

# YSA

# Discussion Bulletin

Vol. XIX No. 9 December 1975

\$ .90

## CONTENTS

|  | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| ON OUR CAMPAIGN WORK, By Bob Robertson and Susan Gary, Houston local   | 3           |
| NEW VICTORIES FOR THE PALESTINIAN STRUGGLE -- NEW OPPORTUNITIES FOR DEFENDING THE ARAB REVOLUTION, By Bill Rayson, Boston local                                  | 5           |
| PUERTO RICANS IN THE SCHOOLS OF NEW YORK CITY, By Juan Rodriguez, Lower East Side, New York local  | 7           |
| HIGH SCHOOLS -- GETTING IN IS THE FIRST STEP, By Claudia Hommel, Detroit local   | 9           |
| FARM WORKERS SUPPORT WORK IN HOUSTON, By Jeff Elliot and Andres Gonzalez, Houston local  | 11          |
| DO WE WANT TO ALIENATE YOUTH FROM THE TRADE UNIONS AND GAYS FROM THE YSA: A BRIEF CRITICISM OF THE DRAFT POLITICAL RESOLUTION, By Thomas Boushier, Houston local | 12          |
| ON BUILDING LOCAL SCAR CHAPTERS, By Tom Campion, Bloomington local   | 13          |
| WOMEN'S LIBERATION WORK IN LOS ANGELES, By Jo-Ann Della-Giustina, Central-East Los Angeles local   | 15          |
| A PROPOSAL TO THE CONVENTION ON AT-LARGE VOTING RIGHTS, By Jeffrey Kegler and Bernie Krawczyk, Upper West Side, New York local                                   | 17          |

Contents continued on page 2.

CONTENTS (Continued)

|   | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| TABLE OF YSA MEMBERSHIP JANUARY 1965 TO APRIL 1975, By Jeffrey Kegler, Upper West Side, New York local                  | 18          |
| A REPLY TO THE MOST COMMON ARGUMENTS AGAINST AT-LARGE VOTING RIGHTS, By Jeffrey Kegler, Upper West Side, New York local | 19          |
| THE DRAFT POLITICAL RESOLUTION AS AN ORGANIZING TOOL, By Craig Olson and Dave Ferguson, Lexington local                 | 21          |
| LOOSE FRACTIONS BUILD BIG FACTIONS, By Myron Eshowsky, Madison local  | 22          |
| UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO COMMISSION OF INQUIRY, By David Paparello, South Chicago local                                    | 23          |
| EXPANSION AND THE ECONOMIC CRISIS -- WHAT IT MEANS FOR LOCAL FINANCES, By Mary Wismer, Lower East Side, New York local  | 26          |
| THE NATION OF ISLAM: NEW DEVELOPMENTS AND POSSIBLE POLITICAL OPENINGS, By Robb Wright, Upper West Side, New York local  | 29          |
| THE ROOTS OF THE DIFFERENCES ON PORTUGAL, By Harvey McArthur, Philadelphia local  | 31          |
| THE LCI, THE FUR, AND POUMIST ERRORS, By Andy Hunt, San Jose local  | 38          |
| THE CARNEGIE COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE YOUTH RADICALIZATION, By David Cahalane, Boston local               | 40          |

## ON OUR CAMPAIGN WORK

By Bob Robertson and Susan Garry, Houston local

By writing this contribution to pre-convention discussion, we wish to share some of our experiences in Houston's local election campaign concerning the strengths and weaknesses of the Houston YSA's work on the university and high school campuses. From this, we hope to aid comrades, especially newer ones, in making the most gains possible in the upcoming campaigns.

Basically, the YSA's work on the campaign centered primarily around building rallies and carrying out consistent propaganda work on the college campuses and high schools. So at the beginning of the fall, we had a discussion on which places we should concentrate our efforts -- attempting not to overstretch ourselves or to miss any opportunities. A decision was made to make our strongest efforts at the University of Houston and Texas Southern University along with four high schools at which we had done sales work.

Starting with the universities first, we chose the University of Houston (UH) for fairly obvious reasons: UH was the campus base of the Houston YSA with a relatively strong campus fraction and over 30,000 commuter students. We decided upon Texas Southern University (TSU), a predominantly Black school, because we wanted to build a campus fraction there and it had a history of struggle that made it the center of Houston's Black community's political life.

The high schools were decided upon, as was already mentioned, due to the fact that we were carrying on regular sales there.

Next, this discussion shall focus on the concrete activities we carried out at the various campuses, beginning with UH. At UH, we organized two outdoor rallies which were fairly successful by leafleting, posting, and getting articles in the campus newspaper. Also, at UH we had a unique advantage in having Betsy Farley, a student, run for controller which was a wedge to force coverage in the campus newspaper and drew many students around our campaign. In addition, we helped build two appearances of our candidates sponsored by the Student Association, drawing even more students around us. All of these events combined with all our other activities, made the YSA be seen as the most active group on campus, cutting away any advantage our opponents had gotten by having a slight organizational jump on us. Also, the respectable 5.3 percent of the vote officially attributed to Betsy was due by and large to the votes of UH students. Lastly, due to this campaign the YSA has further strengthened its position at UH, being able to use this to build Willie Mae

Reid's tour and enabling us to work with more campus organizations than before.

Now, to our work at TSU which was hampered by the extreme bureaucracy due to the administration's repression of a student movement. Susan was able by conscientious and persistent work to overcome all the obstacles placed before us, allowing us to have a moderately successful rally. In addition, her work there made it somewhat easier to get Willie Mae Reid on campus later in the year. So, it is possible to have meetings on repressive campuses if a comrade will expend a lot of effort.

Lastly, we held outdoor rallies at two out of the four high schools where we had regular sales (the reason we did not do the other two was due to the fact that we got there late). At Jones High School we were able to conduct a moderately well attended rally due, by and large, to one of our candidates being a teacher there. Also, we held a somewhat less eventful rally at Davis High School, an almost all-Chicano school -- those persons that came were drawn by our Chicano candidate for mayor. In general, high school rallies were less successful than our university rallies, but that was to be expected. Therefore, this year's campaign had a definite impact on the campuses, however this should be extended more in the future.

The recruitment aspect of this year's campaign was probably the weakest link in the chain, although this was better organized than ever before. Special attention was paid to attempting to instill a "recruitment" consciousness in every comrade's thought centers in the local, with fairly good success. Unfortunately, this declined somewhat as the campaign went into full gear, due to the increased work load on the recruitment director and the other comrades. However, by and large, recruitment work was better systematized than in the past.

First of all, we developed a relatively sound method of making sure that we got all the people's names and addresses at our activities and sending them regular mailings. The campaign committee made a conscious decision to allow for more time for discussion between comrades and the new people attracted to the various events. This provided us with a chance to really talk, one to one, with people who were interested in us and to get their names, addresses, phones, etc. In addition, at every campaign intervention certain comrades were specifically assigned to this task which proved quite worthwhile. We also placed special forms at all of the telephones at the hall so that the recruitment director would be sure to receive the information from the people who had called in.

Secondly, the campaign significantly improved our communication with our supporters by the addition of an addressing machine coupled with a special permit (reducing the postage significantly) allowing us to send regular mailings.

Thirdly, the committee attempted to make regular phone calling of the individuals on our mailing list a norm -- but due to a shortage of personnel, we were unable to carry this out. However, we were able to call a significant portion of the list for our large banquet and rally.

Fourthly, the campaign committee made a special effort to involve non-comrades in our activities. Many high school students, brought by members of the SWP who were teachers, devoted a lot of energy working on the campaign. In addition, other campaign supporters were asked to help with setting up tables on campus, making banners, etc.

Unfortunately, the things we have previously discussed were not generalized enough which is one of the main tasks of the next campaign.

So probably the proposals that we would like to make towards helping our recruitment effort have already been thought of, but we think it should be repeated again: (1) more people assigned to recruitment, since the recruitment director is usually overburdened; (2) the group of people assigned to recruitment should try to get the entire local in participating in this effort (phone calling, etc.); (3) comrades should look for better ways of involving new people and newer comrades into day to day campaign work. So, with these proposals in mind, the YSA should be able to conduct recruitment work in a far better fashion.

December 3, 1975

NEW VICTORIES FOR THE PALESTINIAN STRUGGLE --  
NEW OPPORTUNITIES FOR DEFENDING THE ARAB REVOLUTION

By Bill Rayson, Boston local

The last convention of the YSA in St. Louis took place at the height of a racist, ruling-class propaganda campaign against the Arab people. The Arab countries were being blamed for high fuel costs and openly threatened with direct military invasion by the U. S. The Militant wrote: "The danger of a U. S. invasion of one or more of the Arab oil-producing countries is real, and it is growing. Such a move could set off World War III."

The YSA was then in the midst of a massive campaign to explain the "energy crisis," and counter the racist hysteria and war-mongering of the capitalist media. The Young Socialist, The Militant, and Pathfinder printed numerous articles on this, and the Socialist Workers candidates were campaigning across the country to expose the fraud.

Shortly before our convention, Yasir Arafat made his historic appearance before the U. N. Millions around the world were beginning, for the first time, to ask "What is the PLO?" "Who are the Palestinians?"

Since then, the Palestinian struggle has continued to take big strides forward. The victory of the Vietnamese Revolution has been by far the biggest gain for the Palestinian cause. The Palestinian people understand what Vietnam means -- that they can win their struggle, that imperialism and Zionism can be defeated.

Just as for years the oppressed masses looked to the Vietnamese for inspiration, today all people oppressed by colonialism and imperialism are rallying to support the Palestinian people, who are in the forefront of this international fight. The passage of the recent U. N. resolution on Zionism as a form of racism is a reflection of this fact.

These factors combined with the antiwar sentiment in the U. S. and the continuing exposures of the CIA have forced Washington to postpone any immediate plans for direct military intervention. Emphasis is now being put on "detente" and "diplomacy" to buy off the reactionary Arab governments in order to prevent their alliance against Israel. The recent pact signed by Sadat was a product of this diplomacy, and represents a sell-out by Sadat and a setback for the Palestinian and Arab peoples.

But we need not search hard for proof that what we have been saying about "detente" is true, especially in the Middle East. At the same time that the pact is signed in Egypt, virtual civil war is breaking out just across Israel's other (present) border, in Lebanon. And the question of accommodation to, or combat with Israel is a major issue in the struggle.

The United States showed how determined it was not to lose its foothold in S. E. Asia. It has even more at stake in the Middle East. The continued existence and expansion of Israel is crucial to Washington's imperialist aims in the Middle East. The desire to avoid the tremendous political

costs of direct intervention has forced Washington to choose the only other alternative -- increased military aid and support to its client armies in the Middle East, like the Jordanian army, the Lebanese phalangists, and, most important, the Israeli army.

Over \$5 billion in military aid will be given by the U. S. to Israel this year. As the economic crisis deepens, so will the openings for revolutionists to organize around the demands: "No More U. S. Aid to Israel!" "Money for Social Services, not War!"

The latest step forward for the Palestinian struggle has been the passage of the U. N. resolution describing Zionism as a form of racism. This was an important demonstration of the unity of the colonial world in support of the Palestinian people. This resolution takes the debate away from "terrorism" or the "Palestinian mini-state," and puts it where it belongs, that is -- Is Zionism racist? Is Israel a settler-colonialist, racist state like South Africa?

Many Americans who have supported Israel since it was founded by the U. N. in 1947 are now confused and willing to listen to the Palestinian viewpoint for the first time because of the respect for and illusions in the U. N. that they have. The Zionists are hysterical with their U. N. cover blown. They are running out of arguments -- quoting the Bible just doesn't convince many people anymore. In response they have launched a campaign of mass action and racist slander. The thought of the facts about Israel's racism and aggression getting out is driving them nuts. In many areas, the Zionists are now much more under pressure to debate their opponents, a fact we should take full advantage of.

Palestinian and Arab students in the U. S. and their supporters have been encouraged greatly by the passage of the resolution. This latest in a series of victories has helped to inspire Arab students with the prospect of convincing the American people and they are ready for action.

The Young Socialist Alliance is ready for action, too. Arab students know that we have always been their best supporters. While we have supported unconditionally the struggle led by the PLO for a "democratic, secular Palestine," the Revolutionary Student Brigade has abstained from the struggle under the slogan "Superpowers out of the Mid-East." While we have pointed out the difference between the nationalism of the oppressor and the nationalism of the oppressed, the Spartacist League has called for self-determination for both the Palestinians and the "Hebrew nation;" (but only after socialism). While we explain that Israel is not a promised land, but a death-trap for Jews, the Young Workers Liberation League is in the unenviable position of apologizing for the anti-semitism of the Soviet bureaucracy as well as their general stand in favor of

Israel's "right" to exist.

The YSA is proud of its record of action in educating the student movement on the role of Israel in the Middle East. Through the years we have organized teach-ins and tours, participated in debates and demonstrations, and distributed literature in defense of the Palestinian struggle. But our work was limited by objective conditions, including the overwhelming support for Israel among American youth, and the resulting isolation felt by Arab students.

Americans were almost entirely in support of Israel in the June, 1967 war, which was portrayed by the media as "a war in which it is easy to decide who are the Good Guys," (Israel, of course.) But Israel's aggressive seizure and colonization of more Arab land in 1967 paved the way for and caused the October, 1973 war.

The '73 war exploded the myth that Arabs were inferior and cowardly and that Israel would never lose a war. The Arab masses were inspired by the glimpse of victory in '73. Millions in this country now see the growing determination of the Arab peoples, the inevitability of continued war in the Middle East, the aggressive role of Israel, and the total military dependence of Israel on the United States. They see a future of increasing involvement in continuous war, which could lead to nuclear war, and they don't like the idea.

The American people more than ever want to learn about the Middle East and are ready to listen to the Pales-

tinian side. Palestinian and Arab students and their supporters are inspired by recent victories and are confident and eager to get out the truth. And the YSA is in a better position than ever to respond to these new political openings by initiating, participating in, and helping to organize united front solidarity meetings, teach-ins, debates, and actions with Palestinian and Arab students and other groups.

Well-organized, nationally coordinated educational actions can help lay the basis for an antiwar movement which demands: U. S. Hands off the Middle East! No More Aid to Israel! It will also win new revolutionary internationalists into the ranks and periphery of the YSA.

While working with Arab students we will be able to learn much about life and politics in the Middle East. We will be able to discuss with them the questions of terrorism, the popular front and the united front, the role of the bourgeois Arab regimes, and strategy for the international defense of the Palestinian struggle. In order to be able to do this and defend our support to the Palestinian cause in public debate, we must organize to educate ourselves about the Middle East. No longer can we count on the local "Middle-East expert." Every YSA members must become an "expert" defender of the Arab Revolution.

December 5, 1975

Israel's "right" to exist.

The YSA is proud of its record of action in educating the student movement on the role of Israel in the Middle East. Through the years we have organized teach-ins and tours, participated in debates and demonstrations, and distributed literature in defense of the Palestinian struggle. But our work was limited by objective conditions, including the overwhelming support for Israel among American youth, and the resulting isolation felt by Arab students.

Americans were almost entirely in support of Israel in the June, 1967 war, which was portrayed by the media as "a war in which it is easy to decide who are the Good Guys," (Israel, of course.) But Israel's aggressive seizure and colonization of more Arab land in 1967 paved the way for and caused the October, 1973 war.

The '73 war exploded the myth that Arabs were inferior and cowardly and that Israel would never lose a war. The Arab masses were inspired by the glimpse of victory in '73. Millions in this country now see the growing determination of the Arab peoples, the inevitability of continued war in the Middle East, the aggressive role of Israel, and the total military dependence of Israel on the United States. They see a future of increasing involvement in continuous war, which could lead to nuclear war, and they don't like the idea.

The American people more than ever want to learn about the Middle East and are ready to listen to the Pales-

tinian side. Palestinian and Arab students and their supporters are inspired by recent victories and are confident and eager to get out the truth. And the YSA is in a better position than ever to respond to these new political openings by initiating, participating in, and helping to organize united front solidarity meetings, teach-ins, debates, and actions with Palestinian and Arab students and other groups.

Well-organized, nationally coordinated educational actions can help lay the basis for an antiwar movement which demands: U. S. Hands off the Middle East! No More Aid to Israel! It will also win new revolutionary internationalists into the ranks and periphery of the YSA.

While working with Arab students we will be able to learn much about life and politics in the Middle East. We will be able to discuss with them the questions of terrorism, the popular front and the united front, the role of the bourgeois Arab regimes, and strategy for the international defense of the Palestinian struggle. In order to be able to do this and defend our support to the Palestinian cause in public debate, we must organize to educate ourselves about the Middle East. No longer can we count on the local "Middle-East expert." Every YSA members must become an "expert" defender of the Arab Revolution.

December 5, 1975

PUERTO RICANS IN THE SCHOOLS OF NEW YORK CITY

By Juan Rodriguez, Lower East Side, New York Local

Some two million Puerto Ricans reside in the U. S. and over one-half of the Puerto Rican minority lives in New York City. They comprise 11 percent of the total population. Blacks and Puerto Ricans represent 59 percent of the majority of the entire N. Y. C. public school enrollment. The schools that Blacks and Puerto Ricans attend have the worst educational facilities, the worst teachers, the worst recreational facilities, and are the most over-crowded. For example where the highest percent of Puerto Rican students exist, the percent of over-crowded schools rises from 12 to 20 percent in the elementary schools and 20 to 50 percent for junior high schools.

Despite the fact that 25 percent of the city's student population is Puerto Rican, less than 1 percent of its professional staff is Puerto Rican. That means that there is about one Puerto Rican teacher for every 300 Puerto Rican students. Whites, however, comprise 44 percent of the student population, but the ratio of white students to white teachers is 90 percent. The fact is that there are qualified Puerto Rican teachers but the racist United Federation of Teachers and the teaching system as a whole have made every attempt to exclude Puerto Ricans and Blacks from entering the teaching force.

Besides the low ratio of Puerto Rican teachers to Puerto Rican students, the elementary schools located in the Puerto Rican ghettos have the greatest proportion of teachers with the least experience (29 to 41 percent) and are not properly trained to deal with the problems of the bilingual child. **Substitutes constituted over half of the teaching force for junior high schools in District One before the N. Y. C. crisis.**

The following is an example of what the Puerto Rican student goes through in the public school system. On the Lower East Side there are some 17,000 students in the twenty-one elementary and junior high schools; out of these, 73 percent are Puerto Ricans, 15 percent are Blacks, 8 percent Chinese. As one can see, the majority are Puerto Ricans and Blacks. It would seem that the educational system would be responsive to the special needs of the majority. However, this is not the case. By the time the Puerto Rican student reaches the eighth grade, 85 percent are functional illiterates. They are three to four years behind grade level in reading. The following is a comparison made between two districts, District One on the Lower East Side, and District Twenty-Six in Queens:

|                                |                        |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| <u>District One</u>            | <u>Lower East Side</u> |
| Grade 2 read 2.2               | 73% Puerto Rican       |
| " 5 " 3.9                      |                        |
| " 8 " 5.8                      |                        |
| <br><u>District Twenty-Six</u> | <br><u>Queens</u>      |
| Grade 2 read 3.2               | Middle class           |

|                                    |
|------------------------------------|
| <u>District Twenty-Six (cont.)</u> |
| Grade 5 read 6.6                   |
| " 8 " 10.0                         |

|                |
|----------------|
| <u>Queens</u>  |
| whites 75.8%   |
| Blacks 20.4%   |
| Hispanics 2.3% |

As one can see the Puerto Rican student in the fifth grade has already fallen behind two years while the white student has advanced one year. In the eighth grade, the Puerto Rican student has fallen behind three years and again, the white student has advanced two years. The reading level for the Puerto Rican student tends to fall more and more as its grade level increases. Some 2,000 students on the Lower East Side speak no English at all and some 4,000 barely speak it.

