

Young Socialist Discussion Bulletin

vol. XVII, no. 7

December 1973

60¢

CONTENTS

Page

<u>THE ROLE OF STUDENTS IN THE COMING AMERICAN REVOLUTION</u> , by Dennis Brasky, Chicago Local	3
<u>ONCE AGAIN: CONCERNING AT-LARGE VOTING AND DELEGATE SELECTION FOR YSA NATIONAL CONVENTIONS</u> , by Kurt T. Hill, Jamestown, New York (At-Large)	5
<u>CHILE: ARMED ROAD--ONLY ROAD</u> , by Cathy Matson (Internationalist Tendency), Chicago Local	7
<u>"A CONCRETE EXAMPLE OF PRESENT POLITICAL PRACTICE,"</u> by Rick Wells (Internationalist Tendency), Houston Local	11
<u>FOR A RETURN TO THE ROAD OF THE TRANSITIONAL PROGRAM: IN REPLY TO THE PERSPECTIVES AND METHOD OF THE YSA LEADERSHIP</u> , by Peter Gellert (Internationalist Tendency), Houston Local, and Betti S. (Internationalist Tendency), Brooklyn Local	16
<u>THE BUILDING OF A REVOLUTIONARY PARTY IN CAPITALIST AMERICA II--AN ORIENTATION FOR THE YSA</u> , (Political Counter-Resolution submitted by the Internationalist Tendency of the YSA)	35

Page 2:

was blank in the
original bulletin

- Marty April 2014

THE ROLE OF STUDENTS IN THE COMING AMERICAN REVOLUTION

By Dennis Brasky, Chicago Local

Our sectarian opponents whip themselves into a near frenzy when they argue against our analysis of the present radicalization, especially, its present axis--the student radicalization. Armed not with an understanding of Marxism which enables one to comprehend new social phenomena but only with a great memorization of out-of-context quotes by Lenin and Trotsky, these tiny grouplets bypass the different movements for social change that have arisen in the last decade and a half and instead seek to "go to the workers." Seeking not to scientifically classify these different movements in terms of their class origin, present leadership and in what direction they're headed, but merely looking for a nasty epithet with which to put them down, these sects refer to the entire radicalization of the 1960s and '70s as "PETTY-BOURGEOIS." In this contribution I would like to defend the youth radicalization especially as it has developed on the campuses and high schools. I find it hard to believe that it is still necessary to defend against sectarian foolishness in our ranks, our analysis of the role of students especially with its confirmation by the recent powerful upsurges in Thailand and Greece. But, such is the definition of a sectarian: when reality contradicts one's theories, instead of patching up these theories, a sectarian simply denies reality.

It's a slander and outright lie to say that the YSA has ever or is presently guilty of believing that students have anything approaching the necessary social power to make a socialist revolution by themselves. The social power of students has increased greatly over the last twenty years, but quantitatively; closing down all the campuses and high schools for a while won't (in and of itself) overthrow capitalism, but such a happening would be a huge step towards that end, so why put it down?

We say that students have always had the potential to act as a detonator which could spark even larger and more powerful revolts than their own. This isn't because they're smarter or inherently more revolutionary but because they have a lot of time to read, study and talk about politics and radical ideas. This just isn't the case with someone who has to work in an office or factory for at least eight hours each day. This was recognized by Marx, Engels and especially Lenin. It was Lenin who clearly demonstrated that because of this extra time, the students and intellectuals who broke from the bourgeoisie would be at first the backbone of the party--the cadre.

Because of lack of study and illusions many radicals (who later become sectarians) have this mistaken notion that all radicalizations in the 20th century, the age of socialist-revolution, have started with the "working class." This notion is particularly strong in regards to the radicalization of the 1930s. Comrade George Breitman in his pamphlet, "The New Radicalization," completely destroys this myth

by going back and showing how for years before the working class (as a class) entered the radicalization, the "peripheral" (i. e., not too important) layers--students, intellectuals, vets, farmers, had helped to start and deepen the radicalization. In more recent times, especially in May-June 1968 in France, August '68 in Czechoslovakia and September '68 in Mexico, radicals have been able to see for themselves the detonator role of students. Today we see it in Greece and Thailand. Let's briefly take a look at how the Russian Revolution of 1905 really developed.

The predominant illusion is that all of a sudden, workers councils, "Soviets," fell out of the clouds, and onto St. Petersburg and Moscow--"and there was dual power." Not so. The radicalization period already existed for about six years. There's a book called Revolution in Russia, edited by Edward W. Pearlstein and published by Viking Press. It's a collection of articles written in the NY Herald and the NY Tribune from 1894-1921 on events in Russia pertaining to the build up to each of the three revolutions that took place: 1905, February 1917 and October 1917. After briefly explaining the historical background of Czarist Russia of the 1890s (a new czar whom some liberal intellectuals saw as a reformer), one of the first headlines of the time is printed. It states:

STUDENTS PROTEST IN RUSSIA

"St. Petersburg. March 1, 1899--The strike which recently broke out here among the university students as a protest against the conduct of the police, who had used whips to disperse the student gatherings on the recent festival of the University of St. Petersburg has increased to such an extent that almost all the colleges and schools are now participating in it, including the theological colleges and the high schools for girls."

In the narrative that supplements this collections of articles, it states:

"... the students had already been bridling under the restrictions imposed upon them by the university charter of 1894 which forbade them to hold meetings or organize clubs. There had been ominous incidents and it was evident that a contagion of restiveness had infected the schools, where radical philosophies were hotly debated in secret."

Other headlines--

St. Petersburg, March 4, 1901--"STUDENTS ROUGHLY HANDLED"--"Gathering in St. Petersburg broken up with great severity."

London, March 16, 1901--"MOSCOW IN A FERMENT--
STUDENTS THREATEN BARRICADES AND STREET FIGHTING."

"STUDENT TROUBLES IN RUSSIA"--"State of siege proclaimed in several cities."

After more than two years of mostly student protest the Russian working class entered the scene:

"STUDENTS DEFY RUSSIAN TROOPS; WOMEN STUDENT LEADERS IN RIOT."

"Alarm at the capital. Many workmen involved in demonstration and their presence a dangerous omen." (My emphasis--D. B.)

St. Petersburg, May 17, 1901--"RIOTS AT RUSSIAN COTTON MILLS."

Critics of the analysis of students as potential detonators of a working class upsurge point out that there are no connections between students and workers.

a) Workers don't live in a vacuum. After two years of growing radicalization (coming after almost twenty years of deep reaction), workers themselves became "infected" with the radical "germs."

b) Many student radicals saw the validity of Marxism and joined the organization that based itself on Marxism; the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party (RSDLP). These student radicals learned about the crucial role of the proletariat in society and many accepted Lenin's view that Marxism (the reservoir of the lessons of proletarian class struggle) couldn't be "discovered" by the workers but had to be brought to them by people who had time to thoroughly study it--mostly former students. Thus, it was these student radicals who helped bring Marxism to the Russian working class. They were the party cadres. It was the party that helped connect the student and working class movements.

In the last twenty years the student movement has grown greatly. The reasons for this are given in the pamphlets "A Strategy for Revolutionary Youth" and "The Revolutionary Student Movement: Theory and Practice" by Ernest Mandel. This great growth offers the Trotskyist movement in this country and worldwide the opportunity to grow immensely. What are we supposed to do? The sectarian remedy: students are petty-bourgeois; go to the workers. This is absurd for the following reasons:

a) A growing percentage of students are from working class families. This is perfectly explained by Comrade Mandel's analysis of the changing nature of the bourgeois university. In New York City the great majority of college students are from working class families. A large percentage of them are from the most oppressed sector of the working class--Blacks and Puerto Ricans. Why is this so? Has

the bourgeoisie gone soft by attempting to spread the fruits of knowledge???

b) What does it mean to say students are "petty-bourgeois?" Their class origins? As I just explained, a growing percentage of students are from proletarian families. Does it refer to their present class status? Many students work part-time to meet the growing costs of tuition, books and general cost of living. But this doesn't really count as being "workers" in the mind of a sectarian. Their image of a worker is a middle-aged white male, with a big belly, short hair, a beer can in his hand and a tattoo on his arm. Does it refer to the future class status of students? We agree with Comrade Mandel's analysis that many of today's college students are headed for white-collar jobs.

c) We didn't make this radicalization. We weren't consulted as to how it would develop and what forms it would take. If we had been consulted, we would have requested a YSA of about half a million members, a CP with about a dozen members, a mass labor party, a socialist tradition in the American working class, etc., etc. But the radicalization developed objectively, and we were faced with the task of understanding it, feeding it and recruiting from it. The working class, as a class to this day hasn't radicalized. Are we supposed to sit back and wait, or do we recruit from wherever we can?

The basic need of the Trotskyist movement today is to accumulate enough cadres so as to make our voice loud enough to be heard. For forty-five years there have been opportunities for revolutionary breakthroughs but the misleadership of Stalinism and Social-Democracy sabotaged them. We've always had the correct program but not enough people to take it to the masses. Today, for the first time in forty-five years we have an excellent opportunity to be large enough to win the masses away from reformism. That opportunity is the radical youth, but the sectarians both outside and inside our movement scream--don't recruit petty-bourgeois youth. We must be pure, 100 percent proletarian. Should we recruit petty-bourgeois youth? YES. We'll take cadres from anywhere. What matters is not that much from where someone is recruited, but to what program, and how dedicated to that program someone is. How many years did Lenin and Trotsky spend in a factory? WHO CARES?

Comrades should read the interview with Comrade James P. Cannon in the IP this past summer. Cannon told how the CP was on all the campuses in the early 1930s. They were thus in a position to win over huge numbers of young radicals, and then when the working class radicalized, all these CP "cadre" were sent into the working class movement. The CP didn't ignore the campuses. Students can't make a revolution but what's wrong with winning over 20,000, 50,000 or 100,000 people to a revolutionary proletarian program; people who won't be students forever???

December 11, 1973

By Kurt T. Hill, Jamestown, New York (At-Large)

Last year, I wrote an article which dealt with the fact that at-large members of the YSA are objectively second-class citizens in our organization. That is, while they are permitted to submit discussion articles on any subjects which they choose, they are not permitted to vote pro or con on any of these resolutions, nor are they permitted to choose delegates who reflect their political positions on these resolutions.

At the Cleveland convention, members of the National Executive Committee assured the membership that they would resolve this situation, and that they would institute new procedures which would permit at-largers to fully participate in the internal life of the YSA.

The formula arrived at by the NEC can, at best, be described as inadequate. Under this new plan, three or more at-large members who consistently work with each other in the same geographical area are permitted to choose one "consultative" delegate to the national convention.

The present NEC has, apparently, developed an elaborate rationale for limiting the democratic rights of at-large members. Firstly, it is claimed that at-large members who are unable to work together politically (for geographical reasons) do not have the "common experience" necessary to vote on resolutions as do members of locals. Secondly, it is claimed that at-large members generally lack the political sophistication necessary to intelligently vote on convention resolutions. Each of these arguments is specious. Upon further investigation, one can easily see how groundless these arguments are.

Whether there are two, or two hundred YSA members in a particular geographical area, the real "common experiences" consist of a common struggle to implement a common political program. Each member is expected to do his or her best to further the political aims of the YSA. It is the support and implementation of the program, not the geographical location of individual members, which is of primary importance.

If geographical, rather than political, criteria, are used to gauge "common experiences," several things logically follow. For example, all locals which do not have any members of the oppressed nationalities should be excluded from voting on questions which involve Third World peoples. Or, to carry the argument further, how can white comrades who do not have the same "common experiences" of Black YSAers decide upon a policy for the Black liberation struggle? Similarly, how can male comrades vote on questions concerning the women's movement? Men obviously do not have the same "common experiences" of women, and on this basis must be excluded from arriving at political posi-

tions dealing with feminism.

The YSA as a whole decides its political perspective. Whether a comrade is white or Black, male or female, student or worker, the "common experiences" we face are common struggles around a common perspective. Geography should not play any role in this process. Yet, this is the "logic" used by the NEC when they trample on at-large members' democratic rights.

