

# **PARTY BUILDER**

---

## SWP Organizational Discussion Bulletin

Vol. VII No. 3

July 1972

Contents	Page
<b>1972 ELECTION CAMPAIGN REPORT TO SWP NATIONAL COMMITTEE PLENUM</b> , by Larry Seigle, Approved May 13, 1972	2
<b>APPENDIX</b>	8
<b>IDEAS ON PARTY ELECTION PROPAGANDA</b> , by Doug Jenness	14

20 cents

Published by

**SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY**

14 Charles Lane, New York, N.Y. 10014

1972 ELECTION CAMPAIGN REPORT TO SWP  
NATIONAL COMMITTEE PLENUM

by Larry Seigle  
Approved May 13, 1972

The purpose of this report is to review the accomplishments of our 1972 campaign to date; to compare and contrast these accomplishments with our previous campaigns; and to project our thinking on the direction and tasks of the election campaign between now and November.

We are now somewhat more than halfway through the campaign. This is a good time to assess what we've done, so that we can make whatever adjustments and modifications are necessary to get the most we possibly can out of the time remaining to us before the elections.

There is no doubt that the 1972 campaign is the biggest and the most effective national campaign in the history of our party. Whether the theme we have been utilizing of calling it "the biggest socialist campaign since Debs" turns out to be historically precise, as well as being a useful way of stating the spirit and objectives of the campaign, we can let the historians of radical politics decide.

The SWP 1972 campaign (when I refer to the "campaign" I mean both the national Jenness-Pulley campaign and the local campaigns) has been built on the foundation of the extensive experience of the entire party in electoral campaigns, especially over the past four years. This electoral campaign is a continuation of the approach that was begun with the Halstead-Boutelle campaign in 1968, and it has drawn on the wealth of political and practical knowledge acquired in the 1968 campaign and in the state and local races that followed it in 1969, '70 and '71.

Just as members of the SWP and the YSA over the past seven years have become experts at organizing and building the antiwar movement, so we are showing that we can run professional election campaigns. And just as a large section of our membership has become experienced and skilled antiwar organizers and leaders, we are acquiring a large corps of experienced and skilled candidates, campaign organizers and campaign workers. This knowledge and experience is one of the most important acquisitions of the current campaign and of those that led up to it.

However, while the 1972 campaign is based on what we have done previously, it is not simply a bigger version of the 1968 campaign. It is a qualitatively different campaign than any we have run in the past. It is as much different from the 1968 campaign as the 1968 campaign was from the 1964 SWP campaign.

To give some ideas of the scope of the expansion, I want to report a few of the figures on our performance so far, and contrast them to the figures we have from 1968.

As of the first week in May, we had almost 10,000 endorsers, from all 50 states including Hawaii and Alaska. In 1968, at the end of the campaign we had collected 3,008 endorsers.

By the first week in May, the 1972 campaign had been

reported by 36 different wire stories, some regional and some national. Of these, 19 were AP; 12 by UPI; 3 by the *New York Times* news service; 1 by the *Chicago Daily News* service; and 1 by the *Los Angeles Times-Washington Post* service. In addition we have had two stories in the *Christian Science Monitor*, a national newspaper.

As of May 1, our press clipping service had provided us with 410 news clippings, and we know this is far from complete. These clippings came from 140 papers with a combined circulation of 25 million. These figures do not include the campus or underground press coverage, which has been very extensive and usually quite sympathetic.

At this point in the campaign, Jenness and Pulley have spoken to more than 425 meetings, and the YSJP coordinators have spoken to 175 meetings, for a total of over 600 national campaign meetings around the country. This contrasts with 324 meetings for the entire Halstead-Boutelle campaign.

The financial side of the campaign is one of the best indicators of the gains we have made. When the election campaign was launched, our goal was to make the campaign as nearly self-financing as possible. Our objective has been to minimize the drain on other party financial resources. It seemed realistic to expect that we could translate the expanded political support we anticipated into financial contributions. In addition, we hoped we could raise a substantial sum of money through honoraria, sale of materials, etc.

After an initial loan of \$25,000 received last summer, and an additional \$4,000 received towards the end of 1971, our entire budget, now running at more than \$11,000 per month, has been raised through the campaign itself. We now anticipate that the national campaign committee will spend close to \$200,000 in the course of the campaign, and our goal is to raise as much of that as we possibly can without resorting to loans. I should add that these figures don't contain any large outstanding bills.

One of the most significant figures is the fact that 362 individuals have become contributors to the national campaign, *not including* money given or pledged at rallies. These people, primarily from outside of our party, have contributed more than \$25,000.

The amount of literature produced is another area of contrast with the Halstead-Boutelle campaign. In 1968 we produced and distributed 1.1 million brochures, stickers, buttons and other materials. So far in 1972 we have printed twice that much, over 2 million pieces, the great bulk of which have already been distributed. To give you an idea of the scale of the campaign operation, within one week after the platforms were printed, we had shipped out nearly 130,000 copies to branches and YSJP groups.

One very instructive fact is that to date we have already

collected more signatures on nominating petitions than we did during the entire 1968 campaign. In 1968 we obtained a total of 117,000 signatures. By the end of the first week in May we have already collected 122,000 signatures in 10 states—not counting Texas, Massachusetts, Illinois, or Washington, D. C. And this has been done with far less time and expense to our movement than was the case previously.

Our current projections will have us on the ballot in between 30 and 33 states, as contrasted to 19 states in 1968. For the first time ever, we will be on the ballot in the *majority* of states, and this is a qualitative change from the past.

Our approach to petitioning in 1972 is the result of a process that has been developing over the past few years. It was in 1970, when we made the decision to try to get 45,000 signatures in Illinois—and succeeded—that we first began to seriously discuss the possibility of tackling some of the major states with requirements that we previously judged to be prohibitive. We had a very successful drive in Florida with 51,000, and we are now getting organized to collect at least 90,000 signatures in Massachusetts. This Massachusetts petition campaign, by far the largest the SWP has ever undertaken, will be equal to 75% of the total petitioning we did in 1968.

One of the most significant expansions of our electoral activity has been in the number and the seriousness of our local campaigns. We now have almost 100 local candidates. These candidates add another dimension to our national campaign. In addition to being fighters around issues that directly affect their districts, and intervening with our program into the vital political disputes and concerns of this period, these candidates function as local and regional representatives of, and spokespeople for Jenness and Pulley.

There can be no question about the fact that the political impact of this election campaign has been far greater than any previous SWP campaign. This can be seen in a number of ways.

The various exchanges between us and the bourgeois candidates (the McCloskey debate, the exchange of letters and ongoing confrontations with McGovern, and a number of local confrontations) show that the bourgeois candidates are more and more being forced to recognize us, although they would prefer to ignore us and to act as if we do not exist as a factor in the elections. We don't want to exaggerate the importance of these developments—they are still the exception rather than the rule—but they do illustrate a new stage in our capacity to have an effect through the election campaign on political events and processes.

