



French worker-student alliance shakes France—points the way to victory.

SDS WORK-IN 1968:

TOWARDS A WORKER-STUDENT ALLIANCE

The politics expressed in this pamphlet represent one significant tendency within sds.



Students on picket line in militant L.A. newspaper strike

WORK-IN 1968:

SDS GOES TO THE FACTORIES

STEERING COMMITTEE, CHICAGO WORK-IN

Last summer the 1968 Work-In, based on an SDS National Council resolution on summer program, took place across America, from Los Angeles to Boston. Over 350 students, mainly SDS members, took jobs in factories, warehouses, loading docks and offices in order to talk with working people about the Vietnam war, racism, the student movement and topical political questions. Most of us planned to come back to school and the main emphasis of Work-In activity was not to organize the working class, but to get a deeper understanding of the problems workers face and their ideas.

Students joined the Work-In for a variety of reasons and with a wide range of political viewpoints. Some, opposed to the war and the many social evils that exist in this country, wanted to find out how workers could be won to fighting these injustices. Other students were mainly concerned with their special middle class background, and wanted to broaden their outlook by sharing the experience of the nation's 30 million industrial workers, while some of us already saw the working class as the main driving force for revolutionary change and wanted to gain personal experience to be able to win other students to this view through personal experience.

The need for the Work-In was based on two assumptions about the radical student movement shared by all participants: 1) we are badly isolated from the people as a whole, particularly from the increasingly militant workers' movement and 2) we wanted to develop clearer strategic thinking from which we could help end this isolation.

In most places small Work-In groups of six or eight met to discuss divisions, struggles, attitudes and conversations on the job, current political developments around the war, strikes, rebellions, Columbia, France, Democratic Convention, etc. An important part of the Work-In concerned support groups of people unable to take factory jobs but willing to get up at 5:30 a.m.

to distribute SDS Work-In material to workers in plants with Work-Iners. In many factories these leaflets were invaluable in raising questions with workers, in stimulating political discussion and in introducing SDS as pro-working class. Besides the basic discussion groups, many Work-Ins provided regular forms such as study groups and forums for discussion of theoretical issues such as the class nature of the Black Liberation Movement, New Working Class theory, dynamics of capitalism, the inherent necessity of imperialism, the social role of the working class under capitalism and the role of student movements in the revolutionary process.

Work-Iners made many mistakes in the course of the summer. Perhaps the most widespread was timidity. The main emphasis was to listen and learn, not to preach—and this was correct. But some of us took this too far and played down our real convictions in order to 'fit in'. We were most successful when we put forth our ideas in frank, clear and relevant ways—explaining Columbia, France and the anti-war movement, openly opposing racism as the tool of our common enemy to divide us for his profit and the people's misery. In these cases we made the deepest friendships, gained real clarity about fellow workers' real ideas and learned to make our analyses understandable in terms of their life experiences.

Now most of us have returned to school. The purpose of this pamphlet is to relate a few of our experiences with workers and some lessons we learned in order to help illustrate the realities of life workers face.* We recognize the widespread racism and anti-communism which the ruling class has originated and spread among workers for its benefit.

We found that it is true that white workers are racist and that their racism primarily overshadows class unity. We also found that during periods of intense struggle, it could be at least temporarily overcome (just as on campus through struggle we can defeat some of the racism in white students, including ourselves, and unite with Black students, and support Black rebellions). Mahwah Ford in New Jersey had its third wildcat of Black and white workers in a year against racist foremen. A number of white workers expressed admiration for the Black workers in ghetto rebellions in the sense of, "They have the right idea. The only way you can get anything in this society is to take it." Similar comments were made about the student movement.

One student who started work a few weeks after a strike was told by an older white worker that all the workers except one had been solidly behind the strike. The one scab was Black. The student cringed, expecting a racist connection. Instead, the worker quickly cautioned him not to judge the other Black workers by him, because "They won't even speak to the bastard."

We also found that workers would listen and argue the question of racism with us. More importantly, we realized that we must do this. If we are to build a worker-student alliance to change this country, we must consistently seek out and oppose racism as the divisive tool of those who rule.

We see our primary role in building campus struggles against our administrations along clear and articulated pro-working class lines; combatting Administration racism and imperialism by winning students to understanding that we face a common enemy along with the workers—the Imperialist ruling class that puts profits first and people last in the shops and the classroom—at home and abroad.



Chicago Chrysler workers on solidarity march with striking Ford workers.

*Some articles concerning on-the-job experience have been left unsigned at the request of the authors because they are either continuing on the job as part-time workers and students, or are in school fulltime now and are planning to return to their jobs and re-establish those relationships next summer. They feel that signing their names could unnecessarily jeopardize their political work on these jobs.

CHICAGO WORK-IN SUPPORTS WILDCAT REA STRIKE

5

NINA SHAPIRO, MADISON SDS

CATHY FISHER, U. OF CHI. SDS, PLP

CAROL SHICK, U. OF ILL, CHICAGO CIRCLE SDS

It was four o'clock Tuesday morning in the middle of July. Fifty Black truck drivers picketed quietly in front of Chicago's Railway Express Agency. As the older white drivers began to arrive for work, they gathered across the street from the company entrance. They talked jokingly amongst themselves for a while. Then suddenly, one stepped out and crossed the street. "I feel like a fool just standing there watching you. And what's worse, I was laughing at you. Laughing at you!" He picked up a sign and started walking. Soon a few others joined him, and as the younger drivers began arriving, they too picketed.

Thus began a wildcat strike by drivers against the Railway Express Agency. The drivers quickly elected a leadership and wrote up a list of demands. It was quite a list, ranging all the way from unpaid overtime to dirty washrooms and broken down trucks. One of the main hopes of the striking workers was to get out of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, the union which had been strangling their grievances for several years.

As the men told us later on, this strike had been talked about for over six months. Several attempts at a wildcat had been made before, but all had failed. This time, a Black caucus had been organized, which planned and led the strike. The white drivers understood this, and followed the initiative of the caucus to a man. The strike was similar to the transit workers wildcat earlier in the summer, also led by a Black caucus, and the leaders of the strike said that it was that earlier wildcat which had inspired them to try. The white drivers similarly saw the parallels, and began to throw out the ideas the press had given them that the transit wildcat had been a "Black Power grab".

