



YSA

DISCUSSION BULLETIN

Vol. 7 No. 2
July 1963

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. Tasks and Perspectives (NEC Draft Resolution)	1
2. Report on the Third National Convention of the Student Peace Union, by Peter Camejo	10
3. The Peace Movement: Where Does the YSA Stand?, by Dick Roberts	16

25¢

Young Socialist Alliance

P.O. Box 471, Cooper Station, New York 3, New York



YSA

DISCUSSION BULLETIN

Vol. 7 No. 2
July 1963

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. Tasks and Perspectives (NEC Draft Resolution)	1
2. Report on the Third National Convention of the Student Peace Union, by Peter Gamejo	10
3. The Peace Movement: Where Does the YSA Stand?, by Dick Roberts	16

25¢

Young Socialist Alliance

P.O. Box 471, Cooper Station, New York 3, New York

TASKS AND PERSPECTIVES

(NEC Draft Resolution)

1. The decline and isolation of the socialist movement that characterized the 1950's has come to an end. At the same time the revitalization of the mass working class movement, and a general opening into it, is yet to occur. The beginnings of a radicalization among a thin but growing layer of students and the rapidly deepening radicalization of the Negro people in their drive for Freedom Now are forerunners of and a spur to the next general upsurge of the American working class.
2. The deepening of the Negro struggle and the stirrings of radical activity among students is occurring within the context of increasing economic and political contradictions of the capitalist system. The post-war imperialist expansion, with its concomittant prosperity, is slowing down. The imperialists face not only steady economic growth and competition from the Soviet bloc, and the threat of expropriation from the colonial revolution, but also an increased competition among themselves. Today Europe's economic growth has made her primarily a competitor seeking profitable areas to which capital can be exported. Internal economic contradictions such as the threat of an over-production crisis, the stagnation of the growth rate, the growth of permanently depressed industries and regions, and high unemployment are sharpened by and sharpen the growing stagnation of the imperialist world market. We see increasing attacks on the working class through automation, wage pressures, and anti-labor legislation, designed to meet stiffening international competition. All this points to a more precipitous decline and increased class struggle in the future. Although we are at a decisive turning point and the trends are clear, the pace and form of the decline of the American economy cannot yet be predicted and measured with precision.
3. In this transitional period the revolutionary socialist youth have a crucial role to play as a link between older revolutionary socialists who have been through the class struggles of the past and the as yet unradicalized young workers who will be the vanguard of the class struggles to come. Our ability to intervene as part of the leadership of the mass upsurge tomorrow depends to a large degree on our recruitment today of the thin layer of mostly petty bourgeois youth whose minds are being opened to our ideas. Our fundamental task in this period is to recruit and train new, fresh forces in the theory, program, strategy, and tactics of Marxism in preparation for the next wave of radicalization.

4. In this period the campus is the main source of recruitment and thus should receive primary emphasis. Historical experience has shown that the Marxist vanguard is built by the fusion of workers trained in the class struggle with young revolutionaries from other classes who come over completely to the working class cause. We are recruiting mainly petty bourgeois youth, and we are not yet able to reach many young workers. At present, the fusion we seek can be only partially realized through consciousness of its necessity for the future when it will become possible to recruit young workers from the mass movement, through the absorption by our members of the working class outlook of Marxism, and through close fraternal relations with older revolutionary socialists.

5. The YSA developed as the result of a regroupment process within the radical movement in the last half of the fifties. During this decade the major arena of radical activity was the campus, but not in the same sense as it is today. The fifties were characterized by general apathy and fear of dissent on campus. Isolated individuals were recruited to socialism, and here and there small socialist discussion clubs grew up. But with the exception of isolated local demonstrations and issues, and the two marches on Washington for integration, there was no political action by the students. Radicals formed the major audience for Marxists and their prime arena of work.

