

YSA

Discussion Bulletin

Vol. XX No. 4 December 1976

CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
THE RELATION BETWEEN OUR ANTIRACIST WORK AND BUILDING SCAR CHAPTERS, By Robert Mattson, San Francisco State chapter, San Francisco local	3
A PROBLEM IN REGIONAL TEAM WORK AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES, By Jim Garrison, Wayne State University chapter, Detroit local	4
STRIKE SUPPORT WORK AT COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF PHILADELPHIA, By Mindy Brudno, Temple University chapter, Philadelphia local	5
TWO ISSUES IN THE DESEGREGATION STRUGGLE, By Rob Roper, University of Houston chapter	7
OUR PRESS: KEY TO BUILDING THE YSA, By Steve Iverson, San Jose chapter	8
RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE INTERNATIONAL STUDENT MOVEMENT AND THEIR LESSONS FOR US, By David Cahalane, University of Massachusetts -- Boston chapter, Boston local	10
ON RAPE, By Cathy Hinds, Cal State L. A. chapter, Los Angeles local	14
THE YSA'S SECURITY POLICY: WHY IT EXISTS AND WHAT IT MEANS FOR LIBERALIZED DRUG LAWS, By Osborne Hart, Brooklyn College chapter, New York local, and Brian Williams, Queens chapter, New York local	16
PROBLEMS OF ORGANIZATION AND LEADERSHIP, By Chuck Petrin, East Side chapter, New York local, and Nancy Brown, Newark chapter	17
HOW TO SELECT A LEADERSHIP, By James P. Cannon, former National Chairman Emeritus of the Socialist Workers party	19
U. S. STUDENTS AND THE FIGHT AGAINST RACISM IN SOUTHERN AFRICA. NEC Draft Resolution	23
WHERE ARE WE NOW IN THE DECLINE OF HIGHER EDUCATION? By David Cahalane, University of Massachusetts -- Boston chapter, Boston local	29

\$.60

Page 2:

was blank in the
original bulletin

- Marty May 2014

THE RELATION BETWEEN OUR ANTIRACIST WORK AND BUILDING SCAR CHAPTERS

By Robert Mattson, San Francisco State chapter, San Francisco local

This contribution is a result of formal and informal discussions following the YSA organizational tour and the national speaking tour of NSCAR. Both of these tours had an impact on the leadership of the San Francisco local and its attitudes concerning our antiracist activities. The clearest expression of this occurred in a local executive committee discussion which reflected two views on how to carry out the YSA's antiracist work. The extreme counterposition was between throwing our forces into either "helping form SCAR chapters in the high schools and college campuses" or "forming broader coalitions around the issue of South Africa." This clear cleavage reflected a difference of emphasis between the N.O. tour and the NSCAR tour. Thus I feel a discussion on this particular aspect of our work is needed.

As a framework for this discussion we should analyze our orientation for antiracist work adapted at our last convention "The Fight Against Racism: a Socialist Strategy for the Black Liberation Struggle Today." In the light of our experiences over the past year does the strategic orientation found in the following section of that document still hold true?

"The YSA can be proud of our role in helping to build the National Student Coalition Against Racism. NSCAR's continued growth and its initiatives in the antiracist struggle are of critical importance today because of the step-up in racist attacks and the crisis of leadership that exists within the Black movement.

"This situation poses unprecedented responsibilities and opportunities for the YSA. For this reason, our top priority in the period ahead must continue to be offering our leadership and our energies in helping to build the National Student Coalition Against Racism." (p. 19)

It would be helpful to point out the real differences between the period analyzed by the '75 document and the present situation. Later, we can discuss if these differences merit a basic change in our orientation.

The 1975 document cited above pointed to "three major events [which] have contributed to instilling confidence in the Black community [Boston] and laying the basis for a national counter campaign to the antibusing movement." (p.15) These were: 1) the December 14th, 1974 march against racism in Boston. 2) the May 17th, 1975 national march of 15,000 busing supporters. 3) the formation of the National Student Coalition Against Racism. Both the YSA and SWP supplied major forces to help ensure that these activities were successful. Noting the scope of NSCAR activities all across the country—from the defense of busing and bilingual-bicultural education, to the defense of Joanne Little and other victims of racist frame ups—the '75 document pointed out that "NSCAR can become a viable and permanent fighting coalition for the rights of Blacks and oppressed minority communities. It can aid in the formation of a left wing of the general movement for Black liberation that can begin to fill the vacuum of leadership in the Black liberation movement." (p.16). Does this still hold true? Has our experience the past year necessitated a rethinking of this perspective?

What has changed?

Egged on by the antibusing "ethnic purity" positions of both the Democratic and Republican parties the racist forces have taken the offensive in Boston. The antiracist forces suffered a serious setback when the prodesegregation counter mobilization planned for April 24 had to be canceled. The anticutback forces in New York also suffered a major set back. This combined with the typical election demobilization in the communities shifted the relationship of forces dramatically in favor of the racists.

The reorganization of the YSA and the political turn of the SWP must also be noted in this context. Whereas the party played an important role in the formation of NSCAR, the turn meant that the party's attention was focused on establishing community branches with direct ties to organizations in those communities. So the YSA, numerically smaller and with a far less seasoned leadership, was left as the main national organization building SCAR. City-wide SCAR vanished, often leaving only a legacy of debts for the new campus-based chapters. Amid reorganization pains and the culmination of the election campaign, antiracist work could not but take the back burner in the work of the YSA (if it even made it into the kitchen). The phantom of SCAR seemed to be making a decisive turn towards the "twilight zone".

The attitude in the N.O., as reflected by the impact of the organizational tour this fall, seemed to add authority to the growing pessimism towards building SCAR. The message seemed to be that SCAR was not really what it should be, so we should not let building SCAR organizationally get in the way of forming real coalitions on campus. Some, I think, felt that this was a chance to lift an unnecessary moral albatross from our neck. Now we could go about the real business of building broad coalitions without being continually bogged down with the organizational needs of SCAR.

The "old concept" of building SCAR chapters came to loggerheads with the "new" coalition building approach to antiracist work in an LEC discussion about upcoming South Africa protests. Through the course of the discussion we recognized the unevenness of SCAR chapters on each campus and balanced our view of antiracist work to enable us both to build SCAR and be flexible in forming broader coalitions where possible. This discussion was able to cut across much of the subjectivism toward building SCAR and brought us closer to the real perspectives of the YSA nationally.

First we must realize despite the setbacks in Boston and New York, the temporary demobilization brought on by the elections, and the YSA's own reorganizational adjustments (likewise temporary)—the broad objective conditions which brought NSCAR into existence have not disappeared. (see YSA Discussion Bulletin Vol. XIX No.6 November 1975). Our "top priority in the period ahead must continue to be offering our leadership and our energies in helping to build the National Student Coalition Against Racism." The real question is what is the best way to carry this out.

We must take stock of our forces on each particular campus and come up with the best way to move closer to our goal. We must be flexible, not mechanical. Where we have two YSAers on a campus, this does not automatically mean that one wears antiracist buttons and talks only about racism while the other wears a red star and raps socialism. Likewise, being assigned to antiracist work shouldn't necessarily mean that you run around setting up SCAR tables, organizing meetings, and avoiding the other three YSAers on campus like the plague. Building a SCAR chapter is much more complicated than that. SCAR cannot be the antiracist fraction of a small campus chapter of the YSA, although the YSA can play an important role in establishing viable SCAR chapters through a well balanced approach to antiracist work.

In order to arrive at such a balance it might be useful to take a look at where NSCAR really is at this time. The best expressions of NSCAR at this time are the National Student Conferences Against Racism. These gatherings, while reflecting the ups and downs in the antiracist struggle, have been successful national expressions of the forces involved in the struggle against racism from coast to coast. They have been the only national coalition meetings providing a framework for the antiracist struggles across the country.

On the chapter level, SCAR is generally at a different stage of development. SCAR chapters have rarely been true coalitions of the antiracist forces on a given campus (i.e. Black, Raza, Native American, Asian student groups and other political formations, meeting together to decide on a common focus.) Chapters have tended to be YSA members and individuals who also see the need to have an antiracist organization on campus which has a national impact and an action orientation. Herein lies the weakness and if we are not careful the organizational forms and attitudes which may perpetuate it. We must recognize where we stand in relation to building SCAR as a real coalition on the campuses and then take steps to ensure that for the sake of immediate gains we don't put obstacles in the way of reaching our real goal.

If we aren't careful we can be seen as a threat to those organizations which should be part of an antiracist coalition. We can spend all of our time building the infrastructure of an organization, and miss opportunities to coalesce a real student coalition—if even on a single issue like South Africa. In other words, instead of a few people lopped off from the YSA who are active in SCAR,

we may be able to gain more if the YSA assigns a few people to talk to the different organizations on campus about the possibility of getting together around the struggle in South Africa, (or a cutback fight, etc.) Instead of automatically setting up a SCAR table and beginning to build a "Join SCAR" meeting, we may want to focus our energies on having political discussions with every progressive group on campus about having a planning meeting focused on South Africa. From there we can move to putting out leaflets on the meeting and jointly setting up a table so we can distribute them. If SCAR really doesn't exist on campus, then it may not even figure in this first meeting through the National Action Proposal from the Student Conference.

If we are successful we will have an ad hoc coalition against racism in South Africa. When appropriate we might suggest the name Student Coalition Against Racism, they might like Club Council Against Racism, Ad Hoc Coalition, or no name at all. But regardless of the name, it exists, and it's up to us, through our political intervention, to move it in the direction of a relatively permanent coalition fighting against racism. This is more complicated, and requires more politicking than having SCAR meetings with us and a few good "independent SCAR activists." Forming coalitions is a continual process of building and then watching the building burn to the ground only to begin again. The most important thing is that in the course of carrying out this work we will enter into a political dialogue with *at least* every organization of minority students on campus, not just for an endorsement of this or that issue, but for a commitment to engage in common struggle even if on a limited basis.

Obviously this little scenario is submitted merely for purposes of contrast and to stimulate our collective thinking about this important work. Each high school or college campus will have its own particular openings: already existing SCARs, other antiracist formations, favorable student governments, or whatever. The most important thing is to get people moving against racism. Through all this work we will be laying the basis for new chapters or strengthening already-existing ones. This will be the way we will be able to put ourselves, NSCAR, and thus the antiracist forces in general in the best possible position to take the racists head-on. This means we must update and sharpen our 1975 resolution while reaffirming our basic commitment to the fight against racism.

November 25, 1976

A PROBLEM IN REGIONAL TEAM WORK AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES

**By Jim Garrison, Wayne State University chapter,
Detroit local**

In terms of recruitment to the YSA and dissemination of socialist material, the experience of the Michigan-Indiana Young Socialist team in the fall of '76 was highly successful. The team was able to recruit new members each week it was on the road. Twenty-one students joined the YSA through contact with the Michigan-Indiana team.

A very important factor in this success was, of course, the attractiveness of the SWP campaign and the fact that we were able to build meetings for the SWP Michigan senatorial candidate on most campuses we visited.

One problem we encountered with the team which deserves some discussion towards a solution involves our

work on community college campuses. YSA traveling teams are set up to be largely self-financing. Sales of Pathfinder literature along with single copy sales of our periodicals go to pay subsistence to team members as well as other team expenses. Although the team had a good response from community college students and sales of the press were excellent, we were unable to generate sufficient Pathfinder sales to sustain ourselves for a period long enough to do substantial recruitment work.

This problem is most serious in light of the importance of YSA organizing on the community college campuses during this period of economic crisis and cutbacks in education first noted in the political and organizational resolutions of our last convention. While virtually all students are feeling the crunch of attacks on education, it is the community college students who feel it most acutely. Further, since a large proportion of community college students work for a living, they are most directly affected by the new mood of militancy among American workers. Finally, a larger proportion of community college students are of oppressed national minorities than is true at most four-year colleges.

The financial problem for the team meant that the community colleges—where the YSA should be concentrating its efforts—got the short shift by our regional recruitment team. Our itinerary favored the large universities where our literature tables would attract a larger and relatively more affluent clientele. While the number and caliber of new members at these institutions was quite high, this reflects the opportunities open to the YSA among students in general during this period. Recruitment at community colleges would likely have been even higher in quantity and quality.

As the YSA nationally moves to stepped-up activities around the struggles against cutbacks in education and against national and international racist offensives, we must develop a means for traveling teams to increase their presence on community college campuses.

Some initial suggestions for the spring recruitment teams may be put forward. Many major cities where regional centers of the YSA are located have a large number of community college campuses in their metropolitan area. Regional centers may consider sending teams to these campuses. Although book sales will probably be lower, transportation costs should also be lower. Secondly, many universities where regional chapters exist are located near one or more community colleges. Such chapters may take on, as one of their spring tasks, a recruitment drive at the community college: setting up their literature table there for a full week and organizing a "Join the YSA" meeting. Such a drive on the part of regional chapters would be similar in function to that of traveling teams but would not be part of the team operation nor would it be financed by the national organization.

One final note: A number of the community colleges the team visited had administrators who seemed to view the campus as their own private fiefdoms where political freedom is considered a nuisance.

On the other hand, we found student organizations, including student governments and newspapers, to be quite supportive of our right to function on campus. Careful organization of this student support should protect YSA teams from administrators' threats and stay out of any legal problems, which we want to avoid at any rate.

November 28, 1976

STRIKE SUPPORT WORK AT COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF PHILADELPHIA

By Mindy Brudno, Temple University chapter, Philadelphia local

In the last year and a half there have been strikes or threats of strikes at three of the major colleges and universities in Philadelphia. Each strike involved a different section of the faculty or staff at schools which are quite different from one another in many ways. Yet there are some general trends which can be discerned in the response of students to the strike situations. I am going to focus on the experience at Community College of Philadelphia (CCP), which was the most important for the YSA, and from which some general lessons can be drawn.

CCP is similar to community colleges in most big cities. It is predominantly Black and Puerto Rican, with a large percentage of veterans, students with full or part-time jobs, and an average age much higher than most four-year institutions. The possibility of a teachers' and employees' strike during the spring semester was a very emotional issue from the start, because any days missed of school would have to be made up by extending the semester into the summer, thus making it more difficult to find summer jobs, as well as allowing less working time. Also, threats of

VA benefits being cut off (as well as other benefits) were a major factor in creating an atmosphere of extreme tension just prior to the strike.

To make matters worse, there were *two* separate strikes occurring simultaneously. The teachers and the classified employees (maintenance and clerical workers) both belonged to the same AFT local, but bargained separately. The teachers are almost entirely white, and the classified workers largely Black.

Role of student government

From the start, the student government leaders refused to take any kind of clear position on the strikes. They insisted on "neutrality," saying that students were the innocent victims of the whole situation—a position which eventually led them to seek an injunction against the union to force the teachers back to work. Although the student government leaders don't really represent anyone but themselves, they were able to use the authority of their position, as well as office space, paper, etc., to organize forums which became rallies around their confused

slogans and demands. These demands included a demand for a student on the Board of Trustees, student participation in the collective bargaining process, and for recognition of a student union.

During the mass rallies and forums organized by the student government before the strike, an open mike and an uninhibited crowd allowed us a glimpse of the real sentiments of the majority of students. At the first forum the hatred and distrust felt by students towards the administration was evident, and a general sympathy towards the union's side was shown. The format included speakers from both the union and the administration. Unfortunately, the unionists were too timid in going after the administration while the administration was quite aggressive in soliciting student support for their side.

Administration demagogy

The administration, with the cooperation of student government, played upon the fears students had of the consequences of a strike, which were, in fact, serious for many. They emphasized strike issues which were least directly linked to the quality of education (wages) and ignored others which bore directly upon the quality of education, (size and permanence of the full time teaching staff) in an effort to convince students that a strike could in no way benefit them.

Above all, the administration wanted the blame for the strike, in students' eyes, to fall with the teachers and not with them. The best way (for them) to do this was to play on the fact that the teaching staff is, for the most part, white and privileged relative to CCP students. Thus, it became a case of middle-class white teachers striking, at the expense of students to enrich themselves further. In order to do this, the administration had to sweep the question of the classified employees under the rug as well as many other realities of the strike situation.

