Thursday, May 1
10:00-10:15 Organization of Plenum (1/4 hour)
10:15-11:30 World Political Situation Report (1-1/4 hours)
11:30-12:30 Discussion (2 hours)
12:30-2:00 Iunch
2:00-2:30 Summary, World Political Situation Report (1/2 hour)
3:30-3:45 Political Resolution Report (1-1/4 hours)
3:45-6:15 Discussion (3 hours)
Friday, May 2
10:00-10:30 Discussion
10:30-11:00 Summary, Political Resolution Report (1/2 hour)
11:00-12:00 Black Struggle Resolution Report (1 hour)
12:00-1:30 Lunch
1:30-3:30 Discussion (2 hours)
3:30-4:00 Summary, Black Struggle Resolution Report (1/2 hour)
4:00-5:00 Youth Report (1 hour)
5:00-6:00 Discussion (1-1/2 hours)
6:00-7:30 Dinner (YSA serving)
7:30-8:00 Discussion
8:00-8:15 Summary, Youth Report (1/4 hour)
8:15-9:45 Party Tasks and Perspectives Report (1-1/2 hours)

## Saturday, May 3

10:00-1:00 Discussion (3 hours)
1:00-2:30 Lunch
2:30-3:00 Summary, Party Tasks and Perspectives Report (1/2 hour)
3:00- Break for faction meetings

## Sunday, May 4

10:00-10:45 World Movement Report (3/4 hour)
10:45-12:45 Discussion (2 hours)
12:45-1:00 Summary, World Movement Report (1/4 hour)
1:00-2:00 Lunch (YSA serving)
2:00-3:00 Election of Political Committee (1 hour)
3:00-4:30 National Committee Perspectives (1-1/2 hours)
4:30-5:00 Election of National Officers ( $1 / 2$ hour)
5:00-5:15 Convention Call (1/4 hour)

POLITICAL COMMITTEE PROCEDURAL RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE 1975 NATIONAL COMMITTEE PLENUM

1. To approve the following procedural recommendations:
A. That in cases of procedural disputes, discussion be limited to two speakers, one for and one against, and that each speaker be limited to two minutes.
B. That general discussion be limited to ten minutes per speaker and that no one speak twice until all who wish to speak have already done so.
C. That the Presiding Committee consist of the Political Bureau (Barnes, Clark, A. Hansen, Horowitz, D. Jenness, Iovell, Sheppard, Thomas, Waters).
D. To designate Eidsvik and Rupp as secretaries.
E. To invite as observers: Control Commission members, heads of national departments, members of the youth NEC, branch organizers, campaign committee officers, and special guests.
F. To give voice to organizers and department heads who are not members of the National Committee during discussion of the Tasks and Perspectives report and Youth report.
2. To approve the following agenda and reporters:
3. World Political Situation - Horowitz
4. Political Resolution - Barnes
5. Black Struggle Resolution - Thomas
6. Youth Report
7. Tasks and Perspectives Report - Sheppard
8. World Movement Report - Waters
9. Election of Political Committee - Barnes
10. National Committee Perspectives - Barnes
11. Election of National Officers - Lovell
12. Convention Call - Jenness
13. To approve the following schedule (see attached).

## NATIONAI COMMITTIEE PLENUM SCHEDUIE

```
Thursday, May 1
10:00-10:15 Organization of Plenum (1/4 hour)
10:15 - 11:30 World Political Situation Report (1-1/4 hours)
11:30 - 12:30 Discussion (2 hours)
12:30 - 2:00 Lunch
    2:00 - 2:30 Summary, World Political Situation Report (1/2 hour)
    3:30 - 3:45 Political Resolution Report (1-1/4 hours)
    3:45 - 6:15 Discussion (3 hours)
Friday, May 2
10:00-10:30 Discussion
10:30 - 11:00 Summary, Political Resolution Report (1/2 hour)
11:00-12:00 Black Struggle Resolution Report (1 hour)
12:00 - 1:30 Lunch
    1:30 - 3:30 Discussion (2 hours)
    3:30 - 4:00 Summary, Black Struggle Resolution Report (1/2 hour)
    4:00 - 5:00 Youth Report (1 hour)
    5:00 - 6:00 Discussion (1-1/2 hours)
    6:00 - 7:30 Dinner (YSA serving)
    7:30- 8:00 Discussion
    8:00 - 8:15 Summary, Youth Report (1/4 hour)
    8:15 - 9:45 Party Tasks and Perspectives Report (1-1/2 hours)
Saturday, May 3
10:00 - 1:00 Discussion (3 hours)
    1:00 - 2:30 Iunch
    2:30 - 3:00 Summary, Party Tasks and Perspectives Report (1/2 hour)
    3:00 - Break for faction meetings
```

```
Sunday, May 4
10:00 - 10:45 World Movement Report (3/4 hour)
10:45 - 12:45 Discussion (2 hours)
12:45 - 1:00 Summary, World Movement Report (1/4 hour)
    1:00 - 2:00 Lunch (YSA serving)
    2:00 - 3:00 Election of Political Committee (1 hour)
    3:00 - 4:30 National Committee Perspectives (1-1/2 hours)
    4:30 - 5:00 Election of National Officers (1/2 hour)
    5:00 - 5:15 Convention Call (1/4 hour)
```

Regular members elected by 1973 convention to National Committee：

| J．Barnes | J．Hansen | L．Seigle |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| C．Bolduc | G．Horowitz | A．Sharon |
| G．Breitman | D．Jenness | E．Shaw |
| J．Britton | J．Johnson | B．Sheppard |
| P．Camejo | I．Jones | B．Stone |
| P．Chertov | C．Lipman | T．Thomas |
| C．DeBerry | F．Lovell | J．Tussey |
| D．Garza | D．Morrison | M．Waters |
| F．Halstead | H．Ring | N．Weinstein |
| A．Hansen |  |  |

Alternate members elected by 1973 convention to National Committee：

1．B．Scott
2．L．Evans
3．W．Lyons
4．C．Lund
5．L．Jenness
6．J．White
7．D．Wulp
8．A．Pulley

9．D．Styron
10．D．Roberts
11．J．Benson
12．N．Blackstock
13．L．Henderson
14．S．Stapleton
15．A．Morell

16．S．LaMont
17．P．Seidman
18．F．Boehm
19．J．Hawkins
20．D．McBride
21．M．Dixon
22．J．Mackler

Advisory members elected by 1973 convention to National Committee：

| M．Alvin | F．Dobbs | J．Liang |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| J．Cannon | A．Harer | G。 Novack |
| B．Chester | T．Kerry | E．Reed |

Members elected by 1973 convention to National Control Commission：
A．Chester
B．Matson
D．Ferguson
H．Scheer

Regular members of the Political Committee：

| J．Barnes | Go Horowitz | E．Shaw |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Go Breitman | D．Jenness | Bo Shepard |
| J．Britton | I．Jones | B．Stone |
| Po Camejo | F．Lovell | To Thomas |
| A．Hansen | D．Morrison | Mo Waters |
| J．Hansen | L．Seigle | S．Clark（YSA） |

Consultative members of the Political Committee：
F．Dobbs
T．Kerry
G．Novack

Members of the Political Bureau：

J．Barnes
A．Hansen
G。Horowitz

D．Jenness
F。Lovell
B．Sheppard

T．Thomas
M．Waters
S．Clark

CALL FOR THE TWENTY-SEVENTH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE
SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

May 4, 1975

TO AII LOCALS, BRANCHES AND MEMBERS
Dear Comrades,
Pursuant to the provisions of the party constitution, the National Committee hereby calls the Twenty-Seventh National Convention of the Socialist Workers Party to convene in Ohio at 10:00 AM on Sunday, August 17 and continue through five days (August 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21, 1975).

AGENDA
The National Committee proposes the following agenda for the convention:

World Political Situation Report
World Fiovement Report
Political Resolution
Black Liberation Resolution
Political Reports
Organizational Reports
Youth Report
Election of National Committee

## PRECONVENTION DISCUSSION

The party preconvention discussion is formally opened May 4, 1975. The Discussion Bulletin is open for all party members on the subjects listed in the agenda or others which they may wish to present for the consideration of the party. As authorized by the party constitution, the Political Committee has set a deadline of August 2, 1975, for acceptance of preconvention discussion articles for the bulletin.

Branch membership meetings shall be arranged for discussion of the various subjects on the agenda. Our traditional provisions and safeguards for the adequate and free presentation of all points of view shall govern all discussion.

## CONVENTION ASSESSMENT

As authorized by the party constitution, a convention assessment of $\$ 10.00$ per member is hereby levied, the payment of which is obligatory for every member not totally unemployed.

