

THE MILITANT

Published in the interests of the Working People
Vol. 33—No. 27 Friday, July 4, 1969 Price 15c

The basis for an effective
fall antiwar demonstration

—see page 3—

First-hand report from Chicago

THE SPLIT IN SDS

—Story pages 6-7



Photo by David Fenton/LNS

Bernadine Dohrn reads caucus statement declaring Progressive Labor expelled from SDS

Why Columbia blacks scored PL

A correction of a critic

New York, N. Y.

In reference to Hal Levin's letter in the June 20 **Militant** decrying "inaccuracies" in Paula Reimers' two articles on Columbia SDS, I believe there are some errors in Mr. Levin's own thinking which need to be pointed out. He claims that the Students Afro-American Society (SAS) is anti-Marxist and hence deserves no support, on the basis of a SAS speech which he claims denounced the revolutionary role of the working class. Mr. Levin is apparently referring to a speech by Melvin Tumin at an SAS rally at which I was present.

Actually what that speech did was to denounce PL and the SDS Expansion Committee for their refusal to support the black students' demands for a black studies program at Columbia. The SAS speaker pointed out that the major radicalization at this time is on the campuses, not in the working class — and that student struggles around third-world demands are a way of reaching the working class.

PL and the Expansion Committee have consistently denounced the SAS demands as "ruling class" demands, designed to "share power" with the Columbia trustees. I cannot imagine how a black studies program completely under the administration of black students and faculty could conceivably share anything with the ruling class. Such a program is explicitly a rejection of the racist distortion of education by the capitalist class.

Furthermore, it is not true that student struggles of this type have no relation to the working class. The third-world demands at SF State received broad and active support from both black and white workers.

Admittedly, SAS is not a Marxist-Leninist organization, but that is not the criterion by which rev-

Letters from our readers

This column is an open forum for all viewpoints on subjects of general interest to our readers. Please keep your letters brief. Where necessary they will be abridged. Writers' initials will be used, names being withheld unless authorization is given for use.

olutionaries offer or withhold support. The struggle for black self-determination is breaking out all over this country, and the campus struggles are just one manifestation of this explosion. No group can call itself revolutionary without giving unconditional support to the demands for self-determination of the third-world student community.

Cindy Jaquith

A rights attorney's view of the repression

New York, N. Y.

Elizabeth Barnes is to be congratulated on her trenchant article in the June 13, 1969 issue of **The Militant** demonstrating that the strengths of the antiwar and, potentially, anticapitalist forces in this country today are such that repressive reaction can be beaten back.

Everywhere I hear these fears that America is on the verge of fascism. Particularly are such sentiments rife among the "old left" people. It is almost as if they fear that the young today may succeed where they failed.

May I add that your paper's coverage of the struggle against the war in the Army is of great benefit! When Nixon comes to the belated realization that he can't

rely on his Army to smash progressive forces at home or abroad, we will be on the verge of a basic transformation.

Conrad Lynn
[Conrad Lynn is a veteran civil rights attorney and opponent of the status quo.]

PL sympathizer won over in Atlanta

Nashville, Tenn.

Thank you for sending me the 10-week introductory subscription to **The Militant**.

I attended the first Southwide Young Socialist Conference in Atlanta and really enjoyed hearing and meeting George Novack and Evelyn Reed.

The Atlanta group was most magnanimous and hospitable; they invited me to spend the night in one of their homes. Also, I talked with Mary-Alice Waters that weekend, and she gave me the rundown on PL.

I've been disillusioned with PL for several months but still get their magazine, **PL**, and **Challenge**. PL's position on black nationalism is wrong, and they are losing me as a supporter. Enclosed is a check for subscriptions to **The Militant** and the **Young Socialist**.

D. Q.

On Arab liberation

New York, N. Y.

Hana Niel in her letter to the June 20 **Militant**, states, "The Jewish criminals who massacred the Arab village of Deir Yassin must get extreme punishment." But she does not say who these "Jewish criminals" were and who is going to administer this "extreme punishment." She declares that "Israel is here to stay" and that "Palestinian Arabs must have their own state." She does not try to explain the contradiction that exists in these two statements; having discarded the Palestine commando organizations as "terrorists" she does not say how else the Palestinians are to attain their own state.

Hana Niel does not seem to be cognizant of the realities of the situation; she seems to be talking of a different problem and a different world. Consequently, the proletarian internationalism and socialism that she invokes in the discussion remain utopian abstractions forming a left cover for the Zionist status quo. In contrast, the Marxist analysis starts with facts.

The **Militant** article entitled "Israeli regime seeks to hold annexed land" (**The Militant**, June 13), shows very clearly the true intentions of the Israeli Zionist regime. Not being content with what they have stolen from the Palestinian people all these years, they now want to keep on adding to this stolen property.

In order to steal the land and the resources of a whole nation, they expelled members of this nation and condemned them to a miserable life in refugee camps. They have been shooting and napalming the Arab people who are not willing to bow to the dictates of the Zionist conquerors (see Peter Buch, "Burning Issues of the Mideast Crisis," **International Socialist Review**, March-April 1969).

Even the capitalist press finds itself compelled to report some of these atrocities of the Israeli government. "Israelis Begin Razing Arab Homes at Wailing Wall" is the headline in the June 16 issue of the **New York Times**. The June 22 edition of the same paper reports from Jerusalem: "The Israeli authorities have requisitioned 300 acres of Arab-owned land. . . and have given about 100 people living there a week to leave." These are continuations of Deir Yassin; a policy

THE MILITANT

Editor: HARRY RING

Business Manager: BEVERLY SCOTT

Published weekly by *The Militant Publishing Ass'n.*, 873 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003. Phone 533-6414. Second-class postage paid at New York, N.Y. Subscription: domestic, \$4 a year; foreign, \$5.50. By first class mail: domestic and Canada \$10.50; all other countries, \$15.00. Air printed matter: domestic and Canada, \$15.00; Latin America, \$24.00; Europe, \$28.00; Africa, Australia, Asia (including USSR), \$33.00. Write for sealed air postage rates. Signed articles by contributors do not necessarily represent *The Militant's* views. These are expressed in editorials.

Vol. 33—No. 27



Friday, July 4, 1969

The closing news date for this issue was June 27.

that is aimed at expelling the Arabs from their homes. Such injustice must shock the conscience of every living human being.

In life, as in physics, every action produces a reaction, and the reaction to these Zionist atrocities is the emerging liberation movement of the Arab people led by the uprooted Palestinians. The struggle of the commando organizations to liberate their homeland and establish a democratic state where the Arabs and Jews can live together stands in stark contrast with the racist struggle of the Zionists to impose themselves on the peoples of that area. The Palestinian liberation struggle must be supported wholeheartedly.

The social forces that are being activated in this struggle are capable of not only liberating Palestine, but also overthrowing the imperialists and their local agents and all the exploiting classes in the Middle East. The events indicate the direction of these forces; these are the forces of the socialist revolution that will realize the United Socialist Republics of the Middle East.

It is in the context of these concrete revolutionary struggles and their transitional formations that proletarian internationalism becomes meaningful and world socialism attainable.

M. S.,
A student from the Middle East

Turned on to Militant and Camejo speech (I)

Ann Arbor, Mich.

The speech by Camejo in the May 30 **Militant** was an admirable presentation of clear social analysis, all too rare in an age of self-conscious, pretentious verbiage. I am grateful to **The Militant** for publishing the full texts of presentations of this kind and for its excellent international and national news.

Turned on to Militant and Camejo Speech (II)

Van Dyne, Wisc.

I think your paper is the greatest. I used to tell everyone that **The Militant** was the best radical paper in the country, but when I thought about it, that of course means that it's the best paper of any sort in the country. It's so much better than the underground or other radical papers, which are so often frivolous, unrealistic and depressing.

Besides the basic news items, I especially like the interviews, reviews of books, pamphlets, movies, etc., and educational-type articles like Peter Camejo's recent piece.

I really can't tell how grateful I am to **The Militant**. It's really helped me so much in formulating ideas — it's also turned me on to other Trotskyist literature. I've applied for membership in the YSA.

J. H.

Prisons "perpetrate same damn system"

New York, N. Y.

A June 17th article in the **New York Times** gave a small indication of the feelings of prisoners toward so-called rehabilitation and the prison officials. The pris-

oners had been invited to attend a conference on crime and correction sponsored by the National College of State Trial Judges. Attending the conference along with the prisoners were magistrates, penologists, wardens and police officers. Held in Maryland, the conference drew 21 prisoners from 3 state institutions.

While watching a playlet about prison conditions and homosexuality, the audience of prisoners reacted vocally and militantly against the phony dialogue and situation. In a scene between a new prisoner and a prison officer, the prisoner pleads for and is promised a safer place in the prison to avoid sexual assault. At this point, several prisoners in the audience sprang up, shouting that there was no such thing as a haven from assault in any jail. "It's a jungle," cried a lifer.

Another prisoner said he was disgusted with the whole conference. "When I was first approached to come out here I was skeptical," he said. "Let's get one thing straight," he continued, turning to the criminal-justice officials, "It's people like you who present a false front. It's you who perpetrate the same damn system over and over again." A judge shook his head. "Look, baby," the prisoner said, "I can tell when you're leveling with me. But when you present a false front you're not fooling anybody." The prisoner said that he had heard a lot of talk about "rehabilitation" at the conference but that he had not seen any in the jail. All he had been taught, he said, was how to make license plates, and this would do him no good "outside." "I came in as a laborer," he said, "and you're gonna get a laborer back, baby." A psychiatrist asked if the prisoner would be willing to protect a young inmate if he were promised an early parole. "Yeah, I'd let nobody bother him," the prisoner said. After a moment he added: "But how many men would you have to make that promise to? It's no good. You'd need another system for correction."

Feelings ran so high, a young social worker burst into tears and ran from the room. One judge pleaded for patience, telling the prisoners, "We can't achieve Utopia. We can't make a perfect world 'inside' when it isn't perfect 'outside.'"

Melissa Singler


From a Marine vet

Corvallis, Ore.

Please renew my subscription to **The Militant**, and send some trial subscription blanks for friends. Vietnam and the invasion of the Dominican Republic awakened me from my liberal apathy several years ago. The Democratic convention last year convinced me beyond doubt of the nature of this decadent and corrupt society. It is becoming obvious to me that only through a people's socialism can we hope to achieve democracy, ecological conservation, peace and an end to racism. My one main criticism of **The Militant** is that, no matter how busy I may be, I cannot put it down until I'm through reading it.

Venceremos!

D. H. W., ex-USMC



IF YOU SUPPORT

The Antiwar Movement. The Black Liberation Struggle. The Fight for Socialist Democracy in Eastern Europe. A Socialist America. . .

YOU BELONG IN THE YSA!

----- clip and mail -----
Young Socialist Alliance, Box 471 Cooper Station, New York, N.Y. 10003.

☐ I would like more information ☐ I want to join the YSA

Name

Address

City State Zip

The basis for an effective fall antiwar action

By Gus Horowitz

The July 4-5 national antiwar conference in Cleveland will take place at a critical moment in the development of the antiwar movement. The opportunity exists to mobilize more Americans in opposition to the war than ever before. Washington's continuing aggression against the Vietnam people and the Nixon administration's double-dealing maneuvers confer an added urgency on seizing this opportunity.

To be effective, the deliberations of the conference must proceed from an accurate analysis of the present stage of the war, a clear understanding of the objectives of the Nixon administration, and a realistic estimate of the present capabilities of the antiwar movement.

The Nixon administration, despite its public stance, has not departed from the basic policies followed under Johnson. U. S. imperialism still holds its central strategic goal of maintaining control over South Vietnam. That is the central fact defining the obligations of the American antiwar movement.

Antiwar forces in Calif. ready Nixon welcome

By Terry Hardy

LOS ANGELES, June 24—August 17 will see a mass antiwar action at Nixon's summer White House in Orange County. This was the most important decision reached by the 300 people attending the Southern California Peace Action Conference here June 13 and 14.

The conference, initiated by the Peace Action Council, projected the action as a regional effort which will mobilize antiwar forces from all over California and other western states. This action will show the world that the American people have not been taken in by Nixon's phony "withdrawal" maneuvers and that the antiwar movement will not permit the president to hide out in the isolated, secure little corner of the country he picked for his summer White House.

The action will be at the sight of Nixon's offices in Newport Beach.

The PAC is in the process of implementing conference decisions by building a large staff of young antiwarriors who will work full time on this action. Leaflets are being run off in large quantities.

A highlight of the conference was ex-Pvt. Andrew Pulley, who was in L. A. as part of a tour to publicize the activities of the GIs United Against the War in Vietnam at Fort Jackson. He appealed for support to his fight against the undesirable discharge the Army had given him.

For further information on the Aug. 17 action contact the PAC at 555 North-western, Los Angeles 90004, or call 462-8188.

Advertisement

The split in SDS has been misrepresented in both the bourgeois and movement press and is little understood anywhere. A national caucus of unaligned individuals has published a newspaper explaining why the split had to occur and how it affects the prospects for socialist revolution in the U. S. Included are the following articles:

- 1) An objective blow-by-blow description of the actual events of the convention.
- 2) A critical analysis of the politics of the national office and the Progressive Labor Party.
- 3) A discussion of the kind of national organization we need to defeat the ruling class.

Receive this important publication free by writing immediately: c/o Dillon, 647 W. 148 St., New York, N. Y. 10033.

Through heroic effort, the Vietnamese revolutionaries have sustained their struggle in the face of the massive U. S. aggression. But the war is far from over. The fighting continues, and the outcome is yet to be decided.

Washington is far from willing to accept defeat at the hands of a small, colonial people, for that will give tremendous inspiration to revolutionary struggles throughout the world. The heroic struggle of the Vietnamese has already given a significant impetus to revolutionary struggles in other countries.

Denied victory on the battlefield, U. S. imperialism has been compelled to buttress its savage military effort with maneuvers at the negotiating table in Paris. This strategy, adopted in the last year of the Johnson administration, aims at a negotiated capitulation of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the National Liberation Front. Central to this strategy has been an intensification of the war in South Vietnam, and this fact cannot be obscured by the "bombing pause" in the North. The U. S. military commanders have been instructed to maintain maximum military pressure on revolutionary Vietnam. Far from conceiving of the Paris talks as a means towards withdrawal, the rulers of the U. S. seek to use them as a means to victory.