More than in any previous campaign, our candidates are accepted as serious candidates, and our campaign is viewed as a legitimate campaign. This is true because of the size and scope of the campaign, which can not be easily dismissed; because of the effectiveness and attractiveness of our candidates; because of the growing recognition by the bourgeois press of the role of our party in such areas as the antiwar movement; and because of the increased responsiveness to our campaign, particularly among young activists.

This legitimacy of our campaign is reflected in the way that our candidates are treated by the press, and by the way they are viewed within the radical movement generally. To a very great extent Jenness and Pulley are ac-

cepted as authentic representatives of a significant current within the radicalization.

Another indication of the success of the campaign so far is the fact that the recognition of the names of our candidates and of our party and a general conception of what we stand for—however hazy such a conception might be—are qualitatively more widespread than in any previous campaign. This is especially true, of course, on the campuses and within the antiwar and women's liberation movements, where the average activist has either heard our candidates speak, received a piece of campaign literature, or read in a newspaper about our campaign. Jenness and Pulley both spoke at antiwar rallies on April 24 and November 6, 1971, and on April 22 this year. In addition, Linda Jenness spoke on November 20 at the WONAAC demonstration. In addition, Jenness and Pulley have both appeared at numerous local rallies and marches, as have many of our local candidates.

And this phenomenon of widespread recognition is increasing. It can be seen from the response to the speeches of Jenness and Pulley at recent demonstrations, when a number of demonstrators, most of whom are not in any contact with us directly, identified with the candidates, and greeted them as *their own* candidates. These activists, to one degree or another, identify themselves through the election campaign with the SWP.

This is one of the lessons of the "Choice 72" student preference polls. We generally received qualitatively more votes than the CP or the People's Party, indicating that these votes were clearly not simply casual protest or radical votes, but conscious votes for the Jenness-Pulley campaign and for the SWP.

Of course, it is necessary to be sure that our campaign supporters don't draw the wrong conclusions from these polls with regard to the vote we expect in November. There is one thing that the bourgeois pollsters say that is applicable to these campus polls, and that is that voting in a preference poll is a little like gambling with paper money: you know the results aren't binding, so you are more likely to do things that you wouldn't do in the actual elections. A good percentage of our votes in these polls comes from young people who have not completely shed their illusions in bourgeois politics, and some of them will undoubtedly be susceptible to the pressures of "lesser-evilism" in November.

It is also true that the campuses are not an accurate reflection of the general voting population. Even many of the radicals who vote for us on campus won't vote at all in November. For these reasons it would be very foolish of us to start thinking that our November vote is going to accurately reflect the kind of support we've gotten on campuses. We don't want to start talking about, or have our campaign supporters start looking forward to, our vote in November as an accurate measure of our support.

### *Our Opponents in the Election Campaign*

It is important for us to pay close attention to the developments in the 1972 election campaign as a whole, and to understand the politics of the campaigns of the bourgeois candidates and the electoral strategy of our opponents in the working-class tendencies. This is important, on a national scale as well as on a local scale, if we want to avoid running merely an abstract cam-

paign, one that doesn't relate directly and in an interventionist way to the major events, discussions and issues in the election campaign.

The 1972 race has developed in some ways along lines parallel to the '68 campaign. The McGovern campaign has been an attempt by a section of the ruling class to put up a liberal front, to hold out the promise of "re-ordering priorities" and, most importantly, liquidating the Vietnam war. The purpose of this has been to try to contain the radicalization within the confines of capitalist politics and to maintain and restore faith in the capacity of the two-party system among those sectors of society who are radicalizing and becoming increasingly disenchanted with the politicians and programs of the Democratic and the Republican parties.

This has been the key element in the McGovern campaign, and we can see clearly that this has been to a very great extent meeting with success. There is overwhelming support for McGovern among activists in the antiwar movement, among women's liberationists, campus activists, etc.

Unlike the 1968 McCarthy campaign, however, the McGovern campaign has achieved credibility. Few McCarthy supporters ever really believed he had a chance to get the nomination. Now McGovern supporters not only believe their candidate *can* get the nomination, many think he is virtually unstoppable. Primarily, this credibility adds to the attractiveness of McGovern's campaign. It also raises some big problems for the McGovern campaign that I will return to in a minute.

McGovern is much more vulnerable to criticism from radicals than was McCarthy in 1968. This is not because his positions have been much different from those of McCarthy, but because the radicalization has deepened and matured. McGovern is forced to answer critical questions on such topics as Palestine, abortion, gay rights, and many others. Many young people, including his own supporters, are often quite critical of his stand on these questions, and he has been subjected to some sharp attacks from his campus audiences. The popularity of the truth kit on McGovern is an indication of the degree to which our criticisms of McGovern are winning a hearing. We have already sold 25,000 copies of this 25 cent pamphlet.

It is important for us also to make note of the support that Shirley Chisholm has gotten. Her supporters are not organized into active campaign groups, and even on the campuses there is little organized support for her. But she has a good deal of support, as indicated by her vote totals in the primaries, where she has frequently gotten between 5% and 10% of the vote. These votes indicate, of course, a higher percentage in the Black community. There is also significant support for her among some sections of the Women's Political Caucus groups, among Black students, and among many people who consider themselves radicals.

This support is not based on any program, indeed she has no program, only what she calls a "strategy" for collecting delegates and using them to make deals at the Democratic Party convention. Rather, her support is support for her as a Black and as a woman, from nationalist, feminist and other radical sentiment. To many people, she represents a protest against the McGovern brand of "lesser-evil" liberalism. For that reason her cam-

paign is a significant indicator of the growing sentiment for a radical alternative.

The dominant characteristic of the election campaign, and what we run into everyday in the antiwar movement and in the other areas of our activity, is the belief among the overwhelming majority of activists that the war will be ended by electing a Democratic peace candidate, and the parallel attitude among Blacks, women and other sectors of society that they can win some gains within the confines of capitalist politics. It is this level of consciousness that makes things like the McGovern campaign and the Chisholm campaign possible.

Now I want to discuss our opponents in the radical movement from the point of view of their relationship to the elections.

Our most important competitor for the allegiance of socialist-minded young people in this campaign is the Communist Party campaign of Hall and Tyner. The CP has explained its electoral strategy as a "3-pronged approach." This line was presented by them in 1968, and they are putting it forward again this year. The first prong is support to the "struggles for independence" within the two parties, particularly the Democratic Party. This "prong" includes support to the Congressional Black Caucus and the other caucuses, and open support to "progressives" like Chisholm, Abzug, Dellums, and others. This prong, of course, includes support to "lesser-evil" liberals in the context of the "dump Nixon" campaign.