BASIS OF REPRESENTATION
l. Representation from the branches shall be as follows: One delegate for the first 15 members or less, and one additional delegate for each 15 additional members or major fraction thereof (8 or more constituting a major fraction).
2. Delegates are to be elected by branches in accordance with the actual number of members in good standing who have been admitted to the party prior to liay 4, 1975, and who have paid their convention assessment, as certified by the branch executive committee on the day of voting.
3. Branches organized after May 4, 1975, are entitled to send fraternal delegates as provided by the party constitution.
4. Members admitted to the party after May 4, 1975, are entitled to voice in the party discussion but no vote on resolutions or in the selection of delegates.
5. Absentee votes on political resolutions and in the election of delegates shall not be permitted except in clearly established cases of occupational necessity (for example, regular night workers, etc.). In all such cases the votes must be submitted in writing and recognized by motion at the branch meeting at the time of the branch voting.
6. Members transferring from one branch to another within the same locality subsequent to May 4, 1975, must vote in the branch from which they transferred.

## PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

In case of political differences defined by conflicting resolutions, the election of delegates in the branches is to be on the basis of the vote on resolution or resolutions voted on at the meeting at which the delegates are elected. Members voting for a given resolution designate the delegate or delegates to which they are entitled on the basis of proportional representation laid down in this call, the designations to be ratified by the branch. Abstentions in no case count as votes.

1. If there are two counterposed political positions, the delegates are apportioned between the majority and the minority in proportion to the vote each receives. The percentage of the vote received by the majority, multiplied by the number of delegates the branch is entitled to, is rounded off to the nearest whole number to give the number of delegates going to the majority. The remainder are assigned to the minority.
2. If there are three or more positions, those positions which received too few votes to possibly get a delegate are eliminated first, beginning with the smallest. That is, if the percentage of the vote received by a position is multiplied by the number of delegates the branch is entitled to, and the result is "O" when rounded off, this position is not considered and its votes are subtracted from the total vote. After such positions have been eliminated, the delegates are apportioned to the remaining positions, beginning with the one with the highest vote. Using the new vote total, the percentage received by the position with the highest vote is multiplied by the number of delegates the branch is entitled to and the result is rounded off to the nearest whole number, to give the number of delegates going to this position. The same procedure is repeated with the position receiving the second highest vote, and so on, until all the delegates the branch is entitled to have been apportioned.

CONVENTION ATTENDANCE
The National Committee proposes that all party members in good standing may attend the convention as visitors, and that friends may be admitted to the sessions provided they have been invited by a branch.

Fraternally yours,
NATIONAL COMMITTEE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

- Air Lér xug

U Jack Barnes
National Secretary

CONCERNING THE METHOD USED TO DETERIIINE PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION IN THE ELECTION OF BRANCH DELEGATES TO THE CONVENTION

## BY Barry Sheppard

The method to determine proportional representation in the election of branch delegates to the convention we have used in the past runs into certain difficulties as the party grows.

The method laid down in past convention calls is the following: a minority has to get $1 / n$ of the vote to get one delegate, where $n$ is the number of delegates the branch is entitled to. It has to get $2 / n$ to get two delegates, etc. For example, if a branch is entitled to 5 delegates, a minority must get $1 / 5$ of the vote on conflicting resolutions in order to get 1 delegate. There is another provision, that in the case where the number of delegates a branch is entitled to is even, a minority which gets 40 percent of the vote will get half of the delegates.

This method guarantees that a majority will always receive at least the proportion of delegates as its proportion of the vote among the branch membership, except in the special case when the number of delegates a branch is entitled to is even and a minority receives at least 40 percent of the vote. In most cases, the proportion of delegates going to the majority will be greater than its proportion of the vote among the branch membership. Minorities in a branch under this system often receive less delegates than what would be proportional to their vote among the branch membership.

In the situation where we had a relatively low ratio between branch membership and the number of delegates a branch is entitled to as the basis of branch representation to the convention (one delegate for every 7 members, for example), this method worked out to be close to proportional, and the strength of minorities was represented at the convention in fairly close proportion to their strength in the branches.

As the party has grown, it has become necessary to raise the ratio of branch membership to delegates. We have gone from a ratio of seven members to one delegate to 15 members to one delegate. This was done in the interests of the democratic functioning of the convention itself. In addition, new smaller branches have been built, and larger branches have been divided to establish locals. All these factors increase the discrepancy between a minority's real strength in a branch and the proportion of delegates it receives under the method we have used up until now.

Some examples will show this. The first two concern the effect of increasing the membership-to-delegate ratio. The third shows the effect of dividing a large branch into two smaller ones.

Example 1. A branch of 75 members would be entitled to 11 delegates if the delegate ratio was seven members to one delegate. This was the delegate ratio at the 1971 convention. A minority would have to get $1 / 11$ of the vote to get one delegate, $2 / 11$ to get two, $3 / 11$ to get three, etc. If all the members of the branch voted, a minority would have to get 7 votes to get one delegate, 14
votes to get two, etc. A minority of 25 , for example, would get three delegates; it would have 33 percent of the vote and receive 27 percent of the delegates.

If the membership-to-delegate ratio is raised to 15 members for each delegate, the branch would be entitled to 5 delegates. A minority would have to get $1 / 5$ of the vote to get one delegate, 2/5 to get two, etc. If all the members of the branch voted, a minority would have to get 15 votes to get one delegate, 30 votes to get 2 , and so on. A minority of 25 would get 1 delegate, or 20 percent of the delegates although its vote was 33 percent of the branch membership.

Example 2. In a branch of 48 members, if the delegate ratio was one delegate for every seven members, the branch would be entitled to 7 delegates. A minority would have to get at least $1 / 7$ of the vote to get one delegate. If all 48 members voted, then a minority would have to get at least 7 votes to get one delegate, 14 votes to get two delegates, etc. If a minority had 10 votes and the majority had 38, the minority would get 1 delegate and the majority would get 6. The minority would have 21 percent of the vote among the branch membership and 14 percent of the delegates.

If the delegate ratio is increased to 15 members for one delegate, then the branch is entitled to 3 delegates. A minority of 10 would receive no delegates, since it needs $1 / 3$ of the vote to get one delegate, at least 16 votes.

Example 3. A branch of 100 members is entitled to 7 delegates if the delegate ratio is one delegate for every 15 members. If all the members voted, then a minority would have to get $1 / 7$ of the vote to get one delegate, or 15 votes; $2 / 7$ to get two delegates, or 29 votes, etc.

If this branch is divided into two branches of 50 each, then each branch is entitled to 3 delegates. A minority must get at least $1 / 3$ of the vote in a branch to get one delegate, or 17 votes. Thus a minority of 15 would have received one delegate in the undivided branch, but would not receive any delegates after the division, even if all its members were in one branch. A minority of 25, although it represents 25 percent of the vote in the undivided branch, would receive 1 delegate in the undivided branch or 14 percent of the delegates. A minority of 25 , if it was divided 10 in one branch and 15 in the other after the division, would receive no delegates from either branch.

There is no way to devise a proportional system that will guarantee that the proportion of delegates a minority receives is exactly equal to its proportional strength in the branch membership, unless fractional votes are assigned to the delegates. To assign fractional votes to the delegates, however, would make the voting power of each delegate at the convention unequal. This would violate the principle that the convention delegates are not bound by previous positions, but together as the convention comprise the highest body of the party. Thus each delegate must have one vote.

NEW METHOD OF PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION
The proposed change in the method of proportional representation can be summed up as follows: to apportion the delegates the branch is entitled to between a majority (or plurality) and any minorities, as close as possible to their strength in the branch membership.

This method will often result in the same apportioning of delegates as the old method. In other cases, it will apportion delegates among conflicting political positions closer to their actual strength in the branch membership than the old method did, and at the same time it will guard the democratic principle of majority rule. Iike the old method, it is based on the principle that the convention delegates represeat the branches as the basic units of the party, and is therefore a system for apportioning delegates from a branch and based on the proportion of the vote conflicting resolutions receive in the branch membership, not in the party membership as a whole.

When there are only two counterposed political positions, the new method is relatively simple. The percentage of the delegates received by the majority should be as close as possible to the percentage of the vote in the membership received by the majority。 This can be determined by multiplying the percentage of the vote received by the majority times the number of delegates the branch is entitled to. The answer will generally be a fraction, and must be rounded off to the nearest whole number, because we want to avoid fractional votes for delegates. This gives the majority its number of delegates; the remainder go to the minority. Under this system, the minority will also get a percentage of the delegates that is as close as possible to its percentage of the vote, in most cases. (Since ".5" is rounded off to "I" calculating the majority's delegates first gives it a slight edge. For example, if a branch is entitled to 5 delegates, and the majority receives 70 percent of the vote, then .70 x 5 is 3.5 , which rounded off is 4 delegates for the majority. The minority gets 1 . If the minority position was calculated first, we would have .30 x 5 is 1.5 , which is 2 when rounded off.)

Let's look at some examples of how the new method would compare with the old one, assuming a membership-to-delegate ratio of 15 to one.

