

Young Socialist Discussion Bulletin, No.3

Volume 13, No. 6 December 22, 1969

Published by: Young Socialist Alliance
P.O. Box 471, Cooper Station
New York, New York 10003

→ A CONTRIBUTION ON THE CHICANO STRUGGLE by Tony Camejo	2
THE MIDEAST REVOLUTION by Robert Glasser	6
OHIO REGIONAL ORGANIZING by Rich Finkel	13
ON EDUCATION by Mark Pollock and Steve Bresler	14
THE STUDENT GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS AT SUNY BINGHAMTON by Gary Wurtzel	14
WOMEN'S LIBERATION - A NEW AREA OF RADICALIZATION by Toba Leah Singer	17
AMENDMENT TO THE BLACK LIBERATION RESOLUTION REEXAMINE THE BLACK PANTHER PARTY by Jim Fine	19
FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS ON THE ANTIWAR REPORT by Linda and Jim Fine	20
ON RELATIONS WITH THE ARAB STUDENTS IN LOS ANGELES by David Frankel	22
PERSPECTIVES ON A TRANSITIONAL PROGRAM FOR WOMEN'S LIBERATION by Angie Remedi, Ruth Getts and Laura Miller	23
REGIONAL REPORT by Carl Amedio and Laura Miller	28
THE YSA AND THE WORKING CLASS YOUTH RADICALIZATION by Marc Bender, Natalie Bombaro and Peter Mayer	29
AN ANSWER TO SOME CRITICISMS OF THE NEC DRAFT ANTIWAR RESOLUTION by Susan LaMont	30

A CONTRIBUTION ON THE CHICANO STRUGGLE

by

Tony Camejo

The text of this article is taken from a talk given at the Northern California Young Socialist Educational Conference. This contribution to the preconvention discussion should be taken as only a beginning to a more thorough discussion and analysis which will have to take place on the Chicano struggle in the coming period.

The Chicano people in the U.S. represent an oppressed national minority, that is, they were actually part of a nation, the nation of Mexico, a section of which was broken off by the use of force and violence, it was taken over and a political regime was forced upon the people living there.

But in any case, the Chicano people, in all senses of the conception of nationalism, became an oppressed minority within the U.S., with a common history, common language, and, as Tony pointed out, a common oppressor, the rising capitalist class in the eastern part of the U.S. which was expanding throughout the entire nation. In fact, you might say that the development of the ruling class was done at the expense of the native Americans, who were physically annihilated and the Chicano people who were politically and economically taken over and in many cases also killed.

A new militancy has developed in the Chicano movement over the past few years, and it is challenging the conceptions that a minority cannot do anything on its own and it has to wait for the white majority to move. And this is the result of several things. One is the black struggle. The other is the example of the colonial revolution, particularly the Cuban revolution and its lessons. Corky Conzales and the Crusade for Justice, which is a Chicano Civil Rights Organization, that is, it is organized along nationalist lines, has called for a principled break with the Democratic and Republican parties as the tools of our oppressors, and has called for the formation of an independent political party of Chicanos. It is an indication of the direction people are beginning to move in when they break from the concept that you have to wait until the rest of the population moves. This is a very significant thing, because like black people, La Raza in its great majority still is tied to the Democratic Party. That is why we should support any call for an independent Chicano Political Party. We view that the most important step in the U.S. is to break the 70 year monopoly of the ruling class on the political scene and move

the mass of the working class in this country to independent political action, to create political organs, class organs of their own to be able to fight for liberation, whether they be Black, Brown, or White.

Before analyzing whether it is correct for the Chicanos to break politically with the ruling class, that is, to go it "alone," let us look at the Chicano people as a minority and see where they stand. Again, there are a lot of misconceptions. One interesting thing, to give you an idea of whether the Mexicans looked at the Chicanos as an oppressed national minority, up to 1943, on official maps of Mexico, the territory inside the U.S., the southwest, had a little stipulation on it. It said "territory temporarily held by the U.S." You see that the Mexican people, to this day, not to talk of the bourgeois government, are resentful of the U.S.

We are talking about a people with a particular history and certain characteristics and features. The estimates of size varies greatly depending upon who is making the survey. The only census we have available are the 1960 census and they are totally inaccurate.

An estimate of 20,000,000 is probably accurate. 15,000,000 in the Southwest in terms of Chicanos. In terms of L.A. and California, you have another factor that is very important. The rate of growth is extremely high as compared to the Anglo population. We can safely say, that strictly speaking, in the five southwest states, there are 15,000,000 Chicanos and 5,000,000 Latinos nationally which includes Puerto Ricans and then in San Francisco you have a large population of Central Americans, in fact the seven brothers who were arrested and charged with murdering a policeman, all of them were Latinos, not one of them was a Chicano or of Mexican origin. They were from Central America, from El Salvador and Nicaragua.

Consider for a minute the size of the population, 20,000,000 people. That's 1½ times the population of Cuba. 40% of the population of France. And out of 100 countries in the world, not more than 25 number over 20,000,000. So, that population of Chicanos within the U.S. is larger than some European countries. The distribution of the population is also very interesting. The percent of the total Spanish speaking population in the southwest in 1960 was as follows:

40% Texas

4% Colorado
7% New Mexico
41% California
5.6% Arizona

So the main concentrations are in Texas and California in terms of the distribution. Now, in comparison in terms of percentage with the rest of the population, you have in Texas, by the 1960 census--

14% in Texas were Chicanos; 28% in New Mexico; Colorado 9%; California 9%; Arizona 14.9%. The total overall figure is approximately 11%, which could be increased, like in the state of California.

From 1950-1960 the rate of growth of Chicanos was 88%, about twice that of the Anglo population, and only surpassed by the black population which grew at about 90% over that period. If you extrapolate that 10 years into the 1960-1970 period, we can calculate a population in California somewhere in the area of 4-5 million or approximately 20-25% of the population of California.

So you can see the political weight of a population of that size, just from the sheer size, not to get into its composition or its strategic location.

By 1950, 66% of the Chicano people were in urban centers, and by 1960 it was 79.1% and that trend continues very rapidly. In California in 1960 85% of the Chicano people lived in urban centers. So you see that the conception that everybody is a grape picker, out there with Cezar Chavez, and that the Chicano people are primarily agricultural, is totally incorrect and has no relation to reality. Over 50% of the steel workers in L.A. are Chicanos.

In terms of place of origin, 80 to 96% of the population of the southwest is native born, born in the U.S. Only from 2-16 percent were born in Mexico. And this is dripping.

This refutes the conception that the Chicano has his roots completely in Mexico and is not really to be differentiated from a native resident of Mexico. The Chicano growing up in the United States has developed a separate culture, although a related one, from that of his brothers and sisters in Mexico. This separation has taken place on several levels and goes back quite a ways in history.

The early Spanish colonies in the Southwest in general and borderland colonies (for instance in Texas) in particular were separated from the central colonial administration in Mexico City by a vast stretch of land and desert. It was easier to communicate with the borderland settlements in Texas from St. Louis, for instance, than from Chihuahua, the northern

most outpost in colonial Mexico.

The historical conflict between the nomadic Indians and the agricultural pueblo Indians was inherited by the Spanish, who built their settlements on the pueblo structure. The control of entire areas of the southwest between Mexico and the settlements and between the settlements themselves by hostile nomadic tribes made communication even more difficult. Thus very early the southwestern settlements became isolated from the central administration in Mexico City.

Likewise, the people coming into the Southwest did not view Mexico as a paradise but were well aware of class exploitation within that country. After the Mexican-American War of 1848 the separation was given "legal" status and the Chicano found himself under an alien administration and alien culture. The Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo recognized that while the Chicano might not be a citizen of Mexico he nevertheless was not just simply an "American." The treaty guaranteed complete cultural autonomy and to uphold the economic rights of those people living in the Southwest. The treaty, of course, has been systematically violated. The development of industrial capitalism in the United States created the pre-conditions for a new influx of Mexicans into the United States by creating a higher standard of living just across the border. The oppressive poverty of Mexico drove thousands of people into the United States in hope of a better life, much in the same way that millions of Puerto Ricans came to New York to escape the oppressive conditions of Puerto Rico.

The Chicano growing up in the United States has developed a separate although related culture compared to that of his brothers and sisters in Mexico. Because of his experience in the barrios of the Southwest and other cities of the U.S. he feels neither completely at home here or in Mexico. The imposition of Anglo culture and racist Anglo education makes it impossible for the Chicano to identify with any American "dream." But neither does he look upon the Mexican government as his; with which either he has no connections (i.e. is a North American native of several generations), or with which he has not too fond experiences of oppressive poverty which drove him north.

And the age level of those born in Mexico who come to the U.S. is very high, somewhere around 45 years, while the average age of the Chicano born in the U.S. is around 22, as compared to 27 years of the white population. And if you eliminate the small percent of those 45 years of age who have come into the U.S. the average age drops to 14 years. Incidentally, it is very interesting that the largest influx of people from Mexico has

not been into Texas but into California.

We know that 52% of the overall U.S. working force is 27 years of age or under. They are young workers that have a totally different mentality when they go into the factory to work than the old worker who went through the experience of the depression and now thinks that the best thing he can do is to have a steady job. The young worker goes into the factory and he compares what he has now to what he had maybe a year ago or two years ago and any change in that he responds to. So we find that in Texas, for instance, the average age of the Chicano is 18 years, and in California it is 22 years. And, again, in terms of native born, the average age in California is 12.5 years. This is the median age. This means that 50% are above, and 50% below this age.

In terms of educational level, the Chicano represents an extremely oppressed minority, and they suffer most in the educational field. The Chicano has an average of 8 years of education, as compared to the black who has an average of 11 years of education in the entire southwest.

We also find that the Chicano is also primarily engaged in the industrial centers, and not in agriculture. Some statistics:

Those in the industrial labor force--these are average figures--was 76% in 1960. Unemployment was 8% which is twice the national figure. That is Chicanos and blacks live at about half the standard of living of the white and they suffer twice the rate of unemployment of the white. In New Mexico the unemployment rate goes up as high as 10% and in California it is still 7.7% and of course this doesn't mesh with what the unemployment really is, so it would be safe to say that the unemployment of the Chicano is probably well over 10%, probably closer to 15% which is comparable to some of the years of the depression in this country.

The proletarianization and urbanization took place more organically and over a longer period than for the Black population. The Chicano did not go through 400 years of slavery. Agriculture and mining in Mexico and the Southwest were done on a capitalist basis. The chief source of labor in the mines of the Southwest and on the railroads was the Chicano. In fact the historical origins of the Chicano population of Chicago and St. Louis developed through the Chicano workers on the railroads. The Second World War and mechanization of agriculture accelerated urbanization and proletarianization for the Chicano as it

did for the Black population.

In terms of the concentration in what areas they are, only 5.8% of the Chicano people in the state of California are farm workers. And, the majority of these are not the native born North Americans. They have a much higher age than the urban Chicanos who are in the factories. So that again has revolutionary implications. You have the youth who tend to be more radical who tend to be more optimistic because they haven't suffered many demoralizing defeats. They are in the factories and are proletarian in composition.

Even among the older people, only 37% are farmworkers. So that means that even among the older Chicanos, over 60% are in the urban centers or involved in rural but non-agricultural work. So we find that the Chicano people are primarily proletarian, working class, they are concentrated in the urban centers and that they are in industry rather than in some other type of occupation. This is extremely important. And the income level, 51.6% of the population earns less than \$3,000 in Texas, New Mexico 41%, Colorado 35%, California 19%. \$10,000 and over is 2.7% in Texas, 10% for California. I am sure these latter figures are greatly inflated.

Taking into consideration this reality, the existence of this concentration in the cities, and take into consideration also that this is an oppressed national population, that adds a certain dynamism to their struggle and effects the power they have and the ability to make changes.

If Black people and Brown people begin to see that the Democratic and Republican parties do not serve their interests, but are actually tools of the capitalist ruling class which controls this country, when they begin to see that and they begin to see the necessity to break with those parties and engage in independent anti-capitalist political action, that is a really significant, an historical turning point in the coming American socialist revolution. Because the Chicano people -- I am going to deal with just the Chicano people before I talk about what could happen with an alliance of black and brown people -- have the power to turn the political structure in the Southwest upside down. And there are historical precedents for this too. For example, in California, here the Chicanos remained an important political factor through the 1880's because of their concentration. "In most elections from 1848 to 1880 the newcomers were pitted against the Spanish speaking people. Down to the end of the 1870's local politics in Southern California were complicated by the tendency to diverge on racial lines" (North From Mexico) The ruling class didn't like those complications. And

believe me it is complicated. In the state of California, if the Chicano people refused to vote for the Democratic Party, it could never win another election. The Democratic party would disappear as a political phenomenon in the state of California. The Democratic party in this states wins on a coalition of Black and Brown votes and labor.