One can go even further with this geographical "argument" advanced by the NEC. Let us imagine that there are twenty-five members of the YSA in a small Eastern state. Out of these twenty-five, let us say that only five comrades are members of one, small local. It is possible that these five members, because of "common experiences," support a minority position in the YSA. The other twenty YSAers might support a majority position. Yet under the present rules, only the five minority comrades would be permitted to elect a delegate who reflected their political opinions. The other twenty would be disenfranchised. Naturally, the situation of minority vs. majority opinions could be reversed. Five people supporting the majority would be permitted to elect a delegate, while four times that many comrades supporting the minority would not be able to do so. This situation is inherently undemocratic.

Concerning the lack of political sophistication of at-large members. Comrades should keep in mind that members holding at-large status do so for a number of reasons: financial, academic, etc. Simply because one is not a member of a local, it does not necessarily follow that one is politically less knowledgeable or experienced. In fact, one might be able to make a good case for just the opposite assumption.

In order to carry out the positions of our organization, at-largers must often play a number of roles that the average member of a large city local seldom fills. As an at-larger, I have been forced to perform a number of functions simultaneously--functions which would have been delegated to a number of comrades in a large local. I have served as a mimeographer, leafletter, leaflet designer, poster designer, campus newspaper reporter, coordinator of a three county antiwar committee, SMC organizer and steering committee member, literature agent, education director, convention chairman, and a host of other jobs at the same time. In addition, I have had to arrange for bus transportation to demonstrations, negotiate parade permits with the police, talk to reporters from the bourgeois press, and prepare news releases on movement activities. Political necessity forces at-large members to perform these and other functions. Can one honestly state that the average member of a large local must fulfill all of these functions at the same time because of the lack of comradepower? I seriously doubt it.

In addition to the above-mentioned aspects, there are several other factors which make the present voting policy undemocratic. Why should a comrade who has been a member of our organization only three months be permitted to vote on convention resolutions simply because he or she is a member of a local, while an at-large member of two years standing is not permitted to vote simply because he or she is not a member of a local?

To be fair, the YSA has three basic options. Firstly, we can retain the present policy, a policy which denies full rights to at-large members. However, if at-large members are to be denied equal rights, is it not therefore logical to grant them exemptions from certain obligations of membership? Perhaps they should be permitted to openly criticize YSA policy; after all, democratic centralism is not democratic when one is not allowed to vote on organization policy. From a Leninist standpoint, this is obviously the least viable of the alternatives. Secondly, one could eliminate the at-large status of future members. While retaining the present at-large membership, the NEC could require all future applicants for membership to join existing locals--a position which is similar to that of the SWP. This would, however, seriously cramp our present expansion into areas which have never heard of Trotskyism. Or thirdly, one could adopt the following principles for at-large voting and delegate selection:

RESOLUTION

1) All at-large members living in reasonable proximity to existing YSA locals should be permitted by the locals to

participate in the pre-convention discussion and delegate selection. At-large members would participate in the discussion and voting on the same basis as members of that local. They should be required, however, to notify both the local and the national office of their intent, in writing, immediately after the convention call has been issued by the NEC.

2) Where this is not possible, at-largers should be permitted to make arrangements with other YSA at-largers for such discussions and delegate selection. In order for at-large comrades to elect a delegate, they should be required to gather together at least five members (i. e., the same number of comrades it takes to constitute a local). If more than five at-large comrades participate, delegate selection would follow the same pattern established by the NEC for larger locals. Again, at-largers participating in such pre-convention discussion should be required to notify the NO of their intent, and submit the names of at-largers participating in the discussions, as well as the name(s) of the delegate(s) selected.

3) If three at-large comrades participate in such discussions, they should be permitted to elect one consultative delegate. They must, again, be required to notify the NO of their meeting, and the names of the members attending and their consultative delegate should be sent to the NEC.

December 11, 1973

By Cathy Matson (Internationalist Tendency), Chicago Local

In light of the recent coup in Chile and the continued resistance of the Chilean working class, it is important to bring into the discussion in the Fourth International the lessons of the coup in regard to the International majority's general perspective of armed struggle and the tasks of the YSA. The International Marxist Group stated very clearly in the Red Weekly what the tasks of revolutionists are:

"... to solidarize with and defend those who are fighting back against this bloody military dictatorship, and to learn from the Chilean catastrophe in order that such a tragedy need never again take place."

It is important to briefly review the background to the Popular Unity government. Frei's term, the government immediately preceding Allende, was a reformist experiment supported by the national bourgeoisie and imperialism that succeeded in instituting certain reforms: the Agrarian Reform Law of 1967, which made an attempt at expropriating land and distributing it among the peasants; the setting up of peasant unions; the purchase of part-interest in the American-owned Anaconda and Kennecott copper companies; and various kinds of allocations to social expenditure that increased the availability of services for health care and education, etc. But Frei's policies in no way clashed with the interests of imperialism, especially that of the United States. Moreover, Frei was also quite willing to carry out repression of the workers movement when it so pleased the bourgeoisie; strikers were continually killed, attacked and imprisoned. The minimal reform measures of Frei only spurred the working class and peasantry on to ask for more and when it was not forthcoming, initial forms of united struggle took form. Even within Frei's own party, the Christian Democrats, splits occurred of which MAPU was the most important.

When Allende took office in 1970, Chile was the second most indebted nation in the world. The election of the Popular Unity (UP) was seen by large sections of the Chilean working class as an important step forward, and the program of the coalition did indeed proclaim to create a new Chile, to nationalize all foreign capital and foreign trade, extend the agrarian reform of Frei and to establish an apparatus through which the working class would exercise power. The UP saw that its electoral victory was the beginning of the process of transition to socialism. But though in practice Allende was able to actually institute some of these measures, the Popular Unity was incapable of satisfying the hopes and aspirations which its victory had aroused in the broad working class and peasant masses. Why? Because of the very nature of the Popular Unity coalition--its reformist program and the parties participating in the coalition, and because of its intimate ties to the national bourgeoisie and imperialism.

Regarding the nature of the UP, can we say it was a classical popular front on the order of those in the '30s in Spain and France? Without defining accurately the nature of the Popular Unity coalition in Chile there can be no precise statement of the tasks of a revolutionary organization in regard to it. The LTF has made a fundamental error not only in its inability to consistently apply the concept of the popular front, but in addition cannot agree among itself over the nature of a particular regime or coalition. In the Education for Socialists Bulletin, "Alliances and the Revolutionary Party," Comrade Les Evans states:

"The victory of the Unidad Popular coalition in the September 4, 1970 elections brought a popular front government to power in Chile under the leadership of Socialist Party head Salvador Allende Gossens."

That was in October, 1971; by February, 1972, Comrade Camejo modifies this, but only slightly:

"For a left popular front to come to power, as in Chile, there must be a deep social crisis and radicalization of the masses that precludes an electoral victory by mere capitalist liberals."

When comrades of the LTF are asked why such a characterization is given to the UP, we are told, "it is the program; we know that the UP will not break from imperialism."

Such an unscientific appreciation of the popular front is far from the Trotskyist conception of how to arrive at a definition of the UP. In "For Workers Defense Guards Not the Peoples Front," Trotsky says:

"The peoples front represents the coalition of the proletariat with the imperialist bourgeoisie, in the shape of the Radical Party and smaller tripe of the same sort. The coalition extends both to the parliamentary and extra-parliamentary spheres. In both spheres the Radical Party preserving for itself the complete freedom of action, coarsely imposes restrictions upon the freedom of the proletariat... Yet the Radical Party occupies in this front not only an equal but a privileged position; the workers parties are compelled to restrict their activity to the programme of the Radical Party... Since the parties of the pop front could not reach beyond the program of the Radicals, this signified in reality the submission of the workers and the peasants to the imperialist program of the most corrupt wing of the bourgeoisie... The alliance with the Radical Party is, consequently, an alliance not with the petty-bourgeoisie, but with their exploiters, that is, the big bourgeoisie. Entering into this front the Socialists and Communists take upon themselves the responsibility for the Radical Party and

thus help it in this way to exploit and betray the masses."

Thus, it is not just the presence of the bourgeois parties in the popular front that Trotsky emphasizes, but their dominance over every other party in the coalition. The popular front is not just a class-collaborationist coalition but one defined by the program of finance capital, to the point that all other programs and parties are subordinate. In addition, the popular front was used in past examples as a tactic to contain the rise of the mass movement and to keep a grip on working class parties.

The reality in Chile was that the mass working class parties--the Socialist Party and Communist Party--were the predominant political forces, not the Radical Party, Christian Democrats, or the Nationalist Party. The bourgeois parties in the UP were insignificant and some later withdrew from the coalition. Rather, the UP reflected the general reformist character of the main parties in the coalition--a dilemma between granting the working class reforms and maintaining its alliance with the national bourgeoisie and imperialism (including the maintenance of the standing army and reliance on it to guard the state interests).

Nor was the program of the UP the program of finance capital. The first year of the UP saw the Allende administration carrying out a number of important reforms that had been promised in the UP program. Certainly there can be little doubt that many of these measures were immensely popular with the working class and especially the peasantry. Inflation was reduced, a ceiling was placed on government salaries, wages were increased 60% and many prices were fixed. In the first nine months of 1971 nationalizations were begun and a large proportion of the textile, iron, auto and copper industries were nationalized. 60% of the country's banks were also taken into public ownership, though they were still free to invest in private sectors. And from the start the UP differed from the classical popular front in that it openly proclaimed to carry out these reforms by entering on the road to socialism, and by openly basing itself upon the organized mass working class parties of the SP and the CP. The reforms were carried out through "legal" and "peaceful" means, within the framework of the institutions of parliamentary bourgeois democracy, without destruction of the bourgeois state apparatus, and with no regard to turning to the working class. Though the Socialist Party in Chile was programmatically committed to Marxism and the transition to socialism, and the party had a huge working class base, it nonetheless had no strategy for the seizure of power and relied on Allende's "peaceful road to socialism." And the other major party in the UP, the Communist Party, was completely incapable of breaking its ties to the Moscow bureaucracy.

Thus, the Unidad Popular was not a popular front.

But it must be pointed out that neither does the PST fit into the realm of scientific Marxism with the definition

that "Allendeism is an anti-imperialist, democratic, agrarian and nationalist movement with a petty-bourgeois leadership," and that the UP is a "nationalist front rather than a proletarian united front" (ISR, October 1973). Such a definition is at least elliptical, if we may borrow the term. Historically a nationalist front has been the alignment or collaboration of all parties to fight imperialism, including the national bourgeoisie. But in fact, except for the acceptance of a couple of leading military figures into the cabinet in early 1973 the vastly overwhelming composition of the UP was the working class-based Socialist and Communist Parties. In addition, this error of the PST points to a completely wrong assessment of the turn of events throughout 1973. Such a definition of a nationalist front not only leads to illusions in the reformist parties, but leaves the party no analysis on which to base a revolutionary strategy. In reality, long before the June coup attempt there was an extreme polarization of the working class on the one hand, and the imperialist and nationalist bourgeoisie on the other. As less and less reforms were instituted and some of the gains made by the working class were rescinded as inflation soared, the working class was more and more radicalized. In the period of time between the June attempt and the September 11 coup, it could be said that a mobilization and a growing political consciousness developed in the working class, a consciousness that reached proportions higher than ever before in Chile, with forms of struggle evolving around the need to break with the orientation of the reformists. The beginnings of what could have become widespread dual power grew with the workers defense guards in the cordones industriales, and other forms of mobilization. The working class became less inclined to let itself be channelized into the framework of bourgeois parliamentarism, and began to create organs of self-defense, that is, to arm itself.

