

CALL FOR THE SIXTH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE

The National Committee hereby calls the Sixth National Convention of the Young Socialist Alliance to convene in Detroit on Friday, March 24, and to continue through three days (Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, March 24, 25, and 26, 1967).

The following agenda is proposed for the convention:

Political Report
Antiwar Report
Negro Struggle Report
Organizational Report
Election of the National Committee

Pre-Convention Discussion

Literary discussion will be opened with the publication of the first bulletin. The internal bulletin is open for all YSA members on the subjects listed in the agenda or others which they may wish to present for the consideration of the YSA.

Local membership meetings shall be arranged for oral discussion of the various points on the agenda.

Convention Assessments

A convention assessment of \$2.00 shall be levied to help cover the expenses of the convention, the payment of which is obligatory to every member.

Basis of Representation

1. Representation from the locals shall be as follows: one delegate for the first 5 members and one additional delegate for each 5 additional members or major fraction thereof (3 or more constituting a major fraction).

2. Each local having 5 or more members is entitled to a voting delegate.

3. Delegates are to be elected by the locals in accordance with the actual number of members in good standing who have been admitted to the YSA prior to December 21, 1966, and who have paid their convention assessment. "Good standing" according to our constitution is defined as follows: Article III, Section 5, "Any member more than one month in arrears in dues ceases to be a member in good standing. Only members in good standing may vote or hold office in the YSA. Any member more than three months in arrears may be dropped after notification."

4. Locals organized after December 21, 1966, are entitled to send fraternal delegates to the convention.

5. Members admitted to the YSA after December 21, 1966, are entitled to voice in the local discussion, but no vote on resolutions or in the selection of delegates.

6. Members must be present and voting in person at the meeting where the election of delegates takes place. The only exception is for members whose absence is for a substantial reason such as being sick or working and who send in an unambiguous written statement of their positions or candidate choices.

7. Members transferring from one local to another since December 21, 1966, must vote in the local from which they transferred.

Proportional Representation

Where there is a division on national policy within a local unit, election of delegates in the local is to be on the basis of proportional representation. Delegates shall be elected on the basis of the vote on a resolution or a statement made in writing and submitted to the local unit for a vote. Abstentions in no case count as votes.

The following table shows the modified proportional system to be followed if division occurs:

<u>Number of qualified members in unit:</u>	<u>Total number of delegates the unit is entitled to:</u>	<u>Minimum number of those voting for a minority to get:</u>		
		<u>1 del.</u>	<u>2 del.</u>	<u>3 del.</u>
3-7	1	-*	-	-
8-12	2	1/3**	-	-
13-17	3	1/4	-*	-
18-22	4	1/5	2/5	-
23-27	5	1/6	1/3	-*
28-32	6	1/7	2/7	3/7
in general:				
5n+2	n	1/n+1	2/n+1	3/n+1

(* in the special case of a unit entitled to an odd number of delegates and where the division in unit voting is exactly equal, 2 delegates with 1/2 vote each will be elected.)

(**for example, in a unit of 8 qualified members, 8 times $1/3$ equals $2-2/3$ members; therefore a minimum of 3 (not 2) would get a delegate. If the unit had 11 qualified members then 11 times $1/3$ equals $3-2/3$ members, so 4 voting minority members would be the minimum to get a delegate. The same consideration holds true for figuring all other fractions in the above table.)

In the event a unit undergoes a more than two way division, that unit will elect delegates on a directly proportional basis (i.e., in a unit entitled to n delegates, at least $1/n$ fraction of qualified members must have voted for a position for that position to get a delegate).

After a division has been established, those voting each way will select in caucus their own delegations and report them to the unit as a whole for acknowledgement. Where no division has taken place the election of delegates will proceed normally by the unit as a whole.

National Committee
Young Socialist Alliance

December 21, 1966

Minutes - Fort Hood Three Temporary Steering Committee and staff meeting of December 6, 1966

Present - A.J. Muste, Doug Jenness, Dave Dellinger, Grace Newman, Irving Beinin, Manuel Magana, Carl Griffler, Eric Weinberger, Paul Eidsvik, Ricky Eisenburg, Nora Eisenburg, Fred Halstead.

1. Staff - Doug will be leaving the staff because of other commitments as of December 16. His resignation is accepted with the thanks and the appreciation of the committee for having served as an important member of the staff since August. There was discussion of a possible replacement for Doug, with Carl, Paul, and Dave appointed as a subcommittee to choose a new staff person. There was agreement that the staff should be registered for unemployment insurance benefits. It was agreed that Carl should replace Ricky on the list of persons eligible to co-sign FH3 committee checks.
2. Financial report - Eric reported that the committee presently has a deficit of \$844. There was discussion of this. A.J. reported on a potential source of substantial financial backing for the committee. It was agreed that Carl should take the responsibility of investigating and organizing a fund-raising committee.
3. Luftig case - There was discussion of whether or not FH3 could assume any responsibility for financial support to the Luftig Committee. It was felt that the FH3 committee could not in general assume this responsibility but that Dave, Carl & Paul should check further the legal relationship of the Luftig case to the FH3 case and report back.
4. Organization of the Executive Committee - It was decided to call the first full meeting of the Fort Hood Three Executive Committee for January 10, at 8:00 P.M. Notices are to be sent out immediately and are to be followed up by reminders when the meeting time gets closer. The next meeting of the temporary steering committee will be Tuesday, December 20, at 8:00 P.M.
5. SANE meeting - It has become certain that we will not be allowed to distribute literature on the seats at the SANE Madison Square Garden Rally. We will, however, be allowed use of literature tables, and Grace will be on the program of the rally. The staff will work out the details of distributing literature, etc.
6. N.Y. TIMES ad - Irving has located a sympathetic advertising agency that will be able and willing to handle the full page ad. It was noted that since a rate increase would increase the cost of the ad by \$480 after January 1, all efforts should be made to have it ready before then. There was a report of the progress of the efforts to secure names for the ad. Eleven prominent individuals have agreed to become the initial signers of the ad, and a mailing is going out to approximately 1000 more prominent individuals within the next day or two. There was discussion of the ad copy. It was agreed that the staff plus A.J. and Ricky should work on locating a competent copywriter to "spruce up" the copy editorially -- without making changes in content.

NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES No. 25

December 11, 1966

NEC present: Melissa, Doug, Gus, Caroline, Mary-Alice, Lew, Daniels
NEC excused: Betsey

Convened: 8:40 p.m.

Chairman: Caroline

- Agenda: 1. Sub Drive
2. Fund Drive
3. Bloomington Defense
4. Antiwar report
5. Student Strike Conference

1. Sub Drive - Melissa

The sub drive is doing much better now. There is a good chance it will be completed successfully. Several locals have had good luck with parties where a sub is the admission price. Scoreboard enclosed.

Motion: to approve the report.

Discussion: Mary-Alice, Melissa

Motion Passed

2. Fund Drive - Melissa

Our record breaking fund drive is right on schedule. Scoreboard enclosed.

Motion: to approve the report.

Motion Passed

3. Bloomington Defense - Daniels

Prosecutor Hoadley, who goes out of office in January and is moving to Florida, has offered to drop the charges against the Bloomington students if they will drop injunction proceedings. The defendants in consultation with Boudin, CABS, and YSA have decided to accept Hoadley's surrender. Boudin is now contacting the other plaintiffs in the injunction to inform them of Hoadley's actions. We will know in a few weeks if Hoadley really will go through with these proceedings and consequently if the case can be closed. Since the case is not definitively concluded, and since additional expenses will be incurred, locals should continue with Bloomington defense work, particularly fund raising.

Motion: to approve the report.

Discussion: Mary-Alice, Melissa, Daniels, Caroline, Daniels, Lew, Daniels

Motion Passed

4. Antiwar Report - Lew

Report on the situation of the Spring Mobilization Committee and its plans, the SANE trade unionist conference in Chicago December 17, and the Fort Hood Three.

Motion: to approve the report.

Discussion: Doug, Lew, Caroline, Gus, Caroline

Motion Passed

5. Student Strike Conference - Doug

See enclosed.

Motion: that the YSA participate in the conference with the following general line: 1. that the spring action be an antiwar action, and 2. that any organization that comes out of the conference be on a united front basis.

Discussion: Melissa, Doug, Mary-Alice, Caroline, Doug, Lew, Melissa, Doug, Lew, Caroline, Doug, Lew, Mary-Alice, Melissa, Lew

Motion Passed

Adjourned: 9:40 p.m.

NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

November 23, 1966 No. 24

NEC: Daniels, Caroline, Doug, Gus, Mary-Alice, Melissa, Lew
NEC Excused: Betsey

Convened: 7:30 PM

Chairman: Mary-Alice

Agenda: 1. National Office Report
2. Sub Drive
3. Fund Drive
4. Young Socialist
5. Pamphlets
6. Antiwar Report

1. National Office Report - Lew

A. Lou Davis has appealed to the National Committee plenum.

B. Members at large. Sharon N. in Pittsburgh and Pat W. in Antioch have applied for membership. Locals which know them recommend acceptance.

Motion: to accept Sharon N. and Pat W. as at-large members.

Discussion: Daniels, Lew.

Motion Passed.

C. Nick K., a former member of the Washington local, has re-applied for membership. The Washington local recommends acceptance.

Motion: to re-accept Nick K. into the YSA.

Motion Passed.

Motion: to approve the report.

Motion Passed.

2. Sub Drive - Melissa

The Sub Drive is lagging far behind. Discussions with NCers around the country indicate that a time extension on the drive would facilitate a successful drive.

Motion: to extend the Sub Drive to December 31, 1966.

Discussion: Lew, Daniels, Melissa.

Motion Passed.

3. Fund Drive - Melissa

The Fund Drive is exactly on schedule. A couple of locals have indicated they may go over their quota.

Motion: to approve the report.

Discussion: Mary-Alice, Melissa, Lew.

Motion Passed.

4. Young Socialist - Mary-Alice

The next issue has been delayed slightly. It will be in the locals around December 15.

Motion: to approve the report.

Motion Passed.

5. Pamphlets - Lew

A. China pamphlet. Jon B. in Seattle has agreed to write out a draft for part of the pamphlet. Other NCers and SWPers have agreed to collaborate in its completion.

Discussion: Melissa, Lew.

B. Congo pamphlet. The Congo pamphlet is almost out of print. Orders for it have been low in the past few months.

Motion: to not reprint the Congo pamphlet at this time.

Discussion: Caroline, Melissa, Mary-Alice, Lew.

Motion Passed.

6. Antiwar Report - Doug

Report on the preparations for the Cleveland conference.

Motion: to approve the report.