Let me give another example. New Mexico was a very interesting state because it didn't gain statehood until 1912 precisely because the Chicanos constituted a majority numerically and could control the state, so they couldn't incorporate it into the union. There was a territorial legislature, and that legislature, up to 1912 was controlled by Chicanos. So there are precedents for independent Chicano action.

In terms of our approach to the Chicano struggle for self-determination we can in almost all cases adapt the transitional demands we have raised for Black Liberation to the Chicano struggle. We will have to also develop demands relating

to questions of bi-lingual education, equality of the Spanish language, enforcing of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo and so on.

Central to the demand for Chicano control of the Chicano community and Chicano control of Chicano education will have to be the call for an independent Chicano political party. A call for the formation of just such a party based on the principle of no support to the Democratic and Republican parties has been raised by Corkey Gonzales. He called for a conference in the spring of 1970 which would bring together Chicanos of all political tendencies to democratically work out a program for the Chicano party and issue a call to the entire Southwest for its formation. We should closely watch this movement and participate in its formation giving it our full support.

Berkeley, California
December 7, 1969

THE MIDEAST REVOLUTION

by

Robert Glasser

Prior to the Napoleonic invasion of 1798, the Islamic empire, which extended from southeastern Europe down into north Africa and up towards India and Turkestan, was passing through a protracted era of economic, cultural and political stagnation. The Arab world was fragmented into numerous petty municipalities and feudal fiefs, and broken down into two classes: a ruling military-bureaucratic caste of Turko-Circassians dispatched from Istanbul, and the broad indigenous middle class, consisting of the peasantry and a petty-bourgeoisie of artisans and local merchants.

The occupation of Egypt by the revolutionary French army from 1798-1800 produced the first assaults on feudal property relations by recognizing private ownership and sale of lands on the market, and by the erection of a centralized government by Cairo. After the French withdrawal capitalist institutions were promoted by the Egyptian military leader Muhammad 'Ali pasha, who liquidated the ruling Mamluks, removed Turks from positions of authority, replacing them with native Egyptians and Syrians, initiated Arabic as the official language and enacted a series of land reforms that transformed feudal holdings into state lands subject to lease and long-term rentals. These reforms laid the foundation for the growth, particularly in Egypt, of a powerful bourgeois landed aristocracy. The future course of the Egyptian revolution was greatly influenced by the incessant struggle on the part of the landed bourgeoisie to "translate its economic power into political power."

Another force destined to play a decisive role in the Mideast revolt was the Arab army, built first by Muhammad 'Ali.

After the defeat of the South in the American Civil War, England was constrained to look elsewhere for the raw materials of her textile manufacture. Above all she needed guarantees that heavy investments in agriculture would not be jeopardized by social unrest, crop failures, or inefficient management. Equipped with a more streamline capitalist economy, England was able to wrest Egypt from the French sphere of influence and, through laws exempting firms from significant tax responsibilities and increased loans to the monarchy, was able to penetrate deeply into the Egyptian economy and render it dependent on foreign

capital. The Suez canal was completed in 1869 and Franco-British interests secured a treaty recognizing their control over this strategic enterprise for 100 years.

The first response by the landlords was vociferous denunciation of the exceptional treatment accorded British investment. Colonel 'Urabi's revolt of 1881 was mainly directed against the iron grip of Western Finance on the Egyptian economy, and was based upon a conjunctural alliance between the landed proprietors and the civil and senior officers of the state. On the political level the "Constitutional Opposition" demanded a larger share in determination of foreign policy and curtailment of certain royal prerogatives. Joined by the peasantry, who rose up in the northern Delta regions, this became the first popular nationalist movement in the Mideast.

This revolt was seized as a pretext for occupying the country and placing the organization of the economy directly into the hands of the British Empire. The results of British rule were two-sided: on the one hand, steps were taken to insure investment by establishing honest, efficient administration, a reduction in taxes and abolition of Feudal corvee. On the other hand, "no indigenous commercial or industrial class was allowed to develop during this period, for foreigners controlled not only large-scale finance, industry and commerce, but also petty trade and industry." Only a small portion of the administration's budget was allocated to education and health social or political reforms were virtually nil.

It was during this period that the landed interests forged a permanent alliance with British imperialism. For example, in 1907 it was reported that 51% of foreign capital was invested in land companies, and 24% in mortgage companies. Concomitant with this, between 1894 and 1914, the number of large land owners declined from 1.3 to .8% of the population while their holdings remained at about 44%. But even this is misleading, since the rural Egyptian population rose from 7,960,000 to 9,840,000, along with a rise in cultivated acreage. In other words, there was at once both an interpenetration and fusion of the large landed bourgeoisie with the imperialists, and a polarization in land ownership, resulting in the creation of dispossessed peasants, and

an agricultural proletariat. Just how land-hungry those peasants were may be fathomed by the fact that 70% of those who owned their own land subsisted on ½ feddan each, while some 8 million peasants were landless and could survive only by renting scraps of land or hiring themselves out as farm hands.

Still another element entered into this detente. King Farouk and the Royal family constituted the largest single land owners, 159,000 feddans of the best land. Quite naturally, the burgeoning nationalist democratic movement was confronted by a formidable bloc of Britain, the landlords and the Royal palace.

This was the situation when World War I broke out and the colonial world became embroiled in the European slaughter. Britain proposed to recognize Arab independence in return for their participation on the side of the entente. Acceptance of this proposal marked a new stage in Arab nationalism, since the Muslim Ottomans had aligned themselves with the Kaiser. By taking up arms against the non-Arab Ottomans, the nationalists defined their struggle in terms of a movement of the Arab nation as opposed to that of the Islamic religious community. It should be noticed that at this stage the leadership of the nationalist movement was carried forth by a handful of intellectuals and the Hashmite family, which had visions of an Arab empire under their rule.

At the close of the war, Britain and France reneged on their agreements and took overt political possession of the Arab world under the guise of mandates. The Sykes-Picot treaty dismembered Syria into British Palestine and Jordan, and French Syria and Lebanon, thereby depriving the Syrian nation of its major seaports and its hinterland. The states set up were largely arbitrary, the by-products of intrigues and Big Power wheeling and dealing. The Egyptian Wafdist party, political representative of the national bourgeoisie, requested permission to send delegates to Versailles to plea the case for Arab independence, but they were summarily arrested and deported. This precipitated a national uprising in March, 1919, which for the first time set in motion the students and intelligentsia with the fellahin, against the Mandate power. Ephemeral republics rose and fell and revolutionary paroxysms and workers strikes shook Egypt sporadically for the next three years, until finally in February 1923, faced with an intolerable situation, England unilaterally terminated the protectorate on condition that she be granted what amounted to a Monroe doctrine of the Mideast, legitimizing military intervention should her interest be threatened, without the costs and affront to Egypt of stationing an army on her soil, and while maintaining the facade of Egyptian

independence.

The Mandate grafted onto Arab society alien parliamentary institutions which did little more than facilitate the consolidation of power in the hands of the landed aristocracy, pashas and kings. In Egypt the Wafdist party held the support of the overwhelming majority of the people and yet, after 1927, the governments it formed were continually being dissolved or suspended by Farouk. In 1930 he revoked the constitution, drafting a modified constitution and electoral laws designed to enhance the royal prerogatives. The King could do this with impunity because the national front collapsed shortly after the Wafd took office. From 1927 to 1945 the parties of the great landed proprietors and big business compradors of English financiers, ruled in close collaboration with Great Britain. Similarly, the Syrian National Bloc, the bourgeois front, being primarily an anti-French formation, lost its cohesion shortly after the French evacuation, and governed uneasily until 1949.

1936 marked a mile-stone in colonial-mother country relations when England found it expedient, with the approach of war, to reaffirm her privileges and exclusive relationship with Egypt in the "treaty of preferential alliance,"; in Syria a pact was concluded with France without its ratification by parliament, and resulted in a near national uprising which was only averted by the outbreak of war. Mass street demonstrations and the rise of paramilitary youth formations, which later were to constitute a base of support and inspiration to the nationalist armies, disturbed the tranquility of the '30s.

The Palestine eruptions of '36-39 against the expansion of the Jewish settlements won Egypt, which had previously been isolationist, to the cause of Pan-Arabism. The solidarity organizations of the student movement, along with the right-wing Muslim Brotherhood swept the Arab states with the message, not only of defense of their Palestinian brothers but of radical change at home.

Britain forcefully restored the occupation of Egypt at the beginning of WW II and invaded Syria and Iraq after the 1941 pro-Axis coup of 'Ali al-Gaylapi. It should be made clear at this point that although there were modest forces inspired by Nazi Germany, such as the fascist Young Egypt and the Parti Populaire Syrian, the majority sentiment of the Arabs did not lie with the axis powers. The philosophy which motivated the masses was "my enemy's enemy is my friend." The Arab masses had experienced only the knout of Franco-British imperialism, and having exhausted

all avenues of compromise, desperately looked for other ways of freeing themselves from the West European yoke, but certainly not to exchange it for that of central European imperialism. On the other hand the ruling circles attempted to curb this anti-imperialist sentiment and channel it into support for their own opportunist jostling between the opposing imperialist camps.

The Egyptian economy had been declining ever since 1925 while the population was steadily on the rise, and the close of the war found an impoverished nation, where, e.g., in 1947 the Egyptian peasants outnumbered the labour needs of agriculture by 47%, and of those employed only 1/3 worked for subsistence wages. The Wafd party, discredited at home, was forceably convened in 1942 only to find it had lost its base of support. In Syria the National Bloc fragmented into the conservative Damascus-based wing of the bourgeoisie, the National Party, and the moderate, pro-Iraqi wing, the Peoples Party. King Farouk stepped forward as the prime exponent of nationalism.

Post-war Arab society was confronted with many of the problems that had spoofed Czarist Russia thirty years before: land reform, an undeveloped industrial sector, foreign domination, absence of bourgeois democracy and liberties, the oppression of such national minorities as the Khurds; and in addition to this it was hampered by the legacy of one-crop economies; such as Egypt's cotton.

What sectors of society possessed the power and will to lead the Arab states out of their dead-end?

- 1) the bourgeoisie - In Egypt this class was composed of three main strata: (a) the landed aristocracy organized politically in the liberal Constitutional Party. This was the largest stratum of the capitalist class. It had concentrated in its hands the greater part of Egyptian land in vast estates employing millions of share-croppers and agricultural proletarians. Any attempted land re-distribution would entail their expropriation, and they depended upon British troops to stave off the land-hungry peasants. It was clearly in their interests to maintain the status quo. (b) the compradores, whose political expression was the Saadist Party. These were native appointees of British finance capital. They owed their station to this powerful overlord, and had neither the courage nor the desire to oppose British interests. (c) the national bourgeoisie, represented by the Wafd Party. Along with the compradores

this tiny group owned some enterprises employing a small but aggressive working class. To wage war against imperialism and arm the workers would be suicide, since the latter would have every reason to raise demands of their own that would challenge capitalist rule in its own factories. Besides this, all three strata were bound through family ties, overlapping investment, and each in turn had financial ties with the Palace.

In Syria the bourgeoisie were split between the National Part of Damascus, representing the big capitalists, semi-feudal landed aristocracy, and the traditional tribal and religious bosses on the one hand; and the Peoples Party, speaking for the interests of industrial Aleppo capital.

Iraq was ruled, directly by a monarch and a small clique of oil sheiks, indirectly by Britain.

- 2) the petit bourgeoisie - (a) the peasantry: although numerically strong and desperately longing for land reform, their social weight was weak due to their wide geographic dispersal, their atomization and isolation on little plots of land, their insecurity as they struggled daily to keep themselves from bankruptcy, and their marginal contribution to the production of the economy as a whole. They had risen both in 1881 and 1919 to the call of the army and the Wafd, but exhibited no momentum, no direction of their own. (b) tradesmen, craftsmen, the intelligentsia: their role in the economy was also peripheral, and they were apt to follow the strongest leadership. They had close contacts with the army rank-and-file.
- 3) The working class and its allies - (a) the urban proletariat: although small, the industrial workers were concentrated in the major centers where the military-bureaucratic apparatus reposed. Many of them were organized in unions and affiliated to one or another leftist associations. In Iraq and Saudi Arabia they were strategically located at the source of production of that vital commodity oil. (b) the agrarian worker: this segment of society constituted the largest single aggregate of individuals. The descendants of peasants deprived of their land and compelled to sell their labour power on the agricultural market, as well as former serfs still oppressed by residues

of Feudalism; they constituted the link between the urban workers and the peasantry. They were concentrated on large latifundias, and having in their collective experience social production, could in large part prove sympathetic to the socialist program of the traditional proletariat.