On the other hand, in the short months before the coup the bourgeoisie and imperialism had maintained the strictest discipline in the army and a steady right wing campaign to prepare the rank and file to favor a coup. It was under the conditions of generalized organized discontent that the bourgeoisie decided to move in before a situation of generalized dual power took place and so carried out the coup of September 11. The coup is not simply a matter of "foreign intervention" and the Chilean masses fighting against it, aligned with the national bourgeoisie. The class interests of the Chilean bourgeoisie are indistinguishable from those of imperialism when an inevitable confrontation is on the agenda. Not for nothing did US imperialism finance the Chilean army, knowing that it would later be used to throttle the UP. Nor did the national bourgeoisie's "fight against imperialism" prevent it from sabotaging agricultural production when the Agrarian Reform did not suit its interests, and hoarding goods on the black market when Allende tried to institute certain measures of workers control of distribution. And now, as brutal repression continues the revolutionary organization cannot help but see that the interests of the national bourgeoisie and imperialism are never more united in Chile than at the time armed force must be used

against the working class. But this analysis has totally escaped the PST when it describes the UP as a "nationalist front."

The events in Chile have shown that a working class movement that fails to develop its own political institutions on a mass scale, that fails to challenge the ruling class monopoly of violence, that fails to break up and smash the instruments of capitalist rule, remains completely at the mercy of the forces of reaction. The strategy of the UP was based on the possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism through the existence of an electoral victory and a so-called "neutral army." The Stalinists and reformist leaders of the working class to the very end planted the myth that the bourgeois army had "respect for the constitution," and had a "democratic and humanist tradition," and bear the brunt of the responsibility for the heavy price the working class is paying now. A primary lesson the revolutionary organization must teach is that either the working class resolutely tackles the question of armed struggle or it will be massacred by the armed bodies controlled by the ruling class. The refusal to construct workers and peasants militias, on the basis of a careful technical and political preparation, prepared the way for the growth of illusions about the CP and parliamentary means. Again in Chile, as in Bolivia was the need to penetrate the workers movement by active participation in the working class struggle, by advancing the appropriate transitional slogans, by advocating and organizing armed workers detachments.

The LTF accuses the supporters of the International majority of putting "guns before politics," and in the case of Chile uses an article in Intercontinental Press (Oct. 8) to show that there were plenty of guns in Chile at the time of the coup and still the working class was defeated. The LTF's conclusion? It is; therefore, we must continue building the party and when we have finished building the party, then and only then will we take up the question of guns: we will only liquidate the revolutionary party if we confront the problem of arming the masses and the vanguard party at this time. But in that same article (p. 1109) Creus says:

"The left organizations had a lot of guns. But these weapons were not in the hands of the workers... It was no good having guns, if they were not in the hands of the workers."

This is not ignoring the mass movements or putting guns over politics or abandoning the Trotskyist method of party-building. History has taught us painfully that the crucial question in such a period is not continuing to "build the party" as if nothing were happening, but rather that most important is that at the precise moment if the revolutionary vanguard does not take those guns and put them into the hands of the masses, there will be no victory. Armed struggle is not a tactic for the party to employ at the culmination of the steady growth of the party. Just as it may be disastrous for a vanguard party to attempt to take power on

its own, it is impossible to win with the masses if they are not armed to confront the ruling class.

The class struggle is concrete. To wave away the defeats of the Chilean working class with the truism that there was "no revolutionary party" does not solve the problem of how to build those parties in Latin America. The seizure of power is not possible if the working class is not convinced of the necessity for armed struggle and have not already passed through a number of experiences and clashes with the state. In Chile there has been no lack of tests for the working class. But it is absolutely essential for the vanguard party or nucleus to prepare the masses and the vanguard itself--both theoretically and practically--for the inevitable confrontations. As the class struggle becomes sharper, the refusal to consider the arming of the masses as the most crucial, central aspect of party building in Latin America, both offensively as well as defensively, means taking a course to certain defeat. The LTF has refused to confront this question.

In one instance, for example, the PST asked:

"Why wasn't the slogan launched to mobilize the entire proletariat in a massive meeting to demand that the government, which calls itself a workers government, carry out the plan it has initiated and place all distribution under its control?" (Avanzada Socialista)

Why indeed. We can be sure that the CP of Chile called for such reliance on the class-collaborationist forces. But for an organization which is aspiring to revolutionary leadership to say this, we must stand back and ask why the PST did not call for the arming of the working class and a resolute fight against the CP and the reformist working class leadership. Just after the coup the PST reaffirmed that its call for a "massive meeting" was not just a wrong analysis of the proximity of the coup. We would expect that after the coup, as fascist-like repression continues and all left organizations are banned, imprisoned and comrades are tortured, that the PST would then call for support for the armed resistance. But no; the PST would rather follow the example set in Argentina and called for new elections. Does the PST expect that Pinochet will choose 80% unemployed workers candidates?

Chile is just one more example in Latin America that reaffirms the necessity of armed struggle and the perspective of the International majority. While it is absolutely essential that revolutionists struggle against adventurism which stands removed from the concrete development of the class struggle, it is also equally important not to assign the problems of arming the vanguard and the masses a role secondary to some abstract form of "party building." The defense of the revolutionists to exist and offensive actions through intervention in the vanguard of the working class will be a major task of our sections and sympathizing sections before the final moment of insurrection and in certain cases will strengthen the mass movement as a whole.

Though the party and its sympathizing organizations must fight for even the most modest immediate demands-- higher wages, against layoffs, adequate education, etc.-- an emphasis on transitional demands will be of paramount importance. These include the demand for a sliding scale of wages and hours, nationalization without compensation,

for instruments of workers defense which may become instruments of dual power. In addition the call for a workers and peasants government must become a part of the revolutionary program in Latin America.

December 11, 1973

"A CONCRETE EXAMPLE OF PRESENT POLITICAL PRACTICE"

By Rick Wells (Internationalist Tendency), Houston Local

At the past SWP convention the Internationalist Tendency called on the Party to reorient itself to the molecular radicalization developing in the working class in this country today. The IT showed us politically that a shift toward industrial activity is a necessity for the revolutionary party given the objective situation facing us today.

We ITers in the YSA urge the YSA to join us in calling on the SWP to take cognizance of and intervene in the growing workers radicalization. The YSA and SWP must collaborate in taking on this important task--the YSA must begin turning at least some of its attention to the young radicalizing workers in factories throughout the country.

Young workers are being affected by conditions and situations which develop in their work places. The Lordstown strike, recent occupations at Chrysler such as the Shorter-Carter occupation, are examples of spontaneous struggles that have recently developed in the class, where revolutionary leadership was lacking--these struggles were led by young militants, elements that revolutionary organizations should be orienting themselves to today.

In Houston, Texas the SWP had an opportunity to intervene to a limited extent in a factory situation at Hughes Tool Company. This contribution seeks to review and analyze this intervention and further to encourage the YSA to collaborate with the SWP in seriously orienting to developing workers struggles, and especially to young workers.

The Company

Hughes Tool Company is one of the world's leading manufacturers of rolling cutter rock bits, more simply, oil and gas well drilling bits. The company was founded in 1909 when Howard Hughes first successfully tested rolling cone cutters, which revolutionized the drilling industry. The main manufacturing plant is in Houston, Texas. Subsidiary plants exist in Belfast, N. Ireland; Escobar, Argentina; and Mexico City, Mexico. Hughes products are also manufactured under license agreements with companies in Salvador, Brazil; Calgary, Canada; Dronfield, England; Milan, Italy; Tokyo, Japan; and Vera Cruz, Mexico.

In 1972, Hughes sold the company; all the stock of the new company was sold to the public on December 14, 1972.

At its main plant in Houston, Hughes Tool Co. employs some 3,000 workers as well as a staff of about 1,000 to 1,500 technical, managerial, clerical and supervisory employees.

Of the 3,000 factory workers, the largest number, approximately 35 to 40%, are employed in semi-skilled

machine operator positions doing production work, generally with production rates that are difficult, if not impossible, to meet. The rest of the work force is spread among the transportation, maintenance and quality assurance units, various crafts and a large labor pool.

Blacks constitute about 40% of the work force, there are also a large number of Mexican-Americans and women employed at Hughes. The company has been hiring steadily for a year and a half; this has resulted in a large influx of young workers. At present there is pretty much of a balance, quantitatively, between older and younger workers, with this shifting, more slowly now, toward the younger workers.

The company's most effective strategy for keeping the workers divided is their policy toward advancement. Virtually all of the managerial and supervisory personnel come from the ranks--it is very rare that the company will hire someone for such positions from outside. More militant employees and especially militant grievance men are quickly offered supervisory jobs to co-opt their dissidence. When they decline the company tries to find some way to fire them. Recently after a young, outspoken grievance man was fired his replacement was told by management to watch out or the same thing would happen to him.

The Situation in the Union

The workers at Hughes are organized into Local Union 1742, United Steelworkers of America, with the exception of the electricians and pipefitters, who are organized into their respective craft unions.

Union recognition was won at Hughes in a struggle in 1946 which ousted the previously existing company union. Since that time, at each election of officers (held once each three years) the leadership has been entirely replaced. The president is elected from the ranks and while in office receives a weekly salary equivalent to what he would be making if still working in the plant.

The president himself is not a skilled bureaucrat. When a new president is elected, the staff representative out of the district office (also a member of the International Executive Board of the Steelworkers) takes him under his wing, takes him to Pittsburgh to rub elbows with the International officers, and soon the president becomes the lackey that the International Union wants him to be. But by the time he gets good at it, three years are up, a new president is elected and the cycle begins again.

The local has approximately 1,700 to 1,900 members at the present time, Texas being a staunch "right to work" law state, with legislation now in process to make this even

stronger. This figure constantly fluctuates as Hughes has a relatively high turnover rate. Also, there is a slow, but steady depletion of the ranks going on now, as some of the workers are becoming highly dissatisfied with the union for one reason or another.

Many of the workers see the union as an ineffective way of struggle. All too often it has capitulated to the company on controversial issues. Many workers remain angry that the union did not go out on strike when the present contract came into effect in 1971. Some left the union at that time. Opposition exists to the no strike pledge that the Steelworkers bureaucracy is trying to implement industrywide in steel. Introduction of a policy for mandatory overtime by the company early this past summer sent the union backpedaling again. A leaflet calling for a boycott of this overtime was issued by one of our opponent groups at Hughes, Revolutionary Union. The union responded by denouncing the leaflet and calling on the workers to come to work when scheduled by the company. Another sore point with the workers is that the union settled for much less in their contract in 1971 than the Steelworkers nationally did. Many want this differential eliminated.

All this takes place in a national context in which the international union president, I. W. Abel, is presently working out provisions which would tie increased productivity in with upcoming contract demands. Several anti-bureaucratic caucuses have begun to develop in steel nationally, these mostly in the northern US at this time.

Union meetings are quite lively, generally they are attended by at least 75 members, sometimes as many as 150. They are also quite long as the discontent of many members surfaces quickly and stays so throughout the meetings.

There is a layer of young militants, obviously undirected, who pick at and drag out every point on the agenda, with questions, objections, etc. This layer constitutes a good 30 to 40% of those who regularly attend union meetings. At some meetings this layer has carried a majority of the votes. They often overrule moves by the chair (the president of the local) to cut off discussion, resist hand votes on motions and reports, etc. At present, they are slowly winning the battle for more democracy in the union, but this is only a conjunctural development.

This layer constitutes a real dilemma for us as revolutionaries. While on the one hand, they attract a small number of other young workers to meetings, on the other hand, they drive a number of older workers away. This occurs because the young workers see their peers actively participating in the union and criticizing the leadership, but at the same time they have no perspectives or sense of proportion. Points like financial and treasury reports are drawn out intolerably by questions and objections that appear senseless from any point of view, revolutionary or reaction-

ary. But as revolutionaries, we know this is a manifestation of much more.

An example of the bad effects of this layer was a recent meeting which the president adjourned after finding it difficult to maintain order. Unfortunately, this occurred before the point on new business came up, a point under which members can bring up important issues. There was a group of young grievance men present, who don't regularly attend meetings, who wanted to initiate a discussion on the problem of mandatory overtime under this point.

