

NEC MINUTES for JUNE 11, 1966 No. 16

Present: Mary-Alice, Doug, Daniels, Betsey, Lew
NC Alt: Roland
Excused: NC: Caroline, Melissa, Dan

Chairman: Betsey

Agenda: 1. Plenum
2. Conferences
3. Black Panther Party

1. Plenum - Lew

A plenum should be held before school opens this fall.

Motion: To have a two day plenum September 10 and 11 in New York. All full members of the National Committee will be polled for their approval.

Motion Passed

2. Conferences - Lew

a. SDS Ann Arbor Conference.

SDS will hold a series of conferences, including a meeting of their national council, in Ann Arbor between June 15 and June 19. Ann Arbor and Detroit will have comrades attend.

b. Conference on New Politics

A very important meeting, the Conference on New Politics, will be held in Ann Arbor, June 20-25. This conference is supported by various coalitionist tendencies. YSAers from Chicago, Detroit, and Ann Arbor will attend.

c. DuBois Club Convention

Report on our participation.

Motion: To send at least one representative from the National Office to the DuBois Club convention.

Motion Passed

Motion: To approve the report.

Discussion: Betsey, Lew, Daniels, Lew

Motion Passed

3. Black Panther Party - Betsey

See Attached.

Motion: To approve the report.

Discussion: Roland, Betsey, Lew, Betsey, Lew, Betsey, Roland

Motion Passed

The development of the Black Panther party is an important step forward in the Negro struggle and demands our active and complete support. With the qualitative change in the number of Negro voters in the South, and with the growing Negro electoral strength in the ghettos of the big cities, there is a good potential for the growth of independent Negro parties in other areas. We should do everything we can to encourage this development by propagandizing in support of the Black Panther party and by explaining the reasons for our support. We must become the political tendency which is identified with support for independent all-black parties.

A propaganda campaign in support of the Black Panther party gives us a new opportunity to reach out with our ideas to Negro militants and to civil rights and Negro organizations where there might be interest. It also offers us an opportunity within the antiwar movement and in the new radical milieu to put forth an example of a concrete alternative to coalitionism.

There is a tendency among new radicals to be sympathetic to the Black Panther party on the grounds that it is "organizing the poor." This sympathetic attitude increases our chances of getting a good hearing for our position on independent political action.

The Black Panther party represents the only motion in the working class toward independent electoral action which we can support. We must educate people to understand the differences between the Black Panther party and "peace" candidates - the difference in class composition, the difference in the way they are organized, and the difference in the relationship to the Democratic party and the ruling class.

In our propaganda work we must always be conscious of the difficulties which face the Black Panther party. The pressure being put on its members is very great and includes physical intimidation, slandering from the press, and the constant competition from and attacks by the conservative Negro organizations and leaders.

There are many concrete things we can do to propagandize in support of the Black Panther party. A 32 page pamphlet on the Black Panther party has been published by Merit. It will sell for the low price of 25 cents a copy. It should be sold as a campaign pamphlet - on the campus, in antiwar groups, at conferences, at meetings, and in ghetto bookstores. We should recommend it to contacts and people in the antiwar movement who we are trying to convince of our position on independent political action.

We should continue our sales of Black Panther buttons. We should be active in arranging for meetings where speakers who support the Black Panther party or leaders of the Lowndes

June 11, 1966

County Freedom Organization can speak. We can help to raise money for the Black Panther party through button sales and other activities.

It is important that locals send in reports on the response to the propaganda work we are doing in support of the Black Panther party, and any other information on SNCC, the Black Panther party or important campaigns where Negro candidates are running.

ANTIWAR MOVEMENT

We last discussed the war in Vietnam and the antiwar movement at a resident NC meeting April 6, immediately following the March 25-26 Days of Protest. There has since been a major escalation of the war.

Vietnam

The White House has officially announced that another 100,000 men will be added to the forces in Vietnam by the end of the year, and it is unofficially admitted that 500,000 more is a likely figure. Bombings in the north and south reached a new tonnage intensity on May 13 and again later in June. The official admission of U.S. troop actions in Cambodia and Laos, and unofficial admissions of action in Thailand have raised the specter of a massive Asian land war. The Johnson administration attempts to give the impression of being more solidly behind Ky than ever, as more and more Vietnamese turn against him.

This escalation has paralleled the refusal of the Vietnamese in the cities to lend even the appearance of stability to the Ky dictatorship. The Buddhists and students keep demonstrating, Danang and Hué have had to be virtually occupied by Ky's troops, a series of strike actions by the workers were effective enough for the first time to significantly slow down American supplies, and the army of south Vietnam was rendered totally incapable of spending any of its time fighting the army of the National Liberation Front.

As this has been occurring over the last ten weeks, and as the objective threat of an eventual extension of the conflict with China has increased, Brezhnev and Kosygin, the international coalitionists, continued to ignore China's fears and berate LBJ's "advisors" for leading him into such errors. This was the focal point of the United Secretariat statement.

The Antiwar Movement

One of the marks of the anti-Vietnam-war movement has been its capacity to respond in one form or another, rather than retreat, at each new stage of the imperialist escalation. The last ten weeks have been no exception.

Demonstrations have continued around the world, especially in Japan, Belgium, Germany, and in this country. A new layer of protesters have been brought in through a wave of teach-ins, read-ins, and a series of anti- napalm demonstrations ranging from Redwood, California, to Brooklyn. The large anti-draft rallies at Madison, Chicago and City College of New York in late May were aimed at the antiworking-class anti-Negro bias of the draft system, and in many cases against the war.

"Quickie" demonstrations, often organized on a few hours notice, in opposition to the visits of administration figures

to the major cities and campuses, have become standard. It has become next to impossible for a high-ranking cabinet member to speak anywhere without being met by a picket line or a walkout of the antiwarriors in the audience.

Because of this, it now is White House policy to announce these visits only a few hours in advance. The walkouts at university commencements have been marked by a large element of spontaneity. Students have decided to join the action once several of their friends began. For instance, the walkout of over 150 in opposition to McNamara at the New York University commencement was begun by only six students and faculty members organized beforehand.

The Harris and Gallop polls have continued shifting against Johnson's policies and have indicated a growth in the number of citizens who favor an immediate pullout. This general attitude has been reflected in the friendly response to public sales of the Newsletter, petitions for withdrawal collected on the streets or in shopping centers, and leaflets passed out by marchers as they go through shopping areas.

In April Southern Christian Leadership Conference [SCLC] and Southern Conference Educational Fund [SCEF] made official statements of opposition to administration policies, and Congress of Racial Equality [CORE] demanded immediate withdrawal. SNCC's [Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee] May 23 letter rejecting the invitation to the White House conference on civil rights described U.S. policy as racist intervention against colored people. Adam Clayton Powell described as Hitler-like the racially biased draft apparatus. And the new national chairman of SNCC, Stokely Carmichael, stated on a national television interview that while he of course would not advise Negro GI's to stop fighting, if he were in Vietnam he would recognize that he was fighting the wrong war, that the real war is at home, and that he would act on his conscience.

The political theme of withdrawal is the dominant theme at a growing number of actions.

The Struggle in the Movement

The antiwar movement has continued to divide between right and left around the question of how to mobilize this ever-increasing sentiment against the war, and for what purpose.

The coalitionists drag their feet in every way to oppose regular and deepening extraparliamentary mobilizations that have become the periodic focus of the entire international antiwar movement. In this they are trying to stand against the tide. The large mobilizations with a tone of sharp opposition, conflict and compete more and more with the time needed for work to elect "peace" candidates. Unlike revolutionists, the coalitionists do not see the antiwar movement, and espe-

cially its militant wing, as an ally and a complement to socialist electoral campaigns. Rather, they see the militant wing and its continual call for action as a competitor for the allegiance of those opposed to the war and a growing embarrassment to peace candidates.

This can be seen in the evolution of the National Coordinating Committee [NCC] since March 26 and the unfolding of the fight that originated in the New York Parade Committee to have another International Days of Protest.

At its May 4 meeting the New York Parade Committee, over the opposition of the Communist Party and SANE, voted to call an International Days of Protest from August 6-9. The Parade Committee staff immediately put out a mailing and by the next meeting, May 18, favorable responses were already arriving. On May 23, at a public meeting for Isaac Deutscher and A.J. Muste, Dave Dellinger announced the August 6-9 International Days of Protest.

The NCC had been strongly opposed to calling a day of protest during the summer. The May 19 issue of "Peace and Freedom News" went so far as to inform its readers that the New York Parade Committee had reversed its decision. A naive young leader of a mid-western antiwar committee, which follows the lead of the NCC, wrote a plaintive letter to the Parade Committee pointing out that a summer International Days of Protest would interfere with work for "peace" candidates, and that it would be impossible not to participate in the protest actions as the rank-and-file members of the committees would want to do so, and would the New York Parade Committee please reconsider.

Meanwhile, at a June 4 press conference in New York, with no consultation or polling of its membership, Frank Emspak announced that the NCC was endorsing Robert Scheer, Ted Weiss, and Herbert Aptheker for Congress. This is the NCC which cannot call for withdrawal because it is "a loose coordinating body which does not take a policy position on issues in dispute in the peace movement."

Finally, at a June 18 conference of 175 of the activists and leaders of the antiwar and radical organizations in New York, the August 6-9 International Days of Protest were reconfirmed. The coalitionists who saw this conference as their best chance to reverse the call for the International Days of Protest could not stand up to the general sentiment of the New York activists or the large favorable response from around the country and world. There was no opposition expressed to holding the action, and a representative from the NCC office in Madison suddenly appeared and announced they had decided to endorse and "coordinate" the action. It was decided that the New York action would feature several feeder marches (some organized by the Bread and Puppet Theater) into Times

Square, where a massive rally would be held. Immediate withdrawal will be the major political theme and none of the other slogans will contradict it or cut across the right of the Vietnamese to self-determination.

Now our central task around the country is to make the International Days of Protest as large and united and militant as possible.

To a large degree the position in which the militant wing of the antiwar movement finds itself is the reverse of that at the Washington convention. It is the coalitionists who are opposed to the action and direction and themes that have been decided by the majority of the activists and committees around the country. The militants are trying to maintain a united front and build actions while the coalitionists forced into verbal support are dragging their feet. Under these circumstances the fight of the left is for unity and to build the International Days of Protest.

As part of this fight we must continue to educate and consolidate a left wing fighting for withdrawal in the antiwar movement. The imperialists have made crystal clear these last ten weeks that in spite of the current level of opposition in Vietnam and the U.S. they are prepared for a long and massive ground war in Southeast Asia. The antiwar movement must be built with this in mind. Not only does the eventual national organization of a left wing remain our central perspective, but the consolidation and growth of the left fighting for united actions is the best obstacle to the coalitionists' desire to split the movement, the best challenge to the peace-candidate orientation of the CP, and the best lever to influence and even win over some of the young followers of the coalitionists who do not yet see any contradiction between building the antiwar movement and supporting "peace alternatives" in the Democratic party.

June 17, 1966

NOTE: The results of the June 18 Parade Committee conference were added in the editing of the report.

YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE

P. O. BOX 471 COOPER STATION
NEW YORK, N. Y., 10003 YU9-7570

SHOULD SOCIALISTS SUPPORT PEACE CANDIDATES?

A discussion paper submitted to
the Second National Convention
of the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs.
June 17, 1966

There has been considerable discussion within and between socialist youth organizations about many important political problems that face all of us. The open and serious manner in which the discussions have been carried out is a refreshing development and should be welcomed. It is only through this kind of discussion, in which ideas are weighed carefully and on their merits, that programs and organizations capable of fundamentally changing this society can be created.

We agree with the editorial in Dimensions, the discussion journal of the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, which states that those of us in socialist groups "should state our differences for many are fundamental and far reaching in scope. But we should state them in a manner which does not cut off debate, but rather, which poses the basic questions which need to be tackled by the movement as a whole."

Perhaps one of the most basic current disputes among socialists active within the antiwar movement is whether or not we should support liberal "peace" candidates in the 1966 elections. As part of the discussion, we in the YSA are submitting this paper to the Second National Convention of the DuBois Clubs for consideration.

Those who support "peace" candidates include in this category the liberal politicians who have criticized the Johnson administration's war policies in Vietnam. Almost all of the candidates designated as peace candidates are Democrats, although there is a sprinkling of Republicans as well.

The leading proponents of peace candidates are the Socialist party, the Communist party, SANE, and many liberals. Just recently a new organization called the National Conference on New Politics has been formed to help raise support for peace candidates around the country with Julian Bond and Simon Casady as co-chairman.

"Protest" and "Politics"

One of the most common arguments used in support of peace candidates is that it is not sufficient for a movement like the anti-Vietnam-war movement to remain a "protest" movement where demonstrations, teach-ins, parades, etc., are the most common form of action. It is argued that the movement must extend beyond "protests" and enter the electoral arena where it can become a "political" movement.

In order to discuss this argument adequately we must make clear what we mean by "politics."

Political issues are all those which relate to the policies of the government and who controls the government. All important questions of our time tend to become political questions. Foreign policy and war are obviously political issues, and the antiwar movement, which has as its objective the reversing of a fundamental policy of the U.S. government, is clearly a political movement.

In fact, the movement against the war in Vietnam is the most important political development in the United States today. Its demonstrations and rallies are political in content, and represent powerful forms of political action. They have produced the largest political opposition movement in this country in decades directly challenging the rulers of the country, the capitalist class, on one of its most jealously guarded domains, the conduct of foreign policy.

The antiwar movement challenges the right of the ruling class and its politicians to make war at a time when it is conducting a ferocious war in Vietnam. It is implicitly challenging the right of the rulers to rule on this critical issue.

To create a dichotomy between demonstrations and electoral actions and to call the former non-political is false. Election campaigns are only one type of political action.

What we are primarily concerned with in this discussion is not whether electoral activity should be a major axis of struggle for the antiwar movement, but with the specific kind of electoral action proposed by the supporters of peace candidates. They are proposing coalition politics which means supporting a "progressive" or "liberal" section of the capitalist class.

Coalitionism has been justified by many different arguments. Some have called the Democratic party the "friend of labor" or the "friend of the Negro people." Others say it is a "lesser evil" to the Republicans.

Today the argument is heard that the way to build an effective movement against the Vietnam war is to support Democratic party "peace candidates."

Are these arguments accurate or inaccurate, correct or incorrect? We feel they are neither accurate nor correct, and that their inaccuracy is revealed quite easily by examining the Democratic party to determine what it is and what it isn't.

First of all, the Democratic party is owned lock, stock, and barrel by the capitalist class as is the Republican party. The ruling rich keep their hold on the party through the power of their money to buy and corrupt, maintaining a tight grip on the central apparatus of the party.

A Vote-getting Machine

The tens of millions of Americans who pull the levers in the voting machines on election day do not control or determine the policies of the party. Moreover, the overwhelming majority

of them do not even consider themselves party members. The primary elections do not determine the character of the Democratic party. They are frauds, designed to give the party the appearance of practicing "grass roots" democracy. All important decisions of policy are made at the top and invariably reflect the interests of the ruling class. The truth of the matter is that both the Democratic and Republican parties are vote-getting machines for the ruling capitalist class and not representative political organizations of the voters.

The outstanding characteristic of the Democratic party is that the party bosses have welded together a coalition that includes labor leaders, civil rights leaders, and even some socialists, whose job is to deliver in a bloc the labor and Negro vote on election day. This is a coalition of "leaders" and bureaucrats. The closest that millions of Negroes and workers come to actually participating in the coalition is on election day when they pull down the voting lever.