Alongside these classes were national and religious minorities, such as the Khurdish people, the Druzes and Beduin, who could play a limited role in the emancipation of the Mideast.

It is instructive to observe the role of the working class parties in the unfolding struggle for power. Unlike Europe, Asia and Latin America, the Marxist movement has yet to establish deep roots in the Mideast. This is due largely to the errors and betrayals of the Third International. The years 1919-20 saw the appearance of the first Communist parties in Turkey, Palestine and Egypt. Deeply impressed, but equally confused by what had taken place in Russia, they blindly adopted the schema of building mass proletarian parties in their respective homelands. Their sectarianism lead to dissolution in Turkey and Egypt (the country most devoid of Arab nationalism in the 20's).

After the bureaucratization of the Comintern, and Stalin's rightward turn in 1935 the Communist parties deleted their socialist demands from their program, as well as their enmity towards Islam and became the most vociferous of the Mideast social patriots, mouthing the most undiluted form of nationalism. The temporary alliance between the USSR, France and England for the duration of WW II, lead the CP to shift its previous stance and unequivocally, uncritically support the allied war effort, which included Anglo-French occupation of the Arab states.

Their resultant unpopularity was broken again after the war, as Stalin's erstwhile allies turned on him and the cold war was carried into the Mideast. The CPs converted their war-time "popular front" into a post war "anti-imperialist front", arguing for the unity of all "without any distinction as to class, politics or religion" against colonialism abroad and "feudalism" at home, (these feudalists had for years been engaged in buying and selling land). Due to the prestige of the Soviet Union and the innocuous and "safe" nationalism of the CPs, they experienced a revival, this time establishing themselves in Iraq, Syria and Lebanon, and shifting their base of support from the working class to the intelligentsia. They proclaimed the bourgeois revolution was on the agenda, but proscribed for it the leadership of the

national bourgeoisie. For reasons explained before, the bourgeoisie wanted the last thing in the world to initiate a revolution with a future not at all promising for them.

In Syria and Iraq another major socialist party played an important role in Mideast politics. The Ba'athist ("Resurrectionist") party was formed in the 1930's by a circle of Syrian intellectuals who had been fellow travelers of the CP but were disturbed by conditions in Soviet Russia and the zig-zags of the Stalinized Comintern. They were before all else Arab nationalists, who called for the formation of a single Arab state encompassing the entire Mideast, and they came closest to articulating the aspirations of the Arab masses. The Ba'ath held further a somewhat romanticized often mystical connection between the realization of such a nation and the acquisition of political freedom and socialism by the "People," including the capitalists. Although deriving their support mainly from the students, the Ba'ath attempted to speak for what they felt were the interests of the working class. Over the years the Ba'ath established close relations with a section of the Syrian and Iraq armies, and participated in a number of bourgeois cabinets.

To complete the political spectrum, the right wing was represented in the religious guise of the Muslim Brotherhood, which had chapters in most of the Mideastern states, and in the paramilitary guise of the fascist Parti Populaire Syrien, with branches in Lebanon and Syria. The latter organization, along with the Ba'athists had a base in the Syrian army, though the influence wielded by the PPS there was far inferior to that of Ba'ath.

The army, both in Egypt and Syria, was different in certain aspects from, for instance, those of 20th century Latin America. The army was not exempt from the Nationalist radicalization of society as a whole. Syrians looked with pride upon their nationalist army, "secondary school boys flocked to enroll at the Homs Military College, which became a nursery for nationalist, politically-minded officers." Recruits came from such areas as the militant, radical youth organizations, while the upper layers were filled by members of large, influential families the lower ranks were swelled with the sons of the nationalist minded petty-bourgeoisie and the peasantry. Generally the organized right wing eschewed the army, leaving it open to the transmission of leftist ideas and tendencies. The army was early enamored by the achievements of the mechanized West and sought Arab society to emulate "Modernism." Finally, the privileged upper echelons of the army

were bureaucratically denied to the exasperated rank-and-file. These are some of the outstanding features that endowed the army with the potential to play a decisive role for a whole stage in the unfolding of the socialist revolution.

The final ingredient essential to an appreciation of the dynamics of the Arab revolution was the Palestine struggle. Analogous to the Catholic society of medieval Europe, in which corporate identity was defined in terms of religion rather than nationality, the Islamic Empire was in more than words just that: an empire of the Muslim religion. In spite of their east Asian origins the ruling Turkish people had been accepted by the Arabs as brother of the faith, part of the Islamic world. There was no strong sense of a national state. The Arabs were one people, just as the Germans or the French were one people. But as the source of Arab oppression was traced to the Turkish Mamluks, and the collaboration of the Turkish sultan with the Jewish community in the displacement and persecution of the Palestinian Arabs became shockingly evident, the idea that the Brotherhood of Arabs should rightfully supersede that of Muslims, crystallized in the Mideast. It was not that the Arabs bore the Jewish people any inherent hatred (Baghdad, Cairo, and Aleppo were some of the oldest and most prominent Jewish communities in the world), but they viewed with alarm the massive invasion by this essentially European element, which was transforming an Arab land into an outpost for British colonialism, unabashedly siding with whatever power currently ruled the Mideast. The Jewish boycott of Arab goods and labour and ultimately the expulsion of the Palestinians, verified their suspicions. Out of a feeling of elementary national solidarity, and fear lest they suffer a similar fate, the Arab masses reluctantly entrusted the conduct of the 1948 War to their ruling classes. (These very governments refused the Palestinian refugees entry into their own countries.)

The stunning defeat endured by the Arab armies exposed the political incompetence of the bourgeoisie, the nepotism and corruption in the army and state bureaucracies. It also brought home the concrete need for Arab unity. The Ba'ath brought the students out on strike, a political crisis matured in the Parliaments, strikes and uprisings spread through the Mideast. The 1st military government was set up in Syria in 1949 by Colonel Husni-al-za'im, in a bloodless coup that had the overwhelming support of the people. This was not due to the strength of the army so much as to the weakness of the constitutional government. "The movement which carried Za'im to the presidential palace was powered by the rise of radical pressure groups

and political agitators on the left who undertook the political education of the young, in the army as outside it, giving them a new view of politics and wider ambitions for the Arabs in general." What followed for the next 9 years were successions of coups d'etat and military rule in Syria, interrupted now and then by the restoration of constitutional government, usually led by the People's Party, which first became an empty shell and later a political absurdity as it totally discredited itself by an inability to cope with any of the pressing problems of bourgeois society.

Another feature of the pre-1958 years, was the political tug-of-war between Egypt and Iraq to bring Syria under their sway. The Syrian army was opposed to unification with Iraq since this would entail subordination to the Iraqi crown and the exchange of the French yoke for that of the British. The eventual outcome was the amalgamation of Egypt and Syria to form the UAR, which became the Egyptian yoke around the Syrian neck. In any event, these international machinations substituted as a bizarre character of the desire of the Arab masses for unity.

In 1952 Farouk's Egypt met its denouement. The free officers, which set the masses in motion. A vast wave of workers' strikes swept the nation and a rash of political involvement inundated every pore of Egyptian society. The peasants attacked the large estates; yet, from the very outset the military regime showed its true colors, when it brutally crushed in blood a strike that took place in Kafr-Al-Dawwar, at the Anglo-Egyptian factory. Colonels Naguib and Nasser had no intention of tolerating any manifestation of independent mass action. The officers saw in their horizon only the perspective of building a strong, stable capitalist state in Egypt, that would entice foreign governments to invest in its future. Though land reform would have to be carried out, though reforms were imperative, the army was determined to confine the "Revolution" well within the boundaries of capitalist property relations, and resolved never to loosen the reins: industrialization, yes; workers power, no.

The quintessence of the military regime was Bonapartism; i.e., the army, being the only organized political force in a society in which the political parties had come to lose their popular bases of support, had come to be meaningless, assumed an illusive omnipotence by carefully balancing between the contending classes and between layers of the same class, at the same time as it attempted to uphold bourgeois property relations.

The Nasser regime began its maneuvers with an alliance with the small industrial capitalists, their common goal being the

creation of a modern bourgeois economy. To do so large sums of capital had to be invested in heavy industry. However, the only section of the bourgeoisie which could marshall such large sums was the landed bourgeoisie, and it obstinately refused to channel its funds into such a project. Then foreign capital was reluctant to invest in a country with an unstable government. The solution of this problem was thought to lie in proving the efficacy of Egypt for foreign investment, while undermining the agricultural social foundation of the landed aristocracy through compensated expropriation of lands, prodding it into purchasing factories, oil equipment, textil mills, etc.

On the political level Nasser's revolutionary command council, with the support of the masses, moved against the old regime, dissolved the political parties, banned the constitution and created the Liberation Rally, which was to be the political expression of the new relationship of forces. A month after Kafr Al-Dewwar the army decreed the 1st in a series of land reform laws, which proved to be weak. Alterations were made in 1961 to improve the lot of the Fellah (peasant) somewhat, but no attempt was made to expropriate the capitalists nor to collectivize the scattered parcels of the small holders. The nature and structure of agricultural production remained bourgeois.

When the landed capitalists proved intransigent, Nasser looked to other sources of capital. First he nationalized the Bank Misr, the National Bank of Egypt and Insurance Companies, using their funds to expand the public sector. To make Egypt more attractive for investment he simultaneously arrested and imprisoned the CP, and stamped down on labor unions. Prospects looked good in 1954 when the British withdrew from the Suez Canal and negotiations opened up between the U.S. and Egypt on construction of the Aswan Dam. But when Nasser urged the U.S. to provide Egypt with military material as a ballance to Israeli military might, the U.S. stalled and Nasser did an unprecedented thing — he turned to the Czechs. When the USSR then offered to finance construction of the Aswan Dam, the U.S. rejoined with a proposal that she would finance the dam in Egypt agreed to certain "concessions" along the lines of the English in 1982. Nasser responded by nationalizing the Suez Canal Company, thereby initiating the era of so-called "neutrality," which process what accelerated by the tri-power occupation of the canal in 1956.

In 1958, the Ba'ath-promoted plan of a Syrian-Egyptian merger occurred, and although Nasser was reluctant to associate with Syria put preferred instead a military alliance, he emerge as senior partner in UAR, which provided an outlet for Egyptian

bank investments. Then on July 14th came the Iraqi coup which brought the "left" officers to power, established a republic, and provided a constitutional alternative in the fertile crescent. Inspired by the Iraqi coup an insurrection took place in Lebanon and Jordan. Under King Faisal's Iraq, ¼ of all babies died at birth, while another ¼ never lived to the age of 5. The revolutionary regime cut rents and prices on essential commodities and instituted a tax on the lands of the sheiks. (Similar reforms had been carried out in the UAR.)

At the same time the government gave assurances to the imperialist powers that Iraq Petroleum Co. would not be nationalized. By 1959 the UAR was dissolved.

Beginning in 1961 with the promulgation of the laws of nationalization, all banks, heavy industry, insurance and key economic enterprises had 51% state ownership. In 1960 the 1st of two 5-year plans was inaugurated, and a so-called Arab Socialist Union was set up as a rally for the regime.

It is my opinion that Egyptian society had become simply "state capitalist," not in that the state itself has become the sole capitalist, but that the state is being employed as a tool for administering the capitalist system. Economic planning is still based on private enterprise "and is loosely regulated by market requirements." The land remains untouched by Nationalizations and the state capitalist sector relies on German and American support. Many of the same capitalists who previously owned those nationalized enterprises have been assimilated into Nasser's military-bureaucratic apparatus and are now "managers" of those very corporations. Other capitalists were compensated for nationalizations.

Nasser's "cooperative socialism" as he calls it, is simply a demagogic device to appeal to the pro-socialist sentiments of the masses, his edifice rests on the edifice of capitalist society.

The June War of 1967 overwhelmed Egypt and brought about what should have been the demise of Nasser's regime. According to Anouar Abdel-Mauk, "the only thing that prevented a right-wing coup was 2½ million Egyptians have suffered under Nasser they refuse to grant the imperialist powers the satisfaction of a bourgeois sponsored right-wing takeover."