6. A new phase opened in 1960, coinciding with the establishment of the national YSA. The Sit-Ins marked a new stage for the Negro movement and the beginning of political activity by a minority on campus. During the spring of 1960, while the Sit-Ins were still going on with strong student support in the North, the famous student anti-HUAC demonstrations took place in San Francisco. The new YSA was in the forefront of the Northern supporting movement to the Sit-Ins, gaining some recruits and its first real experience in dealing with a broad campus movement. The YSA, a product of regroupment among radicals, began a turn toward a broader stratum of students and the recruitment of fresh activists.

7. The fundamental characteristic of politics on the campus is that the world wide class struggle reflects itself there as a struggle of ideas, producing a growing ideological polarization. The thin layer of radicalized students is a reflection of and is responding to national and international manifestations of the death agony of capitalism. The upsurge and victories of the colonial workers and peasants, especially the mighty Cuban revolution, the repeated unmasking of American imperialism as the center of world reaction, and the ominous and omnipresent threat of nuclear destruction have been the major international

factors cutting through student political apathy and blind confidence in the ruling class. At home, the instability and inadequacy of capitalism even in a period of prosperity, the decadence of American bourgeois culture, and the radicalization of the Negro movement have further alienated these students from the rationalizations of the ruling class and have opened their minds to the working class (socialist) solution. These students originated at all points on the political spectrum before they became radicalized.

8. Since 1960 student political consciousness has increased with the deepening of the economic and political crisis of world capitalism. The more conservative anti-nuclear student SANE was eclipsed and replaced by the anti-war Student Peace Union. The Sit-In movement in the South, going through many experiences, has developed into the independent Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee. Interest in civil liberties (activities against HUAC, speaker bans, etc.) is reflected in numerous but short-lived ad hoc organizations.

9. Because students are concerned primarily with ideas they react to world happenings which do not directly involve them. The colonial revolution, the successes and failures of the workers states, and above all the Cuban revolution have had a profound impact upon the campus. The YSA as the only organization on campus which both defends and explains the Cuban revolution recruited a whole wave of students on that basis, largely through our work in support of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. It is impossible to concretely pinpoint what international struggles and victories will be important issues in rallying support to revolutionary ideas, but we must be prepared for the emergence of such issues while we continue to carry out our task of the defense of the first socialist revolution in the Americas, and of all anti-imperialist struggles.

10. While student organizations have multiplied and interest in specific issues has increased, both have been characterized by instability and sharp ups and downs. This is attributable to the petty bourgeois nature of the campus and partly to the lack of a sustained working class movement to back up the students. The issue which has brought the most sustained activity and interest is Negro freedom, and this is because of the growing mass character of this struggle. The temporary lag in the radicalization of the working class movement creates a problem of consciousness for the students, who tend to view social struggles apart from the class struggle. Our task is to draw these radicalized students into consistent and sustained struggle against the system through identification with the working class and the goal of socialism.

11. The most important change on the campus is in the ideological atmosphere which opens the door to serious consideration of our socialist ideas. This makes it objectively possible at all times, regardless of the ups and downs of student organizations and activities, to systematically seek out and recruit, through close personal contact work, by ones and twos, radicals on the campus.

12. The Student Peace Union developed into a national movement during the 1961-62 school year. The high point of its activity was the Washington demonstration, (even though the SPU capitulated to the right wing TTP, which demoralized militants) and it had a substantial growth in the spring of 1962 just after the Washington project. The failure of the SPU leadership to follow up Washington with further action further demoralized their membership and laid the ground work for the fiasco around the Cuban crisis. SPU declined in the past school year mainly due to the Cuba crisis and SPU's reaction to it. During the crisis the YPSL leadership of SPU wavered and came out weakly against the crisis with pronounced anti-Soviet sentiment and program. SPU could have taken the leadership of the student protest against the crisis with an aggressive united front policy against Kennedy's war moves, but it was paralyzed by its YPSL leadership, and in many areas the demonstrations were organized in spite of SPU. Wherever YPSL had control, SPU demonstrations became anti-Soviet. There was a general lull in the student movement following the crisis, and the fact that the peace movement was so obviously impotent at the time of the crisis discouraged students. YPSL reacted to the lull by intensifying its campaign to restrict SPU to the YPSL "third camp" viewpoint, which further aggravated the decline of SPU.