Example A
Branch size: 68
Delegates: 4
Miajority: 52, or 81 percent of the vote Minority: 12, or 19 percent of the vote Abstentions: 4

## Old Fiethod

Minority would have to have $1 / 4$
of the vote to get one delegate. Total vote is $64.1 / 4$ of 64 is 16 -- minority is too sinall to get one delegate.
Majority: 4 delegates, 100 percent Minority: O delegates, O percent

## New Method

52
$64 \times 4$ equals 3.25 , or 3
Majority: 3 delegates, 75 percent
I delegate, 25 percent

Example B
Branch size: 76
Delegates:
Majority: 46, or 61 percent of the vote Minority: 30, or 39 percent of the vote

## Old Method

To get one delegate, the minority would have to have $1 / 5$ of the vote, or 16 votes; to get 2 delegates, 2/5 of the vote or 31 votes.
Majority: 4 delegates, 80 percent Minority: 1 delegate, 20 percent

Under the old system, there is a provision that if the number of delegates a branch is entitled to is even, then a minority which gets 40 percent of the vote gets half the delegates. The new system avoids the necessity for such a provision. Under the new system a minority of over 25 percent gets one vote if a branch is entitled to 2 delegates; a minority of over $371 / 2$ percent gets 2 delegates in a branch entitled to 4 delegates; but a minority must get 42 percent to get 3 delegates in a branch entitled to 6 delegates; and almost 44 percent to get 4 delegates in a branch entitled to 8 delegates.

Thus the 40 percent rule can over-represent minorities, as the following examample shows:

## Example C

Branch size: 85
Delegates: 6
Majority: 51, or 60 percent of the vote
Minority: 34, or 40 percent of the vote

| Old Method |  | New Method |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The minority received 40 percent of | 51 |  |
| the vote; therefore it gets half |  | x 6 equals 3.6 or 4 |
| Majority: 3 delegates, 50 percent Riaj | hajorit | 4 delegates, 67 percent |
| Minority: 3 delegates, 50 percent M | Minority: | 2 delegates, 33 percent |

The new proposal for dividing the delegates when there are two counterposed political positions can be summed up in the following formula: If the majority receives M votes, the minority $\mathbb{N}$ votes, and the branch is entitled to $D$ delegates, then

$$
\frac{M}{M+N} \times D \text { rounded }
$$

off to the nearest whole number is the number of delegates the majority gets.

The situation when there are three or more positions is more complicated. If we were to proceed in exactly the same way as in the case where there are two positions, the existence of very small minorities can make it impossible to apportion all the delegates a branch is entitled to. The following example will show this:

Example D
Branch size: 77
Delegates: 5
Position A: 38
Position B: 23
Position C: 10
Position D: 6
Position A: 38
$77 \times 5$ equals 2.46. . ., rounded off is 2.
Position B: 23
$\overline{77} \times 5$ equals 1.49. . ., rounded off is 1.
Position C: 10
$77 \times 5$ equals .649. . ., rounded off is 1.
Position D: 6
$77 \times 5$ equals .38. . ., rounded off is 0.
Thus only 4 of the five delegates is apportioned.
This problem can be avoided by first eliminating those positions which are too small to possibly get a delegate. This is done by starting with the smallest position and testing to see if, when its percentage of the vote is multiplied by the number of delegates the branch is entitled to, the result is "O" when rounded off. If it is zero, the votes of this position are not counted and are subtracted from the total. The same test is made of the next smallest position, using the new vote total (it is possible that a position will pass this test after the votes for the smallest position have been subtracted, but would fail if the original total is used). This is repeated until the smallest remaining tendency passes this test. This establishes a new total vote. In the example above, Position $D$ fails this tests. Its votes are subtracted from the vote total, leaving 71 votes. Position C is tested:

10
$71 \times 5$ equals $\cdot 70$, which rounds off to 1.
Thus position C passes the test, and there is a new vote total of 71. Using this new vote total, the delegates are then apportioned, beginming with the largest position:
Position A: 38

$$
\overline{71} \times 5 \text { equals } 2.6 \ldots \text {. . rounded off is } 3 .
$$

Position B: 23
$71 \times 5$ equals 1.6...., rounded off is 2.
Since all five delegates the branch is entitled to have been apportioned, none go to Position C.

This method of apportioning the delegates favors the larger positions, because it begins with the assumption that in any case
the proportion of the delegates going to the largest positions shoulc. should be as close as possible to the percentage of their vote. This can mean that some smaller tendencies do not get a percentage of delegates as close as possible to their percentage of the vote.

If we were to start the other way around, and begin by apportioning the delegates to the smallest positions, then it is possible to drastically reduce the percentage of delegates going to the largest position, even to the point of making a majority get a minority of the delegates. The following examples shows this:

## Example E

Branch size 62
Delegates: 4
Position A: 35
Position B: 10
Position C: 9
Position D: 8
If we began with position $D$ :
Position D: $\square$
62 $\times 4$ equals .51..., rounded off is 1.
Position C: 9
$\overline{62} \times 4$ equals .58 , rounded off is 1.
Position B: 10
$62 \times 4$ equals .64. . ., rounded off is 1.
Position A: There is only 1 delegate left for Position $A$.
Done the other way around, we first test Position D. It passes the test. Then we begin with apportioning delegates, starting with Position A:
Position A: 35
$\overline{62} \times 4$ equals 2.25 , rounded off is 2 .
Position B: 10
$\overline{62} \times 4$ equals .64. . ., rounded off is 1.
Position C: 9
$\overline{62} \times 4$ equals .58..., rounded off is 1.
This apportions the 4 delegates, so Position $D$ does not get a delegate.

The proposed new system can run into difficulty if there is a tie -- although the old system can also. Any problems resulting from a tie should be referred to the convention, because different solutions can be proposed, depending upon the exact situation, and we wouldn't want to tie the hands of the convention with a formula concerning exactly what to do.

The old system can also run into trouble in a branch where there is no majority. The following example will show this:

## Example F

Branch size: 40
Delegates: 3
Position A: 15
Position B: 14
Position C: 11

## Old Method

A minority must get $1 / 3$ of the vote, or 14 votes, to get a delegate. Position A and $B$ each get one delegate--the remaining delegate is not apportioned.

Position A: 1 delegate
Position B: 1 delegate Position C: O delegates

New Method


Position A: 1 delegate
Position B: 1 delegate Position C: I delegate

## Progress on

Raising National Office Per Capita Sustainer Pledge
January 1974 June 1974 December 1974 April 1975

| Atlanta | $\$ 9$ | $\$ 11$ | $\$ 15$ | $\$ 17^{*}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Berkeley/Oakland | 16 | 16 | 17.25 | $18.5^{*}$ |
| Boston | 18 | 18 | 18 | $20^{*}$ |
| Brooklyn | 15 | 16 | 16 | $17^{*}$ |
| Chicago | 10 | 15 | 17.50 | 17.50 |
| Cleveland | 14 | 10 | 12 | $15^{*}$ |
| Denver | 6 | 6 | 15 | 15 |
| Detroit | 8 | 16 | 20 | $22^{*}$ |
| Houston | 8 | 8 | 15 | $16^{*}$ |
| Los Angeles-CE | 5 | 10 | 11 | 11 |
| Los Angeles-Westside | 6.50 | 11 | 15 | $18^{*}$ |
| Lower Manhattan | 15 | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| Milwaukee | - | - | - | $3^{*}$ |
| Philadelphia | 16.24 | 16.24 | 17.20 | 17.20 |
| Pittsburgh | 3 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Portland | 6 | 6 | 6 | $7 *$ |
| San Diego | 12 | 12 | 6 | $9^{*}$ |
| San Francisco | 15 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| Seattle | 11 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| St. Louis | 7 | 10 | 15 | 15 |
| Twin Cities | 16 | 17 | 20 | $22^{*}$ |
| Upper West Side | 11 | 12 | 12 | $15^{*}$ |
| Washington D.C. | 20 | 20 | 25 | $26^{*}$ |
| Average | 12.05 | $\$ 13.80$ | 15.55 | $\$ 16.45$ |

In December, 1974 a national campaign was launched to increase the total sustainer pledge to the national office by $\$ 1,000$ per month before the convention. The fourteen branches (*) which have participated so far have increased the total sustainer pledge per month by $\$ 1318$ or 132 percent of the goal.