Discussion: Daniels, Doug, Lew, Doug.

Motion Passed.

Adjourned: 7:55PM

NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

November 4, 1966 No. 23

NEC: Daniels, Doug, Gus, Melissa, Caroline, Lew, Mary-Alice
NEC excused: Betsey

Convened: 6:30 p.m.

Chairman: Melissa

- Agenda:
1. Lou Davis Appeal
 2. National Office Report
 3. Fund Drive
 4. Sub Drive
 5. Pamphlets
 6. Bloomington Defense
 7. Antiwar Report
 8. European Trip Report

1. Lou Davis Appeal - Lew

See Enclosed.

Motion: to uphold the action of the Philadelphia local and to adopt the NEC statement (enclosed).

Discussion: Mary-Alice, Gus, Melissa

Motion Passed.

2. National Office Report - Lew

A. Comrades in Seattle have applied for formal local status, having satisfied the requirements.

Motion: to re-establish a local in Seattle.

Motion Passed.

B. Steve W., a former member of the YSA, has applied for membership in Washington.

Motion: to admit Steve W. to the YSA.

Discussion: Doug, Lew, Daniels, Lew, Caroline, Mary-Alice, Lew

Motion Passed.

C. Reports indicate that Betsey's tour is receiving a favorable response.

D. Comrade Jan in Gainesville, Fla., has established a Socialist Discussion Group which puts out a regular newsletter. The group has sponsored meetings for Franz Lee and Peter B., as well as become a center of controversy on the campus.

3. Fund Drive - Melissa
\$3,247 has been collected which is slightly ahead of schedule.

Motion: to approve the report.

Discussion: Doug, Melissa

Motion Passed.

4. Sub Drive - Melissa

The sub drive is 39% behind schedule. A major effort has to be made in order to finish the drive on schedule. A scoreboard has been sent out.

Motion: to approve the report.

Discussion: Mary-Alice, Melissa, Lew, Melissa

Motion Passed

5. Pamphlets - Lew

A. Vietnam pamphlet. In the last two weeks orders have been running very high, bringing our supply to a bare minimum.

Motion: to reprint the pamphlet as it is now written, making only minor corrections.

Discussion: Mary-Alice, Doug, Mary-Alice, Doug, Lew, Doug, Melissa, Lew, Doug, Mary-Alice, Lew, Doug, Lew, Caroline

Motion Passed

B. Troops Antiwar Sentiment pamphlet. Work on this pamphlet is proceeding. If all goes well, it will be printed at the end of this month.

C. China pamphlet. There are several ways of writing the pamphlet and several comrades who might be interested in working on it.

Discussion: Melissa, Lew, Melissa, Doug, Caroline, Lew, Gus, Mary-Alice, Lew, Mary-Alice, Daniels, Gus, Doug, Melissa, Lew, Mary-Alice

Motion: to refer the question of how to write the pamphlet to the National Office.

Motion Passed.

D. Che Guevera pamphlet. Material is now ready for this pamphlet.

Discussion: Melissa, Lew, Doug, Lew, Melissa

Motion: to approve the report.

Motion Passed.

6. Bloomington Defense - Daniels

The hearing scheduled for today has been postponed by the Court with no explanation given. It is expected that the hearing will be re-scheduled sometime after the middle of November. The changed date alters nothing in our Bloomington defense work, and we must continue to raise money and support.

Motion: to approve the report.

Discussion: Mary-Alice

Motion Passed.

7. Antiwar Report - Doug

The demonstrations this weekend will be successful. The Nov. 5-8 Committee is tentatively planning an evaluation meeting for Nov. 26.

Motion: to approve the report.

Discussion: Lew, Doug.

Motion Passed.

8. European Trip Report - Mary-Alice

See enclosed.

Motion: to approve the report.

Discussion: Lew, Melissa, Mary-Alice.

Motion Passed.

Adjourned: 8:30 p.m.

REPORT ON EUROPEAN TRIP given to the NEC by Mary-Alice, Nov. 4, 1966

I. Liege Weekend

The demonstration held Liege, Belgium, on October 15, was called and organized by the Jeunes Gardes Socialistes (JGS - Socialist Young Guards) which is the youth group associated with the Belgian Socialist Workers Confederation. It was originally conceived as primarily a Belgian demonstration, but the response from other socialist youth groups in Western Europe insured that it would have an international character. The major themes of the demonstration were support to the Vietnamese Revolution, the demand for immediate withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam, and the demand for European countries to get out of NATO. The majority of the chants and banners dealt with the Vietnam war.

About 3000 people, almost entirely youth, participated in the demonstration, and the distribution was roughly as follows: Healy's Young Socialists from England, 461; the French Healyites from Lambert's youth group, Revolte, 300; the French JCR (Revolutionary Communist Youth), 220; the German Socialist Students (SDS), 100; Denmark, 80; Italy, 10; the Belgian JGS, 500-700; plus representatives from Spain, Holland, Canada, the U.S., and several other countries.

The untra-sectarianism of the Young Socialists and the Revolte group created several problems during the course of the demonstration and meetings afterward. The first was the insistence by the Young Socialists that they be allowed to carry a banner celebrating the Hungarian revolution of 1956. About 150 pro-Moscow Belgian CPers, who had been looking for some excuse not to participate in the demonstration anyway, seized upon this pretext to walk off the line. Healy reported this in the Newsletter under the headline "Trotskyism Triumphant," saying that the "Pabloites" had called the cops to try to have them thrown out of the demonstration. (For a more detailed reply to Healy's charges see World Outlook, Nov. 18)

After a long march through Liege, during which the YS and Revolte people chanted slogans such as "Stalinism, Out, Out, Out. Trotskyism, In, In, In," and "Long Live the Fourth International," everyone congregated in a large hall for a rally at which one speaker from each delegation spoke for a few minutes. At the end, the JGS presented several resolutions of a very general nature (support to the fighters of the NLF, support to the American antiwar movement, support to the American GI's who refuse to fight in Vietnam) which they expected would be accepted by acclamation and finish off the rally in good spirit. When the resolutions were proposed the Revolte people started screaming about bureaucracy, anti-democratic measures, and that they would agree to no resolutions until a scheduled meeting of delegates from the various organizations was held the following morning. For several minutes it looked like the whole rally was going to break up into a fist fight, as the Revolte people grabbed the microphone and tried to take over the meeting. However, after singing the Internationale the situation

calmed down considerably and the rally broke up peacefully.

The German SDS delegation, which included all tendencies of socialist and communist youth, was so disgusted by the whole situation that they caucused and decided not to remain for the Sunday meeting and left early Sunday morning. The reaction in the Danish delegation was quite similar. The French JCR held a long caucus meeting Saturday night also, but after a very good discussion decided to stay and participate Sunday.

The Sunday morning meeting had been scheduled to discuss a tentative program which could serve as the basis for calling an all-European conference of revolutionary socialist youth to coordinate anti-Vietnam-war activity. There were about 23 delegations present, each with one vote. The JGS had drawn up a nine point program to serve as the basis of discussion, the general line being support to the socialist revolution in Vietnam, the necessity of building a strong international movement against U.S. aggression, the necessity of fighting against NATO, and criticizing the bureaucracies of the workers states and mass working class parties of Europe for failing to give adequate support to the Vietnamese revolution.

The YS and Revolte took the position that discussion of a united front program for revolutionary youth on the question of the war was not enough, and that discussion on the entire program for the formation of a revolutionary socialist youth international was needed. After this proposal was defeated, the meeting proceeded to discuss the nine points, approving their general line. The Healyites were completely isolated in that they were unable to win over any votes which they did not have lined up from the start. On each motion the vote usually divided with approximately six for the YS-Revolte position, 15 for the JGS position, and one or two abstentions. No specific plans were made for a future conference.

Sunday afternoon at least one of our own comrades from each of the countries present attended a short meeting where we evaluated the Liege weekend, and discussed the general problems of better coordination of youth and antiwar work in the various countries. The discussion was very good, and there was general agreement both on the errors made and how to avoid them in the future, and on the importance of the weekend. In essence, that weekend gathered together 3000 of the most politically advanced youth in Europe for the first European international demonstration against the Vietnam war. The fact that we took the initiative for this action and successfully organized it will be of tremendous importance for our work in Europe. It is through this kind of activity that we will be able to put pressure on the mass working class organizations and parties on the key question of defending the Vietnamese revolution.

In addition, the weekend also represented an important step for us internally, as this was the first time our youth comrades from the major European countries worked so closely together on a common project.

II. Belgium

The Belgian JGS is a youth organization of about 200 activists, although they have many more on the books. Until 1965 they were one of the youth groups of the Socialist Party, but they were driven out in the series of expulsions initiated by the right wing. Over the last two years the major problems have been simply trying to come to grips with the rotten political and organizational legacy of the SP and establish themselves as an independent youth group with their own structure, finances, etc. The JGS is mostly working class and lower middle class in composition (there is another organization for socialist students), and they have both French speaking sections and Flemish speaking sections in the organization. Their major strength is in Brussels where they have several locals. I gave a report on the YSA to the Brussels executive committee and there was considerable interest in the general organizational questions such as how we finance ourselves, etc., as well as interesting discussion on the general problems of building a revolutionary socialist youth group and party.

III. England

In England the central problem remains the existence of the Socialist Labor League and the SLL Young Socialists with their incredibly factional and sectarian politics. The SLL Young Socialists are relatively strong as indicated by the size of the delegation they were able to bring to Liege, but they recruit on an extremely low political level. They recruit many young teenagers, orient them to a whole social milieu of dances, parties, and super activism, and burn them out very quickly.

There are two groups in England which are more or less sympathetic to our politics. One is the Revolutionary Socialist League (RSL) which puts out the English Militant and works in the Labor Party, but is extremely sectarian. The other is the group around the the magazine "The Week." They are also oriented towards the Labor Party. The state capitalists have a tendency within the Labor Party in England, and are getting the ear of some of the more militant youth in the official Labor Party Young Socialists, who have just started putting out a paper called "Rebel." However, they are not very hardened state capitalists (for instance, they support the NLF) and are very heterogeneous. I talked with several of the members of the Labor Party YS while I was there and gave them an interview on the YSA for the next issue of "Rebel."

Several of our comrades and people associated with "The Week" group are working with the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign and the Russell Foundation in London, especially helping to organize the first session of the War Crimes Tribunal in early November. The War Crimes Tribunal itself has received considerable support in several countries, particularly Japan, and if it manages to survive the various international political pressures and organizational problems it faces, could serve a very important propagandistic role in relation to the Vietnam war.