But a new force stepped on to the international political arena in June '67. The Palestinian Liberation Movement led by Al-Fatah and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine was able to inflict casualties on the Israeli troops, and have subsequently built a powerful guerilla force which has won the allegiance

of the Palestinians and the enthusiastic support of the masses of Arabs in spite of severe repression by the Lebanese, Jordanian and Iraqi governments. The credo they preach is armed revolution, at the same time realizing the necessity of cooperating with anti-Zionist and anti-imperialist Jews and Arabs within Israel to form a revolutionary bi-national state in Palestine.

Al-Fatah has come a long way since its formation in 1956. Having emerged in 1963 from the Nasser dominated Arab League and with leading figures as King Husein of Jordan (who annexed to his reactionary kingdom a goodly portion of former Arab Palestine, the recent paroxysm in Lebanon has demonstrated the explosive combination of the exiled Palestinians in alliance with indigenous Arab citizens. It has also exposed the equivocal role Nasser must play to keep this potentially revolutionary torch from the flammable Egyptian masses, while still paying lip service to the revolution for which the Egyptians tolerate Nasser.

The decade of the '70's will witness the entry of the workers and peasants themselves on to the political arena. Neither the reactionary autocrats of Jordan and Saudi Arabia, nor the "progressive" states of Syria and Egypt have had any success in meeting the fundamental needs of the people. Although as Marxists we encourage and support the resistance that Nasser has put up to the imperialists and his calls for Arab unity while clearly distinguishing between the revolutionary anti-imperialism of the masses and the Sukarno type vacillations of the petty-bourgeois nationalists, we realize that imperialism will not only be driven out of the Mideast by the resolute armed struggle of the workers and peasants, that a meaningful unification of the Mideast on the basis of equality can be carried out only by the admixture of the peoples themselves, not by the formal agreements of their ruling classes. Further, the productive energies of the nation can only be released and effectively organized by the collective workers through their own democratically run unions and councils. We want workers control over the planned economy. We want planning for use instead of profit. Nothing less than the total expropriation of the Latifundias and their collectivization can supply the solid agricultural foundation required for industrial expansion.

The seeming neutralism of the Egyptian, Syrian, and Iraqi regimes can be attributed in large part to the weakness of imperialism on a world scale as well as to the aid extended them by the workers states. However, as the Palestinians independent revolutionary action, benefiting from the lessons of the Chinese, Cuban, and Algerian revolutions, deepens, the military

regimes will view the revolution with increasing hostility. This will widen the breach between the petty-bourgeois nationalists in general and the masses. Secondly, as the Palestinian struggle deepens the U.S. will doubtlessly be forced into a Mideast war on the side of Israel. Clearly in order to preserve and lead the Arab revolution to victory an international Bolshevik party is desperately needed.

In ejecting the Palestinians from their homeland, the Israelis unconsciously spread revolutionary ferment to Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, and pockets in Saudi Arabia, Yemen, and Egypt. The revolution is profoundly international in both form and content, and is destined to break out of the Mideast and flow into Africa through the North African Arab states.

The establishment of sections of the 4th International in every Arab state can be best promoted at this time by the YSA, through establishing fraternal ties with Arab left emigres, in particular the thousands of Arab students in the U.S.A. We must help to educate the American people, and prove our support to the Arab radicals by promoting their speakers, publicizing and building demonstrations and forums, and collaborating with other organizations of like mind throughout the world. The British Palestine solidarity committees are examples of the sort of united fronts which we must engage ourselves in.

It will also be necessary to saturate the Arab Students Association, the PLO and other Arab societies with the ideas of Trotskyism. Already in the US there has understandably been an influx of Mao-cult and ultra-leftism into some of the activities that have taken place, such as the Columbia teach-in last year. At the same time as our ideas will help to build a movement in solidarity with Palestinian Liberation that enjoys overwhelming support of the American people, we will win students to a Marxist-Leninist program, who can form nuclei of the 4th International in their respective homelands.

New York
December 8, 1969

OHIO REGIONAL ORGANIZING

by

Rich Finkel

This September there was much discussion in the Cleveland YSA as to the possibilities of committing a comrade to do full-time regional organizing. With the financial help of the Cleveland SWP branch we were able to begin regional work despite its drain on our resources. The importance of this commitment is now clear: during the past three months we have helped to establish four new YSA locals, in Columbus (Ohio State U.), Athens (Ohio U.), Oxford (Miami U.), and Lexington, Ky. (U. of Ky.) and bring comrades into the YSA from Dayton and Toledo.

Throughout the fall on campus after campus we saw a tremendous growth of the anti-war movement and a deepening radicalization. Several Moratorium Committees were more than willing to sponsor my talk and agreed on the need for a basic transformation of American society. On campuses where I spoke before large lecture classes, SDS had in general disintegrated in Ohio with only a few Weathermen and small RYM II chapters remaining at some of the major universities. Above all there was interest in radical change and we were able to contrast the YSA's political program and methods of organizing to SDS's adventurism and sectarianism.

We spent the first month of the school semester helping the already existing locals and doing trailblazes to establish contacts. I now feel, however, that we should have immediately begun a speaking tour to help provide a consistent income from the region. We initiated a regular newsletter for the comrades throughout the region and answered all the back correspondence that the N.O. had informed us of. For the speaking tour on "Revolutionary Change and the Radical Movement" we mimeographed leaflets that comrades and contacts could use in building the meetings.

On campuses where we had no contacts I would generally try to find the leaders of the anti-war movement and explain to them that we were trying to set up a local YSA chapter. They would usually arrange for a YSA literature table, introduce me to students interested in revolutionary socialism and help set up and publicize a

future meeting for the speaking tour.

On some campuses where we had contacts or at-large members, we were able to help establish locals. During my first trip to Miami of Ohio two contacts, who had just worked to set up an SMC, joined the YSA. They then set up a meeting for the speaking tour and from that meeting we were able to establish a YSA local. At Ohio University where we had one at-large comrade we placed an ad in the school paper announcing a meeting to form a YSA chapter. Over thirty students came to this meeting and we were able to set up a local of 13 comrades at O.U.

The regional newsletter had been important in keeping comrades informed of our national and state-wide activities, and the regional office is used to keep records of YSA minutes, leaflets, and press releases, to answer inquiries, and to send copies of leaflets from one local to the other locals in the region.

Finances is also an important aspect of regional work. School honorariums, monthly sustainers from YSA locals in the region, and contributions from sympathetic professors can be arranged at most schools. Profit from literature sales can also help the regional work in financing itself.

Our recent regional conference in Cleveland (Dec. 6-7, with 13 different areas in Ohio, Ky. and western Penna. represented) was also an important step forward for the Ohio and Kentucky YSA. At the conference comrades from throughout the region were able to meet, attend the major speeches, and discuss their experiences and problems in workshops. Coordination of the 1970 Socialist Campaigns in Ohio was projected and plans were tentatively laid for holding the next Ohio-Kentucky-western Pennsylvania regional YSA conference in Columbus during late February next year.

Cleveland
December 11, 1969

ON EDUCATION

by

Mark Pollock and Steve Bresler

A revolutionary organization, in order to be effective must meet two mandatory requirements. First, it must present a functional program, an alternative to capitalism. Second, the organization must implement its program in such a way so as to reach the largest possible number of people.

Clearly, the first requirement has been met. The Young Socialist Alliance presents socialism, not merely as an alternative, but as the only system which can be implemented on an international scale. However, the second requirement has not been adequately dealt with. This is due to the fact that the YSA has neglected a very important aspect in the theory of "transitionalism." It is agreed that the organization has properly implemented the idea of the transitional demand. What the organization has failed to achieve is the best possible usage of the transitional program which reaches the greatest number of people.

It is evident that the stage of political struggle we are engaged in is that of education. The YSA confronts this stage through the sales of its two publications, The Militant and the Young Socialist. It is apparent that these two publications communicate on a high level of political consciousness. Unfortunately, the majority of the people have not yet attained this level of awareness. Therefore, the effectiveness of The Militant and the Young Socialist becomes limited in scope.

One must then assume that the educational program of the YSA lacks a broad enough base to reach the majority of the people.

Thus, it can be concluded that the Young Socialist Alliance is in need of a new vehicle of communication to the masses. We call for the formation of a National Committee on Education. It is hoped that out of this committee, a new publication will be created; a publication containing the same type of information found in The Militant and the Young Socialist, but written on the political level of the vast majority of the population, using a vocabulary more comprehensible to these people. It is further desired that this committee research into new avenues of education. Keeping in mind that the people hold our strength, and education holds the people.

San Francisco
December 15, 1969

THE STUDENT GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS AT SUNY BINGHAMTON

by

Gary Wurtzel

Every YSA'er is well acquainted with the theory and practice of revolutionary socialist electoral campaigns. This report is an account of how the Binghamton local carried out such a campaign and what successes and failures followed the election of YSAers to six student government posts including the Presidency.

Background

The State University of New York at Binghamton, Harpur College, is a typical, plastic, almost brand new, tax supported institution. When this year's graduating class entered in 1966 it was an 1,800 undergraduate liberal arts center for the state system. Today it has 4,000 undergraduates, a graduate school including PhD programs, a school of

advanced technology, a nursing school, and a school of continuing education. This expansion, combined with the absence of a traditionally conservative engineering school, and enrollment of over sixty percent from the New York City metropolitan area has created a very liberal, alienated, 'hip' student body.

The other side of the coin is the school's "liberalness:" There is no ROTC, no war research, no social regulations of any kind, no enforcement of laws against the use of drugs (which is ubiquitous). The campus is completely suburban so the sum result is a very alienated very hip student body that is extremely apolitical, almost to a point of being anti-political.

The Campaign

The campaign was successful precisely because it confronted the situation and spoke directly to it. In debates, radio forums, the school newspaper and thousands of mimeographed leaflets, the YSA tried to show that the spiritual malaise and alienation felt by most students was, in fact, a highly political problem. We explained that factory like education was necessary only because the university in capitalist society has one chief concern: to turn our managers for the capitalist system. We showed that competition for grades, while irrelevant to education, was precisely what was needed to produce and place managers in the hierarchical system. We showed that the war, racism, and women's liberation as well as capitalist competition were "on campus" issues, even on our suburban island, by pointing out ---how war spending has resulted in lack of funding and tripling in dorm rooms, huge, impersonal lectures ---how unjust it was that a tax supported institution should have so few third world students and that third world students lacked control over their own education ---how the right of women to control their own bodies was not won in our own infirmary and that a full time gynecologist and birth control devices were not just conveniences for boy friends.

The specific platform we ran on was identical for the most part with the "Program for the Campus Revolt" issued this fall.

The idea that our isolated citadel was directly tied up with capitalist America shook up the six other candidates for president. Some went far to the right, especially on the issue of self-determination for Black students. Others clung to the idea of "student government" as a "government" rather than a vehicle to lead mass struggles. The chief liberal opponent countered with his own anti-war actions (tax resistance and supporting capitalist politicians) as the only authentic anti-war action and condemned the YSA for wanting to make "trouble" that was "ineffective" in either stopping the war or winning student reforms (i.e. our principle of mass action). A member of the Black Student Union ran, but totally neglected the anti-war issue, and a 'hippie' ran.

Whatever happened, we had introduced the ideas of revolutionary socialism to hundreds of people who had never heard that much Marxism before, we countered smear attacks on our position on Palestine, and generally got the entire campus thinking.

On election night there was one of the largest turnouts ever. When the smoke cleared about 2am we got the final word:

YSA by 2 votes.

The Student Government called for a new election because of "irregularities." This time we ran to win. The Black student and the hippie (whose exceptionally low number of votes in the first election indicated a deepening radicalization) supported the YSA. Significantly, the liberal candidate came in third in the initial election, so this second election was viewed as a run off between the far left and the right. 86% of the students voted and the YSA won by a 400 vote margin.

Student Government

Our experiences in student government have ranged from success to dismal failure.

Our biggest success has been SMC. Student Government provided it with unlimited telephone and mimeo facilities. Student government subsidies paid for half of 36 busses to Washington on November 15th. During the two weeks preceding the November 14 strike, the student government office was a center for anti-war activity, especially for high school and junior high school youth who are geographically scattered and isolated from each other. SMC is now aiding local G.E. strikers.

The YSAers in Student Government were able to provide material support for a strike of the (primarily student) dining hall workers.

The presence of YSAers in general has pushed the liberals on student government to more of an activist orientation, in anti-war matters and student reform.

By far the worst facet of winning the student government elections is the fact that though we are a small minority on student government, many students persist in believing that YSA is somehow "in power." When this belief is combined with the illusion that student government, is, in fact, a "government" with real powers, it makes for a wasteful situation in which the YSA must squander efforts on just dislodging this idea.