National Debt Retirement Campaign
Branch Debts April 1, 1975


National Debt Retirement Campaign Comparative Branch Standings - April 1, 1973,

June 1, 1974 and April 1, 1975
Total Debts
April 1, 1973 June 1, 1974 April 1, 1975
Atlanta
Austin
Berkeley/Oakland
2959

1891

Boston
Brooklyn
Chicago

| Cleveland | 1331 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Denver | 4761 |
| Detroit | 3625 |

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Houston } & 4172 \\ \text { L.A.-Unified Branch } & 1161\end{array}$
Los Angeles-CE - $1313 \quad 4134$
Los Angeles-Westside - $518 \quad 320$

Lower Manhattan
604
Milwaukee
979 2769

Philadelphia 200
Pittsburgh -
Portland 2633

| St. Louis | - | 228 | 108 |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| San Diego | 511 | 426 | 543 |
| San Francisco | 1616 | 2378 | 1847 |
| Seattle | 1972 | 520 | 343 |
| Twin Cities | 0 | 92 | 74 |
| Upper West Side | 538 | 323 | 485 |
| Washington D.C. | $\frac{281}{39,452}$ | $\mathbf{7 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 9}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 8 , 8 0 5}$ | 17,461 |  |

Branch Performance on Keeping Current With the
National Office and Departments: Number of Months Current During the Twelve Months from April 1974 to March 1975

No. of Months
Current with All
Sustainer Bulletins Militant ISR Path. Departments

| Atlanta | 9 | 9 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Austin* | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | - | 1 |
| Berkeley-Oakl. 1 | 12 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 7 | 3 |
| Boston I | 11 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 7 |
| Brooklyn 10 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 8 | 5 |
| Chicago 1 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 9 |
| Cleveland lo | 10 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 5 | 3 |
| Denver 1 | 12 | 10 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 9 |
| Detroit 1 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 8 | 7 |
| Houston 1 | 12 | 10 | 12 | 8 | 11 | 7 |
| Los Angeles-CE | 7 | 9 | 12 | 11 | 5 | 3 |
| Los Angeles-W | 9 | 10 | 12 | 11 | 9 | 6 |
| Lower Manhat'n 10 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 8 | 4 |
| Milwaukee* | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Philadelphia 10 | 10 | 9 | 12 | 9 | 10 | 5 |
| Pittsburgh l | 12 | 11 | 11 | 9 | 9 | 8 |
| Portland 10 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 3 |
| San Diego | 9 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 3 |
| San Francisco | 9 | 8 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 2 |
| Seattle l | 12 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 7 | 7 |
| St. Louis 1 | 12 | 10 | 12 | 12 | 9 | 7 |
| Twin Cities 1 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 9 | 12 | 8 |
| Upper West Side |  | 10 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 7 |
| Wash. D.C. 1 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 7 | 7 |
| Average Number of Branches Current per Month in Each |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Category 20 | 20 | 19 | 21 | 19 | 15 | 10 |

PATHFINDER/MONAD
NEW BOOKS \& NEW EDITIONS PROJECTED FOR 1975
Woman's Evolution/Reed
America's Road to Socialism/Cannon (new ed.)
Life in Capitalist America/Coontz, et al.
Women in China/Curtin
Lenin's Fight Against Stalinism/Lenin \& Trotsky
Writings 1930/Trotsky
The New Crisis of Capitalism/Roberts
Dynamics of World Revolution Today (in Spanish)
Challenge of the Left Opposition/Trotsky
Teamster Politics/Dobbs (Monad)
Pragmatism vs. Marxism/Novack
The War Years, 1940-43/Cannon
Writings 1929/Trotsky
PAMPHLETS (published or being worked on)
Who Killed Jim Crow?/Camejo
Struggle for Community Control in NoY. School District 1/Lobman \& Sojourner Strategy for Black Liberation/Thomas
Revolutionary Party \& It's Role in the Struggle for Socialism/Cannon Meaning of Detente/Lund

TOTAL SALES BROKEN INTO CATEGORIES

| Category | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SWP \& YSA | 29\% | 19\% | 19\% | 17\% | 19\% |
| Foreign | 12 | 12 | 16 | -23 | 23 |
| Commercial | 33 | 34 | 30 | 27 | 23 |
| Classroom Adoptions | 6 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 8 |
| Libraries | 14 | 19 | 16 | 17 | 18 |
| Individual sales | 6 | 7 | 9 | 7 | - |
| Total sales (\$) | 1CA, 100 | 175,800 | 207,900 | 270,000 | 276,600 |
| \% Change in Sales |  | -5 | +18 | +30 | +2 |

PUBLISHING RECORD

| Category | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 (proj) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Books | 13 | 7 | 10 | 21 | 13 | 12 |
| New Editions | 2 | 2 | 6 | 14 | 4 | 1 |
| Reprints | 15 | 10 | 19 | 12 | 15 | 16 |
| New Pamphlets | 24 | 27 | 22 | 17 | 15 | 16 |
| Reprint Pamphlets | 30 | 27 | 22 | 12 | 15 | 10 |

#  





$|$| 0 |
| :--- |






Evelyn Reed Tour Summary, January-April 1975
(Pittsburgh, Chicago, Milwaukee, San Francisco, Oakland/Berkeley, Los Angeles, San Diego, Boston, New York, and Atlanta)
Meeting Attendance 3000+
Television Time
1 hour + some campus TV time
Radio
6 shows (6 hours total)
Press
Books ordered by branch bookstores
in above areas
11 articles (news and interviews)

Honoraria
855
$\$ 5925$ + travel + some expenses (hote?.)
WOMAN'S EVOLUTION -- Total sales (to 4/18/75)
cash customers 912
branches
1515
YSAs 215
classroom adoptions 87
retail bookstores 3597
foreign
1731
libraries
18 (31 cloth)
wholesalers to retail
wholesalers to libraries

## 1225

231 (353 cloth)
9531 Total (paperback)
SALES OF WOMAN'S EVOLUTION RESULTING FROM SWP-YSA VISITS TO BOOKSTORES


YS teams:

| Ohio/Ky | 6 | 20 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Upper Midwest | 4 | 9 |
| Ms/Ks | 2 | 6 |
| NY | 1 | 3 |
| Oregon | 1 | 3 |
| MidAtlantic | 1 | 7 |
| Ill/Wisc | 1 | 5 |

cont. next page


REPORT TO LOS ANGEIES CENTRAL-EAST BRANCH ON REED TOUR ( $2 / 23-3 / 1 / 75$ ) by Evelyn Sell

Qverell Evaluation
The Reed tour of Los Angeles was a success politically, promotionally, and financially.

We were able to break through the isolation that has existed between us and the Woman's Building, we made many new contacts with whom we can work in the future on a variety of projects, and we reestablished a good relationship with Jeanne Cordova, an important feminist.

Woman's Evolution received wide media coverage and extensive publicity in connection with Evelyn's various meetings. Out of eight media contacts, we got five positive responses covering all three major media fields: television, newspaper, and radio. Due to the strong interest aroused by Evelyn's personal appearances and media coverage, local retail bookstores and wholesale outlets ordered almost 400 copies of her book and several new stores were added to the list carrying Pathfinder titles. Sisterhood Bookstore told me today that the book is selling very well, better than any other Pathfinder title they have ever carried, and that lots of people know about and ask for the book.

Over $\$ 1,000$ was raised through honoraria and the Militant Forum social. Los Angeles raised $\$ 450$ in honoraria and San Diego raised $\$ 500$. After deducting travel expenses, publicity costs, expenses for the social and the Viewpoint split, the two Los Angeles branches will share about $\$ 175$.

## Details of Various Tour Events

Sunday, Feb. 23, Reception. Attended by two of the women speaking at the March 1 symposium, several women from the National Women's Political Caucus and several members of Sisters United from Cal State.

Monday, Feb. 24, San Diego. A number of press and radio interviews were held with Evelyn. She had supper with some contacts. One hundred fifty attended her meeting at San Diego State -- larger than meetings have been during past period.

Tuesday, Feb. 25, "Let's Rap" show on Channel 1l. The first half of the 30 -minute television program was devoted to an interview with Evelyn and the second part consisted of Evelyn answering phone-in questions. The interviewer, Alicia Sandoval, was very well prepared and asked good questions to help get across major points in Evelyn's book. Evelyn's answers were a model, I think, for party spokespeople. Although she could have talked for an hour on any of the questions, she carefully confined herself to brief, to-the-point answers which allowed the interviewer to cover a lot of ground. Sandoval held the book up several times in the course of the interview so that viewers could see the cover.

Tuesday, Feb. 25, "Dealing" show on KPFK radio. conducted an interview which lasted for 25 minutes.

Barbara Cady Evelyn was
able to get in two very good, detailed plugs for the March 1 symposium and Cady gave the book a very good plug.

Wednesday, Feb. 26, Los Angeles Times phone interview. Janice Mall, from the View Section, had a 10-15 minute interview with Evelyn. Mall had just read the book the previous night and was very excited and enthusiastic about it. The interview was printed in the Sunday I.A. Times's "About Women" column.

Wednesday, Feb. 26, Los Angeles. Free Press interview. Jeanne Cordova held a two-hour interview with Evelyn and the article is appearing in the issue coming out this week. At the end of the session she told Evelyn she would work to get feminists and the SWP together because the SWP is the only group with the answers. This is a significant development for us. Cordova also taped the symposium and attended the social Saturday night.

Wednesday, Feb. 26, Claremount colleges meeting. The dean of students at Pitzer College in Claremount organized, on very short notice, a meeting for Evelyn. The faculty and students of all the small colleges in Claremount (four or five) were invited to have dinner with Evelyn and hear her talk about her experiences as a Marxist and feminist. About 25 persons gathered for an informal discussion with Evelyn. About $\$ 10$ worth of literature was sold and a good discussion was held.

Thursday, Feb。27, California State University。 Evelyn was the featured speaker at the International Women's Week Program sponsored by Sisters United and Associated Students, the student government body. About 60 attended and a good discussion was held. I was told lots of literature was sold but do not have figures.