Opponent Groups at Hughes

Out of this layer of young militants about 10 seem to be close to members of Revolutionary Union. While they have influence, they remain very much submerged, their influence is essentially as individuals only and this influence itself is very diverse. They have been publishing a factory newsletter, Rising Up Angry, for about a year on a monthly or sometimes twice-monthly basis. Their members in the union at Hughes are not openly associated either with the organization or the newsletter even to their contacts. They gave implicit support to an anti-bureaucratic slate for the union elections which took place this last summer. In reality this slate was only an opposition slate. This "anti-bureaucratic" slate has been elected. This gives us an idea of the politics of this group and its newsletter.

Recently, RU in collaboration with the October League set up a meeting at the University of Houston with Isaac Shorter, one of the two leaders of the successful Chrysler rank-and-file action. A leaflet for the meeting was distributed at Hughes beforehand.

Another opponent organization, Progressive Labor Party, has some forces at Hughes. They have only two people at Hughes and much less of a periphery than RU. Their intervention has been limited to talking up "30 for 40" and occasional plant sales of Challenge. They play no significant role at union meetings.

Recently, these two groups clashed with each other in a round of unprincipled politics. A PLER informed on two RUIers for being on company property when not on shift and they were indefinitely suspended by the company. Later they were reinstated and at a union meeting soon afterward, a member of RU filed charges against the PLER. A trial committee recommended that the PLER be stripped of his position as departmental grievance man and expelled from the union for one year. This hinged on membership approval however. The RU's plan backfired at the local meeting when they tried to cut off discussion on the nature of the trial and the proceedings and push approval of the trial committee's recommendations.

The membership probably would have voted to approve the recommendations of the trial committee after a discus-

sion of the specific details of the charges and proceedings, but RU's motion was to cut off this discussion and approve the recommendations and was thus defeated by the membership. This voided the entire proceedings. Part of the reason for their hurry was RU's fear of coming out in the open and their desire to eliminate opponents from the union.

Intervention (?) By the SWP and YSA

In the past year, several YSA and SWP comrades have been hired at Hughes. Events since then have led to several discussions in the Trotskyist movement on the situation there and our possible intervention, and finally to one intervention.

This past July, three women comrades at Hughes, all tendency supporters, were unjustly fired while still on probation. Official reasons were given for two of the firings, which could not stand up to examination. The third firing was not given any official reason or justification except that it was in the best interests of the company and the comrade involved. Previous to being fired, the last comrade had been to meetings of the Trotskyist movement, at our headquarters. Hughes Tool Company security men were observed both before and after the firing of this comrade in the parking lot of the hall. One of the security men was identified as the security guard at the workers entrance to the plant by the last-fired comrade.

While the firings occurred during probation, and there were problems in the application of one of the comrades that could have linked the three, the manner in which the firing of especially the last comrade was carried out led us to conclude that the linking up of the comrades with the SWP precipitated at least the last firing.

This poses a real threat to those of us still employed at Hughes. There can be no doubt that Hughes took note of the fact that these moves on their part precipitated no response from the SWP. This may encourage them to extend such victimizations as they deem necessary. Further, the present political practice of the Trotskyist movement in Houston means that comrades can not even hope to maintain themselves in a union situation, let alone actually carry out any work. It is a reflection of the total lack of any concrete perspective toward the working class.

The issue was raised in the Trotskyist movement in July. Attempts to have the SWP move to defend the victimized comrade (we chose the last-fired comrade because of the clarity of the question involved) were squelched--she was told to go to the unemployment commission to get the reason for being fired. This crude tabling of the problem, at a time when an immediate response was necessary, was done in the guise of "preparing the groundwork" for a defense. It was made clear in this discussion that any defense would take a civil libertarian approach, as the branch did not see this as a political attack on one of its members. Recent discussions have revealed that the "verdict" on the victimized

comrade by the local SWP leadership actually was that she spoke about politics too soon (while on probation) with fellow workers and that she did not immediately inform the organizer when she was fired. These inaccurate criticisms were not even openly discussed at the time of the firing.

As part of the fall sales campaign the SWP began Militant sales at Hughes on a weekly basis. PL was also stepping up its sales of Challenge.

In October, the company issued a leaflet (see Appendix 1) attacking the newsletter Rising Up Angry; the SWP, the Militant; PLP and Challenge. The SWP and PLP were specifically attacked for openly supporting the communist philosophy, for trying to destroy the union, and trying to destroy the "good relations" that exist between management and the employees at Hughes.

PL responded with an abstract, economist leaflet, with no specific demands, slogans or proposals for action.

RU responded with a similar issue of Rising Up Angry which also attacked the SWP and PLP as "phony worker groups."

Several members of the YSA and SWP thought it necessary that the SWP respond to this attack by Hughes and pressed for such a response. Due to the nature of the political line and the local leadership (to the right of the national leadership, though certainly not qualitatively) a totally incorrect intervention was made through the Houston socialist elections campaign (see Appendix 2) which the YSA supports.

At the next SWP meeting, a report was given on the intervention at Hughes. Under discussion the following comments and criticisms, which are of relevance to the entire Trotskyist movement, were offered:

"I'm glad to see that the situation at Hughes Tool has given the SWP an opportunity to intervene in the working class in Houston, but I want to say that I'm unhappy with the content of the leaflet the campaign issued this past week at Hughes. Although I wasn't too happy with some of the things the leaflet said, there are some outright reformist formulations in the leaflet. I was even more appalled at what the leaflet didn't say.

"Interference with the electoral process was the dominant theme in the leaflet, but if the campaign wanted to effectively intervene at Hughes, it should have addressed itself to some of the issues in the plant at Hughes that the workers have to deal with day to day. By showing some interest in these issues and by taking positions on these issues, the workers at Hughes might have taken more interest in the leaflet and the SWP campaign.

"The campaign should have coordinated this intervention with the comrades working at Hughes. This would have given the campaign an idea of the situation at Hughes, which would have enabled the campaign to understand much better just what they were intervening in.

"Formulations in the leaflet, like 'circumvent the democratic process, 'interfere with the legitimate electoral process, 'interfere with the Houston elections, 'all these sow illusions about the electoral process. It should have been made clear that the SWP does not see the electoral process as either 'democratic' or 'legitimate.' Hughes Tool didn't attack the SWP because they were afraid of our election campaign. They attack us because they are afraid of their workers being exposed to communism, especially in light of upcoming contract negotiations and the attitudes of a large number of the workers over wages and working conditions.

"The Hughes leaflet attacked us as openly supporting the communist philosophy. I find it almost unbelievable that our leaflet made no response to this. This red-baiting should have been answered to the workers at Hughes.

"We are not economists, we should have met this red-baiting attack that yes, we are communists and by pointing out why Hughes is opposed to us. This could have been done by explaining our opposition to American imperialism in Vietnam and in the Mideast and by pointing out Hughes' interests in these areas.

"Further, the leaflet should have come out in defense of our rights, as communists, to work and be members of the union at Hughes, as well as those of members of all other radical groups."

These suggestions were met with complete factional silence.

Conclusions

The situation at Hughes Tool Co. and the intervention made there by Houston SWP and YSA members clearly indicates the grave shortcomings of the political line adopted at the recent SWP national convention and the last YSA convention. To limit trade union work to Militant sales and campaign support is to ignore the objective situation in this country today, one in which an increasing radicalization within the working class can be observed, and one which can only continue to develop, given the political and economic problems facing this country.

We urge all comrades in the YSA to seriously consider the present debate, the questions in dispute, and particularly the American question. We know this will lead you to support of the Internationalist Tendency resolution, one which takes cognizance of the objective situation and orients

itself accordingly, rather than one which guides itself by sterile, pat formulas regardless of time and space.

Appended are the leaflets of Hughes Tool Company and the Socialist Workers Party.

December 12, 1973

APPENDIX 1

Hughes Tool Company

October 9, 1972

TO ALL HUGHES TOOL COMPANY EMPLOYEES

Subject: "Rising Up Angry"

For the past year on a regular monthly basis an underground publication has been passed out to employees entering and leaving the parking lot on Harrisburg. This underground paper carried the title of "Rising Up Angry." The authors of this paper are critical of both Union and management. The authors of this paper do not have the courage to publicly identify themselves. The sole purpose is to create chaos and unrest among Hughes employees, and the eventual destruction of your Union and your company. We intend to see that they are not successful.

We believe that "Rising Up Angry" is written by members of an underground subversive element. The "Militant" published by the Socialist Workers Party and "Challenge" published by the Progressive Labor Party also appear at our gate and openly represent the communist philosophy. These groups are said to be working in concert to overthrow our freedom of action which we enjoy as Americans. Trained organizers and members of these groups are trying to develop sufficient strength to overthrow the Union and to force a strike before the next contract negotiation. They appear to be mainly interested in destroying the good relations that exist between company management and the employees.

Has Hughes Tool Company been chosen as the target company in Houston because of our large employment and our equal opportunity employment policy which has resulted in the highest percentage of black, female and Mexican-American employees of any large company in this area? Are they directing their propaganda to our minority employees hoping to mislead them into supporting their cause? Do they think our minority employees are not smart enough to see through their propaganda to their real motives and objectives? We know that our employees are intelligent and will not be misled by the false statements and promises.

We believe that you will join us in telling this element that its disruptive, deceptive tactics will not be tolerated in your Union and Company.

WAK:c1

signed/ W. A. Kistler, Jr.
Hughes Tool Company

APPENDIX 2

MEET DAN FEIN,
SOCIALIST WORKERS CANDIDATE FOR MAYOR

FEIN ANSWERS ATTACK BY HUGHES MANAGEMENT

Some of my campaign supporters recently brought to my attention the statement distributed to all Hughes employees on October 9, 1973, by the management of Hughes Tool Company. I was appalled at what I consider to be an extremely crude effort by the bosses at Hughes to circumvent the democratic process by attempting to frighten workers from supporting my campaign for mayor and from reading the Socialist campaign newspaper, The Militant.

This is nothing less than Watergate tactics on the part of Hughes management--an attempt by the wealthy corporations and their servants to interfere with the legitimate electoral process. The Socialist Workers Party is a legal party, and we will be on the ballot in Houston on election day, November 6. In their message to you, the management at Hughes openly tries to intimidate you into not examining the ideas of my party and buying our newspaper.

This Watergatism at Hughes should come as no surprise to anyone who has been following the news. It has recently come to light as part of the Watergate revelations that Howard Hughes, himself, secretly gave \$100,000 to Nixon through his millionaire friend, Bebe Rebozzo. This was an attempt by the wealthy big boss at Hughes to use his dollars to defraud the voters last fall. Now the bosses at Hughes Tool are attempting to interfere with the Houston elections by threatening their employees and slandering my party. In its statement, Hughes Tool Company says that the Socialist Workers Party is "working to overthrow our freedom of action which we enjoy as Americans." This is a lie. It is the management at Hughes, not the Socialist Workers Party, who is trying to tell you what you can and cannot read. We think that the workers at Hughes should be able to freely

read and consider all points of view, and make up their own minds, without threats and intimidation from anyone.

The Hughes bosses also falsely claim that my party is out to destroy the Union at Hughes. They try to give the impression that Hughes is a great friend of the Union. This is an insult to your intelligence. The only reason that you have a union now is because the workers at Hughes fought for it, and it is the only thing that stands between you and the bosses. The Socialist Workers Party supports union struggles against wage controls, for better working conditions, and for cost of living escalator clauses in all contracts to combat inflation. The Militant reports on these struggles in Houston and throughout the country.

The statement by Hughes makes reference to "the good relations between company management and the employees." This is not the picture I get of the relationship between management and workers at Hughes. I have heard reports that unsafe and hazardous working conditions are common. I am contacting the Hughes management and demanding that I be allowed to inspect the plant so that I can inform the citizens of Houston that the workers at Hughes are being forced to work under improper conditions.