For those students who view student government as more or less a trade union for students, the presence of the YSA as a minority left-wing faction urging the "union" to lead mass movements makes more sense.

Some mention should be made here of the time factor. Of course, it is understood that student government takes up time. But, in a very liberal school, where "student power" for its own sake has been the rallying cry for years, the committees are countless because no faculty member or

administrator will move without consulting at ridiculous length a token student "representative" (one by-product of this has been to sear the name of the YSA in the hearts and minds of the liberal faculty and administrators who don't like our demand for completely open hearings--The school president told me that he had followed the YSA election campaign closely and ascertained that he believed in "American democracy" but the YSA believed in "Marxist democracy". Obviously.) Obviously.

Conclusions

If there are any to be drawn at this time they are:

- 1) The election campaign built the local more quickly than a brand new local might otherwise be able to do.
- 2) It moved other student leaders much more to the left.
- 3) It got many students thinking about capitalist society and Marxism.
- 4) It resulted in the idea of the united front and mass, open decision making meetings being accepted by all tendencies.
- 5) It materially aided the anti-war movement to a great extent, and other movements as well.

Binghamton, N.Y.
December 15, 1969

WOMEN'S LIBERATION - A NEW AREA OF RADICALIZATION

by

Toba Leah Singer

This contribution results from the experience and lessons of the Boston local's participation in Women's Liberation.

The history of our movement in relation to what was formerly known as "The Women Question" helps us a great deal in the educational aspect of our establishing credentials as leaders in the Women's Liberation Movement. The contributions of Evelyn Reed, as a Marxist anthropologist, the forums, which we held in periods when women's liberation was considerably less popular than it is presently, delineate two important factors:

1) The Trotskyist Movement has propagandized for progressive legislation and consideration of women in periods when our opponents have consciously assumed incorrect positions.

In the thirties, the Moscow Stalinists had taken certain progressive steps in the education of women. (Today 75% of physicians in the U.S.S.R. are female.) But concurrent with these advances, the rising bureaucracy in the Soviet Union forced many reactionary postures to be taken by the C.P. leadership regarding the women's function in the home. Many of the victories for the emancipation of women which had been outlined by Lenin and won through the revolution were cut back and denied the culmination of which, was Stalin's prize, awarded to the Soviet woman who reproduced the greatest number of children.

Today, we find the Communist Party - U.S.A. working, in of all things, women's liberation. Several of the leadership of Boston's Cell 16 are ex-DuBoisers. The basis on which these women quit the DuBois Clubs was not necessarily their disagreement with the C.P. line but rather, with the bureaucracy in the C.P. which apparently thwarts female leadership. While these women stand in subjective opposition to the C.P. politically and organizationally many of their methods of dealing with opposing views and disagreements are identical with the Stalinists'. The Y.S.A. and S.W.P. presents itself (with our traditions of democratic procedure and our catalogue of reading material on anthropology) as a formidable foe to these Stalinist elements. Consequently, many Boston women have turned their attention toward S.W.P.-Y.S.A. educationals on Women's history.

Progressive Labor (through the Worker-Student Alliance) takes a position on Women's Liberation similar to its posi-

tion on Black Nationalism. It merely substitutes "Fight hard against male chauvinism" for its famous and impotent "Fight hard against racism." P.L. suggests that implementation of this slogan lies in "convincing men that male chauvinism is bad." P.L. is opposed to waging struggles around demands and hence, plays a less than innocuous role in Women's Liberation in Boston.

2) The second aspect reflecting the importance of our movement's history in Women's Liberation is precisely that history itself. Our past contributions on the Women Question prove that we are not opportunistically jumping on this bandwagon (as have P.L. and the C.P.) demanding a free ride. When Comrade Gustie Trainor gives a class on the History of Women, he can point to her successful experience during the forties, organizing around the various forms of oppression confronting women in the shops. This contrasts sharply with the more petty-bourgeois and impressionistic rhetoric offered by much of the present leadership of Women's Liberation. Those women who are becoming political for the first time are radicalizing much more quickly than those who for example, first came around the Anti-War Movement. This is because the contradictions of capitalism are much clearer in 1969 than they were in 1965, to the student population. But, it is much easier to explain to these women that working women will not be radicalized by the politics of moral witness and personal liberation (leaving their families, forming collectives, etc.) than it was in 1967 to explain to sections of the student anti-war movement that students resisting the draft were not going to mobilize massive numbers of G.I.s to end the war. These women are seeking a political solution to women's oppression and objectively need the leadership of a working-class tendency to provide those political guidelines.

The Y.S.A. can fill this need with the adoption of a concrete perspective for Women's Liberation. The time for hammering out this perspective is now, while such sentiment is on the upswing and the potential for recruitment is great.

Our work in Boston has been largely experimental, but much of it has been successful. At Boston University, we set up six demands for the campus which are:

1) The University must drop its

recognition of the Dean of Women's apparatus and set up a Women's Center.

2) The Women's Center should serve the welfare and progress of the students and employees of the University. It must have a gynecological staff. It must have the perspective of recruiting women into fields of education and employment where they have been socially discouraged.

3) Equal pay for equal work.

4) Day care centers should be set up to serve students and employees, where they can send their children with confidence while they work or study.

5) Support the Bill Baird Campaign. (This man is fighting the Crimes Against Chastity statue on the Mass. Books which prevents the dissemination of Birth Control information). Victory in this legal fight will give women access to birth control information.

6) Courses in Female History and self-defense should be made available to B.U. women.

We welcome all women who wish to work with us, on the basis of these demands, in an independent committee, to do so.

In addition, Comrade Trainor gives classes on the History of Women and become established as an educator in Women's Liberation in Boston. In our classes we have projected special reports by a suffragette on the Suffrage Movement and by a Black woman on the History of Black Women. I have been writing a series of articles for the Boston University NEWS which has met with extremely favorable response. We also intend to incorporate classes and forums on Women's Liberation into our regional traveling activities.

We have taken into account the success of the Jenness campaign in Atlanta and expect to propagandize around Women's Liberation in any campaign which we run in Massachusetts.

Women constitute 50% of the population of the United States. It was a strike of women workers which detonated the General Strike leading to the Russian Revolution. In the Boston local, men outnumber women three to one.

When women are radicalizing rapidly around issues which affect their own lives, as well as around the questions of the War, the Black Struggle, and electoral politics, it should be among the tasks of the Y.S.A. to correctly orient itself toward this radicalization, to actively recruit these women to revolutionary socialism and to develop them, along with the other disenfranchised sections of the population, into cadre capable of leading an American Revolution.

Boston
December 15, 1969

AMENDMENT TO THE BLACK LIBERATION RESOLUTION

REEXAMINE THE BLACK PANTHER PARTY

By

Jim Fine

In the section dealing with the evaluation of the Black Panther Party, there are some serious discrepancies in analyzing the political practice of the BPP and our position on black nationalism and self-determination.

If we as a revolutionary socialist organization recognize that the black people in this country are indeed a national minority and that they can legitimately struggle for self-determination, then we are committing serious mistakes in our analysis of the BPP. While many of the present difficulties of the BPP can be attributed to their ultra-left rhetoric, this cannot, as the Resolution indicates by its overemphasis on this point, account for the BPP's apparent demise as a major factor in the black liberation struggle. By recognizing the unique condition of the black community and the national oppression that it suffers, this should enable us to establish a separate, though parallel, criterion in evaluating the BPP.

Thus when the resolution states "...the political evolution of the Panthers parallels the political evolution of the now splintered and shattered SDS..." seemingly on the basis of the similarity of rhetoric, it ignores the realities of what constitutes political struggle in the black community as differentiated from what constitutes political struggle in a white radical student group (SDS). SDS did not parallel, but true to their externalizing their own struggle (NLF, BPP, etc.), they followed behind the BPP aping its rhetoric and issuing proclamations of support with little concrete practical results. This following behind or using other struggles as a substitute for evolving their own political program largely accounts for SDS's sorry record of abstaining from the antiwar movement.

The Black Panther Party largely symbolically relied on the "theory of the gun;" this did not appear in the abstract but was a response to the humiliating conditions imposed on the black community by the occupying power, dubbed the "Pigs."

The climate of fear and oppression in the black community has been maintained by force and the BPP sought to challenge this force by counterposing the idea of community self-defense. The uniforms, guns, discipline, and, yes, the red book, were means of unifying a disorganized and demoralized community.

The YSA singles out ultra-left rhetoric as a contributing factor but these other "symbols" can also be identified as the source of the BPP's present difficulties. The breakfast for children program came too late to offset the viscious propaganda that the capitalist press, based on these symbols, used against the Panthers. The present crisis and the possible demise of the BPP, however, cannot be explained by only BPP "mistakes."

As a national minority, the black people's experience with democratic rights has and continues to be tenuous. The BPP reflected the community's distrust for the occupier's court system and instead placed emphasis on the "theory" of armed struggle. That they ignored until too late the possibilities of using the united struggle, however, cannot be denied. Now the government, in a concerted nationwide effort, is liquidating the Panthers. Community support for the Panthers will mount but at the price of many lives of courageous black revolutionaries.

But for us, at this time, to put forth a shallow analysis of the Panthers ignoring the real differences between black and white America is doing a disservice to the movement. It opens the way for the capitalist press to seize upon every opportunity to discredit the Panthers as did Ken Hartnett and John S. Lang, AP writers, when they quoted from the YSA "internal" bulletin: "...the Panthers' reliance on ultra-left rhetoric puts them on the outer limits of political reality." These writers state that white radicals are appalled by such rhetoric and imply that we do not support the Panthers.

The section in the discussion bulletin on the Panthers requires some serious re-evaluation, both as to the analogy to SDS and the reasons stated for the Panthers' crisis. The government will undoubtedly succeed in destroying the Panthers, but many of the Panther members will escape to rebuild a new party. YSA, if it is to be a major factor in the struggle for black liberation must acquire a deeper understanding of the origins and the role of the Black Panther Party.

Gainesville, Florida

December 17, 1969

FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS ON THE ANTIWAR REPORT

by

Linda and Jim Fine

The antiwar movement has come to an historic crossroad. It is now a mass movement predominantly of youth but with increasing effects on other sectors of society. The entry of various groups and organizations will, as the antiwar bulletin suggests, deemphasize YSA's leadership role but will increase YSA's responsibility to struggle for the continuation of an independent, mass-based, antiwar movement.

However, in the struggle for an independent and non-exclusionary position, YSA will need added strength from the left and from "independent" radicals. November 15 showed to some degree that there is a mass of radical youth totally unorganized and uncommitted to any particular program. The Justice Department march "organized" opportunistically by Yippies, RYM, etc. had, despite almost no preparation, a large turnout. We can criticize this method of SDS-RYM and SDS-PL of letting others build mass mobilizations and getting the people there so they can have their "actions" as opportunistic; but we must deal with the reality that these actions (e.g. Justice Department, Department of Labor) are the beginning of a new type of mobilization.

The question is do we just write it all off as ultra-left and ignore the thousands of largely unorganized youth who showed up for these actions or do we, as a revolutionary youth organization, decisively intervene.

The YSA is currently the best organized radical youth group with strong influence within the largest antiwar student organization in the country (SMC). It would be a mistake, however, to ignore that increasing mass of radicalized students by having them exposed only to the sectarianism of RYM-II and SDS-PL in these situations. Yet and understandably, our involvement in building SMC has prevented us from also projecting ourselves as a revolutionary socialist youth organization. In the coming struggles against the right of the antiwar movement, YSA, in addition to struggling for non-exclusion and the independence of the antiwar movement, should decisively intervene in struggles on its own and in any future "Justice" Department.

This is not advocating isolation from the antiwar movement for that would be disastrous, but is insisting that the only way our political position on the antiwar movement can be

maintained is by broadening the antiwar movement's involvement in other aspects of society. SMC's program is heading in that direction but SMC could not, without breaking the united front concept, push for a demonstration at the Justice Department.

But YSA while still involved in building the mass mobilization would also build for specific actions using this as a vehicle for educating the non-YSAers and as the cutting edge of differentiation between those who use the antiwar movement to support a "liberal peace" candidate and those who see the antiwar movement as a springboard for a genuine revolutionary movement against imperialism in the future. YSA and its supporters would, by organizing such actions, demonstrate its revolutionary perspective, not only by propaganda but also by concrete practice. Needless to say that a YSA organized demonstration at the Justice Department would have had almost entirely different results than that of the fiasco of November 15.