The second prong is support to groups outside the two parties, such as the People's Party and the Peace and Freedom Party. The CP has been openly critical of the People's Party and is not much involved in it. However, they have run some candidates on the Peace and freedom ticket in California, primarily because the PFP has ballot status in that state.

The "third prong" is support to their own campaigns.

The decisive prong is the one which supports the Democratic Party. That is their fundamental orientation and the central objective of their electoral strategy. In fact, their support to local Democrats is more blatant and done with less cover than in the past.

However, within this context, it is important for us to be aware of the turn that the CP is making with respect to their own campaign. They are running a qualitatively more ambitious campaign than they did in 1968, and the 1968 campaign was their first national campaign in more than 30 years.

In 1968 they didn't announce their slate until July, when it was too late to even make ballot attempts in many states. They were on the ballot in only Minnesota and New York. They did little campaigning in their own name.

This year they announced their ticket shortly after we launched our campaign. And while they were relatively inactive until January, they have since put a great deal of effort into the Hall-Tyner campaign. They have organized tours for their candidates, especially Jarvis Tyner; they have utilized trips to Cuba and Vietnam to get publicity, and they have devoted page after page in the *Daily World* to their campaign.

The clearest single indication of the new look in their campaign is the energetic ballot campaign they are waging. From everything we can tell, their ballot projections are equivalent to ours, although it remains to be

seen how well they will actually do. We have run into their petitioners in all parts of the country. They have launched a ballot drive in Massachusetts. All in all, they are projecting ballot status in between 25 and 30 states, including some states where we have decided not to petition.

The CP is making a concerted effort to expand and consolidate the Young Workers Liberation League through their election campaign, especially utilizing Tyner for this.

This shift in emphasis in the CP electoral tactic is a manifestation of the Stalinists' drive to win legitimacy for the CP, to emerge from the woodwork into a more open and public mode of operation. Part of their effort is the conscious attempt to project Gus Hall as a public spokesman, to enhance his authority, and to establish a growing number of open and public CP leaders around the country.

This is a process that we saw last year with the campaign waged by Pat Bonner-Lyons for school board in Boston, which was an energetic and successful campaign that they have held up as an example and an inspiration for their ranks. In a few places, such as Philadelphia where they are waging the campaign of Tony Monteiro for Congress, they are running significant local campaigns that we will want to actively relate to.

We can see in their electoral tactics the degree to which our past and current campaigns have put pressure on the CP and YWLL. We can see the degree to which they have followed our campaigns, and the extent to which they copy our experiences and try to duplicate them—in their own distorted way, of course. For instance, the stories in the *Daily World* on petitioning, the way in which they are consciously using their ballot work to draw around them new young activists, and their involvement in some legal fights for the right to be on the ballot, all show parallels to our own activity.

We should take maximum advantage of every opportunity to confront the CP openly, to debate their program versus ours, to participate in united front activity with them, such as our joint ballot fight in Pennsylvania, and to utilize the tactic of critical support on a local level as a means of doing opponent work in selected circumstances.

We want to be extremely alert to every opening for us to talk to YWLLers, to counter the slanders they have been told about Trotskyism with the goal of breaking them from the YWLL and potentially recruiting some of them to revolutionary politics. To accomplish this we have to aggressively go after the CP and the YWLL, attend their meetings, talk to their milieu, and get our literature into their hands.

The other nominally independent electoral formation we face in 1972 is the People's Party, a middle-class party with a reformist program, which is the result of the alliance of the remnants of the Peace and Freedom Party and the New Party. The New Party grew out of the efforts of the die-hard McCarthy supporters in 1968. The Peace and Freedom Party has virtually ceased to exist except in California, where their place on the ballot has artificially perpetuated their political life. They are running Dr. Spock for president and Julius Hobson, a leader of the D. C. Statehood Party, for vice-president. They will appear on the ballot in approximately half a dozen states by virtue of ballot status won previously by state groups which have affiliated to the People's Party. In addition, they have been doing some petitioning in other states.

Although they got a lot of initial publicity and made some very ambitious projections, they haven't made much of a dent in the elections. The fundamental reason for this is the success of the McGovern campaign in keeping alive the prospects for a liberal victory in Miami. As a fourth party, the People's Party perspective has been all along to present a *potential* threat to the Democratic Party if it should fail to nominate McGovern or some other "acceptable" liberal.

As long as the Democratic race seems to be wide open, unlike in 1968, few people see any reason to support Spock. And although Spock has stated he will keep running even if McGovern gets the nomination, their campaign is unlikely to continue with any momentum under those circumstances.

There is no question but that our campaign is more active, more widely-known, and more popular than either the CP or the People's Party campaigns.

I want to say just a word about the position of the ultralefts like Jerry Rubin, Abbie Hoffman, Rennie Davis, etc. They have all explicitly and brazenly endorsed McGovern. What we should keep in mind is that this is not a new position for them. The demonstrations that they organized at the 1968 Democratic Party convention were in essence pro-McCarthy actions. What is new is that they are so openly and unashamedly backing a capitalist candidate, and a lot of campus radicals who saw them as among the most radical of movement leaders are more clearly understanding the dead-end road of ultraleftism, and the real political nature of these individuals.

However, if McGovern should be stopped at Miami Beach, we should not exclude the possibility of these ultralefts flipping back to a boycottist position similar to their stance in the fall of 1968. Although this sentiment is not widespread among radicals, given a Humphrey-Nixon rerun or something similar to it, boycott could gain some popularity and it is something that we should be prepared to combat.

### *The McGovern Supporters*

One of the most important areas of our activity will be the work we do directed at McGovern and Chisholm campaign supporters. This is quite a large number of people, since it includes the great bulk of campus activists, anti-war demonstrators, and so on.

It is crucial for us to understand that the average young McGovern supporter is a radicalizing person, often going through his or her first political experience. They are not hardened Democrats or confirmed class-collaborationists. This is true even of some of the young lower-echelon organizers and leaders, as well as of the mass of McGovern volunteers. Many of them are doing exactly what a large percentage of YSAers, including much of the current YSA leadership, were doing in the McCarthy campaign of 1968.

Once we understand who these McGovern supporters are, we can see that our biggest mistake would be to adopt a sectarian attitude, a sectarian approach, or a sectarian tone toward them. In their majority, they are not hardened opponents, but people moving to the left, toward us, and in order to reach the greatest number of them we must not let any unnecessary barriers get in our way.

This means that comrades have got to understand that it should not be our goal to rip these people to shreds when they come near us; or to think that if they don't agree with us on class politics after an hour's discussion, that they are worthless politically. We have to understand that they are going through a process, and that for many that process will continue for some time. We will be making an impact on people that in some cases will only be manifested over time, possibly not until after the elections.