13. The YSA missed the development of SPU in 1961-62, with the exception of the Detroit local which made valuable gains from SPU work there. As a result of fruitful work in some locals we now have a functioning national fraction able to intervene openly with our program. In some areas work in SPU has been tried and because of bureaucratic impediments and lack of student interest has been found unfruitful. The peace issue will be with us until there is socialism, however, and will flare up around specific issues. As long as SPU remains the center of the student peace movement, we have to keep our contact with it, while at the same time avoiding over-extension in this area when the objective situation does not warrant it. Our most important immediate task in SPU is to develop our national fraction as a recognized programmatic tendency in SPU. This will prepare us for differentiating ourselves from the YPSL leadership if the SPU continues its present decline or breaks up, while at the same time will prepare us for a possible revivication of SPU, or for an important international war crisis.

14. Our intervention on the campus is a twofold one of direct socialist activity combined with work in broader student organizations. We will not recruit and hold people on the basis of our activity alone, nor will we be considered militant or serious if we abstain from the student struggles. We must intervene in campus organizations and activities to deepen our ties with activists, to gain a hearing for our program, and to seek out recruitable students. Work in campus organizations also gives YSAers valuable experience in organizing and prevents us from missing upsurges such as occurred around SPU. There are many different campus organizations in which YSAers are working and can work: socialist clubs, SPU, CORE, SNCC, forums, ad hoc committees for special issues, etc. Our main emphasis in campus work, whether in other organizations or directly as the YSA, is on socialist education, propaganda, and recruitment. Although activities which do not lead directly to recruitment may be an important part of every local's activity, it is important to see that recruitment remains the primary aim of each local's work.

15. The student movement is volatile and reacts sharply to changing events. While we can continue to look forward to a growing political consciousness among students, the movement itself has sharp ups and downs, and shifts in organizational forms. We have to be flexible both in our approach to which organizations we work in, and how much effort is put into a particular organization at a particular time, basing our intervention upon objective needs and possibilities. Local work must be carried out according to the general line laid down by the national conference. Practical activity in each instance will have to be determined on the basis of concrete local conditions, in consultation with the national office. In the past a number of locals have become so tied up with work in other organizations that they have not had time for the most important and time consuming task of systematic contact work and recruitment.

16 The radicalization and growing mass character of the Negro movement is the most important development on the national scene. Militant youth organizations, both on and off campus, have developed in the North and South. We should seek to become allies of these groups, winning white students to the Negro cause as supporters, and recruiting a young revolutionary Negro cadre. Work with civil rights organizations and Negro organizations of a more revolutionary, nationalist orientation whether on campus or off, should be considered our primary national fraction work.

17 In the past we have been able to intervene in certain strike situations by bringing student support to workers' picket lines. This has been possible in two types of struggle. In one case

the union was attempting to establish itself among Negro and Puerto Rican hospital workers, and requested student "Sit-In" help. In the other, the capitalists were using students to scab, and the YSA was able to organize anti-scab students. We are the working class tendency on campus, and such work, when it is realistic, serves both to educate ourselves and the students, and begins to prepare the points of support in the working class movement from which we can intervene in the future.

18. The rise of unemployment is hitting the youth, especially young Negroes, hard. Unemployment among young workers is very high, steadily over 15% (officially), and we expect it to grow. As of yet there have been no developments toward organized actions among unemployed youth except those important protests on lack of jobs which have grown out of the civil rights struggle. We should support and participate in these struggles which are going on, wherever possible, and keep alert for any signs of organized activity or interest in organization among the mass of unemployed youth. There is as yet no practical perspective for us to intervene as the initiators of unemployed organizations.

19. Those young workers whom we do meet and recruit at the present time are held to the organization on an intellectual basis. They may join or become attracted to the YSA because it is active and because they see its working class perspective, but they stick in this period because they absorb the program, not because the YSA is leading their class battles.