Puerto Rican, Black, and Chinese history are not taught to these students. Instead, the typical white-distorted history is taught to them. The special problems of the bilingual student are not considered. The food they eat, the manner in which white teachers speak to them is not at all reflective of that student's background. These things are alien to that student. Therefore, it is impossible for these students to take pride in themselves and in their culture. They know nothing about it. In the so-called learning books all one sees are the little white children running around, not Black children. **These are major factors for the "slow" growth of the Puerto Rican, Black, and Chinese student.**

The racist Shankerite UFT makes every effort to exclude Blacks and Puerto Rican teachers from teaching. It has made every effort to stamp out bilingual-bicultural programs. Another example of the racist UFT policy against Blacks and Puerto Ricans took place in 1967 in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville district in Brooklyn (one of the three districts in the city that was set up as an experiment in school decentralization), which is predominantly Black and Puerto Rican. The parents tried to bring in Black and Puerto Rican teachers and also institute new teaching methods. The UFT leadership called a city-wide strike which lasted nine weeks. This was a clear reflection of the racism in our school system.

Junior H. S. and High Schools

In the junior high schools and high schools, Puerto Ricans made up 23 percent (in 1972) of the junior high school population and 22 of the high school population. In 1972, Blacks and Puerto Ricans made up the majority in academic schools. The percentage was 45.6 percent, while white students made up 15.8 percent. However, white students made up the majority in the high-standard academic schools (33.6 percent). The figures below indicate the percent of Puerto Ricans in these special schools for which special tests must be passed. Brooklyn Tech, 7.8 percent; Bronx High School of Science, 5.9 percent; Stuyvesant, 5.3 percent.

As one can see, the percentage of Puerto Ricans is low.



Besides the problems confronting the bilingual students, Puerto Ricans are not prepared in the junior high schools for the special exams to these schools. These exams do not reflect what the Puerto Rican student has learned previously. The estimated push-out rate (known as drop-out rate) ranges from 50 to 70 percent higher than whites and Blacks. Little if any Black or Puerto Rican history is taught in the high schools. The Puerto Rican and Black student loses interest in the different subject matters, especially at this stage when they want to find out more about their history and culture. The majority of Puerto Ricans and Blacks also have to contribute financially to help support their families and themselves since the family income is very low. The following would give one an idea of the family income of Puerto Rican families (May, 1971).

- A. One of four families earns less than \$5,000.
- B. Two-thirds earn less than \$6,000.
- C. 32 percent earn less than the national poverty levels.
- D. Unemployment among Puerto Ricans is three times higher than whites, and twice as high as among Blacks.

So one can see the need for the Puerto Rican student to go out and help the family, thereby taking away a lot of time for studying purposes. The high school system is also a repressive institution for the Puerto Rican and Black student. Uniformed and under-cover police roam the schools to maintain "order."

#### College Students

As of September, 1972, there were approximately 15,000 Puerto Rican college students in the U.S. They constitute .65 percent, less than 1 percent, of a total of seven million college students in the U.S. More than 10,180 attend the senior and community colleges of the City University System of New York. The number in community colleges was higher (5,794) as compared to senior colleges (4,392). The rest attend the state university system and private colleges, where the Puerto Rican student faces aliena-

tion because of geographical isolation from the Puerto Rican community and lack of socializing facilities.

In 1967 the figures were significantly smaller: 3,400 Puerto Ricans in the CUNY system and a few hundred outside CUNY. So one can see a significant growth in the last five years of almost 300 percent. This was due to the open admissions struggle that took place in 1969 at City College led by Black and Puerto Rican students. Opportunity programs such as BEOG, NDSL, SEEK (Search for Education, Elevation, and Knowledge), **College Discovery**, and also with the help of ASPIRA and other poverty agencies. Of the above-mentioned opportunity programs, the most important are the SEEK and College Discovery programs. The SEEK program, for example, provides stipends, guidance, and tutorial services to students living in designated poverty areas where Blacks and Puerto Ricans live. College Discovery, on the other hand, basically offers the same services as SEEK except that it operates in two-year colleges and is aimed at securing B.A. degrees in senior colleges. **Ninety percent of all College Discovery graduates enter senior colleges. However, these programs are limited and those that are chosen are chosen at random or by lottery. The waiting list for these special programs is extremely long. One can therefore see the important role that these special programs serve in both financially and tutorially aiding the Puerto Rican and Black student.**

As one can see, the Puerto Rican student faces many problems under the capitalist educational system. Lack of bilingual/bicultural programs, lack of properly trained Puerto Rican teachers, racism, etc., that demoralizes and pushes out the Puerto Rican student from the educational system. Because of the special oppression that Puerto Ricans and Blacks face they will continue to play a leading role in the student and class struggle movement in the U.S. We in the YSA should make every effort to make sure that we also are in that struggle.

December 6, 1975

## HIGH SCHOOLS--GETTING IN IS THE FIRST STEP

By Claudia Hommel, Detroit local

In reaffirming our orientation to the campuses, the proposed political resolution outlines the special importance of the high school campuses. In this contribution I hope to amplify the discussion of our high school tasks by referring to the experience of the Detroit YSA during this past year. These remarks will focus on the organizational tasks rather than the political tasks which are well described and **integrated** into the general perspective of the political resolution.

At the beginning of 1975, the Detroit "inventory" of high school activity uncovered a bleak record. During the previous three years our high school members had dwindled (through graduation) from three to one and our one remaining high school member was greatly isolated as one of the few white students in a Black high school. The conclusion we drew was to start again from scratch, first by assigning an experienced comrade to be high school work director and prioritizing one or two schools from among the twenty Detroit high schools. Preference was given to the urban high schools where the interest and problems of youth are more concentrated and tend to be more explosive.

Cass Technical High School was chosen as a key school for its radical past in the antiwar movement and Black struggles, for our familiarity with some of its faculty, and for its unique composition as an all-city school with an 80 percent Black population. In March of this year, we approached the social studies department at Cass to set up guest lectures in classrooms on "What Socialists Stand For." The teacher who sponsored the relatively inactive Young Workers Liberation League Club at Cass was particularly interested and suggested that our speakers spend an entire day going from class to class. He reminded us that the Socialist Workers mayoral candidate had spoken in the school in 1973 with much success. The teacher and the YSA high school work director spoke with other teachers in the social studies and English departments and arranged to combine several classes during the day. Meanwhile as weather permitted, we sold YSs and Militants in teams of two or three outside the main doors, and passed out an information leaflet about the Detroit YSA entitled "Does School Have to be This Way? -- A Young Socialist Perspective."

On the day of the speaking engagements at Cass, we took a box of collated leaflets and brochures from the campaign and the YSA, papers, and pamphlets. The two comrades alternated between speaking, distributing the leaflets, keeping an eye on the mailing list as it circulated around the room, and answering or commenting on questions raised. At the end of the day we had spoken to about 250 students of whom 85 signed the mailing list. Of those who signed about 25 indicated in prepared columns their interest in joining, in supporting the campaign for socialism, **needing a ride** to the campaign rally, or finding out more about the antiracist move-

ment. During lunch we also spoke with several students.

In evaluating what can be called "phase one," the response was exciting and unexpected though the gains were not to be seen in immediate recruitment this time around. Passing the mailing list around the classes gave us more than we bargained for. In the next three days we made follow-up calls and started dropping the names of those who were "too busy," "not too interested," or impossible to contact. From the mailing of a newsletter which we sent out soon after, we received no written responses. In order to estimate who was most interested in the YSA, we based our decisions on those who had spoken with us personally or who had checked the mailing list under specific interests along with wanting more information. Because of the tremendous task of working with a large list of people, we have in later speaking engagements at Cass asked that people come to the desk to sign the list rather than passing it around, as a way of selecting out the most interested contacts.

The lack of immediate recruitment can be attributed to several factors, the most important being the lack of an existing base inside the school. Most of the students were hampered by restrictions, both parental and social, from traveling the eight blocks to the Militant bookstore for outside school activities. Also many students, particularly seniors, felt under pressure to crack the books now that the end of the school year was approaching.

"Phase two" was an outgrowth of the response we received at Cass. In April we began setting up weekly literature tables outside the main school door where we could run into students familiar with us through the previous sales and talks. While one person sold papers, another staffed the small table. Both comrades had the opportunity to speak with several students and to get their names and phone numbers. It was out of the Spring literature table contacts that we recruited our first high school comrade in May; another regular buyer of the YS became a campaign supporter and later joined in August; and a third joined in September as a result of her participation in the May 17 demonstration which our first comrade had convinced her to attend.

When the school administrators and police tried to impose a city ordinance against solicitation near schools we were able to respond with a letter from our attorney citing the County Circuit Court decision of 1970 which upheld the **right of free press in our case**. We have had no further difficulty setting up tables outside the doors.

By the end of June we had spoken to classes in a few other schools and had trimmed down a list of twelve contacts with whom we continued discussions during the summer. One suburban high school student and two high school graduates joined during the summer as a result, along with the comrades at Cass.

"Phase three" is where we currently stand in our high school work. We started the school year at Cass with three comrades, a few contacts, and a lot of plans. The first priority was establishing recognition from the administration as a club, which required finding a sponsor and filing an application of purpose. We also helped establish recognition for a SCAR chapter. In Detroit, school clubs are allowed to function fairly freely as the result of suits such as those brought by the Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Southeast Asia. At Cass, clubs meet once a week, are allowed to post their activities, pass out leaflets, sell newspapers, have speakers to their meetings, make announcements over the PA and on blackboards for their meetings. With the relatively high involvement of Cass students in such extracurricular activities, we wanted to present ourselves as an accessible and legitimate part of students' activities. Other legal questions remain unanswered. We plan to hold indoor literature tables now that the weather is getting cold and there are more high school comrades and supporters to staff a table in school. However, the school has peculiar provisions regarding the collection of funds which we may have to challenge along with a recent ruling that no outside activities can be posted or leafletted in the school (such as our forum and campaign notices).

At this point the YSA Club activities are limited to the Club's weekly educational discussions on topics brought up by those in attendance: socialism and democracy, the role of police, the socialist campaign, and the like, as well as

involving those in attendance to support the campaign, help sell and leaflet, and urging all to join the YSA. The club has no decision-making function nor structure. Rather than establish club membership as a separate status, we are encouraging those who are activists to join the YSA local. This is to avoid the "two-stage theory" of recruitment which is unnecessary given the enthusiasm and seriousness of our close contacts.

When the club was first established we thought of it as the Cass fraction meetings, but the interest of students other than comrades dictated a more open format in which to discuss our ideas and activities. The fraction has since begun to meet separately to discuss among other things our "intervention" in the Club meetings. The fraction meetings allow us also to discuss more fully our assignments, our work in SCAR, and recruitment activities. As the fraction grows and as attendance of the club meetings increases, other possibilities may develop. Already a few students who for various reasons have not joined the YSA at this time (parental restrictions, severe limitations on their time, etc.,) are supporting the YSA Club as a natural center of political activity in the school. The club has begun to bring the socialist campaign into the classrooms as well as responding to specific school issues (such as the forced wearing of ID badges, cops in the schools, etc.).

For Detroit, Cass Tech is just a start and other schools are being probed for future activities. As high school students look for political solutions to their problems, we want to be there. Getting in is the first step.

December 8, 1975

## FARM WORKERS SUPPORT WORK IN HOUSTON

By Jeff Elliott and Andres Gonzalez, Houston local

The Houston YSA's role in support of the farm workers movement has taken on a unique character over the past several months.

This is due to the split in the Texas farm workers movement which occurred over the summer.

It was then that UFW President Cesar Chavez officially disassociated the UFW from the extensive organizing efforts in the Rio Grande Valley region of South Texas.

The split found its root in the May melon strike, which resulted in the shooting of several union organizers by grower Chestly Miller and secured a minimum wage for a number of farm workers. Chavez informed Antonio Orendain, the leading organizer in the Valley, that the UFW would not support the strike on the grounds that it was unauthorized and had employed "violence."

Orendain and the rest of the Texas leadership were then forced to constitute themselves as a separate union, the Texas Farm Workers Union (TFW).

Since then, the Texas UFW leadership, based in Houston, has pursued an extremely hostile and sectarian course in their attitude towards the TFW. For example, directly before a TFW support rally held in August, the boycott office issued letters and telegrams to support activists warning them not to come--telling them, in effect, that if they wanted to be real farm worker supporters they would not attend the rally.

Fortunately, this sectarian blindness has not found itself reflected in the TFW's attitude toward the UFW. Not only is the TFW actively working for reunification with the national union, but work in support of the UFW's nationwide boycott is one of the union's most important activities.

At any rate, the split has caused a substantial division among support activists all over Texas in general and in Houston in particular. The confusion the split has caused has led to a significant decrease in overall support work.

The UFW boycott activists, who have been reduced to a tiny handful of hard-core followers of Chavez, have found themselves increasingly isolated from Houston's Chicano community, which was their former base of support.

The TFW, on the other hand, has been able to receive growing support from both the community and campus. The Houston YSA, especially at the University of Houston, has been able to carry out our line of support to both unions with relative success.

Over the summer we helped to organize a film showing of Fighting for Our Lives and Salt of the Earth which drew one hundred people in collaboration with the UFW. Also, we have taken the lead in virtually every significant activity --vigils, marches, etc.--that the boycott office has organized. On campus, the YSA has been the predominant force in the U of H support committee.

Our work in support of the Texas farm workers has been no less active or consistent. On campus the YSA has organized, with the local chapter of MAYO, a successful tour of Antonio Orendain which collected a significant amount of money and was attended by over seventy-five people. In addition, we have been the most active builders of the campus support organization, the Friends of the Texas Farmworkers. The YSA has also worked closely with the Raza Unida Party and the SWP in organizing several fund raising events such as the August rally mentioned before. Through the Militant Forum we have been able to sponsor several TFW speakers.

The YSA has played a leading role in organizing farm workers support in Houston. One thing should be noted, however: there has been only a limited amount of work to do in the past period. This is due primarily to the lack of a real struggle such as was witnessed in May, which would have had the effect of activating a large layer of potential supporters.

In the course of everyday support work we have been able to talk to a number of farm worker supporters and explain to them our view that there is no contradiction between supporting the UFW and the TFW, thus clearing away some of the confusion generated by the split. Most importantly, the YSA has been instrumental in laying the basis for future support work, which, with strike activity in the Valley promising to resume in the next few months, will become increasingly important.

December 8, 1975

DO WE WANT TO ALIENATE YOUTH FROM THE TRADE UNIONS AND GAYS FROM THE YSA:  
A BRIEF CRITICISM OF THE DRAFT POLITICAL RESOLUTION

By Thomas Boushier, Houston local

Although the possibility of the SWP's becoming more oriented towards workers and the YSA's becoming more oriented towards students is just beginning to be considered this fall, there is no need for the YSA's political resolution to advance such an alienating picture of students and youth from the trade unions.

Beginning with Section II, where we advance the notion that youth are to demand union benefits on their jobs without having taken part in the struggles to gain them, then again in Section VI, where we mention only student support for labor struggles in general, we overlook the possibilities of youth's doing trade union work, and in the process, we misplace the importance of racism. Racism manifests itself in educational spheres, but in the overly-empirical nature of our resolution, we fail to mention it in Section II, as a thing needed to be overcome on the job, so that it needn't have to be fought out around the schools. Thus, Section VI must either be tightened up, incorporated into, or expanded out of Section II and Section III. As they are, those three sections leave too many ends hanging.

Again, in Section VIII, there's an evocation of a vague image of all the bad things about trade unions thrust into the single paragraph beginning "some radicals" and ending with "dangerous precedent." It throws far too much into a single paragraph and should simply be excluded. A little later, we contradict the implications we had just gained from Section V: "other people. . . . during a strike" when we say: "active participation. . . . is often the first step"--all from the same, simple situation. But what is worse is that at the end of Section VIII we emphatically state that we are preparing mass actions at the expense of trade union work. And thus, by the time we get around to advocating our line of an "independent labor party based on the trade unions," what possible kind of an image do we want anyone who reads this document to have?

Soon after that, we feign as if to create one. We paraphrase a line or two out of Trotsky's "On the Trade Unions." **But then what? We contrast labor bureaucrats with ultra-leftists!** And it's here that any Marxist can see that we've become so hung up on politics and political figureheads that

we've completely overlooked the economic conditions in which we live.

In 1940, Trotsky placed the fact that labor bureaucrats had become one of the chief roadblocks to political action in a completely valid context of economic realities that haven't changed that much, since that time, for the sake of its validity. But this resolution places that fact in a simplified context that has very little to do with economic realities. By using that fact as the resolution wants it, what is being proposed is that we do mass action work at the expense of the very trade union work which Trotsky advised precisely out of the way he had deduced this fact. But then again, and in light that this was. . . . one of the documents found in his desk, he wasn't simply advising it, but insisting upon it at the time of his death.

If the rulers of this land endeavored to do so, they could theoretically cut back on education to such an extent that they leave no students in the colleges and schools but the very richest youth--everyone else being driven out to work. Those left on campus could shout and scream no matter how loudly of how they feared being next to be forced out to earn a means of subsistence, but without the work force's being organized or able to effectively shut down or strike against some importantly large sector of the economy, all would be wasted. We'd all be wage slaves or compelled to play a role in producing profits at the capitalists' whims.

A detailed criticism of the tenth, or concluding, section would have to include the fact that since thus far, in the entire document, gays have been mentioned only once, there's no need in trying to drag them into what we pass off as a final word. Why weren't they mentioned in Sections V, if, as we say, gay oppression is primarily legal oppression? For that matter, why wasn't Matlovich mentioned in either Section IV or V?

But what is sad indeed is that after nine sections of a resolution that at its best tries to turn our attention to mass action work at the expense of trade union work, our words about a workers' government sound completely hollow.

December 8, 1975

## ON BUILDING LOCAL SCAR CHAPTERS

By Tom Campion, Bloomington local

The YSA's major area of work at this time is antiracist work. Antiracist work dominated the youth report at this year's SWP convention. The party's turn toward mass work and recognition of new openings among struggles of the working class and oppressed nationalities is reflected in this, as is the increasing relatedness of student struggles and those of the working class and of the oppressed nationalities under the common pressure of the current economic situation.

The racist offensive against the oppressed nationalities, which SCAR is combatting in the struggles around busing, cutbacks, layoffs, etc., is an integral part of ruling class strategy during the economic crisis. The ruling class wants to use racism to derail the struggles of workers, students, and others, and seeks to smash Black resistance. If the crisis of Black leadership is not solved, if an aggressive counteroffensive is not carried out, they may succeed. This might set back the American revolution for years.

The task of SCAR is to fill this leadership vacuum. For this reason, the central focus of SCAR must be to draw in the Black community, especially Black students.

Our situation with Bloomington SCAR is probably similar to that of other regional locals on large campuses isolated from urban centers, so our experience may be useful to these locals in particular. We have no Black YSA'ers. The leadership situation among Black students at Indiana University is similar to the national situation. A militant Black movement in the late 1960s was smashed after an ultraleft action trying to prevent a fee increase in 1976. This was done through expulsions of Black leaders, a temporary total halt in Black recruitment, and halving the Black studies budget. Currently there is no campuswide Black Student Union, only Black Greek houses and individual dorm BSUs which are mainly socially oriented.

BSCAR's contacts with Black organizations and individuals in the spring semester were spotty. One dorm BSU sent a couple members to the February conference; several Black individuals drifted in and out of the coalition, and one stuck to become our leading independent activist right up to the present. Nevertheless, our experience was rather frustrating; it seemed that we hadn't made many solid gains.