As the strike date neared, the student government leaders moved further away from their position of "neutrality" and more and more openly sided with the administration. The rallies and forums had a more direct anti-strike, anti-union thrust, although they were always confused.

YSA's activity

As the events unfolded, the YSA chapter discussed what we could do to turn things around. It became clear that any progressive motion would have to occur in spite of the activities of student government—not with their cooperation.

The first thing we did was to meet with the union leaders about the need to reach students and convinced them to print and distribute a fact sheet on the dispute. We realized that we were swimming against the tide and that our position in support of the teachers was becoming increasingly isolated. We had to realistically look at what we could accomplish.

We initiated a strike support meeting the last day of school before the strike to plan activities for once the strike began. The turnout was modest compared to the mass rallies sponsored by student government—about 15 people came—but the meeting was fruitful in that it put us in touch with potential activists. The student government president came and tried to disrupt but was unsuccessful. Out of the meeting picketing was organized with the teachers for the first strike day and a statement was issued

in the name of three pro-union student government senators to be handed out to students who came to school the first day of the strike.

At this point something happened which put our strike support work on a much higher level. A committee of the central labor council of the AFL-CIO in Philadelphia called the "Labor Committee for Youth Activities" expressed a desire to help support the CCP teachers. They functioned out of the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers office, and allowed full use of their facilities, including mimeo, mailing, and calling. They also secured a church for a meeting to plan a strike support action.

Out of the church meeting of about 30 (built through mailing and calling) a picket line was called at city hall to which significant media came. (Because of our visibility both before and during the strike we got much more media coverage than we had expected.)

While the strike dragged on (about 7 weeks) it became impossible to continue strike support activities. For one thing, there was no direct way to reach students, as they were dispersed throughout the city. Also, the momentum that was built up before the strike had been lost, and many students had settled into the strike routine, with jobs and other activities.

Conclusion

Although the strike support work we did was in no way decisive in determining the outcome of the strike (the teachers got a lousy deal anyway) there were several important things we were able to accomplish:

- 1) We helped to educate the union leaders (mostly young, radical-minded teachers) about the importance of winning student support and how to do it. Our good working relationship with the union also opened doors for us with the AFL-CIO youth committee, which led to a successful picket line and a lot of good media coverage.

- 2) We helped to educate new YSA members, contacts, and supporters in the elementary principles of class solidarity. Something we found quite often was that many students who agreed with us on all the bigger issues of the day (Angola, ERA, busing, etc.) opposed the strike!

- 3) We reached many more students with our ideas through distribution of statements, media coverage, and interventions from the floor into the student government-organized forums.

The problem with the strike, and the reason so many students were able to be won to the *wrong* side, is that they have not yet learned to think socially. The strike threatened their livelihood in a very immediate way—and they looked for the quickest way to end it at whomever's expense. The YSA can use the campus strike situation as an opportunity to instill basic class consciousness in students as the first step towards preparing them to face the struggles to come.

November 28, 1976

APPENDIX

Copy

To: Students of CCP

From: Student senators S. Jarosh, G. Yost, and B. Spruill

The students of CCP will be deeply affected by the outcome of the strike of the faculty and the possible strike of classified employees. We feel that these strikes are in the interests of CCP students, and that the striking teachers

deserve our support.

What are the issues?

Two parties, the faculty and the classified employees, have been negotiating with the college. Classified employees at CCP (clerks, secretaries, etc.) earn an average of \$5300 a year, with many earning less. This is barely above poverty level. Employee benefits are minimal.

Teachers want smaller classes, a cost of living clause, equalized course loads, and more office space. (At the Spring Garden campus in particular, offices are the size of small closets.) In addition, they are calling for more permanent, full-time staff. A large proportion of the teachers at CCP are part-timers, who earn as little as \$3000 a year with no job security.

The refusal of the administration to meet the just demands of the teachers and employees is an attack on the quality of our education. The CCP is the only college in Phila. which services, for the most part, poor, Black, and Puerto Rican students. **WE KNOW THE MONEY IS THERE!!!** Perhaps the administration thinks that we, the students, are not worth spending it on.

One rumor that the administration has spread is that

meeting the demands of the teachers and classified employees will result in higher tuition. This is false. CCP is adequately endowed to meet all of the unionists' demands without needing to raise tuition.

The responsibility for the strike lies with the administration. It is they who have refused to budge in the negotiations with both the faculty and the classified employees. This same administration is the enemy of students as well. Who closed WIDS? Who mishandled PHEAA funds? And who must we fight to get anything accomplished?

The faculty and employees do not want a strike. They, as well as the students, lose valuable time and money in the course of a strike. They are being forced into it by the administration—the only party which has nothing to lose by a strike.

Student support for the teachers and classified employees can be decisive in bringing speedy settlements which would improve our learning environment. We urge all students to say to the administration:

MEET THE DEMANDS OF THE TEACHERS AND CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES!!! STOP WITHHOLDING FUNDS WHICH WE NEED FOR OUR EDUCATION!!!

TWO ISSUES IN THE DESEGREGATION STRUGGLE

By Rob Roper, University of Houston chapter

The following contribution to preconvention discussion takes up two issues that are being debated in the antiracist movement. The first part of my article discusses the question of busing in relation to Black control of the schools in the Black community. The second part discusses the question of "white flight" and busing.

Malcolm X on desegregation vs. community control

At our last convention, the YSA passed a resolution on the Black liberation struggle entitled, "The Fight Against Racism: A Strategy for Black Liberation." In this resolution we stated that the central attack on Black rights today was the racist assault on the right of Black students to an equal education. We said that the racist antibusing movement is a major component of the ruling class' attack on the democratic rights of the oppressed nationalities and, in the long run, the working class as a whole. Thus the central task of all those who support Black rights is the defense of school desegregation and busing.

This resolution also noted that some ultraleft, sectarian Black organizations oppose busing and counterpose Black control of the schools in the Black community to desegregation. The YSA's reply is that we support *any* means of achieving a better education for Blacks, whether it be community control of the schools, or busing. Both are merely *means* to an *end*; the two should not be counterposed.

For those not convinced by our arguments, however, we should enlist the aid of Malcolm X, who, as I will demonstrate, supports our side of the argument. Here is what Malcolm X said in 1964:

"So America's strategy is the same strategy as that

which was used in the past by the colonial powers: divide and conquer. She plays one Negro leader against the other. She plays one Negro organization against the other. She makes us think we have different objectives, different goals. . . .

"All of our people have the same goals. The same objective. That objective is freedom, justice, equality. All of us want recognition and respect as human beings. . . . Integration is only a method that is used by some groups to obtain freedom, justice, equality, and respect as human beings. Separation is only a method that is used by other groups to obtain freedom, justice, equality, or human dignity.

"So our people have made the mistake of confusing the methods with the objectives. As long as we agree on objectives, we should never fall out with each other just because we believe in different methods or tactics or strategy to reach a common objective." (—Speech on 'Black Revolution,' New York, April 8, 1964, in *Two Speeches by Malcolm X* (Pathfinder Press, New York, 1972, p. 9).

Thus, when we say that busing and Black control of the schools in the Black community are two means to the same end of "freedom, justice, and equality," we are merely repeating the point made by Malcolm X twelve years ago.

Unfortunately, many pseudonationalist, ultraleft sectarians still make the mistake of "confusing the methods with the objectives." They say, "Busing is not the battleground on which we should be confronting the ruling class today." As if we get to choose the battlefield! I sincerely hope that a group of armed hooligans never attempts to break into

the front door of one of these confused nationalists' homes. Applying their logic, they might rush with their gun to defend the *back* door of their house; the front door not being their preferred "battleground."

Does busing cause "white flight"?

The question of whether or not busing causes "white flight" was the subject of an article by Jon Hillson in the November 26 issue of *The Militant*. Hillson agrees with Professor Christine Rossell of Boston University that the answer is no. According to Rossell, the process of whites leaving the cities for the suburbs has nothing to do with busing plans. The term "white flight" is a false argument used by the racists, according to Rossell, to justify their opposition to busing. Professor Dan Georges of the University of Texas at Arlington and Dallas NAACP leader H. Rhett James expressed similar views in a November 1975 prodesegregation rally in Dallas. Georges and James stated that the issue was economic—Blacks would move out to the suburbs too, if they had the money to do so.

I have serious reservations about such an analysis. It seems to me that busing is indeed a factor in many white racists' decision to move to the suburbs. Since I do not have any figures to support my views, I can only use my personal observations while living in Dallas as evidence.

A limited court-ordered busing plan went into effect in Dallas in 1971 while I was a senior in high school. I can remember hearing several white racists mention to me that they were moving out to the suburbs "where there ain't no niggers around." Small towns around Dallas rapidly grew in population. Certain all-white high schools became majority-Black in two years. When a new desegregation lawsuit was being considered last year in Dallas, antibusing rallies were held in certain Dallas suburbs because there existed a possibility that the new plan would involve the suburbs in busing. The white racist antibusing suburbanites' position was clear—they had moved out of Dallas to avoid desegregation and now there was a chance

that they would still be involved.

Does busing cause "white flight"? Yes, in my opinion, along with the other factors mentioned in Hillson's article. Does that mean that the racists are right and that we should no longer support busing, or modify our support? In my opinion, a very emphatic NO!

Just because racist whites move rather than have their children sit next to Black children in school is not an argument against desegregation. Do racial fights accompany busing? Yes. Does that mean that we should not support busing? No. Does violence accompany revolutions? Yes. Does that mean that we should oppose revolution? No.

We should pinpoint where the responsibility for "white flight" lies—white racism. In the same manner, we have (especially Jon Hillson in his *Militant* articles) pinpointed where the responsibility lies for racial fights in South Boston High—on the white racist thugs and their "adult" Democratic party backers. The responsibility for violence in a revolution lies with the old ruling class who refuses to give in to the majority. The "white flight" question, in my opinion, should be answered along similar lines.

The principle objective of busing is to secure for Blacks and Chicanos an equal education to that of whites. If busing plans have to cross city and county lines in order to assure equal education, then so be it. The YSA's position of opposition to the reactionary Supreme Court decision against a Detroit busing plan crossing county lines could be raised in relation to this issue.

My only reservation, then, concerns our attitude towards racist white attempts to avoid desegregation and maintain their privileges. Jon Hillson apparently denies that this occurs. On the other hand, I concede the reality, but say we should oppose and politically answer it. There is no disagreement, however, between Hillson's views and my own towards the YSA's strong position in defense of busing to achieve school desegregation or the importance of the desegregation struggle for the Black liberation movement.

November 28, 1976

OUR PRESS: KEY TO BUILDING THE YSA

By Steve Iverson, San Jose chapter

The role of the socialist press

An organization that aspires to become a mass revolutionary student organization, one which can win the leadership of student struggles on campuses throughout the country and mobilize students in support of the working class and its allies, must develop a mass-circulation press.

Its press is its public face, and its primary tool for reaching masses of students with its ideas.

The Young Socialist Alliance must rely on the printed word to a great extent in order to spread among students our theories of social change, our historical perspectives, and our conjunctural campaigns around issues central to the student movement and to the class struggle as a whole.

Problems with distributing the *Young Socialist*

No comrade disputes the central role of our press to our task: building the YSA into *the* mass revolutionary organization of the youth in the United States.

And yet, comrades have had difficulties with selling the YS, and even with relating to it in a serious way.

Many comrades resist the idea of selling our press, viewing it as an anemic version of the *Militant* newspaper, and dread the arrival of the latest bundle.

And this situation exists despite the professional layout, the use of attractive photos and graphics, and the generally cogent and well-written articles of our press.

The YS is an excellent publication, one we may justifiably be proud of.

One look at other movement press, such as the Revolutionary Student Brigade's *Fight Back!* or the Spartacus Youth League's *Young Spartacus* will convince anyone of the unique standards of content and appearance of the YS.

This well reflects the sanity and seriousness of our organization, and the people we reach with our press realize and respect this.

The format of the *Young Socialist*

With our present size and resources given, what we need from our press is not a daily or a weekly newspaper.

The *Militant* is useful to us for filling the role of a weekly source of news of the movements for social change.

We need our own press, and an entirely different format for spreading our ideas.

What we need from the YS is a monthly magazine which will not be outdated after the first week of the month.

We need a journal which will avoid strict news coverage and concentrate more on theoretical, historical, and conjunctural issues.

Since our last convention, the YS editorial staff has done a good job of working out a transition from the old "Young Militant" we seemed to be publishing to the kind of press the YSA needs.

We have seen longer articles; more historical items such as Stephanie Coontz's "America's Rebel Tradition" and Frederick Douglass's speech on Blacks and the Fourth of July; more reviews of the theatre, film, and literary works which students are likely to encounter; more internationalist articles about students in Canada, the repression of students in Thailand, and the student upsurge in South Africa; and more conjunctural pieces covering the fight against racist deportations of *raza* workers, the battle to implement busing, and the struggle to defend abortion rights.

What more can we do?

One thing we should consider doing is to change the size and physical format of the YS, if for not other reason than to mark it off from the *Militant*.

The YS is not a newspaper, and it would help clarify the distinction if the the YS were to look like the magazine we need.

There are also things which can be done with a magazine format that cannot be done with a newspaper:

Shorter articles may be printed without chopping up a page.

Longer articles may be printed without appearing awesomely long (i.e., great, page-long columns across two big pages would be spread out.)

The contents may be grouped into logical sections more easily.

More room is available for effective placement of photos and graphics.

The overall effect would be to make our press more attractive, less unwieldy, and easier to read.

Ideas for articles

The direction which the YS editorial staff has given our press since our last convention has been good, and the 1977 staff should be encouraged to continue along the same lines.

Some experimentation would also be desirable.

A "Month In Review" covering the most important

events or events of the previous month is one idea.

An article in each issue on "This Month In History" outlining things like the Russian Revolution, the 1968 student uprisings in France and Czechoslovakia (and how students were involved in sparking revolutions), and the founding of the Fourth International might be tried.

An article in the May 1977 issue on how the YSA's program relates to student government elections would be useful.

Articles on the teachers' unions and struggles would also be helpful to our campus work.

The aim behind all these ideas, and others which we will not list here, is to seek out new and more effective ways to reach students with our ideas in the context of the campuses, where we do our political work and which have tremendous potential social weight.

For an audacious subscription campaign

Since our last convention we have had no big national campaign to increase the YS's readership.

This fall we had no subscription campaign nor even a single-issue sales drive.

This fact, plus the exit of many of our members to devote their energies to the SWP's current expansion effort, has resulted inevitably in a drop in the circulation of our press. We need to turn this situation around immediately.

We need to expand and broaden the readership of our press, to deepen the influence of our ideas among students as we prepare for the big battles to come against racism, sexism, cutbacks, attacks on democratic rights, and new imperialist adventures.

A new and audacious national campaign for YS subscriptions and a bundle-size raising drive are essential to building the YSA.

Our single most important area of work in this period, preparatory to building a mass revolutionary student movement, is constantly increasing the circulation of our press.

What our ideas can do

It is important not to underestimate the influence our ideas will exercise over ever-broadening layers of students.

Our unyielding stance in support of the demands of the most oppressed sectors of society; our firm position against any government austerity program designed to curtail or wipe out the educational and other gains of the working class and its allies; our uncompromising opposition to any imperialist military adventures of the U.S. ruling class; and our strategy of mobilizing the oppressed masses in this country and internationally to implement *their* decisions on economic, social, and foreign policy in *their own* interests; these ideas articulate the instincts students feel as they begin to come into motion.

What did our ideas do inside the anti-Vietnam War movement?

At the beginning of the imperialist military escalation, the YSA was very small, and virtually isolated in our opposition to the war.

But over the course of the war, students began to radicalize and move.

We won the movement to our mass-action united front strategy around the demand, "U.S. Out Now!," mobilized masses of students in actions against the war, and succeeded in helping deal imperialism an historic defeat.

We also built the YSA in the course of that movement, as

antiwar students became convinced through their own experience of the need to build a movement to overturn the system the spawns such genocide.