20. A major activity will be support of the SWP 1964 election campaign. Elections give us a chance to speak to the masses about our socialist program, and to get a reaction from the workers which will by and large reflect their thinking and mood. The question of political action is on the agenda in the Negro struggle, and the SWP campaign will be one way we can intervene in that struggle. Our major task during the campaign will be to organize campus support to the socialist ticket, stressing the need for anti-capitalist political action, and impell a section of the students larger than ourselves into active work for the campaign. The elections open valuable propaganda opportunities for our ideas on campus, and will mean a growth both in our numbers and influence.

21. The Young Peoples Socialist League, still larger than us in book membership (but with fewer active members), had a period of growth in the spring of 1962, in great measure due to their intervention in the SPU. In the past school year however, they have taken a sharp decline, especially after the

pressures of the Cuban crisis which threw them into a rightist swing. The lull in student activity after the crisis took a big toll on the YPSL, as a result of their unclear vacillating "third camp" (imperialist camp when the chips are down) political line, and their lack of organization, education, communication, and general propaganda. They do not yet have a newspaper -- a clear reflection of their lack of serious organization. Their central Schachtmanite leadership, while opportunist in character, has a sectarian streak. They propound especially when they feel pressured by us, "Trotskyist" (Schachtmanite version) positions such as the labor party. These concepts totally foreign to their politically uneducated and unprepared rank and file, further alienates these ranks from the leadership and adds to the instability and high turnover rate of the organization.

22. The youth who follow the CP line have managed to set up organizations in New York, Philadelphia, the Bay Area, and Los Angeles, but do not have a functioning national organization. Although Stalinist deceptions in their presentation of an actual pro-Democratic party line serves to delude some young militants, the continued crisis of world Stalinism has put them on the ideological defensive. But Stalinism in all its various forms still poses a danger. Stalinism is used by some radically inclined students to rationalize a soft job perspective, especially in the University. Stalinism allows students to have "anti-imperialist" ideology while not committing them to acting on it in any serious way. Informal groups such as those which exist around Studies on the Left at Madison have broken with Stalinism to a large degree. However, they substitute radical commentary for commitment and hide their default behind petty bourgeois academic snobbery. While maintaining friendly personal relations we should meet such people head on in ideological debate against their anti-Marxist, anti-working class substitute for joining the YSA.

23. There have been a number of splinter groups from the CP, generally pro-Mao, who have some youth. Most of them do not break with capitalist politics. Even those who do have proven themselves to be confused politically, and tend to substitute the action of a handful for mass action, attempting adventuristically to overleap the adverse objective situation and speed up the class struggle. We have to be careful, therefore, in common work with them, while at the same time patiently explaining our program to them.

24. The Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) is becoming important in some areas. They have a general outlook of working within the Democratic Party, although many of their specific stands, such as defense of Advance, are superior to those of YPSL. They are not homogeneous and contain pro-Labor Party

members, "progressives", self-styled Marxists, social democrats and liberals. If the YPSL remains under the present sectarian Schactmanite leadership there is a chance that SDS may recruit potential social democrats faster than YPSL and become our most serious organized reformist opponent. Their open desire to work in the existing capitalist class power structure in order to realign the "good" Democrats and their mildly pro-Soviet position on the peace question give them an attractive program to reformist youth coming from either the Stalinist or Social Democratic direction. Some youth who follow the CP line in several places have decided to concentrate their work on the SDS and its potential strength can already be seen on several mid-west campuses. The Stalinists and Social Democrats can co-operate together within SDS in fighting revolutionary tendencies in civil rights, election campaigns, etc. The SDS's lack of real political cadre and loose organizational concepts give us an opportunity to cut the ground from them before they gain strength.

25. The YPSL, the youth followers of the CP line, and the SDS all engage in one or another form of class collaboration. In competing with these groups for members the YSA must wage a determined struggle against their class collaborationist programs while pushing for united fronts in action. That is the best way to expose their inadequacies. Keeping potentially revolutionary youth from these reformist groups during this period is the key to smashing reformism during the mass upsurge to come. Our ultimate advantage over these groups can be seen most clearly in civil-rights where they do not have the patience and seriousness to work well with most revolutionary Negro militants.