Were the Justice Department participants that different from the People's Park supporters? It was at the People's Park that Peter Camejo gave his brilliant speech on "how to make a revolution in the US." Further "Justice Departments" can see the same kind of YSA participation in providing a revolutionary socialist analysis and perspective. YSA could do this in alliance with other left-wing tendencies who have not fallen into the trap of "confrontation for the sake of confrontation." Such united action would provide a forum for debating different competing approaches to the making of a revolution in America.

It is by this independent position that we can attract the thousands of organizationless radicals. Although many of the people in SDS, all factions, are hopelessly ultra-leftist, that mass of radicals who are in their periphery can be reached. In any event, the problems of November 15 will be a recurrent theme at all mass mobilizations and we would be in serious error if we simply ignored them.

In practice recruitment to YSA from SMC has, in our own situation, progressed rather slowly. There are many reasons for this but two crucial points are our understandable "overinvolvement" in building SMC and, as a result, our lack of independent identity.

The bourgeois wing of the antiwar

movement will resist the tendency of broadening the perspective of the movement and as labor increases its participation, opportunities to establish a solid working class base will increase. However, YSA by itself and in its present strength will find it difficult to resist the onslaughts of the bourgeoisie and will spend much of its energy in combatting them.

Youth who join SMC take up the demand "immediate withdrawal" enthusiastically but a "peace" candidate from a capitalist party can attract such enthusiasm. YSA knows better but the lure of electoral politics for peace candidates, especially under the right-wing Nixon administration,

would perhaps be too great to resist. Thus, it is now that YSA must build a revolutionary cadre through both propaganda work and action. The right wing of the antiwar movement in sheer manpower depends on the SMC and other youth groups and will not risk a break. We have been propagandizing through literature; we have worked by building the successful united front; now we must organize actions at future mobilizations which will identify us as the revolutionary socialist vanguard group of the antiwar movement which, in practice, educates the masses regarding imperialist war-related issues. We cannot afford any more Justice Department Yippie style.

Gainesville, Florida
December 17, 1969

ON RELATIONS WITH THE ARAB STUDENTS IN LOS ANGELES

By

David Frankel

Our experience with the Arab student movement in Los Angeles began in May 1969. Previous to this time we had held a couple of forums on the mideast and the Arab Revolution, and when the Organization of Arab Students organized "Palestine Liberation Week" we were invited to send speakers to rallies and teach-in at Los Angeles City College, U.C.L.A., and the University of Southern California (U.S.C.). Representatives of the SWP and the YSA were also invited as guests to a fund raising banquet which took place that week. Actions during the week took place on at least six campuses and were highly organized and very effective.

The Arab students were very impressed with our speakers and literature. They took bundles of the April '69 YS (with the cover story on the Arab Revolution) to sell at their literature tables, as well as all the pamphlets we had on Zionism. In addition many of them bought subscriptions to our press. One student, the president of the U.S.C. organization, had only a few sub blanks, so he Xeroxed some more.

Subsequent to the actions around Palestine Liberation Week we held a forum at which one of the Arab students spoke with Peter Buch. We also participated in a demonstration with them and the Iranian students against Golda Meier when she came to Los Angeles on her "shopping" visit to the United States.

The relations which we established as a result of these actions have been important in a number of ways. The least of these is that the Arab students are delighted to provide speakers for us at forums and other events, and to help set up meetings for YSA speakers. Also, they not only read our literature and press, but pass it on to their national organization, and thus to various organizations in the Arab world. Finally, we are currently discussing the possibility of organized campus tours in defense of the Arab revolution.

Such opportunities for work with Arab students undoubtedly exist in many other areas of the country, and in carrying out this work it should be remembered that Arab students, like those of other nationalities, are radicalizing very rapidly. The ones which we have encountered are absolutely clear on the nature of Zionism as a political and not a religious movement, and the necessity of fighting against it politically. We have also discussed such questions as Stalinism, the Chinese revolution, the antiwar movement, the colonial revolution as a whole, and the need for Marxist-Leninist parties to lead struggles for national liberation and socialism. Although some illusions about Maoism have been expressed by the Arab students, no other political tendency has shown any interest at all in their action here in L.A.

Los Angeles, California
December 17, 1969

PERSPECTIVES ON A TRANSITIONAL PROGRAM FOR WOMEN'S LIBERATION

BY

Angie Remedi, Ruth Getts, and Laura Miller

A study of Women's Liberation must include an analysis of primitive or pre-class society since it is only with the rise of classes and private property (8,000-10,000 years ago) that women have been relegated to an inferior position to men.

Primitive society was characterized by its communally owned means of production, lack of coercive state apparatus (i.e. army, police) and a matriarchal family unit. "Family" in the modern sense was non-existent but rather was structured around a clan community in which the children were equally provided for by all the adults who were considered the social parents of all children in the community. With society assuming the bulk of the care of children, women were free to participate fully in the social, economic and cultural life of the community. Women's reproductive role, which in class societies provides a basis for degrading women, rendered to women a central position in the clan community.

While the men were occupied with hunting and food gathering, women developed many of the basic tools and techniques for food production and the domestication of animals. Besides horticulture and agriculture, early crafts such as pot-making and textile-making were developed by women who, in turn, passed their knowledge and skills to subsequent generations.

In Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, Engels emphasizes how all societies have rested on "the twin pillars of production and procreation." Evelyn Reed adds that as the "producers of both new life and material necessities of life. . . (women) became the social leaders and governesses of their communities." Since they worked together as producers, shared the caring of children with the rest of society and were not restricted by a ruling class, women were able to play a central role in society as equals.

As agriculture developed, surpluses grew which provided the basis for class society--private property, a ruling class, and the state. With the emergence of private property and the need to determine an heir when the owner dies, came the transition to a patriarchal system. The practice of inheritance through the father originated with the Romans who codified the laws regarding private property and formulated the "patria potesta"

principle or "all power to the father." Thus, explains Reed:

". . . Male domination and power did not come from any superior biological, physical or mental attributes of males over females but from a socio-economic source -- their newly acquired monopoly of property ownership and its transmission through the patriarchal family line. . ."

As Engels puts it, "The first class antagonism which appears in history coincides with the development of the antagonism between man and woman in monogomian marriage, and the first class oppression with that of the female sex by the male." (Origin of the Family) Under capitalism, a highly developed manifestation of class society, the subjugation of women became even more acute. Both law and religion in the western capitalist systems reinforce the idea of women as dependent on men. Women are raised with the notion of their role being solely that of wife and mother and slave to the home. In the media, women's role as consumers rather than producers is constantly emphasized and job opportunities on an equal basis with men are extremely limited. The common practices of giving women only the most menial and lowest paying jobs, paying women less for the same work, using women as a reserve labor force and part-time workers, denying them advancement, upgrading and apprenticeships all net the capitalists billions in profits each year.

The psychological support for oppression of women consists largely in the proliferation of the "feminine mystique" in which the "ideal woman is docile and passive and the "truly fulfilled" woman is a happy wife and mother. Beauty contests, advertisements which exploit a woman's body to sell a product, "playboy" publications and the double standard of morality are obvious forms of the sexual exploitation to which women are subjected.

The only hope for releasing women from their socio-economic chains that have bound them for centuries and unleashing their vast creative and productive potential lies in the establishment of a classless society. Because the subjugation of women arose only with the rise of private property and classes, any struggle for actual liberation of women must be directed towards the elimination of class societies and can be brought about through a transitional program centered around certain basic demands.

Suggestions for demands to be included in a transitional program: Discussion

One of these demands concerns the right of women to control their own bodies. The opposition arguments center primarily around two points: 1) The rights, if any, of the unborn fetus, and 2) the responsibility of women to rest of society (to propagate the species.) Politically it is very important that the Y.S.A. deal effectively with these arguments and continue to support this demand of women as nothing less than a democratic right.

In the first place, discussion over the morality of abortion and the academic question of "When does a fetus become a human being with rights of its own?" diverts attention from the more important objective of Women's Liberation -- that is the maximization of individual freedom and choice for women. At a time when working and middle class women have no legal, easily accessible means to abortion and contraception, it is a pointless exercise in polemics to discuss whether she should use them or not.

Furthermore, at this time, the capitalist ruling class allows no one the opportunity to make independent moral decisions. In addition, it may be pointed out that it is the very institutions which carry on this moralistic argument which have committed the most crimes against unborn children and their mothers by denying this moral choice to individuals. Church and state institutions refuse to revise and liberalize present doctrine and laws on abortion. What's more, these institutions refuse even to liberalize information concerning contraception which would eliminate the need for such a morally distasteful subject as abortion. If more preventive measures were used, the controversial fetus would never develop. As it is, however, millions of women seeking illegal abortion are murdered by quacks and butchers, and millions more babies are born into families and to single women already economically overburdened and unable to care for them. These children must ultimately be cared for through welfare and charitable organizations.

The only alternative women are left with which to control their bodies is abstention -- which has not worked these 8,000 years. By the double moral standard and the chances of biological evolution, then, women are denied human fulfillment and pursuit of sexual relationships with others which men in this society enjoy. It is also obvious that through denying a woman control over her body she is also denied the means by which she could actually be responsible to the society in which she lives. Without counseling in contraception and abor-

tion, it is impossible for a woman to control the number of children she will bring into society to be supported in it. It can be seen that only in a society where each individual controls the means and condition of his own existence can these decisions become moral with a view to the individual's responsibility to his own society. At this point, such moral decisions are summarily made by the ruling class institutions, not only regarding women, but also regarding the imperialist, genocidal war in Vietnam and the racist war at home.

In the second place, and probably more importantly, these arguments also obscure the real political and economic reasons why capitalism simply cannot fulfill these seemingly democratic demands for women. (It is hard to convince a woman that she lives in a democratic society "with freedom and liberty for all" when she cannot even determine the condition of her own body from one day to the next.) In a secondary position, women play key roles for a capitalist system. (Roles which it would be impossible to confine women to if they could control their lives, roles which it would be unnecessary to confine women to under socialism.) Discriminating wages paid to women in industry for menial or the same labor as men provides billions of dollars in profits annually to industry and forms approximately 25% of all manufacturing companies' profits. (Joan Jordan, The Economic Exploitation of Women) The rest of the female population acts as a reserve labor force, to be pushed into industry as the economy demands and to be pushed back into the home when these demands subside. In view of a current encroaching economic recession, it is not difficult to understand the stubborn refusal of state legislatures and university health services to provide the material conditions of women's liberation in the way of birth control and abortion which would only add more women to a labor force which will become increasingly unemployed.

Even in the home, however, women supply enormous amounts of unpaid labor in performing all the tasks necessary to maintain the home and the family. There were 44 million unpaid domestic workers in the United States in 1965: married women keeping house, (Marlene Dixon, "The Restless Eagles: Women's Liberation," Motive Magazine, Mr.-Ap., '69). This is a great service to capitalism and costs it absolutely nothing. In fact, the family unit, as it is structured in our society, is also a great consuming unit which supplies extensive markets for capitalism, and women are the chief consumers for each family unit. (Susan Sutherland, "The Subversion of Betty Crocker," Motive Magazine, Mr.-Ap., '69)

Present day class society is more complex than its early beginnings. Women are no longer oppressed as a class, but are oppressed across class lines as a group, similar to the way in which black people in the United States are oppressed as a group. For this reason, it is necessary to organize independent women's groups around issues concerning the specific needs of women for liberation.

However, the class nature of capitalist society is still the primary obstacle to the liberation of women. Capitalism cannot liberate women from their inferior economic status or allow her alternatives to her roles as wife and mother. If a woman were independent physically, as well as economically, to do as she liked with her life, it is unlikely she would choose to be the alter-ego to a man, or to exclude all other creative and artistic interests from her life in order to care for a house, or to subject herself to the role of an economic tool. To abolish economic discrimination and supply women with access to abortion, etc., would free women from the necessity of seeking support in the family institution or in men. With this condition of necessity gone, the family itself would cease to play its role in support of capitalism, women would cease to play the role of transmitters of such cultural values and herself become a new economic force to be dealt with. This brings up a second suggestion for a transitional program; that is a demand for economic equality for women centered around 1) a salary paid by the state to women performing domestic duties for families and 2) equal pay for equal work already being performed by women.

With women liberated from the slave aspects of their family role, the state would be forced to provide more and more of her services which were previously unpaid. Industry could no longer enjoy the profits from discriminatory wages. More day care centers would be demanded by women desiring to take advantage of such social liberation. Children would again become the responsibility of society instead of economic burdens to individual families. Families would take on different forms and cease to be the pillar of consumption in a capitalist society. All these developments would mean devastating changes for a capitalist economy.