6 On Thursday, REA succeeded in obtaining a federal court injunction against the strikers and particularly against picketing. The press, in the meantime, reported that the strike was over, and that was the last reportage. The Chicago Work-In, meeting that Friday night, decided to go to the REA depots and find out what was really happening. The drivers were excited to see us (shouts went down the block, "Hey, the students and intellectuals are here to help us!"), and quickly ran down the facts of the situation. They were congregated across the street from the REA entrance, watching since they could not picket. We offered to throw up a support picket line the next day, and the offer was eagerly accepted.

So Saturday, amidst cheering and lots of free coke, about 25 or 30 of us picketed and sang songs. We agreed to return Monday, this time to the terminals where the trucks went to pick up freight. Because there were no pickets at these places, REA was able to hire drivers from trucking companies to pick up the freight. And Monday we were a success. Carrying signs saying "Students Support REA Strikers", we convinced most drivers coming in for freight not to scab. About half a dozen trucks crossed our lines between 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m.

Monday afternoon, the drivers had a meeting to decide what to do. Three of us from the Work-In were invited to the meeting, at which the wildcat leadership announced that according to the National Railway Labor Act they could not get out of the BRC without winning a nationwide vote. They had a list of promises from the BRC vice president to talk to the company about, but no material gains. The meeting was hot and heavy, the drivers feeling up against the wall, but also wanting more than just promises after a week's lost wages.

A couple of men whom we had gotten to know that day wanted us to have a chance to speak—to throw in our support publicly. They were turned down by the chairman of the meeting, who had been urging the men to go back to work. Finally, one of the men was recognized and asked that we be allowed to speak, explaining for those who didn't know who we were. The chair overruled him until the house (600 men) demanded to hear from us. Our spokesman spoke very shortly, saying what the Work-In was, and that we had come to see the class of corporation owners as our enemy too. He ended with a statement of our support for the drivers' strike, and got the biggest ovation of any speaker in the tumultuous meeting. The chairman decided he needed a cooling off speaker before taking

the vote—which was about two to one for ending the walkout.

The whole struggle really opened our eyes in a different way than just working every day had. Suddenly, the power and strength of workers in struggle was no longer only theory. Our involvement with the drivers spurred us to move a step farther, and we invited some of them to see Salt of the Earth, a movie about striking Mexican-American miners, the following weekend.

About eight drivers, three of them with their wives, came to the movie. Along with 40 or so Work-Iners, they watched the stirring film about a community which overcame all obstacles, including racism, male chauvinism, government violence and federal injunctions, to defeat a zinc mining company in the 1950's. After the movie, we rather hesitantly gathered our chairs in a circle to discuss the movie and its lessons.

The chairman somewhat timidly opened the floor for comments. Silence followed, and then suddenly a Black driver stood up. For several minutes he spoke about the movie, about how it paralleled the present situation, and about the need for unity among workers and their allies. He ended with "And all this just goes to show, that if people just stick together we can turn the whole world over if we want to."

Everyone was moved to applause, and then the ice was broken. The drivers began to talk about the Black-white issue at REA, centering around the question of whether the main enemy was racism or the boss. Both white and Black drivers, and a few students, talked animatedly for a long time. Then they turned to the students, and asked us to tell them exactly who we were, where we came from and why we supported them.

Then the students picked up the ball, telling of the campus and anti-war struggles they had been involved in, and how they had come to see themselves as allies of the working class. Two main ideas were expressed: one, that students were impotent by themselves to make the changes that they wanted to see, and that workers had both an interest in these changes and the power to make them; secondly, that the university administrations that we fought were run by corporation owners—their bosses. "In other words," one driver said, "the people that run your schools are the people we work for—we have the same enemies."

The meeting, which we had anticipated to be a failure, had to be called to an end at 12:30. It was really a new and exciting experience on both sides. The students came to understand

8 the struggles of workers, and their political potential, in a real and different way. The workers came to see a potential ally in a force usually used as grounds for getting scabs—the students—and at the same time began to understand what the student movement is all about and how in a very real way it relates to them.

WORK-IN SUPPORTS

GARMENT STRIKE

DENNIS KAMENSKY, CCNY SDS



Picket line at Figure Flattery

This August the New York-New Jersey area Work-In played a role in supporting a strike in New York City's Garment Center. The experience there contradicts New Working Class and Marcuse theories.

The best way to tell the story of the Figure Flattery Strike

is in the words of the workers there. The first two leaflets (the originals were in Spanish, too) were written by the workers and distributed by them and Work-In students. The last one was written and distributed as a Work-In leaflet.

9

FIGURE FLATTERY IS OUTSTANDING FOR THE LOW SALARIES
THEY PAY WORKERS

The Afro-American and Latin workers who are employed by the Figure Flattery Co., (on both the ninth and tenth floors) are forced to work under unbelievably bad conditions. Racial discrimination, personal humiliation, filthy expressions used by the bosses in front of women, hard work at starvation wages. Above all: An atmosphere which damages the mental, physical and moral health of the workers.

The bosses, using the excuse that they have caught workers stealing, have turned the factory into something resembling a prison or concentration camp. The constant vigilance, spying and other forms of coercion practiced by the bosses are clear proof of the contempt in which they hold the Latin American and Afro-American workers. They fail to give us the respect to which we are entitled.

The bosses have installed fences throughout the factory. They lock the gates 15 minutes after work begins. This has blocked off the emergency fire exits—creating great danger to the workers.

The bosses and foremen are carrying on a campaign to divide the Afro-American and Latin workers. By this they hope to block the growth of even the least bit of unity. Unity means the achievement of better wages and working conditions.

All the things mentioned above have already been denounced to the leaders of Local 32, ILGWU. Each and every time their response and action has been on the side of the bosses. This is proof, once again, of the complicity between the corrupt union leadership of Local 32 and the bosses.

In the face of this situation we have organized the Workers' Action Committee. We demand the following:

1. A large enough wage increase to meet the rising cost of living.
2. No new contract to be signed without collective discussion with all the workers, and satisfaction of our demands.
3. Fifteen additional minutes on Fridays to cash our checks

or else payment in cash on Wednesdays as stipulated in the contract.

4. The new contract should be for only one year.
5. Vacation pay for all workers. (This year, only 25 out of 800 received pay.)
6. Equal division of overtime.

SUPPORT FIGURE FLATTERY STRIKERS

We made public, through a leaflet, our just demands and our resolution to fight for our rights. Our rights have, for a long time, been stepped on by the bosses and corrupt leadership of Local 32 (International Ladies Garment Workers Union)

On Wednesday, August 14, after long and fruitless negotiations with the bosses, the overwhelming majority of the workers decided to suspend work. The complicity of the leadership of Local 32 in the bosses' injustices was the final straw leading to the work stoppage. The stoppage continued from 8:00 a.m. Wednesday until 8:00 a.m. Friday, August 16.