This coalition has been very useful to the country's rulers because it has provided them with a means by which dissent and opposition can be drawn into their organization, the Democratic party. Dissenters are trapped into choosing between the liberal and conservative wings of the capitalist parties, both of which are dedicated to the preservation of capitalism. Furthermore, coalitionism blocks the formation of independent anti-capitalist opposition to the ruling parties.

The ruling class is a tiny minority and under an electoral system it is imperative that it find allies who can insure the success of its candidates at the polls. This "alliance" does not benefit the vast majority of workers and Negroes but rather is the means by which the rulers guarantee their continued political dominance. For workers and Negroes, who represent the majority of the electorate, to block with a tiny group of capitalists and politicians on the terms of the latter is like a group of slaves joining their owner in a struggle against slavery.

Coalitionism and "Practical" Politics

Most supporters of coalitionism will agree with many of our arguments about the nature of the Democratic party and the labor-Negro coalition with it. However, they contend that at the present historical juncture it is more "practical" to support "progressive" capitalist politicians in order to win partial gains than to support and help develop the existing independent political movements.

We only need to examine the record carefully to determine whether this contention has any validity or not. What concrete gains were won, for example, for the working class and Negro people as a result of welding a coalition in support of Johnson in the 1964 elections? The answer is none. With a landslide victory tucked under his belt Johnson felt he had enough elbow room to escalate the dirty war in Vietnam.

In response to this gruesome war the anti-Vietnam-war movement emerged and was organized independent of the Democratic party and implicitly against it. Organized labor fared no better. With the labor vote wrapped neatly and delivered to his doorstep, Johnson and the Democratic party politicians felt safe enough to renege on their promise -- a meager promise at that -- to abolish Section 14b of the Taft-Hartly Act. In the civil rights field where some legislation was passed, this was not the result of coalitionism but in reality a response to the independent struggle of the Negro people in massive demonstrations. These direct actions were organized outside of the Democratic party and independent of it.

Bettina Aptheker, in an article in the most recent issue of Dimensions ("Perspectives for the Peace Movement"), discusses this question of winning partial gains by supporting "progressive" capitalist candidates. "But what of the fact that Robert Scheer's election might bring us closer to ending the war? That seems to be ignored." She says, "The idea is also advanced that it would be disastrous if Robert Kennedy became President in 1968 on the pledge of ending the war; and catastrophic if he really did end the war. Granted that Bobby was a McCarthy hatchet man, and isn't exactly a sweet-smelling politician; but we're not being napalmed and gassed and murdered. Maybe, just maybe, we could tolerate Bobby long enough to get the troops home."

Bettina seems confident that Kennedy would bring the troops home, if elected. Such confidence is hard to justify when one listens to Kennedy. In the May 1966 "Report from Robert Kennedy," the former Attorney General of the country said: "Our objective is a settlement which will free the South Vietnamese from the terror and intimidation, and prevent the forceable takeover of their country by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front. To achieve this objective we must continue our military commitment to convince the Communists that they are not going to win militarily."

However, Bettina misses one fundamental fact. The reason Robert Scheer, Robert Kennedy, Theodore Weiss, and other liberal politicians are critical of the Vietnam war is because of the tremendous grassroots pressure from the population, and from the independent antiwar movement which has the capacity to organize that sentiment. It is possible that Robert Kennedy could get elected in 1968 and be forced to end the Vietnam war. But it is also possible that President Johnson might be forced to end the war in 1967. The key question here is how much pressure -- from the antiwar movement and the world-wide struggle against imperialism, including the struggle of the Vietnamese -- can be brought to bear on Johnson, Kennedy, and the rest of the capitalist politicians. Rallying behind Johnson in 1964 or rallying behind Kennedy in 1968 is not the way to put pressure on them. This only guarantees them votes and relieves the pressure on them. It is much more sensible from the point of view of "practical" politics to organize independently of the liberal politicians in order to build the largest counterforce to their policies.

As socialists we support independent political organizations of the working class not only because of the pressure it puts on the rulers. More important, we encourage it because independent working class formations, no matter how small they seem now, are embryos of the political alternative to the ruling class parties.

"Lesser Evils"

The underpinning of Bettina's argument is that we should endorse the "lesser evil." She makes this clear when she depicts McNamara as "insane," and Rusk as "maniacal" but argues that "Morse and Fulbright have a grasp of world realities; an understanding of what the United States can and cannot do in this great revolutionary epoch."

The fact of the matter is that all four of these politicians have well reasoned arguments in defense of their particular approach to preserving capitalism. If Bettina is right in assuming that the "reasonable" politicians who can best defend capitalism are not running the government, that is a problem for the capitalist class, not for socialists. Our job is to help dispel illusions about capitalist politicians, not foster them.

Along these lines it is sometimes pointed out by proponents of coalitionism that there are significant distinctions between different sections of the ruling class. However, these distinctions do not differ qualitatively in the sense that they do not represent a break with capitalism or capitalist politics, but rather indicate different approaches on how best to defend capitalism. These differences can be best utilized, and can sometimes be created, by the movement, if the movement is organized independent of the ruling class as a whole.

Since most of the peace candidates are running in the Democratic party primaries, we have discussed at length the character and role of the Democratic party. However, liberal politicians will sometimes run "independently" of the Democratic and Republican parties. In almost every case such candidacies have in essence not been independent, but merely attempts to jockey into a better position vis a vis the Democratic party and did not represent a genuine break with capitalist politics.

Henry Wallace's Progressive party was this type of political formation. Although it was formally independent of the Democratic and Republican parties its program was pro-capitalist. In fact, this party was essentially a third capitalist party opposing the cold war, but supporting capitalism, and when push came to shove in Korea, Wallace came out in support of the war and the party collapsed. Wallace made no attempt to build his party on the trade union organizations, i.e., to build a labor party. Instead, the Progressive party was posed as a supra-class party - a "people's party" - which was a cover for its pro-capitalist program.

A crucial question for socialists when considering political action of any type whether it is a demonstration or an election campaign is whose class interests are served by the action. Socialists are dedicated to the working class and to the revolutionary transformation of our society by the action of the workers. Our day to day, week to week, and year to year activity is conducted with the viewpoint of how best to build a revolutionary workers movement in this country. Historical experience has demonstrated time and time again that it is impossible for the working class to

take power away from the ruling capitalist class unless it creates its own organizations of struggle. As socialists it is our responsibility to aid and assist the formation of these organizations where they don't exist and to support and develop them where they do.

Regardless of what formations capitalist politicians may create or work in, or how many divisions may exist among them, they are dedicated to the support and defense of imperialism. It is impossible for American imperialism, however, to maintain its dominance without ruthlessly crushing colonial revolutions and maintaining a world-wide police force. The Democratic party which has presided over more imperialist wars in American history than any other ruling party, by its very nature is not going to forsake its defense of imperialism and imperialist war.

In specific interventions like the Vietnam war, the rulers may be forced to withdraw, but not because of any fundamental change in the character of the Democratic party or the "liberal" section of that party. Instead, it will be due to the fantastic pressure exerted by the heroic resistance of the Vietnamese people and the growing international movement against the war. Support to peace candidates is not a way to end war, but rather insures the continued rule and dominance of the capitalist ruling class, imperialism and wars.

What Alternative?

If "lesser evilism" and electoral coalitions with the "liberal" wing of the capitalist class for the purpose of maintaining them in office are unprincipled and ineffective from both a socialist point of view and the point of view of maximizing reforms and concessions, what kind of independent electoral action should we be seeking to build?

Bettina Aptheker states in her article in Dimensions that, "While these coalitions (with the liberals) are often difficult to maintain they are the sure way to win." We have already indicated why they are in fact "the sure way to lose," but of equal importance is the admission that such coalitions are difficult to maintain. Why are they so unstable? It's certainly not because the liberals aren't willing to take support -- especially support in the form of money and good hard leg work -- wherever they can get it. Most liberals will take help from communists, socialists, anarchists, and even the ultra-right, as long as such groups keep quiet and work hard.

The problem in maintaining such coalitions then arises from the fact that the workers and Negroes who are misled into supporting coalitions with the liberals are constantly acting against their own best interests. Even though the majority of workers and Negroes vote for the Democratic party, they are forced by war, poverty, racial discrimination, inflation, and antilabor laws to wage struggles that cut across the interests that the Democratic party is pledged to defend and challenge the right of the rulers to rule. There is the ever present possibility that they will attempt to bolt the coalition -- hence the necessity on the part of the rulers of constant vigilance to keep them from striking out on their own.

As socialists we support and encourage these breaks with the coalition and point to them as examples of what the working class must do if it is to create a counterforce to the capitalist class.

We must have a perspective of electoral action independent of the ruling class and based on workers and Negroes, and we welcome such independent political struggles as the antiwar movement and Freedom Now movement. These movements present a direct challenge to the ruling class and undermine its electoral coalition with the working class and Negroes. The growth and strength of these independent struggles helps to widen the breach between the voters and the coalition, helps to expose the true character of the Democratic party, and helps to destroy the illusions that shackle the Negroes and workers to the Democratic party. The shattering of these illusions will be a step toward building parties of their own, representing and fighting for their own interests.

There are several forms of electoral action which complement the independent thrust of direct action and should be supported by socialists. Independent black political action is one of the most important forms today. The millions of black Americans who vote for the Democratic party are key to the entire coalition. Without them the Democratic party could not win (and as Stokely Carmichael put it, the whole structure would come crashing down in so many pieces "that all the king's horses and all the king's men could not put it together again.") The independent road taken by the Lowndes County Freedom Organization - the Black Panther party - in Alabama is an inspiring example of what can be done. Learning from the experience of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic party, the Black Panther party was built absolutely independent of and in conscious opposition to the Democratic party. It is democratically controlled by the Negroes of Lowndes County who make all the decisions and select their own candidates. It is not dependent on any single candidate or leader for its existence and program. It is financed by the people of Lowndes themselves and is not dependent on Northern or Southern liberals who have their own ideas about how the organization should be run.

In a county where 80% of the population is black, the Freedom Organization could win next November, if free and fair elections are held. Its example will provide a powerful stimulus in other southern counties as well as Northern ghettos.

A second form of independent electoral action which socialists should encourage and promote is that based on the working class and its organizations, the trade unions. The futility of labor's efforts to win concessions by supporting the liberal capitalist politicians is given fresh proof daily by the reactionary antilabor laws which pour out of Washington and every state capital, and by labor's failure to secure even such tiny concessions as the repeal of Taft Hartley 14b.

Although the sentiment for, and the possibility of creating, a labor party in the U.S. was diverted into the Democratic party during the 1930's, in other advanced capitalist countries such parties have been formed. In Canada, for example, which even has the same international unions as the United States, the New Democratic Party was

formed several years ago with the support and active participation of many unions and already polls roughly 18% of the vote in national elections. The NDP is on record in opposition to the war in Vietnam and against Canada's supporting role and has participated in building protest demonstrations against the war.

The third type of independent electoral action that should be supported is political campaigns that are specifically socialist in character and candidates who run on a socialist platform. Such campaigns at this time play a real role in helping to educate the layer of radicalizing youth about the nature of the Democratic and Republican parties and to convince them of the need for a revolutionary socialist perspective in America.

In a world where one third of the population live in workers' states, where the overwhelming majority of the population consider themselves socialists, and where socialist groups in increasing numbers organize against imperialism, socialist electoral action in the United States can only have the most fruitful results in the coming period.

Submitted by the National Executive
Committee of the Young Socialist
Alliance

YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE

P. O. BOX 471 COOPER STATION
NEW YORK, N. Y., 10003 YU9-7570

SOCIALISTS AND THE WAR IN VIETNAM AN OPEN LETTER TO THE DUBOIS CLUBS

February 23, 1966

To the National Executive Committee of the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs:

The enclosed open letter to the members of the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs is a contribution to the discussion on the fight against the war in Vietnam. It is in response to the article entitled "Negotiations and Vietnam: A Debate" that appeared in Dimension, the discussion bulletin of the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs. The future of the anti-war movement is the most pressing issue facing the American left today, and we welcome the opportunity to discuss this with you.

In the introduction to the first issue of Dimensions you state, "Free debate and discussion will be the hallmarks of Dimensions. This first issue contains articles written only by members of the DuBois Clubs. We hope this will not be true in the future. Replies to positions argued for or against by any article appearing in Dimensions will be welcomed." In this spirit of free debate we are submitting this article for publication.

Fraternally,

Doug Jenness
for the National Executive Committee of the Young Socialist Alliance

To the Members of the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America:

An important debate is now going on within the anti-Vietnam-war movement over whether the central focus of the movement should be around the demand for negotiations or immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops. We are pleased to see that this discussion has been taken up by the members of the DuBois Clubs, although the official position of the DuBois Clubs is to support the demand for negotiations.

The first issue of Dimensions, the DuBois Club's new discussion bulletin, contains opposing views on this question: Terence Hallinan presents the majority's position in favor of negotiations, and a counter-position for withdrawal is signed by Mike Meyerson, Carl Bloice, Harold Supriano, Leni Seigal and Jamie Huberman. While we have disagreements with your minority's viewpoint, we feel they are correct in supporting the demand of immediate withdrawal against the demand for negotiations. As one socialist organization to another, we would like to explain the reasons for our position and why we think the anti-war movement as a whole should adopt the demand for immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam.

An important question involved in the debate is the right of self-determination for all nations. Hallinan says, "Those of us who were in the majority on this question felt that we were not in any way compromising our principles because we believed that calling for negotiations to implement the Geneva Agreements would be the most effective way for us to help end the war while assuring the people of Vietnam their self-determination."

The question here is, not whether you are for self-determination in words, but whether your policy is actually in fact consistent with self-determination. Even Johnson claims he is for self-determination, but his brutal war against the Vietnamese is a continuous viola-

tion of this principle. We in the anti-war movement, and especially those of us who are socialists, should be careful that we not only do not make demands which in fact contradict the principle of self-determination, but that we formulate demands to support that right.

The demand for negotiations violates the principle of self-determination. It is true that north Vietnam and/or the National Liberation Front may be forced by the bombs and napalm of the U.S. aggressors to negotiate with them someday. That is their decision, because it is they who are under the gun. It is also true that wars generally end in some kind of negotiations.

But for us, here in the U.S., to call upon our imperialist government to engage in negotiations, implies that the U.S. has the right to negotiate the issues of the war, which are nothing less than the future of Vietnam: the economic and political structure of the country, whether it will remain divided, how much control the U.S. will maintain in Vietnam, etc. The U.S. has no right to negotiate the future of Vietnam, and to call upon it to do so plays into Johnson's hands by conceding beforehand that he does have a right to interfere in the internal affairs of the Vietnamese. In other words, it concedes beforehand the basic justification the imperialists use for every intervention, from Vietnam to the Dominican Republic.

The demand for negotiations also obscures the fact that the U.S. is the sole aggressor in this war. The implication that the U.S. has some right to negotiate gives credence to the idea that "both sides" are responsible for the war and have legitimate rights they are defending. This is completely false, as most DuBois Clubs members know. The demand for immediate withdrawal, on the other hand, puts the blame squarely where it lies: on U.S. imperialism and Johnson. It says in effect, "the U.S. is the aggressor in Vietnam and the cause of the war; and therefore the U.S. should get out, now, unconditionally." As socialists, we should make these points sharp and definite.

The Meyerson minority takes up another important point in this regard: the duty of socialists to defend the world revolution. Socialist are partisans of the Vietnamese revolution, even if they disagree on one or another point with the Vietnamese revolutionaries.

The Meyerson minority puts this whole question into sharp focus by raising the hypothesis: "If the people of the Soviet Union were faced with daily B-52 raids, napalming, systematic torture, a quarter of the population in concentration camps, etc., many of the American left who now make a demand for negotiations on Vietnam would then be demanding U.S. Hands Off, U.S. Withdrawal, etc. Negotiations would not even be considered as a proper demand." If it is obvious that the U.S. has no right to negotiate the future of the Soviet Union, isn't it also obvious that it does not have this right in Vietnam or anywhere else?