We want to take advantage of every opportunity to carry out joint activities with McGovern supporters, such as the debates we have had, and building the antiwar and the women's liberation movements. We want to encourage them to support us in our fights to get on the ballot.

Whether McGovern continues to look like a winner, and for how long, whether or not he wins the nomination in Miami Beach, and the course and outcome of the election itself, will affect the tempo of this process. What we are trying to do is to prepare McGovern supporters for his defeat, in which case we know we will be able to win many of them to our campaign, or for his continued success and consequent shift to the right, in which case many McGovern youth can be won to the conclusion that they have been betrayed, deceived and "co-opted."

McGovern's moves to disavow "radicalism" and disassociate himself from previous positions on such questions as abortion, amnesty, marijuana and party reform, have accelerated rapidly, especially since the Ohio primary.

We have already laid a good foundation, and established our campaign as the most consistent and determined force exposing every one of McGovern's deceptions and capitulations to the right. Now we want to intensify our fire, document every step to the right that he takes and scandalize him among his supporters. We want to make a renewed campaign to distribute widely the McGovern truth kit, and to take full advantage of the running debate between Jenness and McGovern in order to win a hearing among McGovern supporters.

#### *Afro-Americans for Jenness and Pulley*

We have found a significant receptivity to our election campaign among Afro-American youth, especially in the high schools. Some of Pulley's best meetings have been with Black high school audiences, such as in Detroit.

Within the Black movement, we want to make full use of the openings for our campaign to popularize the idea of a Black party in the aftermath of the Gary convention. This is especially important for Pulley's campaign and for the campaigns of our Black candidates across the country, many of whom attended the Gary convention and have already spoken about it at forums and other local campaign activities. We want to relate the question of a Black party to the more general questions of Black control, to the question of the Democratic and Republican parties, and to raise it in the general context of putting forward a number of the demands of the Transitional Program for Black Liberation.

One of the keys to the success of our election campaign in this area will be our ability to involve a section of the nearly 2000 Afro-American endorsers in concrete campaign activity, to draw them around, and to begin to recruit them. That is why the upcoming African Liberation

Day marches are such an important opening for us. They provide a concrete and meaningful action in which Afro-Americans for Jenness and Pulley can participate and build enthusiastically.

A letter has gone out from Pulley to all the Black endorsers, informing them of the demonstration, why it's important, and giving some suggestions for things to do to build it. This letter should be followed up in local areas with calls and mailings to reach those endorsers who are prepared to get involved in some kind of campaign activity. Also, a special tour is now underway with three Black comrades, following up on the contacts made by the Afro-American team that visited the southern Black campuses earlier this spring. The purpose of the tour is to build support for May 27, to sign up additional endorsers, and to try to recruit prospective members contacted on the first tour.

#### *The Chicano Movement*

Just as we want to utilize the sentiment and potential for a Black party to help explain and make realistic the projection of a mass Black political party, we want to emphasize in the Chicano movement the need to build a mass Chicano party completely independent of the Democratic and Republican parties. In this context we want to emphasize our support to the Raza Unida Party's opposition to the Democrats and Republicans. And insofar as we criticize their shortcomings, our criticisms should focus on their weaknesses with regard to Democratic Party politics, such as at the recent meeting of the Texas Women's Political Caucus, when RUP members voted for a slate which included a liberal Democrat.

Wherever possible, we want to run Chicano comrades for office, to explain the need for both a mass Chicano party and for a multinational revolutionary party. We can use these campaigns to convince Chicanos who are ready to accept socialist politics to join the YSA or the SWP, and through these campaigns we can present our full range of ideas for the Chicano community.

In some areas we will be giving critical support to particular campaigns of RUP candidates. In other areas we will be running our own candidates, in some cases even when RUP candidates are entered in the same race.

We will have a campaign presence at upcoming RUP conferences in Texas, Colorado and elsewhere.

In addition, we want to be alert to opportunities for our candidates to participate in every struggle that is being waged by Chicanos, such as the anti-deportation movement, actions called in support of the farm workers, and other such developments.

#### *The Trade Unions*

With regard to the trade-union movement, in addition to the points already raised in the political report, I want to emphasize that we should be following up on every possibility, no matter how modest, to get our national and local candidates to speak to union meetings, strike rallies, plant-gate meetings, and similar events. We have had a few limited experiences with such meetings, and we think a lot more can be done especially during the candidates' summer tours.

We have also just published a brochure entitled "The

Fight Against Wage Controls and Inflation" which we want to distribute widely, along with our platform and other campaign materials, in an attempt to get into contact with those individual workers who are responsive to our program and willing to do something about it.

### *The Women's Political Caucus*

I want to stress the importance of the opportunities to utilize the election campaign in relation to the Women's Political Caucus and the National Organization of Women, because I think we have missed some chances here. The Women's Political Caucus is far from being a homogeneous formation, and openings for us will vary from place to place. In general, however, we should aggressively inject our national and local campaigns into the political discussion occurring in and around NOW and the WPC. To the degree that they function as a non-partisan political forum, we want to take advantage of the opportunities for our candidates to get an equal hearing with all of our opponents. To the degree that the WPC is functioning merely as a vehicle to deliver votes to the Democratic Party with a feminist facade, it will be by aggressively requesting our right to be heard that we will be able to expose and explain to political women the true nature of the organization.

As the Democratic race narrows down, and particularly after the Democratic Party convention, the WPC will tend to shed its nonpartisan covering and become more openly support groups for Democratic candidates. If we are alert to this process we can maximize the number of women who can be won to support our campaign. There is a contradictory element in the sector of the WPC which is campaigning for Chisholm on the basis of insisting on the need for a woman candidate for President: the fact is that after the Democratic Party convention, there will be only one woman candidate.

We should not underestimate the number of women who will be attracted to our campaign on the basis of feminism. The 2,116 women who have chosen to sign the "Women for Jenness and Pulley" cards is an indication of this. Another indication is the fact that there have been a number of successful women's meetings for Linda, with an enthusiastic response to our campaign from independent feminists.

### *Plans for the Summer and Fall*

I now want to give comrades an idea of the way we think the summer and fall will look from the point of view of the election campaign.

The most immediate event of importance will be Linda Jenness' tour of Latin America. She will be leaving for two weeks immediately following the plenum. This will be an important part of the campaign, just as Pulley's tour to Europe last summer was. She will be speaking to meetings organized by co-thinkers and meeting with the press in Mexico, Chile, Argentina and Peru.

We are also entering into a period of very heavy petitioning. The relative weight of our ballot work will increase in May and June, and for several areas it will be their major activity for a period of several weeks.