When two of the leaders, including the shop steward, of the rank-and-file negotiating committee were fired, 150 workers refused to work unless the two were put back. Then the boss fired all 150 with the cooperation of the union leaders, who had helped the boss recruit strikebreakers.

Because of the disinterest of the leadership of Local 32 in fighting for the workers, a committee was organized during the strike to go to the International. We were received by Louis Stulberg, president of the International. Stulberg told us that before the International would appoint a committee to hear our grievances, we would first have to return to work. So we went back. At a meeting that afternoon, the representative of the International, Sabby Nahama, refused to take our side. Instead, he implied that our charges were a pack of lies.

On Monday, ten workers were fired, and so we closed down the shop. That afternoon some union "leaders" came out to tell us if we went back we would get a 4% wage increase and wouldn't lose pay for that day. But they refused to demand rehiring our shop steward, so we stayed out. At closing time, when the scabs came out, the cops jumped the husband of one of the workers waiting to pick her up. When she tried

to defend him, they beat her up and arrested them along with another worker.

11

In conclusion, the workers of Figure Flattery have been stepped on and had our grievances ignored by the leaders of Local 32. We have been fooled by the president of the International, and misled by its representative. But we have decided to continue our struggle for better salaries and working conditions.

WORKERS' UNITY IN GARMENT STRIKE BEATS GANG-UP OF BOSSES AND ILGWU LEADERS

. . . When the workers at Figure Flattery exercised their power, the bosses and crooked union leaders ganged up on them and tried to break the strike. The ILGWU brought down goons and strikebreakers to try to keep the factory running. The corrupt union officials, led by President Stulberg and Sabby Nehama (an official of Local 32) entered the strike on the side of the bosses. This punk, Sabby Nehama, has been used as a strikebreaker by the ILGWU and the AFL-CIO in Latin America for many years.

The bosses did their share—they called out the cops, who arrested five strikers, and harrassed all those on the picket line. They also savagely beat up a Cuban man, the son-in-law of one of the strikers, and charged him with "assault on an officer".

But the workers were not alone. Members of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) Work-In Project leafleted and picketed. Truckers refused to cross the picket lines. Rank and file members of other unions came to the picket lines, distributed leaflets, and raised money to help support the strike.

The workers at Figure Flattery have won a partial victory. They won a 4% cost of living increase, but their demand for \$100 a week is still being negotiated. The unified rank and file forced the bosses to hire back those workers fired during the strike. The union is still controlled by corrupt men and women serving the interests of the bosses. But the shop now has a leadership that serves the workers against the bosses.

Workers produce and distribute everything made in the garment center. The bosses produce nothing. This makes the workers far more powerful and important than the bosses

and corrupt union leaders. That's why the bosses need the cops to protect their interests. But, when well organized, workers are even more powerful than all of the bosses' cops, courts, and jailhouses. When workers rely on their own strength instead of phony union leaders they are the most powerful force in the world.

The workers at Figure Flattery fought the bosses. They fought the ILGWU leaders. They fought the cops. And they fought the no-strike clause in their contract. And they still won. They have gone back to work, not defeated, but ready to organize better and fight for greater victories.

The 800 workers who struck at Figure Flattery are among 26,500 workers directly employed by Kayser-Roth, Figure Flattery's parent corporation. Kayser-Roth operates 117 sweatshops in the U.S. (including 34 in the wage-depressed south, of which only 17 are unionized) and totals \$400,000,000 in sales each year. Yet the average wage within these plants is \$1.60 an hour, the government minimum.

In addition, Kayser-Roth South America has recently opened a plant in Mexico. Kayser-Roth International has factories in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East. (Wages and conditions in these plants are even worse than in the U.S.)

The same bosses that own businesses like Kayser-Roth run our universities. The only way that students can improve their own lives, fight against the bosses' war in Vietnam, and fight to better the generally worsening living conditions in this country is by allying with the workers.

The rank and file leaders told us the workers won because their morale stayed high. Students distributed over 40,000 leaflets in the Garment Center and 50 or 60 students a day came down to help man the picket lines at 7:00 a.m. When new leaflets came out many of the workers in the Garment Center looked forward to getting them. Figure Flattery workers had greater courage to fight bosses, crooked unions, cops and courts because they did not feel isolated.

Probably all members of SDS are glad the workers won. But are we doing anything worthwhile? Are we capable of building something, and bringing an anti-imperialist perspective to

workers in their struggles? Can these struggles be political, or are they only economic?

13

Herbert Marcuse, advocate of the "New Working Class" theory tells us in One Dimensional Man (read: no more classes, no more contradictions) that "Our society distinguishes itself by conquering the centrifugal social forces with Technology rather than Terror, on the dual basis of an overwhelming efficiency and an increasing standard of living." Many of the 400,000 workers in the garment industry live in ghettos. They get lousy wages (Figure Flattery workers get about \$65 a week) and the factories are like prison camps. To say that these workers, Black, Puerto Rican and white, are conquered by an increasing standard of living just doesn't fit the facts. When these people rebel either at home or at work the cops show up with their guns and clubs. The cops showed up in Watts, Cleveland, Columbia, Berkeley, Chicago, Vietnam, etc. The only advance in technology that affects their repression is better guns, chemicals, tanks, etc.

One of the greatest victories of the strike was the class unity of Black and Latin workers, and of men and women. The bosses and corrupt union leaders continually tried to play on these divisions, and were defeated. One of the most significant advances of the strike was that the main leader, Felipe De Jesus, was a revolutionary. When he was attacked and red-baited by the bosses and union misleaders, he answered them by holding a public meeting where he told the workers that he was a communist. He told them that being a communist was what made him different from the bosses and the union misleaders. You can serve one of two classes, either the bosses or the workers. Felipe De Jesus, as a revolutionary communist, serves the workers. The attack on him failed and when the bosses offered to let back all the workers except for a few including De Jesus, the workers told them where to go.

The bosses also attempted to "student bait" telling the workers that this fellow De Jesus had called down all these student outside agitators. That tactic failed just as badly; the workers welcomed the students each day they showed up.