The Hughes management has interfered with the rights of its employees to participate freely in the elections this fall. I have a proposal that might serve to undo at least some of the damage that they have done. I propose that they set up a meeting, on company time, where all the candidates for mayor can address the workers at Hughes. This would allow you to take a look at all of the candidates and hear what they have to say.

Finally, I will be at the front gate at Hughes on Tuesday, October 24, from 3:00 to 4:00 p. m. to meet the workers at Hughes, to discuss this situation with you, to answer any questions you might have, and to talk to you about my campaign for mayor. I hope to see you there.

FOR A RETURN TO THE ROAD OF THE TRANSITIONAL PROGRAM:
IN REPLY TO THE PERSPECTIVES AND METHOD OF THE YSA LEADERSHIP

By Peter Gellert (Internationalist Tendency), Houston Local, and Betti S. (Internationalist Tendency), Brooklyn Local

Introduction

This document is not being presented as a counterline document, but rather, as a contribution to the discussion, a critique of the politics of the current leadership of the Young Socialist Alliance.

A full counterline resolution is being offered by the YSA Internationalist Tendency. I would urge all comrades to vote for the line of their document.

This year's "Draft Political Resolution" from the National Executive Committee of the YSA reaches a new low in political analysis, or to be more precise, lack of analysis. Thus many quotes I use to illustrate points are from past YSA NEC resolutions. The reason these resolutions were not replied to at the time either by myself or others is because the SWP up until September of this year has prevented us from raising our political differences in the YSA pre-convention discussion even though we were members of the YSA. Because of the fact that the YSA is the de facto youth group of the Socialist Workers Party and that the SWP and YSA share a common program and perspectives, I have also used the SWP press and election campaigns as sources to illustrate points I will be making in this contribution.

Finally, if comrades feel that the contribution or the documents submitted by the Internationalist Tendency are overly negative, it should be kept in mind that in the pre-convention discussion the discussion does tend to center precisely on the differences and, rightly or wrongly, the larger areas of agreement necessarily appear to fade in the background.

A Brief Look Backward

At the 1971 convention of the SWP the leadership launched four campaigns which were projected as both politically sound and tactically realizable and at the same time would provide a sizable arena for recruitment.

The mass abortion law repeal movement which would mobilize millions of women in the streets against the capitalist class, the Jenness-Pulley campaign which would be the biggest such campaign since Eugene Debs and would act as a pole of attraction for disillusioned McGovern supporters, the November 3 student strike and November 6 antiwar demonstrations and an energetic campaign to double, if not triple, the size of the YSA.

The organizational report to the June 1971 YSA plenum stated that:

"... it should be clear... that we are confident that over the course of the 1972 campaign the YSA can--at the minimum--repeat the percentage gains made during the 1968 campaign, in which we doubled our membership." (YS Organizer, July 30, 1971, emphasis in original)

I assume that the projection to double, if not triple, the size of the YSA was based on the leadership's analysis of the current situation as well as our ability to organizationally take advantage of the opportunities open before us, rather than on making the membership feel good. And in all fairness to the hard working membership of the YSA the failure of our projection is not due to lack of organizational ability on the part of the YSA--our regional teams, sub teams, literature and press and general degree of organization are truly unique and impressive. The failure to increase YSA membership must be viewed as a serious warning sign that something is wrong with the analysis the leadership is presenting. What must be done is to scrutinize this analysis, not to say that it is wrong to project.

All of the four campaigns previously mentioned have fallen far short of their mark. The original explanation was that it was all due to the pressure of the elections. Not only couldn't the SWP and YSA explain to advanced layers of the population and activists in the various movements what was occurring, it couldn't even tell the ranks of the Party and YSA what was happening and why. The lull on campus resulting from May 1970 was not even recognized until January 1972 when The Militant painfully announced that things did indeed seem to be a bit quiet on campus. Basing itself on the analysis of the 1971 SWP convention we proceeded to build the November 3 student strike, which was such a colossal disaster that The Militant never, ever carried a roundup article describing how the action went.

This would not be entirely negative had the SWP and YSA leadership learned some lessons from this, but alas, this unfortunately is not the case. The YSA continues to look to the rejuvenation of the same campus based social protest movements of the 1960s, in some cases with an almost mystical religious fervor. To the questions of radical youth, "What are we to do?" "Nothing we seem to do has any effect," the answer of the YSA is "parades and more parades."

Despite the decline in the student movement and the beginnings of motion in the working class, the SWP and YSA proudly refuse to involve themselves in the class. The documents of the leadership fail to outline any concrete orient-

ation to the unions or any, even minimal, colonization policy towards industry.

As we go into 1974 the SWP and YSA have no real campaigns to focus on, are isolated from both the working class and the campuses, and equally important, are having their political theories increasingly rejected domestically by activist youth and internationally by the ranks of the world Trotskyist movement.

Economic Situation

Any discussion of the tasks facing revolutionists must proceed first and foremost from an understanding of the economic, material and social realities which are shaping the United States and indeed, the entire world capitalist system. For Marxists, of course, this is axiomatic. Unfortunately, in most YSA documents the analysis of the economy is totally divorced from the rest of the document. (If any analysis is even given--the 1970 political resolution simply avoids the question altogether.) In place of a concrete material analysis of the forces and factors shaping the economy and correspondingly, the class struggle, instead broad sweeping statements like "women are on the move" suffice. Therefore I would like to spend some time discussing and evaluating the current crises of US imperialism and the effects this is having and will continue to have on the class struggle here at home.

The development of the world and American economic situation promises to result in a qualitative increase in the tempo of the class struggle.

After World War II Western European and American capitalism experienced a prolonged period of relative prosperity with only a few minor recessions. For American capitalism Europe and Japan proved to be fertile areas for economic investment. Because of overseas imperialist investment and exploitation, super-exploitation and a high rate of productivity for American workers, and weakened international capitalist competitors, the American ruling class was able to give considerable concessions domestically to the American working class, and at the same time maintain a high rate of profit relative to their capitalist competitors overseas.

The above factors, coupled with the cold war overseas and a mounting witch-hunt at home, enabled the trade union bureaucrats to consolidate their hold over the labor movement. While some significant strike actions did occur, the period was nonetheless marked by relative quiescence of the working class.

At the same time there were changes occurring within the American working class. Blacks were becoming increasingly urbanized and proletarianized, concentrated largely in sprawling northern urban ghettos. The need for skilled and literate labor led to an increase in the number of per-

sons attending college and the rise of junior and community colleges, as well as the expansion of the state university system. As the economic role of the state expanded to keep pace with the rising needs of industry and as expansion of credit led to an increase in capital, there was a corresponding increase in the number of white collar jobs. The unionization of these sections of the work force--service workers and public employees, was a result of the changing structural conditions of American capitalism.

During this period of relative prosperity there was a decrease in the percentage of the work force organized into unions. Despite the merger of the AFL-CIO, the much heralded Operation Dixie never really came off. The south remained largely unorganized. The dominant feature of this period was one of fragmentation and dispersal of the class struggle. Naturally, this was to affect the beginnings of opposition to government policies and not surprisingly this opposition began to be first manifested in the peripheral sectors of society, that is, sectors outside the organized working class. In turn, it is also not surprising that this relative quiescence of the working class could not but shape the ideological outlook of those becoming involved in the developing movements for social change.

The current period and conjuncture can be characterized as one of deepening structural crises for the world capitalist system. Internationally there has been a decisive reversal of the 25 year expansionary period. Europe and Japan, once investment areas, are now rivals in a coming trade war. Military expenditures and the expansion of credit, once a source of expansion, are now a source of uncontrollable inflation. The international monetary crises and the decline of the dollar are symptoms and a reflection of the growing structural weakness of capitalism.

The period since May 1968 has been one of heightened working class struggles. Italy, Belgium, Britain, Denmark, Spain have all experienced tremendous upsurges of the working class. Here in North America one must not forget the massive Quebec general strike. We can confidently expect more and greater upsurges of the class, and it flows from this that we must view our tasks and priorities as resulting from such a prognosis.

How has and will the capitalist class respond to the growing class struggle both domestically and internationally? Incomes policies, austerity programs, strong state apparatuses are the only way out. There will be an increase in government interference in the economy on the side of the capitalists. American capitalism must increase the productivity and lower the wages of the American working class so that it can best compete with its European and Japanese rivals. This is what's behind the current industry-wide forced overtime and speed-up.

So far there does not appear to be any difference in analysis between supporters of the IEC Majority Tendency and the

Leninist-Trotskyist Faction. Neither side in the current International dispute sees any possibility for an extended period of prosperity in the capitalist world. Both sides say that they agree: the crisis of capitalism is laying the basis for heightened class struggles by the working class and its allies. However the SWP and YSA pull back from this analysis when it is applied to the tasks and perspectives of American Trotskyism. What the European comrades see as a need to root the parties of the Fourth International in the working class in expectation of rising class struggles and in recognition of the important gains that can and must be won here and now, the SWP brands as "workerist." When the Fourth International in its European perspectives document calls upon the sections to begin the process of rooting its cadre in the working class for the long, slow patient work necessary to build mass proletarian parties in this period, the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction attacks this as a "shortcut" (!). It is clear that the SWP and YSA need new priorities for the 1970s, and that if these new priorities are not arrived at, our movement may well suffer a tremendous setback.

The rise of the class struggle will see the autonomous movements of the 1960s and early 1970s lose their autonomy in the sense that they will link up--in terms of orientation, program and composition--with the working class. Already we can see this process at work in the women's, Black, Chicano and student movements. Advanced elements in these movements are beginning to see that for their movement to go anywhere it must transcend the campus (and I don't mean in the sense of using student government mimeo machines to give out SMC leaflets at supermarkets). These activists are starting to turn their attention to the working class, as a class. And it is with much regret that we cannot report that the SWP and YSA are doing the same.

Theories of the New Radicalization

To justify the Party and YSA's abstention from the organized working class and its adaptation to various petty-bourgeois milieus and ideologies, the leadership must invent all sorts of new theories which seek to prove the exceptionalness, newness and uniqueness of this radicalization and imbue its component parts with all sorts of magical powers.

In Towards an American Socialist Revolution, George Breitman states that the current radicalization is already the deepest, broadest and biggest ever in the history of the United States. For a Marxist to say that a radicalization is the deepest, broadest, etc., despite the fact that the proletariat has barely been involved in its organized forms is truly amazing. However, if one has any knowledge of the Debs period or the 1930s the statement is even more astounding. During the 1930s, for example, the Communist Party, the dominant party of American radicalism, had upwards of 100,000 members and hundreds of thousands of close sympathizers. Their front groups, like the American League against War and Fascism had half a million members. In addition to several daily newspapers in foreign languages,

they published two English dailies, the Daily Peoples World on the west coast and the Daily Worker, the former with a circulation of 100,000 a day. They could fill Madison Square Garden with 20,000 people at the drop of a hat. In New York there were literally hundreds of CP and Young Communist League clubs. Two prominent CP leaders, Benjamin Davis and Peter Cacchione, were even elected to the New York City Council. Stalinist strength in the unions was nothing to snicker at either. They led (or misled to be more precise) millions of workers and ran several key unions. At one point they were close to a voting majority on the top CIO councils. That the Stalinists betrayed and demoralized this radicalization is undoubtedly correct. But the fact remains that there were hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of workers (and others) who subjectively felt the system was rotten and socialism was needed. The radicalization was stronger then in both organized and unorganized forms. So far this might just seem like a squabble over an assessment of the 1930s or the Debs period, since the statement says, on the surface at least, about as much about this radicalization as it does about those of the past. However, this assessment of the current radicalization is key to the Party's new theories on how the radicalization will unfold and how revolutionaries should relate to its new forms. The statement is integral to the Party's constant assertion of how new, unique and different this radicalization is from those of the past, with the logical implication flowing from this being that the lessons of the past are largely inapplicable to this radicalization.