The minority raises another important point: if the DuBois Clubs can understand this argument when applied to the Soviet Union but not when applied to Vietnam, doesn't that imply a latent racism and chauvinism in the DuBois Clubs approach?

Hallinan attempts to answer the minority charge of lack of solidarity with the world revolution by distorting the argument. "It is said by some that as socialists we have a responsibility to the Socialist world and that since all those countries are opposed to negotiations and call for immediate withdrawal we must do likewise." This is not the question, whether socialists in this country should parrot what others say (anyone familiar with the YSA knows we certainly do not hold this position.) The real question is that solidarity with the world revolution implies in and of itself the withdrawal approach for socialists, especially here in the aggressor nation.

Hallinan, however, explains that "those of us on the NCC (DuBois Club National Coordinating Committee) who voted in favor of the new position on negotiations felt that our primary responsibility is not toward the Socialist world but toward the American people and that the people with whom we must find ways of communicating are not those of Vietnam, China, or the Soviet Union, but those of the United States."

The flaw in this statement is the assumption that solidarity with the world revolution can be inimical to the interests of the overwhelming majority of American people. Nothing is

further from the truth. The real interests of the American people do not lie with the war, witchhunt, racism and reaction of imperialism. And what point is more important to make to the American people than the fact that the rights of all people are equal, regardless of color or nation?

Hallinan's major theoretical argument is marshalled in an astounding piece of illogic subtitled "The Strategy of Peaceful Coexistence."

He says first, "When we in the DuBois Clubs speak of peaceful coexistence we do not mean an oppressor's peace. We feel that working to disarm imperialism even while it has its armies in Southeast Asia, Latin America and the rest of the colonial world is, in fact, the best way we can aid the national liberation movement and assure it of success in the long run." This is perfectly true.

He also says, "As long as more than half the world's population lives in poverty and hunger exploited by a handful of oppressor nations, as long as the great majority of mankind labors to produce wealth and affluence for a few, and as long as two fundamentally contradictory systems continue to exist, antagonistic differences will remain... The respective sharpness of these contradictions will continue to shift and even when all the colonies are freed, the warlike character of imperialism will not vanish. To its dying day it will go on seeking to reestablish its rule and committing new acts of aggression and provocation." But then, he concludes from these correct statements that "imperialism must be prevented from using war as a means of resolving any of these differences, that it can be compelled by today's peace forces to settle all of them peacefully through negotiations rather than on the battlefield." (Emphasis added.)

As Hallinan himself points out, imperialism is basically warlike in character, and will remain so "to its dying day." The only way to end the threat of war contained in imperialism is to "disarm" it, as Hallinan says. But the only way imperialism will be disarmed, the only way it can be disarmed, is if its arms are taken away from it, and that means a victorious workers' revolution here in the United States. It is utter utopian folly to think that imperialism, a system which will be warlike to its dying day, can be disarmed without waging a serious and victorious struggle for power against it. Those arms will have to be taken away.

The eventual disarmament of imperialism through a socialist revolution will provide the foundations for a lasting peace. But, in the meantime, it is important to "work to disarm imperialism" right now, as Hallinan says. The anti-war movement here, together with the forces of revolution throughout the world, can hold back imperialism, postpone its designs for war, and even end specific wars before imperialism is overthrown, provided the anti-war movement vigorously exposes and fights imperialism. The demand for negotiations does not clearly expose and fight imperialism, but, as we have pointed out, covers up the aggressive nature of the U.S. in Vietnam and blunts the collision between the anti-war movement and the war making administration, while the withdrawal position sharpens the struggle of the movement against the administration and thereby puts maximum pressure on it.

Secondly, Hallinan's conclusion that what socialists want is for imperialism to "settle" its conflicts with the world's peoples through negotiations brings out the dangerous and counterrevolutionary nature of the policy called "peaceful coexistence."

What the policy of "peaceful coexistence" means is not a disarming of imperialism at all. At bottom, it means the disarming of the opponents of imperialism. In practice it has meant, ever since the rise of Stalin, when it was called "socialism in one country," the policy of seeking deals with the imperialists to leave the Soviet Union alone and to allow it to develop in peace. In return, the Soviet bureaucrats have used their influence in the world's Communist parties to press for class peace within their own countries.

Under this theory, the Communist parties were transformed from revolutionary parties into pressure groups, not to disarm imperialism, but to plead for a peaceful policy toward the USSR by imperialism. This policy fails because the imperialists are driven in

the direction of war, as Hallinan says, and are continually threatening the USSR in spite of any agreements, and also because the world's peoples continue to rise in revolt irrespective of the programs of the Communist parties.

Hallinan's proposal for imperialism to negotiate with the world revolution is a form of this peaceful coexistence line. What it boils down to, is asking armed imperialism to discuss how much control it should maintain. Negotiations are a part of war, and the purposes of negotiations are for each side the same as the purposes they are fighting about. During any negotiations which may occur, for example, the U.S. will press for the same objectives it is now pursuing with bombs and guns, and its position in the negotiations will be determined by those very bombs and guns. It will try to get from negotiations the kind of government and economic system it wants in south Vietnam, and it will back up these demands with its troops and bombs. And what it wants is a permanently divided Vietnam, with the south one more Southeast Asia base for the military encirclement of China.

The kind of "peace" which "peaceful coexistence" would lead to is an unjust peace, preserving imperialism's control. Such a "peace" would only lead once again to war, as the people once again struggled against unjust conditions. As the Meyerson minority says, "There cannot be peace in Vietnam without self-determination. Our major principles must be, once again, self-determination for the Vietnamese people and withdrawal of U.S. military troops and bases."

At this point, we must raise a disagreement with the Meyerson minority. The minority calls for a return to an implementation of the 1954 Geneva accords. But it was the failure of the Geneva conference to guarantee the right of self-determination to all of the people of Vietnam which has paved the way for the violation of many specific Geneva accord provisions and the entrance of the U.S. into the vacuum left by France.

The Geneva accords arbitrarily divided the country in half, allowed a puppet government responsible to the landlords and imperialists to take over the southern part, and provided for "internationally supervised" elections.

What would the average American or Russian think if an international conference which sliced their country in two, and then proposed "internationally supervised" elections?

The regime in south Vietnam backed by the U.S. opened a campaign against the peasants of south Vietnam, to once again place them under the control of the landlords. The peasants fought back, by organizing the guerrilla movement. The U.S. had to intervene with more arms and men to attempt to save the Saigon regime from revolution.

The present war is an outcome of the failure of the Geneva accords to provide self-termination for Vietnam. In establishing an unjust peace, the accords were in reality only preparing the next war.

The failure of the Geneva accords is a striking example of the inability of the "peaceful coexistence" approach to succeed in even halting the shooting for very long.

Hallinan also raises the specter of the might of U.S. imperialism, and the consequent impossibility of the Vietnamese people winning against imperialism in south Vietnam. Therefore, he believes, the best that can come out of the struggle is a negotiated compromise. The Meyerson minority points to one of the faults of this defeatist attitude: "To say the U.S. is too powerful an enemy is to do precisely what the Pentagon wishes, i. e. to abandon each national liberation struggle."

One need not subscribe to the false and ultra-left theories of the Chinese that weapons mean nothing, to see that the opposite proposition, that superior weapons mean everything, is also wrong. The heroism and fighting capacity of the Vietnamese people have made the cost of "victory" higher and fruits of victory less appealing to the imperialists. As Meyerson says, "The National Liberation Front continues to control 80 percent of South Vietnam, and the U.S. has not gained back one inch of ground, even with the B-52's and the Marines."

At the very least, the cost to imperialism of crushing the people of south Vietnam will be huge casualties, and the necessity of an occupation force, according to most analysts, of over one million. Even more important are the losses imperialism will sustain politi-

cally throughout the whole world, especially here in the U.S. itself, as the movement against the war develops.

Our duty here is not to knife the struggle of the Vietnamese in the back by advising them to give up in the face of U.S. bombs and bullets. In any case, they have demonstrated that they aren't going to give up so easily. What we have to do is help build the kind of movement here that will, in conjunction with their struggle, help get those guns and bombs off their backs.

There is a real danger that the Vietnamese conflict will be widened by the imperialists, with the concomitant danger of a nuclear war. This danger must be answered, not by capitulation, which would only embolden the imperialists, but by a strong response from the Soviet Union, China and the anti-war movement against it.

How can we best do our part, here, to help end the Vietnam war and prevent it from becoming a nuclear war? Which demand, negotiations or withdrawal, will build the largest and most effective movement against the war? Hallinan correctly points out that "as socialists, our job is to find ways of broadening and deepening the opposition to Johnson's policies and reaching the great masses of American people who have a common interest in ending the war."

The first question to answer, is, What people are we trying to reach? If we want to reach liberal Democratic Party politicians, trade union, civil rights and "peace" leaders who do not want to sever their ties with the Democratic Party, or capitalist politicians who want to preserve the right of the U.S. to intervene in countries around the world but who for some other reasons are opposed to the Vietnam war at this time--the negotiations slogan is more acceptable.

It is not an accident that those who want to contain the protest movement within the confines of the Democratic Party, such as the Communist Party and the Socialist Party, are for the negotiations approach. This approach does not lead to a head-on conflict with the Democratic Party, and allows "peace" candidates within the Democratic Party or even the Republican Party not to appear in head-on conflict with the administration and the war. If the whole aim of the anti-war movement is to cuddle up to a few "respectable" individuals and leaders of the type named with slogans which won't embarrass them, then the negotiations approach is the answer.

But if the movement intends to go to the "great masses of American people who have a common interest in ending the war," then, as Meyerson says, "the demand which can, if any can, mobilize large numbers of people is: 'End the war--Bring the troops home.'"

When the average worker, Negro, soldier, housewife, etc. begins to oppose the war, to see that the war is wrong or simply not worth it, he naturally concludes that we should get out. He does not ask himself "Which demand is too radical?" or, "Which demand does my President himself raise?" He asks, "What should we do?" And the answer is, "Get out."

The real problem of the anti-war movement isn't to present people a demand which they may like if they aren't yet opposed to the war (and the negotiations demand doesn't even do this), but to tell the truth about the war and actively demonstrate that growing numbers of Americans are opposed to U.S. involvement in the war. In that way, more and more Americans will become opposed to the war and to the government carrying it out.

The withdrawal approach tells the truth about the war and offers a solution to end it. It is a condescending attitude to assume that the peace movement cannot approach the mass of American people with the real issues of the war. Meyerson correctly writes that "too often the self-interest approach becomes one of trying to hoodwink people: 'We're against the war because it is unjust, but let us organize you because you think it costs too much money.' People are not fools."

The demand for immediate withdrawal is logical, simple and easily understood as being

opposed to the war. The negotiations demand, however, is a demand Johnson himself makes as he escalates the war! Hallinan says we shouldn't allow Johnson to "monopolize what he obviously recognizes is a popular slogan," but should expose "his 'unconditional discussions' for the fraud that they are." We agree that the hypocrisy of Johnson's position must be exposed, but this doesn't resolve the problem that he is able to confuse and undermine a movement based upon negotiations. Look at what he did with the negotiations demand during the "peace offensive"!

The withdrawal demand cannot be confused or used by Johnson to cover his aggression. It puts the most heat on Johnson to end the war. It will also continue to be the best demand if negotiations of some kind do begin, as they probably will at some stage of the war, and after negotiations, if U.S. troops remain as they did in Korea.

The withdrawal demand, especially in the form of "Bring the troops home now," or "Bring our boys home," also has the advantage of being able to win the sympathy of the soldiers, their families, and friends. It demonstrates that it is the anti-war movement which is really on the side of the soldiers, and not those who send American boys to die and kill in this unjust, inhuman war. This demand can help the soldiers realize that they have a stake in the anti-war movement, and eventually can help build the anti-war movement among the soldiers themselves.

As the war deepens, the casualties will rise. The mothers, wives, friends and the soldiers themselves will increasingly question this war in which they are being asked to die. The opposition to the war is increasing and will continue to increase.

We are witnessing the development of a movement against an imperialist war after the shooting has begun. This is the first time in our country in this century this has occurred.

The negotiations demand can only confuse this growing movement about the role of Johnson and U.S. imperialism, obscure the truth about the war, perpetuate the chauvinistic myths of a U.S. "right" to interfere in the affairs of other countries, and tie the movement to the Democratic Party.

The demand for withdrawal is both principled from the viewpoint of socialists, and the best demand to reach the people and build a militant anti-war movement. It goes in the direction of the natural thrust of the movement against imperialism and its parties, and thus helps in the general fight against imperialism and all its wars. There is no contradiction between defending the principle of self-determination, building a movement here against the war in Vietnam, and building a movement which will one day end all wars.

We urge you to join us, and the many organizations against the war which have taken this position, including the Berkeley Vietnam Day Committee, in demanding that the troops be brought home now!

Fraternally,

Doug Jenness

for the National Executive Committee of the Young Socialist Alliance

TO: ALL NEWS MEDIA

RE: POLITICAL ACITIVITY IN LOWNDES COUNTY, ALABAMA ON MAY 3rd, 1966

FROM: BOSTON FRIENDS OF SNCC, 1555 Mass. Ave., Cambridge, Mass. 868 0939

Direct report from the National SNCC office in Atlanta, Georgia
via teletype service.

LOWNDES COUNTY REPORT

A Revolutionary change has occurred in Lowndes County, Alabama where only a year ago Sheriff "Brother Love" Jackson declared to the few registered Negro voters, "If you black niggers and white neggers start some mess, I'll get my shot-gun and kill all you people." For May 3rd Lowndes County was the scene of the most controversial political race in Alabama. At the first Baptist Church on the outskirts of Hayneville 900 Negroes met to nominate 7 Freedom Candidates who will run against Lowndes Democratic Candidates in the November General election.

The Lowndes County Freedom Organization did not split the vote but instead solidly united the vote behind freedom candidates who will be supported by thousands of newly registered Negro voters. Close to a thousand Negroes participated in the Freedom Party nominating convention and only a few hundred went to the poles to vote in the Democratic Primary. A Lowndes County Freedom Party spokesman said, "To join with the racists in the Democratic Party would weaken and split the Negro vote into frustrated factions and give the racists a new cloak of respectability to hid behind."

Hayneville Sheriff Ryals had forbidden the Freedom Organization to use a vacant space near the Courthouse for the Convention saying it would cause "Too much confusion". Justice Department Representative Charles Nessem said if the meeting were held at the Courthouse it would be, "A Turkey Shoot". Concerned that they comply with Alabama law (Title 17, Section 414) which says political conventions must be held in the vicinity of the Courthouse, the Freedom Organization made plans to hold the meeting.

Leaders of the Freedom Party told the US Justice Department that they would protect their own political convention in Hayneville, May 3rd if help was not forthcoming from either the local or Federal Government.

It was only with the assurance of Probate Judge Harrell Hammond and Attorney General Richmond Flowers that the meeting would be legal, that the Freedom Organization decided to hold it at the first Baptist Church, a $\frac{1}{2}$ mile from the Courthouse.

Thus white officials quickly and justly interpreted the law when the rights of the Lowndes County Negroes were backed up with the power of organized and determined numbers. Violence was a constant threat, May 3 but in this black belt community where a Negro majority has for the past year acted decisively and with unity there has been less violence than in other Alabama counties like Jefferson and Macon counties where Negroes play Coalition politics.

