

WHY SMC/YSA LIE ABOUT SDS

The newspapers and the media have never been great friends of the people; in fact, they have consistently tried to discredit workers and students, black and white, who are fighting back against the few rich men who run this country. The Boston area has seen a barrage of stories, none of which are true, about the Student Mobilization Committee meeting at MIT this Sunday -- so we hope you'll read this factual account and explanation.

Sunday morning, 12 SDSers, including several members of the Progressive Labor Party (PLP), attended an open steering committee meeting of the SMC in order to talk to the 200 or so people there about what we felt were lessons to be learned from the recent strike and to see how they related to other people's experiences. There were three main points we wanted to raise about the anti-war movement -- that it must (1) fight racism, (2) link itself to the increasingly militant struggles of workers and (3) in doing these, fight to win (by shutting the school down until victory) concrete demands on the university administration that hurt the war and racism and the giant corporations that profit from them. We also wanted to point out that the leadership of the SMC, the Young Socialist Alliance and the Socialist Workers Party, have consistently opposed building this kind of movement.

One person from MIT SDS and PLP came by the conference to drop off some literature and was asked at the door to register. He explained that he was only there for a minute to give us the literature and started into the conference room, but was grabbed by four people, thrown against the hallway wall and beaten. Those of us in the room had seen him for a second as the door was opened and it looked like he was getting roughed up, so we went out to defend him if necessary. As each of us stepped outside the door, we were each attacked by from four to eight people in waiting; the fight was only being broken up because many honest people came out and saw what was happening to us. We were not allowed to return to the conference. But inside, Peter Camejo, SWP candidate for senator, told the conference that the twelve of us had come to disrupt the conference, break it up, and attack the people there. Someone asked how he thought twelve people were such a ferocious threat to the 200 present and was told not to ask foolish questions.

In the afternoon, we returned with almost 50 SDSers with the intention of being admitted peacefully if possible in order to politically expose the YSA leadership for what had happened that morning and to present our ideas about the

anti-war movement. When we tried to get to the registration table we were attacked by an equal number of people while several campus police appeared at the scene. After about ten minutes of fighting we decided to leave and talk with people as they left the conference.

WHY WERE S.M.C. LEADERS SO AFRAID OF S.D.S. AND P.L.P.?

In general, the leadership of the SMC plans meetings so that there is a minimum amount of political discussion and debate, because they've learned that many of the people who attend their meetings are quick to reject their leadership. For instance, the spring New England Anti-War Conference voted that no liberal politicians, big businessmen or university administrators be allowed to speak at our rallies, despite SMC/YSA leaders attempting to prevent workshops and political discussion on the floor of the plenary. This resolution (introduced by SDS) passed because the majority felt that these politicians aren't really against the war since they push for 'more negotiation, less troops' as a better tactic for the US to gain control of the manpower and natural resources of Vietnam. The politicians and their friends also put forward many of the racist justifications for the war like 'the Vietnamese aren't culturally equipped to determine their own destiny', and people thought it was very important to meet this racism head-on because it wasn't a 'separate issue' as the YSA claimed. Later the YSA/SMC leaders declared the conference illegitimate (with the help of the Boston Globe) and carried out their own plans anyway.

The YSA/SMC leaders back the 'doves' to the hilt, covering themselves with a lot of rhetoric about a 'non-exclusionary' movement. Presumably, it was in the name of non-exclusion that New York mayor Lindsay gave the keynote speech at an SMC-sponsored rally in Central Park while he was sending cops into Columbia to break the heads of students fighting the Institute for Defense Analysis and Columbia's racist expansion into Harlem. In other words, 'non-exclusion' means bend over backwards to include the liberal politicians and their wealthy backers, but exclude anyone who will put forward that these rulers are just as bad as the rest and that the anti-war movement must fight racism and ally with workers for the strength it needs to win.

Concretely, the SMC and the New Mobe steering committee tried to exclude the SDS rally at the Department of Labor on November 15th by denying us a permit -- we held it anyway with 7500 people in the first national demonstration to link

the anti-war movement to the struggle of working people, specifically the GE strikers. And this month in Washington, Mobe marshalls tried to keep people from going to a similar demonstration at the racist Labor Department by saying it was an 'SDS plan to get people's heads beaten'. This time the demonstration was 10-15,000, although the main demonstration was considerably smaller than their November demonstration.

Perhaps the shapest example of the YSA/SMC leaders' policy of 'non-exclusion' was a rally they held at Columbia University at which the school's president, Cordier, spoke. But when a black student came forward to speak about the racism of Columbia towards its own workers and students and the working people of Harlem, and how racism was a key justification for the war, he was pushed from the microphone by an SMCer until black and white students came to his side to help.

The big businessmen and politicians (liberal and conservative) appreciate what the SMC leaders are doing; so all the Boston papers and most of the radio stations had stories talking about how the 'radicals came to MIT to attack the peace conference'. The Globe quoted from SMC leaders right and left about SDS and PLP having a 'history of attacks on the peace movement as far removed from their own causes'. The cause we're removed from is the cause of 'peace' that liberal politicians advocate -- a piece of Vietnam and the peaceful exploitation of working people in Vietnam and here at home. What the Globe and the wealthy men who own it fear is the anti-war movement linking itself to the struggles of workers, who have the greatest power and need to end this rotten war. They know the YSA/SMC leaders will fight tooth and nail to prevent this; that's why people like Cleveland multi-millionaire industrialist Cyrus Eaton and the big businessmen who own the Globe contribute money to the SMC and broadcast their lies.

On June 6, a number of organizations in the New England area, including SDS, will sponsor a conference to plan actions against the war and racism, to develop some kinds of summer programs which can involve people in concrete projects to fight against the war and racism, and to build an on-going movement in the area which can carry on a sustained campaign which relies on the people and not on the politicians, businessmen and their friends, and which can really win.

New England Regional SDS

Radicals, peace group brawl at MIT

The Boston Globe

Monday, May 25, 1970

The Boston Globe, like any "legitimate" newspaper, slants its news in favor of the corporations, individuals and groups that have interests in common with those of the Globe owners. The same paper that tries to discredit General Electric strikers and fighting welfare mothers eagerly sides with the SMC/YSA. After the fight at M.I.T. (see story above), the YSA quickly called several news conferences to parade their casualties and attempt to discredit SDS and PLP with a carefully edited version of the incident. Strangely enough, the Globe was unable to find members of SDS and PLP in the hospital who had been viciously cut with knives and other objects. More importantly, the Globe exercised its editorial judgement in a letter written to the paper by an SDS'er and stripped the letter of its political content--leaving only a skeleton version of the incident. However, no group challenging the power of the bosses' press can rely on that same press to reach the people. Groups like the YSA/SMC that do rely on--and build the credibility of--bosses' papers like the Globe do so only because their interests are indistinguishable from those of the bosses who run the paper.

Attack Cited

**Ultra-Left
Mentality
Is Scored**