Saturday, March 1, Symposium at Woman's Building. Two hundred persons attended the meeting; the audience represented quite a range -- older as well as younger people, a large number of men, university persons and noncampus persons. The meeting was called to order by Michele Kort, a coordinator of the Woman's Building, who told me afterwards that she was very pleased with the meeting. The chairwoman, Gloria Lothrop, did a very good job of introducing the speakers, keeping the meeting rolling along, and helping set the right tone. The audience was very attentive and serious and you could feel the overwhelmingly positive reaction to Evelyn's views and any strong feminist statement made by any speaker.

KPFK got a copy of the tape of the meeting and plans to broadcast the symposium. The Sisterhood Bookstore sold 40-45 copies of Woman's Evolution and Evelyn autographed a number of copies after the meeting adjourned.

Several women told me that news about the symposium was very widely spread. Announcements were carried on KPFK radio, KMET radio, and KCET-TV. Announcements were sent out in mailings from the Militant Forum, the National Women's Political Caucus (700), Women's Building newsletter (500), and a special mailing to a list compiled by Priscilla and myself. Announcements were printed in the Militant and the student newspaper at Cal State. The Los Angeles Women's Switchboard also helped advertise the symposium.

Saturday, March l, Militant Forum social. About 100 persons attended including about 25 noncomrades as best as I could tell. We collected $\$ 326.73$ from the dinner and refreshments. The hall was very nicely decorated, the food was delicious, the atmoshere was very good, and the social was a perfect conclusion to a successful week.

## Music of the future

As a result of the work done on the tour, we have put ourselves in a very good position to continue promotion of Woman's Evolution.

A tape was made of the Woman's Building symposium. The Militant is interested in seeing a transcription for possible publication. The executive committee is considering scheduling some type of gathering for people to listen to the tape.

The producer of Channel 13's "Los Angeles Woman" show wants to book Evelyn for a May program and UCLA has offered $\$ 350$ plus travel money for a May meeting for Evelyn. Dr. Hilda Kuper, who presented the antimatrianchJ view at the symposium, told Evelyn that she wanted very much to have Evelyn speak at UCLA and that she would personally see to it that the Anthropology Department sponsors such a meeting. In addition, there are other media and campus possibilities that we could not work on this time because we didn't have Evelyn enough days to fit everything in. A promotional kit is being put together which will include the Los Angeles articles and tour coverage information; we can use this kit in securing more honoraria and media exposure.
(Note: this report was abridged for space reasons.)
（All statistics are as of April 14， 1975 and unless specified are for locals only．）

TOTAL MEMBERSHIP

|  | May 1974 | Dec． 1974 | April 1975 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Center locals | 791 | 774 | 783 |
| Regional locals | 286 | 221 | 264 |
| At－large members | 133 | 192 | 163 |
| Total | 1，210 | 1，187 | 1，210 |

$35 \%$ of the total membership is in the region．
$35 \%$ in May，1974．
$36 \%$ of the total membership is in the SWP。
$39 \%$ in May，1974．
$55 \%$ of the center local membership is in the SWP．
59\％in May，1974．

RECRUITMENT

|  | Recruited <br> Jan。－May 1974 | Recruited <br> Sept．－Dec． 1974 | Recruited <br> Jan。－April 1975 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Center locals | 140 | 169 | 121 |
| Regional locals | 123 | 95 | 98 |
| At－large members | 60 | 120 | 76 |
| Total | 323 | 384 | 295 |
|  | Dropped <br> Jan．－May 1974 | Dropped <br> Sept．－Dec． 1974 | Dropped <br> Jan．－April 1975 |
| Center locals | 126 | 71 | 87 |
| Regional locals | 39 | 27 | 29 |
| At－large members | 205 | 75 | 42 |
| Total | 370 | 173 | 158 |

25 members were graduated from Sept．－Dec．1974，and 23 from Jan．－ April 1975.

SEX

Male
Female

| May 1974 | April 1975  <br> $60 \%$ $57 \%$ <br> $40 \%$ $43 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: |

OPPRESSED NATIONAUITIES

|  | May 1973 | May 1974 | April 1975 | Recruited since Jan. 1, 1975 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Black | 54 | 56 | 75 | 23 |
| Chicano | 21 | 21 | 31 | 5 |
| Puerto Rican | 5 | 5 | 15 | 4 |
| Asian-American | 11 | 10 | 12 | 1 |
| Other Latino | 5 | 4 | 5 | 1 |
| Of the total membership in locals, $7 \%$ is Black, $3 \%$ is Chicano, and 1\% is Puerto Rican. <br> Of the members who joined since Jan。 $1,1975,11 \%$ are Black, $2 \%$ are Chicano, and $2 \%$ are Puerto Rican. |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

IENGIH OF TIME IN YSA

|  | May 1974 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Less than 6 months 1975 |  |  |
| 6 months-1 yr. | $24 \%$ |  |
| $1-2$ yrs. | $13 \%$ |  |
| $2-3$ yrs. | $17 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| $3-4$ yrs. | $20 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| $4-5$ yrs. | $14 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| Over 5 yrs. | $12 \%$ | $12 \%$ |

AGE

|  | May 1974 |  | April 1975 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 15 yrs. old | $1 \%$ |  | $1 \%$ |
| $15-17$ Yrs. | $5 \%$ |  | $3 \%$ |
| $18-20$ yrs. | $21 \%$ |  | $19 \%$ |
| $21-23$ yrs. | $43 \%$ |  | $41 \%$ |
| $24-26$ yrs. | $22 \%$ |  | $26 \%$ |
| Over 26 yrs. | $8 \%$ | $9 \%$ |  |

CAMPUS BASE
May 1973 May 1974 April 1975
Total of center and regional locals: College
High school
43\%

Regional locals:

College
High school
Center locals:
College
High school

$33 \%$ 6\%

$$
\begin{array}{r}
43 \% \\
7 \%
\end{array}
$$

$$
28 \%
$$

$$
6 \%
$$

$41 \%$
$5 \%$

63\%
6\%

The YSA has members on 123 different college campuses, 9 with 10 or more people.

The YSA has members attending 37 different high schools.

## STUDENT GOVERNMENT CAMPAIGNS

46 student government campaigns were run this spring, and 13 last fall.

4 high school election campaigns were run this spring and last fall.

JOB INFORMATION
Work full-time 33\%
Work part-time
Assigned full-time to our movement
Members of trade unions
Unions with largest concentration of members:

AFSCME
35
Teamsters
CWA
OPEIU
ムFTT

10
8
8
6

NUMBER OF LOCALS AND $1 T$-LARGE AREAS
At the height of the spring, there were 56 locals. 11 locals were chartered between Jan. 1 and April 14. 7 locals were dissolved between Jan. l and April 14. At-large members are in 106 different cities.

1974 YOUNG SOCIALIST TEAMS STATISTICS

|  | Spring | Fall |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | 14 | 15 |
| Number of teams | 60 | 97 |
| Militants sold | 9,200 | 13,688 |
| Young Socialists sold | 8,000 | 9,976 |
| Pathfinder literature sold | 2,000 | 3,713 |
| Number of YSA locals chartered | $?$ | 7 |

SIZE OF YSA CENTER LOCALS

|  | May 1974 | Dec. 1974 | April 1975 | Recruited since Jan. 1, 1975 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boston | 67* | 56 | 54 | 5 |
| Twin Cities | 46 | 51 | 52 | 11 |
| Upper West Side | 44 | 44 | 51 | 9 |
| Atlanta | 50 | 54 | 46 | 12 |
| Lower Manhattan | 49 | 58 | 45 | 0 |
| Brooklyn | 41 | 49 | 40 | 5 |
| San Francisco | 34 | 43 | 40 | 3 |
| Chicago | 46 | 38 | 38 | 8 |
| Central-East, L.A. | - 25 | 29 | 36 | 6 |
| Denver | 33 | 26 | 32 | 7 |
| Portland | 22 | 24 | 32 | 11 |
| Philadelphia | 33 | 35 | 31 | 2 |
| Pittsburgh | 25 | 27 | 30 | 6 |
| Cleveland | 27 | 29 | 29 | 4 |
| Detroit | 29 | 34 | 29 | 4 |
| Washington, D.C. | 34 | 32 | 29 | 6 |
| Berkeley | 40 | 34 | 28 | 4 |
| Houston | 36 | 23 | 26 | 6 |
| St. Louis | 23 | 25 | 26 | 4 |
| Seattle | 32 | 33 | 25 | 2 |
| Westside, L.A. | 22 | 24 | 24 | 1 |
| Milwaukee | 12 | 17 | 23 | 3 |
| San Diego | 21 | 20 | 17 | 3 |

*Combined membership of North Boston and South Boston locals.