Comrades should be aware of the fact that one of the major modifications in our approach to petitioning in this campaign has been our attempts to consciously plan out

the petitioning and related activities as a way to build the campaign by using it to involve independent YSJPers in meaningful campaign activity. We had some success with this approach in Florida, and we are projecting it as one of the central objectives in Massachusetts.

We will also be increasingly involved in court fights over our right to be on the ballot as we file petitions in more states, and as more of our projected legal challenges get into court. The status of our suits is reported in the "Campaign Progress Report" (see Appendix).

I think that many comrades may not be fully aware of the degree to which the SWP has been in the center of the entire legal battle to democratize election laws. Our name and the names of our candidates are on cases forming a major part of legal precedents in this field. This is an area of work that we began in 1969, and it has been expanding since that time. It is definitely something that we will continue to be involved in after November.

After discussions with some of the comrades in the field, we have decided to conduct tours for Jenness and Pulley in June and July. These summer tours will be something of an experiment for us. The tour stops will be shorter, generally three days or so in each branch. There will be reduced opportunities for campus meetings, although we do expect to have some successful meetings on campuses with summer schools, and in some high schools. We want to put a greater emphasis on other kinds of activities than we have in the fall and spring tours.

We want to pay special attention to getting our candidates invited to appear before community groups, Black organizations, Chicano groups, churches, feminist groups, etc. We will be especially interested in any trade-union meetings that can be arranged. Also, we will be continuing the special kind of campaign activities, such as visits to GI bases, prisons, hospitals and so on. And we should be paying increased attention to the expanding opportunities for extensive radio, TV and newspaper publicity.

There will be a major rally organized by every branch, often combined with a banquet. Since the candidates will have very little time, if any, to spend in the region, and because the number of speaking engagements in any city will be limited, these rallies are more important than in previous tours, since they will provide the only opportunity for many campaign supporters to meet the candidates and hear what they have to say.

They can be very valuable in aiding our regional activity if they are projected and built as regional events, with campaign supporters and other contacts from all over organized to attend. Also the collections at these rallies are important because the limited honoraria possibilities will put an added strain on the financial condition of the campaign. Collections should be well prepared and carefully thought out.

The summer tours should be tied into building the summer schools, and can be utilized to draw YSJPers into the summer schools, and, whenever possible, to Oberlin.

We also want to renew the endorser drive over the summer months, taking full advantage of the tours, anti-war actions that take place, the summer schools, and whatever kind of demonstrations develop at the Democratic and Republican conventions. The endorser drive is the cornerstone of all of campaign work, because it is through the endorser drive that we make contact with hundreds and thousands of potential recruits, and encourage large numbers of young activists to become in-

volved, to whatever degree they are prepared for, in socialist political action.

The main task of the YSJP is to constantly be involving these endorsers in campaign *activities*—that's what they will find appealing, and that's what will enable us to recruit them. All of our activities through the summer should be planned with this objective in mind.

We cannot project at this plenum the *details* of the fall fall campaign offensive, but we do know that it will be the biggest and most intensive mobilization—for a short duration—that we've ever mounted. We will have only about six weeks from the time most colleges open until the elections. If we prepare ourselves properly, and think big, this fall can be a substantial opportunity for growth of our movement through the election campaign.

There will be two major aspects to our national fall campaign offensive. First, we will be conducting extensive national speaking tours for the election campaign. We want to supplement the Jenness and Pulley tours with perhaps half-a-dozen or more additional party and YSA spokepeople, who can effectively represent our candidates and help to meet the opportunities for meetings we expect to have this fall.

Second, we are planning to build on the successful experiences of our national campaign teams, and expand this activity substantially for the time between the opening of school and the projected Thanksgiving YSA convention. The number of teams that can be organized will depend almost entirely on our financial situation, and that depends on the amount of money we can raise between now and

September. In projecting these teams, we have to avoid the problem which we ran into this spring of having branches view these national teams as a substitute for regular regional trailblazing and regional campaign activity. The national teams cannot substitute for consistent activity done from the regional centers, but they can be a valuable supplement to it.

One of the most important tasks of the summer months is to think out carefully and thoroughly how to get the maximum gains out of our limited resources and the limited time available to us in the fall.

Much of the fall activity carried out through the election campaign will be geared to getting our campaign supporters to the YSA convention scheduled for Thanksgiving. All of our candidates and YSJP organizers will be inviting and encouraging people to come to the convention.

Of all of the measures of the success of the election campaign, the recruitment to the YSA is the decisive one. Our job is to begin to think about and prepare for the task of explaining politically to the tens of thousands of campaign supporters why they should join a permanent, ongoing socialist youth organization, and laying out a perspective of political activity for them for after the elections.

Our objective should be to do everything in our power to make possible the transformation of the large body of active campaign supporters into a significantly larger Young Socialist Alliance.

## APPENDIX

### National Campaign Committee Progress Report

Through April 30, 1972

(All figures and facts current as of April 30, 1972.)

#### 1. Endorsers of the 1968 and 1972 campaigns

State	1968	1972	State	1968	1972
Alabama	6	67	Mass.	82	468
Alaska	0	5	Michigan	581	668
Arizona	12	138	Minnesota	109	163
Arkansas	0	4	Mississippi	3	110
California	276	2,115	Missouri	26	50
Colorado	14	239	Montana	1	3
Connecticut	19	41	Nebraska	5	24
Delaware	27	4	Nevada	2	9



D.C.	35	124	New Hampshire	4	121
Florida	8	221	New Jersey	65	72
Georgia	54	149	New Mexico	0	90
Hawaii	0	5	New York	542	608
Idaho	1	60	N. Carolina	0	10
Illinois	292	579	N. Dakota	3	3
Indiana	77	137	Ohio	105	277
Iowa	53	107	Oklahoma	0	2
Kansas	1	19	Oregon	82	173
Kentucky	16	34	Pennsylvania	90	528
Louisiana	11	100	Rhode Island	9	249
Maine	4	15	S. Carolina	5	40
Maryland	15	61	S. Dakota	26	9
Tennessee	16	83	Vermont	12	67
Texas	40	497	Washington	77	404
Utah	0	20	W. Virginia	7	117
Vermont	12	67	Wyoming	0	1
Virginia	13	93	Wisconsin	154	289
Foreign	--	37			