26. The past school year was marked by a lull in campus political activity which affected the YSA. Although some of our members quit under the pressure, we continued to recruit. The net result, contrary to the sharp decline of YPSL, was a moderate increase in membership. The upsurge in the Negro struggle had its effect upon the campus and by the end of the school year our recruitment quickened. Equally important, many of our new members have raised their political consciousness and dedication through study and activity.

27. Our work in defense of our Bloomington comrades has given our movement and program a hearing that we would not have otherwise attained. So long as this case is before us, and our comrades are in danger, a major un-neglectible task will be Bloomington defense.

23. While we will still be swimming against the stream in American society as a ~~whole~~, important work is open to us. We are the best organized radical youth group, but we could stand improvement in our finances, communications, and propaganda material. We should work on both improving the YOUNG SOCIALIST and improving our sales, get out a number of pamphlets stating our views on the important problems confronting the student activists, and take fuller advantage of Pioneer literature and the MILITANT. Internal education should be a regular activity of each local, to raise the level of every member and bring each member to full consciousness of our program, and to teach the history of the class struggles in the United States. The YSA must educate itself through links with the older revolutionary socialists who are the only living bearers of the class struggle lessons of our country. To the degree we do this we will be imbued ~~with~~ the class struggle traditions of our country -- traditions we are a part of and continuator of -- and will thereby be preparing ourselves for the great class battles to come.

REPORT ON THE THIRD NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE
STUDENT PEACE UNION

by Peter Camejo

For the first time in who knows how long an open confrontation of different tendencies within a broad student organization took place at the SPU convention. Regardless of the intent of the leadership, SPU tends to develop into a multi-tendency action organization. The reason for this is that the desire for action on specific issues like bomb testing is not limited to any one tendency. There is also a natural desire on the part of students to see the largest and most effective actions. The SPU has tended to play this role. It has brought together students of various political beliefs on the basis of common actions.

The Third National Convention clearly indicated what we have been noticing for the past year. The YPSL "Left Wing" which controls SPU has a policy of limiting SPU to those who agree to their "third camp" politics. This is in direct conflict to the needs of the student movement. As a consequence of this policy, and the lull after the Cuban crisis, SPU has concentrated on internal education as opposed to actions. The result has been a rapid decline of SPU activity and a decline of the membership.

In the National Secretary's report the membership was calculated at 2,300. The SPU locals that exist whether actively or passively numbered about 75. There has been a slight increase in SPU locals on campuses which have otherwise been politically behind the general student movement, and in high schools. The major and larger SPU locals, --Antioch, Chicago, New York area, etc., -- have all be in decline. The SPU leaders tried to pass this off as a step forward claiming SPUers are now more sophisticated. SPU has received rather sizeable donations from adult groups. The New York Regional office's budget is about \$8,000 per year. Of the \$8,000 more than half is salaries for full time do-nothing organizers. The National budget is about \$60,000 per year.

We went to the convention with the orientation to fight for the concept of a multi-tendency action oriented SPU. Unfortunately the lull in the student movement had a deep effect on SPU. Since the October crisis the weakness and ineffectiveness of student demonstrations and picket lines to change U.S. policy has permeated the consciousness of the students around SPU. The student movement in the North where

we exist has not found as a whole any realistic alternative to their original conception of "public pressure" through picket lines which culminated in the 5,000 student march on Washington. Cynicism has grown while only a handful or so have come over to our conception that the working class is the force that can change the policies of the United States.

Under these conditions we could not expect any significant motion within SPU towards a more activist orientation. At the same time due to the general conditions in the country we can not expect any large motion towards revolutionary working class politics. We therefore geared our efforts at the convention around the question of internal democracy, on the right of revolutionary socialists as well as all positions to be heard and participate. We explained in general terms our stand on the role SPU should play.