A deep concern of the Lowndes County Freedom Movement is how to gain control of the political machinery in the county; to take it from the hands of a minority of white landowners and place it in the hands of a majority of black landless. A Lowndes County farmer said " We must use the vote to get out of the cotton fields, and we cant do that by voting for the Boss man." But there is serious question about the efficacy of the vote for the landless, the poor, those average income Negroes who earn about \$1,000 a year. In Lowndes County, the Chairman of the County Democratic Committee, Robert Dickson, is a defendant in a Federal court suit charging that he has evicted Negro Tenant farmers from his land because they registered to vote. This same man, who controls the Democratic

Party in Lowndes raised the qualifying fees for candidates in the Primaries in Lowndes from \$50 to \$500. It is questionable whether the right to vote can effectively counter such sheer power as persons like Mr. Dickson represent. Lowndes County, in a profound sense, a test of American Democracy -- Lowndes asks a question; is America also a democracy for the poor?

Mrs. Crosby said that an important change in the Lowndes County atmosphere is that "Whites are releasing information we couldn't get before about politics and farming. The movement has opened the eyes of many Negroes and whites. We're not willing to accept tokens anymore," Only if it is extreme to ask for rights guaranteed all men, can the Lowndes County Freedom Organization be thought of as extremist.

The Freedom Party's Convention, the first such convention since Reconstruction, was held at 3:00 May 3 in a little church on the outskirts of Hayneville. The wooden pews, sticky with the hot weather, had never held a more serious congregation as seven persons were nominated in secret balloting of the thousand present. Those sharecroppers, laborers, educators, housewives and businessmen present had organized into one of the most controversial political groups in the nation. The cameras and batteries of lights of countless newsmen were grinding away.

There was a Sunday afternoon quiet as the results of the balloting were read. Nominated were: Mr. Sidney Logan (42, Mr. Logan operates a truck farm on his own 80 acres), for sheriff with a vote of 492. His opponent, Mr. Jesse Favors, received 381 votes. Mr. Henry Ross ran unopposed for coroner, receiving 715 votes. Miss Alice Moore, 40, won the race for tax assessor with 852 votes. Mr. Frank Miles Jr., 35, (born in Lowndes County, he works for a furniture company dealer) was nominated for the office of tax collector with 489 votes. Mrs. Josephine Wagner, his opponent polled 362 votes. Mr. Robert Logan, will run for Board of Education - position #3, (he works for Sears and Roebuck). Mrs. Bernice Kelly, his opponent received 330 votes. For the Board of Education, position #4 Mr. John Henson, 35, (born in Montgomery - he's a bricklayer who's lived in Lowndes for 8 years) received 611 votes to his opponents', Mrs. Virginia Shite, 327.

In Board of Education position #5, Mrs. Willie Mae Strickland received 604 votes (38 years old, Mrs. Strickland was born in Whitehall and is a housewife) to her opponents', Mrs. Fannie Bell Scott's, 241.

Mr. John Hulett, LCFO Chairman, lead the meeting, Votes were deposited in cardboard boxes on tables in front of the church and as the votes were counted, the results were announced to the people.

The meeting then quietly dispersed.

Boston Friends of SNCC
News Service
1555 Mass. Ave., Cambridge, Mass.
868 0939, 868 7503

The development of the Black Panther party is an important step forward in the Negro struggle and demands our active and complete support. With the qualitative change in the number of Negro voters in the South, and with the growing Negro electoral strength in the ghettos of the big cities, there is a good potential for the growth of independent Negro parties in other areas. We should do everything we can to encourage this development by propagandizing in support of the Black Panther party and by explaining the reasons for our support. We must become the political tendency which is identified with support for independent all-black parties.

A propaganda campaign in support of the Black Panther party gives us a new opportunity to reach out with our ideas to Negro militants and to civil rights and Negro organizations where there might be interest. It also offers us an opportunity within the antiwar movement and in the new radical milieu to put forth an example of a concrete alternative to coalitionism.

There is a tendency among new radicals to be sympathetic to the Black Panther party on the grounds that it is "organizing the poor." This sympathetic attitude increases our chances of getting a good hearing for our position on independent political action.

The Black Panther party represents the only motion in the working class toward independent electoral action which we can support. We must educate people to understand the differences between the Black Panther party and "peace" candidates - the difference in class composition, the difference in the way they are organized, and the difference in the relationship to the Democratic party and the ruling class.

In our propaganda work we must always be conscious of the difficulties which face the Black Panther party. The pressure being put on its members is very great and includes physical intimidation, slandering from the press, and the constant competition from and attacks by the conservative Negro organizations and leaders.

There are many concrete things we can do to propagandize in support of the Black Panther party. A 32 page pamphlet on the Black Panther party has been published by Merit. It will sell for the low price of 25 cents a copy. It should be sold as a campaign pamphlet - on the campus, in antiwar groups, at conferences, at meetings, and in ghetto bookstores. We should recommend it to contacts and people in the antiwar movement who we are trying to convince of our position on independent political action.

We should continue our sales of Black Panther buttons. We should be active in arranging for meetings where speakers who support the Black Panther party or leaders of the Lowndes

June 11, 1966

County Freedom Organization can speak. We can help to raise money for the Black Panther party through button sales and other activities.

It is important that locals send in reports on the response to the propaganda work we are doing in support of the Black Panther party, and any other information on SNCC, the Black Panther party or important campaigns where Negro candidates are running.

YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE

P. O. BOX 471 COOPER STATION
NEWYORK, N. Y., 10003 YU9-7570

SHOULD SOCIALISTS SUPPORT PEACE CANDIDATES?

A discussion paper submitted to
the Second National Convention
of the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs.

June 17, 1966

There has been considerable discussion within and between socialist youth organizations about many important political problems that face all of us. The open and serious manner in which the discussions have been carried out is a refreshing development and should be welcomed. It is only through this kind of discussion, in which ideas are weighed carefully and on their merits, that programs and organizations capable of fundamentally changing this society can be created.

We agree with the editorial in Dimensions, the discussion journal of the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, which states that those of us in socialist groups "should state our differences for many are fundamental and far reaching in scope. But we should state them in a manner which does not cut off debate, but rather, which poses the basic questions which need to be tackled by the movement as a whole."

Perhaps one of the most basic current disputes among socialists active within the antiwar movement is whether or not we should support liberal "peace" candidates in the 1966 elections. As part of the discussion, we in the YSA are submitting this paper to the Second National Convention of the DuBois Clubs for consideration.

Those who support "peace" candidates include in this category the liberal politicians who have criticized the Johnson administration's war policies in Vietnam. Almost all of the candidates designated as peace candidates are Democrats, although there is a sprinkling of Republicans as well.

The leading proponents of peace candidates are the Socialist party, the Communist party, SANE, and many liberals. Just recently a new organization called the National Conference on New Politics has been formed to help raise support for peace candidates around the country with Julian Bond and Simon Casady as co-chairman.

"Protest" and "Politics"

One of the most common arguments used in support of peace candidates is that it is not sufficient for a movement like the anti-Vietnam-war movement to remain a "protest" movement where demonstrations, teach-ins, parades, etc., are the most common form of action. It is argued that the movement must extend beyond "protests" and enter the electoral arena where it can become a "political" movement.

In order to discuss this argument adequately we must make clear what we mean by "politics."

Political issues are all those which relate to the policies of the government and who controls the government. All important questions of our time tend to become political questions. Foreign policy and war are obviously political issues, and the antiwar movement, which has as its objective the reversing of a fundamental policy of the U.S. government, is clearly a political movement.

In fact, the movement against the war in Vietnam is the most important political development in the United States today. Its demonstrations and rallies are political in content, and represent powerful forms of political action. They have produced the largest political opposition movement in this country in decades directly challenging the rulers of the country, the capitalist class, on one of its most jealously guarded domains, the conduct of foreign policy.

The antiwar movement challenges the right of the ruling class and its politicians to make war at a time when it is conducting a ferocious war in Vietnam. It is implicitly challenging the right of the rulers to rule on this critical issue.

To create a dichotomy between demonstrations and electoral actions and to call the former non-political is false. Election campaigns are only one type of political action.

What we are primarily concerned with in this discussion is not whether electoral activity should be a major axis of struggle for the antiwar movement, but with the specific kind of electoral action proposed by the supporters of peace candidates. They are proposing coalition politics which means supporting a "progressive" or "liberal" section of the capitalist class.

Coalitionism has been justified by many different arguments. Some have called the Democratic party the "friend of labor" or the "friend of the Negro people." Others say it is a "lesser evil" to the Republicans.

Today the argument is heard that the way to build an effective movement against the Vietnam war is to support Democratic party "peace candidates."

Are these arguments accurate or inaccurate, correct or incorrect? We feel they are neither accurate nor correct, and that their inaccuracy is revealed quite easily by examining the Democratic party to determine what it is and what it isn't.

First of all, the Democratic party is owned lock, stock, and barrel by the capitalist class as is the Republican party. The ruling rich keep their hold on the party through the power of their money to buy and corrupt, maintaining a tight grip on the central apparatus of the party.

A Vote-getting Machine

The tens of millions of Americans who pull the levers in the voting machines on election day do not control or determine the policies of the party. Moreover, the overwhelming majority

of them do not even consider themselves party members. The primary elections do not determine the character of the Democratic party. They are frauds, designed to give the party the appearance of practicing "grass roots" democracy. All important decisions of policy are made at the top and invariably reflect the interests of the ruling class. The truth of the matter is that both the Democratic and Republican parties are vote-getting machines for the ruling capitalist class and not representative political organizations of the voters.

The outstanding characteristic of the Democratic party is that the party bosses have welded together a coalition that includes labor leaders, civil rights leaders, and even some socialists, whose job is to deliver in a bloc the labor and Negro vote on election day. This is a coalition of "leaders" and bureaucrats. The closest that millions of Negroes and workers come to actually participating in the coalition is on election day when they pull down the voting lever.

This coalition has been very useful to the country's rulers because it has provided them with a means by which dissent and opposition can be drawn into their organization, the Democratic party. Dissenters are trapped into choosing between the liberal and conservative wings of the capitalist parties, both of which are dedicated to the preservation of capitalism. Furthermore, coalitionism blocks the formation of independent anti-capitalist opposition to the ruling parties.

The ruling class is a tiny minority and under an electoral system it is imperative that it find allies who can insure the success of its candidates at the polls. This "alliance" does not benefit the vast majority of workers and Negroes but rather is the means by which the rulers guarantee their continued political dominance. For workers and Negroes, who represent the majority of the electorate, to block with a tiny group of capitalists and politicians on the terms of the latter is like a group of slaves joining their owner in a struggle against slavery.

Coalitionism and "Practical" Politics

Most supporters of coalitionism will agree with many of our arguments about the nature of the Democratic party and the labor-Negro coalition with it. However, they contend that at the present historical juncture it is more "practical" to support "progressive" capitalist politicians in order to win partial gains than to support and help develop the existing independent political movements.

We only need to examine the record carefully to determine whether this contention has any validity or not. What concrete gains were won, for example, for the working class and Negro people as a result of welding a coalition in support of Johnson in the 1964 elections? The answer is none. With a landslide victory tucked under his belt Johnson felt he had enough elbow room to escalate the dirty war in Vietnam.

In response to this gruesome war the anti-Vietnam-war movement emerged and was organized independent of the Democratic party and implicitly against it. Organized labor fared no better. With the labor vote wrapped neatly and delivered to his doorstep, Johnson and the Democratic party politicians felt safe enough to renege on their promise --a meager promise at that-- to abolish Section 14b of the Taft-Hartly Act. In the civil rights field where some legislation was passed, this was not the result of coalitionism but in reality a response to the independent struggle of the Negro people in massive demonstrations. These direct actions were organized outside of the Democratic party and independent of it.

Bettina Aptheker, in an article in the most recent issue of Dimensions ("Perspectives for the Peace Movement"), discusses this question of winning partial gains by supporting "progressive" capitalist candidates. "But what of the fact that Robert Scheer's election might bring us closer to ending the war? That seems to be ignored." She says, "The idea is also advanced that it would be disastrous if Robert Kennedy became President in 1968 on the pledge of ending the war; and catastrophic if he really did end the war. Granted that Bobby was a McCarthy hatchet-man, and isn't exactly a sweet-smelling politician; but we're not being napalmed and gassed and murdered. Maybe, just maybe, we could tolerate Bobby long enough to get the troops home."

Bettina seems confident that Kennedy would bring the troops home, if elected. Such confidence is hard to justify when one listens to Kennedy. In the May 1966 "Report from Robert Kennedy," the former Attorney General of the country said: "Our objective is a settlement which will free the South Vietnamese from the terror and intimidation, and prevent the forceable takeover of their country by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front. To achieve this objective we must continue our military commitment to convince the Communists that they are not going to win militarily."

However, Bettina misses one fundamental fact. The reason Robert Scheer, Robert Kennedy, Theodore Weiss, and other liberal politicians are critical of the Vietnam war is because of the tremendous grassroots pressure from the population, and from the independent antiwar movement which has the capacity to organize that sentiment. It is possible that Robert Kennedy could get elected in 1968 and be forced to end the Vietnam war. But it is also possible that President Johnson might be forced to end the war in 1967. The key question here is how much pressure -- from the antiwar movement and the world-wide struggle against imperialism, including the struggle of the Vietnamese --can be brought to bear on Johnson, Kennedy, and the rest of the capitalist politicians. Rallying behind Johnson in 1964 or rallying behind Kennedy in 1968 is not the way to put pressure on them. This only guarantees them votes and relieves the pressure on them. It is much more sensible from the point of view of "practical" politics to organize independently of the liberal politicians in order to build the largest counterforce to their policies.

As socialists we support independent political organizations of the working class not only because of the pressure it puts on the rulers. More important, we encourage it because independent working class formations, no matter how small they seem now, are embryos of the political alternative to the ruling class parties.

"Lesser Evils"

The underpinning of Bettina's argument is that we should endorse the "lesser evil." She makes this clear when she depicts McNamara as "insane," and Rusk as "maniacal" but argues that "Morse and Fulbright have a grasp of world realities; an understanding of what the United States can and cannot do in this great revolutionary epoch."

The fact of the matter is that all four of these politicians have well reasoned arguments in defense of their particular approach to preserving capitalism. If Bettina is right in assuming that the "reasonable" politicians who can best defend capitalism are not running the government, that is a problem for the capitalist class, not for socialists. Our job is to help dispel illusions about capitalist politicians, not foster them.

Along these lines it is sometimes pointed out by proponents of coalitionism that there are significant distinctions between different sections of the ruling class. However, these distinctions do not differ qualitatively in the sense that they do not represent a break with capitalism or capitalist politics, but rather indicate different approaches on how best to defend capitalism. These differences can be best utilized, and can sometimes be created, by the movement, if the movement is organized independent of the ruling class as a whole.

Since most of the peace candidates are running in the Democratic party primaries, we have discussed at length the character and role of the Democratic party. However, liberal politicians will sometimes run "independently" of the Democratic and Republican parties. In almost every case such candidacies have in essence not been independent, but merely attempts to jockey into a better position vis a vis the Democratic party and did not represent a genuine break with capitalist politics.

Henry Wallace's Progressive party was this type of political formation. Although it was formally independent of the Democratic and Republican parties its program was pro-capitalist. In fact, this party was essentially a third capitalist party opposing the cold war, but supporting capitalism, and when push came to shove in Korea, Wallace came out in support of the war and the party collapsed. Wallace made no attempt to build his party on the trade union organizations, i.e., to build a labor party. Instead, the Progressive party was posed as a supra-class party - a "people's party" - which was a cover for its pro-capitalist program.