IV. France

In France the birth and early development of the new JCR has been very encouraging. The JCR was formed last April after the Communist Student Union refused to readmit the Sorbonne section, which had been dissolved for refusing to support Mitterand in the elections, and several other sections walked out in solidarity with the Sorbonne group. Since then the JCR has grown from about 120 members to more than 500. They have established about 15 locals around the country and become the primary initiators of sustained activity around the issue of the Vietnam war and support to the Vietnamese revolution. They have been very conscious of and effective in using the Vietnam issue in making inroads into the communist and socialist youth in France.

At the present time they are in the process of working towards their real founding convention, which will be held early next year. They have a functioning national committee which has been meeting every 4 to 6 weeks to discuss national activity, draw up a political program for the JCR, write a constitution, etc. The weekend I was in Paris I attended a meeting of the National Committee of the JCR and listened to the debates on many of these questions. The discussions were on a very high level, especially considering that the JCR has been in existence for only 7 months. I also found that a surprisingly large number of the NC members were familiar with the YSA and the YS and that they have translated quite a bit of our material on the Negro struggle in the U.S., including convention documents, the interview with Malcolm X, George Breitman's memorial speech on Malcolm last February, and John Benson's article on Lowndes. They have also translated a large portion of Doug Jenness's pamphlet on Vietnam.

Our comrades felt that the JCR is now probably the largest militant youth organization on a national scale, although in the north and particularly in the Paris region there is a lot of competition from the Revolte group. Even in relation to the Communist Student Union the JCR compares favorably in terms of active membership. The biggest problem now they feel, will be to begin to move off the campuses and reach out to more working class youth. The strength of the CP in the working class will make this quite difficult, but again, it is on the issue of the war that they can make some headway.

V. Conclusion

Although I was only able to spend time in Belgium, England, and France, I had an opportunity to meet comrades from several other countries, including Germany, Italy, Denmark, and Japan.

The situation in Italy is particularly interesting due to the existence of a relatively large left wing within the CP. Last spring the left wing in the youth began publishing a "cultural" journal called "Falce martello" (Hammer and Sickle) which has already grouped a whole tendency around it, even though it has now been banned by the CP leadership.

The trip was very important, not only from the point of view of the YSA getting a better understanding of the general situation among European socialist youth, but also from the point of view of our fraternal youth organizations in Europe getting a better picture of the YSA and the general situation in the United States. There is a tremendous interest in what is happening in the U.S. and a real feeling of solidarity with the American antiwar movement and American socialist youth. Anything we can do to further these ties is very important.

Philadelphia, Pa.
October 9, 1966

National Executive Committee of the
Young Socialist Alliance
New York, New York

Dear Comrades,

On September 25 I was expelled from the Young Socialist Alliance after charges were placed against me by the Executive Committee of the Philadelphia YSA local. I am appealing my expulsion on the grounds that it is in violation of the Bolshevik conception of democratic centralism.

Because of the gravity of the charges against me and because the Executive Committee's motion called for my expulsion "in view of the charges," I feel that I must answer the charges against me.

The first charge against me is "adherence to the program and policies of the Spartacist grouping." But this is not a charge! It merely states that I disagree with the YSA and agree with the Spartacist League. John Benson, spokesman for the Executive Committee at the trial said that each charge all by itself merits expulsion. Does this "charge" -- political differences -- merit expulsion? I am informed that I acknowledged to members of the YSA my "adherence to the program and policies of Spartacist." I have kept it no secret from the YSA that I am in basic political agreement with the Spartacist League, but can I (or rather, should I) be expelled from the YSA for this crime of different political ideas?

I am also accused of "publicly attacking the policies and program of the YSA," "specifically" in front of some members of SDS. Evidence for this charge was offered on two points: 1) At a recent YSA class at which non-YSAers were also present, I disagreed with Harry Ring's presentation on the expulsion of the Robertson tendency from the Socialist Workers Party. Does this mean "attacking the policies and program of the YSA?" Is it the program of the YSA to undemocratically expel comrades for the opinions they hold? 2) I was arguing with some YSAers against the SWP's support for Aptheker in the presence of several SDSers. The YSAers I was arguing with did not warn me that I was breaking discipline as was their duty to do. At the trial I said that the YSA did not issue a statement of support to Aptheker and therefore I am not obligated to defend a decision made by the leaders of the SWP. It was then that I was informed by Benson that indeed the YSA's NEC voted to support Apthekar. If this is true, then why were the rank and file members not notified of this decision by their leaders?

I am then charged with "miscellaneous acts of indiscipline," such as "attempting to form a faction outside of the pre-convention discussion period." I have done nothing more than discuss my differences with YSAers. Is this "attempting to form a faction?" Is discussion an act of indiscipline? But according to the wording of the charge itself, I have not formed a faction but merely attempted to. Following the line of this logic, I am accused of attempting to break discipline!

Another charge is that of "attempting double recruiting to the position of Spartacist." Since at the trial Benson himself realized the phoniness of this charge, he changed the wording (though not on paper) from "attempting" to "advocating." Thus this time I am not even charged with attempting, but with expressing the opinion that I should attempt to commit an act of indiscipline.

I am then also charged with:

1) "stating that the YSA should be destroyed to candidates of the YSA," and 2) "collaboration with leaders of Spartacist for the purpose of wrecking the YSA." When I questioned the YSAer to whom I allegedly told the YSA should be destroyed, he replied: "Well, I don't remember if that's the exact wording, but you did say that you are in basic political agreement with the Spartacist." What kind of proof is that? What sort of logic? This is something I would expect of Hoadly in Indiana.

Concerning the charge of "colaboration . . . for the purpose of wrecking the YSA," I was told a story that I offered to take two YSAers to Robertson and pay the way, and that several months ago I had a conversation with Robertson. I asked the YSAers if they can deny the fact that it was they who wanted to "see some Spartacists" and said that the only problem is money, and that it was then that I told them that if they need money I will lend it to them. I was here accused of trying to implicate them in an act which I committed.

Of all the charges placed against me only one remains a real charge. All others are phony charges which can in no way be substantiated. The only valid charge is the accusation that I put up the June issue of the SPARTACIST in a bookstore. This is a charge of indiscipline. The proper procedure in such a case would have been to warn me. Had I been told to stop, I would have done so.

But the YSA would have none of this democratic procedure. They were only too glad to get rid of me. On Monday night I was notified that charges were brought against me for being a "supporter of the Robertson grouping." On Wednesday I received the statement of charges against me; on Sunday I was expelled. Pretty fast work! But then, the YSA has had a lot of experience in this sort of activity.

And you, members of the National Executive Committee of the YSA, did not even bother acting upon the letter which I have recently sent you, in which I protested the fact that the leaders of the Philadelphia YSA prohibited me from discussing my differences privately with comrades of the YSA. You either do not consider this matter of any importance, or you decided to add my name to the list of those to be expelled. How else can this be explained?

All this is only too reminiscent of 1938 Moscow.

Now comes the question: Why was I expelled?

At a time when the YSA pursues the classless single issue-single slogan approach in the anti-war movement; at a time when the YSA flirts with the extreme right wing of the movement; at a time when the YSA

supports the candidacy of Aptheker, a Stalinist whose platform is class collaboration and whose program is class peace; at such a time you expell the member who says "NO!" to all this revisionism!

This is clearly to set an example for other comrades who are opposed to the anti-Marxist course being followed by the YSA. And there is opposition! -- Because the growing contradiction between what the YSA claims to be and what it is in reality is too obvious to all those who think for themselves.

I hereby appeal my undemocratic and unwarranted expulsion from the YSA and request immediate reinstatement with full membership rights.

Fraternally,

s/Lou Davis

Phila. Young Socialist
Alliance

Lou Davis
P.O. Box 1827
Phila., Pa. 19105

Dear Lou,

The Executive Committee of the Philadelphia local of the Young Socialist Alliance this evening voted to place formal charges against you, detailed below, and has scheduled trial proceedings before a committee of the whole local for this Sunday, September 25, at 11:30 at 3518 Powelton Avenue.

The constitution of the YSA sets forth the following as the policy and procedure in cases such as this.

Article IX Discipline

1. All decisions of the governing bodies of the YSA are binding upon the members and subordinate bodies of the YSA.
2. Any member or body of the YSA may bring charges against any member for violation of the Constitution, program, or policies of the YSA.
3. Written charges shall be presented to the accused in advance of the trial. Charges shall be filed in the local unit where the accused is a member and shall be heard by a committee it sets up for this purpose.
6. Any member subjected to disciplinary action has the right to submit a written appeal to the next higher body, up to and including the National Convention. This appeal must be filed with the NEC within fifteen days after the action being appealed. Pending action on the appeal, the decision of the disciplinary body remains in force.

Article X Miscellaneous Provisions

1. All decisions of the YSA shall be made by a majority vote.

The charges filed against you are:

1. Adherence to the program and policies of the Spartacist grouping.
2. Distribution of Spartacist.
3. Publicly attacking the policies and program of the YSA.
4. Miscellaneous acts of indiscipline detailed below;
 - a. Attempting to form a faction outside the preconvention discussion period.
 - b. Attempting double recruiting to the position of Spartacist.
 - c. Collaboration with leaders of Spartacist for the purpose of wrecking the YSA.

The above charges are in reference to the following:

1. Acknowledging to members of the YSA adherence to the program and policies of Spartacist.

2. Stating that the YSA should be destroyed to candidates of the YSA.
3. Attacking the program of the YSA in the presence of non-YSAers, specifically members of SDS.
4. Distributing, and acting as agent for Spartacist.

At the New Year's Convention of the YSA held in Chicago 1964-65 a resolution was passed stating that "Collaboration with and support of the American Committee for the Fourth International and Spartacist is incompatible with YSA membership."

You will be given equal time at the trial proceedings. The time allotted will be approximately one half hour.

Comradely,

s/John Benson
for the Executive Committee

To the NEC

Dear Comrades:

On Sunday September 25 the Philadelphia local of the YSA voted to expel Lou D. from membership. The charges were brought against him when two members he had been attempting to recruit to his position reported his activities to the local. According to their reports he had been active for some months as an agent of the Spartacist grouping. Without informing the YSA he had been in contact with Robertson and had made personal visits to see him. At one point he offered to pay the transportation of one comrade to New York in order to talk to Robertson. Lou had told these two comrades that he was in basic political agreement with the Spartacists and he was attempting to win YSAers to this position. Agreeing with the general Spartacist position that the YSA was not a revolutionary organization, Lou was attempting to build a faction within the YSA, a faction which at some time would resign. He stated that there was no chance at all to convince the majority of members of his position. Finally, in an open and clear display of basic loyalties, he had supplied a book store with the Spartacist.