The left YPSLs and professional SPUers went into the convention with an orientation to continue on their course of making the SPU a "third camp" organization and to keep out as best as possible any pro-Soviet opposition.

Democracy in SPU

The convention opened with a fight over the seating of delegates. Behind this fight was the two different orientations for SPU -- Third Camp or Multi-Tendency. We deliberately raised the point that the National leadership of SPU was loading the convention with at-large delegates, and we challenged them before the credentials committee. The official leadership, using every trick they could, challenged both the Boston and the New York delegates which they knew were pro-Soviet, pro-YSA.

Through a document introduced from the New York (off Campus) SPU it was clearly proven that the so-called at-large delegates did not reflect or represent the feelings of at-large members but were in effect a reflection of the National and Regional staffs. The New York at-large delegation of 18 included 13 who were connected with the Regional or National council. Two of these were handpicked by the National Secretary and five of them by the Regional organizer. The total "at-large" membership who voted for these 18 delegates was 50. Theoretically the representation at the convention was to be 1-16.

The Chicago at-large delegates included Gail Paradise, Peter Allen (Nat. Field Sec.) and his wife, Linda Stern (convention director) and two other leading SPUers. The Boston at-large was a leading red-baiter from Brandeis who

was not even listed on a letter naming all at-large SPUers in the Boston area dated June 4th sent out by the National Office. All MAL elections had to be in by June 5. We know of at least 35 who were elected to be such delegates. Total number of delegates was 120 although they were never all present. We raised the point as a step in establishing the more general point that the leadership of SPU was not permitting a democratic internal life as a product of their policy to make SPU a "third camp" organization.

The charges against the Boston and NY delegates first began on the basis that they had faked their membership and then on charges by individuals lined up before the convention by the Regional and National offices that the elections in the locals were not democratic.

The question of the members-at-large (MAL) delegates came up first. However, the convention first voted on a motion by Irving Kirsch from N.Y. to seat one of the N.Y. delegates since only one of the two delegates was being challenged. The credentials committee had refused to seat either delegate even though at that point they had only challenged one delegate. The vote was 24 against and 20 for. No delegate who was being challenged could vote.

The vote on seating MAL delegates was 34 for and 18 against. That is we carried approximately one third of the delegates who represented locals on a vote that would have unseated all the "leaders" of SPU from Gail Paradise down.

The question of the Boston delegation was confused by all types of charges from the National Office until two SPUers from Boston arrived on the scene and presented SIX SPU membership cards (all with Gail Paradise's signature on them) of members who the N.O. claimed were faked by the Boston local.

This turned the convention and the vote was 49 for seating one delegate from Boston, 6 against and 21 abstaining. The no's and abstentions came almost entirely from the leadership of SPU.

On seating the New York delegates the credentials committee dropped the charge that they had fake members admitting that they had "found" the questioned members in their files. They changed their charge to one of fake elections. A YPSL claimed the election had been held behind locked doors at 116 (headquarters of the New York SWP). Other charges of

an equally absurd nature were made. The YPSLs and leaders of SPU were determined to degrade the NY delegates since they were leading the fight in exposing their bureaucratic maneuvers and were YSAers. The first vote to seat NY was 34 for, 37 against and 13 abstentions. The vote among the delegates representing locals gave a clear majority for seating the NY delegation. The MAL delegates, voting almost as a solid bloc, turned the convention against its real desires.

The mood created by this vote laid the basis for a possible turn in the convention against the YPSLs and the SPU bureaucrats. The more political YPSLs began caucusing in the room and in less than half an hour a leading YPSL, Tom Barton from Philadelphia, jumped to the floor requesting a reconsideration of the vote on the NY delegation. What had happened was that the left-wing YPSLs, who are more sophisticated than most SPU leaders, realized the effect the vote on NY would have on independents.