Then, in September, a controversy arose over an article in the school paper (Indiana Daily Student-IDS) unfavorably comparing grade averages of Black and white Greek houses, using inaccurate and improperly obtained information. While **soliciting change for the October SCAR conference, I, a white student, was twice told to go to a meeting being held to discuss the issue.** I went with our one active Black independent and offered our support in whatever action they were going to take. It turned out to be a Black Greek Council meeting, and there was some white-baiting on one individual's part;

we left after speaking and didn't know how we had come off. The next day, Black students were talking about another meeting to discuss the issue the following night; it turned out to be a SCAR forum on busing we had invited the Black Greeks to participate in. About sixty people showed up, half of them Black Greeks. Their speaker was inserted in the program and the discussion period was given over to the IDS issue. SCAR was asked to work with the Black Greeks on this issue.

Nothing more came of this; partially because of the lack of organization among Blacks on campus and partially because of concessions made by the IDS. However, SCAR did gain by this and increase its visibility to Black students. One important factor in this was that we kept bumping into people we'd had fleeting contact with in the spring. Our contacts sort of accumulated without our realizing it. Local actions have since included a picket line against the racial inferiority theorist Richard Herrnstein and a very successful teach-in November 24 where we got several new Black contacts. I think we've continued to see this cumulative effect. One of the speakers at the teach-in was a Black IDS reporter with whom we'd had occasional contact in the spring.

In helping to build SCAR locally, we've got to be conscious that it's a slow, steady process. We're going to accumulate contacts, visibility, and authority and gradually draw in activists. To keep people and to maintain and expand visibility, we have to jump into every opening that presents itself and do educational work in between openings. A good way to keep up visibility is to write letters to the press on any issue that comes up. A project which both keeps up visibility and gets you money is canning--running around with cans asking for spare change for SCAR, like we've done quite successfully in the student union in Bloomington. Literature tables also fulfill this dual purpose. Bringing in SCAR speakers is also valuable, especially in drawing in Black students and in adding authority to SCAR; national figures like Robert Allen, Robert Williams, and Jonathan Kozol are on the SCAR Speakers Bureau while people like Andrew Pulley or other Black activists may be right in your region.

In terms of contacting Black students, we've had pretty negative results with trying to get Black campus groups to send representatives to SCAR meetings. Therefore it's probably a good idea to go to their meetings and make presentations to them. We've done this before around specific actions (May 17th and the conferences) but even if there is no immediate national focus to build around next semester, it would be advisable to just do general education presentations on what SCAR is and to bring up the possibility of cooperation on local issues. This would be a continuation of the period of local coalition-building that we've been involved in most recently.

SCAR has accomplished a lot in its short existence. It has built the May 17th action and many successful local actions around JoAnne Little, which undoubtedly affected the outcome of the case. It has brought together activists from around the country in two successful conferences. It has drawn in significant forces like the FUSP and the NSA into the struggle, and has started to develop the independent Black leadership which is needed (as was evidenced at the last conference). A lot of activists have also been won to the revolutionary movement. Maceo Dixon has spoken

before a congressional committee, and the last conference was even greeted by a capitalist presidential candidate.

The sixty-seven listings in the Student Mobilizer are pretty impressive, even taking into account that some represent only potential SCAR chapters at this time. To put SCAR forth on the road to fulfilling its functions, we have to firm up those listings. This is a slow, steady process but we can make it if we're conscious of what we're trying to achieve.

December 9, 1975

## WOMEN'S LIBERATION WORK IN LOS ANGELES

By Jo-Ann Della-Giustina, Central-East Los Angeles local

In Los Angeles, as in other areas of the country, we've been watching the re-emergence of the women's liberation movement over the fall. On October 29, there was an "Alice Doesn't" march and rally of 4-5,000 women in L.A. Most of these women were conscious feminists, but women all over the city were talking about "Alice Doesn't Day." The media built the action before it happened and gave a lot of coverage on that day. Much of the media interviewed interviewed working women who had not struck and who were not on the march, asking them why they went to work that day. An overwhelming number of women said that they supported the "Alice Doesn't" activities, but could not leave work because they would lose a day's pay which they could not afford or, in some cases, would jeopardize their job.

For example, the telephone company sent around a memo saying that anyone who struck on "Alice Doesn't Day" would have disciplinary actions taken against them. There were many cases of women being threatened by bosses if they didn't show up to work on that day.

Also, there was a good indication that women boycotted many businesses on that day. For example, banks throughout the city had very little business. (This is something that the media pointed out over and over again.)

What made the day seen as a success was the visible march which was held at UCLA. By participating in building activities, the Young Socialist Alliance and the Socialist Workers party contributed significantly to the actions.

When YSA members got involved in the "Alice Doesn't Coalition," a march and rally were already being planned, but the overwhelming focus of the day was the women's strike. The initial national leaflets which came out during the summer, was focused around "Alice Doesn't--you fill in the blanks--are you tired of the System? What system? --THE SYSTEM--then on October 29, don't spend any money, don't go to work, etc."

In Los Angeles, although we were not able to totally change this focus (it had already been set nationally by the National Organization for Women--NOW), we were able to concretize general demands, such as equal pay for equal work, ratification of the ERA, equal educational opportunities, etc. And the L.A. coalition focused more on the march and rally than on the strike and boycott activities, although those were tied in.

Needless to say, the demonstration was a huge success. The role of the YSA was extremely important. Even though the politics of the "Alice Doesn't Day" were abstract, we got involved because it was a feminist action--a demonstration in support of women's rights and women's worth in society. The YSA helped to make the rally broad and representative; it included a Chicana feminist, a former National Board member of NOW, a member of the ACLU and the UCLA "Alice Doesn't" coordinator, who also is a member

of the YSA. Prior to our proposals for speakers, there was to be only one general speaker.

The week after "Alice Doesn't," the L.A. coalition had a meeting to evaluate the march and rally and to decide what to do next. Everyone was very enthusiastic about the turnout of the demonstration and wanted to do another action. After the YSA initiated a discussion around the ERA, overwhelmingly, the women present wanted to organize around the ratification of the ERA. The coalition immediately moved into action. That week, the California state convention of Stop ERA, which is Phyllis Schlafly's group, was held in L.A. The "Alice Doesn't Coalition," along with a number of NOW chapters, held a picket line outside. The action was covered by every major television station in the city.

Since that time, the campaign in support of the ERA has been building in L.A. This is particularly important, not only because of the importance of the ERA, but also because California is a state that has already ratified the ERA. The activities here can serve as an example for other states to follow. It points out the necessity for a nationwide campaign.

The L.A. "Alice Doesn't Coalition," which has recently changed its name to the L.A. Coalition for the ERA, was instrumental in passing a resolution at the California State NOW Convention that called on California NOW to initiate and mobilize support activities for the ERA and to support pro-ERA activities, both education and political, in California and nationwide.

A leader of the L.A. Coalition for the ERA was elected State Coordinator for Special Actions (in NOW) and a special ERA task force has been set up.

This, along with activities building up all over the country, is laying the basis for a national campaign.

At this point, I would like to discuss some general aspects of the women's liberation movement. In general, there are some differences between the feminist movement of today and that of the early 1970s. Today, tens of thousands of women consider themselves feminists, and many more support aspects of women's liberation. During the last few years when the feminist movement was relatively tranquil, literally thousands of women were gaining a feminist consciousness. This has been due largely to the media covering feminist activities that were held, as well as through personal contact, women's centers, and women's studies classes, all which came about because of pressure from the women's liberation movement. In more recent times, the economic recession, Watergate, and the FBI and CIA revelations have made an impact on women.

Many more working women, as well as Black, Chicana, and Puerto Rican women have gained a feminist consciousness, started their own organizations, and see the women's liberation movement as being directly related to them.



Witness to this fact is the number of organizations, such as the National Black Feminist Organization, La Comision Feminil Nactional (the National Women's Commission, a Chicana group), and others that have come about recently.

The composition of NOW has changed significantly. No longer is it only older, professional, more conservative women. Instead, a large section of NOW is young women, working women, Black and Chicana women, and women of other oppressed nationalities.

Also, because of the economic and social conditions that exists in our country today, many feminists have a deeper understanding of the nature of women's oppression. That is, many more feminists, than in the early 1970s, understand that there has to be a fundamental change in our society for women to gain liberation. This is why so many women are interested in socialism. For example, at "Alice Doesn't," the YSA workshop on Feminism and Socialism drew well over one hundred women. We have found similar reactions to tables that we have set up at feminist activities, such as an International Women's Year Conference which was recently held in L. A.

Also, the ideas of mass action are widely spread throughout the feminist movement. Women are getting actively involved in the feminist movement, not just on an intellectual basis. These women want to win concrete struggles. Cut-backs of women's programs on the campuses and in the community have meant that the gains that women fought for in the early 1970s are being lost, and it's making quite an impact on feminists.

There is less of an attitude of living among only feminists, as the counter-culturalists and living-room feminists feel, and more of an attitude of reaching out to all women, feminist and non-feminist alike, and involving them in struggles for women's liberation.

We've noticed, both at the national NOW convention and locally in L. A., a general lack of red-baiting among

feminists. The few times it has been brought up, it hasn't gotten very far. Contrary to the early 70s, there is no question of our being a part of the women's liberation movement, only how we do that.

This hasn't been through a lack of knowledge of who we are. If anything, we are more open as socialists than we were previously. But, politically, feminists in the movement see us as important activists who have good ideas and valuable experience.

Here in L. A., there's an added significance--and that is, throughout the history of the second wave of feminism, the counter-culturalists, or living-room feminists, held a tight grip on the women's liberation movement here. When other cities experienced the abortion movement, an activist movement, taking a lead, that did not exist in L. A.

Now, for the first time, the L. A. women's liberation movement is a mass-action oriented movement. Even the Westside Women's Center, which has been the focus of feminist counter-culturalist activity for years, says that they are now isolated from what's happening in the women's movement. And for the first time ever, they say it's important for them to work with us. And they have initiated discussions with us about joining together in feminist activities.

In conclusion, the second wave of the second wave of feminism has been set into motion. Groundwork is being done to organize a national campaign to ratify the ERA in 1976.

An indication of where things stand in the women's liberation movement can be seen by looking at the activities in Los Angeles. On August 26, a general feminist demonstration of 700 women was held, followed by an "Alice Doesn't" march and rally of 4-5,000 women. On February 7, a large ERA debate and conference is being planned, followed by an ERA march on March 6. The activities are beginning to build around the campaign for the ratification of the ERA in 1976. And the role that the YSA is, and can continue to play, is a very important one.

December 9, 1975

A PROPOSAL TO THE CONVENTION ON AT-LARGE VOTING RIGHTS

By Jeffrey Kegler and Bernie Krawczyk, Upper West Side, New York local

At the Upper West Side pre-convention discussion, we put forward the following resolution:

Resolved that, at the 16th National Convention of the YSA, all comrades should be able to make the decisions which they must carry out.

We asked for a caucus to be formed around this resolution, with the right to proportional representation if the local divided into a minority and a majority.

This resolution was proposed in order to put the issue of at-large voting rights squarely before the local and the YSA. A vote for it does not imply support for Kegler's proposal to give at-largers a vote, (DB, XVIII, No. 1, pp. 22-24), Dave

Brandt's (DB, XIX, No. 2, pp. 5-6) or any other. It does mean support for some alternative to the present system of denying at-largers the right to vote for full, voting delegates to every convention. A vote for this resolution is a signal to all comrades in the region, and all those in the region who are not comrades, that we wish to make every effort in helping to carry out their work--in fact, that we see their work as our work. It will inform all concerned that the YSA does not intend to remain still in the face of the new tasks imposed on it. It will be a small milestone on the road from a compact, tightly knit group of young people to a mass organization of youth. To vote against it, is to declare one's fear of new members, of expansion and of the tasks which await us.

December 9, 1975

TABLE OF YSA MEMBERSHIP JANUARY 1965 TO APRIL 1975  
(DECEMBER 1970 = 100)

By Jeffrey Kegler, Upper West Side, New York local

| DATE            | MEMBERSHIP |
|-----------------|------------|
| 1965, January   | 18         |
| 1966, March     | 18         |
| 1966, September | 20         |
| 1967, September | 23         |
| 1968, February  | 30         |
| 1968, July      | 39         |
| 1968, November  | 54         |
| 1969, June      | 59         |
| 1969, December  | 78         |
| 1970, August    | 92         |
| 1970, December  | 100        |
| 1971, July      | 94         |
| 1972, June      | 92         |
| 1973, May 31    | 94         |
| 1973, December  | 94         |
| 1974, May 13    | 91         |
| 1974, December  | 89         |
| 1975, April 14  | 91         |

Note: This table is based on sources in the National Office.

## A REPLY TO THE MOST COMMON ARGUMENTS AGAINST AT-LARGE VOTING RIGHTS

By Jeffrey Kegler, Upper West Side, New York local

1. The basic defense of the status quo comes down to the assertion, "The local is the basis of the YSA; therefore all decisions of the YSA must be made by locals." This argument confuses the organizational methods we use for our propaganda work, and those we use to make our decisions.

For example, a local's work is carried out through fractions. Does this mean adherence to democratic centralism requires decisions in the local to be made by the fractions?

As another example, certain comrades are far more active than others. Yet each receives only one vote. The voting is based on an abstraction--the abstraction of the equality of individuals. In our work, of course, individual comrades perform quite unequal roles.

What the local fetishists do is attempt to talk away the contradiction between our decision-making and our propaganda work.

This argument, while the basic one, is never used alone. This is because it is based on verbal tricks and sophistic philosophizing. This is hardly the sort of thing most comrades relate to, and so additional arguments are used.

2. The most obvious of these is the appeal to one's fears. At-largers are characterized as less experienced and less loyal comrades, who are not essential to our work and have a high turnover. All these statements are true.

They are true because of **disenfranchisement**, more than for any other reason. The annual discussion of our politics, directed toward taking a vote for or against these politics, is an integral part of the process of assimilating comrades. Its absence isolates at-largers, who become very vulnerable to sectarianism. For this reason, the at-large comrades have always been a transmission for alien class influences on our ranks. To continue the disenfranchisement of at-largers is to mistake the cause of a disease for its cure.

3. An argument combining the first two is the "special privileges for at-largers" approach. Sally Whicker has the misfortune of having first popularized it in the Discussion Bulletin (Vol. XVIII, pp. 12-14). I must confess that I can only hear this argument repeated with a feeling of disgust.

One of the reasons is that I am probably partially responsible for it, since Whicker was probably put onto it by my mathematics. The argument is made by posing a system of electing delegates where at-largers would receive more than their fair share of the vote (as small locals do now). Such a prospect makes those who have been depriving at-largers of their rights for many years cringe. It is then concluded that "by the logic" of our proposals, we are demanding not an elementary democratic right, but (shudder!) "special privileges".

It is quite a sophisticated argument, disguising fear and distrust of at-largers behind arguments based on the authority of democratic centralism and the finality of mathematics.

The last two objections are those made specifically to the resolution proposed in "A Proposal to the Convention on At-Large Voting Rights."

4. The resolution is too vague. By this is meant that it does not attempt to force a specific proposal on all those who favor at-large voting rights. In reality, the objection is that the resolution is too specific, since it focuses precisely on the essential issue without bringing in technical considerations. A discussion around this resolution should do much to clarify the feelings within the YSA on this issue.

5. The resolution could lead to the formation of an unprincipled bloc. This bullying assertion accuses those who support this resolution of seeking to form a bloc which suppresses the real opinions of some or all of its members in favor of the group's unity. Such a bloc would be a serious threat to the organization integrity of the YSA, since it subordinates the political program of the YSA--its reason for existence--to personal and collective ambitions. If "could" were changed to "has" in the sentence at the beginning of this paragraph, it would mean that immediate action was required by the national leadership, to isolate and expose the supporters of this resolution, and insure that we are driven from the YSA with the minimum loss of its cadres.

I plead guilty to seeking unity with Dave Brandt and all others who favor at-large voting rights. They may consider themselves invited to form a caucus with me at our convention and to begin to win over both the delegates and the YSA membership as a whole to the resolution.

I do not ask them to drop their own specific solutions to the problems as a condition for unity. This, I agree, would be unprincipled. Any who wish to join with me are free to vote for my proposal (DB, Vol. XVIII, No. 1), Dave Brandt's (DB, Vol. XIX, No. 2) or any other proposal to give at-largers the right to vote.

I would vote for Dave Brandt's proposal, given the choice between it and the present system. However, it is possible (though not at all probable), that a caucus around the resolution "A Proposal to the Convention on At-Large Voting Rights" could win a majority without any specific proposal having a majority. In this case the present system would continue, which my opponents can hardly claim is their fear.

I see the present task, for both myself and my opponents, as clarifying the feelings in the YSA on this issue. For the supporters of at-large voting rights to line up into two or more different grouplets, each demanding adherence to its bill of goods, would not further the task of getting the debate underway. Unfortunately, sentiment among opponents of at-large voting rights against getting the debate underway is precisely what underlies the very dangerous charge of "unprincipled bloc."

A real instance of an unprincipled bloc would be the

unity of those comrades who oppose at-large voting rights with those who have been maneuvered into voting with them. If you favor at-large voting rights, and you vote for a dele-

gate or a National Committee which does not, you are entering into an unprincipled bloc.

December 9, 1975

## THE DRAFT POLITICAL RESOLUTION AS AN ORGANIZING TOOL

By Craig Olson and Dave Ferguson, Lexington local

While we agree with the concept of using our discussion of the YSA's political perspectives as a way of reaching out to more people and involving them in the YSA, we feel that some discussion on the way this was done could be useful. We realize that presenting the draft political resolution as a public document rather than an internal discussion bulletin is a difficult change and feel that suggestions on how to make that transition would be helpful in future efforts of this type.

We would like to point out what we feel to be two major weaknesses in this resolution's effectiveness as an organizing tool. First, it assumed an understanding of YSA's analysis of many topics that people not close to the YSA would not necessarily have. While we were glad to see the special sections on GIs and Veterans and the role of the "justice" system, and the excellent way in which the special oppression of women and Blacks were dealt with throughout the document, we feel that the lack of special emphasis of the problems facing women, Blacks and other national minorities, and gays was a serious mistake in approaching new people. Two suggestions for trying to deal with this are: 1) Add small sections giving our position on these groups' struggles, as was done on GIs, Vets, and the legal system. These would show to new people that we are aware of these issues and have some ideas on them. 2) We should prominently mention that we have other resolutions on these subjects, inviting those who are interested in

them to participate in these discussions as well.

The second problem we would like to point out is that the resolution addresses itself basically to students. The way it was worded made it difficult to distribute beyond the campus, to what the document calls "non-student youth." It was hard to approach people in downtown Lexington with literature aimed at college and high school students. Most of the people we would sell to there would not feel that the resolution dealt with the problems they face. Another difficulty was in trying to show the resolution to people we work with. One comrade had told a coworker about it in advance, but when it arrived had serious second thoughts about showing it to him because it was so unrelated to the problems facing workers. We think that much work needs to be done to prevent the YSA from becoming isolated from young workers through reaching out and speaking to their needs. This can never be achieved through tokenism.

We think that a great step forward has been made and that our ideas will be reaching many more people. Many young workers are open to our ideas. We look forward to getting the solid perspectives contained in the draft political resolution across to more people. We hope that the suggestions we have made will help the YSA to achieve that goal.

December 11, 1975

## LOOSE FRACTIONS BUILD BIG FACTIONS

by Myron Eshowsky, Madison local

During this preconvention discussion, it's important that we see the importance of fractions in integrating our new comrades as well as improving the work of the local. Madison has had several problems within the local that directly relate to the fact that our fractions met irregularly if at all.

At the time of our local's tasks and perspectives, it was hard to foresee the influx of several new comrades and our active role in several local struggles. The fact that our local doubled as quickly as it did and the development of several areas of work meant a heavy increase in our work as a local. Unfortunately we, as a local, did not adjust to these two unanticipated developments, and the correct use of fractions did not occur.