Victor Riesel, nationally syndicated anti-communist labor columnist, wrote an article entitled "SDS Spreads Revolt from Campus to Labor" September 25, 1968. He overestimates the role of students, playing upon the great "outside agitator" fear. Nevertheless Riesel reflects his bosses' fear of a worker-student alliance:

“Careening in from the left, the self-appointed revolutionaries of the hyperactivist Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) have begun to rough up the labor front as though it were an Ivy League campus. . . These students are bloody serious. They’ve developed a network of SDS Work-Ins. . .

“The new left has a major dialectical problem. It has already engendered a newer left which sneers at the SDS labor programs as nonrevolutionary and reformist. However, there did not seem to be anything reformist about the SDS invasion of a brassiere factory on New York’s Lower West Side. . .

“The Work-In operation is new. . . The objective is to catch the spirit of Paris in the spring. No one thought it could happen there either.”

SDS WORK-IN IN NEW JERSEY COPPER MILL

Reprinted from Challenge.

About 30 students in New Jersey are now active in the SDS Summer Work-In Project. I work at a copper mill, where bars of copper are extruded into long half-inch rods. All the workers were laid off for months during the recent copper strike. A common attitude in the shop is that the strike messed everything up; and yet nearly everyone understands that striking is the best means of fighting the bosses.

The union leadership (IBEW) apparently made no effort at all to explain the issues of the copper strike or to push for militant action in support of the strikers. Right along with the bosses, the union leadership wants no clear thinking and tries to keep the lowest possible ideological level among the rank-and-file. Many workers therefore became divided from their allies, whose gain is their gain. What could make the ruling class happier than having this sort of union leadership in their hip pocket?

But a lot of the men I have talked to realize that since the union piccards aren’t going to fight for the membership, they have to become even stronger locally in order to win. Most of their grievances center around working conditions, but there is also a lot of complaint about wages. To many students, who often take summer jobs to put themselves through school, \$3.00 an hour seems like good money—which leads some students to believe that “the workers are all bought off.” What

hogwash! Being married myself, I think that my wife and I might be able to get along on that if we moved to a cheaper apartment; but how about supporting a family on that wage? And most workers, of course, make much less than that.

No one I've talked to thinks he is living "the good life". LBJ's 10% surtax is now absconding with even more of the worker's wages than before. One guy I work closely with put it this way:

"The reason they're soaking us is to kill more commies in Vietnam and get to the moon faster. I say let them live-- what the hell are we doing in Vietnam anyway? And as far as the moon goes, I hope they never get there, because if they do get there they'll just make a mess of it." The same guy pointed out that he was just barely able to pay his bills as it was.

The workers all want higher wages; they need higher wages. Nothing makes me angrier--especially since I started working-- than hearing from certain students that "the workers are all bought off" or that "we shouldn't fight for higher wages because that's just a selfish demand."

Wages aren't the whole story by a long shot. Much stronger gripes here are on working conditions. For one thing, there is compulsory overtime; for another, the work is very dangerous. The mill is very hot, and when the temperature outside goes into the 90's it's about 120 degrees inside. The bosses' salt tablets don't really solve the problem!

I'll describe the most hazardous job, that of the catcher. With tongs he grabs the red-hot rod flying out of one pipe and places it into another pipe. He needs great strength and agility to do this. He is always surrounded by streams of hot copper, and he frequently complains of dizziness on the job.

A catcher who slips and falls will be seriously burned; he really takes his life into his hands every day. The boss has no regrets about this because the catchers make him a lot of profits. It is cheaper to replace a catcher than to make the machines safe.

One day one of the catchers placed the rod in the wrong pipe. As a result, the machine's "safety device" sent the long snake of metal towering into the air and down upon where he was standing. If it weren't for his buddy's warning he would have been roasted. The company has made no effort to improve this "safety device". They figure a few consoling words ("Aren't you heroic!") will do the trick. In this case the catcher decided

16 to take the afternoon off. The boss didn't think too highly of that, but there wasn't much he could do.

The compulsory overtime makes these grim working conditions even tougher because after eight hours of work you are just about ready to drop dead with heat fatigue anyway. The workers use two methods of telling the boss what to do with his compulsory overtime. Sabotage is one response, the easier of the two. Anyone can stop the line by messing up his machine. Usually the catchers take the lead in this, especially during overtime. If you miss a catch, the copper rod gets tangled up and hardens, which means that over \$350 worth of metal must be remelted, while work stops for five or ten minutes.

Sometimes the catchers get together and plan in what order they will "accidentally on purpose" miss catches, which means that such sabotage can be collectively organized. But generally this sabotage is an individualistic act done because of the workers' honest anger and frustration. The compulsory overtime is made less efficient for the bosses, but it is not stopped, since--to avoid being fired--one cannot use this tactic too often.

Of course, collective action is better than sabotage. If the union were worthy of the name, compulsory overtime could be killed by a strike. As it is, the workers organize in spite of the union leadership. One day the temperature outside was over 100 degrees. One of the catchers led a movement to walk out at one o'clock, after six hours of work. During a break he talked to most of the men in the shop, explaining that if we were all together in this we could pull it off. With a few exceptions, we were ready.

The showdown with the boss came when the foreman went around telling everyone that they had to work two hours of overtime that day. He went to each man, saying "Five o'clock". Each man was pretty much alone at his machine, so the boss was using a very clever tactic, trying to isolate each worker from his fellow. Most of the men backed down. When the foreman came to the more militant catchers, saying "Five o'clock", only half of them responded with "One o'clock". The walkout was defeated right there because the workers' fears were magnified by their being caught "alone" by the boss.

The leader of the movement was upset by this and began to feel isolated himself. Rather than sulking about it, though, he again went around to each worker explaining why the movement had

failed and urging them to really get together next time. Almost everyone was apologetic, accepted the criticism of their hesitation, and vowed to win next time.

Meanwhile the bosses had been thinking over the situation and had decided that the walk-out movement, even though it failed, was a great threat to their authority (and profits). So they decided to throw in a carrot rather than use the usual stick. Work would stop at 2 o'clock, it was announced, because "repairs" needed to be made.

On another hot day that week, the company decided to stop work at one o'clock because "it was too hot to work."

Clearly both of these moves came about because of the workers' show of strength. To the most militant workers, it was also clear that the boss's tactics were designed to split the rest of the men from a leadership that dared to struggle in their interest. The bosses hope that most of the men will be fooled into thinking that it is really the company that is watching out for their safety. While it is too early to tell for sure, it seems to me (and to the other students in our study group) that the bosses have seriously underestimated the consciousness of the workers in the shop. This struggle will probably grow and grow until it is victorious. Then it could well be carried to a higher level.