SIZE OF YSA REGIONAL LOCALS AS OF APRII 1975

| Bloomington | 25 | Cclumbus | 8 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| East Iansing | 15 | Albany | 7 |
| Kalamazoo | 14 | Louisville | 7 |
| Cincinnati | 13 | Madison, Wi。 | 7 |
| Sacramento | 11 | Tucson | 7 |
| San Jose | 11 | Dallas | 6 |
| Austin | 10 | State College | 6 |
| Iogan | 10 | Ames | 5 |
| San Antonio | 10 | Champaign | 5 |
| Santa Barbara | 10 | Charleston | 5 |
| Chico |  | 9 | Edinboro |
| Mt. Pleasant | 9 | Knoxville | 5 |
| Worcester | 9 | Long Beach | 5 |
| Ann Arbor | 8 | Nashville | 5 |
| Baltimore | 8 | Tallahassee | 5 |
|  | Madison, NoJ. | 5 | 5 |

Income
Contributions
Local PRDFs, literature \& buttons Other

Total June 1, 1973 - April 1, 1975
$\$ 106,943.26$
24,601.07
18,994.99
\$ 150,539.32

Expenses
Total June 1, 1973 - April 1, 1975 \$ 147,563.68 Legal Expenses

Total legal expenses paid as of April $17,1975 \$ 46,853.07$
Balance due on legal expenses - April $17,1975 \$ 16,575.80$

Total number of PRDF contributors and sponsors - 2,250.

Printed Literature
Since June l, 1973 about 555,300 pieces of literature were produced at a cost of $\$ 13,112.74$. This consisted of 3 brochures, endorser cards, complaints, blue books, letterhead, 4 newsletters, fund letters and 40 miscellaneous leaflets.

> Total Money Sent To PRDF NO As Of April 1, 1975 From Local Areas *

Atlanta
Austin
Oakland-Berkeley
Boston
Chicago
Cleveland
Denver
Detroit
Houston
Both Los Angeles
Milwaukee
Minneapolis
All three New York
Philadelphia
Pittsburg
Portland
St. Louis
San Diego
San Francisco
Seattle
Wash. D.C.
Total

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 1,179.38 \\
757.30 \\
1,604.14 \\
1,670.00 \\
903.00 \\
862.18 \\
730.00 \\
1,187.07 \\
1,625.00 \\
323.75 \\
\hline 578.25 \\
1,475.42 \\
2,823.00 \\
140.00 \\
243.00 \\
250.00 \\
10.00 \\
1,419.50 \\
973.00 \\
1,355.55 \\
\\
\$ 20,009.54
\end{array}
$$

```
NATION:L C AMP:IGN MEDIN STATISTICS
    as of ipril 25, 1975
```

Total number of articles received from clipping service ..... 296
Number of states where the campaign received coverage ..... 40
States with most articles:
Missouri 41
Texas ..... 29
Number of cities where the campaign received coverage ..... 162
Number of articles on campaign launching ..... 230
States with most articles:
Missouri ..... 38
llinois ..... 22
Number of articles from tours ..... 58
States with most articles: Texas ..... 16
Georgia 13
Number of other articles ..... 8
National coverage:
National Observer
Boston Christian Science MonitorNew York Times
Stars and Stripes
Readership reached by campaign articles Approximately 30 million
Venezuelan coverage:12 feature articlesCovered in El Nacional (the major Venezuelan daily, onfront page), in intorcha and El Informador
Other international coverage
El Nacional - Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic
The News - Mexico City, MexicoKinnipeg Free Press - Vinnipeg, Canada
National TV coverage
Today Show - 10 minutes

|  | Bill of RightsEnglish | Bill of RightsSpanish | Youth Brochure |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Campaign Committees | 140,810 | 16,300 | 14,500 |
| Members of YSA Locals | 12,250 | 620 | 250 |
| At-large Members of YSA | 3,486 | 190 | 600 |
| Independent Supporters** | 2,401 | 17 | 115 |
| Young Socialist Teams | 56,000 | - | 16,500 |
| National Interventions: Dec. YSA Convention (St. Louis) | 1,800 | -- | - |
| Feb. Antiracism Conference (Boston) | 1,200 | 一 | - |
| April 26 Jobs Now Rally (Washington, D.C.) | 28,000( |  | - |
| Miscellaneous Distribution (Inquiries, labor mailing, press mailings, etc.) | 2,000 | 300 | 300 |
| TOTAL | 247,947 | 17,427 | 32,265 |

$* 23$ independent supporters in 16 states ordered bundles ranging from 10 to 1,500 .

## TOTAL DISTRIBUTION OF ALL NATIONAL CAMPAIGN MATERIALS

Bill of Rights for Working People - English
247,947
Bill of Rights for Working People - Spanish
Youth and the 176 Elections
The Socialist Workers Candidates for ' 76
Jobs For All poster
Camejo for President poster
Reid for Vice-president poster
4,900
Camejo photo button
9,300
Reid photo button
9,100
Vote SWP button 3,600
Youth endorser card
19,000
General endorser card
12,200
Socialist Candidates in the News 900
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INQUIRIES RECEIVED BY NATIONAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE JANUARY 1, 1975 - APRIL 24, 1975

| SOURCE | INFO | EXTRA LIT. | ENDOR- | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MIL } \\ & \text { SUB } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YS } \\ & \text { SUB } \end{aligned}$ | YSA <br> INFO | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JOIN } \\ & \text { YSA } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CON- } \\ & \text { TRIB } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PATH } \\ & \text { LIT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SET UP } \\ & \text { MTG. } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MILITANT ADS | 30 | 26 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 1 |
| BILL OF RIGHTS | 33 | 0 | 32 | 29 | 1 | 30 | 0 | 23 | 46 | 5 |
| YOUNG SOCIALIST | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| OTHER | 112 | 9 | 0 | 19 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 29 | 9 | 4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { VILLAGE VOICE } \\ & A D \end{aligned}$ | 49(fr | m 17 st | tes) |  |  |  |  | 15 |  |  |
| JENNESS-HAMILL TV APPREARANCE | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TODAY SHOW | 75 (fr | 31 st | tes) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTALS | 306 | 38 | 41 | 49 | 6 | 33 | 5 | 85 | 55 | 10 |

Note: The total number of inquiries is fewer than the columns' totals because many individuals fall into more than one category.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO NATIONAL CAMPAIGN FROM COUPONS, ENDORSERS, ETC.

| SOURCE | NO. OF CON TRIBUTORS | AMOUNT CONTRIBUTED |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BILL OF RIGHTS COUPONS | 23 | 149.25 |
| MILITANT \& YS COUPONS | 18 | 139.80 |
| ENDORSER CONTRIBUTIONS | 15 | 90.75 |
| YOUTH BROCHURE COUPONS | 2 | 11.00 |
| BIOGRAPHIES COUPON | 1 | 1.06 |
| CONTRIBUTIONS IUITH LETTERS | 8 | 36.75 |
| VOICE CD CONTRIBUTIONS | 15 | 55.00 |
| MISCL. | 3 | 35.00 |
| TOTALS | 85 | 569.05 |

ST. LOBIS RALLY COLLECTION THROUGH APRIL 24, 1975

bills paid and outstanding to the national campaign comm. As of April $\approx 4,1975$

| COMMITTEE | LITERATURE PAID | LIT. DUE | TOUR FEES PAID | TOUR FEES DUE | \% COL. <br> LECTIONS PNID | \% COL. <br> LECTIONS <br> DUE | MISC | TOTAL OUTSTANDING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Atlanta | 0 | 313 | 250 | 88 | 0 | 1,348 | 8 | 1,757 |
| Berkeley | 0 | 327 | 0 | 200 | 0 | 395 | 16 | 938 |
| Boston | 0 | 275 | 0 | 225 | 0 | 1,080 | - | 1,580 |
| Brooklyn | 0 | 302 | 0 | 167 | $\cdots$ | - | - | 469 |
| Chicego | 5 | 0 | -- | - | - | -- | 1. | 1 |
| Cleveland | 0 | 441 | 0 | 200 | 0 | 1,120 | 5 | 1,766 |
| Denver | 111 | 0 | 225 | 0 | 0 | 340 | 20 CR | 320 |
| Detroit | 130 | 116 | 250 | 0 | 542 | 1,088 | 2 | 1,206 |
| Houston | 0 | 333 | 0 | 275 | 0 | 920 | 13 | 1,541 |
| Los Angeles $C / E$ | 255 | 30 | 0 | 175 | 99 | 206 | - | 411 |
| Los Angeles West | 115 | 90 | 0 | 175 | 0 | 636 | - | 901 |
| Lower Manhattan | 0 | 335 | 0 | 167 | - | -- | - | 502 |
| Mi Iwaukee | 0 | 144 | 0 | 318 | 0 | 300 | 1 | 763 |
| Philadelphia | 231 | 0 | 285 | 0 | 0 | 300 | - | 300 |
| Pittsburgh | 146 | 70 | 300 | 0 | 468 | 81 | 1 | 152 |
| Portland | 0 | 275 | 201 | 0 | 0 | 294 | 2 | 571 |
| San Diego | 0 | 133 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 2 | - | 235 |
| San Francisco | 0 | 280 | 0 | 200 | 0 | 960 | - | 1,440 |
| Seattle | 146 | 152 | 129 | 96 | 287 | 473 | - | 721 |
| St. Louis | 0 | 108 | 200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 108 |
| Twin Cities | 120 | 275 | 0 | 225 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 504 |
| U. West Side, NY | 0 | 231 | 0 | 166 | - | - | - | 398 |
| Washington, D.C. | 184 | 40 | 110 | 140 | 300 | 690 | - | 870 |

TOTALS $1,443 \quad 4,270 \quad 1,950 \quad 2,917$ 1,701 $10,233 \quad 33 \quad 17,454$

## REPORT ON THE MIIITANT'S CIRCULATION IN 1974

Branch sales increased by 24 percent from a weekly average of 5,893 in 1973 to 7,319 in 1974. The biggest increase was during the sales campaign weeks. In 1973 sales for the two campaigns averaged 7,158. Sales for the two campaigns in 1974 averaged 9,060--an increase of 27 percent. During the weeks between sales campaigns, sales increased by 10 percent from an average of 4,380 in 1973 to 4,815 in 1974.