One of the listed charges is incorrect -- attempting double recruiting. He advocated such a policy, but had not recruited anyone. Therefore such a charge cannot in anyway be substantiated, although it is clear that people he was working with were not being drawn closer to the YSA.

At the trial Lou admitted supplying the bookstore with the Spartacist, that he was attempting to recruit within the YSA to his position and that he had no chance of winning majority support. Such a position can only be interpreted as an attempt to win as many supporters as possible before leaving. He admitted, in his words, offering to lend money for the trip to New York and that he himself had made at least one such trip to see Robertson. He also said that although he had not known nor agreed with the Spartacists prior to joining the YSA, had he agreed with them he was sure that Robertson would have advised him to join.

All the other charges he denied. He did not adhere to the program and policies of the Spartacists. He was "in basic political agreement" with them. He did not publicly attack the YSA program. To the best of his knowledge he only attacked positions and practices of the SWP, specifically support for the Aptheker campaign and the Robertson and Wolforth expulsions. He denied that he advocated wrecking or destroying the YSA, and he had not collaborated with the Spartacists for this purpose. Rather he had discussions with Robertson which he refused to explain, he agreed with them on most issues including the need for their existence, he tried to recruit to their position, and he saw no hope of ever becoming a majority in the YSA.

By his own admissions, even accepting his semantical objections, Lou's position is clear. He has admitted that his basic loyalty lies with the Spartacist grouping rather than with the YSA.

Comradely,

s/John Benson

Received October 24, 1966

NEC STATEMENT ON THE LOU DAVIS EXPULSION

November 4, 1966

The Young Socialist Alliance does not allow agents of hostile opponent tendencies to operate within itself. In the case of the Spartacist League the 1965 convention passed a motion excluding them from the YSA, having found after several years experience that their political outlook and organizational manuverings were totally incompatible with loyal membership in the YSA. That motion reads, "Membership in, support to, or collaboration with the Spartacist group or the American Committee for the Fourth International group is incompatible with membership in the YSA." Lou Davis tells us in very clear terms in his appeal, "I am in basic political agreement with the Spartacist League," and does not even bother to deny the related charges of collaboration with them. In light of this the NEC upholds and commends the Philadelphia local in expelling Lou Davis.

NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

November 4, 1966 No. 23

NEC: Daniels, Doug, Gus, Melissa, Caroline, Lew, Mary-Alice
NEC excused: Betsey

Convened: 6:30 p.m.

Chairman: Melissa

- Agenda:
1. Lou Davis Appeal
 2. National Office Report
 3. Fund Drive
 4. Sub Drive
 5. Pamphlets
 6. Bloomington Defense
 7. Antiwar Report
 8. European Trip Report

1. Lou Davis Appeal - Lew

See Enclosed.

Motion: to uphold the action of the Philadelphia local and to adopt the NEC statement (enclosed).

Discussion: Mary-Alice, Gus, Melissa

Motion Passed.

2. National Office Report - Lew

A. Comrades in Seattle have applied for formal local status, having satisfied the requirements.

Motion: to re-establish a local in Seattle.

Motion Passed.

B. Steve W., a former member of the YSA, has applied for membership in Washington.

Motion: to admit Steve W. to the YSA.

Discussion: Doug, Lew, Daniels, Lew, Caroline, Mary-Alice, Lew

Motion Passed.

C. Reports indicate that Betsey's tour is receiving a favorable response.

D. Comrade Jan in Gainesville, Fla., has established a Socialist Discussion Group which puts out a regular newsletter. The group has sponsored meetings for Franz Lee and Peter B., as well as become a center of controversy on the campus.

3. Fund Drive - Melissa

\$3,247 has been collected which is slightly ahead of schedule.

Motion: to approve the report.

Discussion: Doug, Melissa

Motion Passed.

4. Sub Drive - Melissa

The sub drive is 39% behind schedule. A major effort has to be made in order to finish the drive on schedule. A scoreboard has been sent out.

Motion: to approve the report.

Discussion: Mary-Alice, Melissa, Lew, Melissa

Motion Passed

5. Pamphlets - Lew

A. Vietnam pamphlet. In the last two weeks orders have been running very high, bringing our supply to a bare minimum.

Motion: to reprint the pamphlet as it is now written, making only minor corrections.

Discussion: Mary-Alice, Doug, Mary-Alice, Doug, Lew, Doug, Melissa, Lew, Doug, Mary-Alice, Lew, Doug, Lew, Caroline

Motion Passed

B. Troops Antiwar Sentiment pamphlet. Work on this pamphlet is proceeding. If all goes well, it will be printed at the end of this month.

C. China pamphlet. There are several ways of writing the pamphlet and several comrades who might be interested in working on it.

Discussion: Melissa, Lew, Melissa, Doug, Caroline, Lew, Gus, Mary-Alice, Lew, Mary-Alice, Daniels, Gus, Doug, Melissa, Lew, Mary-Alice

Motion: to refer the question of how to write the pamphlet to the National Office.

Motion Passed.

D. Che Guevera pamphlet. Material is now ready for this pamphlet.

Discussion: Melissa, Lew, Doug, Lew, Melissa

Motion: to approve the report.

Motion Passed.

6. Bloomington Defense - Daniels

The hearing scheduled for today has been postponed by the Court with no explanation given. It is expected that the hearing will be re-scheduled sometime after the middle of November. The changed date alters nothing in our Bloomington defense work, and we must continue to raise money and support.

Motion: to approve the report.

Discussion: Mary-Alice

Motion Passed.

7. Antiwar Report - Doug

The demonstrations this weekend will be successful. The Nov. 5-8 Committee is tentatively planning an evaluation meeting for Nov. 26.

Motion: to approve the report.

Discussion: Lew, Doug.

Motion Passed.

8. European Trip Report - Mary-Alice

See enclosed.

Motion: to approve the report.

Discussion: Lew, Melissa, Mary-Alice.

Motion Passed.

Adjourned: 8:30 p.m.

Philadelphia, Pa.
October 9, 1966

National Executive Committee of the
Young Socialist Alliance
New York, New York

Dear Comrades,

On September 25 I was expelled from the Young Socialist Alliance after charges were placed against me by the Executive Committee of the Philadelphia YSA local. I am appealing my expulsion on the grounds that it is in violation of the Bolshevik conception of democratic centralism.

Because of the gravity of the charges against me and because the Executive Committee's motion called for my expulsion "in view of the charges," I feel that I must answer the charges against me.

The first charge against me is "adherence to the program and policies of the Spartacist grouping." But this is not a charge! It merely states that I disagree with the YSA and agree with the Spartacist League. John Benson, spokesman for the Executive Committee at the trial said that each charge all by itself merits expulsion. Does this "charge" -- political differences -- merit expulsion? I am informed that I acknowledged to members of the YSA my "adherence to the program and policies of Spartacist." I have kept it no secret from the YSA that I am in basic political agreement with the Spartacist League, but can I (or rather, should I) be expelled from the YSA for this crime of different political ideas?

I am also accused of "publicly attacking the policies and program of the YSA," "specifically" in front of some members of SDS. Evidence for this charge was offered on two points: 1) At a recent YSA class at which non-YSAers were also present, I disagreed with Harry Ring's presentation on the expulsion of the Robertson tendency from the Socialist Workers Party. Does this mean "attacking the policies and program of the YSA?" Is it the program of the YSA to undemocratically expel comrades for the opinions they hold? 2) I was arguing with some YSAers against the SWP's support for Aptheker in the presence of several SDSers. The YSAers I was arguing with did not warn me that I was breaking discipline as was their duty to do. At the trial I said that the YSA did not issue a statement of support to Aptheker and therefore I am not obligated to defend a decision made by the leaders of the SWP. It was then that I was informed by Benson that indeed the YSA's NEC voted to support Apthekar. If this is true, then why were the rank and file members not notified of this decision by their leaders?

I am then charged with "miscellaneous acts of indiscipline," such as "attempting to form a faction outside of the pre-convention discussion period." I have done nothing more than discuss my differences with YSAers. Is this "attempting to form a faction?" Is discussion an act of indiscipline? But according to the wording of the charge itself, I have not formed a faction but merely attempted to. Following the line of this logic, I am accused of attempting to break discipline!

Another charge is that of "attempting double recruiting to the position of Spartacist." Since at the trial Benson himself realized the phoniness of this charge, he changed the wording (though not on paper) from "attempting" to "advocating." Thus this time I am not even charged with attempting, but with expressing the opinion that I should attempt to commit an act of indiscipline.

I am then also charged with:

1) "stating that the YSA should be destroyed to candidates of the YSA," and 2) "collaboration with leaders of Spartacist for the purpose of wrecking the YSA." When I questioned the YSAer to whom I allegedly told the YSA should be destroyed, he replied: "Well, I don't remember if that's the exact wording, but you did say that you are in basic political agreement with the Spartacist." What kind of proof is that? What sort of logic? This is something I would expect of Hoadly in Indiana.

Concerning the charge of "colaboration . . . for the purpose of wrecking the YSA," I was told a story that I offered to take two YSAers to Robertson and pay the way, and that several months ago I had a conversation with Robertson. I asked the YSAers if they can deny the fact that it was they who wanted to "see some Spartacists" and said that the only problem is money, and that it was then that I told them that if they need money I will lend it to them. I was here accused of trying to implicate them in an act which I committed.

Of all the charges placed against me only one remains a real charge. All others are phony charges which can in no way be substantiated. The only valid charge is the accusation that I put up the June issue of the SPARTACIST in a bookstore. This is a charge of indiscipline. The proper procedure in such a case would have been to warn me. Had I been told to stop, I would have done so.

But the YSA would have none of this democratic procedure. They were only too glad to get rid of me. On Monday night I was notified that charges were brought against me for being a "supporter of the Robertson grouping." On Wednesday I received the statement of charges against me; on Sunday I was expelled. Pretty fast work! But then, the YSA has had a lot of experience in this sort of activity.

And you, members of the National Executive Committee of the YSA, did not even bother acting upon the letter which I have recently sent you, in which I protested the fact that the leaders of the Philadelphia YSA prohibited me from discussing my differences privately with comrades of the YSA. You either do not consider this matter of any importance, or you decided to add my name to the list of those to be expelled. How else can this be explained?

All this is only too reminiscent of 1938 Moscow.

Now comes the question: Why was I expelled?

At a time when the YSA pursues the classless single issue-single slogan approach in the anti-war movement; at a time when the YSA flirts with the extreme right wing of the movement; at a time when the YSA

supports the candidacy of Aptheker, a Stalinist whose platform is class collaboration and whose program is class peace; at such a time you expell the member who says "NO!" to all this revisionism!