Obviously this radicalization is going to be different from the radicalization of the 1930s or that of the Debs period. No two generations radicalize in the same manner. However that is not the question in dispute. What is involved is whether the coming American socialist revolution will be a battle between the capitalist class and the forces of labor as such, or whether it will take some other new form. To say that the women's movement, student movement, etc., are reflections of the class struggle and that the questions they raise will play a role in the politicalization and radicalization of the working class is one thing. To assert, however, that these are the new forms the class struggle is taking is quite another. I will return to this point later.

Another new theory to not only explain the newness, deepness, strongness and uniqueness of the current radicalization (and I might add, how it will not be reversed until the question of state power has been posed) but also to elaborate some ideas on how revolutionaries relate to the rise of spontaneous social struggles is the "independent mass movement" theory.

It is true that the antiwar movement, Black and Chicano movement, women's movement, student movement, gay movement, etc., are organizationally independent of the Democratic Party in that the Democratic Party does not officially run and control them. However it must be kept in mind, comrades, that the Democratic and Republican Parties

in the United States today are essentially and fundamentally electoral machines only. Very little outside the organized electoral process and the halls of Congress isn't independent of the Democratic Party. Unfortunately it must nonetheless be recognized that the overwhelming majority of participants in the antiwar movement think that the way to end the war is to vote for a good Democratic "peace candidate" and insofar as they think marches are a good idea it is seen as subordinate to and supplementary to electing "good" Democrats. A similar thing may be said about the other movements, particularly the women's movement. In other words, in a real sense they are not at all independent of the Democrats. Now I am not saying that this means we should ignore or be hostile to these movements. Quite the contrary, revolutionists do not pick the level of consciousness of the masses. Whenever and wherever the masses are in motion is the place for us to be. But just because the masses are in motion does not mean that this motion is automatically, consistently or objectively revolutionary or will lead on its own to revolutionary consciousness. For this to occur the intervention of the Leninist Party is needed around the Transitional Program.

In my opinion, the Party has fundamentally incorrect theoretical positions on the nature of the coming American socialist revolution, the application of the approach of the Transitional Program, the role of nationalism and feminism and how revolutionaries relate to them and how to build a party, that is, the question of party building.

The Coming American Revolution: Struggle of Classes or Struggle of Sectors?

The most fundamental divisions in society are those divisions based on class. While capitalism has created many, many divisions among the population I don't think anyone would disagree that the class divisions are the most crucial, the most fundamental, the most decisive.

The minority believes the coming American socialist revolution will be a revolution by the working class as a class, and other key questions, such as Black and Brown liberation, women's liberation, etc., must be viewed with-in this context, in other words, as part and parcel of the whole class struggle. This definitely isn't to imply that workers will move solely around economic or on the job demands. But the class interests of the proletariat will be the decisive factor in the radicalization of American workers. Struggles around demands centered around struggles against racist oppression and the oppression of women, etc., will tend to develop within this framework.

The SWP and YSA leadership, on the other hand, have brought forth a combined revolution theory.

The combined revolution theory envisions a quantitative deepening of the existing social protest movements of the 1960s. It sees the coming American revolution developing

out of the struggle of parallel social movements with the working class in them but not necessarily moving as workers. It sees the working class moving primarily out of identification with the existing social protest movements and sees these movements as representing "the new forms the class struggle is taking." I remember right before April 24 in the New York YSA local when the reporter on the United Women's Contingent said that April 24 gives comrades a glimpse of what the coming American revolution would look like--the organization of independent sectors merrily marching along the road to social revolution, coming together somewhere along the way. Comrade Horowitz explains it this way:

"Far from diminishing in importance as the labor movement itself radicalizes these movements will grow and continue to be a key part in the general process leading to a socialist revolution. To think otherwise is to think that the radicalizing layers of the working class will be completely incapable of identifying with feminism, Black nationalism, gay liberation, and progressive standards of social morality. If that were the case, there would be no prospect of the working class identifying with the goals of the socialist revolution." (Towards an American Socialist Revolution, p. 15, my emphasis)

In other words, the leadership sees the working class radicalizing but not as a class. Comrade Peter Camejo in the March 26, 1971 Militant summed up his position as follows:

"... if we take the social layers now in motion--the youth, Black people, and women--these three layers make up about 60% of the working class... if you start adding in the Chicanos it goes over 60%. And that doesn't mean the rest of the working class isn't going to be on our side. I'm just pointing out that the social layers that have already begun to move potentially make up the majority of the working class."

The above is what's known as the "sponge theory." The existing social protest movements will simply soak up the working class by sheer means of arithmetic.

As has been previously said it is certainly true that the struggles for Chicano, Black, and women's liberation will play a role in the coming revolution; it is another proposition to state that we can envision the growth of a women's movement united all women as women, a Black movement uniting all Blacks as Blacks, a gay movement... etc. Rather these struggles must be seen as being interlinked with the class struggle as part and parcel of that struggle. The social movements in existence today, such as the women's movement, will tend to polarize along class lines and split under the impact and momentum of the rising class struggle, a key aspect of which will undoubtedly be a growth of consciousness and activity by working women around demands of special relevance to them.

Consistent Struggles Equals Socialism?

Another theory of the current YSA and SWP leadership is that "consistent nationalism (or feminism) leads to socialism."

At this point I'd like to discuss general questions of terminology. Nationalism and feminism are ideologies, that is, outlooks, within the national liberation and women's liberation movements. We make a distinction between the liberation of women and feminism, between the struggle against racist oppression and nationalism, just as we distinguish between struggles against war and pacifism and trade union struggles and trade unionism, that is, economism. With the exception of the SWP and YSA and its supporters in the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction, the Trotskyist movement as a whole does. And in fact, throughout its history (until the "new radicalization") the SWP did too.

However the SWP and YSA have begun to muddle these distinctions. Marxists don't use scientifically precise language to be pedantic, but rather so that we are clear about the phenomenon we are discussing and so that we can clearly formulate on the basis of this what we want to project and do.

Some comrades say that when we speak of nationalism or feminism we are not speaking of it in the model or classical sense of the term. Suppose I said that Nixon was a fascist but not in the classical sense. Or that the Soviet Union was imperialist but not in the model meaning of the term. Obviously we are clear about the meaning of words so we can discuss them intelligently. So far so good. But when you come to nationalism or feminism, then the terms are so muddled and unclear that everyone from Betty Friedan to Ethel Mertz is a feminist.

Mary-Alice Waters justifies this when she explains that:

"... if we often avoid terms like 'bourgeois' or 'petty-bourgeois' feminism today it is because they are not widely understood. Over the years they have been so mis-used in the radical movement that they usually obscure differences rather than clarify them." ("Feminism and the Marxist Movement," October 1972 ISR, p. 21)

This is truly classic. Since the term is unclear due to a lack of theoretical training on the part of American radicals then we'll simply stop using them. Perhaps Comrade Waters feels we should stop using terms like classes, imperialism, the state, parties or even socialism for that manner, since these terms are also widely misused.

While we must be clear on our terminology we of course must realize that not everyone else is, and act accordingly. If someone calls George Wallace a fascist we obviously wouldn't go hysterical over it and charge the speakers plat-

form.

For the SWP and YSA, however, this unclarity and lack of precision results from a tendency to adapt, in practice, to nationalism, feminism and if we ever get close enough to the working class, probably economism.

If by saying that "consistent nationalism leads to socialism" the SWP and YSA means that the Black struggle against racist oppression will play an important role in the radicalization process and that racism cannot be ended under capitalism, then I doubt that there is a group on the left that would disagree with that.

But the danger arises when the Party views these struggles as having an inherent revolutionary dynamic ("independent mass movements which are objectively anti-capitalist") and that then the role of the Party becomes one of attempting merely to mobilize the masses into action around minimum demands. In practice one can see the SWP and YSA's work in the Chicano, Black and women's movements--absolutely no emphasis is placed on the raising of transitional demands, never, ever is a Marxist program proposed for the Raza Unida Party, never do we raise more advanced slogans in our work within the united front type coalitions. While the masses must be put into motion before they can radicalize (something not understood by our sectarian opponents) it is incorrect to say that the dynamics of mass action or consistent nationalism, feminism or anything else leads to revolutionary socialist consciousness. Only a Leninist party organizing the workers and their allies on a class basis can bring socialism. Anything less is a shortcut, if you please.

The expression that "democratic demands in the epoch of the death agony of capitalism have a transitional character" has been the excuse given for refusal to raise transitional demands in our day to day work. Democratic demands obviously play an important role in the radicalization of the masses, but they cannot be viewed as a substitute for the Party raising transitional demands.

While the vanguard party of course supports struggles by the masses around minimum, democratic and partial demands, be they for higher pay or repeal of repressive legislation, our strategy is that of the Transitional Program. Transitional demands are demands which challenge the ability of the capitalist class to continue their rule. Using the subjective backwardness of the masses only as a starting point, the revolutionary party raises such demands as a way of bridging the gap between the present low level of consciousness and the objective needs of the workers, that is, socialism. The alternative to a transitional approach is either the sterile, sectarian ultra-leftism of, for example, the Third Period Communist International where "maximum" demands such as the call for the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat come to the fore regardless of their understanding or support among the masses or the social-democratic minimum/maximum program whereby the day

to day work of the party revolves around minimal reform demands and appeals for socialism are reserved for holiday speech-making occasions.

Naturally the revolutionary party doesn't indiscriminately raise transitional demands for their own sake or to make its own members feel good. The campaigns a party wages and the demands it raises are arrived at as a result of a thought out plan which takes into account innumerable factors of both objective and subjective conditions. But neither does the revolutionary party only raise demands which are already being raised by the masses in the vain hope that the masses will love us for loving them. This is an abdication of the role of the Leninist party.

Despite the fact that the leadership feels we are in the middle of the deepest, broadest, etc. radicalization ever, in the day to day mass work of our movement no emphasis is placed on transitional demands. There is a total stress on democratic, immediate and partial demands, with the revolutionary propaganda reserved for the press, banquets at our headquarters and sometimes our election campaigns. One need merely look at the May 5 anti-inflation action where we limited ourselves to "Lower Food Prices," WONAAC where we confined ourselves to "Repeal the Abortion Laws" and SMC and NPAC where we didn't venture beyond "Out Now." This indicates a very dangerous development in the direction of a minimal/ maximal approach to social struggles.

Some of our sectarian opponents see a contradiction between working in a united front type coalition, working with people at the level they're at, and maintaining your own communist politics. They resolve it by abstaining from the day to day work which is vitally necessary and confine themselves to propaganda in the abstract, and conduct it in a very sectarian fashion at that. The SWP and YSA apparently see the same contradictions and resolve it by not raising demands or slogans that go beyond the minimal, common denominator basis of the united front.

Majority comrades openly defend the theoretical proposition that within the united front the revolutionary party does not raise demands which go beyond the demands of the united front. In polemicizing against the idea that within the antiwar movement the YSA should raise the slogan "Support the Vietnamese Revolution," then national chairwoman of the YSA Susan Lamont explained that "the purpose of our banners is to show what demands we think the mass antiwar movement should be based upon" (YS Discussion Bulletin, Vol. 13, No. 6). This is a total revision of the united front as expounded by Lenin and Trotsky. In the Comintern thesis "On the United Front," Trotsky explains that:

"... we participate in a united front but do not for a single moment become dissolved in it. We function in the united front as an independent detachment. It is precisely in the course of struggle that broad masses

must learn from experience that we fight better than the others, that we see more clearly than the others, that we are more audacious and resolute. In this way we shall bring closer the hour of the united revolutionary front under the undisputed communist leadership." (First Five Years of the Communist International, Vol. 2, p. 96)

The theoretical rationale for this policy towards the united front is that since the movements possess a transitional dynamic ("objectively anti-capitalist") what is necessary is that the movement be organizationally independent of the Democrats and Republicans and engage in repeated street parades, and things will flow from there. In actuality this prevents the Party from acting as the programmatic left wing of the coalition with the end result that we become isolated from the more advanced elements whose political development has gone beyond the minimal level of the single issue coalition and who then often go looking to our sectarian or Maoist opponents. In short, we cease to play an independent political role in the coalition and consequently see the movement co-opted each election period never being able to draw any real lessons from it.