The key to building a mass YSA

In the long run this is where we will win the greatest number of new members, through working with other students in common actions.

Our ideas will have a tremendous impact on the development of such actions, of building social movements

aimed at mobilizing ever-larger numbers of students to defend the gains the oppressed have already won, and to win new gains.

Our press is the key to convincing students that these movements *are necessary*, that they *are right*, and that they *can win*.

And in the course of action masses of students will be convinced through their own experiences of the need to join and to build the YSA as the means to end the need for such struggles.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE INTERNATIONAL STUDENT MOVEMENT AND THEIR LESSONS FOR US

By David Cahalane, University of Massachusetts—
Boston chapter, Boston local

The expansion of higher education was a global phenomenon during the 1960s. In Western Europe, before 1960, only 5 percent of college-age youth were enrolled. Today in West Germany, for instance, over 20 percent are enrolled. Between 1950 and 1964 the world's student population in universities and colleges more than doubled. In France it multiplied by 3.3; in West Germany by 2.8; and in the U.S. by 2.2.

Today, sweeping revisions are being projected and implemented in the advanced capitalist countries concerning education. The *Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)* held its conference this fall, attended by 400 college and university administrators from twenty-five nations. Higher education, they concluded, faces problems worldwide that will extend beyond the current period of "stagnation and retrenchment." They predicted (promised) that even if capitalist economies experienced an upturn, no assurance could be given that education would benefit. Being convinced that an ongoing expansion of higher education is not essential, the conference discussed how institutions can "adapt" themselves to cutbacks and political repression. They voted to begin a three-year program to provide "practical help" on matters of tenure, research, and curricula. Their aim will be to develop general strategies for member nations to reduce their education expenses and train an army of professional "college managers."

The rationale used by these administrators to justify this comprehensive attack on the right to an education was expressed very clearly by *Frank Newman*, president of the *University of Rhode Island*. He said the reasons for fostering education's expansion in the 1950s and 1960s corresponded to an era of growth, but it no longer applies today. Newman concluded:

"If everyone is going to be upwardly mobile, we are going to have a problem, because not everyone can be a member of the upper-middle class. We need a new rationale for why students should go to college and why society should support higher education."

The YSA has carefully studied and anticipated trends in higher education in the United States and we have

solidarized ourselves with students abroad in their struggles to secure their right to an education. We do this because we are victims of the same type of chaotic, profit hungry system. Just as we hope that students throughout the U.S. will join and act together as during the antiwar movement, we view the movements of students in different countries as being involved in essentially one struggle.

We confront an enemy highly organized and coordinated internationally. They have met together regularly in worldwide conferences to discuss *their* problems and to formulate *their* strategies to strip away educational gains. Students in every capitalist country should learn from this example and look to one another for valuable experience and support.

We in America should be acutely aware of the tremendous developments in the student movements of Europe and Canada. Firstly, because governments there have begun to implement many of the same cutbacks and reorganizations in education that we are witnessing here and some we have yet to experience. Secondly, because students abroad have already launched protest movements against these attacks and their methods and strategies can be valuable for us in some cases. Their massive marches and national student conferences can serve as impressive examples to all students in the U.S. and we should be conscious of publicizing these on our campuses (by selling the *Militant*, *YS* and *IP*; by writing articles for our campus newspapers; by holding forums with international students, etc.)

The nature of the international attack on education

The general scope and fundamental character of the accelerating crisis in capitalist education is illustrated by developments in the past year in France, Britain, West Germany, and Canada. Having both common and different features, government plans in these countries for the dismemberment of education encompass: admission standards; tracking; enrollment totals and patterns; tuition fees; teacher training programs and political freedoms on campuses. (I want to add here that I cite these four countries as good examples of both the nature of all attacks on education and of the student protests that have

developed. In the past year, of course, many other countries have been rocked by student and worker protests, i.e., Thailand, South Africa, Bolivia, Brazil, India, etc.)

France

France has been shaken by its most serious social crisis since the May-June 1968 events, triggered by the announcement last January of a series of educational "reforms." These so-called reforms would: 1) Introduce a tracking and admissions system designed by commissions led by representatives of big industry. 2) Take away the right of students to choose their own course of study. 3) Cut the proportion of students enrolled in the arts and humanities and reduce the overall number of students (particularly those in teacher training programs). 4) Make degree programs more "career oriented," meaning vocational industrial training, and reducing the time involved in getting a paper degree. 5) Restrict the present policy whereby high school students have the right to attend a university after graduation.

France's university system is today popularly known as the *unemployment machine*. Forty-five percent of France's one million plus unemployed are under age twenty-five. Conservative estimates are that one half of France's 160,000 university graduates each year cannot find work. Presently, only 13 percent of all university students are even eligible for any government financial aid, which is given on the stipulation that the student not change his/her course of study.

The purpose of the "*Soisson Reforms*" (named after the Secretary of State for Universities who proposed the plan) is to answer the need of the capitalist employment market for a mass of semi-educated, technically specialized workers in industry and government bureaucracy. As in the U.S., France's rulers want a more direct hand in regulating the future lives and work of the working class. They have little need for students skilled in the arts and humanities. But they can profitably exploit graduates in the fields of economics, sciences and technology.

Britain

British workers and students have been buffeted by massive cuts in social programs starting last February.

Twenty-five percent of these billions of dollars in cutbacks affect education directly, particularly teacher training and tuition.

The National Union of Students estimates that about 30,000 of the 42,800 students finishing training will be unable to find jobs as teachers. This is just the opening volley in the government's battleplan, however. The government projects enforcing a 69,500 reduction in enrollment in teacher training programs between 1973 and 1981. This will entail the closure of 37 colleges and polytechnic education departments by 1981.

The consequences of these cutbacks for Scotland are devastating. Scotland's teacher training colleges expect that two-thirds of their 3,000 graduating student teachers will remain jobless. Furthermore, the cuts will eliminate 28 percent of Scotland's teacher colleges and 42 percent of its training programs for primary education.

On top of an announced cut in government sponsored grants to students, tuitions are scheduled to increase by as much as \$900 by 1977-78, followed by further yearly increases. Vocational and part-time students face a hefty 25 percent tuition increase.

West Germany

West Germany's rulers have waged a five- to six-year war against civil liberties that would have made Sen. McCarthy proud.

Although the West German lawbooks have always had witch hunt provisions (in fact, the constitution bans advocating "*class war*"), in recent years the government has gone on an organized drive to expunge all dissidents from public service employment.

There are some five million civil service jobs employing 20 percent of the country's workforce. From mid-1973 to January 1976 alone, some 460,000 job applications in that sector were reviewed under the guidelines of the "extremist executive ordinance." Hundreds have been denied public service because they were suspected of "*not being committed at all times to liberal and democratic order.*"

This screening process includes garbage collectors, bus drivers, workers in nationalized industry (railroads and post offices), *as well as all university professors and other teachers.*

Its aggressive application to the campuses has been a special project of the government. Thousands of students, who had participated in widespread protests back in 1968, have been graduating and represent a threat to "order" after entering factories, courtrooms, and university teaching positions.

This was recognized as far back as 1971 by the Hamburg city senate (controlled by the *Socialist party*). They voted to exclude "elements hostile to the constitution" from all public employment, "especially in the educational field". The Social Democrats have more recently gone so far as to advocate measures to ban all writings that present violence as "desirable, necessary, or inevitable" to bring about social change.

If a prospective teacher or professor had at any time engaged in such subversive acts as leafletting, joining in a demonstration, calling the government imperialist, joined a teacher's union, or was too interested in Marxism, then that person is automatically denied the position. This witch hunt has covered not only prospective teachers, but also those now in the universities.

Canada

The big squeeze on education in Canada has caught students there in a powerful vice between the rising costs of education and a jobless rate twice the national average. The corporate sector is making the government severely cut back its spending on social services, especially education, in order to redirect government revenue directly to themselves through tax write-offs and hand outs.

While profits have soared during the past decade, the corporate contribution to public spending has declined. In the same period revenue from personal incomes has disproportionately risen. The aim of this trend is to make students and working people generally pay an ever increasing part of the costs of education and all social services. This has been compounded by rising residence fees for students and cutbacks in student aid.

The most direct effect of this government-corporate plan is on tuition costs. In British Columbia, tuition will triple by the 1977-78 year. Alberta colleges and universities have already hiked tuitions by 20 percent to 150 percent this year and have announced another increase for 1977-78.

The Ontario government has boosted tuition for international students by 250 percent to 300 percent at university

and community colleges. This is to be coupled with a 15 percent to 30 percent tuition hike for all Ontario students starting next year. This move is part of a plan published by the Ontario government to raise fees a total of 65 percent.

Nova Scotia have moved to standardize its fees, effectively raising them by 150 percent, leading to a 30 percent decline in total enrollment.

These and other measures have accelerated the already declining quality of higher education in Canada. Courses have been abbreviated while others are gone altogether. Staff and faculty cutbacks are more common. In British Columbia, for instance, the Notre Dame University has dropped its degrees in physics, chemistry, mathematics, philosophy, political sciences and languages; released half of its forty-six faculty members; and eliminated first and second year programs entirely.

Canada's rulers are moving in a similar direction as their European and American counterparts. Their aim is to slash spending, "streamline" the educational system, and coordinate its curricula programs with the fluctuating needs of big business. In the same spirit as the U.S. *Carnegie Commission on Higher Education*, Canada's masterminds of capitalist education want to scrap the popular hope of universal accessibility to a quality college education.

Developments in the European and Canadian student movements

The protests which have erupted in the face of these many faceted attacks on education have a combined character. On the one hand they have developed in the immediate sense in response to recent cutbacks, tuition hikes, curbs on campus freedoms, etc. On the other hand they are not naive or spontaneous outbursts. They have been shaped by the past decade of student protest, organization, and even combined action with workers. In each country recent protests have dramatically proved that the 1960s have left a deep impression on students and taught them important lessons.

The first outstanding feature of these protests has been their mass character and form.

France has experienced its biggest student strike and protest movement since 1968. It was estimated that about one-third of France's 850,000 university students participated. This does not include the thousands of high school and technical school students and professors who joined in. Several demonstrations ranged in size from 40,000 to 70,000 and the strike movement itself encompassed more than half of France's universities along with many high schools and technical schools.

Protest in Britain against unemployment among student teachers took the form of sit-ins, strikes and marches at more than 120 colleges, involving an estimated 70,000 students. In Scotland, students responded to the British government's measures by occupying all ten teacher training colleges there.

Protests against the West German government's assault on academic freedom have been less dramatic yet significant. Many university presidents opposed it as an attack on college autonomy. Some 200 Hamburg professors joined in this condemnation, followed by professors from a number of other cities. The most organized opposition took the form of an anti-repression congress held in West Germany, last June, of 20,000 from several European

countries.

The size and militancy of these protests was also reflected in the serious nature of their demands. When thousands of Britain's students occupied teacher colleges last May they demanded an end to all government cuts; guaranteed jobs for all qualified student teachers and the reduction of class sizes to improve educational quality. At that point, the *Scottish Trade Union Congress* joined in and demanded that the government provide 2,000 new teaching jobs. Support for student demands also came from the *British National Union of Teachers*.

The broadening of student struggles around issues like unemployment and government spending for all social services has marked a step forward in the present student protests.

In another way and in another part of the world, this same process is underway.

Last *October 14*, Canada was shaken by an historic day of protest against wage controls involving over one million workers, almost one half the organized workforce, in the most powerful show of force yet mustered by Canadian labor on this issue.

At a time when students were also the victims of increased attacks, the need for some form of common action between Canadian labor and students was never greater. In fact, *October 14* was also historic in that, at campus after campus, students made a significant show of support for the striking workers.

At major universities in British Columbia, Alberta and in Toronto campus newspapers campaigned for student support before *October 14*. Student bodies like the *National Union of Students*, the *Ontario Federation of Students* and the *British Columbia Student Federation* voted to support the day of protest. Local student councils followed up and dozens of campuses nationally organized committees and meetings to explain the issues and bring out students. On the day of protest itself, several universities were closed down entirely and other organized contingents of students for the labor demonstrations against the wage controls.

Who will lead these student movements?

These rapid developments have raised a series of questions in the student movements of several countries about the relationship between students' struggles and the struggles of the whole working class. This was actively debated in Canada and, under different circumstances, in France and Britain as well.

Students were forced to consider seriously what kind of movement the student movement is, whether students were separated from oppressed layers in society and who their allies were.

We consider these issues to be crucial ones for students everywhere to address. The answers will determine in large part whether the student movement will be on the side of the oppressed, fighting for social change, or be isolated and vulnerable.

Internationally, the different answers to these questions are represented in the student movements by three political trends.

The *reformist leadership*, which tends to have great weight (and includes student groups and federations controlled by our *Social Democratic* and *Stalinist* opponents), consciously steers the student movement into a narrow, dead-end course. It wants to permanently restrict students to limited battles over grades, courses, living

conditions, the quality of classroom education, and narrow campus politics. These issues are isolated in their minds from the broader attacks on education and the living standard of the whole working class. They openly oppose mobilizing students around issues like imperialist wars and unemployment. They politically subordinate students' struggles to bourgeois parties and lobbying the government. They fiercely resist joining campaigns together with workers, oppressed nationalities or women to oppose all cutbacks in social services, attacks on the rights of women and oppressed nationalities, and in defense of workers' standard of living, wages and jobs. Above all else, they fearfully dread the idea of independent mass movements among students, women, oppressed nationalities or workers in general. They are interested only in what their name implies, piecemeal reform, not fundamental social change.

Ultraleftist leadership, although divided, has been primarily concerned with initiating "militant vanguard" actions which broadcast their entire program for intergalactic revolution irregardless of the issues or forces involved. Their central aim is to turn the energies of students away from the campus altogether and instead focus on factory gate or vaguely defined "community" issues. Their approach to the struggles of students has only isolated them from the real social and class struggles and has served as the point of departure for many government and university victimizations of all student activists.

Our own movement has been the only source of correct political and practical leadership in the international student movement. Comrades should look back now and study the document on this point written by the *United Secretariat* of the *Fourth International* in 1969 entitled, "*The Worldwide Youth Radicalization and the Tasks of the Fourth International.*"

That document outlined our *internationalist* approach to the student movement, how we view its history and importance for today and in the socialist revolution. It stresses that we fight for a program in the student movement of every country which reaches beyond the campus in its implications and goals but also includes it. We base our analysis of the student movement upon the interrelation of education, government and economy under capitalism. We want to combine the basic issues of the world class struggle with the issues of concern to students.

Our conception of how students should organize is the polar opposite of the narrow and sterile schemes of both our reformist and ultraleft opponents.

We recognize that in order for students to unite massively, broad and nonexclusive coalitions must be built, with complete democratic discussion of all opposing strategies. Furthermore, we recognize that students are most powerful when mobilized in a mass movement in the streets along with workers, oppressed nationalities, and women. This is why we fight for the perspective that students should use their universities as organizing centers to reach all oppressed layers in society.

Our program for the student movement reflects these considerations. It is spearheaded by the demand that higher education should be accessible to all who want it, whether or not they can afford it. Because of the high rate of unemployment among youth, we also raise the demand for guaranteed jobs after graduation. In addition, we recognize that students have to fight for their right to

organize, join any political tendency, participate in mass demonstrations and student strikes, etc. We also recognize that since students are also the victims of racism, sexism, inflation, and unemployment, we must become activists in broader movements around these issues.

The roots of the worldwide youth radicalization

Our view of the student movement and the program and strategy for struggle we propose does not fall from the sky. It is rooted in our analysis of the contradictory role and development of higher education in modern capitalism.

The expansion of higher education, which I indicated with a few statistics before, was the product of what is called the "Third Industrial Revolution." Following the Second World War the advanced capitalist countries required a larger number of educated people to be administrators, superintendents, and to fill a variety of positions in industry and trade. For a number of reasons a generally higher educational and cultural level in these countries was needed as a result, and this meant increasing investment in colleges and universities.