A total of 358,631 Militants were sold by the branches alone in 1974. This compares with 135,840 in 1972. Thus, sales have increased by 164 percent in the two years since the first sales campaign was launched.

An average of 635 comrades from the branches and center locals participated in weekly sales in 1974. The weekly per capita for those comrades selling was 11.5.

The breakdown of where Militants are sold is only available for the sales campaign weeks. The area where we registered the most improvement was in sales in Black and other minority communities. These sales averaged 2,668, or 29 percent of the total sold during the two sales campaigns in 1974-up from 1, 159 per week during the fall 1973 sales campaign. Campus sales increased from 2, 100 in 1973 to 2,446, or 27 percent of the total sold in 1974. Work place sales went from 248 a week in 1973 to 362 a week, or 4 percent of the total in 1974. Sales at political gatherings averaged 723 a week, or 8 percent of the total. The final 32 percent were sold at shopping areas, transportation terminals, and other miscellaneous locations.

The average bundle size for all branches in 1974 was 9,356. The weekly income from this size bundle for the Militant is $\$ 1,591$.

All branches made a profit on sales in 1974 and only one branch now has a back debt. The total profit for all branches was $\$ 11,723$ which is close to the profit made in 1973 and the branches were only charged $121 / 4$ a copy for the first eight months of that year. This is a reflection of the improvement made in the overall organization of sales. The percentage of the weekly bundle sold by all branches increased from 71 percent in 1973 to 78 percent in 1974.

The long term subscription base of the Militant remained fairly stable. At the end of 1973 there were 2,827 domestic and foreign long term subscribers and at the end of 1974 there were 3,130 . In addition to long term subscribers, i.e. people who have subscriptions of at least six months in length, there were an average of 300 introductory subscribers at all times during the year, other than those sold during subscription drives.

As a result of the merger with the ISR, 510 new foreign and domestic long term subscribers were gained.

1972-1974 COMPARISON OF MILITANT BUNDLE, SALES, AND PERCENT SOLD

|  | Average <br> Weekly Bundle |  |  | Average <br> Weekly Sales |  |  | Average Percent of Bundle Sold |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Branch | 1974 | 1973 | 1972 | 1974 | 1973 | 1972 | 1974 | 1973 | 1972 |
| Atlanta | 502 | 380 | 230 | 413 | 305 | 120 | 82\% | 80\% | 52\% |
| Boston | 584 | 550 | 370 | 433 | 374 | 185 | 74\% | 68\% | 50\% |
| Brooklyn | 412 | 405 | 220 | 325 | 248 | 125 | 79\% | 61\% | 56\% |
| Chicago | 570 | 510 | 340 | 450 | 414 | 230 | 79\% | 81\% | 67\% |
| Cleveland | 303 | 315 | 200 | 245 | 229 | 60 | 81\% | 73\% | 29\% |
| Denver | 369 | 290 | 290 | 268 | 235 | 130 | 73\% | 81\% | 44\% |
| Detroit | 531 | 400 | 430 | 472 | 287 | 280 | 89\% | 72\% | 65\% |
| Houston | 457 | 535 | 220 | 351 | 364 | 100 | 77\% | 68\% | 47\% |
| Central-East LA | 406 | 55 | 290 | 312 | 323 | 190 | 77\% | 58\% | 64\% |
| West Side LA | 380 |  |  | 287 |  |  | 76\% |  |  |
| Lower Manhattan | 415 | 530 | 190 | 303 | 387 | 90 | 73\% | 73\% | 48\% |
| Oakland/Berkeley | 682 | 655 | 330 | 559 | 479 | 180 | 82\% | 73\% | 55\% |
| Philadelphia | 411 | 350 | 250 | 354 | 233 | 130 | 86\% | 67\% | 51\% |
| Pittsburgh | 355 | 288* | --- | 277 | 210* | --- | 78\% | 73\%* |  |
| Portland | 320 | 260 | 165 | 253 | 170 | 105 | 79\% | 65\% | 65\% |
| St. Louis | 321 | 205** | --- | 290 | 166** | * --- | 90\% | 81\%** | --- |
| San Diego | 273 | 330 | 180 | 210 | 256 | 90 | 77\% | 78\% | 50\% |
| San Francisco | 453 | 495 | 365 | 315 | 302 | 205 | 70\% | 61\% | 56\% |
| Seattle | 385 | 340 | 160 | 304 | 264 | 95 | 79\% | 78\% | 60\% |
| Twin Cities | 395 | 360 | 260 | 292 | 220 | 145 | 74\% | 61\% | 55\% |
| Upper West Side | 432 | 420 | 225 | 306 | 310 | 120 | 71\% | 74\% | 53\% |
| Washington, D.C. | 400 | 330 | 300 | 300 | 217 | 170 | 75\% . | 66\% | 56\% |
| Austin | --- | 165 | 140 | --- | 131 | 80 | --- | 80\% | 57\% |
| TOTAL | 2,356 | 3,375 5 | , 155 | 2,319 | 5,893 2 | 2,830 | 78\% | 71\% | 54\% |

[^0]|  | Weekly Average Participation |  |  | Weekly Average Per Capita Sales |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Branch | 1974 | 1973 | 1972 | 1974 | 1973 | 1972 |
| Atlanta | 40 | 32 | 25 | 10.3 | 9.4 | 4.3 |
| Boston | 39 | 49 | 48 | 11.1 | 7.2 | 3.9 |
| Brooklyn | 35 | 31 | 33 | 9.3 | 7.7 | 3.3 |
| Chicago | 34 | 43 | 38 | 13.2 | 10.2 | 6.1 |
| Cleveland | 20 | 24 | 17 | 12.3 | 11.5 | 3.5 |
| Denver | 26 | 30 | 27 | 10.3 | 7.2 | 4.3 |
| Detroit | 29 | 26 | 35 | 16.3 | 11.3 | 8.0 |
| Houston | 30 | 33 | 27 | 11.7 | 10.8 | 3.7 |
| Central-East IJA | 32 | 31 | 33 | 9.8 | 10.0 | 5.8 |
| West Side LA | 23 |  |  | 12.5 |  |  |
| Lower Manhattan | 33 | 41 | 19 | 9.2 | 10.2 | 4.7 |
| Oakland/Berkeley | 43 | 44 | 43 | 13.0 | 10.6 | 4.2 |
| ?hiladelphia | 28 | 23 | 23 | 12.6 | 9.9 | 5.7 |
| 'ittsburgh | 23 | $17 *$ | -- | 12.0 | 11.6* | --- |
| Portland | 22 | 20 | 21 | 11.5 | 8.8 | 5.0 |
| St. Louis | 21 | 13** | -- | 13.8 | 11.5** | --- |
| San Diego | 18 | 20 | 20 | 11.7 | 12.7 | 4.5 |
| San Francisco | 29 | 27 | 25 | 10.9 | 11.2 | 8.2 |
| Seattle | 23 | 21 | 23 | 13.2 | 12.1 | 4.1 |
| Twin Cities | 27 | 22 | 29 | 10.8 | 10.0 | 5.0 |
| Upper West Side | 33 | 33 | 27 | 9.3 | 10.1 | 4.4 |
| Washington, D.C. | 27 | 19 | 23 | 11.1 | 10.8 | 7.4 |
| Austin | -- | 18 | 15 | ---- | 7.9 | 5.0 |
| TOTAL | 635 | 600 | 551 | 11.5 | 10.5 | 5.1 |

*Based on 19 weeks.
**Based on 27 weeks.