The vote was reconsidered and the result was 41 for, 21 against, and 26 abstaining. The new vote indicated that the left YPSLs changed their vote from No to Abstain. The SPU leaders who are not in YPSL or who are right wing YPSLs stuck to their position. Some, like Peter Allen (field secretary of SPU) changed their votes from Abstain to No. Thus the vote did not indicate any change in the policy of the left YPSLs or SPU leaders, but was a partial concession to the feelings of the overwhelming majority of SPU members who are independents.

Program

The next point at which the differences in SPU came forth was in the discussion on program. Three documents were introduced. First there was the "Parker" resolution introduced by Mike Parker from Chicago. This document oriented SPU towards being a front for the YPSL third camp position. It was supported by the left YPSLs and the SPU leaders with a few exceptions.

The second document was introduced by the Caucus for Effective Action. This group is an amalgam of different political tendencies. It is led and is mainly composed of right wing YPSLs who hold an openly reformist position towards capitalism and its drive toward war. They introduced a document which in effect held that co-existence was possible or more accurately the only possible solution since they see no chance of a social revolution changing the world situation. The CEA resolution was therefore attractive to the two or three Stalinists (from Seattle and Reed) present as delegates. The CEA resolution was, of course, equally opposed to the Soviet Union as the Parker resolution.

The third resolution was introduced by four delegates who wished to orient the SPU towards action on the basis

of a multi-tendency organization. This third resolution explained that its supporters were pro-Soviet and explained why. In a section of the resolution which was not up for vote they presented the Trotskyist position on the Soviet Union. The document explained that SPU should not at this time attempt to set as its official line a complete analysis of the world situation, but should discuss different points of view while uniting all tendencies in actions against specific aspects of the war drive, and against wars like the war in Viet Nam. This document deliberately made it clear that the authors were pro-Soviet because by doing so they were not only carrying out in practice what they were preaching, but were not seeking any organizational coalition on false premises.

Most independents reacted in a healthy manner to the attempts to place a third camp straightjacket on SPU. They tended toward our conception of SPU as a united front. However, the CEA sponsors concentrated all their remarks toward this feeling. They charged that the Parker resolution would make SPU a third camp front. One went so far as to say he was a YPSL and that everyone knows YPSL controls SPU and that this should not be. Although the CEA document would make SPU into an organization with a definitive political line just as much as the Parker document, this was not clear at the convention. Both the Parker and CEA supporters refused to discuss the third resolution, passing it off as the YSA-pro-Soviet document.

The result was that many independents voted for the CEA document. This was not only due to the illusion that the CEA document was not committing SPU to a definitive line, but also to prejudice against the Soviet Union. Many independents who agreed with our line did not vote for our resolution out of fear of voting for a pro-Soviet stand. Four independents voted for our resolution and about five abstained. The total vote among the delegates who represented locals was 38 for Parker (left YPSLs and SPU leaders), 27 for CEA (right YPSLs, Stalinists and independents), and 12 for YSA line (YSAers and independents). The MAL vote was 17 for Parker and 5 for CEA. The NY MAL vote was 100% for Parker.

We could have won over more independents if we had been better prepared. However, under the given conditions we did rather well. The development of organized tendencies within SPU reached a qualitative new point in the discussion. We can expect a continuation of this process in the next period. Some of the independents who voted with us were pro-Soviet.

The CEA received a higher vote than its true strength. The discussion as well as the vote began to take on a tone of "ins" vs. "outs". A general feeling among the independents whether voting for us or the CEA was that the present leadership and course is undesirable.

Other Questions

The convention got so far behind schedule that many questions were never brought up for discussion and vote. I will limit this report to only one other major point.

When the National Council was elected SPUers supporting the line of the left YPSLs refused to permit any representation of the Pro-Soviets and packed the N.C. almost solid with their people. The excuse they gave for not permitting any representation of this tendency was that geographical representation was needed. This excuse was clearly exploded by the fact that not a single representative was elected from the West Coast (where there are no YPSL representatives).

