for our ideas and recruiting members out of the campaign we have a tremendous task ahead of us in raising money. Just the filing fees alone for the slate we now have

will come to \$1,347. To get our candidates into the voters pamphlet, which goes to every registered voter in the state, will cost another \$750. In addition, we will be putting out a fancy brochure, stickers, posters, leaflets, etc., including sponsor cards.

We plan to try to wage a fight against the filing fees along the lines of the Jenness campaign. We are awaiting work from Atlanta on the legal aspects of that fight before proceeding to meetings with lawyers. We expect to use the fight to get publicity in the same way they did. Hopefully we could win here too, but of course we can't count on that, and have to plan to raise the money to file or not officially file all our candidates when the time comes.

Joe Johnson will be the financial director for the campaign. We will have to run a tremendous number of fund raising events in order to make it. In addition we are still working on increasing the sustainers to the branch. We realize that we cannot see the campaign as an excuse to abandon the perspective of increasing our national sustainer.

In order to get on the ballot we will have to have a convention of 100 registered voters in September, as things stand now. However, ten parties got on during the presidential elections and at the time there was talk of making it more difficult to obtain ballot status. If the law remains the same it should be easier for us to swing it this time, in view of the increased radicalization.

At this point there is no opposing minor party campaign. The New Party will probably put up candidates at some point, but it is not certain. No black groups have announced plans so far, nor are there indications at this point.

We are very excited about the perspective ahead of us. We all feel that there are tremendous gains to be made out of our electoral work for the next year.