Buying time

To wage its diplomatic offensive in Paris while continuing the war in Vietnam, the Nixon administration needs time. But as far as the mood of the American people is concerned, time is running out. The majority of Americans oppose the war and their numbers are growing.


The antiwar movement is an important factor limiting the ability of the ruling class to wage the war in Vietnam. Hundreds of thousands have demonstrated in the streets. These protest actions have helped spark social struggles in all sectors of the population. The ruling class must seek to contain antiwar opposition within "acceptable limits," for to wage the war, it requires social peace at home. Above all, it now needs time to carry out its strategy for victory.

Thus, an important feature of the new stage of the war under both Johnson and Nixon is a propaganda offensive designed to disarm public opposition to the war by perpetrating the fraud that Washington's maneuvers are a genuine move towards withdrawal.

During most of 1968 and early 1969, the Johnson and Nixon administrations succeeded in disorienting much of the antiwar sentiment. The Paris talks seemed to many to be a meaningful step towards peace. After Nixon's election, many people were willing "to give the new president a chance." But the big turnouts for the April 5-6 antiwar demonstrations showed that Nixon's time is running out.

The American ruling class has paid a price in launching its propaganda offensive. All the talk about U. S. initiatives for peace has heightened the anticipation and desire for a quick end to the war. As a result, antiwar sentiment has grown substantially during the past year. This is especially true among GIs, who naturally question the need for risking their lives in a war which is always said to be ending but never does, a war which the U. S. has not been able to win, a war which is being fought to prop up the corrupt Saigon dictatorship. The result is that the potential for mobilizing mass opposition to U. S. imperialism's war in Vietnam is greater now than it has ever been.

Nixon's token withdrawal of troops and demagogic talk of additional troop withdrawals in the future is the latest gambit in the ruling class' propaganda offensive. It does not signify a move towards total withdrawal. Hundreds of thousands of GIs continue to fight in Vietnam, and substantial numbers are stationed all over Southeast Asia. The primary aim of the limited troop withdrawal is to disarm antiwar sentiment, to delude the people into accepting this token step as the first stage



of total withdrawal. But it is not.

As long as the U. S. rulers retain the perspective of a victory in Vietnam, they can do nothing substantial to scale down the fighting. The killing continues. As the deadly facts of the war continue to impress themselves on the American people, ever increasing numbers will be prepared to demonstrate against the war.

Central objective

This reality defines the central objectives of the antiwar movement in the coming months. We must call for another mass mobilization, a demonstration larger than any ever held before, that can demolish Nixon's propaganda offensive and show the intensity and extent of antiwar sentiment. The war is now Nixon's war, and the task of the antiwar movement is to drive that point home to the American people.

Nixon needs time, and the antiwar movement must not let him have it. Our task continues to be to keep the American people in the street in opposition to the war.

New sectors of the population can be drawn into support for another mass mobilization. GIs and high school students have added an important component to the movement in the past year; now there are opportunities to draw some sections of the labor movement into massive antiwar demonstrations. The fall antiwar actions must aim at involving this crucially important social force.

Nixon's token withdrawal of troops makes more important than ever before the central demand of the antiwar movement: Bring all the GIs home now! Not 25,000 troops, not 50,000 troops, but all the GIs must be brought home immediately. By making that the central theme of its demonstrations this fall, the antiwar movement can prevent the Nixon administration from achieving its goal of disarming American antiwar sentiment.

The movement must avoid the trap of projecting its actions in a way that would alienate people instead of winning them over. The politically effective way to confront the warmakers is to build demonstrations that can mobilize hundreds of thousands of Americans in independent action in the streets. For this reason, small scale, adventurous acts of pseudoconfrontations should be strongly discouraged.

Added weight

At the present stage of the Paris talks, the demand for immediate withdrawal of all U. S. troops from Vietnam takes on additional importance. In the course of the Paris negotiations, the NLF has presented a 10-point plan which contains, among other proposals one for the establishment of a coalition government in South Vietnam.

Some sections of the American antiwar movement have suggested that the NLF 10-point plan be made the basis of the U. S. movement's demands. Apart from

possible debate within the movement as to the merit of various points in the program, our task, as American opponents of the war, is to demand nothing less than the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all U. S. troops from Vietnam, not to engage in recommendations concerning the political future of Vietnam. In accordance with the principle of national self-determination, that is for the Vietnamese to decide. For the U. S. antiwar movement to adopt the NLF proposals as its own demands would simply be a retreat from the demand for immediate and complete withdrawal. Such a retreat could serve only to weaken, not strengthen, the position of the liberation forces.

Moreover, from the point of view of winning the American people to the struggle against the war, it would be foolhardy to base our actions on an ultimatic demand for support to the NLF's program. Millions of Americans who may disagree with the NLF, or who simply may have no opinion on the matter, can be won to the idea of self-determination and withdrawal of U. S. troops. The Nixon administration would like nothing better than to be able to counterpose its token troop withdrawal to an antiwar movement that stated it supported the NLF program. For Nixon to be able to say, "I'm for withdrawal; the antiwar movement is for NLF," would be a political trap the movement must avoid.

Our task is to make clear that the antiwar movement is for bringing all the GIs home now, while Nixon is for continuing the slaughter of GIs in Vietnam. This should be the political axis of the fall demonstrations.

With this kind of perspective, the Cleveland conference will be able to call and organize a massive antiwar mobilization, one involving hundreds of thousands of people against Nixon's war, and calling for all GIs to be brought home now. This is the type of action which can prevent the U. S. ruling class from attaining its objectives in Vietnam.

CALENDAR

LOS ANGELES

No forum Fri., July 4. **LOS ANGELES SOCIALIST SUMMER SCHOOL**, Sun., July 6: The Socialist Workers Party Meets the Test of World War II, Oscar Coover, SWP Nat'l Committee, 4 p.m.; Problems of Ultraleftism and Adventurism, Peter Seidman, YSA Nat'l. Committee, 8 p.m. 1702 E. 4th St., 264-5952.

NEW YORK

No forum Fri., July 4. Next forum July 11—**SYMPOSIUM ON THE ARAB REVOLUTION**. Save the date!

The UCLA experience:

You don't have to be mindless to be militant



Photo by Angela Vinther

VOTED STRIKE. Part of crowd at UCLA that voted campus strike action. (In our issue of June 20, we erroneously captioned a photo of a university-sponsored function as the strike meeting.)

By Jesse Parker

LOS ANGELES—The student radicalization is reaching campuses which have been traditionally very conservative. The University of California at Los Angeles, with a student body of 32,000, has until recently seen no major student revolt. A predominantly commuter college situated in one of the wealthiest areas of Los Angeles, the UCLA campus has only a few hundred black and Chicano students and draws the majority of its students from the most conservative sections of California.

But the issues that have precipitated campus revolts throughout the country—ROTC and university involvement in war-related industry—also led to a major struggle at UCLA this past quarter. The occupation of Berkeley by the National Guard brought still another issue to the fore.

Things began during the winter quarter, when the university administration threatened Mike Balter, an SDS-PL activist, with expulsion. To protest this action, SDS and CASE (Community for Awareness and Social Education) called a rally. About 200 of the people at the rally marched to the administration building, where a spontaneous sit-in occurred. At the sit-in, broader issues were raised, including ROTC, university involvement in war-related industry, time-place-manner rules, and open enrollment for third-world people. Demands on these issues were presented to the university's chancellor, who did nothing about them.

The participants in this sit-in also issued

a call for an open meeting to discuss these issues. All groups and individuals who wanted to help fight for these demands were invited. Nonexclusion proved to be the key to building a broad movement on campus. The need for a coalition was so apparent that the group that formed around the demands was eventually called The Coalition. Included in The Coalition were CASE, National Lawyers Guild at UCLA, Young Socialist Alliance, Women's Liberation Front, SDS, PL, and members of The Resistance.

The Coalition's basic policy was to do everything possible to mobilize the greatest number of people around the demands. The group used three main methods to achieve this goal:

1) Education: Every type of educational tool was utilized, including dorm organizing, leafleting, pamphlet distribution, and publication of articles and letters in the campus newspaper;

2) Action: The Coalition organized educational sit-ins—lasting a few hours each—and rallies. Visibility was the primary goal in these actions;

3) Maximum utilization of university channels to present the demands. This was done to make it as difficult as possible for conservative forces to present the argument that The Coalition was not using all the "proper channels" provided by the university.

The regents meet

Events helped promote the struggle. The UC regents—including Reagan—met on the UCLA campus, and this meeting provided a perfect focal point for a major

action against ROTC. A Coalition leaflet was headlined, "We will talk to the regents." The action consisted of a rally followed by a march to the building where the regents were meeting. The meeting had been described by the regents as "open," but the room could hold only 150 people and only 40 students were allowed to enter.

The Coalition sent representatives inside to demand an opportunity to speak and to demand that the meeting be held in a building large enough to hold all interested students.

The main demands were defensively formulated, that is, they put the onus where it belonged—on the regents. The demands included, "Open the doors of the regents' meeting," and "Let the students speak to the regents," as well as the Coalition's anti-ROTC demand. Thanks to the careful preparation and the defensively formulated slogans, almost 2,000 people turned out for this action, making it the largest demonstration at UCLA in years.

Then came the Berkeley events. A majority of students on the UCLA campus reacted with horror, and many previously uninvolved students suddenly became ready for action. The Coalition called a rally which was attended by more than 2,000. An earlier Coalition mass meeting had voted to propose a building takeover to the rally, and more than 1,500 of the 2,000 present at the rally massed in the administration building.

Further action was discussed throughout the night in mass meetings in the administration building. When a call for a statewide strike in support of the Berkeley activists arrived from the University of California at Davis, one of these mass meetings voted to leave the building and immediately begin organizing the strike at UCLA.

The question of the relationship of The Coalition to the strike arose at once. Should the strike be called around The Coalition's demands as well as the Berkeley issue? Should the strike committee be composed exclusively of Coalition leaders?

The majority of The Coalition recognized that since so many previously uninvolved students were responding to the events in Berkeley, the strike should be called simply in support of the Berkeley people. At the same time, it was clearly understood that broad support for the strike on the Berkeley issue would present an opportunity for The Coalition to educate broader layers of students about its demands than had been possible before. Once this decision was made, it was clear that the strike leadership had to be broader than merely the leadership of The Coalition. Strike leadership was finally lodged in a strike committee composed of representatives of the working committees of all striking students.

Unprecedented success

The strike was estimated to be 30 percent effective—a success probably unprecedented at UCLA.

During the UCLA strike, a call was issued from UC, Davis, for a statewide demonstration and march on the State Capitol in Sacramento to protest police brutality in Berkeley. Terry Hillman of the YSA was designated by the UCLA strike committee to represent the Los Angeles

campus. More than 18 campuses were represented in the Sacramento demonstration, and the participants formed an ad-hoc intercampus steering committee. This committee then issued a call for statewide support to the Berkeley Memorial Day march. In accordance with this call, the UCLA strike committee voted to call off the Los Angeles strike and build the Berkeley march.

Some important lessons were learned from the struggle at UCLA:

- All major decisions must be made at mass meetings. Democracy works. The more people are involved in decision making, the more people will build and participate in the action. A leadership that allows itself to become isolated from the student body will end up leading only itself.

- All actions and activity should aim at drawing more and more people into the struggle. The majority of students believe there are "legitimate channels" through which grievances can be made known and redress won. While the more politically advanced students know that this is largely an illusion, the people we are trying to win do not yet know it. Therefore, we must demonstrate the illusory nature of these "legitimate channels" by showing we are ready to use them to the extent that they exist. The administration will do the rest.

- The actions themselves must be timely. At UCLA, for example, the Progressive Labor Party stubbornly advocated taking over the administration building at every point—whether there was any support from the student body or not. But taking over a building before there is sufficient support can kill a movement in its early stages.

Nonexclusion

- The movement, in order to gain as broad support as possible, must be nonexclusionist. Red-baiting, a typical tool of the ruling class, cannot be tolerated. This became a factor at UCLA when sentiment directed against PLP's ultraleftism and dogmatism tended to spread out and encompass all socialist groups and organizations with a definite political line. Although the YSA had consistently opposed PLP's adventurist positions, when there was some reference made to "those crazy (PLP) socialists" at a Coalition meeting, it was a YSA'er who emphasized the crucial importance of avoiding any red-baiting.

- "Do your own thing" must give way to united political action. UCLA suffers from the presence of a sizable group of "change society by changing yourself" hippies. Their solution to the problem of removing ROTC from campus is to build a "community" of people who are not afraid to touch one another and to remove their clothes before the ROTC ranks during drills. The Coalition concluded that this was not the way to build a political movement to abolish ROTC.

Although The Coalition's demands have not yet been won, some concessions have been granted by UCLA's Chancellor Young. The struggle here has resulted in a new awareness on this very conservative campus. For many of the 32,000 students who attend UCLA, the door to the real world has just been opened. Next fall promises to bring even bigger struggles thanks to the foundation laid by The Coalition and the strike committee this spring.

Philadelphia students say: Malcolm, Yes; Franklin, No

By Mareen Jasin

PHILADELPHIA—"Benjamin Franklin bought and sold black men, women and children; he was white. Our school is 99 percent black, and the brothers here want a black image."

That is why the name of Ben Franklin should be changed to Malcolm X, according to Henry Hilton, a representative of the student association at the "Ex-Ben Franklin" High School. He and several other students were discussing their struggle with this reporter June 10.

They held that the students at their school feel the same way an American Indian would attending a school named after General Custer! They have been fighting for a number of changes, including a black department head, student representation at administrative meetings and a jukebox in the cafeteria.

Although they have gained concessions on these points, the school board has refused to give in on the name change.

"We had to convince the significant opposition, at first, among the students, for a name change," stated Lewis Kearney, an organizer of the students. "Many felt we won enough; many were afraid that Malcolm X on their diploma would hinder their getting a job; others were indifferent

or hostile to the name Malcolm X."