This investment in higher education resulted in several important changes, which, under the impact of both general capitalist decay and long term planned cutbacks, have become central issues in the struggle to defend and extend the right to an education.

The first effect of the international expansion of higher education was to significantly lengthen the time students spent as students. Today, plans to *limit* the time involved in earning a paper "degree" (as best explained by the *Carnegie Commission* reports on education in the U.S.), so that students would fit more easily into the short term needs of capitalist employment, are sorely felt by students in a very direct way. It is very hard to convince a student that he/she could receive a quality education at a large urban university, with all its cutbacks, in one quarter or one half the normal time.

Secondly, colleges and universities became concentrated in major urban centers where the bulk of the working class and oppressed nationalities are also concentrated. As most cities have become the victims of decay, and as the living conditions of people living in them have been attacked, these educational institutions are now the focus of both opposition to cutbacks and the struggle of workers and oppressed nationalities for equal access to a better education.

Thirdly, there was an influx of students from the working class and a growing trend among all students to enter the work force after graduation as technicians or skilled workers in some part of production. This has increased the ability of the student population to act as a two-way transmission belt, bringing the issues and problems different sectors of the working class onto the campus. Although not having many illusions about becoming self-employed, most students assumed that a college education would greatly improve their earning capacity and job security. The massive disillusionment which capitalist crises in different countries has caused in this regard has been a radicalizing force. (This fact was even documented by such bourgeois investigators as *Yankelovich* a few years ago).

Fourth, the ruling classes and their governments came to depend more heavily on having qualified but *docile* students graduate from colleges and universities. This is part of the reason why they have shown so much concern

with student opinion and political orientations. Government and business have joined together in a search over the past decade for the most effective means of controlling, diffusing or repressing student dissent for this reason. This task has become increasingly more difficult, however, under the impact of a radicalization which has seen students, women, oppressed nationalities, and workers engage in struggles in their own defense.

In general, it was *never* capitalism's aim in any country to equalize wages and employment; create a climate of free political debate and activity; or realize the goal of universal accessibility to higher education by investing its time and energy toward expanding higher education. But, in reality, such expansion *did* raise expectations and create the vehicle for political education, organization and action.

Our international tasks

With this understanding of the roots and current stage of the international youth radicalization, we should remind ourselves (and our comrades abroad) of the international tasks of the *Trotskyist* movement, which were outlined in the *United Secretariat's* 1969 document mentioned before.

These general political tasks are:

1) *To win the political leadership of radicalizing youth worldwide* in their struggles to win the right to an

education, a job and a secure future without war, racism, sexism, and all the other social evils of capitalism. This includes building international campaigns in solidarity with other student movements, in defense of colonial revolutions and political prisoners everywhere. This will involve a direct political confrontation with our opponents on the left (*Social Democrats, Stalinists, ultralefts, etc.*) in the student movement, which are also our opponents in the workers movement.

2) *To build stronger revolutionary Marxist youth organizations.* In order to effectively lead students and other youth, organizations like the YSA in the U.S. and the other youth organizations that support sections or sympathizing groups of the *Fourth International*, will have to become mass organizations. We need to recruit thousands of radicalizing youth and train the needed revolutionary leadership for the future.

In all of our work towards building the YSA here in the United States and in solidarizing ourselves with the struggles of students abroad, we should keep the following fact in mind, which is the bedrock of our confidence in the future:

"[The] current radicalization is not just a conjunctural phenomena, but a permanent one that will be of continual concern to the revolutionary movement from now on."

(from *Worldwide Youth Radicalization*)

December 6, 1976

ON RAPE

By Cathy Hinds, Cal State L.A. chapter, Los Angeles local

This past summer the Socialist Workers party began a discussion on the Marxist view of rape and the response revolutionary socialists should make to many of the ideas expressed in Susan Brownmiller's book *Against Our Will*. Recently, in my capacity as regional organizer for the YSA, I found that many active feminists accept with little or no qualifications the thesis of Brownmiller's book; that rape is an expression of violence by all men against all women. These same women view rape as one of the central problems facing women today, and many view it as *the* issue women should organize around. Perhaps central to the discussion on Brownmiller's book is the question: where does the oppression of women stem from—class society or males? As the discussion within the feminist movement on rape grows, as I believe it will, our women comrades in particular will need to be prepared on the question of rape. Among many of our comrades there seems to be a certain "fuzziness" on how we view rape, and I hope this discussion contribution will generate some further internal discussion on this subject. I would also encourage comrades to read Brownmiller's book, with Cindy Jaquith's review in the *Militant* (April, 1976) as a companion piece.

As I mentioned above, the key question raised by feminists is where does the oppression of women stem from? According to Brownmiller "Female fear of an open season on rape, and not a natural inclination toward monogamy, motherhood, or love, was probably the *single causative factor in the original subjugation of woman by*

man." (p. 6, emphasis added) As well, she states, "concepts of hierarchy, slavery, and private property flowed from, and could only be predicated upon the initial subjugation of women." (p.8)

This article is not intended to be a discussion on the origins of women's oppression, but I want to remind comrades that Brownmiller's thesis runs counter to the Marxist analysis that women's oppression was a result of the rise of class society and the development of private property. As this analysis lays the basis for our view of the family, and the road to full female liberation, it is crucial that comrades understand this. *Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*, lays the basic groundwork for this analysis.

It is from this basic error on the origins of women's oppression that so many other errors flow. It entraps the feminist into incorrect analysis of current problems, anti-working class views, support to female bourgeois politicians, and into racist demands for "more cops." And finally, it leads women away from the only solution to their oppression, the building of a socialist society.

In viewing rape it is important to insure that we start with the correct analysis: rape is an outgrowth of a sexist society, one that oppresses women and at the same time encourages the suppression of sexuality. It is encouraged by a violence-prone society, one that condones mass killings like My Lai. Rape is an outgrowth of institutionalized sexism and will only be eliminated in a society that does not treat women as second-class citizens.

To give one example. During the Vietnam War, incidents of rape were extremely high by the American troops and the South Vietnamese. On the other hand, there was very little rape committed by the North Vietnamese or Viet Cong. There were two reasons for this. One was that there was a strong military prohibition against rape that was strictly enforced. As well, (and probably the most important factor) North Vietnamese women fought right along beside the men, were artillery defenders of the North, and were accorded equal status. This certainly reinforced the prohibition against rape; women who are treated as equals and as true human beings escape the degrading label of sex object.

Although Brownmiller notes the above in her chapter on "War" (pp. 90-93), she still fails to make the correct conclusion. That is that rape is fostered by a system that is built on the economic and social oppression of women. She also fails to note that rape by the American troops was encouraged by the racist, dehumanization of the Vietnamese (i.e. "gooks" and "slant-eyes", popular terms used by the U.S. Army).

Rape in the United States is now becoming a subject to be discussed in the open, not behind closed doors. This is a direct result of the women's liberation movement and indicates that no longer will women view themselves as having been the 'cause' of their own rape. We no longer have to feel like the criminal when we are indeed the victim. Movies, TV shows, and magazines are taking up the question of rape. Almost every major city has some type of rape crisis or rape prevention center. Cases like Joanne Little and Inez Garcia raised the issue of self-defense. We support bringing rape 'out of the closet' and we support the right of women to defend themselves during a rape attack. But . . . it is very easy to step from self-defense to racist 'vigilante-type' actions. To give an example, I would like to quote from a reprint of a media review of some recent articles on rape. The review was by Jackie MacMillan. "While individual acts of vigilantism *may* be foolish, we should explore the possibility of working through alternative structures. Community tribunals, for instance, *even when no action is taken*, can serve notice to rapists that their acts are not condoned by the community. Another possibility is the development of *networks of neighborhood crime patrols.*" (emphasis added)

Vigilante-type actions, crime patrols, more cops. All these are proposed by serious activists within the movement. And who will ultimately bear the focus of their wrath? The Black, or Chicano, or Puerto Rican, or Asian male. While all of these women would clearly *say* they are not racists, past experience has shown that this is exactly where their actions will lead them. It stems from their view that the male, not the system, is at fault. And it stems from a racist society that stereotypes non-white men as rapists, muggers, etc. Brownmiller's book is a clear outline of how easily the feminist who wishes to combat rape can become racist. Her description of the Emmett Till case, (a Black youth who was murdered for whistling at a white woman. His murderers, despite strong evidence, were not convicted.) is a prime example of this twisted, racist logic. Brownmiller does agree that Till should not have been murdered for whistling at a white woman. However she also characterizes the whistle as a "deliberate insult just short of physical assault. . . ." (p. 273) She goes on to explain that the murderer of Till understood this and

reacted to it (correctly, we may presume) as if it indeed had been a rape. A young boy's whistle is now equated with a rape, *only* because he was Black and the woman was white.

I do want to give credit to Brownmiller for many of the statistics she printed on rape. The chart below was gathered in Baltimore, covering the period from 1962-1966. It gives an indication of the judicial system across the country. The convictions point out that Black men were given the stiffest penalties for raping white women, and the lightest for raping Black women (which constitutes the largest percentage of prosecuted and convicted rapes). The chart does not include the death penalty or life sentences. (p. 237)

Racial Mix	No. of Men Brought to Trial	Conviction Rate	No. of Convictions excl. Life/Death	Sent. in Yrs.
b/w	33	78%	26	15.4
w/b	6	83%	5	4.6
w/w	141	57%	81	3.67
b/b	449	57%	258	3.18

I want to emphasize that these figures are only for *prosecuted* rapists. According to FBI statistics for 1973, only some 51% of rapists are ever arrested. It is also interesting to point out that 51 percent of all rapes (reported and believed) are by white males. (Uniform Crime Reports, 1973). What are our conclusions? The majority of rapes are by white males on white females. But the majority of rapists prosecuted will be Black men who raped Black women. But the stiffest punishment will be given to Black men who rape white women. Finally, and of extreme importance now that the death penalty has been reintroduced, the U.S. Justice Department statistics show that of all men who were executed under the death penalty from 1930 to 1964 (the last execution for rape), 89 percent of those executed were Black.

So what do we do as members of the Young Socialist Alliance? First and foremost, we patiently explain to other women the roots of our oppression and how rape is a by-product of that oppression. We also explain the roots of racism—and how the women's liberation movement must support the struggles of oppressed nationalities. Second, we must recognize that there is no way to build a movement against rape, for rape is a product of this sexist and racist society—a society that produces rapists every minute of its existence. Building strong movements of women to ratify the ERA, to defend abortion rights, and to establish day care centers will help, however. For these movements bring to the forefront the need to recognize women as human beings, not sex objects.

We can also support the formation of rape crisis and rape prevention centers that help and counsel women who have been raped. These centers also provide programs on self-defense methods. In our election campaigns, on the campuses and in the community, we can call for free self-defense programs for all women throughout the educational system, beginning in the primary schools. On the colleges and the high schools, we can demand more and better lighting. I want to note here that escort services on the campuses are becoming popular. We should be wary of calling for the formation of such a service, for it is said that many more rapes are reported following the institution of these services, rapes by the escorts themselves. We

also support women defending themselves against rape by any means necessary at the time of the rape. And finally, if a woman can give an identification of a rapist, she has the right to go to the police.

None of these will solve the problem of rape. They are only band-aid solutions to a problem that can only be

solved through building a socialist society. But many feminists will want to know what we propose to combat rape besides calling for 'more cops'. So we must explain to them carefully our analysis of rape, the roots of women's oppression, and how we can achieve our liberation.

November 28, 1976

THE YSA'S SECURITY POLICY: WHY IT EXISTS AND WHAT IT MEANS FOR LIBERALIZED DRUG LAWS

By Osborne Hart, Brooklyn College chapter, New York local, and Brian Williams, Queens chapter, New York local

Since the founding of the Young Socialist Alliance in 1960, we have maintained a strict policy against our members using illegal drugs. This policy has been discussed and voted on democratically at previous conventions, including our last convention. This contribution is written to reaffirm the YSA's security policy. We think it is particularly necessary to discuss this again because some states and cities have liberalized their marijuana laws.

Organizing the YSA, Part I states our drug policy: "YSA members cannot use illegal drugs of any kind. This policy has no exceptions. This position does not stem from a moral view of drug usage, but from the need to defend YSA members and the entire YSA from victimization by the government. . . . In addition to agreement with our program and active engagement with our work, anyone who wants to join the YSA *must* agree to carry out this policy under *all* circumstances."

The YSA is a political organization that seeks to help lead a socialist revolution in this country. We take this task seriously. Although in the course of the work we carry out we take full advantage of the democratic rights won from the government, we have no illusions about the real nature of capitalist society. We understand that the government will not hesitate, if given the opportunity, to make use of its repressive apparatus to victimize radical organizations and movements for social change.

We see defending our organization from attack by the government as crucial. We prohibit members of the YSA from using illegal drugs because it would leave our organization open to needless victimization that could impair and possibly destroy our effectiveness.

Drug laws and FBI

Recent FBI documents obtained through the YSA and SWP \$40 million lawsuit against the government *prove* that the government uses drug laws to frame up political activists.

In July 1968, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover sent a communication to the Albany, New York FBI office outlining various ways for FBI agents to disrupt radical political groups. This document was sent as part of the FBI's New Left Counterintelligence Program (Cointelpro). The YSA was one of the groups that the program was aimed against.

Suggested disruption ploys listed in this document

include: "taking advantage of personal conflicts or animosities existing between New Left leaders; . . . creation of impressions that certain New Left leaders are informants for the Bureau or other law enforcement agencies; . . . be alert for opportunities to confuse and disrupt New Left activities by misinformation; . . . the use of articles from student newspapers and/or the underground press to show the depravity of New Left leaders and members. In this connection, articles showing advocacy of the use of narcotics and free sex are ideal to send to university officials."

Central to the FBI's disruption schemes are its use of drug laws to frame political activists. The document states: "*Since the use of marijuana and other narcotics is widespread among members of the New Left, you should be alert to opportunities to have them arrested by local authorities on drug charges. Any information concerning the fact that individuals have marijuana or are engaging in a narcotics payoff should be immediately furnished to local authorities and they should be encouraged to take action.*" (emphasis added)

The FBI also outlined ways to use marijuana laws to disrupt the growing GI anti-Vietnam War movement. The same document states:

"The field was previously advised that New Left groups are attempting to open coffeehouses near military bases in order to influence members of the armed forces. Wherever these coffeehouses are, friendly news media should be alerted to them and their purpose. In addition, various drugs such as marijuana, will probably be utilized by individuals running the coffeehouses or frequenting them. Local law enforcement authorities should be promptly advised whenever you receive an indication that this is being done."

The drug laws have also been used to victimize activists in the Black movement. In 1971, Lee Otis Johnson, a Black student at Texas Southern University, was framed up because of his political activity on campus and given a *thirty-year* sentence in state prison for the simple act of passing one marijuana cigarette to a plainclothes cop. He remains in jail today.

More recently, in June, three Chicano activists in El Paso, Texas were framed up on charges of arson. One of the later charges levied against one of them, Ruben Ogaz, was that he was dealing hard drugs. This charge was an

attempt to prejudice the jury in the arson frame-up case. Ironically, Ogaz is well known in the Chicano community for fighting drug abuse.

On the campuses police are stepping up their use of undercover agents to frame up students for marijuana use. An October 29, 1976 article in the New York *Daily News* entitled "Police Check to See if Pot is Boiling at CCNY," describes one example of this: "Police yesterday were investigating reports of thriving marijuana traffic at City College and said they may deploy undercover narcotics agents to the Harlem campus soon to cut back the illegal sales of the drug. . . . Detectives said that if undercover officers are brought in, it would, in their memory, be the first time since the late 1960s that narcotics agents have worked the City College."

It is true that thousands of students who are not politically active use drugs and most are not victimized for it. But to think the same would apply to us is simply not true. We should clearly understand that the activities of the YSA are *not* looked upon with favor, and do not go unnoticed by the U.S. government, or state and city governments. As the FBI documents prove, the police will take advantage of any handle they are offered to destroy or limit the functioning of the YSA.