This is clearly to set an example for other comrades who are opposed to the anti-Marxist course being followed by the YSA. And there is opposition! -- Because the growing contradiction between what the YSA claims to be and what it is in reality is too obvious to all those who think for themselves.

I hereby appeal my undemocratic and unwarranted expulsion from the YSA and request immediate reinstatement with full membership rights.

Fraternally,

s/Lou Davis

Phila. Young Socialist
Alliance

Lou Davis
P.O. Box 1827
Phila., Pa. 19105

Dear Lou,

The Executive Committee of the Philadelphia local of the Young Socialist Alliance this evening voted to place formal charges against you, detailed below, and has scheduled trial proceedings before a committee of the whole local for this Sunday, September 25, at 11:30 at 3518 Powelton Avenue.

The constitution of the YSA sets forth the following as the policy and procedure in cases such as this.

Article IX Discipline

1. All decisions of the governing bodies of the YSA are binding upon the members and subordinate bodies of the YSA.
2. Any member or body of the YSA may bring charges against any member for violation of the Constitution, program, or policies of the YSA.
3. Written charges shall be presented to the accused in advance of the trial. Charges shall be filed in the local unit where the accused is a member and shall be heard by a committee it sets up for this purpose.
6. Any member subjected to disciplinary action has the right to submit a written appeal to the next higher body, up to and including the National Convention. This appeal must be filed with the NEC within fifteen days after the action being appealed. Pending action on the appeal, the decision of the disciplinary body remains in force.

Article X Miscellaneous Provisions

1. All decisions of the YSA shall be made by a majority vote.

The charges filed against you are:

1. Adherence to the program and policies of the Spartacist grouping.
2. Distribution of Spartacist.
3. Publicly attacking the policies and program of the YSA.
4. Miscellaneous acts of indiscipline detailed below;
 - a. Attempting to form a faction outside the preconvention discussion period.
 - b. Attempting double recruiting to the position of Spartacist.
 - c. Collaboration with leaders of Spartacist for the purpose of wrecking the YSA.

The above charges are in reference to the following:

1. Acknowledging to members of the YSA adherence to the program and policies of Spartacist.

2. Stating that the YSA should be destroyed to candidates of the YSA.
3. Attacking the program of the YSA in the presence of non-YSAers, specifically members of SDS.
4. Distributing, and acting as agent for Spartacist.

At the New Year's Convention of the YSA held in Chicago 1964-65 a resolution was passed stating that "Collaboration with and support of the American Committee for the Fourth International and Spartacist is incompatible with YSA membership."

You will be given equal time at the trial proceedings. The time allotted will be approximately one half hour.

Comradely,

s/John Benson
for the Executive Committee

To the NEC

Dear Comrades:

On Sunday September 25 the Philadelphia local of the YSA voted to expel Lou D. from membership. The charges were brought against him when two members he had been attempting to recruit to his position reported his activities to the local. According to their reports he had been action for some months as an agent of the Spartacist grouping. Without informing the YSA he had been in contact with Robertson and had made personal visits to see him. At one point he offered to pay the transportation of one comrade to New York in order to talk to Robertson. Lou had told these two comrades that he was in basic political agreement with the Spartacists and he was attempting to win YSAers to this position. Agreeing with the general Spartacist position that the YSA was not a revolutionary organization, Lou was attempting to build a faction within the YSA, a faction which at some time would resign. He stated that there was no chance at all to convince the majority of members of his position. Finally, in an open and clear display of basic loyalties, he had supplied a book store with the Spartacist.

One of the listed charges is incorrect -- attempting double recruiting. He advocated such a policy, but had not recruited anyone. Therefore such a charge cannot in anyway be substantiated, although it is clear that people he was working with were not being drawn closer to the YSA.

At the trial Lou admitted supplying the bookstore with the Spartacist, that he was attempting to recruit within the YSA to his position and that he had no chance of winning majority support. Such a position can only be interpreted as an attempt to win as many supporters as possible before leaving. He admitted, in his words, offering to lend money for the trip to New York and that he himself had made at least one such trip to see Robertson. He also said that although he had not known nor agreed with the Spartacists prior to joining the YSA, had he agreed with them he was sure that Robertson would have advised him to join.

All the other charges he denied. He did not adhere to the program and policies of the Spartacists. He was "in basic political agreement" with them. He did not publicly attack the YSA program. To the best of his knowledge he only attacked positions and practices of the SWP, specifically support for the Aptheker campaign and the Robertson and Wolforth expulsions. He denied that he advocated wrecking or destroying the YSA, and he had not collaborated with the Spartacists for this purpose. Rather he had discussions with Robertson which he refused to explain, he agreed with them on most issues including the need for their existence, he tried to recruit to their position, and he saw no hope of ever becoming a majority in the YSA.

By his own admissions, even accepting his semantical objections, Lou's position is clear. He has admitted that his basic loyalty lies with the Spartacist grouping rather than with the YSA.

Comradely,

s/John Benson

Received October 24, 1966

NEC STATEMENT ON THE LOU DAVIS EXPULSION

November 4, 1966

The Young Socialist Alliance does not allow agents of hostile opponent tendencies to operate within itself. In the case of the Spartacist League the 1965 convention passed a motion excluding them from the YSA, having found after several years experience that their political outlook and organizational manuverings were totally incompatible with loyal membership in the YSA. That motion reads, "Membership in, support to, or collaboration with the Spartacist group or the American Committee for the Fourth International group is incompatible with membership in the YSA." Lou Davis tells us in very clear terms in his appeal, "I am in basic political agreement with the Spartacist League," and does not even bother to deny the related charges of collaboration with them. In light of this the NEC upholds and commends the Philadelphia local in expelling Lou Davis.

REPORT ON EUROPEAN TRIP given to the NEC by Mary-Alice, Nov. 4, 1966

I. Liege Weekend

The demonstration held Liege, Belgium, on October 15, was called and organized by the Jeunes Gardes Socialistes (JGS - Socialist Young Guards) which is the youth group associated with the Belgian Socialist Workers Confederation. It was originally conceived as primarily a Belgian demonstration, but the response from other socialist youth groups in Western Europe insured that it would have an international character. The major themes of the demonstration were support to the Vietnamese Revolution, the demand for immediate withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam, and the demand for European countries to get out of NATO. The majority of the chants and banners dealt with the Vietnam war.

About 3000 people, almost entirely youth, participated in the demonstration, and the distribution was roughly as follows: Healy's Young Socialists from England, 461; the French Healyites from Lambert's youth group, Revolte, 300; the French JCR (Revolutionary Communist Youth), 220; the German Socialist Students (SDS), 100; Denmark, 80; Italy, 10; the Belgian JGS, 500-700; plus representatives from Spain, Holland, Canada, the U.S., and several other countries.

The untra-sectarianism of the Young Socialists and the Revolte group created several problems during the course of the demonstration and meetings afterward. The first was the insistence by the Young Socialists that they be allowed to carry a banner celebrating the Hungarian revolution of 1956. About 150 pro-Moscow Belgian CPers, who had been looking for some excuse not to participate in the demonstration anyway, seized upon this pretext to walk off the line. Healy reported this in the Newsletter under the headline "Trotskyism Triumphant," saying that the "Pabloites" had called the cops to try to have them thrown out of the demonstration. (For a more detailed reply to Healy's charges see World Outlook, Nov. 18)

After a long march through Liege, during which the YS and Revolte people chanted slogans such as "Stalinism, Out, Out, Out. Trotskyism, In, In, In," and "Long Live the Fourth International," everyone congregated in a large hall for a rally at which one speaker from each delegation spoke for a few minutes. At the end, the JGS presented several resolutions of a very general nature (support to the fighters of the NLF, support to the American antiwar movement, support to the American GI's who refuse to fight in Vietnam) which they expected would be accepted by acclamation and finish off the rally in good spirit. When the resolutions were proposed the Revolte people started screaming about bureaucracy, anti-democratic measures, and that they would agree to no resolutions until a scheduled meeting of delegates from the various organizations was held the following morning. For several minutes it looked like the whole rally was going to break up into a fist fight, as the Revolte people grabbed the microphone and tried to take over the meeting. However, after singing the Internationale the situation

calmed down considerably and the rally broke up peacefully.

The German SDS delegation, which included all tendencies of socialist and communist youth, was so disgusted by the whole situation that they caucused and decided not to remain for the Sunday meeting and left early Sunday morning. The reaction in the Danish delegation was quite similar. The French JCR held a long caucus meeting Saturday night also, but after a very good discussion decided to stay and participate Sunday.

The Sunday morning meeting had been scheduled to discuss a tentative program which could serve as the basis for calling an all-European conference of revolutionary socialist youth to coordinate anti-Vietnam-war activity. There were about 23 delegations present, each with one vote. The JGS had drawn up a nine point program to serve as the basis of discussion, the general line being support to the socialist revolution in Vietnam, the necessity of building a strong international movement against U.S. aggression, the necessity of fighting against NATO, and criticizing the bureaucracies of the workers states and mass working class parties of Europe for failing to give adequate support to the Vietnamese revolution.

The YS and Revolte took the position that discussion of a united front program for revolutionary youth on the question of the war was not enough, and that discussion on the entire program for the formation of a revolutionary socialist youth international was needed. After this proposal was defeated, the meeting proceeded to discuss the nine points, approving their general line. The Healyites were completely isolated in that they were unable to win over any votes which they did not have lined up from the start. On each motion the vote usually divided with approximately six for the YS-Revolte position, 15 for the JGS position, and one or two abstentions. No specific plans were made for a future conference.

Sunday afternoon at least one of our own comrades from each of the countries present attended a short meeting where we evaluated the Liege weekend, and discussed the general problems of better coordination of youth and antiwar work in the various countries. The discussion was very good, and there was general agreement both on the errors made and how to avoid them in the future, and on the importance of the weekend. In essence, that weekend gathered together 3000 of the most politically advanced youth in Europe for the first European international demonstration against the Vietnam war. The fact that we took the initiative for this action and successfully organized it will be of tremendous importance for our work in Europe. It is through this kind of activity that we will be able to put pressure on the mass working class organizations and parties on the key question of defending the Vietnamese revolution.

In addition, the weekend also represented an important step for us internally, as this was the first time our youth comrades from the major European countries worked so closely together on a common project.