The question ended with a resurgence of the question of internal democracy. Many of the independents who may have been partially satisfied by the switch in vote on the NY delegation question were disillusioned and went home with the taste of the suppression of minority rights that ended the convention. Two delegates, for instance, from Carleton that are in no sense pro-YSA politically but reflect the mood of uncommitted students interested in hearing all positions deliberately voted for all pro-Soviet candidates and refused to vote for any others.

One YPSL took the floor and charged the YPSLs of being hypocrits in calling themselves democratic socialists while they were deliberately preventing the YSA from any representation. Danny R. . . . from Detroit came within one vote of being elected to the N.C. The convention ended by a statement by Danny exposing the lack of internal democracy and again calling for a multi-tendency SPU.

Next Steps

We have recruited and reached students through our SPU work, and the convention reflected this. We can expect a continuation of the present decline in SPU, although it is not yet clear how far the decline will go or what the fate of SPU will be. To a large extent, this depends upon the mood on campus and upon international events.

We should continue our general policy of work inside SPU. The amount of energy put in should be geared to the needs of other work and the ups and downs of SPU itself. Where we are deeply involved in other work we should at least maintain our formal membership in SPU.

Our major task is to continue to develop a pro-Soviet anti-imperialist caucus as a vehicle for presenting our program for peace in the SPU.

THE PEACE MOVEMENT: WHERE DOES THE YSA STAND?

by Dick Roberts

No direct reference is made to the peace movement in Section 5 of the NEC Draft Resolution Where We Stand, which states the YSA position towards the imperialist war drive.

Point 1 of Section 5, "support to all actions against the war drive", suggests unconditional support of the peace movement; however this statement is, at best, ambiguous, and at worst, inaccurate.

The peace movement in the United States is not a mass movement, but rather an expression of certain political tendencies. While there may be grounds for thinking that the present peace movement is ineffective, -- it is clearly ineffective, -- and for believing that the YSA should devote little or no energy towards furthering the peace movement at the present time, the YSA should make its position towards the peace movement clear.

Certainly the YSA does not support the third camp position which is prevalent in the Student Peace Union, the largest functioning student peace movement. Further, the YSA must challenge the position of the Women Strike for Peace, because it does not recognize the aggressive role of the United States in the cold war, and the WSP is probably the largest adult group in the peace movement.

Thus the YSA does not unconditionally support all positions against the war drive.

If Point 1 is intended to distinguish action from position, then this distinction should be made clearer. The distinction between action towards a common goal, and action from a united policy, may be obvious enough to members of the YSA, but could be quite misleading to someone unfamiliar with the YSA position.

Section 5 would be strengthened, then, if it stated explicitly that the YSA favored united action against the war drive, although the YSA is in political disagreement with certain tendencies within the present peace movement.

The statement might be made even stronger by calling for a common forum in which members of the peace movement could meet to discuss the basic issues of the cold war.

Resumption of Nuclear Testing

The statement of "opposition to nuclear arms testing" in Point 5 is again an ambiguous position.

It is particularly important that the YSA consistently stress the aggressive role of the United States and the defensive role of the Soviet Union on the question of nuclear arms. For this reason, the opening paragraph of Section 5 is a major improvement over Section 2, sub-section 7, of the Founding Declaration.

Thus the resumption of nuclear testing by the Soviet Union in 1961 should be viewed as a response to the first-strike Counter Force strategy of the United States, and the espionage flights of the U-2 which gave the United States information requisite to attacking the Soviet Union.

Furthermore, the YSA should stress the deceptive nature of the nuclear test ban treaty: such a ban is not a step towards disarmament in any sense; but it is good propaganda mileage for the "Peace Race" so called of the Democratic Party, and the "peaceful coexistence" so called of the Soviet Union.

If Section 5 is intended to reflect the political understanding which is expressed in other parts of the NEC Draft Resolution, then it seems rather careless to throw in "opposition to nuclear testing" without any clarification of the possible meanings of this position.

If opposition to nuclear testing was phrased specifically in terms of the dangers due to radio-active fallout, and this statement was clearly subordinate to the YSA position against the peace propaganda and corresponding military aggressiveness of the United States, there would be less room for misunderstanding the YSA position.