"Decriminalization"

Recently eight states—Alaska, California, Colorado, Minnesota, Ohio, Oregon, South Dakota, and Maine—have "decriminalized" the possession of small amounts of marijuana. Some cities like Ann Arbor, Michigan have adopted similar laws.

The Minnesota law, for example, orders a fine of not more than \$100 for first-time offenders possessing less than one and one-half ounces of marijuana. A second conviction within a two-year period, however, draws a possible ninety-day jail term and a \$300 fine. Sentences for selling marijuana or possession of larger quantities are much stiffer.

"Decriminalization" laws have also not slowed down narcotics cops. According to FBI statistics, marijuana arrests are on the increase, and comprise nearly 70 percent of all drug-related arrests. In 1970 there were 188,682 marijuana arrests; in 1974 there were 445,600.

The rulings "decriminalizing" possession of small amounts of marijuana do not change the YSA's policy banning the use of marijuana. These regulations have many flaws in them. It is still a crime to use marijuana—just a lesser crime than before. Once someone is arrested for possession of marijuana, whether it is a misdemeanor or a felony, law officials can attempt to fabricate the more

serious charge of selling marijuana, for the purposes of a political victimization.

In addition, "decriminalization" laws in local areas have no bearing on the federal drug laws that remain in effect. The Controlled Substances Act of 1970, a federal statute, makes possession of marijuana a *felony* with a five-year maximum prison penalty. This law applies in every state—even those with "decriminalized" laws.

The YSA is a national organization. A change in the drug laws in one state would not change our policy for any YSA member. Any individual YSA member who would use illegal drugs would endanger the entire national organization. If a YSA member were to be convicted of drug use it could establish a precedent for "law enforcement" officials to plant drugs on YSA members or at YSA meetings elsewhere in the country. However, these tactics are difficult for the police to use as long as our policy against the use of illegal drugs is widely known and strictly enforced by *every member*.

The YSA, of course, is in favor of legalizing the use of marijuana. When this question has come up in referenda we have urged a vote for legalization. However, this political position is totally separate from the YSA's policy prohibiting our members from using marijuana or other illegal drugs.

To avoid any misunderstanding of the meaning of the YSA's policy one important point should be kept in mind. The essence of the YSA's policy is that YSA members have *no association whatsoever* with drugs, including marijuana. This means that comrades must stay out of living arrangements where illegal drugs are used or are kept by other individuals in the same living situation. YSA members also must stay away from all parties or gatherings where drugs are used. If a YSA member is in an area where people are smoking marijuana or using other drugs, he or she must leave immediately.

A policy of this type, strictly adhered to, makes it difficult for the government to carry out credible frame-ups of our members.

The YSA policy on illegal drugs is not merely a publicly stated position that we are not really serious about enforcing! This policy is vital to defending the YSA from needless victimization by the government. It applies to every member of the YSA without exception or flexibility. Our policy should be thoroughly explained to every new member before they join, and accepted by them. Using illegal drugs, including marijuana, is incompatible with membership in the YSA.

We must reaffirm this position at the convention.

December 8, 1976

PROBLEMS OF ORGANIZATION AND LEADERSHIP

**By Chuck Petrin, East Side chapter, New York City
local and Nancy Brown, Newark chapter**

Our national convention last year marked a turning point for the YSA. New opportunities lay before us to expand the YSA's activities on college campuses and in the high schools: unrest and radicalization among stu-

dents was growing. But to take full advantage of these opportunities a significant change was called for in the basic structure of YSA chapters. The purpose of this contribution is to raise in a general way some of the

problems that remain, so they can be thought through and specific solutions raised at the convention.

For some time we had been discussing the need to get more of our members onto campus and to turn the full attention of our chapters to campus work. Much progress had been made over the years, a fact confirmed by our increasing involvement in campus struggles and the growth of our campus fractions.

By the time of the 1975 convention we had members on 186 campuses, with fractions of five members or more on about 50 campuses. We felt then that we were in a strong enough position to take the next logical step forward: move our entire chapter operation onto campus.

With our headquarters, meetings, press sales, election campaigning, and other activities rooted on campus, and with our student members able to play a more central role in all the YSA's work, we could expect to make some valuable gains. Above all, our chapters would become more a part of the political life of the campuses, and the YSA would become more accessible to radical-minded students interested in joining us.

During the past twelve months that is exactly what has begun to happen.

There is no question that this reorganization of our chapters has greatly benefited the YSA's student orientation. But the overall process of establishing strong campus-based chapters with a leadership that is confident of its tasks is by no means complete. How to continue this process over the next year will be an important responsibility for our upcoming convention to reckon with.

Strengthening our campus base is a long-range problem for the YSA. The reorganization by itself could not totally solve things. What it has done is to lay bare the problem in a new light.

"Building the YSA," a report to the June 1976 meetings of the YSA National Committee (YSA Discussion Bulletin: Volume XX, Number 2, November 1976), outlines some of the big changes the reorganization has meant, particularly for the longer-established chapters in cities where there are SWP branches. These changes took place very fast, and they were carried out during a period of sustained political activity by all the chapters.

In some respects it has been a pretty unsettling process. The shift from city-wide chapters to campus-based chapters involved much more than relocating our work. The new chapters were considerably *smaller* chapters than before, either because of a division into separate campus chapters or because large numbers of nonstudent members were released to take on full-time assignments in Socialist Workers party branches. Work needed to be organized on a different scale; assignments needed to be adjusted to fit the new situation. Hundreds of newer members needed to be brought forward to assume leadership responsibilities, from chapter organizers and financial directors to educators, public spokespeople, and heads of antiracist and women's liberation work.

This transition in leadership responsibilities was not always particularly smooth—in many cases the normal continuity of experience was disrupted.

Chapter and local executive committees that were newly elected confronted the job of trying both to sort out a number of organizational/reorganizational problems *and*

direct the work of our chapters to carry out the national fund drive, participate in the Camejo-Reid ballot drive, build the May 16 pro-ERA march and rally, respond to the emergency situation last spring in Boston, build the National Student Conference Against Racism, help get 20,000 new readers for the *Militant*, prepare the YSA's preconvention discussion, and many other activities.

For even the most experienced of our members, this was no simple task. It is little wonder that some things did not get done as well as they might.

Shifts of leadership—both on a local and national level—are a natural and essential part of building the YSA. We want every member to become a leader of the YSA.

No formulas apply to this task; no set "terms" can be prescribed. But the process must be *planned* and *prepared* if it is to work effectively. Experience is best gained through the collaborative work of newer and older members, in which the lessons our movement has learned over many years are passed on and practiced. Leadership *teams* need to be developed that can work together over a period of time in order to accomplish this.

It is this aspect of the reorganization process that has suffered most and that we need to give top priority to in the next year.

In this regard, careful consideration will have to be given by every chapter to the role of nonstudent members of the YSA. Some have recently graduated from school; others may have taken a semester off to work. Often there are members who have had considerable experience in the past on campus, but who may not now have an immediate prospect of going back to school. Should these members, if they are also SWP members, be automatically released? Or is there a valuable role they can play as active members in some way? More thought will have to be given to this.

Our regular collaboration with the Socialist Workers party branches also needs to be thought through. During the past year, many SWP branches have gone through their own process of reorganization—establishing new branches in various communities—and this has tended to upset the normal day-to-day channels of common discussion we have had in the past. To the extent that such collaboration has been weakened, we have suffered a loss that needs to be corrected.

The election of a new national committee at this convention must also take into consideration the problem of leadership transition. At our last convention, 35 full NC members and 31 alternate NC members were elected. Because so much of our leadership was released to the SWP, only 33 are still members of the YSA.

What kind of national leadership team is needed now? It is obvious that many new members will be called on to take this responsibility, a change that accurately reflects the growing leadership in every area of our work. But a careful balance will have to be struck that draws on the experience of our more tested national leaders and reflects the emphasis that must be placed on strengthening the internal organization of the YSA.

If we approach these questions seriously at our convention, we can confidently expect to advance the reorganization we started one year ago.

December 8, 1976

HOW TO SELECT A LEADERSHIP

The following article is reprinted from Letters From Prison, by James P. Cannon, former National Chairman Emeritus of the Socialist Workers party.

In our opinion the most important reason or stretching the convention out for another day is to give adequate time for a *free* and *well-deliberated* selection by the delegates of the new National Committee. This is one of the strongest guarantees of the democracy of the party. Our party has always been more democratic, ten times more democratic, in this respect than any other party. But there is room for improvement, and we should consciously seek out the necessary methods.

We never went in for any of the rigging, wangling, vote-trading and leadership-pressure devices by which, in practically all other parties (strike out the word "practically") the convention delegates are usually defrauded of a large part of their democratic freedom of choice. If one has a self-sufficient revolutionary party in mind, all such methods are self-defeating. A revolutionary party needs a leadership that really represents the party, that is really one with the party.

Without this democratic corrective, freely brought into play at every convention, centralization and discipline inevitably become caricatures and forms of abuse which injure the organization every time they are exercised. A revolutionary leadership must feel free at all times to act boldly and confidently in the name of the party. For that, it needs to be sure that there is no flaw in its mandate.

No rules exist to guide us in the technical execution of this difficult and delicate task to the best advantage of the party. The democratic selection of the primary and secondary leaders is a sufficiently important question—nobody knows how much damage can be done by bungling it—but, as far as I know, nobody has ever written anything about it. Nobody has taught us anything. We are obliged to think and experiment for ourselves.

The democratic impulses of the rank and file incline them to react unfavorably to "slates," as they feel, not without reason, that they narrow down for all practical purposes the freedom of choice. The Social-Democratic politicians, who are as undemocratic a collection of rascals as one can ever expect to meet, have always exploited this sentiment by announcing their firm, democratic opposition to slates. Of course, there was a little catch to their virtuous slogan of "no slates." They meant no openly avowed slates which would possibly be open to discussion and amendment. Instead of that, the noble Social-Democrats rig up secret slates by means of horse trades and petty bribes to

ensure their control. A good 50 percent of Social-Democratic convention "politics" is always devoted to this kind of business.

From the first days of American communism, which also coincided with the first appearance on the scene of a new type of leader with a new conception of "politics," we tried to break through the "no-slate" fraud and devise a more honest system by which the leaders would take open responsibility for their proposals and give reasons for their preferences in the make-up of the leading committee. It became rather common practice for the leading committees, in national as well as local conventions in the communist movement, to propose a slate of candidates for the new committee to be elected. We carried the practice with us in the independent movement of Trotskyism. (During factional struggles the slate-making arrangements were carried on in the separate caucuses of the factions.)

This method was, without doubt, far superior to the "no-slate" tricks of our socialist predecessors, being more honest, and in the essence of the matter, even more democratic.

But this system also was not free from negative aspects, and even dangers. I perceived some of them long ago, have thought much about the matter, and from time to time have tried to devise corrective experiments. What impressed me most of all was the quite obvious fact that while the presentation of a slate of candidates by the leadership is the most "efficient" way to get through the business of the election of the NC—usually the last point on the agenda, carried through in a great hurry—it concentrates too much power in the leadership just at that very point—the convention—where the democratic corrective of rank-and-file control should be asserted most strongly.

It is not the election of the central, most prominent and influential leaders themselves. That problem solves itself almost automatically in the interplay of party work and internal strife. The problem arises over the selection of the secondary leaders, the new committee members, the potential leaders of the future. As a rule, this part of the slate if presented by the most authoritative central leaders, is accepted, whether enthusiastically or not, by the convention; many delegates are reluctant to oppose them.

It is senseless, of course, to speak of a revolutionary combat party without recognizing the necessity of a centralized, fully empowered leadership. But this states only one half of the prob-

lem. Leninist centralism is *democratic* centralism, a profoundly dialectical concept. The other half of the Leninist formula recognizes no less the necessity of subordinating the leadership, really as well as formally, to the party; keeping it under the control of the party. The party constitution does everything that can be done in a formal sense to provide for the interaction of centralism and democracy.

The structure of the party is strictly hierarchical. Higher committees command the lower. Full authority over all is vested in the National Committee. But the NC, like all other committees, is required to render accounts and surrender its mandate at stated intervals to the party convention to which it is subordinated. This is the formal, constitutional guarantee both for centralization and the ultimate control of the leadership.

But it is also necessary to think about the spirit as well as the letter of the party constitution. A farsighted leadership should concern itself with the elusive, intangible factors which can play such a great role in determining the actual relationship between the NC and the ranks.

Some of these factors arise from the composition of the NC and the division of functions within it. Nominally, this body consists of twenty-five members, and they all have equal rights. In addition there are fifteen alternates. But the majority come to the center only for meetings of the plenum which are not held very often. Between plenums the power is delegated to the Political Committee. From this it is quite clear that one section of the National Committee is in a position to exert far more influence on the day-to-day work and interpretation of party policy than the other.

Again, some are older, more experienced and more prominent than others, and consequently wield greater authority in the committee as well as in the party as a whole. On the other side, the committee members from the districts and the younger members of the committee generally, who are active in local work, are closer to the rank and file than the central leaders of the party are, and represent them more directly and intimately. This gives them a special function in the NC of extraordinary importance.

Their presence represents a form of continuing rank-and-file control and supervision over the central leaders. They can fulfill this function, however, only insofar as they are people of independent influence and popularity in their own localities; only insofar as they are freely elected on their own merits, not handpicked.

To be sure, the central leaders cannot be indifferent to the selection of the secondary leadership. In this, as in everything else, leaders must lead. In a certain sense, the central party leaders "select" their collaborators and eventual successors. The question is, how to go about

it? It is often easy for politically experienced leaders to convince themselves that they are better judges of the qualifications and potentialities of certain candidates than the rank-and-file delegates. And, as a rule, it is not too difficult to force their selections through by means of the "slate." This may appear to be the most "efficient" way. But in my opinion, there is a better way.

Wisdom lies in "selecting" people who have popularity and influence in their own right, and whose promotion coincides with the wishes of the party members who know them best. That means to select people who are advancing under their own power.

I came to this conclusion a long time ago, and as far as I have been able to influence the course of things it has been the party method of selecting the NC. Extensive and varied experience, with every imaginable kind of experiment, has convinced me that this method, even at the cost of incidental mistakes, works out best in the long run.

The central leaders of the party who work from day to day without close contact with the internal life of the branches, need such a constitution of the NC if they are to lead the party confidently; lead it with the assurance that they know the moods and sentiments of the ranks and are in step with them. When doubt arises, or when some new important step is under consideration, it is only necessary to consult the out-of-town members of the NC by mail, or to call a plenum, in order to get a reliable sounding of the party. Approval of a given course by the plenum is a pretty certain forecast of similar action by the party.

Conversely, when the plenum finds it necessary to overrule the Political Committee—and this has happened more than once, notably in 1938-1939—it is a sign that the Political Committee is out of line with the party and requires a change in its composition. The 1938-39 National Committee rebuked the PC several times and finally reorganized it, and later tests showed that the full plenum most accurately reflected the sentiment of the party.

A serious and conscientious party leadership should deliberately aim at a National Committee so composed as to be, in effect, a microcosm of the party. When the full plenum of such a National Committee meets between conventions, to all intents and purposes *the party is there in the room*. That is far more useful to responsible political leaders than a roomful of handpicked supporters without independent influence and authority. Bureaucrats who have special interests of their own to defend against the rank and file need to surround themselves with dependent henchmen; but revolutionary political leaders need support of an entirely different kind, the support of people who really represent the rank and file of the party.

There is another, and even more important, reason the rank-and-file convention delegates should take over the election of the National Committee and be free from undue pressure and influence on the part of the national political leadership in exercising this function. The free selection of the full membership of the National Committee is perhaps the most decisive way to strengthen and reinforce genuine party democracy. It puts the political leaders under the direct supervision and control of a second line of leaders who are in intimate daily contact with the local and district organizations and, in fact, represent them in the plenum.

This control doesn't have to be exercised every day to be effective. The fact that it is there, and can be demonstrated when necessary, is what counts. Strange to relate, the professional democrats have never once in the history of our party bothered their heads about the method of selecting the National Committee from the standpoint of reinforcing party democracy. This, in my opinion, is because they tend to think of democracy almost exclusively in terms of unlimited and unrestricted self-expression and forget that control of the central leadership, which in day-to-day practices is limited to a very small group, by a larger group standing closer to the rank and file, is the most important mechanism to assure the democratic half of the Leninist formula: democratic-centralism.