These are the real economic and political reasons why capitalism will not meet the demands of women's liberation. It is not a moral issue over the rights of the unborn fetus or the responsibility of individual women to society. Individual state governments and our federal government which conduct genocidal war on peoples in Vietnam and black people at home are, at best unconvincing when they argue that their main objections

to granting women the right to abortion on demand is an overriding concern for the moral issues involved.

The question of population control.

The main objective of the Women's Liberation movement is the maximization of freedom and choice for all women; only in the mouths of the bourgeoisie does it become a question of population control. The moral arguments are only a facade. Our government has no such squeamish morals when it comes to pushing birth control programs on third world nations where, in some places, the population is increasing at a rate of 3 to 4 times that of the United States. As stated in the '68 senate hearings of the Foreign Aid Expenditures subcommittee of the committee on Government Operations, primary emphasis is placed on providing developing countries with programs to "face up to and overcome their population and growth problems."

The white minority ruling class is observing the decline of its own population in comparison to the "population explosion" of third world countries. According to U.N. study compiled by Goran Ohlin, Population Control and Economic Development, it is projected that even in the year 2000 the population of underdeveloped (super exploited) areas will proceed at a rate 3 times that of developed countries like the United States. The United States' genocidal wars and birth control policies are an attempt to control and correct this ratio. The "growth problems" of third world countries are obviously also the problems of U.S. Imperialism.

While pushing programs for controlling populations in these areas, the policies are somewhat different here in the heartland of capitalism. State and federal government agencies will not move in the direction of liberating women physically and providing freedom of choice, etc.; but, in legalistic ways, these institutions will attempt to regulate and control who has access to abortion and contraception information, when, where, and under what conditions. These programs will be primarily aimed at maintaining the family and the position of women in it (available only to married women or women about to be married, etc.), and poor white and black working classes and minority groups (Indians, Eskimos) as outlined by the '67-'68 Report on family planning issued by the United States Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare. These "programs" make it clear that the demands for Women's Liberation will only cease to be tools for population control and become means of liberation for all women when they are provided for all women on demand regardless of her race,

social class, or marital status.

It is of the utmost importance, then, that the democratic right of women to control over the body and economic equality (i.e. state salary for domestic work, equal pay for equal work) be seriously considered in a transitional program for women's liberation not only because these demands begin to supply the material conditions for physical and economic freedom and independent for women, not only because they will draw support from a wide range of black and white working women and women students and again release women's creative talents for social use, but also because these demands will expose the contradictions and hypocrisy in the social system most blatantly and point to the need for a new, socialist solution to these problems.

Perspectives for Y.S.A.

Our intervention in the budding Women's Liberation struggle here on the campus of Northern Illinois University in DeKalb, Ill. as well as the strong emphasis we place on education on the subject within the local, have given us some concrete ideas about ways in which to facilitate Y.S.A. leadership of the Women's Liberation struggle from here on out, especially on the campus. To begin with, all locals should have Women's Lib. Fractions and each local should plan some type of educational program on the subject for the membership. At this point in the Women's Lib. movement, education is absolutely crucial to both the development of men and women comrades in this area and to the success of Y.S.A. intervention in the movement. In the long run, our leadership of the struggle will depend on our knowledge of the reasons, etc. of Women's oppression and our ability to lend correct political guidance to the ever growing Women's Liberation struggle.

On those campuses where there are no organized Women's Lib. groups, Y.S.A. should begin to organize them. In order to form a Women's Lib. group on our campus, we first intervened in the S.M.C and organized a Women United Against the War caucus within S.M.C. From this caucus came the nucleus of our recently established Women's Lib. Group/ Daughters of the American Revolution II. To our pleased surprise, the women involved in the founding of the group were at a very high political level. This will greatly facilitate our recruitment of the best of the W.L. activists to the Y.S.A.

One of the most important beginning tasks of the new Women's Lib. group is mass education of the campus to the subject. Our projection for the Women's Lib. group in this area is a series of leaflets, forums, guests lecturers, and

mass publicity on the two issues we've decided to organize around: establishment of a free day care center on campus and overturning the reactionary policies of the university health center in the area of birth control. Since these issues are centered around clear demands, and since they already have quite a following on campus, we have a quite optimistic perspective for the success of these struggles in the coming months.

What is needed on a national scale to help lend direction to the movement and also to make it easier for Women's Lib. fractions to organize in this area is a transitional program for Women's Liberation. This program could possibly be structured around the following demands:

- 1) Free public nurseries and child care centers for working mothers and mothers who attend school.
- 2) Planned parenthood centers available to any man or woman.
- 3) Free legal abortions for women on demand regardless of class, racial, social, or marital condition.
- 4) Reorganization of home industry by application of mass production methods.
- 5) Equal economic, social, and educational opportunities for women:
 - a) more apprenticeships for women
 - b) equal pay for equal work
 - c) right to organize
 - d) open admissions to universities and special recruitment of women to colleges and universities.
 - e) an end to tracking systems which channel women into home centered occupations and out of the sciences, politics, and industry.
- 6) Four-hour work days for all men and women so that fathers may regain their lost role and growth experiences with the children.
- 7) Payment of wages to mothers for the bearing and raising of children.
- 8) Special Women's Studies Departments in all high schools and universities in order that women may be written back into the history of mankind and know the origins of their present social roles.

This is just a skeletal outline of demands; as experience in women's liberation struggles adds to our knowledge of the subject, more demands, etc., can be worked out.

It is extremely important that

all comrades understand the Marxist approach to Women's Liberation. Our ability to formulate a clear course of action for the movement, as well as our success in organizing in the movement in our respective areas, now, in the beginning of the struggle, will determine our future position in the Women's Liberation struggle, and, in the long run, our ability to greatly increase the numbers of our cadre by recruiting out of this area of struggle.

Bibliography

- 1) Marlene Dixon, "The Restless Eagles," Motive Magazine, Mr.-Ap.-'69.
- 2) Susan Sutheim, "The Subversion of Betty Crocker," Motive Magazine, Mr.-Ap.-'69.
- 3) Engels, The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State.
- 4) Linda Jenness, "For the Cuban Women the Revolution Means a New World," Militant, Mr. 21, '69.

- 5) Joan Jordan, "The Economic Exploitation of Women" (pamphlet).
- 6) Mary Alice Waters, "Women's Emancipation," Militant, Mr. 21, '69.
- 7) Susan La Mont, "The Movement for Women's Liberation," Militant, Sept. 12, '69.
- 8) Evelyn Reed, "A Marxist Approach to Women's Liberation."
- 9) U.S. Senate Committee on Government Operations: Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures: Population Crisis, '68.
- 10) Goran Ohlin, Population Control and Economic Development, United Nations' Publication.
- 11) U.S. Office of Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs: Report on Family Planning, U.S. Dept. of Health Education and Welfare. '67-'68.

DeKalb
December 17, 1969

REGIONAL REPORT

By

Carl Amedio and Laura Miller

Regional work is a crucial part of our work as revolutionary socialist; we are constantly expanding into new areas of the country, and every new expansion is considered an important breakthrough because it opens up broader opportunities for recruitment to our ranks, which is our ultimate organizational goal. In the past, most regional work has been carried on by those relatively few big city locals which had the money, manpower, and perspective to take on the work. However, as radicalization deepened, more and more large locals began doing recruiting work in their regions. We've reached a stage now where even campus locals are beginning to venture beyond their own town limits to spread the name of the YSA.

Regional work is second in importance only to antiwar work in the general perspective of our campus local. This is due to the fact that: (a) getting the YSA program on to the other campuses in our area of northern Illinois opens up tremendous possibilities for recruitment to and expansion of the YSA; (b) we are a relatively stable local with enough experienced comrades to carry on regional work.

At the beginning of this semester, after our tasks and perspectives, we embarked upon a extensive campaign within the local to broaden our regional contacts, and develop a strategy for regional work. First we established a regional fraction of two people (which eventually was expanded to the present number of seven comrades) which carried our an initial, experimental excursion to Western Illinois University, a large campus about 200 miles from DeKalb.

At WIU we found that no organized political tendency existed. Independent radicals were in the process of building the October 15 moratorium, and in our conversations with several contacts we found that the radical elements on campus were extremely open to our program. Another example of the openness of the campus to revolutionary politics was our literature sales. On our first trip we began selling Militants in the Student Union and were completely sold out in fifteen minutes. During the moratorium itself we sold about 30 subs. By our intervention with our press and political intervention in the October 15 moratorium we were able to recruit two comrades after only one meeting.

After the tremendous success we had at WIU, we decided that our next main

project would be Illinois State University, which is about 130 miles from DeKalb. Our first intervention onto ISU was through a statewide moratorium conference called by the American Friends Service Committee. The conference was very beneficial in several respects. Our comrades successfully countered a RYM II intervention into the conference, and made contacts at several schools throughout the area. More importantly, by proposing a viable alternative proposal of action to the conference, our comrades not only gained prestige for YSA, but exposed RYM II as the sectarian, ultra-left, stalinist organization it really is.

Our above-noted experience with regional work, though extremely limited in scope, has given us good grounds for recommending that other small locals begin doing regional traveling. Regional work is an important area of recruitment; and it is the ability of the YSA to recruit new cadre that will determine the eventual hegemony of our revolutionary socialist program.

If the YSA is to capitalize on the massive radicalization that is taking place nationwide, it is of the utmost importance, that all locals make a serious effort to do regional work. If we cannot reach out to new areas with our program, we are failing in our revolutionary duty. For if we do not recruit, other tendencies will. A perfect example of this is Illinois State University. Two months ago RYM II was non-existent. Since their intervention onto that campus they have developed a hard-core of some 25 people. Many small locals may feel that they do not have the strength to get out on regional trips, that they cannot spare comrades from duties within their own local. We feel that this outlook is not in keeping with the national perspective of the YSA as an organization, and the needs of the radical student movement as a whole. The best insurance for moving the radical youth movement towards the correct revolutionary ends is by building the YSA. We will never do that by sitting at home. The DeKalb YSA has set the perspective for regional work as being equally as important as our antiwar work. We feel this is a correct orientation and urge all locals to take very seriously the importance of regional work.

DeKalb, Illinois
December 18, 1969

THE YSA AND THE WORKING CLASS YOUTH RADICALIZATION

By

Marc Bender, Natalie Bombaro, and Peter Mayer

The introduction of the draft political resolution states: "While this (youth) radicalization began earlier and is still more extensive among Third World and white student youth, it is by no means limited to the campuses. It has had a deep impact on the youth of the Black and Third World Communities; it has effected the youth who are forced into the imperialist armed forces, and it has had an effect on young workers." Unfortunately, because the document does not contain a separate section on radicalization of young workers, there is a tendency to infer that it dismisses working class radicalization as unimportant with regard to the tasks of the YSA in the current period.

If this were a period of mass working class upsurge, then radicalizing workers would be recruited directly to the revolutionary party rather than to the YSA. Because this is not such a period, most of the newly radicalizing young workers who are looking for a revolutionary organization will not be ready to join the party immediately. It is therefore a task of the YSA to make efforts to recruit the best of the workers to its ranks.

Although there is not now an upsurge involving millions of workers, there is a significant battle of the class struggle now going on. The strike against GE is the first national strike to take place in the US during a major war. The fact that the corporation being struck is a major contractor for the war makes the strike even more significant. During previous wars, the government was able to convince the workers to support the war effort by keeping quiet, but workers are now making their demands in spite of the government.

A strike of 147,000 workers clearly involves many young workers. The anti-authoritarian attitude of today's youth is one of the factors which has encouraged the unions not to submit to the government's pressures. The gains made by the antiwar and black liberation movement serve as a model for the labor movement in the coming period. As the only youth organization which consistently builds all three movements, the YSA is in a position to recruit radicalizing young workers to its ranks.

In the coming period the YSA will have more opportunities to reach out to these youth and to draw them into our organization. It is wise to take advantage of these situations by uniting the

workers in our common struggle. Young people today are growing more aware of the links between the antiwar movement, the struggle for black liberation and workers' demands.

A major way in which the YSA will be building the antiwar movement, in addition to strengthening this movement, will be by bringing the trade unions into the antiwar coalitions which will encourage workers to oppose the government in other areas. High school students and GI's will use the talents they develop in the antiwar movement when they enter industry and get involved in labor struggles.