TOTAL ENDORSERS FOR 1968: 3,008

TOTAL ENDORSERS FOR 1972: 9,666

YSJP-4,221; General-1,735; Women-2,116; Afr.Am.-1,389; Chicano  
205

## 2. Ballot status

	<u>Projected</u>	<u>Collected</u>	<u>Filed</u>	<u>Certified/Rejected</u>
Arizona	8,200			
Colorado	900			
Connecticut	25,000	1,000		
Delaware	Conv.			
D.C.	25,000			
Florida	45,000	51,600		
Idaho	3,500			
Illinois	40,000			
Indiana	16,000	16,500		
Iowa	2,500			
Kentucky	2,000	2,007	yes	
Louisiana	3,000	2,950		
Massachusetts	90,000			
Michigan	24,000	28,700	yes	Certified
Minnesota	3,000			
Mississippi	3,500			
New Hampshire	3,500			
New Jersey	2,000	2,350	yes	
New Mexico	Conv.			
New York	40,000			
North Dakota	750			
Ohio	10,000	9,767	{ yes plus signatures for	
Oklahoma	9,000		{ congressional candidates	
Pennsylvania	4,500	4,500	{ yes, congressional candidates	
Rhode Island	1,500		{ only	
South Dakota	7,000			
Tennessee	550			

Texas	45,000	4,000		
Utah	1,000	945	yes	Rejected
Vermont	5,000	3,000		
Virginia	16,000			
Washington	100			
Wisconsin	4,500			

Total number of states		33
Total number of signatures	442,000	
Signatures collected to date	127,319	
Signatures collected in 1968	117,400	

### 3. Comparison with the Communist Party ballot plans \*

#### a. States where the CP has filed:

Alabama	6,393 signatures	Rejected
Kentucky	1,450	
New Jersey	1,700	
Ohio	9,400	
Pennsylvania	40,000	
Utah	927	Rejected
Michigan	23,000	

#### b. States where adequate number of signatures collected, not yet filed:

Arizona	8,500	*All figures taken from <u>Daily World</u> reports
Colorado	350	
Iowa	1,500	

#### c. States where CP has announced a ballot drive:

Alaska	2,500 signatures required
California	325,000
Connecticut	12,700
D.C	13,010
Hawaii	3,000
Illinois	25,000
Indiana	10,500
Louisiana	1,000
Maine	3,300
Massachusetts	56,000
Minnesota	2,000
Missouri	17,000
New Hampshire	1,000
New York	20,000
North Carolina	10,000
North Dakota	300
Oregon	24,000
Rhode Island	500
South Dakota	4,800
Tennessee	25
Vermont	1,500

Washington 100  
Wyoming 5,800

At one time the CP announced petitioning in Maryland. However, they did not list Maryland on their most recent chart in the Daily World, dated May 6, 1972.

4. Status of lawsuits challenging undemocratic election statutes.

a. California

Challenges procedure for forming a political party.  
Attorney: Michael Sorgen, for CoDEL  
Plaintiffs: Prohibition Party, Socialist Labor Party,  
Socialist Workers Party  
Status: Filed in State Supreme Court April 12. No hearing  
date set.

b. California

Challenge to filing fee requirement in Alameda County.  
Attorney: Marjorie Gelb, Vernon Salvador (Legal Aid Society  
of Alameda County  
Plaintiffs: Alphonso Zapata (LRUP), Sandy Knoll (SWP)  
Status: WON.

c. California

Challenge to filing fee requirement in Los Angeles, and  
candidate loyalty oath.  
Attorney: ACLU  
Plaintiffs: SWP candidates  
Status: To be filed.

d. Florida

Challenges 10¢ per name requirement.  
Attorneys: Tobias Simon, Bill DuFresne, for CoDEL  
Plaintiffs: Linda Jenness, Andrew Pulley  
Status: Filed in U.S. District Court for the Southern District  
May 9.

e. Illinois

Challenges distribution requirement for signatures, loyalty  
oath, and procedure for remaining a political party.  
Attorney: Bob Edwards, for CoDEL  
Plaintiffs: SWP  
Status: To be filed.

f. Louisiana

Challenges loyalty oath.  
Attorney: Ben Smith, for CoDEL, ACLU  
Plaintiffs: SWP (CP considering)  
Status: To be filed.

- g. Ohio  
 Challenge to filing deadline.  
 Attorney: Ben Scheerer  
 Plaintiffs: SWP  
 Status: Won filing extension.
- h. Ohio  
 Legal action to bar Secretary of State from ruling Jenness off ballot on the basis of her age.  
 Attorney: Ben Scheerer for CoDEL  
 Plaintiff: Jenness, SWP  
 Status: To be filed.
- i. Oregon  
 Challenge to 3-year residency requirement for candidate.  
 Attorney: ACLU  
 Plaintiff: Phil Hardy, SWP  
 Status: Lost in lower court, no time to appeal before election.
- j. Pennsylvania  
 Challenge to new requirements for signatures to place candidates on ballot.  
 Attorneys: Harry Levitan, Harry Lore for ACLU, CoDEL  
 Plaintiffs: CP, Consumers Party, SLP, SWP, Peoples Party  
 Status: Heard before Federal District Court April 7. Jenness testified. Baumann of CoDEL testified. Awaiting decision.
- k. Rhode Island  
 Challenges right of Department of Defense and Commander, Quonset Point Naval Air Station, to bar candidates Jenness and Spock from base.  
 Attorney: David Rosenberg for NECLC, CoDEL  
 Plaintiffs: Linda Jenness, Benjamin Spock  
 Status: Filed in Rhode Island Federal District Court, Feb. 24.
- l. Texas  
 Loyalty oath challenge from 1971 suit still pending in Federal District Court.
- m. Texas  
 Challenge to procedure for forming political party.  
 Attorney: ACLU  
 Plaintiffs: Peoples Party, SWP  
 Status: To be filed.
- n. Texas  
 Challenge to ruling keeping SWP candidates off ballot because of age and failure to sign loyalty oath. Unsuccessful in lower courts and no time to appeal before election.
- o. Utah  
 Challenge to distribution requirement for signatures and county conventions.  
 Attorney: ACLU  
 Plaintiffs: SWP (CP may also be plaintiffs)

Status: SWP ruled off ballot for failure to hold conventions in each of 10 counties. CP ruled off for failing to obtain signatures in each of 10 counties. (The SWP met this requirement, although we intend to challenge it.) To be filed.

p. Washington

Challenge to filing fees.

Attorney: ACLU

Plaintiffs: SWP candidates

Status: Some question as to whether this can be filed before the SWP becomes a political party in September when it holds its nominating convention.

5. National Campaign Trailblazing Teams

A total of 18 comrades participated in 6 national campaign trailblazing teams which visited 104 campuses in 26 states.

Number of endorsers gathered	1,698
Number of YSJP chapters formed	30
Amount of Pathfinder literature sold	\$1,114.77
Number of Militants sold	4,000
Number of introductory subscriptions to The Militant sold	425
Number of year subscriptions to The Militant sold	23
Number of McGovern Truth Kits sold	1,445

The total cost of the teams was \$8,673.00, \$3,673.00 of which was raised by the teams themselves through literature and Militant sales.

## IDEAS ON PARTY ELECTION PROPAGANDA

by Doug Jenness

[The following is based on a class given to the New York SWP branch organizers, campaign directors, candidates and the national SWP campaign staff on April 13, 1972.]