Throwing the floor open for nominations on the last day of the convention is not the only alternative to a slate presented by the outgoing NC. That only throws the delegate body into disorganized confusion and facilitates the manipulation of the election by means of secret slates and horse trades, the favorite method of Social-Democrats.

There is no infallible formula, but the results of our experiments over a period of many years argue most convincingly in favor of a slate prepared by a *nominating commission*. Of course, there are nominating commissions and nominating commissions. But the best, that is, the most democratic, is not the nominating commission appointed by the outgoing NC, nor the one elected at random from the floor of the convention. The most efficient, for the purposes set forth above, is the nominating commission selected by the branch or district delegations on a roughly proportional basis — each delegation selecting its own representative — and then ratified by the convention. The nominating commission, thus conceived, is a body actually representing the rank-and-file delegations from the districts.

It would be grossly improper for individual central leaders to intrude themselves upon the commission and seek to dominate its proceedings. That would amount to a circumvention of the democratic process aimed at in the pro-

posal. It is the part of wisdom for the central leaders to leave the nominating commission to its own devices, respecting the essence of party democracy as well as the form.

The nominating commission should be selected on the first day of the convention; it should begin its sessions at once and meet at least once a day thereafter to consider the various nominations until a slate is decided upon for presentation to the convention when the election of the NC comes up on the agenda.

In my opinion, the first step of the commission at the 1944 convention should be to discard formally the ruling which paralyzed the work of the nominating commission at the 1942 convention — the utterly stupid and reactionary principle that every member of the outgoing NC was, as a matter of course, to be reelected unless good cause was shown to *remove* him. That turns things upside down. Nobody can be "frozen" in any position in a revolutionary party. He must stand for election at each convention, and the election must be free and open.

Room must be left for competition and rivalry and differences of opinion to operate without artificial restraints. Members of the outgoing NC should be placed in exactly the same status as new aspirants — as *candidates* for election. The nominating commission should adopt a rule to this effect at its first session.

The most practical next step is to take a preliminary poll to ascertain how many candidates are generally favored for election as national leaders who are not counted as representatives of any special district of the party. This will clear the road for the apportionment of the remaining places on the slate for local and district representatives. Here, again, there should be no "freezing" of old representation and no automatic closing of the door to new candidates from districts previously not represented.

The object should be to provide the fairest possible representation of the districts in the new NC; but the principle of proportional representation should be modified by other considerations: the relative importance of the district; the quality of the candidates; the special role played by certain candidates, etc.

The commission should announce the time and place of its daily sessions, and invite any delegate who wishes to argue for or against any candidate to appear and take the floor. The slate finally decided upon, either by agreement or majority vote, should be presented to the convention as the *nominations* of the nominating commission. That leaves the floor open for other nominations and free discussion before the ballot is taken.

Naturally, one would have to have some good arguments for another candidate to hope to amend the slate of the nominating commission. But if he thinks he has a strong case, there is

no reason why he shouldn't make the attempt. Adequate time and patience must be accorded for the presentation of any such proposed amendments. The heavens will not fall if a slate is amended once in a while.

One word more. The convention should not shunt the election of the new NC off till the last hurried half-hour of the convention, when impatience of departing delegations would tend to discourage full discussion and ample consideration of the various nominations. The best procedure would be to fix a definite hour and day to take up the election of the NC whether the rest of the agenda is finished or not at that time. This decision should be made demonstratively in order to call sharp attention to the vital importance of full and careful deliberation in selec-

ting the party leadership. And even more important, the convention will thus give itself time to do the job right.

All of these measures will not guarantee the election of an ideal National Committee. But they should help to provide us with the best committee that a free party can select from the material at hand by the method of party democracy. If the returning delegates go home with the feeling that this has been accomplished, the new NC will be able to begin its work with a strong authority. On the other hand, the leadership, precisely because of the care and deliberation taken in the selection of the personnel of the NC, will feel itself to be more than ever under the watchful supervision and control of the party.

U.S. STUDENTS AND THE FIGHT AGAINST RACISM IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

YSA National Executive Committee Draft Resolution
Submitted December 13, 1976

Introduction

In the past two years the victories of the liberation struggles in the two southern African countries, Angola and Mozambique—along with the liberation of Guinea-Bissau in 1974—meant the downfall of the Portuguese colonial empire in Africa. This set the stage for a rise in the liberation struggles in all of southern Africa and was a setback for both U.S. and South African imperialism.

Independence groups in Namibia (South-West Africa) and Zimbabwe (Rhodesia) have continued to step up their fight for freedom. And the Black workers and students in South Africa itself have gained new confidence and launched a wave of struggles against white minority rule.

When the United States intervened into the Angola war in the fall of 1975, the Young Socialist Alliance played an important part in helping to educate about the U.S. role in southern Africa, and in beginning to build a movement that demanded "Hands off Angola." Leaders of the Young Socialist Alliance and the Socialist Workers party toured the country speaking on "Angola: The Next Vietnam?" A series of articles in the *Young Socialist* and *Militant* exposed the role of U.S. corporations in Angola. And YSA chapters helped initiate forums, teach-ins, rallies, and picket lines demanding "No U.S. intervention in Angola."

It is up to revolutionaries in this country to take the lead in building a movement in support of the Black liberation struggle in southern Africa. This draft resolution is intended as a step in that direction, by opening a discussion in the YSA about the type of political campaign needed in the United States to force Washington to end all involvement in southern Africa. This resolution is not intended to be a thorough analysis of the revolution in southern Africa. Its main purpose is to outline the strategy the YSA should follow in helping to initiate a national movement in the United States to support that revolution.

The discussion on the YSA's perspectives for a southern Africa campaign will continue at the upcoming sixteenth Young Socialist Alliance national convention. At the convention the delegates should decide to shift this campaign into high gear through our use of the *Young Socialist*, the *Militant*, and other educational tools, as well as through our participation in the National Student Coalition Against Racism (NSCAR).

Upsurge in South Africa

The upsurge in South Africa, ignited by the Soweto rebellion in June 1976, is a major component of the freedom struggle in southern Africa today.

South Africa is a country of 26 million people, where the more than 22 million Black majority is completely dominated by the 4.3 million white minority. It is a modern industrialized capitalist economy, and imperialist nation which was created by white colonization. South Africa serves as imperialism's main striking force—militarily, economically, and politically—against any and

all advances of the liberation forces in southern Africa.

The white minority government rules South Africa through apartheid—an all-encompassing system of national oppression, in which the Black population is reduced to little more than a source of cheap labor.

Under apartheid, Black South Africans are not free to travel from one place to another without a pass book. They are told where they can live, which jobs they can work, and whom they can marry. In the Black township of Soweto, near Johannesburg, only a small percentage of the homes have running water; fewer have electricity or bathrooms. Entire families live in unbearably crowded conditions. Living conditions are so wretched that even U.S. Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development H.R. Crawford called the townships where Blacks are forced to live "modified concentration camps."

The June 16 student-initiated rebellions in Soweto dealt a severe blow to the white minority regime, the most powerful stronghold of white rule on the African continent. On that day, 10,000 students and youth took to the streets to protest the imposition of the Afrikaans language in the schools. Afrikaans is a Dutch-based language spoken by almost no one outside of South Africa, and is closely identified with the ruling National party and its policy of apartheid.

The students viewed this move as just another way the apartheid system retards Black students' development and makes them slaves in their own land. As Winnie Mandela, an executive member of the Black Women's Federation and Black Parents Association in Soweto, pointed out: "The language issue is merely the spark that lit the resentment that is building up among Black people. Every car that looked like a white man's car was burned. That was nothing to do with Afrikaans."

The June 16 protest began with a march that converged on Phefeni junior high school, the center of a student strike. The march was peaceful, with banners that read: "Down with Afrikaans," "We are not Boers," and "Viva Azania [an African name for South Africa]."

The demonstration was met with murderous force by the apartheid regime. At least two students were killed—one was seven years old. This protest and the violence and repression that followed set off a chain of events that catapulted all of southern Africa onto the international political scene.

Within a few days of the initial Soweto rebellion, protests broke out in at least ten other Black townships surrounding Johannesburg. Schools, government offices, stores, and other symbols of authority, racism, and exploitation were attacked in reaction to the language policy, the police killings, and oppression.

Black university students throughout South Africa organized sit-ins, rallies, strikes, and other protests in support of the Soweto students.

Some white students chanting "Power to Soweto" also

marched in solidarity with the Black students.

The student struggles influenced the activities of Black workers. Within a week of the Soweto rebellion, at least two strikes by African workers were reported.

Later, an August 23-25 general strike of Black workers immobilized most of Johannesburg. The *New York Times* reported that the overwhelming majority of Black workers who commute to Johannesburg from Soweto observed the first day of the strike. The second day the Transvaal Chamber of Industries reported that only 10 percent of the Black workers reported to their jobs. Closed down were 300 clothing factories, most construction sites, delivery services, factories, department stores, offices, and almost all businesses.

A week after the Soweto general strike, Coloureds [people of mixed African, Asian, and European descent] demonstrated in Cape Town, taking the protests to white areas for the first time. This protest shocked the South African regime, which has sought to divide Coloureds from the Africans and Indians by offering them token privileges under the apartheid system. A white South African journalist explained to Michael Kaufman of the *New York Times*, "The most astounding thing for us here has been to watch colored and black youth standing together saying the same thing."

The fact is that the apartheid regime has little more to offer Coloureds than it has to offer Indians and Africans. Many Coloured and Indian youth, like their African counterparts, view themselves as part of a Black power movement. They reject the regime's divide-and-rule strategy of fighting each other. This is shown by the ongoing protests organized by Coloureds and Indians since June 16.

The depth of the mass ferment among Blacks was highlighted by a student-initiated three-day general strike held September 13-15. The strike was the biggest single protest against apartheid since June 16. Seventy-to-eighty percent of Soweto's workers stayed away from work.

Police arrests and detainment

Since the protest began, the white minority regime of Prime Minister John Vorster has arrested and detained thousands of Blacks.

Hardest hit by the police repression have been the students and youth. Central targets are the South African Students Organisation (SASO), the Black People's Convention (BPC), and the South African Student Movement (SASM), a high school organization. In addition to student leaders, the government has rounded up and arrested trade unionists, doctors, religious figures, women's leaders, journalists, poets, playwrights, and actors.

Between June 16 and October 31, nearly 4,200 persons were arrested and charged in court, according to the South African Institute of Race Relations (SAIRR). In addition, SAIRR reported that it knew of 423 persons being held without charges under various security laws. Hundreds of students have fled the country seeking exile, in fear of their lives. And according to South African official figures, more than 350 Blacks have been killed; almost all in police or vigilante raids organized by the white authorities. The real figure could be much higher. As a result of brutal treatment in the prisons, at least 6 Blacks have died in jail.

It is clear that a massive campaign is needed against the South African regime and in solidarity with the Black

struggle for majority rule. An especially urgent demand is for the release of all political prisoners and detainees. This makes it extremely crucial to begin now to organize a movement demanding: "Free All Political Prisoners in South Africa, Zimbabwe, and Namibia."

This will be one of the central demands of the March 25-26 actions initiated by the National Student Coalition Against Racism (NSCAR).

Political aid from U.S.

Faced with the continuing Black protests throughout South Africa, the racist white minority regime is developing a two-sided strategy for the survival of apartheid. At home, Vorster's regime is trying to quell the Black revolt through massive repression while giving some token concessions. At the same time, it is seeking to diffuse the mounting freedom struggles in Namibia and Zimbabwe. The Vorster regime and other imperialist powers fear that the Black freedom struggles in these countries will further encourage Blacks in South Africa.

Washington's policy has been to publicly criticize the policy of apartheid while continuing to give the regime both direct and indirect economic, military, and political aid. Protecting U.S. corporate interests in South Africa is a task that can best be accomplished by protecting white minority rule.

The United States's plan in southern Africa is to try to stall off a confrontation between the masses fighting for freedom in Namibia and Zimbabwe and the racist colonial-settler regimes. It is the fear of what a victory by the masses in Namibia and Zimbabwe would mean to Blacks in South Africa that has made Washington suddenly become a "friend" of majority rule in Zimbabwe and Namibia.

Another goal of the United States is to consolidate or establish friendly relations with the Black African capitalist countries, and try to establish neocolonial governments in Namibia and Zimbabwe that would be agreeable to continued U.S. presence.

For more than three decades the United States has been one of the major defenders of the racist regime in South Africa. This is because South Africa is an important center for imperialist investment. The apartheid system supplies a wealth of cheap labor for corporations. In addition, the country has vast supplies of valuable natural resources needed by imperialism.

More than \$1.6 billion worth of American corporate investments help prop up the South African economy. The United States is Southern Africa's third largest trading partner. Since 1972, U.S. investments in South Africa have been growing at the rate of 20 percent a year.

There are 350 U.S. corporations with subsidiaries in South Africa. This does not include investments that U.S. businesses have in non-U.S. firms operating there. The U.S. government tries to cover up the complicity of U.S. corporations with apartheid by refusing to publish figures on U.S. investment in areas such as mining, petroleum, and motor vehicles. Nonetheless, it is possible to get a picture of the important role the United States plays in the South African economy.

General Motors, Chrysler, and Ford have full-scale assembly plants in South Africa, supplying 44 percent of the South African vehicle market in 1970. Firestone is the leading tire manufacturer, followed by Goodyear, which controls one-third of the country's tire market.

In the early 1970s, three American oil companies—Caltex (which is jointly owned by Texaco and Standard Oil of California), Mobil, and Esso (now Exxon)—controlled 44 percent of the petroleum market of South Africa. Other U.S. companies, such as Amoco, Chevron, Placid Oil, Gulf, Syracuse, and Superior Oil of Houston have all been active in exploring for oil in South Africa.

The U.S. government, which speaks for U.S. corporations, has shown that it will defend corporate interests in South Africa. The United States and other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) have played a decisive role in accelerating the military build-up of South Africa, which allows it to strike beyond its borders to advance its own interests and those of U.S. and European imperialism. For example, the entire South African army and police forces are equipped with NATO FN rifles, manufactured in South Africa under the license of NATO.

In 1970 the White House adopted a secret policy toward southern Africa (nicknamed “Tar Baby”) that included a relaxation of the arms embargo against southern African racist governments. In line with this policy, Washington sold South Africa millions of dollars worth of “dual-purpose” equipment. While ostensibly earmarked for civilian use, this equipment could also be used for military purposes.

Included in this “dual-purpose” equipment were Bell helicopters, Lear jets, and C-141 and C-130 military transport planes. Under this cover, \$22 million worth of communications equipment—including radar and electronic “search and detection” gear—was exported from the United States to South Africa between 1967 and 1972. During the same time, more than \$10 million worth of herbicides and defoliants—the type used in Vietnam—were sold to South Africa.

The United States is not alone in its interest in maintaining the apartheid regime in South Africa. Joining forces to protect their own corporate interests are Britain, France, West Germany, Japan, and other imperialist powers, all with large investments in South Africa.

Upsurge aimed at destroying system

The ongoing upsurge in South Africa since last June has been squarely aimed at the apartheid system. Apartheid permeates every aspect of life in South Africa. South African imperialism is based on national oppression and would crumble if this racist system were abolished.

For this reason, a struggle around any specific democratic or economic demand can put the oppressed into conflict with the entire system. It raises the question of who should rule South Africa? The white capitalists? Or the majority—the Black workers and farmers? The logic of these struggles is that they cannot be solved under capitalism, but that only socialism will solve the problems of the Black South African masses.

The struggle for Black majority rule in southern Africa is an important one for the Young Socialist Alliance. Black students united with, and helped organize Black workers into general strikes in August and September, showing by example the potential for students to spark actions on the part of the working class. Students in South Africa have a history rich in struggle against the apartheid regime.