Party Building

The leadership also has some new theories on the question of the relationship between the Party and the class and party building in general. The lessons of Struggle for a Proletarian Party retain their fundamental validity. Today the need for proletarianization of the ranks and sinking the roots of the party into the working class is at best of remote concern to the SWP and YSA leadership. YSA comrades not on the campus are not colonized into industry. The campuses are seen not merely as an arena for fruitful work, but as the arena. What was originally a correct tactical turn towards the campus as an area from which sizable numbers of cadre could be obtained is being transformed into a strategy for revolution.

The atmosphere inside our movement is such that very often working class youth are uncomfortable in the YSA and quit. Rather than there being a difficulty with comrades from privileged backgrounds integrating themselves in and feeling at home in the workers movement, the workers are having a hard time fitting in!

How are advanced workers to find their way to our movement? According to Comrade Jack Barnes:

"... the key to becoming a mass working class party ... lies in the recruitment of politicized workers to a party that has proven itself in the political and social struggles that are occurring, that has geographically spread and grown to a size that it is seen as a revolutionary alternative. ... Workers become politicized by the struggles they engage in, and radicalized by the important social and political issues facing the country and at

the center of the radicalization. As this occurs they begin to look for an alternative political organization." ("Lessons and Perspectives of the New Radicalization," my emphasis)

Comrade Cannon in the Socialist Appeal said:

"We hear it... nowadays that the unions are too slow in responding and that we must go directly to the masses. The masses it seems are something entirely outside the unions with their seven million or so members. The masses are presumably only waiting to hear from us and are ready to act without the formality of organization."

Or as Trotsky put it:

"... it is not enough to offer the masses a new address. It is necessary to seek out the masses where they are and lead them." (Leon Trotsky on the Trade Unions, p. 5)

The leadership views party building in an administrative way, rather than as a process of sinking the roots of the party in the mass movement coupled with the recruitment of advanced elements within the working class. The tasks of the Party are viewed as propaganda for recruitment on the one hand and calls for action on a minimal level through the medium of a united front on the other. Absent is the political role a Leninist party must play in terms of raising the level of consciousness of the broad vanguard, not only through mere action, important as that may be, but also through and interlinked with revolutionary propaganda.

Now I'd like to touch on the various mass movements and elaborate a bit in light of the remarks I've made in the first part of this contribution.

Black Struggle

The SWP and YSA leadership has drawn equivalent signs between nationalism and the Black liberation struggle. To the SWP's way of thinking, any Black who is not an out and out Uncle Tom and who desires to fight militantly for freedom is a nationalist--in other words the SWP says that Black militancy and nationalism are synonymous. In 1961 SWP leader George Breitman answered the question of what nationalism is and isn't this way:

"I think it is correct to call the Black Muslims nationalist because they openly and explicitly advocate a separate nation, and that it is wrong to call any group nationalist unless it does advocate a separate nation... Nationalism is a program, not a form of organization. A group is nationalist when it wants a separate nation. Whether or not it is genuinely nationalist depends not on the way it is organized but on the objectives it seeks." (SWP Discussion Bulletin, Vol. 22, No. 18)

Nationalism is an outlook. It sees the interests of the

nation as a nation, and does not base itself upon the class struggle. Nationalists see independence as flowing from the successful conclusion of a national struggle led by a nationalist movement or party.

Marxists are not nationalists. We see the class struggle as primary and see the road to Black liberation along class struggle lines. We see the coming American socialist revolution as being a proletarian one, with the working class as a class in the leadership with Black workers playing a key role at that. The establishment of a workers state in the United States will lay the material and political basis for the destruction of racism in both institutionalized and other forms.

Marxists support the democratic and progressive content of the nationalism of the oppressed and only that. That is, the struggle against the national oppression of the oppressor nation. We do not however support nationalism. The YSA says that revolutionaries distinguish between the nationalism of the oppressed and the nationalism of the oppressor. That is very true. We must wage unmerciful war against the latter and must take a more understanding attitude towards the former. In a not unsimilar manner we distinguish between the pacifism of the masses and the pacifism of the professional pacifist organizations. We support the progressive thrust of national struggles and at the same time seek to break the participants in the struggle away from nationalist ideology.

For the comrades who say Lenin supported the nationalism of the oppressed the natural question that must be posed is: where? Did Lenin support Ukrainian nationalism? Lithuanian nationalism? Polish nationalism? There were some 150 nationalities in czarist Russia. Minus one (for the Great Russian nationality) this leaves at least 149 left. Surely Lenin and Trotsky must have supported at least one nationalist movement. Perhaps they advocated an independent Latvian political party? Perhaps Lenin and Trotsky were supporters of an independent Jewish political party?

Actually the record of the Marxist movement on nationalism is quite clear for those who wish to read. In particular every comrade should make it a point to study Lenin's "Critical Remarks on the National Question" and "The Right of Nations to Self-Determination." In these two important works Lenin explains how:

"... Marxism cannot be reconciled with nationalism, be it even of the 'most just,' 'purest,' most refined and civilized brand. In place of all forms of nationalism Marxism advocates internationalism... Marxists fully recognize the historical legitimacy of national movements. But to prevent this recognition from becoming an apologia of nationalism, it must be strictly limited to what is progressive in such movements, in order that this recognition may not lead to bourgeois ideology obscuring proletarian consciousness. The awakening of

the masses from feudal lethargy, and their struggle against all national oppression, for the sovereignty of the people, of the nation, are progressive. Hence, it is the Marxists' bounden duty to stand for the most resolute and consistent democratism on all aspects of the national question. This task is largely a negative one. But this is the limit the proletariat can go to in supporting nationalism, for beyond that begins the positive activity of the bourgeoisie striving to fortify nationalism." (Critical Remarks on the National Question, "Progress Publishers edition, p. 22)

Consistent nationalism equals socialism? Hardly!

At this point a word must be said on the question of self-determination. The SWP and YSA commonly define supporting self-determination as supporting whatever the oppressed may want on the road to achieving their liberation. This may range from specific tactics Third World students used in the 1968 Berkeley strike to the right to control the community schools, to national independence. To unconditionally support whatever the oppressed may want is to put the Leninist party in the role of cheerleader of the national struggle since to pose any independent strategy within the movement would be a violation of self-determination. However, self-determination from a Leninist point of view means only the right to form a separate state. Lenin was quite clear on this. He states many times that:

"... self-determination of nations in the Marxist programme cannot, from a historico-economic point of view, have any other meaning than political self-determination, state independence, and the formation of a national state."

He says:

"... it would be wrong to interpret the right to self-determination as meaning anything but the right to existence as a separate state." ("The Right of Nations to Self-Determination," pp. 44, 41, respectively, emphasis in original)

No less an authority than Political Committee member Caroline Lund candidly states that "the term 'self-determination' refers to state forms. It means the right to decide whether or not to form a separate state" (SWP Discussion Bulletin, Vol. 29, No. 28, p. 8). The reason we support the right of self-determination (we support it, do not advocate it) is to show the workers of the oppressed nation that it is not the workers of the oppressor nation that are responsible for the continuation of their oppression. In other words, we aim to split the workers of the oppressed nation away from their nationalist leadership.

While it is necessary to study and re-study Marx, Lenin and Trotsky, any discussion of the current state of the Black struggle must proceed from an understanding of the material

reality of the situation and not from surface impressions. Clearly the trend is towards increased urbanization and proletarianization of the Black masses. Any material basis that could give rise to the creation of a Black nation is being undermined. As white workers begin to radicalize and engage in common struggles with Black workers we can foresee a decrease in nationalist and separatist sentiment as Black workers will begin to look upon white workers as allies in the common struggle and vice-versa. This is no small point. The leadership is totally silent on this question as any answer to it would clearly pose the question of Marxism vs. nationalism.

Of course if Blacks did opt for self-determination we would support that right. And again, the reason we support it is precisely to indicate to the Black workers that it is not the workers of the oppressor nation who are responsible for their oppression.

Karl Marx outlined a communist approach to the question of national oppression in the section of the Communist Manifesto entitled "Proletarians and Communists." It is worth quoting this inasmuch as Marx gives the foremost and guiding principle which should be the basis of our analysis and work. He wrote:

"The communists are distinguished from other working class parties by this only: 1) In the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries, they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat independently of nationality, 2) In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie has to pass through, they always and everywhere represent the interest of the movement as a whole." (Communist Manifesto, Progress Publishers Edition, p. 61)

Lenin expressed it equally well when he said that:

"The proletariat... while recognizing equality and equal rights to a national state, values above all and places foremost the alliance of the proletarians of all nations, and assesses any national demand, any national separation, from the angle of the workers class struggle." ("The Right of Nations to Self-Determination," p. 55, emphasis in original)

Thus, revolutionary Marxists, Trotskyists, intervene in the struggles of the oppressed against national and racial oppression through propagandizing and raising demands which link the national question with that of the whole working class, and, in this case, show both Black and white workers how the just demands of the Black masses are in the interests of the working class as a whole, how both Black and white workers have common interests in the fight against the bosses, etc. Needless to say this is coupled with involvement in the day to day struggles of the Black masses.

In real life, the SWP and YSA leadership have proceeded very differently from the course outlined by Marx, Lenin and Trotsky. On one level very little work is done in the Black community and in the Black struggle. Very few locals have functioning Black work fractions. On the other hand, in our propaganda, that is, our election campaigns and press, the SWP and YSA tail-end and opportunistically adapt to nationalism. Rather than raise demands which stress the class question and the class nature of Black oppression, the SWP and YSA ourselves raise, and advocate strictly nationalist demands. Demands such as "Exempt Black youth from the Military Draft," "Black Party," "Preferential Hiring of Blacks," etc. and YSA comrades putting out SMC Third World Task Force leaflets that say "Vietnam: White Man's War" do absolutely nothing to educate anyone about the nature of class rule in American society and only attempt to prove to nationalists that we're just as nationalist, if not more so, than they are. I'm sorry to report that this opportunism has proven a dismal failure as far as recruitment of Black youth goes.

What's wrong with these demands? Let's take the Black party demand for a moment. Some comrades compare this with the demand for a labor party, but in reality they are quite different. The labor party demand says to the workers that as a class we have interests separate and apart from the capitalist class and must organize ourselves in the political sphere through our own political party just as the workers are organized in the economic sphere through the trade unions. If a labor party were formed, even with a reformist program, it would be an enormous step forwards in terms of the class consciousness of the American proletariat, that is, the elementary recognition that as a class, workers have their own interests to fight for and defend.

The Black party slogan on the other hand tells Blacks that they have interests separate and apart from all whites and must organize their own political party to fight for these interests. As Leninists, it is not our job to call upon the working class to organize themselves on the basis of their ethnic background. If a Black party did come into existence (there has been little if any motion in this direction despite the fact that the SWP has been screaming about it for ten years) we might wish to extend it critical support so as to educate its ranks and supporters about what a Marxist approach to the national struggle entails, but for the SWP to advocate (virtually by itself) separate political parties for different groups of workers on the basis of national background is incorrect.

Similarly with preferential hiring. The argument proceeds from the assumption that there are only a certain amount of jobs to go around and concludes by pitting the Black working class against the white working class in a scramble for employment. I don't have to go into detail on what this demand would lead to in a period of heightened economic crises and mass unemployment. As Trotskyists we raise the demands of "30 hours work at 40 hours pay!"

"Jobs for all," "Job training for youth at union wages." If the demand for preferential hiring was being raised in a concrete situation by the Black masses (as it has been in the past) we would probably support it and become active in the struggle. The real problem with this slogan is that the SWP applies it across the board in a general, national political sense. As such it is an incorrect demand for us, the Marxist-Leninists, to raise, advocate and convince others of.

The opportunism of the leadership on this point is perhaps best exemplified by the fact that in the 1972 election campaign our different brochures aimed at different sectors raised different, contradictory demands. Our brochure "The Black Community and the '72 elections" raised preferential hiring as the demand the Blacks should struggle around while the labor brochure suggests jobs for all, 30 for 40. What crass opportunism! Who does the leadership think they're kidding? What do they hope to gain from such an approach?