The result of this has been several mistakes on our part in the last few months. These mistakes caused lots of dissent, defensiveness, and confusion within the local. This was especially true for our newer comrades who were beginning to have some serious doubts about the YSA. To some extent this was due to their constant exposure to the many "so-called" left groups in Madison and the polemics thrown at the YSA. This may have planted the seeds for questions as to where the YSA stands but did not account for the real basis of the doubts in their heads.

As Comrade Mindala demonstrated, too often we wait until a mistake is made to point out the correct political line or method in a situation. Our local has spent much of its time on "what should we have done?" and not on "what is to be done?" The effect of these mistakes was a cloud of con-

fusion in the heads of newer comrades. They were confused as to how we apply our political line to the struggles with which we're involved.

It is now very clear to the local that the proper use of fractions would have better planned many of our interventions and prevented many of the mistakes we made. The fractions are now set to meet regularly so that we can better plan, anticipate, and criticize our areas of work.

I can't emphasize enough how important fractions are in involving and showing our new comrades the way we apply our politics to our work. While the Madison local has had a successful educational series and our comrades have been very active, our development as comrades comes in the testing of our politics in real struggles. Better use of fractions will help bring this about.

There is one additional benefit that I think sometimes gets lost when we assess our work in fractions. Fractions have the psychological benefit of improving and providing a means of communication among comrades. Quite obviously, this sets the stage for constructive, serious political discussion within the local.

Strong and active fractions are the task of all locals. By continued reassessment of our fractions, the YSA will be able to increase its effectiveness as an organization in addition to the development of new leadership.

December 11, 1975

## UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

By David Paparello, South Chicago local

On September 21, the New York Times reported on the Chilean junta's economic policy. The junta described it as a "shock treatment" for the Chilean working class.

The NYT reported that the architect of this policy was Prof. Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago. In fact, the Chilean economic policy makers referred to themselves as the "Chicago Boys" since they were trained by Friedman and Prof. Arnold Harberger, head of the UC economics department.

The first time any YSA member heard of this issue was when posters appeared on campus declaring "Drive Friedman Off Campus Through Protest and Exposure." The posters were printed by the Spartacus Youth League.

At the same time, the SYL initiated the Committee to Protest Friedman/Harberger-Collaborators with the Bloody Chilean Junta. The Committee was organized around two demands: protest Friedman/Harberger's collaboration with the junta and free all Chilean political prisoners. The Committee called a campus rally around these two demands which was endorsed by several campus groups and professors.

This development posed several problems for us. We clearly did not support the SYL demand to drive Friedman off campus. The SYL argued that, unlike calling on the bourgeois state to curtail anyone's democratic rights which would then give the state a handle to repress the left, they were calling on the workers and students to carry out this action.

We replied that this demand directed discussion to the false issue of Friedman's right to teach on campus or give advice to the junta. More importantly, by raising the idea that anybody could drive anyone off campus, the SYL was giving the administration or the right wing the green light to attack the left. Under the present situation, the SYL or the YSA are much more likely to be driven off campus than Milton Friedman.

We said that the people on campus who were opposed to any collaboration with the Chilean junta were in a minority. Most students were confused about the issue. Therefore, we called for an educational campaign to explain to the university community what the situation is today in Chile and the meaning of collaboration with the junta.

So our approach and the SYL's were clearly counterposed. However, they didn't organize the Committee around the drive Friedman off campus demand, but around demands

we could support. Furthermore, there were other groups involved in the Committee as well as professors from the Latin American studies and Political Science departments. We decided to support the Committee's rally and to speak at it.

The rally drew about 170 students and was dominated by SYL signs proclaiming "Drive Friedman Off Campus." It was covered by the campus paper and the SYL used the rally in a sectarian fashion to milk every possible bit of publicity for themselves. The SYL appeared as the prime force behind the Friedman/Chile issue and as the leadership of the committee.

Of course, because of their reputation as "crazies," the SYL's presence kept the Committee from being as broad as it could have been. Groups like the New American Movement and some professors simply abstained from any action around this issue because the SYL was involved.

The YSA was caught in the middle of this situation. While we felt there was a need for some other vehicle to organize the broadest possible support for this issue, we did not feel that we or USLA could call a meeting to form a new committee. Since we were not certain that forces other than those already active in the Committee would attend, we wanted to avoid a situation where we would appear as sectarian splitters.

On the other hand, we could not simply abstain from the Committee's actions which were attracting independent students. To do that would leave the entire issue in the hands of the SYL, allowing them to masquerade as the real political leadership on campus while they destroyed whatever potential the issue had. We decided to stay with the Committee and judge each action as it came up, at the same time looking for some other vehicle to organize around this issue.

The next Committee action was a rally before the student government meeting to "pressure" the student government into supporting a resolution condemning Friedman/Harberger. We did not support this rally. We were sure it would be a small, ultraleft action that would turn off members of student government.

This rally drew 35 people, most of them members of the SYL. The student government thought it was a "nut" action and quickly voted down the resolution when it was presented by the SYL.



The Committee then called a Teach-In which we supported. It was built in only a few days and drew about 100 students. No action was projected.

Meanwhile, working with USLA, we began to raise the idea among some professors of setting up a student/faculty Commission of Inquiry to investigate possible university complicity with the Chilean junta. USLA invited three professors, the president of student government, several student senators and the YSA to a meeting to discuss this.

Everyone at the meeting agreed that student government should organize a Commission of Inquiry to investigate 1) relations of the university and its members with the present government of Chile, 2) the present economic and political situation in Chile and 3) the effect these relations have on the reputation of the University of Chicago. The student government would elect a 3 member Search Committee which would then solicit nominations from the campus community for a slate of 3 students and 3 faculty members to comprise the 6 member commission.

The slate would be subject to student government approval. The Commission would be as politically broad as possible. The only criterion for serving on the Commission would be a desire to see a thorough investigation carried out. A special appeal was made to the economics department and Friedman and Harberger to put forward nominations to the Commission.

The Commission would be charged with organizing a series of public hearings on the issues it was investigating. It would accept both written and oral testimony. At some undetermined time in the future, the Commission would release a report based on its research.

The YSA spokesperson at the meeting was asked to draft a resolution and present it to student government. The resolution was passed and this comrade was elected to the 3 member Search Committee.

We felt the Commission would be a perfect vehicle to carry out an educational campaign. The main value would be in the public hearings which could offer an opportunity to bring speakers to campus who could explain the present situation in Chile. We hoped to meet many students who would be interested in this issue and would want to do research on possible university complicity.

Friedman claimed that everything he did was on his own time and that the university was not connected in any way. If we could discover actual university ties with the junta, the issue would become much clearer and would present a focus for a struggle against university complicity. At present, the focus on Friedman as an individual made it difficult to formulate any demands. We could protest Friedman's collaboration and make a moral condemnation. We could also demand that the university disassociate itself from any collaboration with the junta. But we could not demand that force be used to end Friedman's collaboration without falling into the trap of appearing to be opponents of democratic rights. As long as

Friedman remained the focus, our main accomplishment would be the education we and USLA could do around political prisoners and the nature of the junta.

The two other largest left groups on campus, the New American Movement and the SYL, completely failed to see the significance of the Commission. The SYL said they neither supported nor opposed the Commission. They abstained on the vote in student government claiming that the facts were already known and that action was needed, i.e., drive Friedman off campus.

NAM said the Commission would simply come up with a whitewash. We pointed out that the facts were overwhelmingly in our favor and that it was highly unlikely that the Commission would come up with such a report. In any case, regardless of what report they wrote, the major value would be in the public hearings where there would be an opportunity to debate supporters of the junta and get out the truth.

NAM tried to form a "left committee" of students and professors who were opposed to the junta. They would not allow the YSA to work in this committee claiming that we would turn off some of the professors. However, this committee never materialized and NAM was left doing absolutely nothing.

Friedman, Harberger and the university administration were very clear on the meaning of a Commission of Inquiry. From the moment the student government passed the resolution to set up the Commission, they began a campaign to slander the Commission and try to prevent professors in particular from supporting it. Friedman and Harberger sent a letter to every faculty member and to the student newspaper denouncing the Commission as a witchhunt. These collaborators with one of the most undemocratic governments in the world tried to make themselves appear as defenders of civil liberties and the students as attackers of their democratic rights!

The acting president of the university also sent a letter to every department presenting the same argument and asking that no one cooperate with the Commission.

A debate raged in the student newspaper. Over 40 letters were written and we're fairly sure that most favored the Commission. However, very few letters were printed. Most people writing in defense of the Commission were not very adept at answering Friedman & Co's slanders.

The Search Committee wrote a letter to all departments explaining that the Commission, unlike any government body, had no power of any kind. The Commission was interested in investigating the university and not in persecuting individuals. Furthermore, Friedman & Co. were really attacking the right of students and faculty to know the truth about university relations and policies.

Unfortunately, the slander campaign succeeded in preventing any professors from serving on the Commission. Many clearly feared losing their jobs. It also created wide-

spread confusion about the aims of the Commission.

This was facilitated, of course, by the SYL's crazy demand to drive Friedman off campus.

Our comrade, Garrett, as the head of the Search Committee, reported back to the student government on why it was not possible to form a Commission at this time. He explained the campaign waged by the administration as an attack on the right of students to know anything about university policy.

To underline this point, Garrett reported on a meeting he had had with the acting president of the university (now the newly appointed president). The meeting was arranged by the acting president who wanted to discuss the Commission with a representative of the Search Committee. Garrett asked that a reporter from the student newspaper be allowed to sit in, but the president refused. At the meeting, the president expressed his total contempt for students and the idea that students have any right to know about university policy. He stated, "You can have a university without students, but you can't have a university without an administration."

Garrett reported the entire meeting to the student newspaper which ran a front-page story including the quote about students.

Garrett proposed to the student government that the former Search Committee be designated as a Forum Committee charged with organizing a meeting or meetings next quarter on the issues which the Commission was to have investigated. This proposal passed.

The situation around this issue is now totally reversed.

Garrett, who was widely known as a YSA spokesperson, has become a real campus figure. He has been interviewed by the campus paper each week for the last several weeks, including an interview exclusively on what the YSA is about.

As a result, the YSA is seen as clearly leading the campaign to get out the truth on the issue of collaboration with the junta as well as exposing the administration's real attitude towards students.

We have withdrawn from the Committee which we feel has outlived its effectiveness. The SYL is now considering having the Committee (which is mainly the SYL) sponsor a guerilla theatre action -- a mock trial of Friedman and Harberger. After this raging debate in which students were accused of trying to organize a witchhunt, the SYL wants to stage a mock trial! We wonder if Friedman is collaborating with the SYL on tactics.

While the campaign to stop the Commission from forming was a setback, the forums on Chile should serve the same purpose as the Commission's public hearings. While we have not as yet recruited any students specifically through this activity, we have pushed the YSA into the middle of campus life and made contact with many professors, student government members, and the radio and newspaper staffs. We have established the YSA as an important political force on campus.

With the public forums next quarter, we hope to meet many students who will decide to work with or join the YSA.

December 12, 1975

## EXPANSION AND THE ECONOMIC CRISIS --WHAT IT MEANS FOR LOCAL FINANCES

By Mary Wismer, Lower East Side, New York local

The past six months have brought a definite change in the YSA's financial functioning. In my opinion, there are two main reasons for this change -- the first is the amount of expansion that the Party and the YSA have been carrying out and the second is the economic crisis. The purpose of this contribution is to discuss some of the aspects of this change and to invite discussion among the membership of the YSA on this topic.

### Expansion

Since Oberlin we have set up six new branches and locals. In addition, we have moved the Lower Manhattan headquarters into the Lower East Side. Recently the city-wide membership of the New York SWP and YSA voted to establish a new branch and local in the borough of Queens. In total, that makes eight different places where expansion work is being carried out.

Expansion brings many new and exciting political opportunities for us. It also, however, carries with it all sorts of problems that many of us have never had to deal with before. The range of this expansion is wide in a geographical sense and it has been carried out in a relatively brief span of time. Previously we would set up, say, two new branches and locals, wait a year or so and then think about setting up another new branch and local. Now we have projected a continual process of expansion. This process will not end with the expansion work that has already been carried out.

If we are going to continue to expand in this manner, we will have to grapple with these problems and solve them. Finances is a crucially important aspect of our work in this area.

### Expansion in New York City

In New York we have participated in two different expansion efforts, building a new local and branch in Newark, New Jersey and moving the Lower Manhattan YSA and branch into the Lower East Side. This involved a reduction of the three locals and branches in New York in order to free up comrades to go to Newark and to other parts of the country. The Lower Manhattan YSA was reduced from a size of 46 comrades down to 36 comrades -- 29 locally assigned and the rest assigned to the city or national offices. **Repercussions** were immediately felt in the local in two areas. First of all we began to feel a personnel crunch. We discovered we did not have enough comrades to fill all the assignments and so some comrades were asked to take two or more assignments. (Many locals have been experiencing this since the base of our political work expanded.) Secondly our sustainer base fell rather drastically. The Lower Manhattan YSA went to Oberlin with a sustainer base of \$130/week. When we returned our sustainer base was down to \$88/week--a drop of almost \$40 from our weekly income. Although we were a smaller local, our

headquarters was still in the same place and our operating expenses were still the same. Consequently it took no great act of perception to see that we were going to be headed in to some rough water financially during the Fall.

### The fall budget--financial problems and working to solve them

As we prepared our budget for the Fall we began to see that we would be in serious financial trouble in December. To patch up the weak spots in the budget we had to begin to make provisions early in September. Our first task was obvious, to go on a sustainer raise campaign. We did this and were able to get our sustainer base back up to between \$95 and \$100/week by the end of September. But the New York financial crisis had an effect on this. We urged comrades to raise their sustainer with as much fervor and political motivation as possible but in many cases the money just wasn't there. Many of our members were in financial difficulty and to find out the extent of this we did some investigating in the local. We found out the following: 6 comrades were employed full-time, 10 comrades were unemployed (some receiving unemployment, some not), 6 were on full-time assignments either for the national office, the city office or for the local and the rest of our membership was on campus.

With statistics like the above, it was simply unrealistic to expect that we would be able to raise our base to much over \$100/week.

Faced with this situation we began to take alternative steps to help shore-up the budget. First of all we encouraged our unemployed members to get jobs as soon as possible. To help this process along we set up a jobs committee that included both YSA and SWP members which met on a regular basis. This committee gave comrades leads on how and where to look for jobs. It also gave them moral support in getting through the often demoralizing period of job hunting. A few comrades were successful in finding full-time jobs (including the author of this contribution) and the idea worked fairly well even though it was not 100 percent successful.

Another factor that went into the raising of our sustainer base from its all-time low of \$88/week was recruitment. Due to the intense level of cutbacks activities and the excellent work that was carried out by our campus fractions, we were able to begin recruiting on a regular basis. Since September we have taken 11 new members into the local. Although often these new comrades were not in the position to make large sustainer pledges, it did help to raise our base somewhat.

Recruitment and getting jobs for comrades, however,

are relatively slow processes. We had to take concrete measures immediately to avoid sinking into debt. As we prepared the Fall budget in September we calculated that we were going to run a \$200 deficit during the Fall period. Most of that deficit would be occurring in the month of December. No matter how we juggled the figures around we could not alter that combination of heavy expenses in December. Realizing that this was coming up, we set about building a financial cushion in the bank to help ride out the difficult month of December.

We began this process by looking for ways to add to the income side of the picture. At first we decided to project a weekly meals program which was to net us \$5.00/week in profits. This proved unrealistic as the weeks went by--the time and effort it cost organizationally just was not worth the little financial gain it brought us. So we decided to scrap that idea and replace it with something else--a coffee concession at the local meetings. The concession was much easier to organize, cheaper to finance and still netted us the same amount of profit that we projected for the meals. \$5.00/week does not sound like much but when stretched out over four months of the Fall it amounts to quite a bit.

Another item in the budget that has been a source of good, steady income was button sales. This was a big surprise to me as from my earlier experience I thought that button sales was not a really dependable source of money. Happily I was proven wrong. Button sales have been very successful in New York, especially the sales of the YSA cutback button. We began in September with a projection of \$50.00 income in button sales. We felt that this was a realistic projection due to the level of the cutbacks activities on the CUNY (City University of New York) campuses. We were able to go over that projection in the month of September by selling over \$60.00 worth of buttons. In October we lowered our projections, thinking that the level of activity around the cuts would be much lower. We were proven wrong in this estimation. The level of struggle remained about the same as in September. We went over our modest \$10.00 projection and took in over \$30.00 in button sales in October.

In November the cutbacks activities reached a real peak. There were actions, demonstrations and picket lines almost every day. We decided that we wanted to go all out in our projections for button sales and ordered 300 buttons from the national office. We sold the buttons everywhere we could and ended up selling over 240 buttons in November.

These two items, button sales and the coffee concession worked out well for us financially. But they did not solve all of our financial problems. One problem still remained--that our sustainer base was not meeting our weekly expenses.

One of the reasons for this was that the projected move into a smaller headquarters on the Lower East Side did not actually happen until December. What did happen was that our local was reduced in size and we remained at our present location--706 Broadway. 706 Broadway contained the city offices of the New York Local of the Socialist Workers Party, the city and regional apparatuses of the New York YSA, and

the Lower Manhattan branch and local. The place itself is very large and the rent is staggering. In the Fall our share of the rent was still the same as it had been when our sustainer base was \$40 larger.

Moving into the Lower East Side headquarters, however, will not magically solve the financial woes of the Lower East Side YSA. Financial functioning will continue to be very tight for a long time to come.

This has turned somewhat into "The Story of How the Heroic Lower East Side YSA Kept the Wolf From Its Door." Hopefully, however, it has provided some comrades and locals who are in similar situations with some new ideas. For the rest of the contribution I want to draw some ideas and observation about functioning in this difficult period.

#### Finances during the economic crisis

First of all, we all realize that capitalism is not going to solve the current crisis that it is undergoing. There may be brief periods of relative prosperity ahead of us but these periods will be short and real wages of the workers will continue to decline. We have to realize that life in capitalist America will continue to be rough on us financially --both personally and politically.

Because of this economic crisis we are going to have to learn to live with tighter finances. Our finances will have to be well and tightly organized every step of the way. We will find it necessary to have stronger financial committees, closer attention of the leaderships of the locals to finances and tighter control over both expenses and income.

One thing that also will become necessary is that all comrades take the time to understand what finances mean for the YSA. Every comrade should take the time to read the section of the Organizing the YSA pamphlet on finances. The entire local should be able to understand what a budget is all about so we are all able to spot problems and offer suggestions before the situation gets out of hand.

It should be the responsibility of the financial director to explain the budget. A good time for this might be during a tasks and perspectives report. Such a report might include an explanation of how financial projections are arrived at--what the expenses are on a week to week and day to day basis, etc. Going into the process of compiling a balanced budget might enable comrades to better understand the problems involved with local finances. It also would help comrades to understand what their sustainer is and why it is so important.

Comrades should also have a full understanding of dues, outside fund raising and the fund drive. It should not be the sole jurisdiction of the financial committee, the financial director, or the organizer or even the executive committee to have a working understanding of the day to day financial problems and functioning of the local.

There is a real, profound, political link between our financial functioning and the day to day political work we are able to carry out. This has been said over and over in every financial tasks and perspectives report but still many com-

rades don't quite understand it. That is, until they are made the financial director, or put on the financial committee and suddenly it all becomes painfully clear. There is too much of a tendency to let the financial director or the financial committee deal with finances alone.