There has been a close link between the Black struggle in Africa and in the United States. Out of the struggles

that were fought in the United States in the 1960s came a new Black consciousness. Black people in the United States are proud of their African heritage and identify closely with the African freedom struggles.

The movement against Jim Crow laws in this country—the early civil rights movement—received an important impetus from the colonial revolutions in Africa that broke out after World War II. African nations began standing up and demanding their independence, and the United States had to begin dealing with the independent Black nations. These colonial revolutions were a factor in the historic 1954 Supreme Court decision, *Brown vs. Board of Education*, which declared segregated schools unconstitutional. The U.S. government was forced to change its racist policies at home to add credibility to its foreign policy in the eyes of developing African nations.

The young freedom fighters in Africa today look to the history of the Black struggle in the United States for inspiration. When Black students in South Africa were interviewed and asked who their heroes were, many replied: Martin Luther King, Jr. and Malcolm X.

As a revolutionary socialist youth organization, the Young Socialist Alliance must come to the aid of our brothers and sisters fighting for freedom in southern Africa.

The YSA is an internationalist organization. We were formed in the early 1960s by young activists who radicalized not just around events in the United States, but around international events such as the Khrushchev revelations and the uprisings for socialist democracy in Hungary and Poland in 1956. One of the first major campaigns of the YSA was in defense of the Cuban Revolution. In the 1960s and early 1970s a major focus of our activity was the anti-Vietnam War movement. In the early 1960s, the YSA helped organize a campaign against U.S. intervention into the Congo (now Zaïre) and in defense of African liberation leader Patrice Lumumba, who was killed by U.S.-backed forces.

We are part of the freedom struggle in southern Africa because of the important role that the United States plays in maintaining the racist regimes there. We can expect that any serious mobilization of the Black African masses will be threatened by U.S. imperialism. As we saw in Angola, the United States government is willing to go to war against the African liberation movement to maintain United States interests.

The U.S. government does not act in our interests in southern Africa. A defeat for U.S. imperialism in southern Africa would be a tremendous victory for American working people—particularly for the 22 million Black brothers and sisters fighting for their freedom in the United States. The millions of dollars spent to prop up the apartheid regime in South Africa and the racist governments in Zimbabwe and Namibia could be spent to create jobs, housing, schools, and other necessities here in the United States. The same U.S. government that coddles racists in this country is also fighting to maintain racism in southern Africa.

Our job—which is a crucial one for the African revolution—is to help initiate and build a massive student movement that can reach out and help mobilize Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, feminists, trade unionists, and all others to demand an end to all U.S. support to the racist governments in southern Africa.

A key demand of this movement will be "No U.S. military, economic, or political aid to the racist southern Africa regimes!" We must expose U.S. imperialist complicity with the racist and colonial governments in southern Africa. Part of this campaign on the campuses will be exposing the complicity of many colleges and universities with the southern African regimes.

"Free all political prisoners" will be another important demand of this movement. The aim of the Vorster regime is to try to smash the liberation struggle by arresting a new generation of militant fighters who have challenged their racist rule. Some of these political prisoners are as young as nine years old. Others are junior high school, high school, college, and working youth. They have been arrested by the thousands and tortured; some have been killed.

This movement must also demand, "Black majority rule now."

Students are important to movement

As the Soweto uprising demonstrated, the participation of students and youth is an important component of the fight against racism. The actions organized by students against apartheid was the catalyst for broader sectors of the Black South African population moving into action against apartheid. American students can learn a lesson from Soweto students. Students in this country can also play a central role in initiating and building a movement against U.S. support to the southern African regimes. The strength of this movement lies in the ability of the student movement to draw in other sections of the population who have the social power to make Washington back down.

The best example of the kind of campaign that can be waged is the campaign against the Vietnam War. In the early 1960s, the Vietnam War was supported by the majority of American people. The small minority opposed to the war organized teach-ins, classes, picket lines, and rallies demanding: "End the war now. Bring the troops home now," to help educate the public about the war. Widely sponsored actions were called around the single issue of ending the war. By the 1970s, the overwhelming majority was opposed to the Vietnam War. Millions of people participated in the movement to end the war. On April 24, 1971, for example, more than one million people marched in Washington, D.C., and San Francisco demanding an end to the Vietnam War. This was the biggest political demonstration in U.S. history.

Students played a crucial role in the antiwar movement. Students were the first to be radicalized by the war and began holding campus protests and other actions which reached out to the broader sections of the population. It was when these broader forces became involved that the United States was forced to withdraw its troops from Vietnam.

A crucial component of the fight against the war was the Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Southeast Asia (SMC), which organized on the campuses and in the high schools.

The anti-Vietnam War movement is a model of the type of campaign that needs to be built now around U.S. complicity with the racist governments in southern Africa. The National Student Coalition Against Racism (NSCAR) can play the same role in organizing students that the SMC did in the antiwar movement.

Like the anti-Vietnam War movement, the movement

around southern Africa must be broadly based and all-inclusive. Coalitions organizing actions around southern Africa should be open to *everyone* who is opposed to U.S. support to racism in southern Africa. The key basis of unity for an action campaign should be *ending U.S. presence in southern Africa*. This movement must also be politically independent of the Democratic and Republican parties. Although these parties claim to stand for Black majority rule in Zimbabwe sometime in the distant future, it is crystal clear that the Democratic and Republican parties, and the corporations they represent have every interest in maintaining a U.S. hold in southern Africa.

At this time we are only at the beginning of building a movement opposed to the U.S. role in southern Africa and in support of the African liberation struggles. The actions that take place this spring will probably not be massive demonstrations. These initial activities will help begin the process of assembling the forces to build this movement.

Many of these activities will be educational. We must explain about the millions of dollars in profits U.S. corporations reap from the exploitation of Blacks under the apartheid system. Not only is education needed on what the U.S. role is, but also on the type of movement that must be built to force Washington's withdrawal from southern Africa. This will happen by organizing teach-ins, forums, picket lines, rallies, and demonstrations.

Protest actions this past fall and summer showed the sentiment for actions in support of the Black struggle in southern Africa and the broad forces that can be drawn into these activities. For example, on November 12 a meeting of 1,200 people was held in San Francisco. The meeting was sponsored by one of the broadest coalitions ever assembled in San Francisco's Black community. Speakers included representatives from the NAACP, the World Community of Islam in the West, the Zimbabwe African National Union in North America, the People's Temple, and the Socialist Workers party.

Actions like this are just the beginning of the movement.

National Student Coalition Against Racism

Key to initiating and building an action campaign around southern Africa is the National Student Coalition Against Racism. NSCAR sponsored the Third National Student Conference Against Racism November 19-21 at Boston University. The theme of the conference was "No to Racism: Boston to Southern Africa." This conference brought together for the first time many different organizations and individuals involved in activities against U.S. involvement in southern Africa to discuss how to build a national movement around this issue.

Individuals participating in the conference were members of many groups, including Black student unions, student government representatives, the American Civil Liberties Union, the National Student Association, the American Friends Service Committee, and representatives from more than 120 schools, including 40 high schools. More than 130 organizations were represented at the conference.

The NSCAR conference issued a call for nationally coordinated actions in cities across the country March 25-26 to demand an end to U.S. complicity with the white racist regimes in southern Africa. These actions will mark the anniversary of the March 21, 1960, Sharpeville massacre when Blacks protesting racist pass laws were brutally gunned down by South African police.

The "Resolution on Southern Africa" adopted at the NSCAR conference states in part:

"On Friday, March 25, campus-wide coalitions can organize teach-ins on the U.S. involvement in southern Africa. These teach-ins can include workshops and forums on university investments in U.S. corporations which support apartheid; military aid to South Africa and Zimbabwe and other governmental and corporate ties to the white majority regimes.

"On Saturday, March 26, city-wide coalitions can organize rallies, marches, and/or picket lines at South African consulates or other symbols of southern African racism. Demonstrations outside of federal buildings are especially important since the U.S. government is the main prop holding up the racist regimes. We should also demand that U.S. corporations and banks open their books so that we can see for ourselves what their involvement is in southern Africa."

The resolution raises the following major demands to organize actions around: *No U.S. aid to Vorster and Smith! No U.S. corporate, military, or government support to South Africa! End campus complicity with apartheid! Free all political prisoners in South Africa, Zimbabwe, and Namibia! No to racism—Black majority rule now! Stop the murders of Blacks!*

This national call to action is an important first step toward building the movement needed to get the U.S. out of southern Africa. This proposal can be used to reach out and organize the power of the student movement in support of the southern African struggle.

As it has done for the past two years, NSCAR has again set an example on how to organize to fight racism.

NSCAR was formed in February 1975 by student leaders, including members of the YSA, in response to the racist attacks against school desegregation in Boston. Here again students took the lead to involve leaders of the Black community in organizing an effective response to the ongoing racist attacks.

NSCAR's perspective of building a nonexclusionary, mass action movement, independent of the Democrats and Republicans, was key in mounting a campaign that prevented Boston's racists from turning back the gains of the Black community. NSCAR also helped to turn the campaign to defend busing in Boston into a *national* campaign of civil rights forces.

Students have always played a central role in the struggle for Black rights. Students were the backbone of the civil rights movement throughout the sixties, helping to organize demonstrations, sit-ins, marches, and picket lines. With the new attacks on the Black community today, there is more need than ever for a multiracial student antiracist action organization. Today, NSCAR is the only national antiracist organization that has the mass-action strategy needed to effectively build the fight against racism.

NSCAR's campus and high school chapters are organizing students in action against racism on many fronts: in defense of busing—which remains the cutting edge of the racists' drive against Black rights—in opposition to the death penalty, against racist frame-ups, in defense of affirmative-action plans and minority admissions programs; and for equal rights in other areas for Blacks, Chicanos, Native Americans, Puerto Ricans, and other oppressed minorities.

NSCAR recognizes that antiracist activists in the United States have an important obligation to oppose racism in this country *and* around the world.

With this perspective, NSCAR can draw independent activists, campus organizations such as student governments, Black student unions, African students, Chicano, Puerto Rican, and religious groups, and women's organizations to help build for the March 25-26 actions.

NSCAR can use campus resources to organize meetings, classes, and teach-ins on southern Africa. Campus newspapers and radio stations can publicize the March 25-26 activities and help educate about the U.S. role in southern Africa.

An important part of NSCAR's work this spring will be building the tour of Tsietzi Mashinini, a leader of the Soweto rebellion, now in exile in England. NSCAR will be cosponsoring the tour with the American Committee on Africa. Mashinini's tour can help build for the March actions.

Over the past few months there have been a number of important actions—picket lines, marches, and teach-ins—in cities across the country demanding an end to U.S. complicity with apartheid and supporting Black majority rule. Many of these actions were organized by coalitions set up after the initial Soweto rebellion in June, largely by African student groups, Pan-Africanists, and other African liberation support groups.

These coalitions and their activities are just one reflection of the widespread support that exists for this type of campaign, particularly in the Black community. Black Americans and African students have played a major part in organizing and participating in these protests, and will undoubtedly continue to play a central role in organizing protests against the U.S. government's exploitation of their brothers and sisters in Africa.

NSCAR will want to join with these groups and coalitions in activities around southern Africa. These groups should also be asked to support and help build the March 25-26 activities.

Role of the YSA

The Young Socialist Alliance wholeheartedly supports and endorses the March 25-26 actions. A central part of building these actions will be our work in helping to build NSCAR chapters. NSCAR has the potential to play an important role in continuing to build an ongoing movement.

For the next few months helping to build Tsietzi Mashinini's speaking tour and the March 25-26 southern Africa actions will be a major national focus of activity for the YSA.

This means that every YSA chapter will be involved in helping to initiate March 25-26 actions in their area.

In addition, the YSA will continue to work closely with NSCAR in all its campaigns, from the defense of Gary Tyler, to the fight to maintain minority admissions at the University of California.

Through our participation in helping to organize students in a movement demanding U.S. out of southern Africa—and in other antiracist struggles—we will meet many activists who will be won to revolutionary socialism and will join the YSA.

The YSA is an organization of uncompromising fighters for Black liberation. Ours is the only revolutionary youth organization whose program unequivocally supports the

demands of Blacks and other oppressed minorities and has a strategy to fight back and win.

We want to pay special attention to winning antiracist activists to socialist ideas and the YSA. The *Young Socialist* and the *Militant* will be running regular articles on southern Africa, as well as other antiracist struggles around the country. The *YS* and *Militant* newspapers can be valuable assets to antiracist fighters informing them about these struggles and a perspective to win them. They can also introduce them to a socialist perspective on

broader social questions.

Many of the antiracist activists that we are already working with support abortion rights, the Equal Rights Amendment, and the fight for democratic rights. We want to involve these activists in these struggles, as well as in support of the YSA's activities and local Socialist Workers party 1977 election campaigns.

All these activities will help us gain a broader hearing for the YSA's ideas and help us win the most uncompromising antiracist militants to the fight for socialism.

Appendix: Motion passed by Third National Student Conference Against Racism

MARCH 25-26: NATIONAL DAYS OF PROTEST AGAINST U.S. COMPLICITY WITH RACIST REGIMES IN SOUTH AFRICA, ZIMBABWE, AND NAMIBIA

As student leaders and activists opposed to American racism we feel a special obligation to aid our southern African brothers and sisters in their battle for freedom and equality. Being in the homeland of the white minority regimes' most powerful backers, we can play an important role in mobilizing the American people in a powerful movement to end U.S. political, economic, and military ties to the white racist southern African regimes.

We therefore call upon students and others in the academic community, trade unionists, activists in the women's movement, Blacks, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, Native Americans, religious people and all others to join together to build a movement in support of Black majority rule in South Africa, Zimbabwe, and Namibia. We demand that Washington get out of southern Africa immediately—lock, stock and barrel!

Only by building such a united movement—involving student governments, Black Student Unions, the NAACP, SCLC, Urban League, the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists, UAW, African student groups, the National Organization for Women, church organizations and others—will it be possible to exert maximum pressure on the American government to end its ties to apartheid and the white minority regimes. A mass movement for Black majority rule NOW and against Washington's racist African policies practiced in Boston, Louisville, Chicago and throughout America—is the most effective way to support the struggles of our brothers and sisters in southern Africa.

The massive international movement against U.S. aggression in Vietnam combined with the struggle of the Vietnamese people themselves was instrumental in forcing the U.S. government to get out of Southeast Asia. Such a powerful movement is needed again to force the government and U.S. corporations to end their support of the white minority regimes in southern Africa.

Moral opposition to apartheid—a system that forces Blacks to be virtual slaves in their own countries—already has support of most throughout the world, including the United States.

Because March 21 marks the anniversary of the brutal 1960 Sharpeville, South Africa, massacre, and it is expected that international protests will be organized in Europe, Africa, and the Caribbean around that time

against racism in southern Africa, we propose that this conference call upon the American people to organize: TWO DAYS OF NATIONAL PROTESTS AGAINST U.S. COMPLICITY WITH RACIST REGIMES IN SOUTH AFRICA, ZIMBABWE, AND NAMIBIA ON MARCH 25 AND 26.

On Friday, March 25, campus-wide coalitions can organize teach-ins on U.S. involvement in southern Africa. These teach-ins can include forums and workshops on university investments in U.S. corporations which support apartheid; military aid to South Africa and Zimbabwe; and other governmental and corporate ties to the white minority regimes.

On Saturday, March 26, citywide coalitions can organize rallies, marches and/or picket lines at South African consulates or other symbols of southern African racism. Demonstrations outside of federal buildings are especially important since the U.S. government is the main prop upholding the racist regimes. We should also demand that U.S. corporations and banks *open* their books so that we can see for ourselves what their involvement is in southern Africa. By building student-initiated teach-ins on the campus and citywide rallies that involve the labor, Black and women's movements, the American people can send Washington a powerful message. The success of these actions can also lay the basis for even further, even larger protests in the future.