So a group beginning with 22 members started a system of education and explanation to win the rest of the students over. Malcolm X High sweatshirts and buttons were sold and distributed; the library ordered Malcolm X literature.

"Many students were learning that Malcolm X was a great man for the first time."

"And we didn't use violence . . . When you do your own thing, do it with unity . . . and never knocking another brother's movement was the way to win support," Greg Ferguson and Jarvis McCarther said.

On the anniversary of Malcolm's assassination, Feb. 21, an assembly was held during which "a few brothers went around and put black sacks over the school's statues and a large 'Malcolm X High' sign outside. From that day on, the school was spiritually Malcolm X High school."

In Philadelphia, the majority of the public high school students are black and attend schools named after whites. The only school officially named after an Afro-American is the recently built Martin L. King High School. "The struggle here is a spark for the rest of the city. We expect that the spirit of Malcolm X High will permeate to others in the black community."

Portland blacks hit with mass arrests

By Herman Porter

PORTLAND, June 23—Police harassment of Portland's small and quiet ghetto reached a climax during the period from Saturday, June 14, through Wednesday, June 18, with a series of arrests of residents of the black community that totaled nearly 200 in all.

Events began about 1 a.m. Saturday morning, when a police car drove into Lidio's drive-in restaurant in the Albina area, where the black community is located, and arrested two young men for curfew violations. (Portland has midnight curfew for people under 18.) Rather than leave, the cops hung around to harass the crowd.

Kent Ford and Tommy Mills, captain and lieutenant of defense, respectively, of the recently formed Portland Black Panther Party were driving by and stopped. Ford offered to see that the young men got home safely. He was immediately arrested and put into the patrol car, whereupon the incensed bystanders tried to prevent the cops from taking him. Other cops arrived so quickly that it seemed to some that the whole thing must have been planned in advance. Ford, according to someone who saw him afterwards, was maced on the way to jail.

Ford was charged with inciting to riot, and bail was set at \$5,000. Nine other adults were arrested on charges of disorderly conduct, resisting arrest or interfering with an officer, with bail set at \$500 each. Ford was bailed out by his lawyer that morning, who set about raising bail for the others.

The Oregonian, Oregon's most influential newspaper, carried a short story on the event under the headline: "Police Battle Youths, Make 12 Arrests." It was embellished with two items: "Other youths pulled Broadway cabdriver Thomas J. Kelley, 52, from his car and beat him," claimed **The Oregonian**. "Two other motorists, Richard Dowty and a companion in his car, Gale Starr, ages and addresses un-

known, were apparently dragged from their vehicle and 'roughed up,' they reported."

Police took the incident as their cue to intensify the harassment of the ghetto. They cruised Albina in force at night, sometimes four to a car and armed with shotguns. Residents reported that many removed their nametags and badges and that some cars had their license plates covered.

While police officials denied specific charges that cops had removed badges and nametags, the following appeared in **The Oregonian** of June 23: "The police bureau said badges and nameplates were removed because they are easily ripped off in a scuffle. 'That would be the first thing we would lose—and badges cost money.' Also there was concern among some policemen that 'our homes might be next if they got our names.'"

By Monday, according to a news report, 51 minors and 85 adults had been arrested. The drunk tank was emptied Saturday to make room for the anticipated arrests of blacks. One young woman, a minor, told me that she had been thrown into the drunk tank.

Two sisters, Linda and Elinor Myrick, 18- and 19-years-old, told me that they had been arrested at Lidio's and that on the way to jail the cops had stopped and beaten Elinor, "who was handcuffed, with a nightstick."

The black community responded. Roscoe L. Anderson of the Albina Citizens Council announced Monday afternoon that his group and the Panthers would take charge of patrolling the black community and that white police were not wanted or needed. There was some patrolling Tuesday night. A number of people went out to urge the community to remain cool in the face of police provocation.

A number of fires were set. The newspaper reported that total claimed damage done by fires was a half-million dollars.

It is likely that not all the fires were set by blacks. The office of Legal Aid in Albina, which has defended blacks, was firebombed. It and the American Civil Liberties Union organized a meeting where the victims of police brutality and false arrest could tell their stories. More than 20 came forward.

One woman told of the police breaking down the door of her home and dragging her 12-year-old son outside and arresting him for curfew violation. The police admitted breaking the door down but claimed that they had the right to do so because they were in "hot pursuit" of someone who had entered there. He was captured in the house, they said, and charged with speeding. The charge against the 12-year-old was interfering with the police, they said, not curfew violation.

Talking with a number of those arrested, it was obvious that what was involved was a pattern of harassment by the police and an attempt to intimidate the black people.

MIT protest hits complicity; oppression of Puerto Rico

By Mike Kelly


BOSTON—On the occasion of MIT's homecoming ceremony June 16, a rally of nearly 500 protesters confronted the MIT alumni at the ceremony with some things to think about: MIT's complicity with the Vietnam war, its expansion at the expense of the working people in the Cambridge community and its invitation to Gov. Ferre of Puerto Rico to speak at the homecoming.

The rally was sponsored by the Science Action Coordinating Committee (SACC) and the Puerto Rican 96 Support Committee.

Gov. Ferre, who is a multimillionaire industrialist besides being the most active proponent of statehood for Puerto Rico, is also a graduate of MIT and one of its trustees.

Chuck Turner of Roxbury's Black United Front ripped into MIT for misusing science, for applying its scientific resources to the perpetuation of the military machine.

Rodolfo Rodriguez of the Puerto Rican 96 draft resisters' support committee attacked Gov. Ferre's attempts to lie about the abject poverty of the Puerto Rican



Kent Ford

One young man, Percy Hampton, told me how he had been arrested three times in the past three weeks. The last time—Sunday, June 15—for "loitering"—three blocks from his home. Bail was set at \$500 for the loitering charge.

Another man told me the circumstances of his arrest. He had seen some young people on the street at 11:30 p.m. Wednesday night and given them a lift home. As they got out, cops came over and charged him with aiding and abetting juveniles in violation of the curfew.

One of the arrests that police officials said was a "mistake" was that of a well-known black newsman, James Walker, the editor and publisher of the **Clarion Defender**. He was taking pictures of the cops in action and when he refused to leave, he was beaten, arrested and charged with disorderly conduct and resisting arrest. His cameras were recovered later without any film in them.

Clarence Williams, who photographed Walker being beaten, was arrested on charges of interfering with an officer and resisting arrest. His film was taken by the cops. Bail was set at \$1,000.

As the arrests continued, several Black Panthers who had been arrested and bailed out were re-arrested on more serious felony charges, and bail was set much higher. John Duehart, a leader of the Panthers, his brother, and three other Panthers were accused by an off-duty patrolman of shooting at his car Tuesday night. Their bail was reported variously at \$3,000 and \$5,000.

Wednesday, Kent Ford and others went to bail out Duehart but were unsuccessful. Reportedly, the bondsman was threatened with losing his license if he put up bail.

Ford was then arrested once more and charged with arson. Charges were later changed to inciting to riot and felonious assault, and finally to inciting to riot and rioting. Bail was set at \$40,000.

R. L. Anderson of the Albina Citizens Council and two or three others were arrested and charged with second-degree arson and conspiracy to commit a felony in connection with a fire at the Jansen Knitting Mill May 25, with bail set at \$35,000 each. Anderson's brother Robert had previously been charged with the crime and released on his own recognizance, but this was revoked.

As of now, Kent Ford is still in jail while his attorney is trying to get the punitive bail reduced. Efforts are being made to raise the money for bail.

S.F. Panthers are threatened with Smith Act

SAN FRANCISCO, June 22—the government revealed this week that three local members of the Black Panther Party are the target of a federal grand jury investigation of alleged violation of the Smith Act.

The three Panthers—Landon Williams, Louis Randolph (Randy) Williams Jr., and Warren Tucker—the Black Panther Party, and their attorney, Charles Garry, have vowed to fight this additional attempt to crush the Black Panther Party.

The Smith Act, a notorious law originally used against the Socialist Workers Party, permits imprisonment solely for the advocacy of ideas. It provides a maximum penalty of 20 years imprisonment and a \$20,000 fine.

The grand jury revealed on April 30 that they were studying possible indictments against the Panthers for allegedly "advocating the violent overthrow of the United States Government."

Since April 30, the jury has sought to have three other Panthers testify before it. They have refused.

In response, the government has sought to compel them to testify by the device of granting them immunity from prosecution. But Attorney Charles Garry told Federal Judge Oliver J. Carter that the tactic will not work. "My clients will not testify before the grand jury," Garry said.

Judge Carter replied, "Well, then I will order him (Garry's client), and he will go to the grand jury and if he refuses I will do what I have to do."

The **San Francisco Chronicle** reports that "the usual penalty for refusing to answer after immunity has been granted is the witness goes to jail and stays there until he does answer the questions."

S.F. killer-cop found guilty by black inquest

SAN FRANCISCO—Last March 30, San Francisco policeman Gerald Roberts stormed into a record shop on Third Street and shot in cold blood Alvert Joe Linthcome, 19. The defenseless Linthcome had allegedly driven a stolen car at a high speed. The cop had chased him to the record shop and there "administered justice."

On April 10 an official coroner's jury ruled that this was a case of "justifiable homicide."

The youth's funeral was widely attended by the black community. It became a silent protest of yet another case of the unjust clearing of a cop after the killing of a black youth.

On June 6 a "black inquest jury" convened to render the verdict of the black community. They ruled that policeman Roberts was guilty of "unjustifiable homicide."

Sitting on the black inquest jury was James Forman, leader of the National Economic Conference, who is demanding reparation to the black community of \$500 million from American churches and synagogues for hundreds of years of injustice to Afro-Americans.

Lois Linthcome, the dead youth's sister, and Lucious Reynolds—eyewitnesses to the shooting—gave testimony, as they had done earlier at the coroner's hearing.

They also told about the harassment and threatening telephone calls they had received.

As the jury deliberated after hearing the testimony, members of the gathering discussed the killing of black youths around the country. Among the speakers were members of the Black Panther Party. There was general agreement that the black community must become better organized to prevent police murders.

Among many parts to the verdict the jury called for criminal action against Roberts and his partner, and legislation that would make it illegal for police to kill when no life is in danger.

The split at the SDS national conver

By Mary-Alice Waters

Article II: Membership

Section 1: Membership is open to all who share the commitment of the organization to democracy as a means and as a social goal.

Section 2: SDS is an organization of and for democrats. It is civil libertarian in its treatment of those with whom it disagrees, but clear in its opposition to any anti-democratic principle as a basis for governmental, social, or political organization.

**The Constitution
Students for a Democratic Society**

Thus stood, and still stands, the constitution of SDS. But by the end of the stormy five-day convention held in Chicago June 18-22, such provisions of the SDS constitution had been rendered meaningless by the bureaucratic expulsion from SDS of all members of Progressive Labor and anyone agreeing with PL on certain questions. Meeting in closed caucus, a minority of the convention voted to expel PL and all those who agreed with their ideas from SDS.

The organization which was founded nine years ago as a "new" experiment in building a political group free from ideology and program, trying to escape the "sterile political squabbles" of the "old left," and hoping it had found a way to escape the bureaucratic, undemocratic methods of Stalinism and social democracy—that organization has now come almost full circle. The "new left" failed to examine and take sides on the burning issues that divided the reformists and revolutionaries in the past, that divided the Stalinists, social democrats, anarchists and others from the Marxists, the Trotskyists. This flight from ideological responsibility made it certain that when faced by the same political issues, they would be easy prey to the reformist line being pushed by social democratic tendencies and Stalinist

tendencies of both the Moscow and Peking variety.

The convention strikingly reconfirmed that there is no way to cheat history by trying to avoid political program; that in the end politics is always decisive; that the debates which have divided the political tendencies in the working class movement for almost 70 years, far from being "sterile," remain the most fundamental and burning questions of today. It also showed that the "new left," like the Communist Party and social democracy, is entirely capable of violating the basic democratic rights of members—when it fits their needs—not because they want to be undemocratic, but because they are politically incapable of dealing with serious, organized opposition.

From the moment the convention opened it was dominated by the fierce factional struggle between supporters of the current national leadership of SDS—Mike Klonsky, Bob Avakian, Bernadine Dohrn, Mark Rudd, Jeff Jones, and others (who have differences among themselves)—and the Worker-Student Alliance caucus (WSA), which was led by the Progressive Labor Party. The supporters of the national office organized themselves in the Revolutionary Youth Movement (RYM) caucus.

There was also a significant number of delegates who supported neither caucus. These included many SDSers who had not yet made up their minds on the political issues dividing the groups, as well as other organized caucuses, such as the Independent Socialist Club (ISC) caucus, and the Joe Hill caucus from San Francisco. These other caucuses, some organized around specific programs, generally disagreed with both major factions on one or more points, and many of them were opposed to the split that occurred.

Opening skirmishes

During the first two days of the convention little of substance took place, but several questions over which there were sharp differences came to a vote, giving

both factions an opportunity to gauge their strength. The results were reassuring to PL and the WSA caucus, and, consequently, quite unsettling to the RYM faction.

PL won two such votes—to exclude the commercial press and to schedule more workshops—while the national office faction won a vote to give the floor to Chris Milton, an American student who joined the Red Guards in China for a while. PL charged that Milton had been cashiered out of the Red Guards and shouldn't be allowed to speak.

Aside from the vote itself, which was 586-577, the incident was also significant as an example of the method used by the national office throughout in trying to combat PL. Unable to answer PL's utterly false political line, they attempted to "out-Mao" the Maoists, to prove by frequent reference to and quotations from the Red Book, Lin Piao, and similar sources, that they were the real Maoists. The country which has had the most consistently revolutionary line for more than a decade—Cuba—received no attention.

The split that occurred at the SDS convention has been maturing for well over a year. As the PL-led caucus grew from one convention and national council meeting to the next, the inability of the national leadership of SDS to meet the challenge became more and more obvious. At this convention, when the national leadership realized that PL might be able to win a majority of the delegates on some of the key resolutions, and perhaps even win the leadership, they precipitated the split without waiting to see how many they could win over in political discussion.