Not only are we grappling with an economic crisis, but we are also carrying out a good deal of expansion work as well. This means that locals will be smaller and sustainer bases will also go down. In the coming years we may find that we will have to project more outside fund raising into the budget in order to balance it. There is nothing wrong with this so long as we understand that the local is mainly financed by the weekly, regular pledges of comrades, in other words, the sustainer base. Outside fund raising should never become the largest item in income projections on any budget. Also any outside fund raising that is projected should be well organized and the project of the entire local, not just the responsibility of the campus fraction or the financial committee. An example of this is button sales. In order to carry out successful button sales it is obvious that the entire local must become involved. Such sales are successful when every comrade participates, selling buttons at the campus, at political events and on sales of the Militant and the YS.

During expansion we must be sure that new branches and locals are provided with a sound financial base from which to build on. Size of the headquarters, size of the local, full-time personnel that are needed--all of these things should be very carefully considered and discussed out before the move is made.

The stability of our individual members personal finances is also important both in light of expansion and with the burden of the economic crisis. It has become very clear to me in the course of my experience with the Lower East Side YSA how much the stability of personal finances reflects upon the

stability of the local's finances. When lots of local members do not have jobs or have continually fluctuating financial situations the local suffers accordingly. What happens is that the local's sustainer base tends to go up and down like a roller coaster and its very hard to keep track of what the sustainer income really is. Consequently it is much harder to make month to month projections, not to mention a Fall budget.

Comrades both who are assigned to new areas and those in established places have a responsibility to themselves and our organization to stabilize their personal finances. Comrades that are not on campus or assigned full-time should not become permanent unemployed campus activists. Every comrade that is unemployed should be able to get a job. When a member is unemployed, one of their most important assignments should be to either get a job or get on campus (if possible). If this becomes a problem, as it did in the Lower East Side, job committees should be formed.

This is a time that has many contradictions for us--while our financial functioning is getting tighter there are ever increasing opportunities for us as a political organization. We cannot afford to cut-back on our personnel, or our activities at this time. It would deny us tremendous gains that can be made. As the class struggle heats up we will want to expand more and more geographically and politically. But if we are to grow into the mass youth organization that we aspire to be we have to organize ourselves well now and lay down the base for which to build. Part of this base must be strong finances.

I hope comrades will not hesitate to contribute to this discussion and bring up new ideas they have tried in their areas.

December 12, 1975

## THE NATION OF ISLAM: NEW DEVELOPMENTS AND POSSIBLE POLITICAL OPENINGS

By Robb Wright, Upper West Side, New York local

As comrades have seen from the media and the press of the Nation of Islam, Bilalian News, important developments have begun taking place in the Nation of Islam. States a Sept. 30 report sent out by Doug Jenness from the SWP National Office,

"Since the death of Elijah Muhammad earlier this year there appears to be some shakeups taking place in the Nation of Islam. They've shown more interest in some cities to political activities such as supporting the Hurricane Carter defense case in Newark and supporting a Black Democrat for mayor in Philadelphia."

In addition, comrades in Cleveland, New York and other YSA locals across the country have had increased contact with representatives of the Nation of Islam, either attending their functions or participating in meetings with them to discuss the changes in the policy of the Nation and possible collaboration in different areas.

These are exceptionally important developments reflecting the growing pressure affecting many older civil rights and nationalist organizations in this period of increased ruling class attacks on the Black community. Comrades should attempt to stay abreast of the activities of the Nation of Islam in their areas.

The "Lost Found Nation of Islam" is the largest and most powerful Black nationalist organization in the U.S. Formed in the northern urban ghettos in the 1930s, this religious nationalist movement is estimated to have between 50,000 and 270,000 members. The "Freedom Now" resolution adopted by the 1963 Socialist Workers Party convention has this to say in regard to the Nation of Islam:

"The Muslims, headed by Elijah Muhammad, are one of the most dynamic tendencies in the Northern Negro Community. Previously a small uninfluential religious sect, they have acquired a considerable predominantly working-class membership in the Northern cities, a more substantial following, and the respect of millions of Negroes who are stirred by their forthright denunciation of racial oppression and their determination to free themselves from white domination. Nationalist and separatist, they reject not only gradualism and tokenism, but also the right of their oppressors to control and exploit Negroes. They boldly declare the capacity and right of the Negro people to govern themselves. Important weaknesses include their failure to understand the economic causes of racism and their lack of a program of action enabling them to participate in and influence partial, immediate, and transitional struggles of the Negro masses."

These "important weaknesses" were the basis of Malcolm X's political break with the Nation of Islam in 1964 and led him in the direction of organizing an independent Black movement which would have a program of mass action based

on the struggles of the Black community against national oppression and economic exploitation. Malcolm X in his autobiography had this to say on the reasons for the developing split which was to occur between him and the Nation of Islam; "If I harbored any personal disappointment whatsoever, it was that privately I was convinced that our Nation of Islam could be an even greater force in the American Black man's overall struggle -- if we engaged in more action. By that, I mean I thought privately that we should have amended, or relaxed, our general non-engagement policy. I felt that, wherever Black people committed themselves, in the Little Rocks and the Birmingham and other places, militantly disciplined Muslims should also be there -- for all the world to see and respect and discuss."

Since the split in 1964 up until recently, the Nation of Islam had continued to pursue the same isolationist course which led to Malcolm X's exit. However in the past year, since the death of Elijah Muhammad, a number of significant developments have taken place. At a rally which drew over 20,000 people in Chicago, marking the first public appearance of Wallace D. Muhammad, the new supreme minister of the Nation of Islam, a number of changes in the official policy were announced, including the first public disclosure on their financial affairs, membership figures and the revelation that whites would be accepted into the Nation of Islam. According to Nathaniel Muhammad one of the major spokespersons at the rally, "What was taught yesterday was yesterday's message. Now we are evolving to where the nation will open up to all without regard to race, color or creed." Wallace Muhammad stated further, "If whites can mature, so can we."

In addition, other important developments have taken place.

These include,

- \*An end to the goal of a separate Muslim geographic state although still considering it an option.
- \*The promotion and active recruitment of women for leadership roles. Women are now to be allowed to become ministers in the movement, reflecting the pressure of the feminist movement on the Nation of Islam.
- \*Active recruitment of professional and intellectuals in both philosophical and practical areas of running the 176 temple-church apparatus and its associated business.

The most important changes in the Nation of Islam's activities are its announced consideration of participation in political activity including the support of Black candidates for office and a shift in the direction of participating in social struggles affecting Blacks. This is of significant

interest to our movement. In some areas, for example, temples of the Nation of Islam have already announced support for different political candidates. Muhammad Ali recently has spoken favorably of the Tom Hayden campaign for Senate in California. In addition, Bilalian News (formerly Muhammad Speaks) has had several articles on the 1976 SWP presidential and vice-presidential campaigns and the coverage has been quite good.

These apparent changes in the organization provide our movement with an excellent opportunity to begin discussing with individual members of the Nation of Islam and its leadership our 1976 political campaigns and the possibilities of our national and local candidates speaking before Muslim audiences. In New York, representatives of Bilalian News have expressed interest in covering the Willie Mae Reid tour.

In areas around the country it has been reported that there has been some actual involvement of members of the Nation of Islam in different political activities. In Newark, N.J. for example there is some involvement in the Hurricane Carter defense and in Atlanta some participation of individual Muslims in ERA work has occurred.

For a number of years, the Nation of Islam has been making different attempts at broadening its influence among the Black community. Its public affairs such as Muhammad Appreciation Day and Black Family Day have drawn tens of thousands of Blacks and other oppressed nationalities. Numerous political figures have attended these functions as in Chicago where Mayor Daley has made appearances at these important events.

The Nation of Islam has attempted to reach out to other oppressed nationalities such as Puerto Ricans and West Indians. In New York's Lower East Side, Bilalian News salespersons distribute their press regularly. Also on many campuses the Nation of Islam holds regular meetings. At Brooklyn College, for example, upwards of 60-70 Black students and faculty attend these meetings.

However, it is in the area of economic self-development that the Nation of Islam has concentrated most of its efforts and has attracted considerable attention from the broader Black business community due to the limited achievements of the "pull ourselves up by our bootstraps" philosophy it pursues. Through their press and hosting special meetings and business bazaars such as one which was held in Chicago

in 1972 drawing 500 business and professional leaders from the New York area, the Nation of Islam has attempted to recruit technical expertise and expand its business opportunities in an attempt to lay the basis for a joint effort to improve the economic foundation of the Black community. At the present time they control financial assets estimated at \$50 million to \$70 million. This includes business ties with the government of Libya which has supplied them with several million dollars in loans.

The Nation of Islam has a considerable attraction for Black youth who are impressed with the posture of the Nation of Islam and the positive image it projects to the Black community. This is particularly in regard to its teachings concerning Black pride, heritage and identity of self. Many members of the organization are newly recruited young people. These shifts on the part of the Nation of Islam, regardless of the motives of the leadership will undoubtedly have considerable effect on these young people and our movement should be in a position to discuss these changes and our politics with them.

Our program and ideas concerning the role of the Democratic party, Black control of the Black community, school desegregation, support for colonial independence struggles and why the Nation of Islam should support the 1976 Socialist Workers election campaigns, give us ample room for discussion with whatever members of the Nation we come in contact with.

YSA locals and SCAR chapters (especially our Black and Puerto Rican cadre) across the country should have a presence at all of their public functions in order to be in a good position to discuss ideas and possibly work with this movement at every opportunity.

Suggested Reading List on The Lost-Found Nation of Islam.

Bilalian News

The Autobiography of Malcolm X

Black Nationalism - E.U. Essum Udom

The Black Muslims in America - C. Eric Lincoln

The Myth of Black Capitalism - Earl Ofari

December 12, 1975

## THE ROOTS OF THE DIFFERENCES ON PORTUGAL

By Harvey McArthur, Philadelphia local

The explosive political developments in Portugal mark a return of political struggle to the imperialist areas. It demonstrates the inability of the bourgeoisie to solve the economic crises generated by capitalism, or even to defend the basic democratic rights of the masses of workers and peasants.

The events in Portugal also confirm the Marxist analysis of the revolutionary potential of the working class--the class that has sustained eighteen months of mobilization and resisted all efforts by the bourgeoisie to stabilize their rule. The rapid growth of the mass workers parties, of unions and committees in the factories and armed forces, reflect a tremendous ferment amongst the masses. The elections last April showed that the workers saw socialism as the only way out of the crisis confronting them.

But Portugal also shows the desperate need for a revolutionary party. In 1938, Trotsky wrote that "the historical crisis of mankind can be reduced to the question of the crisis of the revolutionary leadership"--and nowhere is that more true than in Portugal today. The masses remain under the sway of the Communist and Socialist parties, parties committed to the status quo. The "far-left" has been engrossed in ultraleft adventures and pseudo-revolutionary rhetoric; culminating in the fiasco of the attempted coup last month. The main lessons embodied in Trotsky's Transitional Program of 1938--how to win the masses away from the treacherous reformist parties, how to help them develop a revolutionary consciousness and confidence, and above all, how to build a mass revolutionary party--these remain the key lessons needed by revolutionaries in Portugal.

The Trotskyist groups in Portugal, the Liga Comunista Internacionalista (LCI), and the Partido Revolucionaria dos Trabalhadores (PRT), are both very small and new. The world Trotskyist movement has an especial obligation to help them analyze the events in Portugal and project a correct strategic orientation for their work. However, the two main factions within the Fourth International, the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction and the International Majority Tendency, have taken sharply conflicting positions on Portugal. One of the important tasks facing the YSA at our convention will be to evaluate these two lines in light of the actual experience in Portugal. Although the YSA is unable to have any affiliation with the Fourth International due to the reactionary laws in this country, we take these discussions very seriously. In the past, we have agreed with the positions and political perspectives held by the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction, and I believe that it is the IMT that is fundamentally wrong on the issues in Portugal.

The differences over Portugal are not entirely new; they reflect deeper differences that emerged several years ago in discussions around Latin America and that have extended to most aspects of revolutionary work. While the situation in Portugal provides the most important test for the two lines

today, it is also important to look at the roots of the dispute to understand the fundamental issues at stake.

This contribution is intended to give some background on these issues, and help comrades put the discussion around Portugal in perspective.

\* \* \* \*

The IMT has held a confused evaluation of the Armed Forces Movement (MFA), the military government ruling for the bourgeoisie. They gave support to its corporatist Guide Document, and even held illusions about the "revolutionary credentials" of some of its leaders. They were characterized as "confused but uncorrupted left-radicals." The LCI went even further in putting this line into practice: joining a popular front coalition that aimed to include the MFA, and calling upon the MFA to intervene in its former colony, Angola.

The IMT has failed the test on another key issue around which revolutionaries should be appealing to the masses. They stood on the wrong side of the fight for democratic rights, and attacked the Constituent Assembly at a time when the only alternative was the military government. They have made a fetish of workers committees, and have more or less reduced politics to calling for the "extension and generalization" of these committees.

In pursuit of the "unity of the working class," or more precisely of its supposed vanguard, the "far-left" groups, the LCI has been led into unprincipled coalition politics. And even when our comrades have disassociated themselves with some of the extremes of the ultralefts, they have not been able to present any real alternative analysis or course of action.

These fundamental departures from the practices and lessons of the Trotskyist movement require explanation. I believe that they stem from fundamental revisions in the concept of how a revolution will be made, and of the role of the revolutionary party.

Consider for instance, the resolution adopted by the majority of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International in June of this year. It contains a lengthy analysis of the developments in Portugal, and outlines a perspective for revolutionists to follow. After listing a series of axes for "massive political campaigns" that revolutionary Marxists must wage, the resolution states that: "The comrades of the LCI will have to: \*Assure themselves of an every broader implantation in the working class; \*Extend the influence of the revolutionary Marxists in all the sectors that are now mobilizing and offer them a perspective of struggle for socialism; \*Consolidate the organization of hundreds of adherents in order to make the LCI a real political striking force capable of contesting reformist hegemony on the concrete



field of class struggle." (Emphasis added).

The first two points are rather vague generalizations that it would be hard to disagree with, but they do not give the comrades much direction. The third one is the most interesting--"the organization of hundreds of adherents." How is a party of hundreds of members going to play a decisive role in the revolutionary struggle in Portugal? How is it going to challenge the hegemony of the massive reformist parties that can mobilize tens and hundreds of thousands of people into action? How is it going to extend the influence of revolutionary Marxists into all sectors, with only hundreds of members?

Yet this statement must be taken seriously. It cannot be dismissed as a careless formulation by one writer or another, for it is part of a major political resolution by international leaders of the Trotskyist movement. And we can be sure that comrades of the calibre of Ernest Mandel, Livio Maitan and Pierre Frank, leaders of the IMT, do not think that a few hundred Trotskyists will by themselves have a decisive influence on the course of events in Portugal.

So who will play this revolutionary role?

The answer is apparent in earlier parts of this same resolution. The comrades call upon the "revolutionary vanguard," the "revolutionary left," and the "proletarian vanguard" to take on the reformist organizations, to "regroup broad layers of the working class," and so forth.

And what is this revolutionary left, this proletarian vanguard? The resolution calls for a "flexible tactic of the united front" to regroup this vanguard, and an article in the July 3 Inprecor spells out what this means. "The LCI is waging this campaign in a united front with other organizations, such as the MES (Movimento de Esquerda Socialista), the LUAR (Ligo de Uniao e Accao Revolucionaria), the PRP (Partido Revolucionario do Proletariado-Brigadas Revolucionarias), etc." This coalition of radical groups--Trotskyist, Maoist, centrist, anarchist, etc.--this odd coalition is supposed to play the role of the revolutionary party in Portugal!

### The Guerrilla War Strategy in Latin America

The deviations in the IMT perspective for Portugal are not new--they have their roots in differences that first emerged in the late 1960s.

Building a revolutionary party is no easy task. We know that it takes a lot of patient effort to win people to the YSA and to educate and train ourselves into Trotskyist cadre. Many other radicals reject our insistence upon political clarity and political principles. They think that there must be some easier way to make a revolution; some other social force that can substitute for the disciplined, revolutionary party.

During the 1960s, this pressure was particularly strong. There was the massive radicalization of youth, a radicalization that led to enormous political struggles and the organization of many radical youth groups. These groups reacted against the bureaucratic and conservative example they saw

in the Socialist and Communist parties. This was a very healthy step. Unfortunately however, many of them associated the building of a Leninist party with these reformist organizations--and rejected the many positive lessons of the Marxist movement, as well as their caricatures. They tried to build a new revolutionary theory--but without the firm basis revolutionary Marxism provides. This left them open to all sorts of Maoist, anarchist, spontaneist and adventurist tendencies. Their attitude could perhaps be summed up in Jerry Rubin's famous phrase "Do It!"--just point out the need for a revolution, act militantly and watch the workers seize power. There was tremendous pressure to engage in action without worrying so much about deep theoretical analysis or political principles.

The Trotskyist groups entered this radicalization very small; and in many cases lacked a layer of older, experienced comrades who could help educate newer members. It is not hard to see how comrades could feel isolated by sticking to our political principles, and how they could begin to give in to the strong pressures of this large ultra-left milieu. This pressure was probably increased in Europe since the new radical youth automatically looked much better than the bureaucratized and reformist mass organizations that dominated the working class.

The first serious change in political program came around the perspectives for revolutionaries in Latin America. The 1960s were ushered in by the success of the Cuban revolution. This struggle was led not by a revolutionary Marxist party, but by a petty bourgeois formation led by Castro and Guevara; one that had initiated a campaign of guerrilla warfare. The reasons for their success were many, not the least being their ability to raise demands that won them the support of the masses of Cuban workers and peasants, and the confusion and weakness of U. S. imperialism and the Batista regime.

Thousands of radicals took a quick look at the Cuban success, saw that they had gone into the hills and organized a guerrilla band, and came out several years later with a successful revolution. They concluded that if they did the same thing, organizing a guerrilla band, that they too could spark a revolution in their own country. Picking up the gun seemed to be the paramount activity; building a party seemed too dull and fruitless.

Thousands of people did put this theory into practice, including Che Guevara in Bolivia. None of them had any success, however. The imperialists had learned a few things from the Cuban experience, and stepped up their counter-insurgency attacks. The guerrillas failed to realize the importance of the struggles of the masses of workers and peasants, and wound up isolated and defenseless in face of the fierce bourgeois attacks.

Nonetheless, some of the best young revolutionists went into these campaigns and were lost. It was a heroic example of revolutionary dedication, but a disastrous political orientation. These guerrilla groups received tremendous sympathy and respect from radicalizing youth around the world. As the appeal of the Cuban revolution swept the

globe, the image of the guerrilla fighter seemed to be the essence of revolutionary struggle in Latin America. And even many Trotskyists began to bend to this pressure.

At the Ninth World Congress of the Fourth International, held in 1969, a resolution on Latin America was adopted that marked a profound departure from traditional Marxist and Trotskyist thinking and political perspectives. The resolution stated: "The fundamental perspective, the only realistic perspective for Latin America is that of an armed struggle which may last for long years. This is why the technical preparations cannot be conceived of merely as one of the aspects of revolutionary work, but as the fundamental aspect on a continental scale, and one of the fundamental aspects in countries where the minimum conditions have not yet been met."

This perspective was justified through a very simple and schematic conception of the political options facing revolutionists in Latin America. For one thing, this perspective held for the entire continent, despite the tremendous differences between different countries. Some had democratic regimes, many had military dictatorships; some had large working classes with extensive political organizations, some did not; some had a recent history of struggle, some had been crushed under a dictatorial regime for years.

Nonetheless, the comrades held that there was no perspective other than out-right military repression from the bourgeoisie, and hence armed struggle was the only response from revolutionaries. "Thus, not only in a historical sense, but in a more direct and immediate one, Latin America has entered a period of revolutionary explosions and conflicts, of armed struggle on different levels against the native ruling classes and imperialism, and of prolonged civil war on a continental scale."