II. Belgium

The Belgian JGS is a youth organization of about 200 activists, although they have many more on the books. Until 1965 they were one of the youth groups of the Socialist Party, but they were driven out in the series of expulsions initiated by the right wing. Over the last two years the major problems have been simply trying to come to grips with the rotten political and organizational legacy of the SP and establish themselves as an independent youth group with their own structure, finances, etc. The JGS is mostly working class and lower middle class in composition (there is another organization for socialist students), and they have both French speaking sections and Flemish speaking sections in the organization. Their major strength is in Brussels where they have several locals. I gave a report on the YSA to the Brussels executive committee and there was considerable interest in the general organizational questions such as how we finance ourselves, etc., as well as interesting discussion on the general problems of building a revolutionary socialist youth group and party.

III. England

In England the central problem remains the existence of the Socialist Labor League and the SLL Young Socialists with their incredibly factional and sectarian politics. The SLL Young Socialists are relatively strong as indicated by the size of the delegation they were able to bring to Liege, but they recruit on an extremely low political level. They recruit many young teenagers, orient them to a whole social milieu of dances, parties, and super activism, and burn them out very quickly.

There are two groups in England which are more or less sympathetic to our politics. One is the Revolutionary Socialist League (RSL) which puts out the English Militant and works in the Labor Party, but is extremely sectarian. The other is the group around the the magazine "The Week." They are also oriented towards the Labor Party. The state capitalists have a tendency within the Labor Party in England, and are getting the ear of some of the more militant youth in the official Labor Party Young Socialists, who have just started putting out a paper called "Rebel." However, they are not very hardened state capitalists (for instance, they support the NLF) and are very heterogeneous. I talked with several of the members of the Labor Party YS while I was there and gave them an interview on the YSA for the next issue of "Rebel."

Several of our comrades and people associated with "The Week" group are working with the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign and the Russell Foundation in London, especially helping to organize the first session of the War Crimes Tribunal in early November. The War Crimes Tribunal itself has received considerable support in several countries, particularly Japan, and if it manages to survive the various international political pressures and organizational problems it faces, could serve a very important propagandistic role in relation to the Vietnam war.

IV. France

In France the birth and early development of the new JCR has been very encouraging. The JCR was formed last April after the Communist Student Union refused to readmit the Sorbonne section, which had been dissolved for refusing to support Mitterand in the elections, and several other sections walked out in solidarity with the Sorbonne group. Since then the JCR has grown from about 120 members to more than 500. They have established about 15 locals around the country and become the primary initiators of sustained activity around the issue of the Vietnam war and support to the Vietnamese revolution. They have been very conscious of and effective in using the Vietnam issue in making inroads into the communist and socialist youth in France.

At the present time they are in the process of working towards their real founding convention, which will be held early next year. They have a functioning national committee which has been meeting every 4 to 6 weeks to discuss national activity, draw up a political program for the JCR, write a constitution, etc. The weekend I was in Paris I attended a meeting of the National Committee of the JCR and listened to the debates on many of these questions. The discussions were on a very high level, especially considering that the JCR has been in existence for only 7 months. I also found that a surprisingly large number of the NC members were familiar with the YSA and the YS and that they have translated quite a bit of our material on the Negro struggle in the U.S., including convention documents, the interview with Malcolm X, George Breitman's memorial speech on Malcolm last February, and John Benson's article on Lowndes. They have also translated a large portion of Doug Jenness's pamphlet on Vietnam.

Our comrades felt that the JCR is now probably the largest militant youth organization on a national scale, although in the north and particularly in the Paris region there is a lot of competition from the Revolte group. Even in relation to the Communist Student Union the JCR compares favorably in terms of active membership. The biggest problem now they feel, will be to begin to move off the campuses and reach out to more working class youth. The strength of the CP in the working class will make this quite difficult, but again, it is on the issue of the war that they can make some headway.

V. Conclusion

Although I was only able to spend time in Belgium, England, and France, I had an opportunity to meet comrades from several other countries, including Germany, Italy, Denmark, and Japan.

The situation in Italy is particularly interesting due to the existence of a relatively large left wing within the CP. Last spring the left wing in the youth began publishing a "cultural" journal called "Falcemartello" (Hammer and Sickle) which has already grouped a whole tendency around it, even though it has now been banned by the CP leadership.

The trip was very important, not only from the point of view of the YSA getting a better understanding of the general situation among European socialist youth, but also from the point of view of our fraternal youth organizations in Europe getting a better picture of the YSA and the general situation in the United States. There is a tremendous interest in what is happening in the U.S. and a real feeling of solidarity with the American antiwar movement and American socialist youth. Anything we can do to further these ties is very important.

Committee to Aid the Bloomington Students

P. O. Box 213 Cooper Station New York, New York 10003
Phone: YU 9-7680 Area Code: 212

ational Co-Chairmen:

Herbert J. Muller
Distinguished Service Professor
of English and Government
Indiana University
Mark DeWolfe Howe
Professor of Law
Harvard University

Honorary Chairman: Lord Bertrand Russell
National Secretary: Joyce DeGroot

Attorneys:

Leonard B. Boudin, New York City
Daniel T. Taylor III, Louisville, Ky.

October 24, 1966

SPONSORS

JAMES BALDWIN
Author
CARL and ANNE BRADEN
SCEF
GERMAINE BREE
U. of Wisconsin
PAUL BULLOCK
UCLA
REV. ALBERT B. CLEAGE, JR.
Detroit
DAVID DELLINGER
Editor, Liberation Magazine
JAMES P. DIXON
President, Antioch College
RAY GINGER
Author
PATRICK GORMAN
Chicago
FOWLER HARPER
Yale University Law School
JBERT J. HAVIGHURST
University of Chicago
REV. VINCENT L. HAWKINSON
Minneapolis
ROBERT L. HEILBRONER
New School for Social Research
H. STUART HUGHES
Harvard University
MURRAY KEMPTON
New Republic Magazine
JOHN LEWIS
SNCC
HELEN MERRELL LYND
Sarah Lawrence College
NORMAN MAILER
Author
HERBERT MARCUSE
Brandeis University
ERNEST MAZEY
Detroit
REV. A. J. MUSTE
Chairman, CNVA
HANS J. MORGENTHAU
University of Chicago
LINUS PAULING
California Institute of Technology
HILARY PUTNAM
MIT
DR. BENJAMIN SPOCK
Cleveland
ONEL TRILLING
Columbia University
NORMAN THOMAS
WILLARD UPHAUS
Director of World Fellowship
REV. WYATT T. WALKER
SCLC

Dear Friend,

On November 4, 1966 the federal district court in Indianapolis, Indiana will be asked to declare the Indiana Anti-Communism Act unconstitutional. This hearing is the latest step in the 3½ year fight being waged by Jim Bingham, Ralph Levitt, and Tom Morgan, the three Indiana University students indicted under this law in 1963 for their ideas and activities as socialists on the Indiana University campus.

In 1964, the Indiana State Supreme Court reversed a lower court decision in favor of the defendants, and upheld the law. The students, who face three years prison under this act, then filed an appeal for an injunction. After a year's delay, the federal court has set the hearing date for November 4.

County Prosecutor Thomas Hoadley, who initiated the case, emphasized that the central issue is the constitutionality of the law. In his reply to the request for an injunction, he stated that "There is such a danger of irreparable, clear, imminent, great and immediate injury to the plaintiffs Levitt, Bingham, and Morgan if they were to be tried under the criminal charge prior to the determining the constitutionality of the statute in question as should warrant this Court of Equity in passing upon the question of enjoining this criminal prosecution."

This hearing has great significance in the long and costly legal battle to break down this state statute, which is regarded as clearly unconstitutional by most competent jurists. A favorable ruling could strike a big blow at the suppressive witch hunting laws passed in the McCarthy period, which are now used to prosecute civil rights fighters, intimidate critics of the administration's foreign policy, and stifle dissent on university campuses.

This requires your further help. Be with the defendants and their eminent counsel in the Indianapolis courtroom on November 4 by sending a contribution to help defray the heavy legal expenses involved in the hearing. We cannot falter or fail at this crucial juncture in this test case.

Sincerely,

Joyce DeGroot
Joyce DeGroot
National Secretary

ANTIOCH COLLEGE

PROF. MICHAEL J. KRAUS
 PROF. ARTHUR E. MORGAN
 PROF. WILLIAM BERNARD HOUSTON

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

PROF. STEPHEN S. ANDERSON
 PROF. FRIEDA REBELSKY
 PROF. ARTHUR H. RICHARDSON

BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY

PROF. JOHN P. ROCHE
 PROF. KURT H. WOLF
 PROF. ROBERT EVANS

CARLETON COLLEGE

PROF. JOHN DYER-BENNET
 PROF. JOHN J. SHERWOOD
 PROF. BARDWELL L. SMITH

CENY

PROF. BERNARD BELLUSH
 PROF. ABRAHAM EDEL
 PROF. SAMUEL HENDEL

GOUCHER COLLEGE

DR. ALLAN BRICK
 PROF. WILLIAM L. NEUMANN

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

PROF. GORDON W. ALLPORT
 PROF. OSCAR HANDLIN
 PROF. LOUIS L. JAFFE

HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY

DR. WILLIAM MARCUS
 PROF. E. R. STABLER
 PROF. ALBERT TEPPER

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

PROF. PHILIP APPLEMAN
 PROF. MICHAEL SCRIVEN
 PROF. ALFRED LINDSMITH

JOHN HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

PROF. GEORGE BOAS
 PROF. ARTHUR L. STINGHCOMBE

MARYLAND INSTITUTE OF ART

PROF. PETER HOOVER
 PROF. RICHARD W. IRELAND
 PROF. SHERMAN MERRILL

MIT

PROF. STEPHAN L. CHOROVER
 PROF. CHARLES GROSS
 PROF. RICHARD HELD

NEWSCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH

PROF. PAUL JACOBS
 PROF. KARL H. NIEBYL
 PROF. H. P. NEISSER

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

PROF. JOAN DUC CHAPMAN
 PROF. NORMAN REDLICH
 PROF. DANIEL G. COLLINS

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

PROF. KARL DE SCHWEINTZ
 PROF. PAUL A. SCHILPP
 PROF. L. S. STAVRIANOS

PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGE

PROF. MILNOR ALEXANDER
 PROF. J. D. MC AULEY
 PROF. GEORGE E. MURPHY

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

PROF. MARTIN B. DUBERMAN
 PROF. ARTHUR MENDEL
 PROF. H. H. WILSON

OHIO STATE COLLEGE

PROF. GORDON K. GRIGSBY
 PROF. DAVID SPITZ
 PROF. WILLIAM VAN ALSTYNE

ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY

PROF. GEORGE H. WATSON
 PROF. DALE PONTIUS
 PROF. ESTELLE A. DE LACY

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

PROF. GORDON A. MARKER
 PROF. PAUL TILLET
 PROF. JACKSON TOBY

SAN FRANCISCO STATE COLLEGE

PROF. ALVIN SCODEL
 PROF. LLOYD CRISP

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

PROF. PAUL A. BARAN
 PROF. KAREL DE LEEUW
 PROF. I. N. HERSTEIN

TUFTS UNIVERSITY

PROF. WOODROW WILSON SAYRE
 PROF. FRANKLYN D. HÖLZMAN
 PROF. GUY D'AMATO

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO-Boulder

PROF. FRANK OPPENHEIMER
 PROF. GORDON W. HEWES
 PROF. JUDSON B. PEARSON

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA-BERKELEY

PROF. FREDERICK C. CREWS
 PROF. JOHN H. SCHAAR
 PROF. FRED STRIPP

UCLA

PROF. DOUGLAS C. LONG
 PROF. DONALD B. MEYER
 PROF. DAVID C. RAPAPORT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