On the three main political questions before the convention, PL's "revolutionary"

rhetoric is nothing but cover for abstention from the real struggles with revolutionary implications going on in the world today. They condemn the leadership and policies of the NLF and North Vietnam, refusing here in the U.S. to build the mass anti-war movement. They condemn all nationalism as reactionary, including the revolutionary nationalism of the oppressed, and even attack as "bourgeois" the struggles by oppressed national minorities for university education. They condemn struggles for women's rights unless they are directly tied to the struggles of women workers for equal economic opportunities. Even against such rotten, reformist positions, the national leadership of SDS proved incapable of engaging in a political debate with PL.

The miserable conduct of PL also contributed to the lack of rational political debate. Using tactics that have long been second-nature to those in the Stalinist movement the PL leaders and the WSA faction systematically attempted to drown out their opponents by mass chanting every time a statement was made with which they disagreed. The RYM caucus responded by adopting the same methods, with the result that any attempt to debate political questions rapidly degenerated into opposing sides shouting slogans and epithets at each other and shaking their fists in unison.

For example, whenever anyone attacked PL's refusal to support the struggle for black control of the black community, open admissions, and many other demands of the black struggle, they were answered not by political argument, but by 500 voices screaming, "Smash racism." The usual response of those supporting the RYM was limited to a near-hysterical "Free

SDS -- an historical

By Elizabeth Barnes

SDS was one of a number of radical student organizations which grew up during the first stirrings of campus activity after the witch-hunt era of the 1950's. Like other radical students of the time, the early SDSers were inspired by the desegregation movement of black students in the South. The impact of the colonial revolution (most importantly the victory of the Cubans in 1959) and a new consciousness of the dangers of nuclear war also influenced their thinking.

Rejecting the ideology of the cold war and its simplistic notion of the "free world" versus "communism," SDSers espoused an alternative, amorphous philosophy of left-liberal-pacifist humanism.

SDS began as the student group of the League for Industrial Democracy (LID), a letterhead organization supported by social democratic trade-union bureaucrats and run by the Socialist Party. But from the beginning, the approach of SDS was more critical of the traditional labor and liberal establishment than the LID would have liked, and the relationship between SDS and its parent organization was strained.

Although some SDSers considered themselves to be socialists (using the broadest possible meaning of the term) SDS in no way espoused any clear revolutionary perspective. Traditional Marxist ideas, including the perspective of a working class revolution, were considered by SDSers to be irrelevant to an American reality in which, they said, the workers had become conservatized and bought off.

A principal activity of SDSers during the early 60's was its attempts to intervene at conferences of the National Student Association. At these gatherings, SDS worked with the Americans for Democratic Action and other groups to build the Liberal Study Group which pushed for the passage of various progressive resolutions.

The years 1963 and 1964 were ones of relative inactivity on campus. The most important events were taking place in the black community. The black struggle was beginning to move North, and more and more black people were looking to the philosophy of black nationalism. Malcolm X emerged as the chief exponent of revolutionary nationalism.

The implications of this turn in the black struggle were pretty much lost on SDS. Many SDSers were even hostile to it. SDSers were not to take a clear position on the question of black nationalism until some

four years later, when the development of the Black Panther Party, along with PL's reactionary stand on the question, forced them to do so.

SDS's approach to the black struggle was influenced by their general perspective of "community organizing." During the middle '60s such community organizing was aimed mainly at poor people (both black and white) who the SDSers felt were going to play the key role in changing society.

This community orientation, which most often did not go beyond the level of social-work-type activities, was reflected most clearly in ERAP (Economic Research and Action Project) which was an SDS project that used UAW funds to set up community organizing projects in nine cities across the country. It is significant that at the very time they were involved in ERAP, the Peace Action Project of SDS was spearheading SDS support for Johnson in the 1964 elections with the slogan "Part of the way with LBJ."

The spring of 1965 marked an upsurge in the student struggle. The bombing of North Vietnam in February and the 25,000-strong SDS March on Washington that April were the turning points. By calling the April 17 demonstration, the SDS played an important role in getting the antiwar movement off the ground. But, after this initial effort, four years ago, the SDS leadership stepped back and stubbornly refused to help build the antiwar movement.

Although large numbers of rank-and-file SDSers took part in the countless demonstrations, teach-ins, and other actions taken by the antiwar movement, the SDS leaders rationalized their abstention in a number of ways. Initially, they counterposed "community organizing" to national demonstrations. Then they counterposed the abstract concept of opposition to "imperialism" in general to the work of building mass demonstrations against an imperialist war. During 1967 and the beginning of 1968, they counterposed the formation of draft resistance movements to the antiwar movement. Today, with the upsurge of the GI movement, this draft orientation has been dropped.

In 1966, the SDS convention raised the slogan of "student power." Student power and black power were seen by SDS in the old terms of participatory democracy: it was merely a matter of people making decisions which directly affected their lives.

At the 1966 convention something else happened which was to have a big effect



COMRADES, WHERE WERE YOU?

In a message of support to the April 6 antiwar demonstrations the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam said:

"We are happy to see that world public opinion, and particularly North American public opinion, has chosen April 6 International Day of Mobilization Against American Aggression in South Vietnam."

SDS's continued abstention from these mass antiwar demonstrations is a betrayal of the Vietnamese revolution.

All the super-revolutionary rhetoric about "anti-imperialist" purity has been nothing but an excuse for inaction.

In Left-Wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder, Lenin said:

"For the whole task of the Communists is to be able to convince the backward elements, to work among them, and not to fence themselves off from them by artificial and childish 'left' slogans."

And the South Vietnam NLF said in the above mentioned message:

"What more to say than that we are entirely pleased with your suggestions to concentrate on the themes: TOTAL AND UNCONDITIONAL WITHDRAWAL OF AMERICAN TROOPS! VIETNAM FOR THE VIETNAMESE!"

COMRADES, WHERE WILL YOU BE THIS FALL? If SDS abstains from defending the Vietnamese revolution against American imperialism again, will you? NO! Come to Cleveland July 4th for the conference of all antiwar forces in the U.S. Help mobilize masses of students, Third World people, white workers and G.I.s into the streets against imperialist war!

Those who want to reach the American people with action and ideas in a serious fight for socialism should contact

YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE BOX 471 COOPER STATION N.Y., N.Y. 10003 OR VISIT OUR TABLE AT THE CONVENTION

YSA leaflet distributed at SDS convention

tion

Huey." And so it went throughout.

Split number one

On Friday evening, when the discussion on resolutions was to begin, the convention proceedings were suspended to hear a delegation from the Illinois Black Panther Party. Stating that he was speaking on behalf of the national organizations of the Black Panthers, the Brown Berets and the Young Lords, Panther Bobby Rush launched into a vitriolic attack on PL for its refusal to support the black liberation struggle in practice.

(Undoubtedly, some hoped this would produce an anti-PL stampede in the convention, but the Panther statement did not have quite the desired effect. One reason was that the previous evening the same Panther spokesmen had seriously discredited themselves and had been literally booed off the platform for their male-chauvinist remarks about "pussy power." When they mistakenly assumed that the source of hostility was prudishness, they only succeeded in making matters worse by saying, "You sisters have a strategic position for the revolution . . . prone." The hall bust loose and the ensuing chaos prevented the Panthers from saying any more.)

In denouncing PL, Rush accused them of "deviating from the Marxist-Leninist position on the right to self-determination of peoples," and declared, "they will be considered as counterrevolutionary traitors" if they don't change their attitude. "SDS," he said, "will be judged by the company it keeps and the effectiveness with which it deals with factions within its organization."

As the convention neared chaos once again, Jeff Gordon of PL took the floor to defend PL's position, denouncing the SDS leaders for trying to use the Panthers



Photo by Harry Ring

PRESS CONFERENCE. Young Socialists, at SDS convention as observers, give views to Chicago news media. Participants (left to right) were: Larry Seigle, YSA nat'l organization sec'y; ex-Pvt. Andrew Pulley (He told newsmen his experience in GIs United convinced him of the need for socialism and he joined YSA on release from Army); Paula Smith, Chicago YSA and high school antiwar fighter; Peter Camejo, former YSA nat'l sec'y. They explained that while they disagreed

with SDS decision to bar capitalist news media from convention, they intended to respect decision and didn't answer questions about convention events. They emphasized their solidarity with SDS against reactionary attacks and said they had appealed to SDS to get into antiwar movement. YSAers at convention discussed political issues with SDSers and YSA literature table did a brisk business.

as a club against the WSA caucus and for their inability to carry out a political debate themselves.

Bernadine Dohrn, Mike Klonsky and other SDS leaders responded by declaring that it was impossible to remain in the same organization with people who opposed self-determination in practice and demanded an immediate split. Then Bernadine Dohrn announced she was walking out and invited all those who agreed with her to follow. The convention was in such total chaos that few people even heard what she said. Less than half followed her out.

From Friday evening till late Saturday evening the SDS convention met in two different wings of the Chicago Coliseum. Those who had walked out, and others who had joined them later, debated whether or not to split SDS, and if so how. Those who remained with the WSA caucus held general workshops and waited to see if the others would "return to SDS." Throughout the day the RYM caucus fluctuated between 500 and 700, reaching its peak late Saturday night.

Split number two

When the final decision was reached, the RYM caucus voted to expel PL, and all those who agreed with them, from SDS. About 10-15 percent of the RYM caucus voted against expulsion. Abstentions were not counted.

In short, a minority of the SDS convention, in a caucus which excluded those to be expelled, voted to expel what might have been the majority of the convention. They were expelled not for specific acts against which they could defend themselves, but solely for their ideas. Technically, they have no means to appeal the expulsion.

The RYM caucus returned to the convention hall and read a statement enunciating two principles which henceforth are supposedly criteria for membership in SDS. (RYM leaders shamefacedly admitted the next day that they had forgotten to read a couple of additional points.)

"One: We support the struggle of the black and Latin colonies within the U.S. for national liberation and we recognize those nations' rights to self-determination (including the right to political secession if they desire it.).

"Two: We support the struggle for national liberation of the people of South Vietnam, led by the National Liberation Front and Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam. We also support the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, led by President Ho Chi Minh, as well as the People's Republic of China, the People's Democratic Republics of Korea and Albania, and the Republic of Cuba, all waging fierce struggles against U.S. imperialism. We support the right of all people to pick up the gun to free themselves from the brutal rule of U.S. imperialism."

The statement stipulated that in addition to PL, "all people who do not accept the above two principles are no longer members of SDS." Where this could lead was made abundantly clear the following day when Bob Avakian (creator of the out-Mao-the-Maoists strategy), running for national secretary, announced that if elected he would work to exclude members of the Independent Socialist Club, a group which does not support the governments listed.

After reading the statement, during which screams of "bullshit", "shame" and similar political slogans reached their convention peak, the RYM caucus filed out of the hall.

Two, three, many SDS's

On Sunday afternoon the two sections of the SDS convention met on different

sides of the city.

Four to five hundred gathered in the Coliseum to constitute the WSA caucus as SDS. PL, perhaps emboldened by the fumbling ineptness of the national office leadership, succumbed to the temptation to try to become SDS, and bulled ahead. Instead of deciding to appeal to the ranks of SDS against the undemocratic expulsion, the WSA caucus passed its resolutions, elected its officers, and scheduled a press conference to declare itself the SDS and to denounce the "splinter leadership" for "anti-working-class politics and practices." In a painfully slow and lifeless meeting, SDS (WSA) elected John Pennington of Boston PL as national secretary, Pat Forman of San Francisco as inter-organizational secretary, and Alan Spector of the New England Regional SDS as educational secretary.

Across town some 700-800 members and supporters of the RYM caucus gathered to decide in what form SDS would continue. The general mood was one of great relief to have finally, somehow, been freed of the millstone. But very rapidly the political differences within the RYM faction intensified, and the national leadership found itself under attack from those who objected to the lack of democracy within SDS.

The first point of discussion was a set of five principles, drafted by the Avakian-Klonsky group and supported by the Bernadine Dohrn-Mark Rudd wing. The five points were intended to concretize and buttress the "principles" adopted to expel PL. The motion put forth was to adopt the five principles as the basis for membership in SDS. In response to a question from the floor, the chair ruled that the principles would definitely constitute the basis for excluding people from SDS.

The five "unity principles of SDS" proposed were: "1) Oppose white supremacy. Full support to the national liberation struggles of oppressed peoples against U.S. imperialism. For the right of self-determination for the black and Chicano nations. Independence for Puerto Rico. 2) Oppose male supremacy, support the struggle for women's liberation. 3) Support for armed struggle. 4) Exclude anti-

communism. 5) Fight for socialism."

Strong opposition came from a minority of delegates who felt the principles were irrelevant to the day to day work of SDS and would not be acceptable to the bulk of the membership. They tended to want to return to the "old SDS" which was anti-ideology and anti-program, with everyone free to do his own thing.

The proposed set of principles, if adopted and enforced, would change the fundamental character of SDS as it has existed for nine years. Yet, the leaders tried to ram it through after 45 minutes of debate. But the opposition was vociferous enough to force a retreat, and it was decided to print the proposed program in *New Left Notes* and allow a written discussion.

Antiwar inaction

By far the most important issue acted on by SDS (RYM) was on the proposal for a fall action. Despite all the self-criticism about SDS's past errors and failure to make the fight against the war in Vietnam the central task, the action proposal adopted by the SDS (RYM) convention represented no fundamental change in policy.

SDS decided to call an action in Chicago in late September when the eight indicted for last August's Chicago demonstration go on trial. The demands of the demonstration will be withdraw the troops, support the NLF, support the GIs, support black liberation, free all political prisoners. There was no mention, much less discussion, of how SDS could work with the antiwar coalition and other organizations to build mass demonstrations against the war and for the withdrawal of troops. The July 4-5 Cleveland conference sponsored by antiwar organizations across the country to discuss the next mass action was not mentioned once! Unable to lead even its own membership in the struggle against the war, SDS is once again offering its leadership to the entire antiwar movement.