The SDS Work-In project has greatly improved my understanding of the strength of the US working class. When these workers really get together to defeat the ruling class, it will be all over for the bosses—that's for sure. Workers are just the opposite of what our professors tell us they are. Rather than the failures of society, they are the prime movers. Only they can keep production going; only they can grind production to a halt; and only they can overthrow the bosses.

This summer has proven to me once and for all that workers surely aren't bought off or automated out of existence—in spite of what some so-called leaders of the student movement keep saying. They have plenty of muscle and plenty of fighting spirit—but their mis-leaders have been too successful in insulating them from working-class ideology. Armed with Marxism-Leninism, workers and their allies in the US will put up a hell of a fight—and win!

It has been very instructive to see in concrete terms the difference between individualistic sabotage and united struggle. One guy messing up on the line is only minimally successful in showing his hatred of the job and in cutting down the boss.

18 When the union leadership doesn't struggle against the boss or strengthen the collective spirit, it is all the more difficult to organize everyone on the job. But that fighting spirit is there on my job—it just hasn't been strengthened and made totally effective.

One lesson students can get from this is that in order to fight our own (the same) bosses we very much need to rely on the collective spirit within the student movement. Our individualism holds back the struggle. As Mao observes, the best way to combat this individualism is to begin serving the people. Some of us are trying it in a small way with the Work-In; and we believe it works.

COMPANY BUILDS RACISM AMONG WOMEN IN ROCHESTER

This summer, while working in an electronics plant dealing with government contracts, I experienced first-hand how the ruling class maneuvers to control and oppress workers.

Playing on the insecurity and desperateness of people seeking work, the company tried to overawe us. The hiring procedure was so drawn out, so many of us were eliminated, that we were finally damned grateful to get to work. Then we were confronted with security guards, security procedures, badges, and "orientation" sessions with long speeches about security for "our" company. I observed with many others that our security was carefully avoided—job security.

The company advertises itself as an Equal Opportunity Employer—a good guy. But inside the plant it became obvious that the company profited by creating inequalities; by using low-paid women for most production, by racism, by division of labor and by a company union.

The company managed to get away with paying women the lowest wages by playing us off against each other. We were divided, with almost all Black women on production and almost all white women on inspection. I, as a white woman, was made an inspector. White inspectors are made to feel "superior" to Black production workers by getting four cents an hour more, and having a more "intellectual" job. The excuse the company gives is that by having some college education we are more qualified. This is a lie. Some of the Black production workers

also had college experience. Racist feelings were intensified. White inspectors were constantly angry at Black workers because of "bad" work, which made inspection hard and re-inspection harder. Black workers were angry at white inspectors who were sitting over them, writing rejects against them, and making them do work over. At first I wasn't aware of this situation and by trying to do a good job found myself feeling uncomfortably like a racist and like a boss. I was able to become friendly with the Black women when they agreed that we weren't the boss—that we had to do our job, too, or be fired. I tried to show other inspectors that the workers weren't just giving them a hard time—but that they were just as frustrated and bored with the work as we were. As we started feeling like we were all in the same situation, the division of labor, and along with it the racism, started breaking down. Inspectors would sneak repairs and workers would examine their own work before "inspection".

We had the time to talk and became friends because accuracy, not speed, is most important in this work. But the company prevented the development of a united rank and file by switching people and frequent firing. It did this through a "union" which had a seven-year contract that sounded like the company wrote it. The rapid turnover was very expensive for the company. Each worker had to be trained and it takes years on the job to become proficient. But this was ultimately less expensive and less a threat than the development of a militant union or decent pay.

BUILD A BASE — SMASH THE BOURGEOISIE

JON HARRIS, HARVARD-RADCLIFFE SDS

I worked for nine weeks this summer in a small meatpacking plant. It's organized by the Packerhouse Workers. The small size of the place hasn't impeded militancy; most of the workers describe themselves proudly as union men, and the shop stewards do a fairly good job of fighting on everyday issues of speedup and working conditions. The summer brought home to me very sharply the central importance of the union struggle, and the

far-reaching effect of a half-way decent union on workers' attitudes toward almost all political questions. It wasn't so much the "progressive" nature of the UPWA (for example, our local took a fairly firm anti-war stand). Rather, it was people's ability to relate other political issues to their own experience of class conflict on the job that proved crucial in argument after argument.

There aren't many illusions in the plant about "getting ahead" and there's no sympathy for the boss. Two years ago there was a five-month strike which didn't win very much and caused considerable hardship. But people are talking of going out again this winter: "It's the only weapon we've got," one guy told me. One man who scabbed during the strike was promoted, but he's roundly hated, and now is able to work only in a section of the plant where he has virtually no contact with the other workers. The boss himself likes to appear liberal and friendly. One worker remarked, "He's a nicer guy than most bosses. But they're all out for the same thing: to make money off our backs."

The plant has about 25% Black workers. While overt racism is rare, white workers generally harbor firmly-held illusions about Blacks having equal or better opportunities than whites, being coddled by the government, etc. Their attitude toward rebellions is in many cases "Well, I've got it tough too, but you don't see me throwing rocks and looting."

But two things work against this erroneous attitude. First, the good relations between Black and white workers in the plant permit open discussion in which Black workers invariably speak out against the "equal opportunity" type bullshit. Second, the more important, the good racial situation in the plant itself arises from the leading role Black workers often take in day-to-day struggles. The solidarity of the Black workers sets an example which strengthens the whole union.

One instance: the boss often puts on new workers who don't know their jobs well without slowing the line--this means that everyone else's job is made harder. One morning Phil, a Black worker, kicked up a fuss because an inexperienced man had been placed ahead of him on the line. The foreman told him to keep working. Phil walked away from the line. The foreman told Jackie, also Black, to take Phil's place. Jackie refused. Then, of course, no one would do it and the whole line stopped until the boss himself came down the dealt with Phil's grievance. The militancy of these two guys benefitted everyone,

and encouraged others who might have been less inclined to fight back.

21

Similarly, Phil and Jackie keep up pressure on the shop steward, Vercell, who's also Black, ribbing him about being an "Uncle Tom" if they think he's not holding his end up against the foremen. Everyone can see that Vercell does a pretty good job, for white workers as well as Black. Here it's easy for guys to see that unity is needed and racism hurts both white and Black workers. It's not so easy to extend that conclusion to issues which touch them less directly. But their experience on the job does work against the illusions inculcated by the press. Bill, a white worker, couldn't be convinced by a mountain of statistics that Blacks aren't coddled. But I did make some headway talking about the UPWA (35% Black) as an example of successful common struggle, and the politics of the Boston school system as an example of self-defeating racism on the part of many whites.