PROF. MARC GALANTER
 PROF. HARRY KALVEN, JR.
 PROF. MALCOLM SHARP

UNIVERSITY OF DENVER

PROF. GEORGE E. BARDWELL
 PROF. HARVEY GROSS
 PROF. PHILIP W. PERDEW

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

PROF. NORTON T. DODGE
 PROF. ROBERT E. L. KNIGHT
 PROF. MELVILLE J. ULMER

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

PROF. HEINRICH FLEISCHER
 PROF. DAVID W. NOBLE
 PROF. MULFORD Q. SIBLEY

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

PROF. IRVING M. COPI
 PROF. JOSEF BLATT
 PROF. ARNOLD S. KAUFMAN

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

PROF. ANTHONY G. AMSTERDAM
 PROF. DERK BODDE
 PROF. STANLEY E. JOHNSON

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

PROF. GIOVANNI COSTIGAN
 PROF. GORDON H. ORIANA

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

PROF. PHILIP LAMBERT
 PROF. WILLIAM G. RICE
 PROF. WILLIAM A. WILLIAMS

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

PROF. H. NORTHRUP FRYE
 DR. H. BLÜMENFELD
 PROF. J. I. MC DONALD

UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO

ONTARIO, CANADA
 PROF. L. ARMOUR
 REV. DOUGLAS J. HULL
 PROF. E. R. OFFICER

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

PROF. HENRY HERRMANN
 PROF. R. H. BROADHEAD
 PROF. DAVID HERRESHOFF

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

PROF. FREDRICK L. SCHUMAN
 PROF. DAVID ALAN BOOTH
 PROF. CHARLES THOMAS SAMUELS

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

PROF. CHARLES C. DAVIS
 PROF. RICHARD O. RECKNAGEL

YALE UNIVERSITY

PROF. B. I. BITTKER
 PROF. THOMAS EMERSON
 PROF. PAUL H. LAVIETES

GENERAL

NELSON ALGREN
 Author
 JOAN BAEZ
 BARD COLLEGE COMMUNITY
 COUNCIL
 DOROTHY DAY
 Editor, *The Catholic Worker*
 MARK LANE
 Former N.Y. Assemblyman
 JOHN LEO
 Associate Editor, *The Commonwealth*
 JULIAN MAYFIELD
 Editor, *The African Review*
 OTTO NATHAN
 Economist
 FRITZ PAPPENHEIM
 Sociologist
 ANNETTE T. RUBINSTEIN
 Lecturer and Writer
 REED WHITEMORE
 Carleton College

*Institutions and publications cited for purposes of identification only.
 Sponsorship in no way implies agreement with the political ideas of the defendants.
 A partial list of names and universities.*

Box 213 Cooper Station
New York, N.Y. 10003
October 22, 1966

To All Those Working on CABS:

The coming November 4 hearing is a significant event in the Bloomington Case. For the first time in its four year history, the case is before a federal court.

As you will remember, in November 1965, we filed an appeal for an injunction from the federal court on the grounds that the three defendants were being harmed because of the prosecution under this unconstitutional state statute. In this request, the three students were joined by Bill and Rhoda Lindner, who at that time were students at Indiana University, and two professors at Indiana University. These individuals also felt that their freedom of speech and assembly were curtailed by the existence of this law.

The hearing on November 4, however, will not include the two professors and the Lindners. The hearing will be only on the basis of the constitutionality of the law as it applies to the three already indicted students.

This hearing is significant for two reasons:

1. A federal court is being asked to rule. Thus it is no longer a question of a local court or a local prosecutor, but a federal question. The panel of three federal judges who will hear the case has the power to declare the law unconstitutional.
2. Prosecutor Hoadley agrees that the constitutionality of the law is the basic question, and thus it is upon this issue that the court is being asked to rule.

A decision from the three judge panel is not expected until about one month after the hearing. If the decision is in our favor, it is likely that Hoadley will appeal it to the U.S. Supreme Court. If the decision is not in our favor we will:

1. First, request a broader hearing from the federal district court, this time including the two professors and the Lindners, to again request a ruling on the constitutionality.
2. If this decision is not in our favor, or if the court refuses to rehear the case, we will appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court.

At this juncture it seems highly likely that we must be prepared for an appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. Thus CABS activity should be viewed, not as something which can only be done before the November 4 hearing, but activity which should be carried on throughout the fall.

Hoadley is leaving Indiana in January, but that does not mean that the case will automatically end at that time. The incoming prosecutor can drop the case, but we must be prepared in the event he does not.

This means that once again we must work to publicize the case and raise money for the defense. We need:

1. Fund raising. CABS has paid all its previous legal debts, but we now need to concentrate on raising funds for the November 4 hearing. About \$1,000 is needed to pay the lawyer's expenses, transportation costs, photostatic fees, etc. The length of time the case has been existence is also costly. In addition, we must be prepared for the expenses involved in an appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Each area should try to have one money raising project within the next two months. One of the best ways is to put out a mailing to individuals who are opposing the war in Vietnam from newspaper ads. We have found that the return from mailings of this nature is quite high.

We can also approach individuals or groups for contributions. The best example of this was in Detroit, where the Jackson Welfare Fund of the Unitarian Church contributed \$400 to the case in the earlier stages. Not all groups will give this amount, but approaching individuals or civil liberties organizations should again be tried.

Things like rummage sales, cocktail parties, folk concerts, of course, are also good. However holding activities like this will depend on the time and individuals available to carry out the work.

2. Publicity. Since it has been some time since a new legal event in the case has taken place, it is important we attempt to get the broadest publicity possible. This includes many of the things we have done before, such as articles in school newspapers, local papers, using the brochure as a handout, etc. An entirely new layer of students is on the campus today, many of whom have not heard about the case. Our job will be to make the publicity as broad as possible, to inform this new generation about the facts of the case, and about the importance of the hearing.

3. Sponsors. At the present time we have about 1300 sponsors, thus we do not need to launch a major campaign to obtain them. However, everyone should be conscious that we do need them, and approach professors on the campus, antiwar leaders, or well known persons in the community who are not sponsors presently. **EACH AREA SHOULD AIM TO OBTAIN AT LEAST 25 ADDITIONAL SPONSORS** within the next three months.

One of the easiest ways to do this is again, through mailings. Include with a letter on the latest events, a copy of the brochure, a sponsor card, return envelope, and any other information or reprints you think might be helpful. A short follow up visit is good, although not always necessary. A copy of the letter being sent to all sponsors from New York is enclosed. This can be modified and used for mailings to people who are not sponsors.

The basic piece of literature on the case is still the brochure, which all areas should use freely. In addition, we have copies of the earlier reprints on the case, as well as a large supply of stationery which can be used for local mailings. All material can be ordered from the CABS National Office. A package of the brochures, and 50 sponsor cards have already been mailed to each area.

Please send copies of all news coverage, reports on money raising projects, and copies of articles to the CABS National Office. This makes it possible to share some of the best money raising ideas, and gives an idea of the breadth of the publicity we are receiving.

Sincerely,



Joyce DeGroot
National Secretary
CABS

Philadelphia, Pa.
October 9, 1966

National Executive Committee of the
Young Socialist Alliance
New York, New York

Dear Comrades,

On September 25 I was expelled from the Young Socialist Alliance after charges were placed against me by the Executive Committee of the Philadelphia YSA local. I am appealing my expulsion on the grounds that it is in violation of the Bolshevik conception of democratic centralism.

Because of the gravity of the charges against me and because the Executive Committee's motion called for my expulsion "in view of the charges," I feel that I must answer the charges against me.

The first charge against me is "adherence to the program and policies of the Spartacist grouping." But this is not a charge! It merely states that I disagree with the YSA and agree with the Spartacist League. John Benson, spokesman for the Executive Committee at the trial said that each charge all by itself merits expulsion. Does this "charge" -- political differences -- merit expulsion? I am informed that I acknowledged to members of the YSA my "adherence to the program and policies of Spartacist." I have kept it no secret from the YSA that I am in basic political agreement with the Spartacist League, but can I (or rather, should I) be expelled from the YSA for this crime of different political ideas?

I am also accused of "publicly attacking the policies and program of the YSA," "specifically" in front of some members of SDS. Evidence for this charge was offered on two points: 1) At a recent YSA class at which non-YSAers were also present, I disagreed with Harry Ring's presentation on the expulsion of the Robertson tendency from the Socialist Workers Party. Does this mean "attacking the policies and program of the YSA?" Is it the program of the YSA to undemocratically expel comrades for the opinions they hold? 2) I was arguing with some YSAers against the SWP's support for Aptheker in the presence of several SDSers. The YSAers I was arguing with did not warn me that I was breaking discipline as was their duty to do. At the trial I said that the YSA did not issue a statement of support to Aptheker and therefore I am not obligated to defend a decision made by the leaders of the SWP. It was then that I was informed by Benson that indeed the YSA's NEC voted to support Apthekar. If this is true, then why were the rank and file members not notified of this decision by their leaders?

I am then charged with "miscellaneous acts of indiscipline," such as "attempting to form a faction outside of the pre-convention discussion period." I have done nothing more than discuss my differences with YSAers. Is this "attempting to form a faction?" Is discussion an act of indiscipline? But according to the wording of the charge itself, I have not formed a faction but merely attempted to. Following the line of this logic, I am accused of attempting to break discipline!

Another charge is that of "attempting double recruiting to the position of Spartacist." Since at the trial Benson himself realized the phoniness of this charge, he changed the wording (though not on paper) from "attempting" to "advocating." Thus this time I am not even charged with attempting, but with expressing the opinion that I should attempt to commit an act of indiscipline.