A crucial question for socialists when considering political action of any type whether it is a demonstration or an election campaign is whose class interests are served by the action. Socialists are dedicated to the working class and to the revolutionary transformation of our society by the action of the workers. Our day to day, week to week, and year to year activity is conducted with the viewpoint of how best to build a revolutionary workers movement in this country. Historical experience has demonstrated time and time again that it is impossible for the working class to

take power away from the ruling capitalist class unless it creates its own organizations of struggle. As socialists it is our responsibility to aid and assist the formation of these organizations where they don't exist and to support and develop them where they do.

Regardless of what formations capitalist politicians may create or work in, or how many divisions may exist among them, they are dedicated to the support and defense of imperialism. It is impossible for American imperialism, however, to maintain its dominance without ruthlessly crushing colonial revolutions and maintaining a world-wide police force. The Democratic party which has presided over more imperialist wars in American history than any other ruling party, by its very nature is not going to forsake its defense of imperialism and imperialist war.

In specific interventions like the Vietnam war, the rulers may be forced to withdraw, but not because of any fundamental change in the character of the Democratic party or the "liberal" section of that party. Instead, it will be due to the fantastic pressure exerted by the heroic resistance of the Vietnamese people and the growing international movement against the war. Support to peace candidates is not a way to end war, but rather insures the continued rule and dominance of the capitalist ruling class, imperialism and wars.

What Alternative?

If "lesser evilism" and electoral coalitions with the "liberal" wing of the capitalist class for the purpose of maintaining them in office are unprincipled and ineffective from both a socialist point of view and the point of view of maximizing reforms and concessions, what kind of independent electoral action should we be seeking to build?

Bettina Aptheker states in her article in Dimensions that, "While these coalitions (with the liberals) are often difficult to maintain they are the sure way to win." We have already indicated why they are in fact "the sure way to lose," but of equal importance is the admission that such coalitions are difficult to maintain. Why are they so unstable? It's certainly not because the liberals aren't willing to take support -- especially support in the form of money and good hard leg work -- wherever they can get it. Most liberals will take help from communists, socialists, anarchists, and even the ultra-right, as long as such groups keep quiet and work hard.

The problem in maintaining such coalitions then arises from the fact that the workers and Negroes who are misled into supporting coalitions with the liberals are constantly acting against their own best interests. Even though the majority of workers and Negroes vote for the Democratic party, they are forced by war, poverty, racial discrimination, inflation, and antilabor laws to wage struggles that cut across the interests that the Democratic party is pledged to defend and challenge the right of the rulers to rule. There is the ever present possibility that they will attempt to bolt the coalition -- hence the necessity on the part of the rulers of constant vigilance to keep them from striking out on their own.

As socialists we support and encourage these breaks with the coalition and point to them as examples of what the working class must do if it is to create a counterforce to the capitalist class.

We must have a perspective of electoral action independent of the ruling class and based on workers and Negroes, and we welcome such independent political struggles as the antiwar movement and Freedom Now movement. These movements present a direct challenge to the ruling class and undermine its electoral coalition with the working class and Negroes. The growth and strength of these independent struggles helps to widen the breach between the voters and the coalition, helps to expose the true character of the Democratic party, and helps to destroy the illusions that shackle the Negroes and workers to the Democratic party. The shattering of these illusions will be a step toward building parties of their own, representing and fighting for their own interests.

There are several forms of electoral action which complement the independent thrust of direct action and should be supported by socialists. Independent black political action is one of the most important forms today. The millions of black Americans who vote for the Democratic party are key to the entire coalition. Without them the Democratic party could not win (and as Stokely Carmichael put it, the whole structure would come crashing down in so many pieces "that all the king's horses and all the king's men could not put it together again.") The independent road taken by the Lowndes County Freedom Organization -- the Black Panther party -- in Alabama is an inspiring example of what can be done. Learning from the experience of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic party, the Black Panther party was built absolutely independent of and in conscious opposition to the Democratic party. It is democratically controlled by the Negroes of Lowndes County who make all the decisions and select their own candidates. It is not dependent on any single candidate or leader for its existence and program. It is financed by the people of Lowndes themselves and is not dependent on Northern or Southern liberals who have their own ideas about how the organization should be run.

In a county where 80% of the population is black, the Freedom Organization could win next November, if free and fair elections are held. Its example will provide a powerful stimulus in other southern counties as well as Northern ghettos.

A second form of independent electoral action which socialists should encourage and promote is that based on the working class and its organizations, the trade unions. The futility of labor's efforts to win concessions by supporting the liberal capitalist politicians is given fresh proof daily by the reactionary antilabor laws which pour out of Washington and every state capital, and by labor's failure to secure even such tiny concessions as the repeal of Taft Hartley 14b.

Although the sentiment for, and the possibility of creating, a labor party in the U.S. was diverted into the Democratic party during the 1930's, in other advanced capitalist countries such parties have been formed. In Canada, for example, which even has the same international unions as the United States, the New Democratic Party was

formed several years ago with the support and active participation of many unions and already polls roughly 18% of the vote in national elections. The NDP is on record in opposition to the war in Vietnam and against Canada's supporting role and has participated in building protest demonstrations against the war.

The third type of independent electoral action that should be supported is political campaigns that are specifically socialist in character and candidates who run on a socialist platform. Such campaigns at this time play a real role in helping to educate the layer of radicalizing youth about the nature of the Democratic and Republican parties and to convince them of the need for a revolutionary socialist perspective in America.

In a world where one third of the population live in workers' states, where the overwhelming majority of the population consider themselves socialists, and where socialist groups in increasing numbers organize against imperialism, socialist electoral action in the United States can only have the most fruitful results in the coming period.

Submitted by the National Executive
Committee of the Young Socialist
Alliance

NEC Minutes for June 4, 1966 No. 15

Present: NEC: Lew, Betsey, Caroline, Doug, Mary-Alice, Daniels,
Melissa, Dan
NC ALT: Roland

Chairman: Daniels

Agenda: 1. National Office Report
2. Seattle Report
3. Bloomington Defense
4. Northern Convention Report
5. DuBois Club Convention
6. Antiwar Report
7. Tour Report

1. National Office Report - Lew

a. Merit Publishers will be publishing a pamphlet on the Black Panther Party, which will include John Benson's article in the Young Socialist, the interview with Stokely Carmichael printed in the Militant, and John Hullet's speech in Los Angeles. Selling this pamphlet will be one way in which we can help publicize and support the Black Panther Party.

Discussion: Betsey, Doug

b. Mary-Alice has been functioning as editor of the Young Socialist for the last few months.

Motion: That Mary-Alice be editor of the Young Socialist.

Motion Passed

c. Comrades John C., Joe H., Carol L., Irving K., and Evelyn K. have been transferred to Detroit to reinforce the Detroit local.

Motion: To approve the transfers of NCers John C., Joe H., and Irving K. to Detroit.

Discussion: Betsey, Dan, Lew, Doug

Motion Passed

d. A group of six young people in Milwaukee wish to join the YSA. Comrades from Chicago have had discussions with them and recommend we accept them into membership and constitute a local in Milwaukee.

Motion: To accept Jim E., Duane W., Loretta W., Russel C., Richard A., Jim R., into membership in the YSA and constitute them as a local.

Discussion: Dan, Melissa, Lew, Betsey, Roland, Lew, Doug, Mary-Alice, Caroline, Lew

Motion Passed

e. Announcement that we received a letter from Jan. He is recuperating in Florida and doing well.

2. Seattle Report - Betsey

See enclosed.

Motion: To approve the report.

Discussion: Melissa, Betsey

Motion Passed

3. Bloomington Defense - Daniels

Ever since the request for an injunction was filed last November, we have been expecting a date for oral arguments. So far the date has not been set, and it now appears that the hearing will take place this fall.

Hoadley defeated his Republican opponent in the May primary and will be running for re-election in November.

Motion: To approve the report.

Discussion: Doug, Daniels, Mary-Alice, Daniels, Mary-Alice, Betsey, Daniels

Motion Passed

4. Northern Convention Report - Mary-Alice

Betsey and Mary-Alice attended the Northern Convention as observers. The convention was followed by a one day plenum of the youth.

Discussion: Betsey, Mary-Alice

5. DuBois Club Convention - Lew

The DuBois Club is holding a convention in Chicago June 17-19. We have received an invitation to send a YSA representative with limited speaking privileges.

Part of our Open Letter was printed in the Spring issue of Dimensions.

Motion: To approve the report.

Discussion: Melissa, Lew, Betsey, Dan, Lew, Daniels, Betsey, Daniels

Motion Passed

6. Antiwar Report - Lew

See enclosed.

Motion: To approve the report.

Discussion: Betsey, Mary-Alice, Lew, Dan, Roland, Dan,
Betsey, Roland, Daniels, Melissa, Dan, Lew, Doug, Lew

Motion Passed

7. Tour Report - Doug

See enclosed

Motion: To approve the report.

Motion Passed

The growth and strength of the YSA is very positive. The tendency toward increased recruitment that was noted at the convention in March has continued, and the majority of locals have more contacts around them than they've had in several years. Most of the new contacts and recruits have come directly out of the antiwar movement.

Nearly all locals are conducting summer educational programs and my observation was that these are better organized and more seriously handled than they've ever been before.

The relationship between us and our opponents has shifted more in our favor, particularly in the arena of antiwar work. In several important cities we presently have political hegemony in the sense that young people who are radicalizing have to deal with our ideas first.

A couple of locals have a few more Negro contacts around than was the case a year or so ago and several new Negro recruits have been made to the YSA. In Philadelphia a group of young black militants who identify with the ideas of Malcolm X are in contact with the YSA and participate to some extent in antiwar activities.

The Black Panther Party is very popular among SDSers, antiwar activists, and black militants. Unfortunately not enough publicity and literature about it has penetrated the campuses. I found very little antagonism or disagreement from my audiences with references of support to Malcolm X's ideas.

I gave my prepared talk to twenty-five audiences as well as speaking informally to a number of antiwar meetings. The audiences tended to be modest in size ranging from eight to forty-five with an average of about twenty to twenty-five people attending. Since the talk was directed primarily at contacts of the YSA it didn't go over too well with people who came to hear a socialist out of curiosity. The best audiences were those with some good contacts. The most common questions were about the capacity of the working class to radicalize, whether the working class even exists, whether the capitalists are rich enough to buy out revolutions, etc.

Literature sales continue to be very good. Malcolm X Talks To Young People sells very well and sales among white college students have been rising. War and Revolution in Vietnam sells very well and is sold by non-YSAers in several areas. Pamphlets and books by George Novack sell very well also.

Young Socialist sales continue to be good and YSAers seem to enjoy selling it. However, I noticed that many YSAers don't get around to reading the Young Socialist or using it in their contact work. One local has started a practice of assigning comrades to report on Young Socialist articles at YSA meetings.

Our most important political opponent at this time remains the DuBois Club. It was difficult for me to ascertain how significant their recruitment has been. It is clear, however, that their much publicized recruitment drive following the bombing of their headquarters did not win them many new members. Furthermore, it was my observation that at present their recruitment still comes primarily from the sons and daughters of CPers and former CPers. They've had difficulty recruiting from the new radicals. Our policy of approaching rank and file DuBois Club members with our Open Letter on withdrawal vs. negotiations and our conscious policy of fraternizing with them has reaped fruits. In Cleveland we recruited two regional organizers of the DuBois Club and in other areas we have managed to neutralize some of their members. Their two concentrations of strength are San Francisco and New York.

The Progressive Labor Movement is having difficulties all over the country. I found active PL groups in very few areas and in these areas they have sent many of their people into SDS chapters. The dissolution of the May 2nd Movement alienated a small alayer of independent non-PL youth some of whom have formed a group called the American Liberation League, which is small and exists only in New York and one or two other areas.

There are no signs that a new social democratic youth movement is emerging at this time. The American Socialist Organizing Committee (remnants of YPSL) dissolved a few months ago and with the exception of four chapters in Indiana YPSL does not amount to much. In Berkeley, the Independent Socialist Club (led by Hal Draper) has won some recruits recently and is an active part of Berkeley politics.

It was my observation that SDS is very large and still growing relatively rapidly. There are few campuses in the country where there isn't some kind of an SDS group. Generally speaking SDS is strongest on the outlying campuses and weakest in the larger metropolitan areas. The recent wave of sit-ins against university complicity with the draft deferment examination turned out to be the most successful SDS action since the April 17, 1965 March on Washington.

With the arrival of summer the division in the antiwar movement that has existed since its inception revolves now more and more around the question of the elections -- electoral actions and independent political action. The debates and differences of the past over non-exclusion, withdrawal, etc., remain, but tend to be subsumed in debate around the elections. The debates will be more in the open, causing the division in the movement to deepen.

As we outlined at the YSA convention, the elections will exert enormous pressure on the movement causing the cold split to become warmer. The division over orientation is now showing up in the plans for the summer. Two distinct lines are pushed and offered as an axes for summer antiwar activity. One is around the August International Days of Protest and the organizing of mass action. The second is the summer project approach being pushed by many sections of SDS, NCC, DuBois Clubs, etc. laying the basis for support to the peace candidates in the fall.

The national alliance of the radical pacifists, the militant independents, the Newsletter supporters, and us has proved effectual in calling and organizing for the next International Days of Protest. To this point responses have been received from twenty-five cities, including four in Canada, saying they will support and build the IDP. International responses have not come in as rapidly. Responses have been received from England, France, and Belgium. In addition, a group in New Zealand has responded and has put out a mailing to eighty groups in Southeast Asia calling for support. No response has been received from Japan although there is reason to believe that their support will be forthcoming.

The coalitionists, who are orienting toward the peace candidates, are dragging their feet on the IDP and attempting to water it down in any way they can. The NCC has in one way or another tried to get the August 6 date changed to October, and has only reluctantly agreed to help. The NCC put out a poll on the IDP which was totally erroneous in its facts, and has succeeded in dispelling more illusions about the NCC. The Parade Committee, for instance, has put out a letter refuting the NCC's poll signed by Dave Dellinger. (See attached)

It now appears that as a result of the maneuvering around the days of protest that the coalitionist forces are in a position where they will have to at least support the days of protest. However, because of the unwillingness of the coalitionists to really build this form of protest, it is now clear that these days of protest will be smaller than at least, the last IDP, barring a major change in the situation in Vietnam.

The NCC has launched its summer project with the support of Hayden, Aptheker, and Lynd. It is not known yet how much support this has. In the press conference in New York where this was announced Emspak also made an appeal of support for a list of peace candidates which the NCC is supporting. Aside from the fact that this exposes the

NCC for what we always knew it was, it shows that the NCC is far from dead and moving to take advantage of the peace candidates.

Our task in this situation is to continue to educate those independents around us for the long haul. Most independents will not understand the division that will take place, and it is therefore important to explain the situation to them. Moreover we must convince them that the division taking place now and the smaller demonstrations in August are simply the prelude to mass actions at a later stage. It is important, in other words, that they see themselves for what they are -- a cadre for a future mass movement.

The Newsletter: The Newsletter circulation both subscriptions and individual sales continues to rise. In addition, a large number of letters and inquiries are being received daily at the Newsletter office. Several locals, supporter groups, or individuals, have reported excellent response in broadside sales to campuses or high schools, or to just the general public, in addition to their sales to antiwar and radical meetings.

In spite of the maneuvering around the International Days of Protest and the deepening of the cold split in the movement, our tasks remain fundamentally the same. We should continue to build the IDP and try to get as broad an endorsement for it as possible. We should continue to use the Newsletter as the key to our intervention in the movement. And we should continue to educate the independents on political action and the meaning of national developments in the antiwar movement.

In this work we have the definite advantage. In an important sense the situation we faced last fall has now been reversed. In many areas our initiative is not challenged and it is the coalitionists who bear the responsibility for attempting to slow down or split the IDP and reverse the relationship of forces, so they can introduce a peace candidate perspective.