In fact, however, there had been massive mobilizations of the peasants and urban masses during 1968 in several countries, and this promised a rise of "traditional" types of struggles, and new opportunities for party building and political organizing along the lines presented in the Transitional Program. "Nonetheless," the resolution stated, "revolutionary Marxists cannot conclude from this that the 'classical' variant calling for a progressive rise and broadening of the mass movement and its structuring and reinforcement through traditional organizational forms before it reaches the armed struggle has been revalidated. In the international context, after all the experiences of the last decade, and in face of an increasingly brutal repression by the native ruling classes and imperialism, such a variant is not the most probable. . . . Even in the case of countries where large mobilizations and class conflicts in the cities may occur first, civil war will take manifold forms of armed struggle, in which the principle axis for a whole period will be rural guerrilla warfare."

Even small or isolated guerrilla actions were seen as the key thing needed to get a revolution going: "In the situation of pre-revolutionary crisis such as Latin America is now experiencing on a continental scale, guerrilla war-

fare can in fact stimulate a revolutionary dynamic, even if at the start the attempt may seem to have come from abroad or to be unilateral. . . ."

The errors of this perspective were soon born out as comrades tried to put them into practice; they received decisive tests in Argentina and Bolivia in 1970 and 1971.

In Bolivia, the pressure of the masses forced the military government to back down and allow more openings for mass struggles and political organizing. There were fights around wages, land, and democratic rights that threatened to topple the bourgeois regimes. It was a classical opening for a revolutionary party, even a small one, to work amongst these politicized masses and win them to a revolutionary perspective. Yet our comrades, following the guerrilla war line, concentrated on the preparations for rural guerrilla warfare, and were left behind and disoriented by the new developments. They did not make the gains offered by the objective situation, and the masses, left in the hands of the reformists, were eventually defeated by a coup in August, 1971.

Argentina was in some respects an even more decisive test, since the Trotskyist group, the PRT, had split into two groups just before the Ninth World Congress. One group, the PRT-Combatiente, held the guerrilla war line and tried to put it into practice. As a logical outcome of such a perspective, its members held Castroist, Maoist and other wrong political positions, and eventually decided to leave the Fourth International altogether. After several splits, they remain as a small and isolated group in Argentina.

The other group, the PRT-La Verdad, merged with the Argentine Socialist Party to form the PST--the Socialist Workers Party. It holds to the traditional Trotskyist perspective of mass struggle and building a revolutionary party. It has grown into one of the largest Trotskyist groups anywhere in the world, with extensive influence amongst the youth and parts of the working class. A much fuller analysis of these events can be found in the document "Argentina and Bolivia--A Balance Sheet" in IIDB Vol. X, No. 1.

Despite this clear test, the comrades who supported the guerrilla warfare line maintained it. They made a few modifications, like holding that urban guerrilla warfare was as important as rural, but the basic line did not change. At the Tenth World Congress in 1974, the majority adopted a resolution "On Armed Struggle in Latin America," that stated: "The Ninth World Congress resolution affirms the relevance of armed struggle in Latin America, and thus represents one of the gains made by our movement."

It was this refusal of the majority leadership to take account of the disastrous results of their policy that necessitated the formation of a tendency within the Fourth International, the Leninist-Trotskyist Tendency, to try to win over a majority of comrades to a correct political perspective. The LTT based itself upon the lessons of the events in Argentina and Bolivia, and called for a return to the former position held by our movement on party building. The persistent refusal of the majority comrades to change their course, and the extension of their errors into other areas of

work, notably Europe, made necessary the formation of a faction to fight for the leadership of the International. Accordingly, before the Tenth World Congress, the Leninist-Trotskyist Tendency voted to become the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction. The supporters of the majority also have formed a faction--called the International Majority Tendency.

#### The New Mass Vanguard

It was during the discussions preceeding the Tenth World Congress that the IMT perspectives were deepened and extended to Europe. In particular, it was then that the theory was developed that a combination of different radical groups could somehow replace the revolutionary party as the vanguard of the working class. Comrades interested in studying this further should read especially the documents of the Tenth World Congress, printed in a special issue of Intercontinental Press, dated Dec. 23, 1974.

In the majority "World Political Resolution," the new mass vanguard is defined: "The new mass vanguard can be characterized most succinctly as the sum of forces acting independently and to the left of the traditional bureaucratic leaderships of the mass movement. It is both a social and political phenomenon: the new vanguard includes the radicalized layers of the youth, the working class and women--most of whom are unorganized. There is however, an organized fraction that follows or is part of the far-left organizations: Trotskyist, centrist, Maoist, Maoist-spontaneist, etc."

The majority resolution "The Building of Revolutionary Parties in Capitalist Europe" spells out the new orientation the comrades are following. "What chiefly distinguishes the new vanguard from the one we have known throughout the preceeding decades is its ability to intervene in the class struggle in its own right, to take political initiatives, and here and there, to take the leadership of mass workers struggles."

They admit that the vanguard has many members who may "remain prisoners of spontaneism, sectarianism, ultra-left infantilism, apolitical workerism or primitive syndicalism," and most of it has not been won to revolutionary Marxism. Yet despite these glaring weaknesses the vanguard "is for the first time in a long period becoming capable of effective action." (Emphasis added). It is now the body having the key task of winning the masses from the misleadership of the Stalinists and Social Democrats, to "change the relationship of forces in the mass movements through its ability to impel masses much broader than those consistently associated with it into action that overflows bureaucratic control."

The conclusion drawn from all this is that "the central task for revolutionary Marxists. . . is to win hegemony within the new mass vanguard." However, this does not imply winning this vanguard to our parties, nor even winning them to a full revolutionary program as we understand it. "Political hegemony implies that the revolutionary Marxist organization, through its propaganda, its campaigns and its initiatives appears as a pole of reference for this broad vanguard, even

if a large part of it is not yet directly organized by our movement."

The resolution states that this vanguard can be transformed into "an adequate instrument for restructuring the organized workers movement." It can win the masses from the reformists, win them to a fight for socialism, and project the tactics and strategy needed in this fight. Yet these are the tasks that require the most clear and consistent political program and understanding, as well as common organizational experience and collaboration. That is why we have always held that they are crucial tasks for the revolutionary party alone. Other radicals and groups that share our basic perspective should join with us in a common organization. Most other groups that exist have such wrong positions on key issues that we could not merge with them. They are in fact obstacles to a correct revolutionary strategy, not an adequate instrument. To think otherwise is to hold spontaneist illusions about the process of developing revolutionary consciousness, to underestimate the importance of political program and the lessons of past struggles, and to romanticize the abilities of these ultraleft groups.

Nonetheless, the IMT says that these are the people we must orient towards. One of the tools we must use "as much as possible in the present stage," is to organize "national political campaigns on carefully chosen issues that correspond to the concerns of the vanguard, that find an echo in mass struggles by expressing the objective needs of these struggles, and that offer a chance for demonstrating a capacity for effective initiative, even if modest, by our sections." The concerns of the vanguard, not those of the masses of workers and their allies, these are key. We must impress the vanguard that we are militant and revolutionary, and need not worry about the mass of workers now. Indeed, if their struggles are even a dim echo of our revolutionary adventures, that will be fine.

Such a "get-rich-quick" schema has never worked before in revolutionary history, and it came home with a vengeance in Portugal.

#### The IMT on Portugal

It is this orientation to the new mass vanguard that has caused the disastrous line followed by the IMT. It has meant abandoning critical analysis and political principle under pressure of these ultraleft and sectarian groups.

For instance, rather than expose the bourgeois character of the MFA, the comrades have gone along with illusions about its "revolutionary role." They gave theoretical explanations as to why some of these officers may open up the road to revolution. Rather than clarifying this crucial issue, helping the working class to understand the need to break with the MFA, and differentiating ourselves from the morass of ultralefts, the comrades have contributed to the confusion.

The ultraleft and sectarian groups do not share our analysis of how the working class radicalizes and of the role for a revolutionary party. In bending to their pressure,

the IMT comrades have abandoned many key aspects of the Transitional Program and our political principles.

The resolution of the United Secretariat of last June states that "almost spontaneously, and with extraordinary rapidity, the Portuguese working class is taking up, and sometimes enriching, the most advanced experiences of the struggles that have developed in Europe since 1968." Who really needs to worry about building a mass revolutionary party when the working class is apparently learning all these lessons "almost spontaneously"?

The resolution declares that "on March 11, there was a fusion between the workers upsurge and the emergence of the mass movement into the political arena." A new mass political movement? But the masses are still following the SP and CP for the most part. Doesn't this call for a careful and aggressive campaign to win the masses to a correct program?

This is apparently unnecessary. Last July, Daniel Bensaid, another leader of the IMT, wrote that "not only the Constituent Assembly, but also the MFA has been outflanked by the flowering of committees and assemblies that are being coordinated by region and by industry, that are demanding workers control, expropriation of the capitalists and a planned economy." The masses have, in the opinion of this comrade, arrived at the consciousness of the necessity and fundamental nature of a socialist revolution, and are spontaneously creating the bodies needed to put it in practice. All that we have to do is point out the necessity for "generalizing and coordinating these committees on a national scale," and the revolution will be assured.

During the hectic July days, when the key fight over democratic rights was taking place, when the CP and SP were mobilizing tens and hundreds of thousands of workers around their programs, the LCI put out a major agitational leaflet that the IMT comrades felt important enough to reprint in *Inprecor*. It listed three demands for the struggle:

\*All united in our workers commissions, tenants commissions, united assemblies, and people's assemblies for the construction of a National People's Assembly, organs of workers power!! For a workers government!!

\*Against capital and reaction, proletarian unity!  
Vigilance!

\*Forward to the Socialist Revolution!!

Politically, this leaflet could have been put out by the MFA. It repeats their call in the Guide Document for the establishment of workers committees, a National People's Assembly, etc. And it has no other political demands--nothing about democratic rights, no demand to break politically with the MFA, no demands directed at the mass workers parties, nothing.

Such an abstract, misguided leaflet might be expected of ultralefts and sectarians, but not of Trotskyists.

Now, if the masses are at a revolutionary consciousness, and ready to struggle for socialism, what could be holding them back? Obviously, they have for some reason failed to figure out how to organize their organs of state power, al-

though they seem to have gotten everything else right by themselves. Thus, the only remaining political task confronting revolutionaries is to point out to the workers that they should extend and link-up their diverse committees, and the revolution can happen. This logic led the "far-lefts" to launch massive campaigns for forming, extending, coordinating, generalizing and linking-up workers, soldiers, peasants and tenants committees.

The IMT comrades have unfortunately gone right along in this simplistic campaign. Articles in *Inprecor* have carried banner headlines like "For the Generalization of Workers Councils!" The LCI issued a statement in July titled: "Forward to the building and generalizing of workers councils! Create and unify armed self-defense pickets in the unions, neighborhoods and factories." The only demands raised in the statement (presumably the political focus around which to build these committees) were "Forward to the Socialist Revolution! For the Socialist United States of Europe!" These are noble sentiments, but seem more like radicals trying to up the ante in revolutionary rhetoric than a realistic call to action from a Marxist party.

There are virtually no politics in the statements and analysis of the IMT comrades. The mere existence of these workers committees is enough for them--the question of their program, their plan for action, is totally secondary. That is why it was so easy for the MFA to take them in with its Guide Document--it sure called for workers committees all over the place, so it must be revolutionary, or at least open the road to revolution.

\* \* \* \*

It is true, as the comrades point out repeated, that there are a large number of committees in Portugal. They were thrown up by the masses in their struggles, and have existed in large numbers since the first days following the coup in April, 1974. However, these are not an arena of political debate or mobilization for most of the working class. During the July days, it was the mass parties, the CP and SP, that the workers followed into action, not these committees. The committees have not generally advanced beyond the level of union organizations, dealing with matters at the factory level and leaving larger political issues alone. Many have been set up by individual "far-left" groups, who view them as their own property, and as the embryo of their own future state power.

They stand in sharp contrast to real soviets which, as Trotsky points out in the Transitional Program open the stage "when the mass movement enters into an openly revolutionary stage. From the first moment of their appearance, the soviets, acting as a pivot around which millions of toilers are united in their struggles against the exploiters, become competitors and opponents of the local authorities and then of the central government." Trotsky also stresses the political character of real soviets, which arise from the day to day struggles of the masses. "Factory committees, as already

stated, are elements of dual power inside the factory. Consequently, their existence is possible only under conditions of increasing pressure by the masses. This is likewise true of the struggle against war, of the committees on prices, and all the other new centers of the movement, the very appearance of which bears witness to the fact that the class struggle has overflowed the limits of the traditional organizations of the proletariat." Yet these themselves, which could be said to exist in Portugal, are not yet soviets. Soviets arise out of the need to coordinate and unify all these struggles; they arise out of the political struggles of the masses, to help them struggle for the political demands that they see as so pressing. They become political organizations of the masses.

In the classical example, the Russian revolution, soviets sprang up as an alternative to the hated and discredited Czarist regime, and as the vehicle through which the masses intended to struggle for their key demands of Land, bread, and peace. As such, they became an alternative government to the bourgeois regime.

The IMT comrades apparently cannot distinguish between any body of workers, and real soviets. They are certainly providing no clarity on the key need to break with the MFA government. And they have not advanced a series of demands that could help further the political consciousness of the masses. Without such a program of immediate and transitional demands, the calls for the "generalization of workers councils" remains abstract and useless.

\* \* \* \*

Reducing revolution to an organizational question and elevating the new mass vanguard to the role of revolutionary party has led the LCI into unprincipled coalition politics. The first coalition was based upon the August 25 unity agreement. It included the CP and a host of far-left groups and invited the MFA to join it. Its program supported the MFA Guide Document. It was in fact a popular front coalition.

In a statement on the accord, the LCI stated that they felt that all of the MFA should not have been included in the coalition, just the more radical part of it. But in any case, they felt that this was "not a question involving political principles." The "essential point is that the agreement reached permits the first steps to be taken in unifying the working class." The political program around which they were trying to unify the class was apparently of little importance. After all, if the workers have a revolutionary consciousness, and all that remains to do is point to the need for unity, then why worry about details of program. The example of the unity of the far left should be more than enough to show the way to revolution.

This coalition only last three days, since the CP pulled out to pursue its opportunist politics elsewhere. The coalition remained however, with all the same political weaknesses. It was re-named the Front for Revolutionary Unity, the FUR.

This coalition is important because it shows the extent to which the comrades have adapted to the ultraleft milieu, and are carrying out the consequences of the new mass vanguard theory. For us, winning the masses to a correct program and building a revolutionary party is key. For the IMT remaining in an alliance with the "far-left," the "adequate instrument" is paramount.

Even when the political errors and bankrupt policies of other members of the FUR become glaringly evident, the comrades maintained their course. In an article in the October 9 Inprecor, Charles Michaloux and A. Udry bemoan "the adventurist policy of some of the organizations in the FUR." They decry the alarmist way which the FUR reacted to some of the government's moves, and the ultraleftism and adventurism of some of its groups, notably the PRP-BR. They conclude that the "far-left" groups could become caught in a dangerous adventurist trap, similar to the one which the German Communists fell into in 1919. "But," they write, "the development of the political situation, as illustrated by the latest events, can facilitate a process of clarification that would permit a response to the need for unity in action." They are still banking upon the FUR becoming that adequate instrument, and they remain limited to the role of loyal opposition.

The November 27 issue of Red Weekly, the paper of the British Trotskyists, printed an interview with Francisco Temudo, a leader of the LCI. By this time, the adventurist policies of many of the FUR groups had become very clear. Temudo decrys the "opportunism" of the MES, the adventurism of the PRP--"its illusions about the possibility of an immediate insurrection"--and the sectarian attitude that many of these groups take towards workers still following the SP. These are valid criticisms, and it is good to see the comrades making them.

Nonetheless, Temudo makes no criticism of the FUR as a whole, or explains the roots of these deviations by its different components. In fact, "the FUR could potentially play a very important role in developing a revolutionary alternative in the present situation." All that is needed is for these groups to come to their senses.

The comrades of the IMT fail to draw the necessary conclusions from the test of these "far-left" groups in Portugal. They still characterize them as part of the "revolutionary left," a key component of the revolutionary leadership. They have not analyzed the roots of their wrong policies--their illusions in the MFA, their spontaneism, their rejection of the Leninist party and its role in working with the masses, their ultraleft and sectarian errors on many specific issues. In fact, the comrades share many of these basic illusions. Until such a critical analysis can be made, our comrades will not be able to chart a correct political course in Portugal, and will not be able to present a real alternative to this "far-left" melange.

#### A Final Comment

In my opinion, the debate over Portugal is not yet

through. Many comrades who accepted the policies put forward by the IMT may yet be able to draw correct lessons from the actual experiences of these struggles. It is worth noting that the comrades have pulled back from the ultraleft extremes of many other groups in Portugal in the last couple of months.

The fiasco of the recent coup attempt and the blows it dealt the working class, may prompt a search for a new political perspective and an evaluation of how and why the "revolutionary left" fell into such errors. Supporters of the line of the LTF will be better able to convince other comrades of the validity of our views.

Our comrades in Portugal are for the most part very new to politics and Trotskyism. They have had tremendous practical experience in the unfolding mobilizations in Portugal,

but lack the tested and experienced leadership that can help develop a correct analysis and lay out a strategy based upon the decades of experience of our movement.

This is why our discussions and contributions can be so important. We can help clarify the issues, and delve into the fundamental roots of the differences within the Trotskyist movement. We can help explain the lessons of the Transitional Program and why they are so important in the struggles today. And we can set an example to radical youth across this country and throughout the world of how a revolutionary Marxist youth organization analyzes and participates in the struggles of the working class and its allies.

December 12, 1975

## THE LCI, THE FUR, AND POUMIST ERRORS

By Andy Hunt, San Jose local

The comrades of the Liga Comunista Internacionalista (LCI, a sympathizing organization of the Fourth International) have committed perhaps their most potentially grave error in the signing of the August 25 "Accords of Unity", and in its continued participation in the Frente de Unidade Revolucionaria.

1. The August 25 accords came out of a meeting between the Portuguese Communist Party, a section of the MFA (Movimiento das Fuerzas Armadas, the Armed Forces Movement), and a number of small groups to the left of the mass reformist workers' parties.

The programmatic platform of this grouping was:

1. The Copcon document: a document written by ultra-left officers in the military security forces.

2. The "Lines of Actions" of the Fifth Provisional Government of Vasco Goncalves: the "lines of action" of a bourgeois government!

The LCI expressed its reservations in a statement in its newspaper, stating that this was not a programmatic front, but a united front against the reaction and the return of neo-fascism. It also objected to the participation of the CP in the "united front".

However, the fact remains that the LCI, despite its reservations, signed a document forming a front which endorsed the MFA as a revolutionary instrument. This front also endorsed programmatic documents incompatible with revolutionary Marxism. The comrades gave critical support to a grouping which had an objectively Popular Frontist Programme.

The parallel of these errors with those of the POUM and the loss of the POUM to Trotskyism during the crucial period of the Spanish Republic and Civil War, may not be obvious.

The POUM (Workers' Party of Marxist Unity) was the result of the fusion of the Spanish Opposition with Joaquin Maurin's Workers' and Peasants' Bloc. Andres Nin, the leader of the Spanish Trotskyists, tended to subordinate the revolutionary Marxist programme of the Left Communists to that of Maurin, and later to that of the Anarchists, in order to gain temporary tactical and numerical advantages, and to avoid conflict with them. Nin also often and for the same reasons, avoided taking steps which would throw the Trotskyists into common mass organizations with the Socialist and Anarchist youth and workers, where they could win many to a correct programme. Eventually, Nin gave "critical" support to the class-collaborationist Popular Front election slate, and later, during the Civil War, the POUM joined the government of betrayal.