On the war, militant union consciousness doesn't by itself bring workers to a good position, but it definitely makes them open to one. In general, people don't sympathize with the government and see it as "their war", whether or not they agree about withdrawal. Most guys were sympathetic to the problems of facing the draft, and we had a good discussion of whether jail or the army was worse without any "patriotism" or "cowardice" bullshit.

Also very important is people's experience with the press as a weapon of the bosses against labor, which helps them see through the lies about Vietnam. For example, this was an exchange over the SDS Tax Hike leaflet. One guy (jokingly): "Looks like Communist propaganda to me." Another: "Hell, man, this is the truth. It's the newspapers that are the propaganda."

Since people don't believe everything they read in the press, they're willing to listen to what students have to say--provided it's really relevant to their needs, not just a lecture on Southeast Asian history. Radical students do have something to offer to workers; though they have more to learn from them. I found it difficult to strike a balance between being too timid and being too gung-ho. At first I think I was rightly cautious about putting forward my ideas when people weren't anxious to listen or when I might not understand the situation. But I probably carried this caution too far.

In any case, I found that lying gets you nowhere—you have to be honest. I always felt a little embarrassed to admit that I was a Harvard student. But discussions about it generally turned out well: guys were interested and often surprised to hear how much Harvard's admissions are based on class rather than intelligence. I did encounter some fairly strong anti-student prejudice. But in the long run it's what you say and what attitude you take to your work—what you do—that determines people's judgment of you.

One place I fell down was in neglecting or even actively avoiding talking with the other students working in the plant. Toward the end I remedied this a bit, and found the results very good. Most guys had developed a healthy antipathy to the boss, and the experience of having worked together made our political discussions much better than the usual "student organizing" effort. Guys were impressed with what they'd seen of the union. Also they were interested to find that the SDS rhetoric about the working class did have some bearing on reality. For McCarthy types as well as SDSers, the attempt to relate one's own politics to workers proved very instructive.

N.Y. WORK-IN: STUDENT TELLS WORKERS "I'M A COMMUNIST"

I worked loading trucks this summer at a terminal of a large trucking company. My hours were midnight to 9:00 a.m. The pay was \$3.50 an hour.* I was a "shaper". We called in and asked if there was work. The regular employees, the members of the Teamsters or Longshoremen, were mostly Italian Catholics in their thirties, forties and fifties, often supporting families by working two jobs. Their politics were

*A note on \$3.50 an hour. I am married and have two kids. You need a car to get to this job. It was almost impossible to live on the \$115 a week take-home I received IF I got five nights' work. The regular workers told me that after Christmas through late March there is a layoff of all but the men with the most seniority, because of the slack season for this kind of freight.

primarily racist and anti-communist. This expressed itself in some of the workers in support for Wallace, in others in support of more "subtle" anti-communists and racists, such as Humphrey or McCarthy.

During lunch hour (4:00-5:00 a.m.) my third night on the job I made a tactical error which the Work-In Organizers Manual correctly advises against. We were in a room with about 25 workers, mostly union regulars. A young worker who also attended a Catholic community college began asking me about the Columbia strike last spring. Each man loaded about ten to fifteen tons of freight a night, by hand, so I was worn out and not very conscious of what I was doing. I loudly and aggressively defended the Columbia students. (I am in the Progressive Labor Party and SDS at City College, up the block from Columbia.) I should, especially after only three days on the job, have been quieter, tried to draw him out and to relate Columbia to his own experience. The subject quickly grew to include Vietnam. I slammed him with the facts about U.S. imperialism and aggression there. After a few minutes he jumped up and said (showing plenty of ability to get to the heart of the matter), "Listen! I just want to ask you one question—when push comes to shove, are ^{you} for us or are you for the Communists?"

At this point I noticed that all other conversations in the room had stopped and that sandwiches and cards had been put down on the tables. One stevedore was absently patting the wooden handle of his loading hook. All I could hear was the hum of the air conditioner and my heart beating. I figured that having blundered this far there was no principled way for me to back out, and that the situation didn't allow for involved explanations of my politics. So I answered, "I'm a communist."

The fellow who asked stalked out of the room without another word. There were about thirty seconds of silence, then the other guys returned to their food and cards. A few minutes later the whistle blew and we went back to work.

For the next few nights I thought I might get jumped. I knew that at least one worker, who hadn't been in the room, was a "Minuteman". A number of times when I went on a break or to lunch I saw a worker pointing me out to one or two others, "That's the communist". I would walk over and say that I was the communist and were they interested in talking about

it. This had a beneficial effect of showing that I wasn't ashamed or trying to hide that I was a Red. Perhaps it also made people think I wasn't scared (a complete misconception). The tension died down after a few nights. Over the next six weeks I spoke to most of the workers involved in a friendly way, sometimes about politics, sometimes not, including the one whose question helped start it. What I did was tactically dumb. It could have led to getting beat up and/or losing the job. But I learned some positive lessons from it:

1) No foreman found out about my politics. The workers told each other, but not the foremen. They hated the boss, represented by the foremen, who made us work very hard by frequent firing and the threat of firing, especially of shapers. This hatred was greater than their anti-communism, which was relatively superficial. Communists did not exploit them eight hours a day.

2) It's possible even for a student to exist as an open communist among one of the more reactionary sections of the working class. Some thoughts on this. I worked hard, but not too hard. I wear normal clothes and have short hair. I fought against the wise-guy attitude that is inculcated in students. The workers reacted much more adversely to two bearded, beaded long-haired hippies who worked on the platform for two nights. The hippies managed to project the attitude that workers who did this every night for years to support their families were stupid; that if only you were clever this is "post-scarcity society".

I took a week off and went to Chicago. When I got back the workers wanted to know "who started the violence", the demonstrators or the police. I tried to explain that it was who was right that was important. I didn't get very far until I put it in class terms. I asked, "Would we be making \$3.50 an hour unless some guys had been willing to go on strike and use violence against scabs and cops protecting them?" Many workers responded, "You've got a point there."

Most of the workers who supported Wallace for President did not consider him or themselves fascists or "ultra-right". Many had reasons similar to student and middle-class support of McCarthy. They hated Johnson and thought the Republicans were much the same. They were against the tax hikes. Many thought the war should be either won promptly or the U.S. should get out. Racism was certainly a big underlying factor. But it's also a big factor in liberal support of McCarthy and

others who smile and talk comfortably about civil rights while they support shooting down Black people in the streets when they rebel against intolerable conditions.