In the present situation we have far more advantages on our side than we did last November at the Washington Convention.

The failure or reluctance of our opponents to go along with the IDP puts the onus of split on them rather than us. The refusal of the coalitionists to build the Berkeley Vietnam Day a few weeks ago, and the Women's March in New York put the responsibility of split on their shoulders and strengthened our position within the left wing of the movement. This shift in the relationship of forces within the movement is clearly to our advantage.

Seattle Report Given to the NEC by Betsey June 4, 1966

Youth Conference: The youth conference called by the Seattle ex-YSAers to form a new socialist youth organization was a failure. Thirty people attended including nine from our movement, seven ex-YSAers and ex-SWPer, seven independents, and seven from other organizations. Those from other organizations included one Spartacist, one Marcyite, one anarchist, one DuBois Club member, two Methodist pacifists, and one person from the American Friends Service Committee.

The conference opened with a report outlining the reasons for forming a new socialist youth organization at this time and the minimum program which could be the basis for membership. The YSAers present pointed out that such a new group was inviable because of the very real differences between the existing socialist tendencies. We stressed the fact that the reporter had not even mentioned the war in Vietnam and pointed to this as an area where the different groups could unite for common action.

During the discussion the independents started walking out and before the meeting was over we left also. The "continuations committee" consisted of the anarchist, the Spartacist, the Marcyite, the DuBois Club member, and four ex-YSAers.

The Seattle YSA: The three YSAers who moved to Seattle to build a YSA there are active, along with members of the SWP, in Vietnam activity, sales, contact work, and finding out more about Seattle. They have helped to set up a new antiwar group, the Northwest Committee to Bring the Troops Home Now. The Committee has had very good results in selling the Newsletter at high schools. It also sponsored a successful meeting for Lt. Howe.

The Vietnam committee in which the ex-YSAers had been active was an ineffective committee which supported the NCC. It was very ingrown with strong pacifist and "nut" influence.

Room 204, 302 S. Canal
Chicago, Illinois 60606
May 27, 1966

Dear Comrades,

We would like to call your attention to an excellent three tape series entitled "The Legacy of Malcolm X." These tapes include selections from speeches of Malcolm X and commentary by George Breitman. The topics covered in this series are:

- I. The American Power Structure and How It Functions.
- II. The International Scene as Viewed by Malcolm X during His Last Year.
- III. The Question of Alliances.
- IV. Nationalism and Separatism.
- V. The Radicalism of Malcolm X.
- VI. The Wit and Wisdom of Malcolm X.

These tapes are recommended both for use in classes and for individual listening. The complete set sells for \$9.

As a supplement to the tape series, the enclosed study guide is very valuable. As you will notice, it includes questions for class discussion and lists the source of the various selections on the tapes. The guides are 10¢ each, or you may reproduce them yourself.

Within the next month, a revised list of the tape library will be available. This will be organized by subject matter to facilitate tape selection.

Please send payment with all tape orders. The cost is \$3 per tape, or ~~\$2.50~~ if four or more are ordered at one time.

Comradely,

Beverly Webber
Beverly Webber

NEC Minutes for May 10, 1966 No. 14

Present: NEC: Lew, Dan, Melissa, Mary-Alice, Daniels, Caroline
NC Full: John Ben.
NC Alt: Roland

Excused NEC: Betsey (Late), Doug (Tour)

Chairman: Lew

Agenda: 1. Fund Drive
2. Young Socialist
3. Antiwar Report
4. Report on Southern Trip

1. Fund Drive - Mary-Alice

With a little more than half the drive completed, we have collected 52% of the pledges.

Motion: To approve the report.

Motion Passed

2. Young Socialist - Mary-Alice

The May-June-July issue will be out by the end of next week. There has been a good return on the renewal letter which was sent out to the sub drive subscribers.

Motion: To approve the report.

Motion Passed

3. Antiwar Report - Lew

Report on the New York Parade Committee's call for International Days of Protest August 6-9.

Motion: To approve the report.

Discussion: Melissa, Dan, Roland, Mary-Alice, Dan, Lew

Motion Passed

4. Report on Southern Trip - John Ben.

See enclosed

Motion: To approve the report.

Discussion: Dan, Mary-Alice, John, Melissa, John, Dan, Caroline, John, Dan, John, Melissa, John, Roland, Daniels, John

Motion Passed

NEC Report on Southern Trip by John Benson

During my three weeks in the South I spent about half of my time gathering information on SNCC and the Lowndes County Freedom Organization, and half the time on the southern student and antiwar movement. I will divide this report into four parts: (1) the Black Panther Party, (2) SNCC, (3) the Southern Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam, and (4) the Southern Student Organizing Committee.

Black Panther Party

The basic core of organizers were originally SNCC workers, but about half of these have left the county. There are three left, and they plan to stay until after the elections. Now the overwhelming majority of the activists are from Lowndes, and the central leadership has come from a group that had begun to work on voter registration before they met any SNCC workers. The party grew out of the civil rights activities of the people in the county. The question of building a party came up as a result of a discussion on what to do with the vote now that they were registered. As a result of their experiences they wanted Negroes in office and they felt that it couldn't be done through the Democratic party.

The lessons of the MFDP and Atlantic City were important to the SNCC workers especially in making the decision to build independent Negro parties. The state Democratic party's symbol of the white rooster with the motto "white supremacy" also played a big role in their decision. This motto has since been removed and the organizers of the party consider this their victory, since it was their first leaflet which called attention to the symbol and forced the change.

As the movement in Lowndes has developed the people involved have relied almost entirely on themselves. They expect no help from whites; and they expect no help from either the state or federal government, at least until they have won the county offices. At that point they feel they will have the power to force at least the federal government to help them through such things as poverty programs and grants for schools and housing.

The movement has grown up around the problems the people of Lowndes face in their daily lives. From this their whole approach is on the local level. They do not even consider state and federal elections. They definitely want to spread beyond Lowndes, but they don't talk about the alternatives to the Democratic party on a state level. They talk of Negroes in other counties taking power on the local level. They seem to have the same approach to the North. Their approach is that the Negroes in the ghettos should smash the Democratic party in the ghettos, but not worry about anything outside the ghetto.

The local leadership in Lowndes has fought against pro-Democratic party leaders in Alabama. Several of the leaders from Lowndes participated in a meeting in Selma which became an open debate between them and the Dallas County Voters League, an old pro-Democratic party group. This meeting laid the basis for the formation of a Freedom Organization in Dallas County. One of the leaders

went to Perry County to take on Albert Turner, SCLC's Alabama project director, who had been openly attacking the Freedom Organization SNCC had been trying to build there.

The mood outside of Lowndes is still basically for working within the Democratic primary. The SCLC leadership was able to draw over 50% (maybe as high as 75%) of the registered Alabama Negroes into the primary. About 1000-1100 participated in the Freedom Organizations in the four counties, 900 of them in Lowndes. Even in Lowndes, perhaps 500 Negroes (25% of the registered Negroes) voted in the primary. The organizers of the Black Panther Party think the results of the primaries will help the Freedom Organizations spread because of the overwhelming racist victory.

The program of the Black Panther Party is based on using the taxing power to redistribute the wealth. They want to take over the tax structure to get money for their projects. The leadership thinks there is a good chance the landowners will refuse to pay the taxes. Then they will auction the property to pay the taxes. They are making plans to buy as much land as possible, both for a co-operative shopping center and to build homes for those who have been evicted. They also plan to buy land for cooperative farming and to set up handicraft production.

The LCFO members pay great attention to organizational details. They take regular minutes and read and approve them. Nothing is done without passing a motion getting approval. They are very concerned about doing everything precisely and making as few mistakes as possible. The leadership is very broad and respected by the people in the organization. The LCFO members in turn are from all parts of the county so that the Freedom Organization is capable of reaching out to almost everyone.

The major weakness appears to be an underestimation of the enormity of the task they have set before themselves. They think that they can take over one county and succeed. They are not completely sure they can do it electorally, but they still think they can take over the county. But they are doing everything they can to prevent being ruled off the ballot. They know they will win the election if they are on the ballot and their votes are counted.

They realize that the Lowndes County Freedom Organization is alone as yet in their struggle but they don't think that this will hurt them too much. Their mood is one of determination to win, and confidence that they have the power. They are based solely on the Negro population of Lowndes and have deep roots in it.

SNCC

The Alabama section of SNCC is the only section that I became really familiar with. This section is tending more and more towards all-black organization. I also found the tendency toward all-black organization among people in the Atlanta office and talked to people

from other areas that are in favor of it. For some this is a practical decision, for others it is more of a political one. Some of the people just feel it is safer not to have integrated projects and that any peculiar local problem can best be discovered and understood by Negroes, while others want to unite Negroes and have Negroes organize themselves. They do not want to depend on whites or be controlled by them. Whites are not being told to leave, but no more are being recruited and some find this mood difficult to work in and do leave. Some whites have left because they agree with the trend. Many of the same people who are favoring all-black organization also say their goal is "black power" rather than integration. None of the SNCC people I met were opposed to self defense. A lot of them are reading Malcolm X Speaks and in Lowndes County, Stokely Carmichael has loaned it to some of the leaders of the Black Panther to read.

Every SNCC worker in Alabama is trying to build independent Negro parties. The experience of the MFDP has lead many of those working to build these parties to consciously reject working within the Democratic party. Stokely Carmichael appears to be the main spokesman for this group. Although they are adopting many nationalist concepts, they reject use of the term "black nationalist," viewing it as a white smear word, much as the word communist has been used.

At the same time their basic orientation is "community organizing". They are very unclear as to just what kind of "community organizing" is worth-while. Many speak favorably of such SDS projects as the Newark and Cleveland projects. On the other hand, Carmichael is opposed to moves by SDS into government sponsored poverty projects. The real question of what are they organizing for is answered by the approach of "let the people decide". In fact, if it hadn't been for the people of Lowndes it is questionable whether SNCC would be organizing independent parties in Alabama. Even within Alabama, SNCC has not provided a unifying force. Each party has a different name and symbol. The main unifying force actually comes from the willingness of the Lowndes leaders to go out and speak in the surrounding counties.

SNCC's greatest weakness is their unwillingness to consciously learn from the experiences of others. SNCC workers do very little reading and when they do read, many of them just do it to see if someone else has articulated their particular experience better than they themselves can. What this all adds up to is that they really do not lead, but tend to go into an area and organize on the level that the local people happen to be at.

Southern Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam (SCC):

SCC was set up at a conference on November 6, 1965 called by SCLC and SNCC. But neither SCLC or SNCC play any active role in SCC. Right now its main base of support is southern "progressives." This is where it gets its money. Anne Braden raises quite a bit of money. Two members of the steering committee are professors at Atlanta University and hard Stalinists. Two of the three members of

the staff (new people are coming in) are members of the DuBois Club. It has become an official branch of the NCC.

The SCC has contact with only about five viable committees in the South - Atlanta, New Orleans, Nashville, Gainesville, and Miami. I don't know of any other antiwar committees as such in the South. There is antiwar activity in Virginia and North Carolina, but the SCC does not have more than a formal contact with these people.

SCC puts out a newsletter every two weeks and this is their main activity. They correspond with some of the committees in the South, but they are closest to the weakest groups. These are in reality little more than peace discussion groups. A lot of their correspondence is to northern Stalinist peace groups. They collect NCC, Stalinist and pacifist literature and distribute it free to people in the South.

Their main approach is to build a "peace and freedom movement." They believe that the way to build the antiwar movement in the South is to get SNCC and SCLC to support the SCC and for SNCC and SCLC to go out and build the SCC. They consider the lack of involvement in antiwar activity by Negro organizations to reflect a "low understanding" of its importance. They have no perspective of building and organizing antiwar sentiment among whites. Several of the committees have shown that this is possible through their activities, but the SCC leadership does everything to prevent these experiences from being generalized and applied throughout the South. The successful committees are likely, therefore, to remain scattered for a while yet. There is a need for a southwide organization to exchange experiences and help build, but the SCC is not this organization.

The SCC held a conference in Nashville which was an attempt to gain support among the antiwar committees. Instead the conference succeeded in deepening the antagonism. Carl Braden pushed peace candidates but very few people picked it up. They didn't really respond to anything suggested. SCC has the most hostile relations with the Atlanta Committee, primarily because of day to day contact between the two in Atlanta. SCC has little to do with building the antiwar activities in the South. Their conferences may call them, but the local committees build them without the help of the office. The demonstrations on February 12 were called by the November 6 conference and picked up and carried out by the local groups.

Southern Student Organizing Committee (SSOC):

SSOC was formed about three years ago, originally as a group to organize poor southern whites - sort of a white SNCC. But they never began any projects and soon developed into the main pole of attraction for southern white students who were radicalizing. They have organizational forms similar to SNCC's with no membership and just a staff and a mailing list. Organized local groups can not even affiliate. They have a budget of about \$5000-\$10,000 per

month getting most of their money from the Southern Conference Educational Fund and various foundations. They have a paid full time staff of fifteen.

The major question confronting SSOC now is what kind of organization it should be - what role it should play in the South, what type of program and orientation it should adopt. Most of its "members" were white southern students who began to identify with the integration struggle in the south. With the current developments in SNCC they are not quite sure what to do. Their reaction to the all-black orientation of SNCC has tended to be personal - "If I can't join SNCC what can I do? I'm for integration and SNCC says they don't want to integrate with me." After Stokely Carmichael spoke on this question the first evening of the conference, the discussion revolved around this in one way or another.

The basic impulse is to move to white community organizing and this is what Stokely recommended. SNCC is encouraging them to do this. They are planning a pilot project in Appalachia. Their basic orientation is toward the "poor" and against the big corporations. In addition, they place heavy emphasis on the ownership of land. Some say that a land reform is needed in the South.

A section of the SSOC leadership supports the Black Panther Party, not because it is in opposition to the Democratic Party, (and in their view in spite of its being all black) but because it is "organizing poor." They see no basic difference between the Lowndes Freedom Organization and the Newark Project.

The most likely direction of development for SOCC is toward a membership organization. What they will choose to build around is uncertain. It may be that SSOC can provide speakers and stir up controversy on campuses. They may become active in building campus reform movements. Right now it seems that the Vietnam war could be the main area of concentration. Several SSOC people argued against continuing the SCC at the Nashville conference because SSOC would probably be doing the same thing and would be doing it better. Very few openly argued this line, but none of them were willing to commit any money or personnel to SCC. They are all looking for more anti-war activity within SSOC. I don't think they argued against continuing SCC because they saw it as a competitor but because they saw SCC was not a good organization.

SSOC is the main group that has contact with people active throughout the South. Most of those identifying with SOCC are native southerners. Very few have had any direct contact with the organized radical groups. There is some prejudice against us, but generally it is not hardened. They do not seem to consider the organized tendencies as opponents and we should be able to work with them.

May 10, 1966

(This report was written before the recent change in the SNCC leadership. Carmichael's election does not basically change anything in the report. It only signifies that the current he represents in SNCC had more support outside of Alabama than I knew about.)

YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE

P. O. BOX 471 COOPER STATION
NEW YORK, N. Y., 10003 YU9-7570

PRESS RELEASE

May 17, 1966

MURDER OF A YOUNG SOCIALIST ANTIWAR ACTIVIST IN DETROIT

The National Executive Committee of the Young Socialist Alliance issued the following statement on May 17, 1966:

* * * * *

On May 16 Leo Bernard was murdered and Walter Graham and Jan Garrett were seriously wounded in the Detroit headquarters of the Socialist Workers Party. All three were young men, one still in his teens. All three were active socialists, antiwar fighters, and participants in the Freedom Now struggle. They were all members of the Young Socialist Alliance or the Socialist Workers Party -- organizations which have been in the forefront of the anti-Vietnam-war movement in the United States.