Far from being a turn to the antiwar movement, SDS's new action represents just one more variation on their five-

Continued on page 10.

sketch

on SDS in the next years. Members of the Progressive Labor Party began to participate in the organization, and to win SDSers over to their politics.

By the June 1968 convention, it became clear that PL was gaining real strength within SDS. PL formed a caucus advocating what they called a "worker-student alliance." The SDS leadership's first response to this was a red-baiting attack on PL. But PL continued to grow and the SDS leaders, who had no clear revolutionary perspective of their own to counterpose to the false policies of PL, began to clutch at a number of different approaches.

At the last fall's meeting of the NC, the SDS leaders attempted to put themselves forward as the true revolutionary alternative to PL by taking up the defense of Che Guevara and the Cuban revolution. At this NC, PL was able to get its reactionary anti-black-nationalism line passed, even though nationalist struggles were beginning to break out on campuses across the country. The SDS leadership had still made no serious analysis of nationalism. Completely unprepared for the debate, Mike Klonsky even went so far as to say that while he didn't agree with PL, he thought the PL resolution was better than none! Less than one year later, the same SDS leaders were to declare the PLers expelled from SDS over this very issue.

At the Austin meeting of the NC in March, the SDS leaders made another attempt to combat PL. This time, they contradicted their earlier pro-Cuba orientation and switched over to support for Chairman Mao. By the time of the split convention this June, the rhetoric of the SDS leaders and PLers alike was filled to overflowing with pseudo-revolutionary jargon and quotes from Chairman Mao.

The split with PL, and the simultaneous latching onto Maoism poses acute problems for the old SDS leadership. Throughout, SDS has maintained its prestige and size because of its character as a democratic, all-inclusive catch-all organization for radicalizing students who did not want to commit themselves to any of the major socialist tendencies or ideologies. But, now SDS has gone on record as **not** being all-inclusive. Certain ideas are banned from the organization. And it remains to be seen to what further lengths the restrictions will go.

One thing is for sure. It will be very difficult for the SDS leadership to recapture that old image of new-left innocence.

New From Merit Publishers

The Founding Convention of the IWW

Proceedings


Stenographically Recorded

Officially Approved

616 pages

Publication Price \$15.

Pre-publication offer to Militant readers \$9.50



The summer of 1905 witnessed a unique historic event in Chicago. From all over the country, militants and radicals, hard-rock miners, railroad men, agricultural and factory workers gathered in a 12-day convention to found a revolutionary organization to overthrow capitalism.

In this volume are recorded the words of the 112 delegates who took the floor. Among them are the speeches of such figures as Eugene V. Debs, Daniel De Leon, Big Bill Haywood, Lucy Parsons and Mother Jones.

This is the stenographic report, officially approved, of the historic convention, including communications read, resolutions passed or defeated, committee reports, and the tabulation of roll-call votes.

Merit Publishers, Dept. G
873 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003

Detroit mayoral race draws many hopefuls

By Frank Lovell

DETROIT—The deadline for candidates to enter the mayoralty primary election contest in this city is July 26, and as the time draws closer the list grows longer. This is common in municipal "nonpartisan" elections, where any number of publicity seekers are willing to pay the \$100 filing fee to see their names on the ballot. What makes the list of candidates here unusual this time is the inclusion of several prominent politicians who regard themselves as "serious" candidates looking to win. The fact that each of them begins with financial backing and hopes to pick up more as the race develops shows the rather serious divisions and doubts that exist within the ruling class and the existing political structure that serves the big money interests.

One of the local politicians who filed early for the mayor's job is Ed Carey, president of the city's common council. This week, one of his colleagues on the council, Mary Beck, entered the race. She has been a member of common council since 1949, and once got the highest vote to become its president for a two-year term. Next week, the incumbent and tarnished mayor, Cavanagh, is scheduled to make his announcement. All three—Carey, Beck, and Cavanagh—are Democrats.

Carey has a labor background with the United Auto Workers and as a state legislator was always counted "the union man" in the Democratic Party. Since becoming prominent in municipal politics, he most often identifies with the police wing of the council and expects to win endorsement of the ultraright, which calls itself The Real Detroit Committee—a coalition of white homeowners, policemen, firemen and small-business groups. In addition, Carey still retains ties with elements of the UAW bureaucracy.

Mary Beck began her long stay on the city payroll as a juvenile-court investigator and has always been loyal to the police department. She hopes to win support of the Real Detroit Committee and seems to think the election of Yorty in Los Angeles and of a police detective in Minneapolis is her cue to enter here as the next mayor of Detroit.

As the mayoralty campaign opens, it is noteworthy that a huge mailing has gone out signed by prominent individuals urging

that race prejudice, bigotry and slander be kept out of the race. Everyone, almost, is now saying that all candidates should address themselves to "the issues" and scorn "emotional appeals."


While this posture of "clean politics" and "good government" is assumed by all leading spokesmen of the ruling circles, in their more candid remarks they reveal their concern and fear that the black community, which represents half the city, cannot easily be controlled and used as in the past.

How to continue to control this burgeoning black community is the major concern of the politicians and their financial backers. There is a reluctant feeling among them that the best way is through a black man as mayor. They are encouraged by the success of the ruling class in Cleveland with their black mayor. The Cleveland experience to date suggests that this way is cheaper and easier.

This inclination among some of the big-money interests to follow Cleveland's example continues to feed and encourage the hopes of another politician in the Democratic Party, Richard Austin, the only black candidate so far to announce his intention to run for mayor. He is a "safe" candidate, completely acceptable to the white ruling class. He makes no threats to bring down the existing political structure nor even to overturn "the establishment" at city hall. As Wayne County auditor he has been a very mild and seldom heard critic of the scandalous Cavanagh administration. As a loyal Democrat he is not known ever to have questioned the chicanery of that party. He now emerges as a champion of "black business interests" and a political representative of "black professionals," but this is in keeping with present trends and is encouraged within both Republican and Democratic parties.

He has never in the past and does not now champion any of the causes of the black community or of black workers. Black control of the black community is alien to him and to his niche in the Democratic Party.

Despite Austin's very bland political record and his cautious campaign opening, there is pressure within the black community to support him as "the one who can win." A writer in a recent issue of the **Michigan Chronicle**, Detroit's black weekly, appeals to "my militant black brothers



DETROIT, JULY 1967. The Motor City's capitalist politicians are now weighing the possibility that a "safe" black mayor might succeed in keeping the city cool.

to lay aside petty differences and irresponsible demonstrations and unite behind this one black candidate."

Two arguments are advanced in support of this course. The first is that "with a responsible black man running, how could any sane black voter do otherwise than vote for him? You don't have to be an extremist to vote black, just intelligent, because as a member of a minority group you would be doing yourself a service that you have failed to do in the past." The second argument is a variation of the first and relates to the relative weight of the black vote. It goes like this: "The white vote will be split in the primary if two strong white candidates run. This

makes it imperative that blacks 'plunk' in the primary."

Militants here are asking other questions. What happens if a black candidate is elected? Mayor Stokes was elected in Cleveland two years ago and may be re-elected this year. He serves as a part of the Democratic Party political machine, a rather important cog in that machine, and as such he serves the interests of the ruling class in that city, the same ruling class that was served by his white predecessors in the mayor's chair. The result is that not very much changes when a black man becomes mayor under these circumstances.

This tends to discourage many who look back upon the important changes that have occurred in the most recent years. None of these changes were brought about by the election of black capitalist party candidates to public office. On the contrary, all the gains were the direct result of militant street actions, mass demonstrations, the ghetto uprisings. So the question is often put now whether the "old politics" is of any use. Young militants are not anxious to involve themselves in election campaigns and tend to regard such activity as wasted effort at best and a possible trap under certain circumstances. The present mayoralty primary in Detroit has aspects of a cleverly laid trap to keep the black community pre-occupied with a "safe activity" during the summer months when tensions mount.

Others are beginning to look beyond the primary election and even beyond the run-off. They are asking what law requires them always to serve in the political machine of the ruling class. Why can't black people have their own political party? And why can't a black candidate run **against** the Democrats and Republicans instead of always having to run for them? Why can't he run just for black people? And if he did this, wouldn't it be a good way to start the organization of a black party that may win in the next election even if it doesn't win this time?

These are some of the questions now being asked here among young black militants. Whether an independent black candidate will file in the current campaign appears dubious, but the amount of attention this campaign has commanded at this early stage is a sure sign of independent political development outside the straight jacket of the Democratic Party in the very near future.

DETROIT, June 24—Mayor Jerome Cavanagh announced today that he would not be a candidate for reelection.

—Malachi Constant

In passing . . . views and reviews

At the time of the June, 1967, Middle East war revolutionaries found wide opposition within the radical movement when they politically defended the Arab revolution against Israeli aggression. Illusions were widespread about the "progressive" or even "socialist" character of the Israeli state.

The arrogance of the Israeli ruling circles in insisting on holding the land they occupied is one of the factors turning that situation around. Revolutionaries find themselves winning over a larger segment of the radical movement to the view that the only realistic solution to the problems of the Arab and Jewish populations of the Middle East is a revolutionary anti-Zionist and anti-imperialist solution.

The information gap on the reactionary Zionist role in the Mideast is still almost as great as it ever was. There are few political situations which are more distorted in this country's bourgeois press than this one. Fortunately, some important materials have been made available recently that can help fill this gap.

The **Arab World** magazine has prepared a special issue on "The Arab-Israeli Confrontation of June 1967," which contains several articles by various scholarly authors on the background of the June war. In regard to the particular event which it attempts to put into a historical framework it is probably the best single source of information currently available.

One article that will be of special interest to U.S. radicals is "The American Left and the June Conflict" by Abdeen Jabara. Jabara states that the Socialist Workers

Party and the Young Socialist Alliance have "one of the strongest and most consistent anti-imperialist positions in the American left." "The Young Socialist Alliance actively set up forums on the Middle East, organized and participated in demonstrations against Israel, attended and reported on Arab student conferences in the U.S., and generally sought to learn the facts in the Arab-Israeli conflict."

Jabara gives similar praise to the **Guardian** and **Workers World**. He makes no mention of the positions or activities of SDS, Progressive Labor or the CP.

(A copy of this issue of **The Arab World** may be obtained by writing to The Arab Information Center, 405 Lexington Ave., New York, N.Y. 10017. Subscriptions to the magazine which in the past has not concentrated on political topics are \$2 a year.)

The Arabs in Israel by Sabri Jiryis is a book by an Arab living in Israel about the oppression of Israel's internal Arab population. Jiryis documents how the racist policy of Zionism accords the Arabs a humiliating kind of pseudo-citizenship that is in many ways similar to the way the U.S. government treats the American Indians.

In his conclusion Jiryis states that "we have seen that the policy towards the Arabs in Israel has been nothing more nor less than one aspect of the systematic Zionist policy followed vis-a-vis the Arabs in general, and that the policies of military government, racial discrimination and repression are all different aspects of this same policy."

Jiryis lacks a clear revolutionary perspective, unfortunately, and tends to ascribe the faults of Zionism to a few individuals "who are largely responsible for this deplorable situation," rather than to the capitalist and imperialist systems which spawned and maintain the policy of Zionism.

(Jiryis' book may be obtained in this country from Militant Labor Forum Books, 873 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003. A copy costs \$2.45, plus 12 cents postage.)

Two informative reprints have been issued recently. One is I.F. Stone's "For a New Approach to the Israeli-Arab Conflict" which was originally published in the August 3, 1967, **New York Review of Books**. Despite his Zionist leanings, Stone gives (as usual) a good factual account of his topic and makes some cogent observations. A few of the things he says will (also, as usual) be annoying to revolutionary-minded people.

The other publication is a reprint of an article by Erskine Childers called "The Other Exodus" in the May 12, 1961 issue of the **British Spectator** and of the correspondence in that publication that followed from it. The pamphlet is loaded with historical background material on the pre-June, 1967 Arab refugee problem. Now the problem is worse.

(These two publications may also be obtained in the U.S. from Militant Labor Forum Books. The Stone reprint is 25 cents, the other, 50 cents. Both plus five cents postage.)


Los Angeles clerks union scores a decisive victory

By Gordon Bailey
Los Angeles—Retail Clerks Local 770 has won a decisive victory over the strongest grocery chains in Los Angeles. In a 20-day strike-lockout, they won every major demand, including the right to respect the picket lines of other unions.

This demand, which is a basic principle of union solidarity, had been a major block to an early settlement. It also proved to be the key to victory for the Retail Clerks.

Acting by themselves, the 24,000 members of Local 770 would have had a hard time enforcing their demands. But the 125,000 strong Joint Council of Teamsters joined the Retail Clerks on the issue of union solidarity. Together they put on the squeeze and forced Safeway, Ralphs, and other giant food chains to capitulate.

Berkeley loses riot insurance



San Francisco Chronicle

By Lew Jones
BERKELEY—Some of the "city fathers" chickens seem to have come home to roost here. In the wake of the ferocious police riot and police terror during the Peoples Park dispute, a Swiss insurance firm has canceled the City of Berkeley's riot insurance.

Berkeley is "a particularly bad risk," City Attorney Robert Anderson grimly announced.

The Zurich Insurance Company notified Anderson in a coolly worded letter that, as of June 27, it will no longer honor personal and property liability claims stemming from police-related actions.

"I guess they have been reading the newspapers lately," the city attorney said.

The Zurich company said riot-related claims in Berkeley in the last fiscal year exceeded the city's \$121,000 premium by \$84,000.

The grocers, organized into the Food Employers Council, had not planned things this way. They thought that Joseph DeSilva, head of Local 770, was on the outs with his international union and would be isolated. They did not think the Teamsters would respect the Clerks' picket lines.

So they went on the offensive, locked out 11,000 clerks, hired scabs, and urged the public to help break the strike. Robert K. Fox, spokesman for the Food Council, said the grocers could defy the union "for two months or more."

Actually the bosses' resistance crumbled in less than three weeks. Far from isolating Local 770, Fox found himself hemmed in by unions acting in solidarity. Seven thousand five hundred Teamsters refused to cross the Clerks' picket lines at 284 stores, sharply curtailing deliveries. Teamster members, who work in the wholesale warehouses serving the stores, walked off the job in a number of plants, so supplies dwindled further. Butchers refused to process meat in some key packing plants, and meat counters in struck stores began to run out of supplies.