25

One World War II veteran and Wallace supporter asked me, "Was it really that bad in Chicago?" I said, "Worse". He said, "I was watching it on television. That looked like Nazi Germany."

SDS HOSPITAL WORKER IN CHICAGO

I joined the Work-In with the attitude that I was going to educate the working class. I came out with the realization that we students and workers have much to learn from each other.

I worked at a Chicago Catholic Hospital for 18 months full time before going back to school. I worked in physical therapy, so I was in a position to have contact with other hospital workers and with patients, many of whom were workers too. I learned from both of these groups of people, and would like to share a few of the experiences I had.

While the Brothers (religious group responsible for the management of the hospital) enjoyed retreats and weekend trips to Wisconsin for water skiing, swimming, sailing, etc., the kitchen workers (all Black) and the dishwashers (all immigrants) received \$1.50 an hour. By giving only the skilled workers air conditioning, the boss was able to get workers to become antagonistic toward each other, instead of fighting the real enemy—the boss.

My own boss taught me an important lesson. He seemed a very nice person to most of us. He got along with everyone and even had a likeable personality. But he worked for the Administration, not the workers. At one point during the summer, our department received an increase in wages. The boss called our staff into his office individually, to inform us of the increase. I was the third one to be called. I sat down and the boss began with his bullshit. He told me that our department was the only one which had received a wage increase; that I was the only one who had received \$40 a month increase; and that everyone else had received from \$10 to \$30 a month. He told me that he really had to fight the Administration to get me that

much money, and that he expected me to work much harder now. He concluded his inspiring fairy tale by telling me not to say anything to anyone about my increase (after all, if the word got out, it wouldn't be fair to let me keep the extra money!).

As I came out of his office, I walked over to the two co-workers who had previously been informed of their increases. I asked them how much they had received, but they would not say. So I told them how much I had gotten, and that I had been told not to tell anyone. They looked at me with astonishment. They also had received \$40, as everyone else did, and also had been told not to tell anyone. This is another way the boss tries to keep the workers separated from each other. Each worker feels that he is special and the boss is his friend, and becomes friendly to the boss and jealous and antagonistic toward other workers. By fighting each other, the workers become each other's enemies and the real enemy—the boss—is completely taken out of the picture, safe and sound behind his desk.

* * * *

Elgin S. was a Black carpenter. He had injured his hand and came for physical therapy treatments five times a week for two months. During this time we became very good friends. We began to talk about his home state, Arkansas, and the racism that exists there. We talked about the Kerner Report on Civil Disorders which blames everything on "white racism". Elgin felt that the real enemy is not "white racism"—although that definitely exists—but is the ruling class. By forcibly discriminating against Black people the ruling class has profited in two ways: 1) it has been able to pay the Black worker and his family \$3200 less per year than the white worker and his family; and more important, 2) it has been able to use the carefully cultivated division between Black and white workers to prevent the working class from uniting.

Originally, Elgin had a lot of respect for Dr. Martin Luther King. He told me that Black ministers had always been used by the plantation owners to keep the Blacks in their places. And not until Dr. King came along did any minister try to unite the Black people. I learned, as Elgin had, how religion is used by the ruling class to keep the people from rebelling. Elgin believed, following Dr. King, that if we turn the "other

cheek" the ruling class will feel guilty and give up its tremendous profits for the common good of the masses. He believed that man could not change anything—only God could.

27

Through conversations, through the death of Dr. King, and the failure of the Poor People's March on Washington, Elgin adjusted his thinking toward the belief that man does make his own history. One day one of my co-workers, a Nixon supporter, asked Elgin what he thought of Nixon's acceptance speech at the GOP convention. Elgin, with eyes blazing, made a fist, and lifting it up in the air said, "That S.O.B. doesn't fool me! He says that all the Black people want is 'a piece of the action'. It's a bunch of bullshit. I don't want to be a capitalist. The only way the Black people will have real freedom is to fight for it! It doesn't matter who gets in office, it is not the man who has to be changed, it is the system. What we have to do is for Black and white working people to unite and overthrow the government and take over."

Elgin's ideas had changed since I first met him. And I had learned a hell of a lot in the process.

WORK-IN NOTES FROM BOSTON

KAY KREISS, HARVARD-RADCLIFFE SDS

WITH BRUCE ALLEN, HARVARD-RADCLIFFE SDS

DENNIS DECOSTE, BOSTON

STATE COLLEGE SDS, PLP

The 1968 summer Work-In in the Boston area involved some 60 or 70 students, many of us new to radical activity. Through the Work-In we hoped to get a better idea how the war and the system that produced it really hurts working Americans, and so be able to link up our struggles with theirs.

The success of the Work-In can be partially gauged by the changes in the participants. Many students that participated probably had been told that most working people are racists, which few of us can now deny based on our own experiences in factories. However, I, as well as many Work-Iners, never had more than a liberal aversion to racism before the summer:

The claim of some SDS members that racism is propagated by the ruling class in its own interest and against the interest of working people made no sense to me until concrete examples gave us a new understanding, a class understanding of racism.

One of the most vivid examples occurred in a paper factory whose working conditions were notorious among Work-Inners. A 12-hour day, 60-hour week is mandatory, most workers working 68 or more hours to take home a living wage. Black workers are assigned to the hardest jobs as a matter of course. The incident in question involved a Black worker being assigned alone to a two-man job requiring him to lift 150-pound rolls of paper coming off a machine at a fixed rate for 12 hours at a time. After initially refusing, the foreman informed the white workers that the "lazy nigger" had refused to do the job, playing on and building their racist inclinations. This case dramatically shows how racism hurts the white worker too: A precedent had been set of a man doing twice as much work. In addition, since there was no solidarity with the Black workers and since opposition to the unjust task was associated with being a "lazy nigger", white workers assigned to the same job afterwards performed it as a matter of racist pride.

Very clearly the boss had been able to use racism to boost production and screw his workers. To me and to most Work-Inners, racism is no longer objectionable only on liberal egalitarian grounds; we now see it in class terms as an ideology that is in the interest of the bosses to perpetuate. Racism hurts not only Black people, but also white working people. The same perception is extended to Irish or Italian nationalism and to craft divisions.