I am then also charged with:

1) "stating that the YSA should be destroyed to candidates of the YSA," and 2) "collaboration with leaders of Spartacist for the purpose of wrecking the YSA." When I questioned the YSAer to whom I allegedly told the YSA should be destroyed, he replied: "Well, I don't remember if that's the exact wording, but you did say that you are in basic political agreement with the Spartacist." What kind of proof is that? What sort of logic? This is something I would expect of Hoadly in Indiana.

Concerning the charge of "colaboration . . . for the purpose of wrecking the YSA," I was told a story that I offered to take two YSAers to Robertson and pay the way, and that several months ago I had a conversation with Robertson. I asked the YSAers if they can deny the fact that it was they who wanted to "see some Spartacists" and said that the only problem is money, and that it was then that I told them that if they need money I will lend it to them. I was here accused of trying to implicate them in an act which I committed.

Of all the charges placed against me only one remains a real charge. All others are phony charges which can in no way be substantiated. The only valid charge is the accusation that I put up the June issue of the SPARTACIST in a bookstore. This is a charge of indiscipline. The proper procedure in such a case would have been to warn me. Had I been told to stop, I would have done so.

But the YSA would have none of this democratic procedure. They were only too glad to get rid of me. On Monday night I was notified that charges were brought against me for being a "supporter of the Robertson grouping." On Wednesday I received the statement of charges against me; on Sunday I was expelled. Pretty fast work! But then, the YSA has had a lot of experience in this sort of activity.

And you, members of the National Executive Committee of the YSA, did not even bother acting upon the letter which I have recently sent you, in which I protested the fact that the leaders of the Philadelphia YSA prohibited me from discussing my differences privately with comrades of the YSA. You either do not consider this matter of any importance, or you decided to add my name to the list of those to be expelled. How else can this be explained?

All this is only too reminiscent of 1938 Moscow.

Now comes the question: Why was I expelled?

At a time when the YSA pursues the classless single issue-single slogan approach in the anti-war movement; at a time when the YSA flirts with the extreme right wing of the movement; at a time when the YSA

supports the candidacy of Aptheker, a Stalinist whose platform is class collaboration and whose program is class peace; at such a time you expell the member who says "NO!" to all this revisionism!

This is clearly to set an example for other comrades who are opposed to the anti-Marxist course being followed by the YSA. And there is opposition! -- Because the growing contradiction between what the YSA claims to be and what it is in reality is too obvious to all those who think for themselves.

I hereby appeal my undemocratic and unwarranted expulsion from the YSA and request immediate reinstatement with full membership rights.

Fraternally,

s/Lou Davis

Phila. Young Socialist
Alliance

Lou Davis
P.O. Box 1827
Phila., Pa. 19105

Dear Lou,

The Executive Committee of the Philadelphia local of the Young Socialist Alliance this evening voted to place formal charges against you, detailed below, and has scheduled trial proceedings before a committee of the whole local for this Sunday, September 25, at 11:30 at 3518 Powelton Avenue.

The constitution of the YSA sets forth the following as the policy and procedure in cases such as this.

Article IX Discipline

1. All decisions of the governing bodies of the YSA are binding upon the members and subordinate bodies of the YSA.
2. Any member or body of the YSA may bring charges against any member for violation of the Constitution, program, or policies of the YSA.
3. Written charges shall be presented to the accused in advance of the trial. Charges shall be filed in the local unit where the accused is a member and shall be heard by a committee it sets up for this purpose.
6. Any member subjected to disciplinary action has the right to submit a written appeal to the next higher body, up to and including the National Convention. This appeal must be filed with the NEC within fifteen days after the action being appealed. Pending action on the appeal, the decision of the disciplinary body remains in force.

Article X Miscellaneous Provisions

1. All decisions of the YSA shall be made by a majority vote.

The charges filed against you are:

1. Adherence to the program and policies of the Spartacist grouping.
2. Distribution of Spartacist.
3. Publicly attacking the policies and program of the YSA.
4. Miscellaneous acts of indiscipline detailed below;
 - a. Attempting to form a faction outside the preconvention discussion period.
 - b. Attempting double recruiting to the position of Spartacist.
 - c. Collaboration with leaders of Spartacist for the purpose of wrecking the YSA.

The above charges are in reference to the following:

1. Acknowledging to members of the YSA adherence to the program and policies of Spartacist.

- () 2. Stating that the YSA should be destroyed to candidates of the YSA.
3. Attacking the program of the YSA in the presence of non-YSAers, specifically members of SDS.
4. Distributing, and acting as agent for Spartacist.

At the New Year's Convention of the YSA held in Chicago 1964-65 a resolution was passed stating that "Collaboration with and support of the American Committee for the Fourth International and Spartacist is incompatible with YSA membership."

You will be given equal time at the trial proceedings. The time allotted will be approximately one half hour.

Comradely,

s/John Benson
for the Executive Committee

To the NEC

Dear Comrades:

On Sunday September 25 the Philadelphia local of the YSA voted to expel Lou D. from membership. The charges were brought against him when two members he had been attempting to recruit to his position reported his activities to the local. According to their reports he had been acting for some months as an agent of the Spartacist grouping. Without informing the YSA he had been in contact with Robertson and had made personal visits to see him. At one point he offered to pay the transportation of one comrade to New York in order to talk to Robertson. Lou had told these two comrades that he was in basic political agreement with the Spartacists and he was attempting to win YSAers to this position. Agreeing with the general Spartacist position that the YSA was not a revolutionary organization, Lou was attempting to build a faction within the YSA, a faction which at some time would resign. He stated that there was no chance at all to convince the majority of members of his position. Finally, in an open and clear display of basic loyalties, he had supplied a book store with the Spartacist.

One of the listed charges is incorrect -- attempting double recruiting. He advocated such a policy, but had not recruited anyone. Therefore such a charge cannot in anyway be substantiated, although it is clear that people he was working with were not being drawn closer to the YSA.

At the trial Lou admitted supplying the bookstore with the Spartacist, that he was attempting to recruit within the YSA to his position and that he had no chance of winning majority support. Such a position can only be interpreted as an attempt to win as many supporters as possible before leaving. He admitted, in his words, offering to lend money for the trip to New York and that he himself had made at least one such trip to see Robertson. He also said that although he had not known nor agreed with the Spartacists prior to joining the YSA, had he agreed with them he was sure that Robertson would have advised him to join.

All the other charges he denied. He did not adhere to the program and policies of the Spartacists. He was "in basic political agreement" with them. He did not publicly attack the YSA program. To the best of his knowledge he only attacked positions and practices of the SWP, specifically support for the Aptheker campaign and the Robertson and Wolforth expulsions. He denied that he advocated wrecking or destroying the YSA, and he had not collaborated with the Spartacists for this purpose. Rather he had discussions with Robertson which he refused to explain, he agreed with them on most issues including the need for their existence, he tried to recruit to their position, and he saw no hope of ever becoming a majority in the YSA.

By his own admissions, even accepting his semantical objections, Lou's position is clear. He has admitted that his basic loyalty lies with the Spartacist grouping rather than with the YSA.

Comradely,

Received October 24, 1966

s/John Benson

NEC MINUTES OCTOBER 22, 1966 No. 22

NEC: Caroline, Melissa, Doug, Daniels, Gus, Lew.
NEC excused: Betsey (tour), Mary-Alice (Europe)

Chairman: Daniels

Agenda: 1. National Office Report
2. Pamphlets
3. Sub Drive
4. Fund Drive
5. Young Socialist
6. Bloomington Defense
7. Antiwar

1. National Office Report - Lew

A. Transfers. Paul and Norma have accepted assignments to go to Seattle.

Motion: to approve the transfer of NC member Paul to Seattle.

Discussion: Melissa, Lew.

Motion Passed.

B. Sub and Fund Drives director.

Motion: to approve the assignment of Melissa as sub and fund drives director.

Motion Passed.

C. Informational report on Liege demonstration as reported in Mary-Alice's letter.

2. Pamphlets - Lew

A. Malcolm X Talks to Young People is out of print.

Motion: to reprint 5,000 of the pamphlet as a YS publication.

Discussion: Caroline, Lew, Daniels.

Motion Passed.

B. The pamphlet on antiwar sentiment in the armed forces is being prepared. It will be printed in November.

C. China pamphlet. There are several possibilities for a China pamphlet that are being explored by Merit and the YSA.

Motion: to approve the report.

Discussion: Melissa, Lew, Melissa, Lew, Caroline, Lew.

Motion Passed.

3. Sub Drive - Melissa

Only 33 subs have been received so and only one half of the sub directors have sent in their addresses. A scoreboard will be sent out next week.

Motion: to approve the report.

Discussion: Lew, Daniels, Lew, Doug.

Motion Passed.

4. Fund Drive - Melissa

\$2,142 has been received so far, which is approximately on schedule. A scoreboard will go out in the next few days.

Motion: to approve the report.

Discussion: Lew, Melissa, Doug, Melissa.

Motion Passed.

5. Young Socialist - Doug

The YS plans to send 1 or 2 comrades to Lowndes County at the time of the November elections to interview Hulett and to observe. Other articles in the next YS will be on the antiwar movement in Europe, the Bloomington defense case, the draft, and a book review.

Motion: that Caroline be added to the YS editorial board.

Discussion: Lew.

Motion Passed.

6. Bloomington Defense - Daniels

A sponsor letter will be sent in the next day or two. Raising money for the November 4 hearing will be a key task.

Motion: to approve the report.

Discussion: Caroline, Daniels, Caroline, Daniels, Lew, Daniels, Doug, Daniels.

Motion Passed.

7. Antiwar Report - Lew, Gus, Doug.

A. November 5-8 - Lew

Committees that are on campuses have experienced an influx of new activists as the schools have opened up. At the same time previous activists tend to be tired and demoralized in most areas. The November 5-8 mobilization call has been supported

around the country, and in most areas a mass demonstration of some kind is planned. It appears the mobilization will be successful.

B. Newsletter - Gus.

The Newsletter now has more legitimacy than it has ever had. Two tours sponsored jointly by the Newsletter and the Nov. 5-8 Committee have received excellent responses. The Newsletter has active contact with antiwar groups in all areas of the country. However, the financial crisis still exists.

C. Fort Hood Three - Doug.

The wide support to the Fort Hood Three, the defense committee, and the complementary task of bringing the facts of the case to large numbers of people, especially GI's, has continued. Many areas have defense committees and most major centers have had at least one action in support of the three. The Fort Hood Three Defense Committee executive committee recently added Carl Griffler to the staff as Executive Director.

Motion: to approve the reports.

Discussion: Melissa, Doug, Caroline, Gus, Lew, Gus, Caroline, Lew, Doug, Gus, Daniels, Gus, Doug, Lew, Caroline, Lew.

Motion Passed.