This act of terroristic violence is not an isolated event. It follows closely after other attacks which have been aimed at intimidating our generation of radical youth. In recent weeks the national office of the W.E.B. DuBois Club in San Francisco was bombed, DuBois Club members were attacked by a mob in Brooklyn, and the headquarters of the Berkeley Vietnam Day Committee was dynamited.

This attack, like those before it, cannot be dismissed as the chance act of an insane man. The murderer of Leo Bernard claimed that "the United States is overrun by Communists," and told his young victims that he was "killing Communists." In

(more)

March the racist killer had applied for admission to the Union of South Africa, telling the consulate he was "armed and prepared to fight against the Communists."

The attack was a politically motivated piece of terrorism bred by the atmosphere in which we live. The movies, TV, radio, and press, as well as official and unofficial agencies from the White House to the Pentagon to the John Birch Society, are all conditioning this society to the acceptance of violence and killing.

The Vietnam war has intensified this atmosphere. The killing of innocent men, women, and children in Vietnam has been justified as a war against communism and the murder of "communists" has been glorified as a heroic task. The daily body count of "Vietcong" dead released by American military officials in Saigon and Washington is gruesome testimony to this attitude.

The murderer of Leo Bernard was acting out the logic of this official anti-communist crusade. His action confirms the warnings of many that any attempt -- official or unofficial -- to stifle the growing opposition to the war in Vietnam will be a menace to the civil liberties of all Americans. Our response must be to build a stronger and more effective antiwar movement.

All those who are shocked by this ominous killing must unite against the reactionary assaults on the antiwar movement, the Freedom Now struggle, and the socialist movement.

In this spirit, students around the country have already reacted to this most recent attack by showing their support and solidarity. At Wayne State University in Detroit many young

(more)

people came to the hospital offering to donate blood and help in any way possible.

The Young Socialist Alliance is grieved by the loss of Leo Bernard. But we are all the more dedicated to the fight for the socialist ideas for which he died. We are all the more determined to build a society free of violence and war, race hatred and inequality. This is the best way to honor Leo Bernard.

End.

NEC Minutes for April 24, 1966 No. 13

Present: NEC: Melissa, Caroline, Lew, Mary-Alice, Doug, Daniels,
Betsey
NC ALT: Roland

Excused NEC: Dan

Chairman: Doug

Agenda: 1. National Office Report
2. YS Report
3. Fund Drive
4. Education
5. SDS National Council Meeting
6. Tour Report
7. Antiwar Report

1. National Office Report - Betsey

a. Mike H. from the University of Illinois (Champaign-Urbana) has requested membership in the YSA. Comrades from Chicago have been in contact with him and recommend him for membership. He will be attending part of the Chicago summer school. The two present at-large members in Champaign-Urbana have been inactive and have shown no interest in the YSA.

Motion: That we drop from membership the two present at-large YSA members in Champaign-Urbana because of their inactivity and lack of interest.

Motion Passed

Motion: That we accept Mike H. as a member at-large.

Discussion: Doug, Betsey, Lew, Roland, Betsey

Motion Passed

b. Motion: That we reaccept John B. into the YSA because of his work in Seattle.

Motion Passed

2. YS Report - Mary-Alice

A renewal letter has gone out to this month's YS-Militant combination subscription expirations. We will be mailing tapes of the YS-Militant subscribers to each local for renewal and contact work.

The next issue of the YS will be 32 pages and will be dated May-June-July. It should be out near the middle of May.

Motion: To approve the report.

Motion Passed

3. Fund Drive - Mary-Alice.

The amount received totals nearly \$2,000. We are 10 percent behind schedule, and thus the locals should make an effort to send in the money that has been pledged.

Motion: To approve the report.

Motion Passed

4. Education - Daniels

Most of the locals have started planning their summer school programs. Speakers from New York who will be lecturing in each local have been finalized. The study guides will be ready this week.

Motion: To approve the report.

Discussion: Doug, Daniels

Motion Passed

5. SDS National Council Meeting - Betsey

See enclosed.

Motion: To approve the report.

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

Motion Passed

6. Tour Report - Doug

Report on West Coast leg of tour and Philadelphia.

Motion: To approve the report.

Discussion: Mary-Alice, Lew, Mary-Alice, Doug, Roland, Lew

Motion Passed

7. Antiwar Report - Lew

See enclosed

Motion: To approve the report.

Discussion: Caroline, Roland, Melissa, Lew, Roland, Mary-Alice, Betsey, Mary-Alice, Roland, Melissa, Doug, Betsey, Roland, Lew, Daniels, Lew, Doug.

Motion Passed

Within the context of the antiwar movement -- that of a militant movement, but having no national ties or leadership -- several important developments have taken place since the demonstrations in Vietnam.

1. The Vietnam Day Committee has reorganized itself and is planning another Vietnam Day on May 21. When the VDC several months ago voted to endorse the Scheer campaign, it began a process of dissolution and inactivity. The pro-Scheer forces left the VDC and threw their weight into the campaign, taking many independents with them. This resulted in a long deep spell of inactivity for the VDC, including no mobilization for March 26.

As it gets closer to election time, the campaign has become more and more respectable. Types like Weissman, Bettina Aptheker, and Scheer have used the campaign to attack the VDC publically and try to kill the VDC.

The YSA throughout this period stuck with and defended the VDC against the Scheerites. With the bombing of the VDC headquarters and the demonstrations in Vietnam, a campaign was initiated by the YSA and NEWSLETTER supporters to revive the VDC. The march and rally of 4,500 in support of the Saigon demonstrations was the first act by the VDC in the process.

A recent meeting of the VDC adopted a set of bylaws providing for an elected steering committee, a single-issue approach, and a dues paying membership. Three YSAers were elected to an eight person steering committee. The repeat of Vietnam Day will be the key activity for the VDC in the coming month, and is an activity that can place the VDC back into the leadership of the antiwar movement.

YSAers now have an enhanced authority in the VDC because of our stalwart defense of the VDC -- sticking with it the whole way. Moreover, what we said about the Scheer campaign and multi-issueism now is taking on a concrete meaning to many of the VDC activists.

2. In New York the Organizing Committee to Bring the Troops Home (NEWSLETTER supporters group) has initiated a women's march which has received widespread and enthusiastic support.

Acting on the example of the Women's March in Berkeley, the OCBTHN put out a call for a similar march in New York. Scheduled for May 7, the march has the sponsorship of close to 150 women ranging from WSP to the SWP. The Bread and Puppet Theater has agreed to perform at the rally.

The march promises to be large and spirited. Initially opposed by the right wing forces within WSP and the Stalinists, the March Committee had the strength to carry through the planning and force the moderate elements to go along. Launched solely by the

NEWSLETTER supporters it shows the weight and authority the NEWSLETTER can have in the movement.

3. The NEWSLETTER continues to grow. Two hundred new subscribers have been added in the past few weeks. NEWSLETTER trailblazers are on the road in New England, New York, Chicago, the Southwest, the Bay Area, and the Pacific Northwest.

An introductory brochure and membership card have been printed. The brochure should be given the widest possible circulation. The NEWSLETTER will be printing thousands of them, with the aim of distributing them to the entire antiwar movement.

4. The NCC regional conferences that we have reports on (New Haven, Cincinnati, and Nashville) have been failures. The NCC wants to use these conferences to endorse peace candidates, multi-issueism, and the organizing and launching of summer projects implementing the above. In every case the conferences have had small and lethargic attendance and have accomplished next to nothing. To our knowledge no summer projects have been organized to this point.

Very few committees have participated in these conferences, but those that have were contacted and acquainted with the NEWSLETTER at the conference.

It is now quite clear that the left wing of the antiwar movement is dominant, forcing the right wing forces to compromise or withdraw, such as SANE, WSP.

Although the needs for a national organization have not been satisfied as yet, several trends are moving that direction. Much is still in flux, and we will have to wait a week or so to take a full accounting of the present stage of the movement.

Report on SDS National Council Meeting -- Betsey Barnes
April 24, 1966

Approximately 108 delegates attended the SDS National Council meeting in Antioch the weekend of April 9, 10, and 11. The proposals and resolutions which took up most of the discussion time were initiated by the right wing leadership. Although the leadership did not get its proposals accepted in the form they wanted, the opposition was unorganized and the political level of the political discussion was low. The main disputes came over the questions of the draft and "peace politics" and electoral action. Below are excerpts from the report that came in on the meeting:

"Peace Politics" and Electoral Action

The position paper by Paul Booth, "On Peace Politics" was passed as amended by the "Resolution for Coordinated Independent Political Activities". (Both enclosed) The discussion around these proposals indicated that most of the delegates didn't understand the question and really didn't care. There was significant opposition to the Booth proposal which helped to delay the decisions. Some of the opposition centered around non-support to the Democratic Party. They passed an amendment not to make any decision on the position papers until after an SDS conference on independent action, even though they had taken a vote on the Booth proposals.

The Draft

The point on the draft took up most of the time at the council meeting and indicated that the vast majority of delegates had been and are at present involved in antiwar work. A proposal on the draft by Lee Webb was passed. The main point of the proposal was that SDS "propose a national program of activity at the draft exams of May 14, 1966. On the national scale, the program will be the preparation and distribution of an 'exam'. The purpose of the 'exam' is to raise questions in students' minds about the war.... The only national coordination will be a call for the activities and the preparations for a distribution of the exam."

Most of the discussion centered around Booth's amendment to the Webb proposal that "SDS oppose the draft exam and will not participate in it and urges all people of our generation to do the same." In the discussion over the amendment many of the delegates vacillated from side to side. Some said that if it passed, their chapters would dissociate themselves from the national policy. Many said that they would cross the picket line to take the exam. They ended up deciding to have a referendum by mail ballot within the next two weeks and from this they will decide what to do on the draft.

Vietnam Work in General

A representative of the NCC came before the council and asked for support for the NCC summer Town Meeting project. The following motions were made and passed on this and on the general question

of antiwar work: 1. That our opposition to the draft is not our central opposition to the war and that we find other means to express our opposition to the war. 2. That the N.O. should allocate its resources for summer projects against the war and should coordinate them. 3. The NC urges that regional SDS summer educational projects (Town Meetings) be held. 4. That SDSers be assigned to Vietnam work in specific regions. 5. That there might be "possible" training sessions at the beginning of the summer in coordination with the NCC.

General

Paul Booth reported that there are 4,150 members in SDS that have paid dues in the last 18 months. He also reported that of the five projects that were outlined at the last SDS Council meeting, only one had been carried out - the work with the Delano Grape Strike. SDS took credit for the success of the strike.

A YSA literature table netted over \$52.00 in sales. There was no general pattern in the type of literature sold. PL and the Antioch CEWV also had tables with NEWSLETTER materials being the main literature on the Antioch table.

(C O P Y)
ON PEACE POLITICS

Electoral politics 1966 and adult organizing

The confluence of several trends makes it important for SDS to make a primary direction of its action program for the next months engagement in electoral campaigns.

First: SDS has grown in its local base to the point where its active membership and potential membership in many locations can provide important force to such efforts. In a number of cities at-large chapters based primarily on non-students have begun to gain strength, and for them there is no more natural arena for activism than electoral politics (for the student the campus is that arena). There is a very large "young adult" constituency which is looking for a way to be involved in SDS but to which we have offered no program.

Second: In our activity aimed at organizing against the war in Vietnam, the universal experience has been that for the bulk of Americans, Vietnam does not fit into a realm of experience which is immediate and therefore requires of them a more than passing consideration. For most people, a political campaign is an occasion in which there is a greater expectation of the need to make judgements about foreign policy issues.

Third: SDS understands the necessity of making political connections between issues, which we understand intellectually, felt politically: an electoral campaign is an occasion for multi-issue organizing. Among thousands of the young people who have been moved into activism recently there is a sense that the problems are more farreaching than their single issue protest activity would suggest. These young people are looking for a sensible form of action in which a general disaffection and opposition to the direction of the society can be brought to bear.

Fourth: Those liberals whom LBJ has been unable to either coax or bully into his Great Consensus are being cut off politically and are searching for allies. These include both liberals who are deeply moved by the Vietnam issue, and liberals who have been involved in reform and other insurgent movements in local politics against mainstays of the Johnson coalition such as Mayor Daley of Chicago. In almost every case they are open to more radical political approaches than before.

"Peace politics"

The most likely course of action for Vietnam activists to take is that of the traditional peace campaign: heavy emphasis on the need to end the war, and an attempt to use the forum of a campaign to carry on the educational job on the war. This will be unfortunate if it is the dominant type of politics entered into, for: (1) it fails to build anything permanent, although the war is a symptom of deeper facts of American life which require a more radical and broader critique and movement to change. (2) It will have no effect on the war, because such candidates tend to get

very few votes, and the President will be much more hostile to antiwar candidates than Kennedy was to the peace candidates of 1962, who fared poorly nevertheless. (3) It will pass up the opportunity to reach out for allies around domestic concerns, allies desperately needed in this coming period of heightened Cold War anxieties at home.

How should radicals approach the '66 elections?

The basis of our involvement should be the understanding that there is no organized left in this country, and that our job is to bring that into being in order to have the power to influence the course of politics. These electoral campaigns should be seen as a stage in the development of local insurgencies in many cases, the initiating stage. The important work is organizing work, but this should not be seen narrowly. The elections afford the opportunity to: (1) build precinct organizations to canvass and campaign and to carry over past the election, hopefully contributing to the growth of neighborhood unions; (2) expose to the public the results of our analysis of issues and institutions, taking advantage of the attention on the candidacy to carry out political education; and (3) build various campaign committees based among different professions and walks of life with the intention of sustaining these groups around programs relating to the radical concerns of the profession.

We believe that it is possible to achieve these ends either through Democratic primary insurgencies or independent candidacies, and that the choice of electoral form is much less significant a question than what radicals do in these campaigns. As long as the campaign is structured so that radicals can build independent organization, the organizing goals cited above can be achieved. The particular electoral rules of the state and its recent political history are legitimate considerations for choosing electoral forms.

Paul Booth

C O P Y . C O P Y C O P Y

A RESOLUTION FOR COORDINATED INDEPENDENT POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Objectives

...In New York a group has been formed by two of the editors of Studies on the Left, in the West Side of Manhattan, that has attempted to integrate a political perspective on the question of power and community (and national) relations with community organizing. Various specific issues (such as urban renewal in the poor and working class area, and Vietnam and education in the middle class areas) have been used as levers in which various social groups can be linked as powerless (or disaffected) stratum in opposition to the prevailing power relations. The link-up occurs through a political framework which eventually hopes to create a viable alternative to the two political parties. Therefore, electoral activity is used as one part of a strategy that aims for the growth of a radical constituency.

Similar projects, with S.D.S. people involved in their initial formulation are being formed in the Chelsea and Lower East Side areas of Manhattan. These activities might become S.D.S. summer projects with the hope that some S.D.S. people might continue organizing for a longer period of time....

Proposals

1. That a national conference on independent political action be called, perhaps sometime during the early summer, to clarify and coordinate existing projects and initiate new ones where desired.
2. That out of this conference some means of communication be started as a technique between different projects on the model of the former ERAP newsletter.

These are only proposals that should be taken as preliminary suggestions that can hopefully lead to more comprehensive thinking on the part of S.D.S. about long-range political objectives and strategy.

Submitted by Hal Benenson (Harvard del.), John Fuerst (Columbia U. del.), and Bob Gottlieb (City College N.Y. del.)