Implicit in the change in our understanding of racism is a change or development in our understanding of American social structure and conditions. The factory experience convinced many of us for the first time that classes exist in America—a feat that no social science course (!) or SDS discussion had performed for some of us. It was obvious to us after working a week, as it has always been obvious to the men and women we worked with, that they (and we) are getting screwed—producing the wealth of this country without compensation for the ever-present speedups; working in heat and under hazardous conditions for 35 or 45 years without having lived well and without the hope of retiring securely; often being slaves to a company that would hire workers before finishing high school, thereby preventing them from leaving for better work

due to educational deficiencies. Most of our co-workers saw themselves rather clearly in class terms and talked about "the bosses", "the working people", and even "classes".

Given the experiences of the 60-odd Work-Iners, it is impossible to start fall chapter work with the presupposition that the American working class has been integrated into the "American middle class", that aside from ghetto-dwellers and migrants and hillbillies, everyone shares in the economic wealth of this country. Many of us took home less than \$60 a week; we all had working friends that held more than one job, it being impossible to support a family by working only 40 hours a week. For Black and women workers, jobs tended to be harder and the pay less. One source of the antagonism between working people and the Mothers for Adequate Welfare in the Boston area, who were sleeping-in at City Hall to win economic demands (we passed out a leaflet on this action), was that the latter were demanding necessities which working people themselves can't afford. Work-Iners tried hard to combat this antagonism to welfare recipients by directing blame to those who profit from low wages and unemployment.

Working people are forced to fight for a decent life and are not faced with getting too much. It is the consensus of nearly all of us who have participated in the Boston SDS Work-In that economic demands of working people should be supported rather than labeled as "a conservative, if not reactionary struggle", as Calvert and Neiman have done. Almost every student doing factory work would see economic demands that ought to be fought for—the elimination of the compulsory 60-hour week, the slowing of the conveyer belt to the speed indicated in the union contract, an annual wage greater than three or four thousand dollars, the years-long injustice of sweetheart contracts, etc. The struggle for such just economic demands, when infused with political education, is not reactionary; change and development of politics comes most readily through struggle and experience. In addition, such political-economic struggles are needed to combat the cynicism and sense of impotence that many of our co-workers express and that we all have run into while canvassing or working on referenda.

Although many of us were amazed and heartened by the militant language and class perceptions of our fellow factory workers, racism was not the only discouraging quality that seemed to be against the workers' own interests. Again and again we ran into Wallace and Nixon supporters, war sympathizers, welfare anta-

gonists, and Kennedy idolators. This was not as discouraging, however, as it might seem. Often such opinions were based on lack of information and had never been challenged. For example, telling firm Wallace supporters about wage differentials between Alabama and the rest of the country (bus drivers earn \$30 less a week; carpenters \$40 less a week; teachers \$200 less a year), or that he supported right-to-work legislation that prevents union organizing, elicited the response, "Okay, you've said enough. I'll never vote for Wallace!" several times. Often facts which have become the assumptions of the student left are entirely new to working people. For example, one of my co-workers would not believe that U.S. troops bombed hospitals and schools in Vietnam, relocated the population in strategic (concentration) camps, used defoliants over vast areas, and used torture tactics. She was visibly shaken when an anti-war worker who had worked beside her for 15 years substantiated my description of the war.

The Work-In accomplished in a limited way what we all came to feel is a necessity: getting information to the people through leaflets and conversations. During the course of the summer, factories were leafleted with information on rebellions, on the war surtax, on the California farm workers strike and Boston grape boycott, and on the welfare struggle in Boston. Most of us heard very little antagonism to the leaflets; some of us, none at all. In my factory leafleting had a tremendous effect. For a week afterwards, women on the belt would discuss the leaflets—especially those that contradicted their own ideas such as our leaflet supporting welfare mothers' demands. Many workers were impressed that students would go to such an effort and "were telling it straight". After the surtax leaflet we received a phone call from a man whose wife worked in the same plant; he asked us to stop leafleting because his wife was now talking revolution. The long-term effect is hard to gauge. I met a woman who thought she had read a leaflet, perhaps put out by SDS, that said that the Boston Prudential Center didn't have to pay real estate taxes until the year 2000. We found the leaflet. It had been distributed five months earlier during the Metropolitan Boston Transit Authority anti-fare hike campaign and the year was 2040. We all felt that our conversations about anti-communism, racism, the war, welfare, the Democratic convention and electoral politics, were not in vain.

Chapter work in the Boston area will be significantly influenced by the Work-In experience of the 80 to 100 Work-Iners and

supporters. We are convinced that factories should continue to be leafleted often throughout the school year and many of us will be in touch with our working friends. We are convinced that strikes and economic demands must be supported, that a worker-student alliance must be built if SDS is going to become a viable and politically effective group. In addition our chapters will probably be infused to some extent with a working class perspective in a larger portion of their membership, that will determine the struggles we will choose to involve ourselves with.

In fact, every struggle in which students are engaged will be in alliance with workers; it is not just a question of walking picket lines every now and then. For instance, do we fight for NO DRAFT FOR VIETNAM, or do we fight to retain our student exemptions, at the expense of working people? Do we oppose Dow recruiters because we are more appalled by napalm than liberals are, or do we oppose Dow because the use of napalm reflects a consistent policy to exploit and suppress workers by any means necessary, in Vietnam or anywhere else? At Harvard, do we oppose the newest fee hike only because it makes our lives more difficult, or do we oppose Harvard's entire system of systematically excluding working class students, a system of which the exorbitant fees are an integral part? There are two important movements in America today: the workers' movement (including the Black liberation movement, since most Blacks are workers), and the student movement. On the basis of the Work-In we feel that it is possible and necessary to ally with workers to defeat racism, to end wars like Vietnam, and to fight for social justice in our common interest against the common enemy.

The change or growth in political consciousness that is reflected in the Work-Iners, however, is not always gained by simply reading an article like this one, especially if you are from an upper middle class family as many of us are. Join the Work-In next summer and learn for yourself. Help build a pro-working class SDS on your campus now. Fight to build the worker-student alliance!

Students for a Democratic Society

\$5 for members (\$1 for sub, \$4 for dues)
\$10 for non-members

- I would like to join SDS and receive New Left Notes (dues \$5/year)
- Send me _____ more copies of this pamphlet
- Send me a complete list of SDS publications
- Send me further info on SDS

subscribe to new left notes
find what SDS is about
learn our plans for the future
read the ongoing debates inside the organization
read about your brothers and sisters in other parts of the country

(name)

(address)

(city, state, and zip)

1608 West Madison, Chicago 60612 (312-666-3874)