Further pressure was exerted by Teamster pickets who were flown to Oakland and other cities to picket Safeway warehouses all along the Pacific Coast. The Teamsters also expressed their solidarity with the Retail Clerks by sitting in on all negotiating sessions with them.

The food chains agreed to wage increases variously estimated at from 60 cents to 80 cents an hour over three years. Journey-men clerks have been making \$3.44 an hour, although unskilled workers get considerably less. These increases will be added to the contracts of other Clerks' locals in Southern California that have already signed agreements for lesser raises.

Rules for nondiscriminatory hiring have been strengthened so that minority applicants can't be turned down on flimsy excuses. Improvements were made in the health and pension plans.

Most important of all, the union solidarity clause has been written into the contract. Now the Clerks have the right as well as the duty to support the Butchers and the Teamsters when their contracts come up for negotiation next year.

The Retail Clerks have come out of the strike with solid gains. But one gain accrues to all of labor in Southern California. This demonstration of Labor's potential strength has revived in a small way the spirit of solidarity that brought so many victories to labor in the thirties. It has also broken the long losing streak that has plagued Los Angeles unionists in recent years.

Seattle culinary union in major strike action

By Josephine Short
SEATTLE—In a historic move, the five locals of the AFL-CIO hotel and culinary workers' union here have united to hold steadfast in their demands for a living wage. On June 17 the first strike in the history of the industry here began with pickets being posted at the largest and most powerful of the Restaurant Employers' Association member stores.

Not wanting to hurt any more workers than absolutely necessary, the union closed with pickets only the stores it felt necessary to settle the labor dispute. In retaliation, the REA locked out union employees at other stores, declaring, "A strike against one is a strike against all." At the end of the first week, negotiations broke down. Of almost 500 stores, 63 have signed interim agreements with the union so that they may remain open throughout the dispute. Twenty-eight have been closed by the REA, and of 18 picketed stores, 10 remain open with supervisory help—wives, sweethearts and families of supervisors as scab labor.

Before negotiations broke down, the REA had offered the "generous" proposal of what amounted to an increase of two and a half cents an hour each year over a period of three years.

At two mass meetings on Sunday, June 22, more than a month after expiration of their contract, over 7,000 of the 11,000 union members rallied to the support of their negotiating team. They cheered as the union lawyer told them that they were now at war with the REA, that they were fighting for a living wage for one and for all, and that they were fighting to win.

With 100,000 Shriners about to arrive in Seattle on June 29, the general strike of the hotel and restaurant employees will begin on June 25, pulling all union employees out of every union store in the Western King County area except those 63 with interim agreements. The battle for living wages is being carried to all parts of the United States as the union exercises its right to seek out the employer no matter where he may be. Hotels of the Western Hotel chain in New York, Chicago, Cleveland, San Francisco, Honolulu, Los Angeles and Alaska will be picketed by the international union at the same time that the general strike begins here, with the promise that other chains in other cities will also be picketed if the REA continues to refuse to listen to their employees' demands.

Those stores hoping to remain open with scab labor will have a hard time as sup-

port grows. The King County Labor Council has revoked the work permits of all those under 18 in the industry. The Teamsters will not cross picket lines to deliver supplies to Seattle stores, and they have agreed to honor picket lines in other cities. Garbage will be left sitting. Entertainment will be unavailable as musicians honor picket lines. And in this seaport city the seamen's union has set up its own pickets to insure that no seaman crosses the picket line of his favorite hangout. The whole atmosphere is alive with the excitement of impending battle.

Morale is high as workers plan strategy for what may be a long siege. They know full well that they are not alone, that they have the best wishes and good will of workers all over the world. They are determined to win, and in winning they will gain not only for themselves but will establish the right of culinary workers throughout the U. S. to living wages.

Never before in this billion-dollar industry have the workers dared request a living wage. In Seattle, waitresses, for instance, are paid only \$12.80 per day, making it necessary to depend on tips. In the past, workers in this industry have been compelled to accept their pittance and hope that the gratuity of their customers would prove enough for them to live on. No longer do they want to be subservient. Now waitresses here are demanding \$20 a day. Hopefully, victories here will spearhead the fight for living wages over the entire industry.



Unions win key legal victory against GE

The U. S. Court of Appeals handed down what might become a landmark decision June 9, in the appeal of the General Electric Company against an NLRB ruling of unfair labor practice. During the 1966 negotiations with the International Union of Electrical Workers and 10 other unions with members employed by the giant corporation, GE walked out of the bargaining session, refusing to deal with the multi-union negotiating team.

The Appeals Court held that an employer cannot refuse to bargain collectively for a contract with a multi-union negotiating team, provided only that the unions involved all represent employees of the corporation.

General Electric employs 290,000 people in 60 plants and 400 other installations. About half the workers are organized, 80,000 of them in IUE, another large segment in the independent United Electrical Workers Union, the balance in 78 craft unions. (The UE, expelled from the CIO during the McCarthy witchhunt in the 1950s on charges of "communist domination" was not included in the 1966 negotiations. However it has been invited to join a coalition negotiations committee in forthcoming bargaining between Westinghouse Electric and the 11 other unions representing WE workers, so it is likely also to be included in multi-union contract talks with General Electric, if these are forthcoming. (See *Militant*, April 25 "Picket Line" for a report on coalition bargaining team and Westinghouse.)

Paul Jacobs, president of the IUE, hailed the decision. "It will go a long way toward equalizing the 'imbalance' of bargaining

The National Picketline

power that has resulted over the years from the technique of multiplant corporations 'whipsawing' one union against another during negotiations," he said.

* * *

Inflation and increased taxes have eaten up most of the wage increases won by American workers during the past year. Here are a few examples:

According to the May 7 *San Francisco Chronicle*, the buying power of California factory workers has reached its lowest point in 5 years, even though factory wages have reached an all-time high.

Between March 1968 and 1969, wages rose by 4.2 percent, or \$5.75 per week. Yet the average wage of \$141.71 **bought less** than the lower wages of a year ago. The average worker with three dependents lost 2.4 percent in purchasing power, the single worker 3.3 percent.

In Chicago, an industrial worker with three dependents averaged \$141.96 gross pay this March and took home \$121.05—which bought \$98.49 in relation to the 1957-59 dollar standards. Four years ago he took home \$16 less a week but had 93 cents more purchasing power.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics says the average take home pay of a worker with three dependents in April, 1969, was

\$98.11, up from \$92.68 a year ago. But the actual purchasing power of the 1968 average wage was only \$77.62—only 30 cents a week more than in 1968.

It is in Detroit among the auto workers that the financial facts of life are becoming glaringly clear. Once the auto worker was considered the elite among all industrial workers because he had the protection of a cost-of-living bonus based on increased prices as released quarterly by the BLS. In the last contract, Reuther emasculated that escalator clause for a mess of fringe "benefits" which UAW members now say "aren't worth a damn." Under the emasculated cost-of-living clause which Reuther gave to the auto industry, the bonus is now limited to 8 cents per hour per year, paid quarterly. Under the old contract, the cost-of-living addition to hourly wages would have amounted to 16 cents in this, the second contract year. The difference is \$6.40 per worker per week. It saves the corporations **\$100,000 per hour**.

The auto workers are feeling the squeeze in another direction—overtime has literally been eliminated as the industry continues to cut back production.

A Ford worker interviewed at the sprawling River Rouge plant by the *New York Times* on June 1 said: "A year ago we were putting in a 10-hour day, six-day week. Now it's 8 hours, five days." The worker now takes home **no more than \$115 a week**, as contrasted to as much as \$170 a year ago.

All of which must make Ford workers happy to read an item found tucked away on the financial pages of the *New York Times*.

"Salaries and bonuses for Ford Company's top officials climbed sharply last year.

"The officers received \$4,204,612 in salary and another \$5.805 million in bonuses in 1968 as against \$3.658 million in salary and only \$12,500 in bonuses in 1967. . .

"Henry Ford 2nd, chairman, received \$600,000 in salary and bonus, against \$200,000 the year before. . ."

— **Marvel Scholl**



Walter Reuther

The moral: It pays to fight back

A court victory for S.F. State strikers

By Dianne Gannon and George Johnson

For four months San Francisco State College was shut down by the longest student strike in recent history. The strike was led by the Third World Liberation Front. Central demands were for adequate admission of students from oppressed minorities into S.F. State and for the right of S.F. State third-world students to exercise control over their own education and receive an education relevant to their needs.

Authorities responded with mass arrests. About 700 students were jailed. The biggest mass bust in the city's history occurred Jan. 23 at a peaceful campus rally, when 437 arrests were made in an all-out effort to smash the strike.

Among those arrested was Helen Myers, a member of the Young Socialist who had been singled out for another arrest earlier in the strike. On June 10, she and nine others tried together were acquitted. Shortly thereafter we interviewed Helen and asked her to describe her trial.

* * *

"Ten of us happened to be lumped together for the trial because we were all arrested by the same three-man team," Helen told us. "Other than that, we were a pretty diverse group. There were five men and five women. Four different schools were represented: San Francisco State, Marin Junior College, San Francisco City College and San Jose State College. Two in the group were independent SDSers, one was a pacifist, two were members of the Worker-Student Alliance Caucus of SDS, one was a Welfare Rights Mother, and there was me, a YSAer. Nobody but the San Jose people knew each other before the trial."

Two PLers hit with stiff terms in S.F. trial

By Dianne Gannon

SAN FRANCISCO, June 20—Two members of the Progressive Labor Party who acted as their own attorneys in a trial resulting from the mass arrest at SF State College last January were found guilty here today of three standard, trumped-up charges: disturbing the peace, unlawful assembly and failure to disperse. They were convicted along with one other defendant, while a fourth was acquitted.

To date, 47 defendants have been acquitted, 54 have been convicted of at least one charge, and the trials of six have ended in hung juries.

The two convicted PLers, Sue Bethel and Larry Larson, conducted their defense along the lines of PL's defense strategy as outlined in the pamphlet, **Put the Imperialist Courts on Trial**. The pamphlet was distributed in the courtrooms by members of the Worker-Student Alliance caucus of SDS. The strategy was also outlined in an article in the June **Challenge** entitled "Mission 7 Learn: Speak Out; Rely On People, not Lawyers Who Won't Back Your Politics." This article advised defendants, "Once you understand that there is no easy way out, that going to jail for the struggle is a badge of honor that you can basically escape only by backing down or by building your base so solid that the rulers stand to lose more than they will gain by jailing you, then you stop worrying about getting the best legal experts and trying not to admit you ARE 'guilty' of 'resisting arrest,' of 'disturbing' the rulers' gory 'peace.'"

Just prior to the sentencing, one of the PLers tried to get a public defender to handle the case.

Judge Fitz-Gerald Ames released sections of the court transcript which, he said, formed the basis of the sentence he imposed. One of the defense witnesses, Bridges Randall, also of PLP, had testified that "we" brought two-by-two picket sticks to campus that day "to have something to defend ourselves with" against the San Francisco police department.

Judge Ames imposed the maximum penalty, one year in jail. Until this sentence, the most severe penalty had been 100 days, meted out to Third-World strike leader Roger Alvarado. After sentencing, Larson told the judge, "This sentence indicates that you're scared." The appeal bail was set at \$10,000, about five times the amount usual in SF State cases.



Cops grab Helen Myers at S. F. State

We asked Helen how the prosecution conducted its case. "They had only circumstantial evidence," she replied.

"And of a whole parade of teacher prosecution witnesses, not one claimed their classes were disturbed by the rally—only before or after it. One of them, a typing teacher, claimed the strike made her tense, but she was composed enough to attend strike meetings daily so that she could later offer her services as an informer. And one of our lawyers, Malcolm Burnstein, got her to admit under cross-examination that she was calm enough to eat lunch on Bloody Tuesday, Dec. 3. He even established that she was on desert when the cops cracked the first heads."

"To make up for the weaknesses of its witnesses, the prosecution presented some physical 'evidence.' They had a two-by-two stick and some billiard balls on the table. They didn't even try to prove they belonged to any of the defendants in our group. They also took the jury to a 'weapons room,' where they had knives and clubs."

"And the police testimony revealed not our guilt but their prejudices. Their star witness was Sgt. Eptin of the tac squad. In previous trials he equated the clenched-fist salute with the Nazi salute, and said that during World War II 'I saw Joe Stalin doing it, too.'"

"But Mal Burnstein and our other lawyer, Charles Warner, just devastated him. The only real fact in his testimony was that he was there, and that he had ordered the arrests."

We asked Helen what kind of people were on the jury that brought the acquittal. "Well," she said, "it took nine-and-a-half hours to impanel them. Black jurors were systematically excluded; eight in a row were excused by the prosecution. We ended up with a member of the painters' union, an information officer for the phone company, an architect, a personnel officer for Standard Oil, a graduate of the Moody Bible Institute, a housewife and an Army widow. And the prosecution read them each a list of 106 organizations and asked if they knew anyone in them. The list included the YSA, American Federation of Teachers, Friends of the Irish Republican Army and Glide Memorial Church. There were no young people on the jury." Yet this jury acquitted the students.

"Yes," Helen explained. "They heard our arguments that we had a right to be there. They listened to cops admit to beating students, and to buying their own Samurai-sword clubs because the regulation sticks, the 3-inch riot batons, break too easily. And they became convinced that police were responsible for the violence, not us."

"Our lawyers were great, too. Chuck had defended an earlier campus case. And Mal had helped Charles Garry defend the Oakland Seven; he was also a striking AFT member at State. They both fought the case on its political basis, defending our rights to have a rally, and putting the blame for the violence where it belongs—with the cops."

"The defense witnesses, too, were able to explain the politics of the strike—why we were on strike, what our aims were. They explained that the slogan, 'Power

to the people," did not mean, as the prosecution contended, that a minority was trying to undemocratically seize power; just the opposite, that the slogan expressed the demand for self-determination, the right to participate in decision-making. The clenched fist, too; it was not a 'threat to take power,' as the prosecution claimed, but was a sign of solidarity."