## BREAKDOWN ON WEEKLY AVERAGE SALES IN 1974

| Branch | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Jan. } \\ & 1974 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 18-week Spring Sales Campaign | 12-week Summer 1974 | 11-week Fall Sales Campaign | Last 5 Weeks of 1974 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Atlanta | 314 | 422 | 415 | 470 | 307 |
| Boston | 175 | 395 | 193 | 935 | 196 |
| Brooklyn | 180 | 389 | 142 | 482 | 276 |
| Chicago | 396 | 554 | 308 | 500 | 340 |
| Cleveland | 204 | 270 | 134 | 394 | 116 |
| Denver | 169 | 247 | 220 | 418 | 189 |
| Detroit | 200 | 466 | 233 | 976 | 125 |
| Houston | 147 | 368 | 249 | 590 | 195 |
| Central-East LA | 181 | 252 | 291 | 463 | 327 |
| West Side LA | 187 | 321 | 266 | 330 | 182 |
| Lower Manhattan | 102 | 406 | 168 | 395 | 178 |
| akland/Berkeley | 399 | 716 | 372 | 640 | 362 |
| + ailadelphia | 275 | 382 | 271 | 474 | 235 |
| Pittsburgh | 190 | 331 | 160 | 395 | 160 |
| Portland | 170 | 260 | 224 | 326 | 186 |
| St. Louis | 87 | 309 | 183 | 509 | 122 |
| San Diego | 134 | 240 | 135 | 295 | 143 |
| San Francisco | 235 | 322 | 161 | 544 | 200 |
| Seattle | 337 | 369 | 226 | 323 | 200 |
| Twin Cities | 291 | 296 | 147 | 504 | 159 |
| Upper West Side | 237 | 306 | 184 | 517 | 176 |
| Washington, D.C. | 164 | 314 | 256 | 421 | 170 |
| TOTAL | 4,774 | 7,935 | 4,938 | 10,901 | 4,544 |

Breakdown of 1974:

|  | Aver. Wk'ly Bundle Size All Branches | Aver. Wk'ly Income for The Militant | Aver. Sales | \% of Bundle Sold | Weekly <br> Profit/ <br> Loss all. <br> Branches |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. January (3 issues) | 6,439 | \$1,095 | 4,774 | 74\% | + \$99 |
| 2. Spring Sales Campaign (18 issues) | 10,052 | \$1,709 | 7,935 | 79\% | + \$275 |
| 3. Summer $\underset{\text { (12 issues) }}{\text { ) }}$ | 6,719 | \$1,142 | 4,938 | 73\% | + \$93 |
| 4. Fall Sales Campaign (11 issues) | 13,016 | \$2,213 | 10,901 | 84\% | +\$512 |
| 5. December (5 issues) | 6,878 | \$1,169 | 4,544 | 66\% | - \$ 33 |
| $1974 \text { Weekly }$ <br> Average | 2,356 | \$1,591 | 2.319 | 78\% | +\$239 |

Comparison with previous performance:

|  | 1974 | 1973 | 1972 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1. Average bundle size per issue: | 9,356 | 8,375 | 5,155 |
| 2. Average sales per issue: | 7,319 | 5,893 | 2,830 |
| 3. Total copies sold for all issues: | 358,631 | 282,864 | 135,840 |
| 4. Total income from branch sales: | $\$ 89,658$ | $\$ 70,716$ | $\$ 33,960$ |
| 5. Income for the Militant: | $\$ 77,935$ | $\$ 57,787$ | $\$ 30,930$ |
| 6. Total pirofit for all branches: | $\$ 11,723$ | $\$ 12,929$ | $\$ 3,030$ |

(Note: From January 1972 to August 1973, the branches were charged $121 / 2 \chi$ a copy; from September to December 1973, they were charged 171/24; in 1974 they were charged $17 \%$ a copy.)

## Branch

Debt at End of 1974
Atlanta
3oston
Brooklyn
Chicago
Cleveland
Denver
Detroit
Houston
Central-East LA

West Side LA
Lower Manhattan
Oakland/Berkeley
iladelphia
rittsburgh
Portland
St. Louis
San Diego
San Francisco
Seattle
Twin Cities
Upper West Side
Washington, D.C.
Austin

TOTAL
-0-
-0-
-0-
-0-
-0-
-0-
-0-
-0-
-0-
-0-
$\$ 200$
$-0-$
$-0-$
$-0-$
$\$ 451$
-0-
-0-
\$21
-0-
-0-
\$10
-0-
---
\$682

Debt at End of 1973

Debt at End of 1972

| $-0-$ | $\$ 785$ |
| :---: | ---: |
| $-0-$ | $\$ 483$ |
| $\$ 83$ | $\$ 705$ |
| $-0-$ | $\$ 2,699$ |
| $\$ 54$ | $\$ 509$ |
| $\$ 922$ | $\$ 1,033$ |
| $\$ 822$ | $\$ 1,309$ |
| $\$ 318$ | $\$ 1,314$ |
| $-0-$ | $-0-$ |
| $-0-$ | $-0-$ |
| $\$ 37$ | $\$ 617$ |
| $-0-$ | $\$ 120$ |
| $-0-$ | ---- |
| $\$ 714$ | $\$ 679$ |
| $-0-$ | ---- |
| $-0-$ | $-0-$ |
| $-0-$ | $-0-$ |
| $-0-$ | $\$ 762$ |
| $-0-$ | $-0-$ |
| $-0-$ | $-0-$ |
| $-0-$ | $-0-$ |
| $-0-$ | $\$ 340$ |
|  |  |
| $\$ 2,950$ | $\$ 11,355$ |

\$11,355

DOMESTIC (Excluding introductory subs)
1974
1973

Paid
Long term subscribers

$$
\begin{array}{rr}
2,870 & 2,626 \\
218 & 250
\end{array}
$$

Libraries

Other
Exchange 143289
Complimentary 131163
Prisoner subs 303325

Total Domestic Subs $\quad$ 3,665 3,653

FOREIGN

| Paid long term subscribers | 260 | 201 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Complimentary and exchange | 216 | 242 |
| Total Foreign Subs | 476 | 443 |


| TOTAL COMPLIMENTARY \& EXCHANGE | 793 | 1,019 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| TOTAL PAID | 3,348 | 3,077 |
| TOTAL LONG TERM SUBS | 4,141 | 4,096 |

NEW MILITANT SUBSCRIPTIONS AS A RESUUT OF THE MERGER WITH THE ISR (AS OF APRII 1975)

1. Total number of ISR subscriptions at the time of the merger:

1,583
2. The number who were already Militant subscribers: 825
3. Number of new Militant subscribers gained: 758
4. Breakdown of new subscribers:

Domestic long term subscribers 370
Domestic introductory subscribers 80
Foreign long term subscribers 140
Libraries
168

## COMPARISON OF SUBSCRIPIION RENEWAL RATES FOR THE MILITANT

| Long term subscribers: | 1974* | 1973 | 1972 | 1971 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Renewing |  |  |  |  |
| \# Renewing | $36.2 \%$ | $36.4 \%$ | $29.4 \%$ | $27.4 \%$ |
| \# Sent Letter | 910 | 947 | 790 | 841 |
| \# | 2,515 | 2,599 | 2,690 | 3,065 |

*These figures for 1974 reflect the number and percentage of people who renewed in direct response to the renewal letter which is sent to subscribers every month as they are due to expire. However, in August of 1974, we sent out a special letter to all subscribers asking them to renew their subscriptions, regardless of when they were due to expire, because of the new rate increase which was taking effect in September. A total of 655 subscribers responded to this letter. We didn't keep track of how many of these 655 people had already renewed once in 1974. Thus, we can't accurately calculate the renewal rate for 1974. The 36 percent figure is the minimum.

Introductory subscribers (non-subscription drive):

| \% Renewing | $\frac{1974}{15 \%}$ | $\frac{1973}{12.9 \%}$ | $\frac{1972}{8.2 \%}$ | $\frac{1971}{10.2 \%}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# Renewing | 302 | 301 | 235 | 220 |
| \# Sent Letter | 2,012 | 2,327 | 2,861 | 2,149 |

Introductory subscription drive renewals:

|  | SP 74 | FALL 74 | FALL 73 | FALL 72 | FALL 71 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Renewing | $3.9 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ |
| \# Renewing | 2889 | 301 | 453 | 633 | 1,62 |
| \# Sent Letter | 7,331 | 10,525 | 15,935 | 34,471 | 31,240 |

## COMPARISON OF AVERAGE WEEKLY PAID CIRCULATION FIGURES

$1974 \quad 1973 \quad 1972 \quad 1971 \quad 1970$
The Militant

```
bundles
subs
total paid
```

11,822 11,920 10,396
11,964 19,479
23,786 31,399

26,057
10,866
36,923
bundles
subs
total paid
-

25,405
10,156
35,561

| 15,779 | 14,945 | 12,175 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 10,315 | 10,100 | 8,292 |
| 26,094 | 25,045 | 20,467 |

## Guardian

```
bundles
subs
total paid
```

| 2,800 | 3,019 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 17,918 | 16,391 |
| 20,718 | 19,410 |

2,875
15,612
18,487

$$
\begin{array}{r}
2,300 \\
15,805 \\
18,105
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
4,852 \\
20,010 \\
24,862
\end{array}
$$

## Bulletin

```
bundles
subs
total paid
```

5,975
10,022
15,997


$$
\begin{aligned}
& 4,842 \\
& 2,231 \\
& 7,073
\end{aligned}
$$

People's World
bundles subs
total paid

2,843 2,608
5,451

5,351
2,746
8,097


3,530
3,133
6,663
$*$
$*$
$*$


[^0]:    *Based on 19 weeks of 1973.
    **Based on 27 weeks of 1973.