Because of the POUM's eventual programmatic capitulations to the anarcho-sindicalists and Stalinists (who made up the Popular Front in Spain) there was no revolutionary party to counterpose a revolutionary programme to that of

the reformists and anarchists and win the masses. Because of that lack of revolutionary leadership for the Spanish proletariat and its allies (Catalans, Basques, peasants), the revolution in Spain was defeated, and crushed by the fascist armies of Franco.

The signing of the August 25 accords of unity reflect a misunderstanding of what a Popular Front is. The August 25 accords do not present a revolutionary Marxist programme. They instead mislead the masses, projecting the strengthening of the Bonapartist MFA and its bogus "organs of people's power." The FUR's demonstrations, ultraleft in character, complete with fist waving, "revolutionary theatre" and tiny soldiers' contingents, have nevertheless continually changed "MFA - People's Power," endorsing the MFA and its pseudo-Soviets. Our comrades of the LCI did not intervene in the SP's demonstrations in favor of its democratic rights, where they could present a revolutionary programme to the SP workers and youth -- just as the POUM abstained from such interventions. Instead, because of their POUMIST capitulations to the ultraleft (since there are no anarchists to capitulate to) they found themselves manning barricades against the SP's demonstration of 70,000 in Oporto. "The People's Power" never showed up at those barricades. The demonstration met no resistance. Our Comrades, already denying the SP's freedom of press, now joined a counterdemonstration which attempted to deny the SP's right to assemble! Why? Another capitulation to the ultraleft position on "bourgeois democracy" and democratic rights. Another programmatic cave-in. Another POUMist error.

The August 25 grouping was so blatantly a POUMist combination that even Cde. Mandel was forced to vaguely disassociate with it. But this grouping was the logical pay-off of the IMT's (and LCI's) continual maneuvering with the "new mass vanguard" -- the ultralefts, Maoists, and Stalinists. The LCI having capitulated to the ultraleft on the Republica affair, the Constituent Assembly, the SP's "spearhead of reaction" nature, and even partially to their analysis of the MFA (the LCI now says it is a petty bourgeois formation -- not an instrument of the bourgeois army), finally made a programmatic concession by signing the August 25 accords, which hail the MFA as revolutionary. The LCI remains in the FUR, builds its demonstrations, mouths its inane, ultraleft demands, and rejects the call of their fellow Trotskyists in the PRT to join in building a revolutionary workers party. Perhaps the ultralefts are more correct than comrades adhering to the Fourth International, (although the PRT has not always been a shining example of revolutionary Marxism, nor does it join Popular Fronts). Will this course lead to POUMist "critical" support of the MFA? The LCI must join with their comrades in the PRT

and leave this popular front formation before it is too late! Failure to do so would mean disaster for the Portuguese proletariat and its allies, including the agricultural workers and small farmers (whom our comrades seem to have written off as inherently reactionary, yet another concession to the

fist-pumpers). These programmatic concessions are the same sort of concessions that the POUM made to the anarcho-syndicalists, and later to the Popular Front. The LCI comrades should learn from, not repeat, this experience.

December 12, 1975



## THE CARNEGIE COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE YOUTH RADICALIZATION

By David Cahalane, Boston local

The well worn phrase -- 'capitalism is anarchistic' -- is a half truth. The crisis that confronts youth today is not only the result of rampant capitalist economic and social forces. It is also deliberate, painstakingly thought out by policy makers in government, education and business.

The question is: who creates the plans implemented by the two capitalist political parties? In this period, which is an historical juncture for American capitalism, the ruling class would hardly trust incompetents (no matter how well intentioned) like Gerry Ford. The importance of choosing the best weapons for use against the American working class requires the best technical, political and financial "advisors." These advisors are culled from those who work with capitalist ideology and government daily. Their mysterious societies are known to us as "Think-Tanks." The Pentagon is the most famous employer of "Think-Tanks" -- yet government, industry and educational institutions are no less dependent on them.

A connecting theme in the draft political resolution is the developing friction between the American people and the ruling class over cutbacks in education, jobs, equal opportunity, etc. Among youth, the YSA has outlined the best strategy for a successful struggle against these attacks.

The strength of the YSA's strategy depends on our correct assessment of -- what the cutbacks are, how far the ruling class expects to extend them, and how they are being implemented today. Lacking this, we would run a great danger of miseducating thousands of students about what is happening, what may happen and how. Without this background YSA members would be left open to confusion, tactical errors and even political demoralization.

The draft political resolution is an excellent example of how we should approach this problem, to avoid mistakes. It includes a concise summary of the basic trends in American education, the general plans of the ruling class for its future and a few illustrations. In particular, it uses concrete statistics from the ruling class's own studies. One of the central studies of this kind, mentioned in the resolution, is the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

It was impossible for the draft political resolution to detail the recommendations made by the Carnegie Commission, which covered nearly every related topic in higher education. Draft resolutions, of course, are not intended to be substitutes for a fuller understanding of political life. It is left to each comrade to familiarize herself/himself with the content of important policy statements by the ruling class. The Pentagon Papers, Watergate tapes, Cointelpro documents are among the best examples of these. The Carnegie Commission's reports on higher education are some of the most vital for comrades to understand. Collectively, they are the blueprint for current and future

cutbacks in education as they affect enrollment, tuition, affirmative action, student rights and employment, university services, health care, etc.

In this contribution I will try to answer (in part) the following questions: (1) What is the Carnegie Commission?; (2) What are its recommendations regarding future college enrollment, funding and student dissent?; (3) How are these recommendations being implemented today on a national scale?; (4) How do these questions relate to the youth radicalization and the YSA?

### What is the Carnegie Commission?

The Carnegie Commission was established in 1967 by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Its stated purpose is to study, and make recommendations concerning, the future of higher education until the year 2000.

The Commission is certainly one of the most prestigious and authoritative "Think Tanks." Since 1967 its investigations, which continue today, have become the most comprehensive public study of its kind. The Commission has produced nearly fifty volumes of reports (each from 200 to 600 pages), dozens of additional papers and an uncounted number of spinoff studies and ongoing research projects. The Commission works closely on projects with the Ford Foundation, Commonwealth Fund, Office of Education, American Council of Education, and others. Its reports absorb the findings of every other important post World War II commission on education and civil disobedience.

The Commission's membership is indicative of its authority as a mouthpiece for ruling class interests in education. A highly dedicated group, it includes a sampling of leaders in education, government, law and business.

From education: the Commission includes the heads of the following institutions -- Clare College (England); Center for Higher Education (U. of Michigan); U. of No. Carolina; U. of Notre Dame; Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton; Bryn Mawr College; International Council for Educational Development; and others. From business: the chairman of the Board of National Machinery Co.; the Chairman of the Exec. Committee of Marine Midland Banks, Inc.; the President of the Andrew Mellon Foundation; and the Chairman of the National Liberty Corp. From law and government there is a partner of Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver and Kampeman; and a former governor. These individuals were not chosen simply for their titles, but for their known "expertise" in higher education. Each has a history of involvement with other studies, commissions and investigations concerning some aspect of higher education. Besides the core Commission members, there are also scores of technical assistants, government sources and business friends.

In the final analysis, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education is the most intensive ongoing research and policy making group of its kind. It is the central authority for theoreticians of cutbacks. It is the working committee of policy writers for the ruling class. Its reports are funneled directly to the federal and state governments for their study and implementation (where feasible). It is the most public and outspoken commission of its kind. It issues implied warnings and directives to everyone who administers the capitalist system of higher education.

#### The Commission's recommendations

The draft political resolution outlined the tremendous growth experienced by higher education in American history, especially after World War II. American capitalism, however, is no longer willing to offer any prospects for permanent, unlimited growth of education. They are deeply disturbed by studies, like Yankelovich's, which show that most young people expect an education as their right, regardless of whether they can afford it. The expectations of a growing proportion of all Americans are outstripping the limited amount of education offered by the ruling class.

The Carnegie Commission believes that American higher education has reached an historic turning point. They mince no words in telling youth what to expect:

"Higher education has been a growth segment of American society since 1636. IT IS NO LONGER. This new stage of development comes as a great shock, a great change of life, and creates many new problems. It marks a first descent into a strange world where future prospects are no longer thought to be limitless."

Their recommendations are not intended as a final solution to this crisis. Instead, they are meant only to cushion the impact. I wish to explain only three, of their more general, categories of recommendations: a) Enrollment; b) Funding and tuition; and c) Student dissent.

#### (a) Enrollment

The Commission's goal is to alter the nation's pattern of college enrollment. They want to encourage students to attend one and two year colleges, instead of comprehensive four year universities. The purpose is to shorten the time required to receive a paper degree, so that young people can enter the job market sooner.

Their explanation contains some long range social engineering. The future of American capitalism, they admit, will always be uncertain. In periods of "economic dislocation" millions will lose their jobs. The Commission tells us that we can expect to be unemployed periodically throughout our lives. But millions will discover that their jobs no longer exist after each "slump." This will force nearly all of us to change our occupation several times. When this is coupled with the increasing demand for technical and vocational education, a pretty problem develops under capitalism. How can one change occupations several

times, and go to college for four years to do it? The answer, the Commission says, rests with a shorter and more specific education. Instead of attending college for four years or more, by changing enrollment and graduation norms youth can be rocketed through college in from one to two years. Obviously, this means students will graduate with fewer professional skills and less of a general education, whether they like it or not. The Commission explains this is necessitated by the rapidly changing demands of capitalism's labor market. They expose the underlying purpose capitalism has set for higher education -- a training school for obedient, available and productive (read: profitable) workers.

They suggest that by the year 1980, 40 percent of all students be enrolled in one and two year community colleges, and that by the year 2000 this be increased to at least 45 percent.

Enrollment patterns are not their only concern. The Commission urges measures to severely limit the trend of expanding enrollment of the 1960s. The table below is a comparison of total national college student enrollment if: (1) 1960's trends continued, and (2) the Commission's recommendations were followed:

| <u>Year</u> | <u>Current trends</u><br><u>(millions)</u> | <u>Commission's trends</u><br><u>(millions)</u> |
|-------------|--|---|
| 1980        | 13.5                                       | 12.5  |
| 1990        | 13.3                                       | 12.3  |
| 2000        | 17.4                                       | 16.0  |

The Commission's recommendations would drastically reduce the 1960's enrollment growth rate. This would effectively prevent from one to one and a half million qualified students from attending college (assuming that the future demand for higher education is as low as the Commission projects). The combination of these two recommendations is very significant. In appearing to favor higher education, by suggesting an expansion of community colleges, the ruling class seems to answer the demand for universal higher education. However, as the draft resolution points out, "Far from being the promised gateway to a degree, two year schools are most often a roadway out of higher education," because of tracking into vocational, rather than degree, programs. While 70 percent of all community college students hope to attain a bachelor's degree when they first entered school, only 25 percent do it.

The Commission made note of a number of historical stages in the growth of American higher education, tracing the development from "elitism," to mass higher education, to universal access. They also detect a future trend -- universal attendance -- and are absolutely opposed to it. They claim that not everyone needs, or wants, to attend college. They estimate that up to 12 percent of all currently enrolled students are "reluctant attenders," who want to leave college. No one, they argue,

should go to college if their future job does not require it. This flies in the face of the fact that, according to Yankelovich's famous 1974 study "The New Morality," 70 percent of all non college youth, and 74 percent of all college students, said they wanted more education; 45 percent of all young workers feel that their educational background is the major barrier to their job advancement; and only 13 percent of all minority youth feel that they have had enough education.

What does the Commission tell parents, students and institutions to do? Very simple. They urge parents not to press "...too hard for attendance of their children in college right after High School." They tell students to "...develop vocational skills ... secure vocational guidance early ... and develop realistic job expectations. "; assess "... options carefully, including 'STOP OUTS', (meaning: leave school for a period of time), and three-year A.B. degree possibilities." Institutions, they recommend, should seek an "...extension and improvement of a series of educational channels for young persons to enter adult life and work and service and not through college attendance alone."

Some of these recommendations have been incorporated into the plans of colleges across the country. There are many examples; I will cite only a few:

\* The State University of New York announced its intention earlier this year to hold enrollment at current levels for the next five years at 20 of its campuses.

\* Michigan State U. plans to limit enrollment, decreasing it by 1,000 by next fall.

\* The U. of No. Carolina has limited enrollment at its Chapel Hill campus, has cut off new admissions at Appalachia State U.

\* The Champaign Urbana campus of the U. of Ill. has closed admissions for next spring to reduce enrollment by 1,000.

\* The Florida board of regents is considering limiting enrollments statewide next fall at all state university campuses.

\* Applicants have been turned away at the U. of Colorado's Boulder campus, at Colorado State U. and at the U. of Northern Colorado because of imposed ceilings.

The final goals of the Commission, in summary, are to:

(1) Slash normal time spent in formal education, so as to push youth into the job market sooner and facilitate their accommodation to the demands of the market.

(2) Increase the proportion of students enrolled in one and two year colleges.

(3) Severely reduce the growth rate of national enrollment in higher education.

(4) Prevent any trend towards universal attendance in college, maintenance of the division between those who can and cannot attend college.

#### (b) Funding and tuition

The Commission's recommendations on who should pay for higher education, and what spending levels should be,

are equally devastating.

They recommend a \$5.6 billion reduction in monies spent on new construction for higher education between 1970 and 1980.

Based on the growth rate during the 1960s, \$51 billion would be spent on higher education by the year 1980. In one of the Commission's earlier reports, it recommended a reduction of 20 percent to \$41.5 billion by 1980. However, in a later report, it revised this figure. It now urges a still further, more drastic, cut in total spending by institutions. In the 1960s the annual rate of increase in total spending per student was 3.4 percent. The Commission recommends instead a future growth rate of only 2.4 percent, or an approximate 30 percent reduction.

How are institutions of higher learning to hold down their spending? The Carnegie Commission outlined several possibilities:

(1) "Withdrawal of the reluctant attenders."

(2) Shorten the total time spent by each student in college.

(3) Freeze PhD. programs.

(4) Shift over to year-round operation.

(5) Intensify the general effort to reduce costs in "all categories."

The Commission recommends that tuitions be simultaneously increased, in order to shift the burden of paying for a college education on to students and/or their families. They especially wish to close the gap between tuitions at private and public institutions. Tuitions at public colleges, they suggest, should rise at a faster rate than at private ones. Currently, tuition pays for one-sixth of the costs at public colleges. If their recommendations were followed, they say, students would pay for one-third in the future, causing skyrocketing tuition. They specifically warn parents to be "...prepared to pay rising tuitions as part of their planning of future family accounts."

How have these recommendations affected Federal spending? A comparison of federal appropriations to the Office of Education in fiscal years 1975 and 1976 is revealing. The total 1976 budget will be \$2.4 billion, or only a 4 percent increase over 1975, not nearly enough to cover the costs of inflation. A number of no-growth appropriations and direct budget cutbacks are included.

The 1976 budget for the Office of Education retains current spending -- equalling reduced spending with inflation -- in monies toward:

Student Direct Loans

Student assistance in cooperative education

Programs for the disadvantaged

Payments to enrolling college veterans

Developing institutions

Land Grant colleges

Public service training

Teacher corps

College library resources

Appropriations were directly reduced in the following categories:

- Supplementary Opportunity Grants
- University Community Services (by approx. 14 percent)
- College teacher fellowships (by 75 percent)
- Fellowships for the disadvantaged (by 33 percent)
- Career opportunities and urban, rural programs (by 33 percent)

Higher education budget and academic cutbacks are a truly national phenomena and not restricted to a few news-worthy metropolitan colleges and universities. The Chronicle of Higher Education printed an article in early Sept. 1975 which reported: "Higher education's statewide governing and coordinating boards, concerned only a few years ago with orderly growth, increasingly are trying to organize an orderly retreat. Nearly half of the statewide boards are undertaking reviews that may result in the elimination or consolidation of courses or programs." Their information came straight from Robert Berdahl, senior fellow of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education.

Lyman Glenn, director of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, at the U. of California at Berkeley, conducted a survey of top officials at more than 1,200 colleges and universities last year. The results indicate a sharp increase in the number of courses and programs expected to be eliminated or consolidated, as part of planned budget restrictions and cutbacks.

His survey reported the following percentages of institutions which have experienced (or expect to) extensive eliminations and consolidations:

| <u>Courses:</u> | <u>'68-'74</u> | <u>'74-'80</u> | <u>(% change)</u> |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Undergraduate   | 5%             | 14%            | +9%               |
| Graduate        | 3%             | 7%             | +4%               |
| Professional    | 3%             | 4%             | +1%               |
| <u>Programs</u> |                |                |                   |
| Undergraduate   | 3%             | 9%             | +6%               |
| Graduate        | 3%             | 7%             | +4%               |
| Professional    | 2%             | 3%             | +1%               |

Lyman Glenn's survey is the basis for the projection, cited in the draft political resolution, that about 10 percent of all colleges and universities can expect to be defunct by the end of this decade. This is equally true for both public and private institutions. Especially hard hit will be private liberal arts colleges, 20 percent are expected to go under or consolidate. Already, between 1972 and 1975, seventy-seven private colleges have either been closed, merged or put under public control. Thirty states were involved. New York led the field with eleven casualties; Mass., Maryland and Texas followed second with five each. Of the

seventy-seven, fifty-six were closed, twelve merged and nine made public.

These cutbacks in courses and programs have been coupled with (even preceded by) escalating tuition costs. As cited in the draft political resolution, between 1968 and 1973 the cost of an education increased 34 percent at public institutions and 40 percent at private ones. In the fall semester of this year, the estimated increase in the total cost of a college education rose 12 percent. At particular universities, like the U. of Mass. in Boston, tuition will nearly double. No college is sacrosanct in this general attack. Students, who fought hard for tuition-free universities in New York are threatened with dismissals, program/course cutbacks and tuitions.

### (c) Student dissent & the youth radicalization

As I mentioned before, the Carnegie Commission has reached the conclusion that higher education is no longer a growth factor in American society.

They also recognize the contradictory character of this new development. Although capitalism now requires a more tightly controlled and streamlined system of higher education, the masses of people are convinced that educational opportunity must be greatly expanded.

An equally profound problem confronts them in education. The willingness of students to participate, even lead, struggles for social change is potentially more dangerous to this country's rulers. Students were an integral part of the movement to abolish Jim Crow; and are presently the ally of the Black community in Boston, and elsewhere, in its struggle to implement school desegregation. The student movement was the lifeblood of the antiwar movement, it was the first to appreciate the potential power of mass, independent action (which continued, despite the great pressures of liberal capitalist politicians). Students have shown their ability to reach out to others; including unions, women, Blacks and GIs; to build broader coalitions and more powerful actions, to make gains in civil rights, end a war, or defend Black rights.

The political and cultural radicalization among students has quickly spread to young workers and the rest of the population. Daniel Yankelovich's comprehensive study was the first to bring this fact to light.

The "New Values" that Yankelovich found among students, a product of politization and periods of intense activism, have since been largely adopted by young workers. This change was reflected in their new attitudes towards capitalist institutions, values and wars.