"Dr. Larry Rose testified to the serious injuries he'd treated—broken wrists, deep scalp lacerations—the day of the rally, and how the cops put him in a police wagon, too, for crossing their line to treat a student."

"Some of us testified, too. Susan Malloy was asked during cross-examination if I was a strike leader, and she answered that the strike was led by the Third World Liberation Front, and then explained the strike demands. Pat Morton told how watching the police violence on TV in San Jose had moved her to come to State to show her solidarity. The prosecution was reduced to trying to discredit us personally. They went so far as to claim that one of the girls told the arresting officer her address and that he'd be welcomed at any hour if he'd ring three times. Coming from cops, that was a particular insult."

"Our lawyers were able to point out in their summations that there was no evidence against us, and that we were within our rights. Chuck described the trials as political persecution, and Mal cited World War II and the Korean and Vietnam wars in asking the jury if they wanted to continue the use of violence to stop social change."

"And the DA knew he was licked. At the last minute, on the morning the jury was being instructed, he tried to offer a deal, but our lawyers told him they'd recommend against our taking it since we were so clearly not guilty."

"It took the jury only two-and-a-half hours to vote on three counts for all 10 of us—not guilty for all."

"Afterward we were hugging the jurors and they were hugging us. A couple of women told us they knew all along we weren't guilty. And when they were leaving the foreman said that after they'd seen the billiard balls and the two-by-two, he'd thought of marching back into the courtroom with a bowling ball on the end of a club and yelling, 'Power to the jury.' When the jury got to the elevator, they exchanged clenched-fist salutes with us"

Helen discussed the main points in the defense: "You need fighting, competent lawyers; serious, united defendants working as a team; and you need to present the facts of the case and convince the jury that your cause was just and within your rights and theirs. Progressive Labor called the verdict a 'fluke,' but I believe it is possible to convince the American people, even what the ruling class will accept on a jury as a 'cross-section' of society, that we are within our rights. It's certainly stupid not to try."

"And we are convincing them. This has not been the only 'fluke' in these trials; there've been 37. So far we've had 37 acquittals, 25 convictions and 6 hung juries."

Helen contrasted her defense strategy to PL's. "They now claim you should defend yourself, since it's the PL line that all lawyers are liberal cop-outs and members of the ruling class. They're completely unserious. They sell **Challenge** in the corridors, just like they did in Hazard, Ky., and they distributed a leaflet entitled 'Smash the imperialist courts' in front of the jurors. We stopped this nonsense in the courtroom I was in after a PLer said loudly in front of the jurors, 'Helen, is this your last trial, or how many more do you have to go?'"

"After that we all agreed PL shouldn't sell literature or talk about the cases in the courtrooms."

Knowing the attitude of some ultralefts toward winning battles with the ruling class, we jokingly asked Helen if she had been "co-opted" by winning.

"Of course not," she replied. "But this summer I'll be in school instead of jail and we'll be free for political work. If there's been any co-opting, it was done by us, when we used a part of the ruling class' own weaponry—the courts—against them."

"In convincing the jury of our right to have a rally and our right to attend it, we managed to accomplish a lot of political education in general and about the specific strike issues—and get acquitted in the process."

... SDS convention report

Continued from page 7.

year-old policy of hoping to substitute themselves for the mass antiwar movement in the U.S. Their adoption of the negotiations line, under cover of supporting the NLF 10-point program, represents a retreat, not an advance for the anti-imperialist forces in the U.S.

The SDS (RYM) convention concluded in the early morning hours of Sunday with the election of Mark Rudd (who modestly labeled himself an internationally known "symbol of the movement") as national secretary, Jeff Jones of San Francisco as inter-organizational secretary, and Bill Ayers of Michigan as educational secretary. Defeated in the elections were two ISC candidates, and the Bob Avakian—Lyn Wells ticket, running for national secretary and national educational secretary respectively.

The new national interim committee is composed of Barbara Reilly from Columbia, Bob Avakian of Berkeley, Linda Evans of Michigan, Mike Klonsky, Noel Ignatin, Bernadine Dohrn of Chicago, Corky Benedict of Ohio and Howie Machtlinger.

SDS has traveled a long way from the days of its founding as a liberal anti-communist organization. While the political level of the delegates at the convention did not accurately reflect the total SDS

membership, certainly the majority of the delegates at this convention considered themselves "some sort of communist." This indicates the rising political consciousness of the American student radicalization.

But at the same time, the shallow, pragmatic philosophy on which SDS has based itself, and the lack of understanding of the need for principled politics and clear program has permitted the factionalism, supposedly barred at the front door, to come flooding in by the windows, and back-alley entrances. Along with the increasing Marxist jargon have come all the vices, but few of the virtues of the "old left."

The ninth national convention of the Students for a Democratic Society was possibly the most bureaucratic, undemocratic and factional youth convention in the history of the radical movement in the U.S.

In its wake, there are now two groups claiming to be the real SDS, each with an essentially factional and sectarian program, and one of them excluding the other. The factional battle will now continue on campuses across the country. But the convention itself provided striking confirmation that an attempt to build a broad student movement by ignoring political program can lead only to one variation or another of the current crisis. The steadily radicalizing student movement will gain little from either of the warring groups.

The Great Society

Cemetery socialists—In bygone years the Socialist party was known as the party of "sewer socialism" because it concentrated on such municipal issues as utilizing human waste for fertilizer. Now the remnants of the SP are digging even deeper for issues. In a letter to the June 19 **Village Voice**, New York Party Chairman Robert Koeppecus noted that he had called on the city fathers to move all the bodies in the city's cemeteries onto a vacant island to make more room for housing. He said nothing, however, about the poor stiff who paid for a plot presumably into eternity without any provision about being moved into a different neighborhood.

Such touching sentiment—Three tobacco companies voluntarily withdrew cigarette commercials from a TV showing of a film starring Robert Taylor who died the week previous of lung cancer.

Keeping stiff—O. L. Nelms, a Texas millionaire, has bought himself a \$25,000 coffin and is seeking to establish a tax-exempt trust fund of \$5-10 million for a continuing round of cocktail parties in his memory. The coffin would be wheeled from one binge to the next. Any heir who tried to bury him would be disinherited. He hopes to get the trust fund going before he cashes in so he can get to a few of the parties upright.

Be it ever so 'umble—John D. Rockefeller IV, insists there will be nothing ostentatious about the home he's building on his recently acquired 3,000-acre estate in West Virginia where he's secretary of state and off and running for the governorship in '72.

Progress report—The Minnesota Supreme Court refused a new trial for a man convicted of attempting to rape a 14-year-old girl. The appeal was based on the allegation that new evidence indicated the girl was a prostitute. The court rejected this despite a state statute which forbids "indecent liberties with or on the person of any female, not a public prostitute, without her consent freely given. . ."

The march of science—An Arkansas company has obtained world rights for

a self-propelled, battery-powered golf cart that automatically follows a golfer around the course. But can it mix a decent martini?

Below the belt—We assume it's for real because it came from a reliable Minneapolis friend. It's a duplicated copy of an unidentified newspaper clipping datelined Chicago and reporting that the makers of Jockey shorts are suing Munsingwear for alleged, and seemingly contradictory, unfair competitive practices. They assert Munsingwear has been riding on their trademark with a slogan, "Jockeys wear Munsingwear." But they also charge that a Munsingwear ad falsely asserted that Jockey shorts have no pouch and that Munsingwear salesmen have been seen sporting buttons stating, "Jockey shorts cause cancer." We can't judge the merits of the dispute, but we have heard that when you wear Jockeys your breath tends to come in short pants.

On the peace front—Recently returned from Gay Paree, Herb Caen, the usually well-informed columnist for the **San Francisco Chronicle**, says he learned the reason the peace negotiations are being protracted is because across the street from the Hotel Majestic, scene of the talks, is located what he describes as the most elegant sporting house in the world.

No loophole—We recently reported that a London ironsmith was cleaning up on men and women's chastity belts. But now the British government is moving in on the take, claiming the iron jocks are in the same tax category as furniture and similar items. The manufacturer, who does concede they make good flower pot holders, insists however that they're safety equipment and, as such, tax-exempt. Which sounds like a strong legal argument as long as they work.

They may painttoo—A **New York Times** ad offered this lower Fifth Avenue co-op: "Unique penthouse apartment covering entire floor, fully serviced building with garage, huge terraces. . . 6 masters, wood-burning fireplaces, 4 maid's rooms, library, 10 baths. Available immediately. \$300,000. Maintenance, \$2,600 a month. . ."

— Harry Ring

Meet Socialists in Your Area

ARIZONA: Phoenix: YSA, c/o Lindley Garner, 1010 Lemon St., #12, Tempe, Arizona 85281. Tel: (602) 966-4025.

CALIFORNIA: Berkeley-Oakland: SWP and YSA, 2519-A Telegraph Avenue, Berkeley, Calif. 94704. Tel: (415) 848-9334.

Los Angeles: SWP and YSA, 1702 E. 4th St., Los Angeles, Calif. 90033. Tel: (213) 269-4953.

San Francisco: SWP, YSA, Militant Labor Forum, and Pioneer Books, 2338 Market St., San Francisco, Calif. 94114. Tel: (415) 626-9958.

San Diego: YSA, c/o Bill Williams, 897 Vista Grande, Apt. 4, El Cajon, Calif. 92020.

COLORADO: Boulder: YSA, c/o Chuck Melien, 648 University, Boulder, Col 80302.

FLORIDA: Tallahassee: YSA, c/o Doug Lord, 610 N. Calhoun, Tallahassee, Fla. 32301.

GEORGIA: Atlanta: SWP, YSA and Bookstore, 187 14th St., Atlanta, Ga. 30309. Tel: (404) 876-3887.

ILLINOIS: Champaign-Urbana: YSA, P.O. Box 2099, Sta. A, Champaign, Ill. 61820. Tel: (217) 359-1333.

Chicago: SWP, YSA and bookstore, 302 S. Canal St., Rm. 204, Chicago, Ill. 60606. Tel: (312) 939-2667.

DeKalb: YSA, c/o Steve Sappanos, 111 Carroll, De Kalb, Ill. 60115.

Peoria: YSA, c/o Mike Ghelfi, 1522 N. Bradley, Peoria, Ill. 61606.

INDIANA: Bloomington: YSA, c/o Rick Congress, 207 E. 2nd St., Bloomington, Ind. 47401.

MAINE: Brunswick: YSA, c/o Ted Parsons, Senior Center, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine 04011.

MASSACHUSETTS: Boston: SWP and YSA, c/o Militant Labor Forum, 295 Huntington Ave., Rm 307, Boston, Mass. 02115. Tel: (617) 536-6981.

MICHIGAN: Detroit: SWP and YSA, Eugene V. Debs Hall, 3737 Woodward Ave., Detroit, Mich. 48201. Tel: (313) TE1-6135.

East Lansing: YSA, P.O. Box 9251, East Lansing, Michigan 48909.

Ypsilanti and Ann Arbor: YSA, c/o Dave Davis, 913 Washtenaw #16, Ypsilanti, Mich. 48197. Tel: (313) 482-7348.

MINNESOTA: Minneapolis-St. Paul: SWP, YSA and Labor Bookstore, 704 Hennepin Ave., Rm. 240, Mpls. 55403. Tel: (612) 332-7781.

MISSOURI: St. Louis: YSA, c/o Bill Onasch, Schardell

Hotel, Rm. 30, 280 N. Skinker Blvd., St. Louis, Mo. 63130.

NEW JERSEY: Newark: YSA, c/o Walt Brod, 425 Mt. Prospect Ave., Newark, N.J. 07104. Tel: (201) 483-8513.

NEW YORK: Albany: YSA, c/o Bill O'Kain, 313 State St., Albany, N.Y. 12210.

New York City: SWP and YSA and bookstore, 873 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y. 10003. Tel: (212) 982-6051.

NORTH CAROLINA: Chapel Hill-Durham: YSA, c/o Bob Friedman, H6 Camelot Apts. Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514. Tel: (919) 942-3024.

OHIO: Cleveland: SWP and YSA, 9801 Euclid Ave., Cleveland, Ohio 44106. Tel: (216) 791-1669.

Kent: YSA, P.O. Box 116, Kent, Ohio 44240.

Yellow Springs: YSA, c/o Peter Graumann, Antioch Union, Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387. Tel: (513) 767-5511.

OKLAHOMA: Norman: YSA, c/o Sudie Trippet, Rt. 2, Box 453, Norman, Oklahoma 73069. Tel: (405) 321-2594.

OREGON: Portland: YSA, c/o Tonie Porter, 5203 S. W. Pomona, Portland, Oregon, 97219. Tel: (503) 246-9245.

PENNSYLVANIA: Philadelphia: SWP and YSA, 686 N. Broad St., Philadelphia, Penna. 19130. Tel: (215) CE 6-6998.

RHODE ISLAND: Providence: YSA, c/o Jeff Powers, 134 Benefit St., Providence, R.I. 02902.

TEXAS: Austin: YSA c/o Tom Kincaid, 2201 B Nueces, Austin, Texas 78705.

Houston: YSA, c/o Fred Brode, 5420 Olana, Houston, Texas 77039.

UTAH: Logan: YSA, c/o Sterne McMullen, 763 E. 9th North, Logan, Utah 84321.

WASHINGTON, D.C.: YSA, c/o Kathy Coram. 3218 Wisconsin Ave. N.W. #3. Tel. (202) 362-0037.

WASHINGTON: Seattle: SWP and YSA, 5257 University Way N.E., Seattle, Wash. 98105. Tel: (206) 523-2555.

WEST VIRGINIA: Beckley: YSA, c/o John Milan, Box 906, Beckley, W. Va. 25801.

WISCONSIN: Madison: YSA, 202 W. Gilman, Madison, Wisc. 53703. Tel: (608) 256-0857.

Milwaukee: YSA, c/o Peter Kohlenberg, 912 E. Ogden Ave., #608, Milwaukee, Wis. 53202.