Since the YSA still has a largely student composition, one of the most important ways we can build the labor movement will be by building strike support actions among the students. Unlike other tendencies, we do not (and should not) hand out leaflets urging workers to throw out their union bureaucrats, nor do we spend most of our time calling for "worker-student alliances." Yet there have recently been and there will continue to be opportunities for genuine cooperation between students and striking workers. At San Francisco State, a student strike led to a teacher's strike, and both cooperated with striking oil workers. In DeKalb, YSAers were influential in building student and faculty support for striking university workers. In many cities students have actively expressed support for the GE strikers by interfering with GE recruiters.

The 1970 SWP campaigns offer the YSA an opportunity to educate large numbers of people in the significance of the labor struggles now going on. The campaigns will allow us to contrast our position with the position of the "prolabor" Democratic Party and to show the necessity for a mass labor party.

The YSA's role in the struggle of the working class is summed up in the conclusion of the draft political resolution: "It is the young militants of this generation who, together, with the vanguard party will provide the leadership for the American working class in the most decisive event in human history -- The Third American Revolution.

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
December 19, 1969

AN ANSWER TO SOME CRITICISMS OF THE NEC DRAFT ANTIWAR RESOLUTION

by

Susan LaMont

Among the various contributions to the pre-convention discussion there have been two important ones which contain substantial criticisms of our antiwar work: the "Contribution to National Discussion of the Draft Antiwar Resolution," by six comrades in the Madison local, and an amendment entitled "Further Considerations on the Antiwar Report," by Linda and Jim Fine of Gainesville. While the two are by no means identical, they raise some of the same basic questions, and it is helpful to discuss them both at the same time.

There are essentially three things which need to be clarified. One is the current state of the antiwar movement, the existing relationship of forces, our role and the role of the SMC. Second is the Justice Department demonstration and our attitude toward it. And third is the suggestion that the YSA should push the demand "Support the Vietnamese Revolution" as "our" slogan within the antiwar coalition.

Current Stage of the Antiwar Movement

One of the most striking things about the contribution from the six Madison comrades is the predominately pessimistic tone. Far from being inspired and reinvigorated by the fact that the YSA and SWP played a decisive role in organizing the most massive political demonstration in American history, one aimed squarely against the most vital needs of America's rulers, they seem uneasy and uncomfortable with the role we played. It's as if they're not sure, but think maybe real revolutionaries should not have been the key leaders in a demonstration of a million people most of whom were not even anti-imperialist in their consciousness, much less Marxists.

The six Madison comrades mention some of the problems we will have to deal with as a result of the tremendous growth of the antiwar movement, and then add, in a way that makes it seem almost like an afterthought, "Fortunately, the qualitative expansion of the antiwar forces harbors positive prospects as well." The main advantage, they seem to think, is that YSAers will not have to do so much antiwar work.

Everything is turned on its head. What is the real relationship of forces that we will face in coming months in the antiwar movement?

Any comrade who thinks we will now have less work to do in keeping the antiwar movement on the path of mass actions for the immediate withdrawal of troops, and

independent of the capitalist political parties, is sadly mistaken. The bigger the movement become, and the more successful its actions, the higher the stakes are. Our opponents realize that all too well, and their attempts to derail the movement will become even more determined. This is doubly true of our central enemy--the American ruling class.

One need only look at the results of the most recent meeting of the New Mobe steering committee to see what kind of a fight lies ahead. We can be sure this fight will be carried over into the SMC as well.

It has been almost axiomatic throughout the history of the antiwar movement that the more successful the action we have just organized, the more vehement the reaction against it, the more determined the attempts to prevent another successful action from taking place. We have always been successful in preventing the antiwar movement from being destroyed, and we can succeed this time as well because as long as the war continues the antiwar sentiment of the masses will continue to grow. But we will not succeed if we think that we can sit back and let someone else carry the fight. There is no one else who will fight, who agrees with us on the need to fight uncompromisingly.

The Fall Antiwar Offensive has changed very little except the size of the opportunities and responsibilities before us. The new stage in the antiwar movement does not mean that our fundamental objectives or means of attaining those objectives have changed. We are fighting for exactly the same thing we have been after for the last five years. We simply have greater openings and more determined opponents.

The radicalizing young people who were disappointed by the November 15 demonstrations (and there were some), saw only the superficial aspects, only the static situation. They proceeded as if they were analyzing a snapshot of Washington, D.C., November 15, 1969, rather than a full length feature film on politics in the United States, 1965-1975. To those with an "advanced" state of anti-imperialist consciousness, half a million people singing "give peace a chance" suddenly became a depressing sight because they did not understand the process that had taken place. They did not comprehend what a tremendous step forward the expression of that sentiment was, and that is was only a beginning. They forget that they too -- and probably not so long ago -- went through a stage of

"give peace a chance."

What is the role of the YSA, the revolutionary socialist youth organization, in this process? And what is the role of the SMC, the student-based, left-wing of the antiwar movement?

The crucial role of the SMC will, if anything, increase, as the fight it will have to carry against the right-wing of the movement will become tougher. It is the organized left-wing of the movement, the bulwark against all attempts to divert the movement into a multi-faceted morass of reformist political schemes. Attempts by our opponents to turn the SMC off its course will undoubtedly increase.

Any suggestion, such as that made by two Gainesville comrades, that the SMC should, at this critical juncture, broaden its scope to become a "radical" organization concerned with organizing around many issues would be fatal. What more conclusive proof is needed than the history of the SDS during the last year! SDS did not disintegrate solely because it refused to make the struggle against the Vietnam war a focal point of its activity - important as that factor was - but also because it attempted to build a broad multi-issue, multi-tendency radical organization which had, and could have, no clear program or strategy. The inevitable result occurred as the organization disintegrated into three or four warring factions. A repeat performance, only with the YSA involved, would turn out no less disastrously.

The time, energy and resources of personnel that the YSA will have to put into building the SMC will certainly not decrease in the coming months. But this does not mean we will be building the SMC instead of the YSA. The idea that somehow building the SMC takes up time and effort that could be used to build the YSA reflects at best a very mechanical view of the relationship between the YSA and the SMC.

We determine the priority of our tasks by assessing the needs of the international revolutionary movement, by determining where we fit into that world process, how we can help advance it, and then determining what our resources are and how we can best use them in the light of this analysis. There is no contradiction between advancing the world revolution and advancing the American revolution. They are totally interrelated.

Our first and foremost task today is to do everything in our power to assure the victory of the Vietnamese revolution. The reason the best of the revolutionary minded youth are attracted to us is precisely because we do have a thoroughly internationalist perspective. Recruitment to the YSA follows.

No matter how small, or how large the YSA is, we will never be able to pull back from building coalitions for struggle around particular issues which include much broader forces than ourselves. And we will always be playing leading roles in such coalitions.

As we have been in the antiwar movement, we will always be the leadership of the class struggle, left-wing of such movements. We do not project anything different for the coming period in the antiwar movement. We've always functioned openly and proudly as YSAers. We've always spoken out with our ideas, our analyses, our interpretations - both inside and outside the antiwar coalition. And it is largely because of our uncompromising role as the best builders of the antiwar movement that we have experienced the tremendous growth of the last few years. Again, you need only compare the recent histories of the YSA and SDS.

To pull back from building the SMC is to retreat from building the YSA as well.

The Justice Department Demonstration

The six Madison comrades and the two Gainesville comrades all think that the YSA made a mistake by not intervening in the Justice Department demonstration in Washington on November 15. Although they are critical of the way the action was carried out, they think the YSA could have fruitfully involved itself, helped to direct the action in another way and made it more successful.

First of all, what about the underlying assumption that the Justice Department action was more "advanced," more militant, more revolutionary than the march and rally against the war involving over three quarters of a million people?

Does carrying the NLF flags and shouting about the pigs make an action more revolutionary? Does planning an action so that a confrontation with the cops is inevitable make it more revolutionary? Does getting yourself and thousands of others gassed make you more revolutionary? Obviously not, though some of those who organized the action think so.

What about the effectiveness of the demonstration in achieving its aim - stopping the Conspiracy trial? From start to finish the action could not have been better calculated to seem like a failure. The most important fact is not that some 10,000 people either marched or drifted over to the Justice Department, but just the opposite. There were probably half a million people in Washington that day who were disgusted by the mockery of "justice" being played out in Chicago, who wanted to protest the inhuman treatment of Bobby Seale and the Panthers. That was clear

from the crowd's response every time the Panthers or the Conspiracy trial were mentioned. But the organizers of the Justice Department demonstration were not concerned with building the broadest and most effective defense of the Conspiracy victims. They were concerned with proving how "revolutionary" they were as compared to the rest of the hundreds of thousands of people in Washington that day. So they ended up with an action that made it look like only some 10,000 of the 800,000 opposed the trial. It's the kind of pseudorevolutionary play-acting the YSA does not go in for.

Could the YSA have made a decisive difference by intervening? No, definitely not. The demonstration was, from its very conception, designed to split off a small part of a mass action and lead it into a physical confrontation. It was counterposed to the November 15 action. If the YSA had supported it, no matter what the form of our support, it could only have added strength to the action and miseducated those who look to us for leadership.

The implication that we didn't reach the people who participated in the Justice Department action with our view of how to build an anti-imperialist movement in this country is absolutely false. What was November 15 all about anyway if it wasn't the most successful demonstration yet of our view of how to build an effective, powerful anti-imperialist movement. Not only did we reach those who participated in the Justice Department action, but we reached the 790,000 others who were in Washington that day.

"Support the Vietnamese Revolution"

The Madison comrades propose that we should begin advancing the slogan "Support the Vietnamese Revolution" as "our" slogan in the antiwar movement, as counterposed to the SMC's central demand, "Bring the Troops Home Now."

First of all, the best way to express it is not that the YSA agrees with the SMC's slogan, but visa versa. From its inception the SMC has been based on agreement with our demand.

From the very beginning our slogan has been "Bring the Troops Home Now." It is the demand we have put forward as the correct one around which to build a mass anti-imperialist movement which would provide the most effective support for the Vietnamese people in their struggle against American imperialism. Over the last five years we have won more and more people to this demand. The SMC was merely one of the earliest organizations to adopt the same demand and begin to fight for it - in early 1967. Today millions of Americans agree with our demand. Does that mean we are now wrong? Was it right to advance that demand when almost no one agreed with us, but wrong now that millions agree?

The comrades who raised the proposal would probably say "Bring the Troops Home Now" is not wrong, but that is no longer sufficient, that we must "escalate our level of intervention," that we must dis-

tinguish ourselves from the millions who now agree with us. If, like the Stalinists, we had not raised our real demands from the very beginning, that might be true. But in relation to the Vietnam war, what more should we demand than the immediate withdrawal of troops?

As revolutionists in the imperialist country, the axis of our approach is around demands for the right of self-determination in Vietnam. That is why our demand is immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops. At the same time, this is the most effective way for us to implement our support for the Vietnamese revolution.

What does the demand "Support the Vietnamese Revolution" mean? We do not raise slogans because they sound good or attract attention, but because of their political meaning. This slogan is vague, but let us assume that it means support to the socialist revolution in Vietnam (as distinct from the demand for self-determination). In practice, if this became the axis of our approach, then it would mean increasing our criticisms of the NLF and PRG, pointing to their shortcomings and the possible dangers which lie ahead, calling for them to adopt a revolutionary Marxist program. But this is probably not what the Madison comrades had in mind. And the YSA does not propose to do that either because our primary responsibility is to get US imperialism off the backs of the Vietnamese so they can proceed to work out their own problems and build their own revolutionary Marxist organization and program.

At all antiwar demonstrations we sell the Militant and Young Socialist and a whole range of revolutionary socialist literature. This is the best way for us to reach the most politically conscious activists on the demonstrations with our program. Through this literature we have the opportunity to explain our position on Vietnam and other issues in more comprehensive fashion. Some of the most important literature we have explains the dynamics of the permanent revolution in Vietnam, the nature of American imperialism, and the nature of Stalinism.

Slogans raised on banners cannot do this propaganda job. Nor should they. The purpose of our banners is to show what demands we think the mass antiwar movement should be based upon. We think that "Bring the Troops Home Now," is the best slogan and we carry it proudly on our banners in the name of the YSA.

Many of our political opponents have been making a determined effort to belittle both the demand for immediate withdrawal and the mass antiwar movement. They call for "escalating" the tactics and slogans of the antiwar movement. This makes it all the more important for us to clearly be identified as the upholders of mass action and immediate withdrawal. We revolutionary Marxists will gain by being differentiated from the various ultra-left trends. The healthiest, most politically astute antiwar activists will be attracted to our position.

New York, N.Y.
December 22, 1969