I have condensed Yankelovich's findings, and selected only a few, key topics. The following table shows the change in opinion among both college and working youth from 1969 to 1973:

|  | Non-College |     | College |     |
|--|-------------|-----|---------|-----|
|  | '69         | '73 | '69     | '73 |
| Private property sacred                          | 88%         | 74% | 76%     | 67% |
| Competition encourages excellence                | 81%         | 66% | 72%     | 62% |
| Accepts reasons given by gov't. for going to war | 56%         | 43% | 34%     | 29% |
| Accepts authority of police                      | 79%         | 60% | 48%     | 48% |
| Accepts authority of a "boss" at work            | 71%         | 57% | 49%     | 44% |

The impact of war, inflation, unemployment (worst among youth), racism and the political leadership found on the campus has produced other far reaching changes. The table below summarizes some of the opinions of both college and working youth, by 1973:

|  | Non-College | College |
|--|-------------|---------|
|  | 1973        | 1973    |
| Vietnam-type wars unavoidable  | 81%         | 80%     |
| American society democratic in name only                                   | 58%         | 63%     |
| Business too concerned with profits, not enough with "public"              | 92%         | 94%     |
| U.S. foreign policy "based on our own narrow economic and power interests" | 88%         | 88%     |
| Defense budget should be cut and used for domestic needs                   | 75%         | 81%     |
| Institutions needing fundamental reform or elimination:                    |             |         |
| *Political parties   | 64%         | 61%     |
| *Big business  | 45%         | 54%     |
| *Military  | 38%         | 54%     |
| We are rapidly losing our right to dissent                                 | 73%         | 67%     |

Yankelovich placed special importance on what he labelled American youths' "Psychology of Entitlement." A whole series of basic human and social needs are now seen by a growing proportion, and even a majority, of youth as their inalienable right and not as an earned privilege. These rights (which are incorporated into the "Bill of Rights for Working People") are shared by both college and working youth. Yankelovich found the following percentages of youth who recognized these rights:

|  | Total       | Total   |
|--|-------------|---------|
|  | Non-College | College |
| Entitled as a right                          |             |         |
| Best medical care                            | 51%         | 59%     |
| Participation in work decisions              | 52%         | 56%     |
| Send kids to college even if can't afford it | 46%         | 52%     |
| Secure retirement                            | 37%         | 37%     |
| Right to work                                | 23%         | 27%     |
| Minimum income                               | 22%         | 26%     |

Yankelovich was primarily concerned in his study with the "diffusion" of these beliefs from students to young workers. However, the impact of domestic and international crises and the youth radicalization were felt deeply by all layers of the working class. The People's Bicentennial Commission hired the well-known Hart Research Corp. to conduct a national survey earlier this year. Their findings show a profound distrust of American capitalism's economy, government and political parties.

The table below summarizes their findings among all Americans:

|   | % Yes |
|---|-------|
| <u>Business and government</u>  |       |
| The economy has already reached its peak and is declining   | 33%   |
| "Big business is the source of most of what's wrong today"  | 49%   |
| "Profits major goal of business even if it means unemployment and inflation"                                    | 72%   |
| "There is a conspiracy among big corps. to set prices as high as possible"                                      | 61%   |
| <u>Alternatives and solutions</u>   |       |
| Dem. and Rep. parties favor big business  | 57%   |
| "America's major corps. tend to dominate and determine the actions of our public officials in Washington"       | 58%   |
| "More good than harm to institute public ownership of oil and other natural resources"                          | 44%   |
| If given choice, prefer to work in company owned and controlled by employees                                    | 66%   |
| "More good than harm to develop a new political movement to challenge the influence of big business"            | 49%   |
| Willing to support a Presidential candidate in 1976 who favors employee ownership and control of U.S. companies | 56%   |

Many apologists and defenders of bourgeois society have decried the YSA's stubborn belief that college campuses are an important part of social life and radical change. We replied as Karl Marx once did in the Communist Manifesto in 1847:

"And your education? Is not that also social, and determined by the social conditions under which you educate, by the intervention direct or indirect, of society, by means of schools, etc.? The Communists have not invented the intervention of society in education; they do but seek to alter the character of that intervention, and to rescue education from the influence of the ruling class."

The bonds between college and working youth and the working class as a whole have been strengthened since

World War II. As the draft political resolution explains, the college population has undergone a change in its composition. America's college student population has jumped by over 600 percent. Today, students are not in their majority the sons and daughters of economically independent petty-bourgeois and bourgeois families. They are predominantly from working class or lower middle class families, who are heading for the chaotic jungle of the job market after graduation. The political resolution notes that only 2.5 percent of the 1970-71 college graduates became managers or administrators of any kind, the majority enter the 'real' world of punchclocks and hourly wage rates.

The "diffusion" of "new values" has been a catalyst for the development of some new ways of political thinking in the working class. The youth radicalization provided a focus for the discontent caused by political scandals such as Watergate, the phony price freezes, the revelations about illegal FBI programs domestically and CIA intrigues abroad, the war in Southeast Asia and the staggering impact of the current economic depression.

The Carnegie Commission is well aware of both the youth radicalization and its effects upon American society.

The Commission places student dissent in an historical perspective relative to social change:

"The U.S., in the last decade, has been in greater turmoil than at any time since the period of the civil war a century ago. The campuses have, in recent years, been in the greatest turmoil in all their history of over three centuries. New directions are required and are being chosen both by the nation and by the campus. The campus has an essential role to play in this period of historical transition."

The Commission notes that public confidence in educational institutions has dropped significantly in the last period. From 1966 to 1971, the American public's confidence in education has fallen by 39 percent. This, says the Commission, has produced certain problems:

"A lack of confidence now exists in what is being done, in conception of what should be done, in the processes for making changes. This lack of confidence weakens administrative leadership on campus. A traumatic loss of sense of assured progress, of the inevitability of a better future, has occurred."

Student dissent is a chief concern among the problems considered by the Commission. These, in turn, are directly related to general social problems:

"Dissatisfaction and disaffection on our college and university campuses reflect many current problems in American society."

These "current problems" are: racism, war, poverty, sexism, ecology and democracy. Student dissent, they add, is also a reflection of conflicts over campus governance and academic content and programs. The Commission makes the prediction, a safe one, that campus dissent will continue "for some time." In fact, "...a base now exists for more political dissent on campus than has ever before

been the situation in the U.S."

The Carnegie Commission drew its lessons from the scope of student protest during the antiwar movement. Of the 2,500 campuses in the country, at the time, about 50 percent, or 1,250, were the scenes of organized protest.

"For the first time in history, students, on a major scale, tried to assert their own 'power' over the inner sanctum of academic and administrative affairs and to use the campus as a base for political action against elements of the surrounding society. The most massive confrontation by far ever to take place occurred in May 1970. A central theme of the leaders was reconstitution of the university and of society."

The Commission's first aim is to re-establish the power of the institution over the student body. The "...major functions of public college or university are teaching/learning, scholarship/research, and appropriate public service, as determined ultimately by the board of trustees." These different functions, they submit, cannot be seriously interfered with without threatening the institution itself.

The Commission claims that the Board of Trustees must be able to give the college president "...all the authority necessary to carry out the duties for which he is held accountable." These powers include: the direction of plans for the college's future goals, programs and enrollment, as well as "...the development of... (the) policy making structure...the financial budget and the allocation and supervision of all appropriated and other funds that finance any activities under the jurisdiction of the college."

The Commission claims that students are not entitled to any real control of the policy decisions. "Higher education is not a government. It is more a service that people can choose to obtain under certain conditions, and they can also choose to forgo it (sic). Thus, students have no inherent right to participate in governance on the grounds that no one should be governed compulsively without being given a chance to join in the selection of those who will do the governing. There is no issue of the consent of the governed."

### Recommendations

The Commission makes a series of recommendations to all levels of higher education. First, it outlines some concessions which should be implemented. To defuse dissent on the issue of governance, they urge more involvement of students in an advisory status. The emergence of the "student" trustee is one example of this tactic. The Commission also issued a proposed "Bill of Rights and Responsibilities," which is supposed to safeguard the rights of free speech and dissent, while protecting the "rights of the institution."

In light of the experience of student takeovers and strikes, they claim students have no right to interfere with "...normal academic and administrative activities," and they would prohibit the "unauthorized" use of university property or any interruption of the "administrative process."

In order to regulate the element of 'outside agitators,' they suggest that anyone on campus should be subject to a requirement to "identify themselves by name, address and state what connection, if any, they have with the campus." In general, they claim the university has the right to "...set reasonable standards of conduct in order to safeguard the educational process."

The Commission recommends that students have the right to use rooms "provided" by the administration, "...under the rules of the campus," but includes a prohibition of their use for "...meetings of political clubs...(or) use of its rooms on a regular or prolonged basis by individual members or groups of members as free headquarters for political campaigns; and to prohibit use of...(the college's) finances, and its office equipment and supplies for any political purpose at any time."

The Commission notes that "organized protest has become a frequent form of dissent on many campuses." In order to assure the orderly continuation of "education," they recommend "... rules be formulated which regulate the Time, Place, and Manner of peaceful assemblies...(and) the president must have the full power to deal with crisis situations..." When students strike, or, when campus employees (faculty and workers) strike, the Commission claims the administration must have the absolute right to "...deny pay and academic credit..." In their report entitled "Dissent and Disruption," the Commission considers many variations in students and faculty protest. They suggest that campus administrations develop "contingency plans," complete with maps of strategic locations, such as "communications" and key administrative offices. They recommend that detailed plans be drawn up with local and state police, to react quickly and avoid 'mistakes' like Kent State. They recommend a number of tactics for campus presidents to use against campus protest, including: negotiations, injunctions, disciplinary action (including legal action), and even closing the campus when "normal" activity is impossible, i.e., strike.

### Conclusions

The Carnegie Commission attempts to palm off its recommendations as the 'democratic answer' to student dissent. From a casual reading of their volume entitled "Dissent and Disruption," their main concerns appear to be: the protection of free speech, peaceful assembly and the right to dissent. They are neither so innocent or naive as they seem to be, however.

They readily admit that student protest against campus governance and broader social issues will continue, regardless of what is recommended or implemented. They want to dispel any illusions campus administrations may have that students have returned to quiescence following the antiwar movement. They submit that now is the time for consolidation on the part of educational institutions, to try to regain their footing and ability to conduct "business as usual" as far as possible. Towards this, they step back and assess

the position of college presidents and trustees relative to what can be done to defuse, forestall or control future student dissent. For this reason they counsel administrations to drop the iron glove approach, reject flagrant "repression," i.e., "excessive" or "premature" use of police, banning speakers and censorship of campus media.

This tactic sports a gilded sword against students. On the one hand, they recommend a limited amount of student involvement in campus government. At the same time, no student governance structure is supposed to assume veto power, let alone control, of policy decisions made by the president or trustees. The guidelines contained in the "Bill of Rights and Responsibilities" are the hallmark of this approach. It rests on twin pillars -- the authority of the institution and the exclusion of students from real control. Built on these foundations are the rules that violate the rights of students to peacefully assemble or organize ongoing campaigns. The Commission's rounded program is aimed at channeling student activism into impotent channels, while appearing to uphold their right to dissent. Their entire plan is spurred by an unholy fear that the unprecedented degree and militancy of student protest in the antiwar movement may re-appear, on an even larger scale and armed with the definite aim of asserting, and winning, the right of students to control their academic lives and to secure their right to an education.

### Youth and the YSA

Emerging from the mounting conflict over our right to an education is a new beginning of student activism on many campuses. Potentially, as the Carnegie Commission points out, this new stage of the youth radicalization could outstrip past experience.

The Carnegie Commission takes refuge and obvious comfort in the belief that students will opt for orderly change within the structure of educational institutions and society. Yet, they remain unsettled by a nagging fear that students may have some surprises in store for them.

The YSA has for a long time recognized that the radicalization of youth (especially on the campuses) is more profound today. We have even called the campuses "political tinderboxes," from time to time. The "new values" adopted during the 1960s and early 1970s among college youth have found acceptance in broader social layers. This has prepared students for a new and somewhat different period of activism, and another advance in political awareness. We can already see (as does the ruling class) some of the issues which will dominate campus political life in the coming years. Cutbacks and tuition hikes will of course predominate periodically, but students will also be once again propelled into social movements involving others as well.

The ruling class has divined the primary elements of student dissent. In fact, they have applied quite a bit of time to it, especially its long-range possibilities.

In its analysis of student politics and dissent, the ruling

class discerns several closely related reasons for its continued growth. The Carnegie Commission admits to one profound contradiction in American society after another. In the most general sense, there is the contradiction between the supply and demand of education, the "...expansion of expectations when higher education is approaching a 'stationary state'." They forewarn the American people that capitalism has decided to pull in the reins on education. Yet, as Yankelovich said, the majority of youth desire more education as their right, regardless of their ability to pay. He also found the mechanism whereby youth will be greatly disillusioned. He reported that a majority of youth believe they can control their personal futures (i.e., job, happiness, etc.), and also have a clear idea of what they want to do with it. Moreover, 81 percent of college, and 75 percent of working youth feel they have adequate opportunities to attain their life's goals. In other words, most youth know what they want, feel they can achieve it and will. Is it any wonder, that when they find out their need for education is stunted or denied, and when they are shunted into the ranks of the underemployed and unemployed, these millions of youth will be angry?

Women and minority students will bear the brunt of the ruling class's assault on the right to an education and a job after graduation. The Carnegie Commission's recommendations about women and minority enrollment alone would bring about a clash. In 1970 the labor force in America was 38 percent female and 15 percent minority. At the same time, total enrollment in higher education was 22.5 percent women and 5.3 percent minority. The Commission recommends that this 1970 disparity be used as a guideline, and maintained until the year 2000. Such a policy would effectively prevent millions of women and minority students from attaining better jobs after graduating from high school. The Commission also explained that while education is approaching a stationary state, "...women and members of minority groups have greatly increased their hopes for faculty positions at a time when the rate of new hires is declining rapidly." This is happening in the context of a general, long term crisis in employment. The Commission admits that, despite short fluctuations, "...the supply of college graduates (will) more than meet the demands for them in jobs customarily held by college graduates."

Youth unable to attend college face growing unemployment and a bleak future. However, as Yankelovich found, these same youth have similar expectations from life and society as college students. Yankelovich concluded, "...the difference between the personal rewards and satisfactions found at work by college educated young people and blue collar workers points to one of the major disparities in our society.... The young blue collar worker often brings to the job many of the same desires for rewarding work that demands the use of his (sic) brains, full resources and creativity. In many instances, however, unlike the young executive or professional, he finds a job that is 'just a job -- a

way to kill time and make a living." The fact that working youth, "...assume that their employers cannot -- or will not -- provide ... interesting work..."; "...are inclined to take 'less crap' than older workers..."; "...are not as automatically loyal to the organization as their fathers..."; and "...far more cognizant of their own needs and rights," is recognized as a growing problem by the ruling class. The threat that these developments pose assumes two forms. First, "...being less fearful of 'discipline' and the threat of losing their jobs, they feel free to express their discontent in myriad ways, from fooling around on the job to sabotage." This type of rebellion, however, would be unlikely to lead to any serious challenge to capitalist order, let alone rule. A more serious threat lies behind Yankelovich's statement that "...they want more freedom and opportunity and will struggle hard to achieve it." The ruling class clearly understands this 'struggle' in terms of more than individual young workers trying to protect their individual futures. From reliable researchers like Yankelovich, they know that this 'struggling' is a general phenomenon which unites groups of young workers around particular issues, and is of vital importance. Yankelovich noted "...that the majority of non-college youth face the prospect of growing difficulties with their jobs (and this) must be regarded as a matter of serious concern to society. These young people, after all, represent the great bulk of the new labor force. The problem they face is compounded by the multiplier effect of higher expectations with lower opportunities: their New Values inevitably clash with the built in and limited responses of the traditional work place." These young workers potentially pose a deep problem to the ruling class, as a class. The idea of working youth fighting for their recently adopted "new values" is a growing worry to capitalism. America's rulers are fearful of its implications for the future. As Yankelovich put it, "One can only begin to speculate what this new, intense expression of social rights among young people will mean in the way of social change in the future."

We are confident in the future course of the youth radicalization among students and working youth. Yankelovich explained quite well the important factors in its future this way:

"If America's work, education, and political institutions prove to be flexible and responsive, we can look forward to a period of social stability, moderation in politics, and perhaps even a resurgence of traditional American optimism about the future. If, however, these institutions prove rigid and unresponsive and our political leadership shows insensitivity to the changing needs and values of our youth, then the underlying potential for discontent will become all too real and we will face a period of instability..."

While Yankelovich, the Carnegie Commission and others believe that capitalism can meet the requirements necessary to avoid exposing "...the underlying potential for discontent...", we do not.

We say the scope of future campus struggles will some-



day surpass past experience for two reasons. First, because the desires and demands of students, which stem from their needs as students (i.e., the right to an education and control over it), cannot be met under capitalism. Moreover, in the immediate period ahead, the ruling class cannot even offer adequate concessions or partial reforms. The cutbacks and tuition hikes are the signs which show that this road to social peace for America's rulers is blocked. The Commission's recommendations, as I've tried to show, are in reality attacks which threaten to eliminate past gains won by students and prevent the realization of a whole series of other social rights (the "new values"). Using Yankelovich's standards, this would certainly mean that capitalism's institutions are, in fact, "rigid and unresponsive."

The second reason for our confidence in the potential power of the youth radicalization stems from the place students and college campuses occupy relative to society and national and international social issues. The Carnegie Commission is acutely aware of this relationship, and points to it as the main propellant of the rise in student activism and politicization in the last decade. The issues of racism, sexism, imperialist wars, economic depressions, political scandals and all the other intractable diseases of capitalism will provide a rich fuel for student concern and activism in the future. In the broader sense, these constitute the most powerful cause for our confidence. American capitalism is even less capable of offering partial concessions or reforms on these issues than on the campuses.

Students will be directly affected by the increase in discontent and protest of other social layers. The draft political resolution explains it this way:

"Our prediction of growing activity in the youth radicalization... (is based on)... the renewed combativeness of the Black movement, the struggles of working people, the fight for women's equality, and revolutionary developments abroad...."

These developments will sustain student militancy, as in the past, and will create an opportunity for students to combine their struggles with those of young workers, women, Blacks, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, etc.

The 1960s and early '70s were an acid test for revolutionists. Different assessments of the ruling class's strategy about the war, i.e., ultraleft and class collaborationist, were offered. Different proposals were made to youth for a strategy to end the war, i.e., support trashing, capitalist politicians.

The YSA has been the only revolutionary youth organization in the United States to have correctly followed the

course of the youth radicalization. As a result of our correct analysis of both the ruling class's aims and the strategy needed to combat them, we were propelled into the leadership of the student movement, politically and as an organization.

Today, we are an organization of leaders in the anti-racist struggle, in the effort to pass the ERA, in the growing movement to reverse the cutbacks in all levels of education, and in other issues from the defense of Joanne Little and Hurricane Carter to the prevention of another imperialist war abroad by America's rulers.

The 1970s pose similar tasks for the YSA on campuses as the 1960s did. The quality of political leadership on the campuses depends upon our continued emphasis on a correct assessment of the real plans of America's rulers for higher education. Obviously, there is the empirical method, which would encompass only immediate plans for cutbacks. This is a tempting approach, and one followed religiously by our opponents. But, it would provide no protection against surprises and certainly allows little long range preparation or anticipation, which have been the keynotes of the YSA's success in the past.

Each comrade, as well as the YSA as a whole, must avoid these pitfalls, which are caused by a sloppy or inaccurate knowledge of the ruling class's specific plans and general strategy for their implementation.

The purpose of the draft political resolution is to analyze the fundamental elements of these plans, particularly as they apply to youth, and explain what a winning strategy for youth will be. For students, the resolution provides many answers to the questions of what the cutbacks are, how far the ruling class expects to extend them and how they are being implemented today. In this way the resolution seeks to avoid the problems I mentioned at the beginning, miseducation, confusion, tactical errors and political demoralization.

Yet, this is not meant to be a substitute for the effort of every comrade to become familiar with the sources the resolution cites, like the Carnegie Commission.

The YSA's political integrity is one of the most important and fundamental differences between ourselves and other groups on the left. In the final analysis, our leadership is effective only in so far as students can believe our political judgements and integrity. This belief is possible only when we can prove that we know what the hell we are talking about.

December 10, 1975