In support of our African brothers and sisters, we demand:

**NO U.S. AID TO VORSTER AND SMITH!
NO U.S. CORPORATE, MILITARY, OR GOVERNMENT SUPPORT TO SOUTH AFRICA!
END CAMPUS COMPLICITY WITH APARTHEID!
FREE ALL POLITICAL PRISONERS IN SOUTH AFRICA, ZIMBABWE, AND NAMIBIA!
NO TO RACISM—BLACK MAJORITY RULE NOW!
STOP THE MURDERS OF BLACKS!**

Submitted by:

Maceo Dixon, national coordinator of NSCAR
Tony Austin, coordinator of Philadelphia SCAR
(This proposal is based on a similar one adopted by the October 23 NSCAR national steering committee meeting. The only significant changes are in the dates—March instead of February.)

WHERE ARE WE NOW IN THE DECLINE OF HIGHER EDUCATION?

By David Cahalane, University of Massachusetts-Boston chapter, Boston local

The draft political resolution describes many sides of the education 'dream freeze' in America. It explains how attacks on education have sharpened the growing contradiction between the needs of the capitalist system and the needs of the majority of Americans and how these attacks fit into long-range plans to restrict higher education as one part of a more general assault on living standards. (For a more detailed look at these long-term plans for education, comrades should go back and read last year's draft political resolution, printed in the *Young Socialist*, and YSA (1975) discussion bulletin #9, page 40.)

This contribution is an attempt to illustrate how far we have fallen in the decline of education in terms of three national issues: 1) the conflict between educational expectations and capitalist aims (the development of "career oriented" public education); 2) the sharpening issue of who is being made to pay for a failing system of higher education (tuition, federal spending for education, college enrollment); 3) recent attacks on affirmative action in education.

Educational expectations vs. capitalist aims

Yankelovich's famous 1974 study on the changing political attitudes of all youth in the United States, showed that the vast majority of college and non-college youth want a lot more education. The majority also consider education to be a right of every person irregardless of their ability to pay. Another study, of the same time, revealed that 44 percent of all high school students want to continue their education in order to go on to a professional career (as opposed to vocational training).

These expectations have been dissatisfied for some time. Recent research by the *College Placement Council* and *National Institute of Education* found that less than one-half of those students who started college in 1961 have been able to use their college majors in work, and over one-half are now in jobs they did not plan for at all. These graduates said they wished they had taken a more general course of study (English, psychology or business administration), and built broad skills, rather than training, as they did, for a specific job.

The plight of youth without any education beyond high school is reflected in a comparison of the unemployment rates for college and high school graduates. In 1975 the jobless rate for minorities with only a high school education was four times greater than for those who had graduated college. The jobless rate for white youth with only a high school education was 50 percent higher than for those who were college graduates.

The demand and need for a good higher education today is clear. But, how many have actually been able to reach college, or even graduate from high school? According to the most recent (1975) government figures, 34.1 percent of all Americans have completed four years of high school; only 5.6 percent have been able to get two years, and 7.1 percent have finished four years of higher education. These statistics mean millions of working people are trapped into worse jobs with lower pay and little security.

How do these facts fit into the plans and needs of

capitalism today? Put simply, America's rulers are no longer willing to offer any hope for the ongoing growth of higher education. As detailed in the *Carnegie Commission Reports on Higher Education*, this means launching a frontal assault on enrollment, tuition, student rights, affirmative action, and the direction of education in general.

I want to explain what this last attack means. The *Carnegie Commission* concluded that the American economy would always be "unstable." In periods of "economic dislocation" millions will be out of work. They warned us to plan on being jobless periodically for the rest of our lives. Since many will have to look not only for a job, but a new kind of job, the *Carnegie Commission* recommended that students (whether new or returning) be "encouraged" to enter school for a shorter time to learn a specific trade or skill. This means forcing students into one- and two-year college or vocational schools, as opposed to four-year institutions or professional schools. These efforts to "streamline" education are meant to refine its ability to train students as obedient, productive, and profit-making workers. This was very recently echoed by Janet Norwood, the deputy commissioner of the *US Bureau of Labor Statistics*, who said: "The effectiveness of vocational educational programs centers on their ability to provide training to people preparing for work that is relevant to the skill needs of employers."

Today, the ruling class wants to extend the concept of what is called "career education" to all levels. While vocational training has been a part of the tracking system of most high schools for many years, "career education" goes much farther. In theory, it is supposed to permeate all academic subjects from kindergarten through junior college.

Kenneth Hoyt, director of the *US Office of Career Education*, describes it as the "... effort to put proper emphasis on education as preparation for work. We are talking about the reform of the entire education system."

Beginning as early as the first grade, "career education" is teaching children what are called "good work habits." Throughout grade school children are taught what it means to be a store clerk, for instance, and how to do the job 'well' while being "happy." After reaching high school, students are ready to go through a series of mock job interviews to groom their ability to sell their labor after graduation.

"The whole purpose behind it," says a Rutgers University professor who supports "career education," "is that we can no longer afford to send people to school just to send them. They have to have a purpose, and that purpose is preparation for careers."

This so-called "career education" is nothing but another sophisticated mechanism to channel youth, at the earliest possible age, into the labor market with a narrow but employable education. It is in perfect harmony with one of the proposals of the *Carnegie Commission*: "... (the) extension and improvement of a series of educational channels for young persons to enter adult life and work and service and not through college attendance alone."

Today, about 9,000 of the United States' 17,000 school districts have launched programs using "career education." To no one's surprise, support for these programs has poured in from more than seventy national organizations, including the US Chamber of Congress and the National Alliance of Businessmen, as well as General Motors Corp., General Electric Co., and the American Telephone and Telegraph Co. In fact, General Motors has hired career education "coordinators" at most of their 117 American plants.

One of the biggest champions of these programs has been the federal government. Beginning in 1969, it funded 248 pilot programs with \$64.5 million. In 1974, the government set up the US Office of Career Education and authorized \$15 million annually for the next four years to sell the idea.

State governments have also fallen right in step. Right now, at least four states (Michigan, Iowa, Louisiana, and Kentucky) require their school systems to set up such programs. In addition, another eight states have spent money towards it. Arizona, for instance, has spent \$22.9 million for "career education" programs in 78 percent of its grade schools and 98 percent of its high schools. The other states are Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Kansas, Ohio, Vermont, and Washington.

Who will pay for higher education to stay alive?

A Federal study has determined that one in seven (14.4 percent) of all colleges and universities are now so "financially unhealthy" that their "long term survival is problematic." These tottering institutions included 27.1 percent of all private and 2.4 percent of all public colleges; 13 percent of all Black schools; 22.1 percent of all institutions with an enrollment of less than 1,000; 25 percent of all four year colleges and 15.3 percent of institutions with master degree programs. Of all institutions of higher education 14.4 percent are in the "problematic" category; 34.8 percent are "relatively unhealthy"; 6.9 percent are holding their own; 25.1 percent are "healthy" and only 18.8 percent are "relatively healthy." These statistics mean that *about one-half of the country's colleges and universities are either near collapse or in serious financial straits.*

What has the Federal government done? The proportion of institutional income from Federal funds has fallen from 23.1 percent in 1963-64 to 15.7 percent in 1973-74. The total amount of Federal aid to higher education (in constant dollars) actually declined by about one-half billion dollars between 1973-74 and 1974-75 alone. The future of government support under Carter is dim, to say the least. Carter has warned us that: ". . .there will be no new (federal education) programs implemented under my Administration, unless we can be sure the cost is compatible with my goal of having a balanced budget."

Who is going to pay to keep America's shaky system of higher education in business? The *Carnegie Commission* was quite clear. It suggested several years ago that tuition be increased and federal financial aid decreased, to the point where students and their families are contributing twice the proportion of the total costs of education they do now.

This year, the cost of a college education has jumped significantly for students. According to the *National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges*, the median increase in tuition (at state colleges and

universities) for the current academic year was 10 percent for in-state students and 12.5 percent for out-of-state residents. At the same time, the median increase in room and board charges for all students was 7 percent.

This year's hikes in tuition and other required fees at state schools represent an acceleration of the trend of spiraling education costs.

By 1970-71, students' costs (at these schools) had risen an average of 45 percent for state residents, 50 percent for out-of-staters, over 1965-66. By 1975-76, state residents were paying 82 percent and out-of-staters 95 percent, more than in 1965-66. This year's hikes mean that *resident students now pay about 103 percent and non-resident students 108 percent more than they did eleven years ago.*

The combined effect of this year's tuition and fees hike, with shrinking financial aid awards and many college recruitment ceilings, has made this a unique academic year. Contrary to government projections for national enrollment, which had indicated a 4.5 percent increase, it has actually dipped slightly by 1 percent. Four-year institutions have been hit hardest, where enrollment is 13.6 percent lower among part-time students (after several years of significant increases). Full-time student enrollment was up by about 1.5 percent, cushioning the overall decline in enrollment there to 2.2 percent. Although two-year colleges experienced their smallest enrollment increase in years, 1.5 percent, the *Carnegie Commission's* recommendation that a larger proportion of students be enrolled in one- and two-year colleges seems to be taking effect overall. More importantly, the 1 percent drop in total enrollment in all institutions is an historic event in itself. In the 1970s total college and university enrollment has been increasing yearly by at least 3 percent, 1975's increase hitting 9 percent. Although total enrollment may continue to swell some during the rest of the 1970s, government experts are now echoing the desired projections made earlier by the *Carnegie Commission*, that enrollment will take a beating in the 1980s.

Affirmative action under fire

The draft political resolution covered many of the ways in which racism in education, through tracking, school segregation, attacks on bi-lingual and affirmative action programs (at the U. of Calif.), is used to perpetuate a higher drop-out and unemployment rate and lower wages among oppressed nationalities.

I want to add only a few points relevant to higher education and racism.

I think we should fully appreciate the impact of the recent California legal ruling that affirmative-action quotas at the U. of California are discriminatory against whites. It has given all of the racist "educators" new heart.

Dallin Oaks, the president of *Brigham Young University* believes that:

The highest single priority of federal aid [to higher education] should not be equal opportunity or social justice. It should be the search for truth and the perfection of learning.

Oaks contends that equal opportunity and social justice should be pursued through the "private sector" rather than by government "interference" like affirmative-action regulations.

The intentions of the "private sector" are very clear if you listen to Oaks's comment on the California ruling:

[This decision] probably will pave the way for further legal remedies on the part of those who contend that affirmative action programs have, in effect, institutionalized a form of discrimination almost as vicious as the one they attempt to counteract.

Undoubtedly, many of Oaks's co-thinkers at colleges and universities across the country will take up his call and push for such "legal remedies" with the help of the organized racists in their own communities. We, in return, should be just as aggressive in organizing educational and protest activities about the racist nature of these "remedies" and cutbacks in education generally.

Another example of how affirmative action is under attack is this year's proposed changes by the *Department of Labor* in regulations dealing with fair-employment practices.

These proposed changes would have a big impact on employment practices associated with higher education.

The changes would reduce the number of factors contractors would have to comply with in regards to employment goals and their timetables for hiring women and minorities. Employers would be able to lump together jobs with a small number of employees so that hiring goals would be "realistic" in number. This translates very simply into fewer women, Blacks, Puerto Ricans, and Chicanos being hired on campuses. In addition, written affirmative-action plans would be required only if the employer has 100 or more employees and if the contract involved more than \$100,000 (currently, it is required if there are fifty or more employees and the contract exceeds \$50,000.) "Pre-award compliance reviews" by the H.E.W. would only be necessary if the institution was about to receive a federal award of over \$10 million (currently, a review is done if the award is over \$1 million). Finally, the changes would eliminate the regulation which specifies the procedures for affirmative action, so as to "permit contractors the latitude to tailor such measures to fit their own legitimate employment structure, operations, and local circumstances." This would give employers on campus a free hand to continue racist hiring practices, in keeping with their traditional "operation," "employment structure" and "local circumstances."

As past gains (no matter how slight) in affirmative-action programs in admissions, and campus employment are subjected to new attacks next semester; along with minority studies, bilingual education and minority enrollment as a whole; we will have to step up our efforts to build opposition as part of our work in building the entire antiracist movement around the issues of U.S. support to South Africa's apartheid, the death penalty, school desegregation and the defense cases of victims of racist frameups. *SCAR* chapters across the country will be in a good position to carry out important educational and protest activities concerning all these attacks.

But the YSA will also have more of an opportunity to reach many Black, Chicano, and Puerto Rican students with our socialist analysis of the role of racism in society and in education particularly. We should think about having more YSA forums, where possible, to present our socialist program and strategy for Black, Puerto Rican, and Chicano liberation in the U.S. If there is going to be an increased level of interest and activity among Black, Puerto Rican, and Chicano students in the anti-racist movement, then this will also be the best time to win these students to a revolutionary-socialist program and to the YSA.

What we can expect in the near future

We are now getting the first serious taste of what America's rulers have planned for the future of not only higher education, but public education generally.

What then can we expect in the near future in those areas discussed here?

1) The Purpose Of Education: America's rulers want to combat rising expectations for, and demands on higher education by forcing more youth (due to tuition costs; enrollment ceilings at many four-year schools; high school advising and shrinking financial aid awards) to attend one and two year colleges and vocational schools. The *Carnegie Commission* suggested that the proportion of students in these schools be increased to 40 percent by 1980. As I've indicated, this change is already on its way in.

At the same time American industry wants all public schools, from kindergarten onward, to become better equipped for teaching youth how to get an early job, do it "well" and be obedient. Whereas over one-half of the school districts in the nation have "career education" programs already, it would not be surprising to see them as nearly universal by the end of this decade.

2) Who Will Pay? The quickest way for these master-minds of capitalist education to implement these goals in education is to continually raise tuition and other required fees, in order to make students pay an increasing share of their education's costs and take it beyond their reach. This strategy will hit oppressed nationalities and women the hardest, since their living standard and available financial aid are lower and declining. If today a college education at state schools cost twice what it did eleven years ago, you can expect such an unchecked trend to double the cost again in a much shorter time.

3) Enrollment: The crisis in education has put the brakes on college and university enrollment very hard. If this freeze or a modest growth is continued, many more millions of youth will be thrown into the ranks of the unemployed and unemployable during the rest of the 1970s. This contraction in enrollment, even sharper than proposed by the *Carnegie Commission*, is especially devastating since high school enrollment is at a record high level now. These youth will be forced in the next few years to compete for unskilled jobs or the shrinking openings even in one and two year schools.

4) Affirmative action and education: The ruling class will have to rely more and more in the 1970s, in order to implement its attacks on the living standard of all workers, upon their well-honed weapon of racism. It will be used to beat back school desegregation, and the wages, job security, living conditions, and civil rights of all oppressed nationalities. It will be used to try to keep the labor movement from organizing as a whole and fighting in its own defense. Above all, it will be used to make minorities bear the brunt of the capitalist class' need to soak up record high profits in the rest of the 1970s.

In higher education, racism will be used to try to defeat and extinguish forever all affirmative-action programs. The ruling class will use racism in its attempts to smash these newly won gains in admissions, campus hiring and promotion, bilingual and bicultural services, and education, and in minority studies.

This year's defeat of the affirmative action admission policy at the U. of California in court should be seen in this light as an important and dangerous development.

Less-publicized, more subtle, but just as dangerous, erosions of affirmative action for women and minorities are being tried at other colleges as well.

The YSA's Role: These measures represent real attacks that will have an increasing impact on students in the next few years. But the potential for an active movement against them by oppressed nationalities, women; and all students is also rising. More students in colleges depend on their education for a better chance at a job than ever before. The majority of all youth, in and out of college, consider a higher education to be their right, not a "privilege" of those who can still afford skyrocketing tuitions.

The YSA needs to be on more campuses with more student members than ever before to meet the challenge of providing the best possible leadership in the struggles

which are unfolding and those to come. We need to see *ALL* areas of our work on the campuses as being directly related to the task of educating, organizing, and mobilizing students in defense of our right to an education. The student movement in the U.S. of the 1970s will become active around different issues at different times. But every issue is vitally important, since it will involve more students in struggles that will give the whole student movement more confidence and experience.

At the same time, these struggles mean the YSA will be working with more students and campus organizations than ever before. Our individual recruitment activities, YSA forums, and sales will be able to convince many to join the YSA if this work is organized as a priority, and not left to when we have 'spare time.'

December 7, 1976