Reading for revolutionaries

An analysis of the USSR

THE REVOLUTION BETRAYED, by Leon Trotsky. Merit Publishers, 1965. 308 pp., \$5.95 cloth, \$2.95 paper.

In our times, one can say without any hesitation that the Soviet Union, China and the other countries that have abolished the capitalist system are in the center of all important world events. This has been the case, actually, since the Russian Revolution of October 1917 gave birth to a workers state for the first time in history.

The defeats of revolutionary struggles of the 1920s and 1930s in China, Germany, France, Spain and other countries served to isolate the Soviet Union. The internal development of the Soviet Union became subject to a condition of encirclement accompanied by external hostility. Nevertheless, every important international development had to take into account the existence of the Russian Revolution.

During the 1930s a great many books and articles in the capitalist press began to take notice of the USSR's plan of industrial development, the Five Year Plan, and of the continued growth of the Soviet economy during the great depression elsewhere. New "friends" of the Soviet Union mushroomed in various countries, writing approvingly and uncritically of everything that existed there.

As a result, Trotsky undertook a two-fold task: first, to give a scientific explanation of what was really taking place in the Soviet Union; second, to reply to the distorted and often false writings of the "friends."

The result, in the present book, is the first comprehensive and genuinely Marxist account of the reality of the Soviet Union and its ruling stratum. Although more than 30 years have passed since Trotsky wrote this book, its many lessons are entirely pertinent for today's generation of revolutionaries.

Trotsky does not write about the Soviet Union as an isolated and individual phenomenon in history but draws the lessons for revolutions in our epoch for all countries. Therefore, his book has enduring value and can be studied with considerable profit today.

Among the subjects that are treated are the economic developments, the relationship of socialism to the state, the bureaucracy that usurped the power and why it did so, the social antagonisms, family, youth and culture, the Army, foreign policy and world revolution, the then new constitution and where the Soviet Union was going. A discussion of the Stalinist theory of "socialism in one country" concludes the volume.

The great contribution that Trotsky made, particularly in this book, is in giving us a scientific understanding of the nature of the bureaucracy that rises to power in a workers state in the period of the ebb of the revolution. It can be categor-

The works reviewed in this column are generally available from Merit Publishers. For a free catalog write to Merit Publishers, 873 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003.

ically asserted that it is impossible to make head or tail of current political events on an international scale without such an understanding. We can rest assured that the capitalist class knows quite well just what these ruling bureaucracies really are; it is out duty to know at least as much.

— Milton Alvin



Trotsky

Merit announces publication of 3 new pamphlets

NEW YORK—Merit Publishers announced the release of three new pamphlets for July.

Leon Trotsky on Engels and Kautsky, 32 pages, 50c. This collection includes three articles out of print for more than 30 years, the first of which, in the form of an extended review of **Engels' Letters to Kautsky**, is a gem of Marxist literary-political-psychological analysis.

The other two deal with how **Pravda** celebrated an Engels anniversary and an obituary notice about Karl Kautsky. An appendix, translated here for the first time, is the letter Engels wrote to Kautsky in 1889 about the French Revolution, which Trotsky described as "one of the most magnificent documents of the human mind. . . [It] will forever remain not only the source of theoretical instruction but also of esthetic joy to anyone who has seriously pondered the dynamics of class relations in a revolutionary epoch, as well as the general problems involved in the materialist interpretation of historical events."

How Can the Jews Survive? by George Novack, 24 pages, 25c. Subtitled **A Socialist Answer to Zionism**, this is Novack's response to the recent book, **The Non-Jewish Jew** by Isaac Deutscher, published posthumously by his widow.

How to Make a Revolution in the U.S. by Peter Camejo, 24 pages, 25c. A simple, vivid exposition of why socialism is needed and how it can be achieved in the U.S. Written by the well-known Berkeley campus activist now awaiting trial for "conspiracy" to organize a campus sit-in.

----- clip and mail -----

Special to New Readers

If you would like to get better acquainted with THE MILITANT, you may obtain a special, introductory three-month subscription for \$1. (If you're already sold on the paper, you can help out by sending a regular one-year subscription for \$4.)

- ☐ Enclosed is \$1 for a 3 month introductory subscription.
- ☐ Enclosed is \$4 for a 1 year regular subscription.
- ☐ For GIs—\$1 for a 6-month introductory subscription.

NAME

STREET

CITY STATE ZIP

Send to: The Militant, 873 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003

Where headlines were off on N.Y. elections



Herman Badillo and SWP mayoral nominee Paul Boutelle at recent debate.

By Harry Ring

NEW YORK—The victory of "law and order" reactionaries in both the Republican and Democratic primary elections here was widely interpreted, at least initially, as one more indication of a voter shift to the right and a major victory for the racist "backlash" camp. The actual returns, however, show a different picture.

One significant feature of the contest, for example, was that the first Puerto Rican politician to contest for the Democratic mayoralty nomination—Bronx Borough President Herman Badillo—polled a very high vote.

Badillo directed his campaign to the Puerto Rican and black communities. While, as a capitalist politician, he took a miserable stand on the issue of community control, he did try to present himself as a representative of the ghettos concerned with seeking action on the major grievances of the poor. He ran as an opponent of the Vietnam war, speaking of the need to use funds now squandered on the war for social services.

Despite the presence of three other candidates in the race with a liberal image, Badillo piled up 215,291 votes, nearly 30 percent of the Democratic total and only 37,000 less than the winner, Procaccino.

Badillo's performance has added significance in that it comes after a year of intense struggle on the community control issue during which the Puerto Rican community has been involved in city politics to a greater extent than ever before.

Right-wingers did turn out in numbers for the two party contests. In the Republican primary, John Marchi, a state senator who has emerged as the most articulate spokesman for the openly reactionary opposition to any form of community control by black and Puerto Rican people, beat liberal incumbent John Lindsay 111, 725 to 105,358. Even this though cannot be properly interpreted as a straight backlash vote. The ills of this town have become so great that almost anyone running against the mayor is bound to benefit. Marchi's campaign was, however, run on a clear-cut reactionary basis.

In the Democratic primary, City Controller Procaccino, who can be most kindly described as a clown, also appealed for the racist vote with mouthings about "crime in the streets." However, as a Democrat in a city with a strong liberal Democratic tradition, his reactionary stand was more muted than Marchi's.

In addition to Badillo, there were three others running against Procaccino. These included former Mayor Wagner, still a strong figure in the Democratic machine; author Norman Mailer, who received a generous amount of media coverage; and Congressman Scheuer, a wealthy nonentity who apparently enjoys spending his money campaigning.

Despite greater machine resources and funds, ex-Mayor Wagner outpolled Badillo by only 6,000 votes.

Mailer, who ran along with fellow author Jimmy Breslin, presented a weirdly formulated concept of community control apparently intended to appeal to both left and right and embodied in the proposal to make New York City the 51st state. Mailer entered the campaign to tap the wide voter discontent in the city. He then switched

to the role of a "responsible" politician. The voters responded in kind, according him 41,136 votes.

Scheuer drew 38, 631.

While the primary vote does indicate certain features of the present state of New York politics, the results are limited and must be understood in that sense. Capitalist elections generally serve to muddy rather than clarify political relations. And this is particularly true of primaries. New York primary elections are traditionally the vehicle whereby the competing machines select the candidates to confront the voters in the general election. The general public is discouraged from participating by a requirement that in order to vote in a party primary you must have registered as a member of that party the previous year. And over the years, primary elections have been generally regarded with properly cynical indifference by the bulk of voters. In this election, with heightened dissatisfaction in the city, there was as big a turnout as in any previous primary—and that was only 35 percent of the voters.

The vote for Marchi and Procaccino certainly indicates that a continuing process of polarization is taking place. As a recent *New York Times* study found, the mounting pressure by black and Puerto Rican New Yorkers for control of the institutions of their communities has increased "tension" in the city.

But while this process has increased the political activity of the right, it is also developing the beginning of political consciousness among the black and Puerto Rican people who are becoming increasingly determined to do something about their lot by winning at least a measure of control over the institutions relevant to their lives and the lives of their children.

Such sentiment can only be exploited and dissipated by a capitalist politician like Badillo. It remains for the Socialist Workers ticket, which stands unequivocally for community control and for fundamental social change, to tap that sentiment and help develop it in a revolutionary direction.

Move to discharge two antiwar GIs

Gen. Hollingsworth, commanding officer at Ft. Jackson, S. C., has before him an Army field-board recommendation to give undesirable discharges to Pvs. Joe Rudder and Joe Cole of the Ft. Jackson GIs United Against the War in Vietnam.

The two servicemen were among the Ft. Jackson 8 who were imprisoned for 62 days before the Army was compelled to beat a retreat and admit it had no case against them. The present move to penalize them with an undesirable discharge was based on the flimsiest of pretexts and constituted one more effort to victimize them for their political views. This too will be challenged legally and publicly.

The Israeli occupiers

An editorial

In the first attack by Arab revolutionaries on a major industrial site in Israel, guerrillas of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine blew up an oil pipeline near Haifa June 24, destroying 1,000 tons of fuel. This resistance to the colonial occupier is destined to continue and escalate.

The destruction of the pipeline came in the wake of a monstrous crime committed by the Israeli government against innocent people. On June 23 Israeli soldiers sent into East Jordan sabotaged Jordan's most important irrigation system, which had turned a desert into fertile land for an estimated 60,000 people. The \$85-million canal that utilized the waters of the Yarmuk River had taken the Jordanians six years to build.

In an underdeveloped country so lacking in arable land, it was no small achievement to finally be able to provide the precious water that made farming possible. And doubtless many of the farmers whose land was ruined in this raid were refugees from the more fertile valleys of Palestine, evicted by the Israeli colonizers in 1948 or 1967.

Israel's Zionist rulers did not even attempt to claim as a pretext that the people whose land was destroyed were in any way responsible for guerrilla actions. The crime against the 60,000 Jordanians was committed to "punish" King Hussein for permitting Arab revolutionaries to exist in his country. It is a shocking repetition of the age-old practice of conquerors seeking to control the subjugated. Through reprisal and retribution against the general population, they hope to terrorize entire peoples into restraining the revolutionaries in their midst who insist on continuing the struggle against the occupier.

This was the policy pursued by the Nazis when they leveled the town of Lidice in Czechoslovakia and murdered its residents after a German army officer had been shot; this policy was pursued by the French Secret Army Organization and Foreign Legion when they dynamited the Casbah, the Arab ghetto of Algiers, in desperate attempts to terrorize the Algerian Revolution out of existence; this policy is being carried out today by the U. S. in Vietnam. With such reactionary policies, the Zionists will spark the same mass opposition.

If there had been one among those 60,000 poor farmers eking out a living on his arid plot of ground who was unsympathetic to the Arab liberation struggle, he has certainly been won over now.

As the Israeli rulers continue to reveal ever more clearly the racist, oppressive character of Zionism, the movement demanding self-determination for the Palestinian Arabs will gain ground within Israel, just as the U. S. antiwar movement has arisen in support of the right of self-determination for the Vietnamese.

The destruction of the Haifa oil pipeline will give the Israeli ruling class something to think about. And Jewish Israeli workers and intellectuals will begin to awaken to the fact that for them Zionism is a suicidal course, that they will be able to live at peace with the Arabs only by joining forces with the Arab revolution in a movement to replace the system of imperialism and Zionism with a socialist system based on equality and brotherhood.

U.S. Army keeps pressing to get Pvt. Joe Miles

A summary court-martial at Ft. Bragg, N. C., on June 23 found Pvt. Joe Miles guilty of a trumped-up AWOL charge. The military trial came just four days after a federal judge in Clinton, N. C., refused to bar the Army brass' attempt to ship the black, socialist GI to a remote base in Alaska as punishment for his antiwar ideas and activities.

Miles was one of the leaders of the Ft. Jackson, S. C., GIs United Against the War in Vietnam. After his transfer to Ft. Bragg, he helped organize the GIs United chapter there.

At the conclusion of the day-long court-martial June 23, the court officer, Major Laurence Buffaloe—acting in his capacity as jury—found Miles "guilty as charged" by Major Buffaloe acting in his capacity as prosecutor, and—acting in his capacity as judge—Major Buffaloe sentenced Miles to forfeiture of a half month's pay. The mildness of the sentence testifies to the phoniness of the charges.

The brass did not attempt to deny that Miles was properly signed out for the three-day Memorial Day weekend, nor that he had a valid pass; nor did they try to pretend that his name appeared on any duty roster that weekend. The two prosecution witnesses, a staff sergeant and a captain, only testified that in two separate conversations, they had informed Miles there would be "work for him to do Saturday." Three defense witnesses who were present during those conversations denied that there was any mention of Miles working that Saturday.

The prosecution witnesses admitted that they had checked their stories with each other before the trial and had gone over them carefully with judge-prosecutor Buf-

faloe. There were numerous other procedural irregularities during the trial, but each time defense attorney Laughlin McDonald moved for dismissal because of them, Major Buffaloe, acting in his capacity as judge, overruled the motion.

The three defense witnesses were all enlisted men of the military-police unit to which Miles is attached. None of them sympathizes with Miles' political views. All three described the pattern of harassment to which Miles has been subjected. According to one of them, Sp/4 Steven Peterson, "Joe is treated like a stockade parolee. He is continually given details that none of the rest of us would do, and he does them without complaining."

This court-martial conviction is only the latest incident in the brass' incessant harassment of Miles for exercising his Constitutional rights. On May 23, Miles was placed on a special one-man levy for transfer to Alaska. The transfer order had a clearly punitive intent and was issued in violation of procedures established by Army regulations. Miles does not have the military occupational specialty required for his new assignment, and he has only 11 months left to serve in the Army, while the normal tour of duty in Alaska is 18 months.

Pvt. Miles and the Ft. Bragg chapter of GIs United will continue to fight the Alaska transfer. A petition is being circulated on the post by GIs United charging that the transfer is an attack on the right of all GIs to speak out on the war and demanding that the orders be revoked.

The GI Civil Liberties Defense Committee is supporting the Miles defense effort. Contributions to aid the fight may be sent to the committee at Box 355, Old Chelsea Sta., New York, N. Y. 10011.