The purpose of this class is to provide some general guidelines in preparing election campaign platforms, speeches, news releases, etc. I'm not going to discuss the political content of the election propaganda. Rather I want to discuss general ideas for formulating it in the most attractive and convincing way possible.

I think that comrades are generally aware that in the last three or four years there has been a significant increase in the number of local campaigns that we are running. In 1968, for example, we ran 44 local candidates in 11 states, which far surpassed anything we had ever done previously. In 1969 we ran some important mayoralty campaigns. Then in 1970 we ran 75 candidates in 15 states. This year we've already announced 89 candidates in 15 states, and more will be announced before the campaign is over.

So it's clear that local campaigns have become an important and regular part of party activity. Through this intensified participation in campaigns, we've learned a few things.

First, candidates and campaign directors should think about what they write or say from the viewpoint of what the candidate would do if elected to office. It is useful for the candidates to put themselves in the frame of mind of what they would do when they took office. How would they govern the country, the state or city in which they are running? What would they propose on their first day in congress or at their first city council meeting? Campaign directors or other comrades involved in writing campaign literature or helping to write speeches should think about this question in the same way. By doing this you start thinking about our party as an organization that is serious about governing the country and is capable of doing so. This is precisely the image we want to project.

The Democratic and Republican candidates attempt to denigrate our campaigns by saying that we're sideline nuts or oddballs or idealists who have no chance of winning. They try to peddle the concept that it's inconceivable that we could ever be elected or are competent to run this country.

It's bad when a candidate says, "We're just running an educational campaign. We don't really think we can get elected this year." This statement puts you in a different framework than all the other candidates. It appears that the SWP is a small educational society and not a *party* that's willing, capable and eager to take political power and govern this society in the interests of the majority of American people.

Without exaggerating or pretending that we're going to win, we should formulate our statements in a way that shows our seriousness. That is the only way to be taken seriously. Actually, what we're doing is utilizing

the electoral arena to project the SWP as a much larger party than it really is.

A useful exercise for every candidate is to prepare a short speech on "What I would do the first day in office" or "What I would do if elected." This can help start the candidate thinking along the lines I have indicated.

I have here a platform from our mayoralty race in Austin, Texas, last year which has a couple of references that I thought were good. In one place it said: "If elected, they [the SWP candidates] will continue their antiwar work by stopping any tax money used to bomb and destroy." Then in another place it says, "With socialists in office, birth control information centers and free birth control would be available in all parts of the city." These are small examples but they illustrate the positive approach of indicating to the people of Austin that they are thinking about what they will do when they assume office.

### *Know Your Audience*

An important principle involved in any writing or speaking, which often seems to be forgotten, is knowing who your audience is. If comrades are involved in a lot of internal work most of the people they see and talk to every day are often other comrades. It's possible to develop ingroupish lingo and forget how other people talk or what their political level is.

When you write a campaign brochure or news release, you should ask, "Who am I talking to? What is their political level? What is the best way of interesting them in our ideas? Will this piece of literature go over their heads? Will it just be seen as some sort of strange thing that's stuffed into their hand by a leafletter?"

Audiences differ greatly. A speech at a campaign rally attended by comrades, supporters and prospective members would likely be different than a speech in a high school. The kind of speech given at an antiwar rally would differ from one given at an abortion repeal rally. When a candidate is on radio or television he or she has to be particularly conscious of the tens of thousands of people who are watching or listening. You have to speak in ordinary language so that people who are not socialists or even radical can understand. These people are not necessarily going to join today or tomorrow or next week or next year, but the impression they get of socialists, whether or not they appear serious or from outer space, makes a big difference.

Candidates are often invited to speak on panels with other candidates at meetings where there are few people that are seriously interested in our ideas such as the Chamber of Commerce, the Lion's Club, etc. In this situation the candidate should orient himself to the fact that parts of their speech will be picked up by the news media and that their real audience is those people listening or reading the media.

One of the things that's been shown by the various ballot fights we've waged or any other struggles in which

party candidates have come to the fore as champions of democratic rights, is that hundreds of people will say: "Yes! I agree with them on that. I respect them for putting up a fight against city hall, even though I'm not a socialist and I'm not going to vote for them." They have a good impression of candidates who are championing democratic causes in a serious way and aren't acting like some wild nutty ultralefts or talk in some strange jargon. Creating this kind of positive impression is good political capital that will pay off in the long run.

When talking to campus audiences one of the things to keep in mind is that students are not just looking to see whether or not the candidate is like students on the campus but whether they have serious answers to the problems facing the country and are serious about wanting a chance to take power.

I remember several years ago when we started increasing the number of our local campaigns that there was a tendency in some areas to orient the campaigns to the campus rather than to the population as a whole. They centered more on the concerns of students rather than talking about the broader social problems of society. Of course students are the main area where we are winning recruits at this time, but we should recognize that they will take us more seriously if we act like a political party with a program to change all of society.

Another mistake is to think that because we're running a revolutionary election campaign that we have to continually prove that we don't really have any illusions about elections. For example we don't have to make a big point about saying that we're running in elections in order to expose them. Nor do we have to continually use words like "revolutionary" in our literature to somehow tell people that we're not selling out. We should let our ideas and demands convince people. We don't have to sound like we're posturing or apologizing for running a campaign.

Another part of creating a serious impression is dressing neatly. We don't have any principles against coats and ties.

### *Avoid Radical Jargon*

Another aspect of our propaganda is avoiding hackneyed language or jargon. The radical movement, including our party, has developed its own lingo. Ordinary words are used over and over until they become jargon or assume a different meaning for us than they do for other people. Here's a few examples:

1) "Third World"—This doesn't really mean anything to most people. It's not used widely in the news media and when it is it is usually in reference to the colonial world rather than to the oppressed nationalities in this country. There's also a political reason why we shouldn't use it. It tends to become a shorthand way of lumping separate and distinct oppressed nationalities together.

2) "Concrete"—This is a good word to use once in a while but it has become so overworked by the radical movement that it has become jargon. It's almost a trademark of a radical.

3) "Coming period"—Another phrase that's been used so often that it is part of the radical jargon. Attempts should be made to say the same thing in different ways.

4) "Oppressed nationality"—This isn't jargon, but without adequate explanation it will not mean much to most people. When we refer to oppressed nationalities we should

indicate right away that we're talking about Blacks, Chicanos, etc.

5) "Use our campaigns"—This may just be a pet peeve of mine but I think it sounds strange to many people when we say that we use our campaigns to build other movements. It is politically correct, inside our movement to talk of *using* our campaigns to build the movements for social change, but most other people don't talk about campaigns that way. I think it sounds better to the non-SWPer to say that our candidates *support* other movements and help to build them. The meaning is exactly the same.