Box 471 Cooper Station
New York, New York, 10003
April 18, 1966

ATTENTION ALL YSA'ERS

FUND DRIVE SCOREBOARD

<u>Local</u>	<u>Quota</u>	<u>Paid</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1. San Jose	\$ 125	\$ 60.00	48.0
2. Twin Cities	475	225.00	47.4
3. Philadelphia	250	104.65	41.9
4. San Francisco	350	128.00	36.6
5. New York - Down	450	150.00	33.3
6. New York - Up	675	216.00	32.0
7. Madison	200	60.00	30.0
8. Berkeley	600	170.00	28.3
9. Boston	850	199.50	23.5
10. Detroit	350	60.00	17.1
11. Washington	200	25.00	12.5
12. Chicago	1000	107.70	9.3
13. Los Angeles	400	10.00	2.5
14. Kansas		50.00	
15. Ann Arbor	250		
16. Cleveland	450		
17. San Diego	50		
18. Seattle	100		
19. At Large			
<hr/>			
TOTALS	\$6775	\$1565.85	23.1
Should Be To Date	\$6775	\$2547.40	37.6

Dear Comrades,

This is the second scoreboard for the Spring Fund Drive and, as you can see, we're still behind schedule. \$729.65 has come in since the first scoreboard two weeks ago, but we're 14.5% behind, or \$981.55 short of where we should be to date. The next scoreboard will come out after the half way point of the fund drive. Let's see if every local can pay at least 50% by then!

Comradely,

Mary-Alice Styron

Mary-Alice Styron
Fund Drive Director

PO Box 471 Cooper Station
New York, New York 10003

April 14, 1966

To All Organizers & NCers:

Dear Comrades,

YSA members in Seattle who have held minority views within the organization have resigned. Included in this group are: Larry Shumm, Mellina Jones, Ron Ginther, Miriam Rader, Don Glick, Tim Patrick, and Larry Glickman. These people can no longer be considered as YSAers.

These former YSAers are now planning to organize a new "Revolutionary Socialist Youth Organization" and have called a founding convention for this group for April 24.

A loyal member of the YSA has recently transferred to Seattle so that the YSA is represented there. The NEC will now consider further steps to rebuild a YSA local in Seattle on a stronger basis. In addition, YSAers will attend and intervene in the convention, where the splitters propose to establish their new organization.

Comradely,

Lew Jones
National Chairman

PO Box 471 Cooper Station
New York, New York 10003

April 13, 1966

To all Organizers & NCers:

Dear Comrades,

It has been reported to us that the DuBois Club has called a national convention in Chicago, June 17-19. We hope that this gathering will give the YSA an opportunity to present our ideas to serious rebels in the DuBois Club, as we have done in the past with the open letter.

Comrades should send into the N.O. any information they have on this convention. Particularly important is information on what issues will be discussed at the convention, any discussion material, and convention arrangements.

Comradely,

Lew Jones
Lew Jones
National Chairman

The attached report by Jack Barnes who is head of the joint YSA-SWP antiwar fraction covers the same material that Lew covered in his report to the NEC on April 9, 1966.

Antiwar Report by Jack Barnes

The March International Days of Protest were larger and more militant than any held so far and mark another step forward for the antiwar movement. In all areas, with the exception of Berkeley, the numbers mobilized were significantly larger than in the October 16-17 demonstrations. The massive parade in New York was doubled in size. Chicago's demonstration of 6,000 represented a big gain over last October's 300.

Not only were the demonstrations bigger, but there were demonstrations in more areas than in the October Days of Protest. Many small towns had demonstrations.

The Days of Protest organized people on a larger international scale than has been the case before. There were mass demonstrations in many countries. 5,000 demonstrated in Vancouver and 2,700 in Ottawa in the first protests on this scale held in Canada.

The right wing was very unsuccessful in mobilizing opposition to these protests. With the exceptions of Boston and Denver there were no real threats to the demonstrations that we know of. Even in the small towns the demonstrations did not face opposition which interfered with their protests.

The demonstrations reflected the present composition of the movement which is still basically young people, students and radicals. But there were significant changes since the October Days reflecting the growth of antiwar sentiment in the country as a whole. In many areas there was an increase in the number of young people involved relative to the older radicals. There were contingents of "Afro-Americans Against the War" and larger numbers of workers came out. There was a higher degree of participation by organized groups such as the veterans, teachers, professionals, medical students, etc. marching under their own banners.

Large numbers of the demonstrators were not conscious opponents of imperialism or socialists. They came out to demonstrate because they were radicalized on the issue of the war. Thus while the general political understanding of many protesters was quite low, they had a very high level of consciousness on the issue of the war - as reflected in the militant signs and chants, and the almost universal acceptance of the "Bring the Troops Home Now!" signs that were sold.

The Situation in the Antiwar Movement Now

At the Washington convention and after, those who wanted to organize on a national level around the slogan of "Bring the Troops Home" were unable to do so. Events since that time - including the recent Days of Protest - have convinced a growing number of people that this perspective is necessary. Many of the things we fought for at the convention are becoming accepted in the movement as a whole:

1. The recent demonstrations in Saigon and the lessons of the "peace offensive" have made it much more difficult for the right wing of the movement to impose the negotiations theme. Many rank and filers from the DuBois Clubs, and even from the CP and SANE support the slogan of "Bring the Troops Home Now!" Dorothy Healy reflected the pressure to accept this slogan when she ended her talk at a Los Angeles rally with, "Bring the Troops Home Now!"

2. The need for a single issue antiwar movement is clearer than ever. It is the war which is radicalizing people and which is the issue around which massive united actions can be held.

a. This was shown positively in the International Days of Protest which mobilized thousands of new people and in the generally good responses to antiwar committee activities both on and off campus.

b. It was shown negatively by the decline of the Berkeley Vietnam Day Committee and the Berkeley protest movement when many activists concentrated on the Scheer campaign or temporarily turned to the multi-issue Peace-Rights Organizing Committee for Vietnam protest.

Those who were once strongest for organizing the antiwar protest by making the Vietnam Committees multi-issue have been forced to retreat - at least temporarily. They no longer raise the issue in its old crude form. In a recent article in the April 1 New Left Notes Paul Booth, the National Secretary of SDS, gives the impression that the fights over "multi-issueism" in New York and elsewhere were over the question of whether we should concentrate on organizing the "already committed people" as opposed to reaching out to new people. The debate really revolved around the question of which is the best form for the committees to take in order to win the maximum number of people to oppose the war, single-issue or multi-issue.

3. Our views on the organization of the movement are becoming more accepted. Real non-exclusive united fronts of the type we projected nationally in Washington are growing up in more local areas. These groups often include SANE and the pacifist organizations as well as all the radical groups and the Vietnam Committees. The various single-issue Vietnam Committees and Newsletter Organizing Committees have played the biggest role in organizing the withdrawal wing of the movement in local areas.

4. Many of the committees have had bad experiences with bureaucratic leaderships and procedures - either at the hands of the Stalinists or of phoney participatory democrats. Because of these experiences more people see the necessity for such things as elected leaderships, votes on important matters, and defined memberships.

The National Perspective

There is no national organization which has the loyalty of the movement as a whole - or of even its militant wing. Although the press helped the National Coordinating Committee to maintain the fiction that it was responsible for the International Days of Protest, it has become increasingly isolated from the living movement and is viewed by the activists more and more as the representative of a tendency within the movement. It is not a national coordinating committee.

Although many leading activists in the committees belong to the Newsletter it is too small to speak authoritatively for even the entire withdrawal section of the movement. Parade committees such as the ones in New York, Chicago and Philadelphia have gained in prestige because of their role in organizing the Days of Protest and the Berkeley VDC maintains some of its previous authority.

Despite the organizational vacuum on a national level, we must push for the continuation of antiwar actions on a national and international scale. It is not yet clear what forms these can take and what organizations can take the initiative in organizing them. As of now a second Vietnam Day is planned for Berkeley on May 21. The Chicago parade committee has called a demonstration for July 4.

The two general organizational frameworks for the antiwar movement which we fought for at the Washington Thanksgiving Convention - a united front non-exclusive coordinating committee for agreed upon actions, and a national organization of independent committees for immediate withdrawal of American troops - are represented in an embryonic form by the Parade Committees and the Newsletter supporters. But neither are yet really national organizations.

The Perspective of the Newsletter

With the increasing acceptance of the Newsletter's perspective, it has become the spokesman in many areas for the left wing of the movement. Organizing committees of Newsletter supporters are being successfully set up in a growing number of cities. In the present conjuncture the Newsletter should grow and gain in influence. It is expanding its activities so that it can play more of an organizing role than it has before. It helped to initiate the post-Days of Protest demonstrations in solidarity with the Vietnamese demonstrations. A membership card and throw-away brochure have been printed up in preparation for a membership drive. It has organized six different trailblazes to introduce new areas to the Newsletter, and to organize new antiwar committees. The goal of the Newsletter is to have a membership drive bringing in thousands of new members by the end of the summer.

Summer Projects and Peace Candidates

The main competing line with the perspective of the Newsletter of deepening and extending the antiwar protests and propaganda activities is that of the DuBois Clubs, the NCC, and some of the SDS leadership who have projected "summer projects." These projects are to lay the groundwork for "meaningful" electoral work in support of "peace candidates." Articles by Frank Emspack in Peace and Freedom News have pointed to Bob Scheer and Sen. Gaylord Nelson as outstanding Democratic Party candidates, urging support for them and urging antiwar activists to form Committees for Independent Political Action.

Thus far those who have emphasized the support of "peace candidates" have been relatively unsuccessful in channeling antiwar sentiment in this direction. In Chicago the Committee for Independent Political Action has had trouble getting young antiwar activists to do leg work for a Sidney Lens campaign. In Texas, Ronald Dugger who was heralded as a peace candidate has given up his campaign because he believes Johnson is now aware of the feelings of the American people and he doesn't want to jeopardize the chances of the Democratic candidate running for the same office. The Scheer campaign, which originally split the Berkeley VDC, has lost the support of many of the activists it originally attracted as the California Democratic Council has demanded concessions.

The Militant Drive

The Militant subscription drive has come at a perfect time. We are attracting many new people to us because of the deepening Vietnam protest and because of our role in the movement. We need to get the Militant into the hands of these people we have drawn around us and we need to spend time recruiting them to the movement.

April 6, 1966

NEC Minutes for April 11, 1966 - No. 12

Present: NEC: Melissa, Lew, Caroline, Dan, Daniels, Betsey
NC ALT: Roland

Excused: NEC: Mary-Alice, Doug

Chairman: Caroline

Agenda: 1. National Office Report
2. Conferences
3. Fund Drive
4. Education
5. Antiwar Report
6. VDC Bombing

1. National Office Report - Betsey

a. Dale of the Chicago local is over 29 and has asked to remain a YSA member.

Motion: That Dale be allowed to remain a YSA member.

Discussion: Melissa, Lew

Motion Passed

b. Jack S. has asked to rejoin the Berkeley local.

Motion: That Jack be accepted into membership.

Discussion: Dan, Betsey

Motion Passed

c. Jim V. of San Jose has asked to rejoin the San Jose local.

Motion: That Jim be accepted into membership.

Discussion: Lew

Motion Passed

d. A request has come from Antioch to accept Rick W. into the YSA as an at-large member.

Motion: To accept Rick into membership.

Discussion: Daniels

Motion Passed

2. Conferences - Lew

a. The SDS National Council is meeting in Yellow Springs over the weekend of April 8-9. Two YSAers from Chicago will be attending.

b. YSAers from Detroit and Ann Arbor will be attending a radical conference in E. Lansing over the weekend of April 8-9.

c. There will be a conference of the Southern Student Organizing Committee in Atlanta over the weekend of April 8-9. The N.O. has sent John B. to cover this. At the same time he will try to find out more about the Southern Coordinating Committee, the Black Panther Party, and contacts we have in Atlanta and Baltimore.

d. It has been reported that the DuBois Club will be having their national convention in Chicago June 17-19.

Motion: To accept the report.

Discussion: Melissa, Lew, Betsey, Roland, Betsey, Roland

Motion Passed

3. Fund Drive - Daniels

All the locals have accepted their quotas.

4. Education - Daniels

Thus far eight locals have begun to plan summer schools. Arrangements for the schools are going well.

Motion: To accept the report.

Discussion: Betsey, Daniels, Lew, Betsey

Motion Passed

5. Antiwar Report - Lew

See attached.

Motion: To approve the report

Discussion: Melissa, Daniels, Lew, Caroline, Lew, Roland, Lew, Roland, Lew, Betsey, Lew, Daniels, Betsey

Motion Passed

6. VDC Bombing - Dan

Motion: To send a telegram to the Berkeley VDC on the bombing.

Discussion: Dan, Melissa

Motion Passed

PO Box 471 Cooper Station
New York, New York 10003

April 13, 1966

To all Organizers & NCers:

Dear Comrades,

It has been reported to us that the DuBois Club has called a national convention in Chicago, June 17-19. We hope that this gathering will give the YSA an opportunity to present our ideas to serious rebels in the DuBois Club, as we have done in the past with the open letter.

Comrades should send into the N.O. any information they have on this convention. Particularly important is information on what issues will be discussed at the convention, any discussion material, and convention arrangements.

Comradely,

Lew Jones
Lew Jones
National Chairman

Box 471 Cooper Station
New York, N.Y. 10003
April 12, 1966

ATTENTION ORGANIZERS

Dear Comrades,

The next issue of the Young Socialist (Vol. 9, No. 5) will be a special 32 page issue, dated May-June-July 1966. It will be off the presses about the second week in May.

Although this issue will be dated to cover three months, it will be sold for the same length of time as the regular two month issues. In other words, the August-September issue will be out around the middle of July (and the October-November in the middle of September). This arrangement means that we can begin selling each issue before the month for which it is dated, which should make it easier to sell. We felt that dating this special issue for three months was a better method of catching up than trying to put out two issues very close together.

The May-June-July issue will contain an article by George Saunders on the Sinyavsky-Daniel trial and its relationship to recent Soviet developments, an interview with the Chinese revolutionary Peng, Doug Jenness's talk on Socialism and the New Radicals, an article on the antiwar movement around the world, and two book reviews.

Please fill out the enclosed bundle order slip, as well as the Meet Young Socialists in Your Area form, and return both by April 22.

Comradely,

Mary - Alice

Mary-Alice Styron

Box 471
Cooper Station
New York, New York 10003
April 12, 1966

ATTENTION ORGANIZERS

Dear Comrades,

As many of you may be aware, some mistakes and mix-ups have occurred with the special introductory subscriptions to the Young Socialist. A few people may have received only one or two issues. We are also aware of several instances where subscribers received no issues of the YS at all.

If any of our subscribers ask about this or indicate that they did not receive some of the issues please check carefully to find out when they bought the sub and what issues they have received. (It's a long time between issues, and also some forget they received one copy when they bought the sub.) If someone who missed an issue would like a copy of the YS issue they didn't receive, or if they would like a copy of the current YS, we should be sure to get it to them right away. The easiest and fastest thing would be for you to give the subscriber whatever issues he wants, then write the N.O. telling us what issues were given to whom. We will give you credit for these copies.

If any of our subscribers received no YS's (or if by some chance they never got anything, either YS or Militant) we are willing to give them a free one year subscription to the YS. Ask if this is agreeable to the subscriber, then send in the name and address.

Within a week we will begin to send out renewal letters to our introductory subscribers. The Militant has found that these special combination subs are yielding a very high rate of renewals, and we should have similar results from the YS renewals.

To help with both the Militant sub drive and YS renewals we will be sending to each local a tape listing the special combination subs in your area. Although renewals for the YS should not become a big campaign, whatever time can be spent visiting people who have been reading the YS and Militant for several months will help you build your contact lists, as well as help our subscription lists.

Comradely,

Mary-Alice

Mary-Alice Styron