6) "Mass movement" and "mass action"—We too often employ these terms to movements or actions that are not massive. There are many significant actions in the women's liberation movement or the Chicano movement that aren't mass actions. We shouldn't use these terms every time a few hundred people hold an action. A person outside of our movement either won't understand what we're talking about or will think we're liars.

7) "Reformist"—We know that there are organizations and individuals in the radical movement that have consciously worked-out ideologies counterposing reforms to revolution. Inside the Marxist movement, the term "reformist" is used to describe these opportunists. But many people who are not in the radical movement do not know what we mean by the term "reformist." Many people whom we are trying to reach think of a reformist as a person who wants progressive reforms. "What's the matter with being a reformist?" they will say. We don't help convince them by using the word "reformist" as a derogatory word. It is better to use a different word, such as "opportunist."

8) "Principle"—This is a good word to use once in a while in a campaign speech for emphasizing that we stand on principles, as opposed to the Democrats, for example. But if it's used repeatedly it sounds strange and defensive, as if some invisible person in the audience was challenging your sincerity.

In addition to these, there are demands from the transitional program like the sliding scale of wages and hours that we should try to find popular ways of saying. For example most campaigns have used formulations like "cost-of-living wage increases" and "shorter work week with no reduction in pay" as understandable ways of presenting the sliding scale of wages and hours at this time.

I'm sure that there are many other examples of hackneyed phrases or overworked words that you can think of or will find when you re-read some of your campaign literature and speeches. After writing a speech or brochure it's good to go through it consciously looking for formulations that come under this category.

If you do this people will notice it right away. They'll say, "This candidate doesn't use the normal radical jargon. It's a fresh change."

This doesn't mean that you should sacrifice political precision. I think that we can state our political ideas just as precisely without sounding ritualistic or using jargon.

Another important guideline is to attempt to relate what we say in our propaganda to the problems of the particular political divisions in which we run our campaigns. One of the really fruitful aspects of running local campaigns is that we can take parts of our program and relate them to specific problems that people are thinking about every day. It doesn't mean we're like "sewer

socialists" that attempt to talk just about the specific neighborhood problems of where to put traffic lights or how to fix the sewers and pave the road in the back section of the district. We relate the problems of the city or state to the important national and international events of the day and explain that we're for socialism. But local campaigns are a real opportunity to make our basic ideas relevant to the actual people that we speak to in our cities; the issues that they're concerned with, the demonstrations that take place there, including rent strikes, school boycotts, or local union developments (strikes, rallies, etc.). For example the bus drivers at the University of Texas went on strike recently and our candidates helped organize support for the strike and spoke at strike rallies.

What we are actually doing in our local campaigns is taking parts of our transitional program and relating them to current situations today in a language that people can understand.

In order to be specific in relation to a local area the candidates and those directing the campaigns should keep current with whatever is going on in the district. If a candidate's speech uses only the examples that could have been used three or four weeks earlier it's going to sound stale. It will also sound like the candidate doesn't know what is going on in his or her district.

If an opponent candidate makes some stupid remark or takes a certain position that gets a lot of publicity on one day and on the next day our candidate is on a panel with them, our candidate should weave an answer into his or her remarks. This may stimulate a rise out of them so that they'll be forced to respond to our candidate and maybe give him or her some publicity. At least our candidate will appear more legitimate and serious to the audience.

### *Personalities*

We should not be shy about projecting the individual personalities of our candidates. Of course there's a negative aspect to projecting personalities like Norman Thomas who stood above the Socialist Party. He was a figure who probably had more influence and prestige when he ran for president than the Socialist Party did most of the time. And he said whatever he wanted. We don't want that. But we should recognize that people identify our ideas with individuals in our movement that they know or have heard or read about. As people radicalize they develop heroes—Che Guevara, Malcolm X, Trotsky, Luxemburg—and their attraction to these personalities may have a lot to do about convincing them to become revolutionaries.

This can also be true of our candidates. Probably most people who look at our party think of it in terms of the leading personalities they know or have heard about. Therefore, it's important for us to select our candidates carefully and to build them up as attractive leaders. We want the kind of candidates that people radicalizing today can identify with and respect and look up to and that will help us recruit.

If the candidates weren't important we'd just put out a brochure with our program and not mention the candidates.

We also want to try to use the national scope of the campaign. This can be done in off-year elections but it's particularly effective when we're running a presidential campaign. In our news releases, speeches, brochures,

etc., we can weave in the fact that we are running 89 or more local candidates and that we have a national ticket that's aiming to be on the ballot in 30 states. It helps create the impression that we are more than just a small propaganda group but a much larger national party. There's no other party outside of the Democrats and Republicans that is running that many candidates. It's also a strong point against the CP. They're running a few local campaigns but nothing near 89 or more candidates.

### *Pointers on Speech Writing*

I'm of the opinion that the most effective speeches candidates give are those that are written out. Comrades often say that "I'm more effective giving a speech off-the-cuff, or from notes. I'm more relaxed and don't sound so mechanical." This is generally not true.

Sometimes candidates are put in situations where they have to speak extemporaneously, but that's the exception. Generally, candidates know in advance that they will be giving a speech and have time to prepare it. You might not think it's necessary to write out a short one- or two-minute speech that candidates commonly have to give. The shorter the speech, the greater reason it should be written out, because you have less time to say what you have to say. It requires greater precision. You can be much more precise politically and say exactly what you want to say if you write it out. There's always a tendency to get off the subject or ramble when you're speaking extemporaneously, especially if you're nervous.

Many of the meetings to which candidates are invited are panels with other candidates where each speaker gets from two to ten minutes. That's not much time to say everything you'd like to say. You can't even read the platform in that amount of time. The biggest mistake then is to think that you've got to get every idea in, or even every important idea. What you want to do is single out one or two key points. It's possible that you may not mention women's liberation or the Black struggle in every single speech. Also you can leave some points that you want to make to the discussion period.

Once the speech is written, either by the candidate or the campaign director, the candidate should practice giving it. The more familiar the speaker is with the speech the less it will sound like he or she is reading it. Furthermore, this aids in giving extemporaneous speeches.

It's useful to practice it in front of someone else. They can often make helpful suggestions that you would not notice if you were reading it to yourself. This includes things like where to put emphasis and pauses, if you've repeated the same word or phrase too often, if your speaking loud enough, and timing.

The latter is very important. The general tendency of speakers with a prepared speech is to speak too fast so it is important to mark some pauses on your copy. And if you have a time limit for your speech and don't want to be cut off in the middle of a phrase it's good to time your speech in advance.

If your speech is typed double or triple spaced it will be easy to read and easy to mark pauses, emphasis, etc.

The campaign committee should keep a file of all speeches. All the copies should be kept because they are useful for writing future speeches where you may want to use some of the same facts and formulations.