While opponent groups such as the Workers League and the Communist Party are able to recruit Black youth despite their incorrect programs this should indicate that there are fruitful openings for work in the Black community. It should indicate that radicalizing Blacks are beginning to understand that the solution to their problems lies in a class struggle approach, not narrow petty-bourgeois nationalism.

It must be stated that many of the activities of the SWP and YSA in the Black struggle are good. The mass action approach is essential to any winning strategy for the Black movement. Similarly, the importance of remaining independent of the Democratic Party and their flunkies in the Black community. Militant coverage of the struggle has been steadily improving, although I still think we have a ways to go.

The SWP and YSA must involve itself in the Black struggle. Actions such as the Polaroid workers movement, the refusal of longshoremen to unload Rhodesian chrome, the community struggles against cutbacks and for day care are all fruitful areas of Party work. And we must reject the notion that only Black comrades can do "Black work."

Finally, I wish to make clear that no one, least of all the Internationalist Tendency in the YSA, is telling Blacks that they must wait until white workers begin to move before initiating any struggles. What is being said is that the SWP and YSA should be intervening in the struggles with a class line, and to begin to do this we must go where the masses are.

Women's Liberation

In the struggle for women's liberation the SWP and YSA have pursued a course completely at odds with the historic traditions of the Marxist movement. Feminism is an ideological outlook, a false consciousness of how women can achieve liberation. Feminism teaches that the oppression of

women stems from the division of society into men and women, and that liberation can be achieved through a women's movement uniting all women as women. Feminism bases itself on a non-materialist analysis of the causes of women's oppression and on a non-class struggle approach towards ending it. Krupskaya, Kollontai, Natalia Sedova, Clara Zetkin and Rosa Luxemburg were not feminists and they made absolutely no claims to be such. In fact, the writings of early Marxists are full of polemics against bourgeois feminism.

The historic position of the SWP can best be found in Evelyn Reed's excellent pamphlet Problems of Women's Liberation. Of particular interest is the article "Sex Against Sex--Or Class Against Class?" Originally written in 1954 for the SWP internal discussion the article was printed in the original Pathfinder editions of Problems of Women's Liberation. It is worth quoting at length. Comrade Reed begins by explaining how:

"... the class distinctions between women transcend their sex identity as women. This is above all true in modern capitalist society, the epoch of the sharpest polarization of class forces.

"Historically the sex struggle was part of the bourgeois feminist movement of the last century. It was a reform movement, conducted within the framework of the capitalist system, and not seeking to abolish it. But it was a progressive struggle in that women revolted against almost total male domination on several fronts. Through the feminist movement a number of important reforms were won by the women. But that feminist movement has run its course, achieved its limited aims, and the problems we face today must be placed within the context of the class struggle.

"The 'women question' can only be resolved through the alignment of working men and women against the ruling men and women. This means that the common interests of workers as a class override the special interests of women as a sex.

"Ruling class women have exactly the same interest in upholding capitalist society as their men have. The bourgeois feminists fought, among other things, for the right of women as well as men to hold property in their own name. They won this right. Today, plutocratic women are completely at one with the plutocratic men in the desire to perpetuate the capitalist system. On basic social and political issues they are not in sympathy or alliance with the working women whose needs can be served only through abolishing the system. Thus the emancipation of working women will not be achieved together with women of the enemy class but just the opposite-- in a struggle against them as part of the whole anti-capitalist struggle.

"The attempt to identify the interests of all classes of women as a sex takes one of its most insidious forms in the field of female beauty. The myth has arisen that since all women want to be beautiful, they all have the same interest in cosmetics...."

Comrade Reed ends her article by reminding the reader that:

"In short, first the capitalist system degrades and oppresses the great mass of women. Then it exploits the discontents and fears in women to stoke the fires of unlimited sales and profits. And yet, this relentless abuse of the female sex cannot be overcome through a sex war, for wealthy women profit from it as well as wealthy men. Only through class struggle will this problem of the great majority of women be solved."

(In the "fifth and enlarged" edition Pathfinder makes some minor stylistic changes. For example, the article is renamed from "Sex Against Sex Or Class Against Class?" to "Cosmetics, Fashions and the Exploitation of Women." The entire introductory remarks which I have quoted as length were completely removed with the new article starting with "The myth has arisen...." The ending of the article states:

"In short, first the capitalist system degrades and oppresses the great mass of women. Then it exploits the discontents and fears in women to stoke the fires of unlimited sales and profits."

It stops there! In the process of enlarging the book the editors edited out the part about the necessity of a class struggle approach!!)

While the SWP and YSA of course are not really feminist as such, in practice the leadership tail-ends and adapts to feminism. Here is how the SWP's 1972 election campaign brochure explains it:

"Society has created many divisions among women. Women have been isolated from each other in individual homes, divided by class and race, and pitted against one another. A woman is told that if she is unhappy there is something wrong with her, not with society. But women today are discovering that All women are oppressed as women and are developing a sense of sisterhood in the fight against that oppression. The movement to repeal abortion laws can unite women from the high schools and college campuses, the Black and Brown communities, the trade unions, the professions, gay women, young and old women, housewives and others in a united struggle. Massive demonstrations on November 20 will show the rulers of this country that women will no longer be silent." ("Women's Liberation and the Socialist Workers Campaign," emphasis in the original)

You see, comrades, the evil men who run this society have plotted and schemed to prevent women from getting together by dividing them by, among other things, class!

In the document "Toward a Mass Feminist Movement" passed by the 1971 convention of the SWP, the Political Committee of the SWP explained how:

"... we believe sisterhood is a real and powerful thing. But it doesn't mean the same as friendship, and it doesn't mean an end to political differences between women of different backgrounds and classes. It doesn't mean, for example, that someone who works as a maid has any great love for the woman who exploits her. What it does mean is that, whether they are conscious of it or not, these women do have certain political objectives in common, because of the fact that they are both oppressed as women... The truth is that women are at the same time both united by sexist oppression and divided by class society. There is an objective basis for a unified struggle of women of different nationalities and classes because all women are oppressed as women by capitalism. Sisterhood is powerful because of this universal female oppression, and this is the basis for the existence of an independent, non-exclusive mass feminist movement, with an anti-capitalist logic." (p. 11, emphasis in original and added)

The resolution entitled "The Struggle for Women's Liberation: Strategy for a Mass Movement" adopted at the 1970 YSA convention polemicizes against the argument raised by the "workerist sectarians" about women being too divided to unite, by explaining how the YSA:

"... must make it clear that all women, regardless of class or racial background, face some degree of oppression. No woman, even in the ruling class itself, can be arbitrarily ruled out as a potential feminist. While it is obvious that most women in the ruling class have more loyalty to the privileges of their class than to other women, there can be and are exceptions." (p. 7)

It should be noted that this was not raised to emphasize a point concerning non-exclusion in the women's movement. That was covered in another section of the same document. But rather this was raised as a political principle we should follow in the women's struggle.

Rather than thinking that there exists the objective basis for an ongoing women's liberation movement uniting all women as women, the comrades of the minority stand with the resolution of the Third Congress of the Communist International which states plainly and for all to see:

"The Third Congress of the Communist International confirms the basic proposition of revolutionary Marxism, i. e., that there is no "specific woman question" and no "specific women's movement," and, that every sort of

alliance of working women with bourgeois feminism, as well as any support by the women workers of the treacherous tactics of the social-compromisers and opportunists leads to the undermining of the forces of the proletariat, delaying thereby the triumph of the social revolution and the advent of Communism, and thus also postponing the great hour of women's ultimate liberation."

In contrast to the National Executive Committee we feel there exists only the objective basis for an ongoing women's struggle as part and parcel of the class struggle. We agree with the German socialist theoretician August Bebel who states in his classic work Women Under Socialism that:

"... the larger portion, by far, of the women in society, engaged in the movement for the emancipation of women, do not see the necessity for such a radical change. Influenced by their privileged social standing they see in the more far reaching working women's movement dangers, not frequently abhorrent aims, which they feel constrained to ignore, eventually even to resist. The class antagonism that in the general social movement rages between the capitalist and the working class and which, with the ripening of conditions, grows sharper and more pronounced, turns up likewise on the surface of the women's movement; and it finds its corresponding expression in the aims and tactics of those engaged in it." (p. 5)

The petty-bourgeois political character and composition of the women's liberation movement in the US today turns off many women who could be attracted to such a movement. The National Organization for Women and the National Womens Political Caucus are middle class feminist organizations whose ideas and activities have very little relevance for working class women. What Bebel is talking about is reflected in the women's struggle in a thousand and one ways. The feelings of a perhaps sizable number of poor and working class women towards the existing women's liberation movement is expressed in the article "Letter from a Welfare Mother" published in the Baltimore-based magazine Women: A Journal of Liberation. The letter, bitter and angry, makes many political mistakes. But it is interesting as an example of the absurdity of an ongoing women's movement "uniting all women as women." The letter says:

"You murder me, women's liberationist, every bull-shit demand you make; not because what you ask for is wrong, but because of what you leave out. Where is free childbirth in your platform, where is decent prenatal care? Where is nourishing food for me, so my child isn't born premature and retarded? So he doesn't die in infancy?... Why do you ignore us? Where are our needs in your demands? We can't fight for freedom as women when we're struggling just to stay alive. Your movement is a farce and a travesty to us, because you uphold the forces that make us beg for our existence; that make our lives a series of lines and interviews and

endless waits in filthy, noisy rooms; that brand and label us as those who live at the whim of the State. Your silence consents to our misery. How dare you call yourselves our Sisters?" (Women, Vol. 2, No. 3, p. 51)

The only way you are going to have an ongoing women's movement uniting all women as women is to attempt to prevent the movement from developing and splitting across class lines. The orientation which is being developed towards NOW is an example of the Party attempting to muddle class lines in the women's movement. The NEC document avoids mention of NOW altogether, and the PC document adopted at the recent SWP convention is very unclear as to how we're to relate to NOW. In Houston, at any rate, leading women comrades hold membership in NOW. Listening to comrades talk, you'd think our only objection to NOW revolved around the fact that they didn't involve themselves in WONAAC and were friendly to Democrats. NOW can be defined as a petty-bourgeois feminist group, in both program, orientation and composition, and represents the right wing of the women's movement. Our approach to this group should be a critical one.

Slogans such as "Women of the World Unite," "Sisterhood is Powerful," etc., which the SWP and YSA raise and our comrades leading fights to exclude men from women's liberation activities miseducates the women involved about what a correct approach to women's liberation entails. Our guiding principle should be, as Evelyn Reed used to say, "Class against Class, Not Sex against Sex."

Our job is not merely to be the "most active builders" of the women's movement, to seek positions on assorted movement office staffs. Our role is first and foremost to aspire to give political leadership. Our press, election campaigns and interventions in the movement must be based on a revolutionary perspective for women's liberation, not merely to indicate to the women involved that we're better feminists than they are. Needless to say, we don't combat feminism by breaking up conferences, by intervening in a rough, hostile manner. One can critically relate to a phenomena without beating it over the head with a sledge hammer. Nor do we combat feminism through articles in The Militant and ISR alone, even though that's quite important. The main way the revolutionary party and youth group combat the influences of feminism in the women's liberation movement is by raising demands in our own name and projecting demands and activities for the movement as a whole which bring to the fore the class question, which link the women's question with the broader social issues facing workers and which lead to the questioning of the basic tenets of capitalist society. We must also be the "most consistent" advocates of orienting the movement, in both program and activity, to those who have the most to gain from it--working women. The criteria for deciding which demands to raise must not solely be which ones will bring the maximum number of women as women into the street.

Rather than proceeding from an understanding of the changing material conditions of women; the fact that women make up 40% of the work force, the impact and potential impact of women on the union movement, the large increase in the percentage of women with children seeking employment, the SWP and YSA leadership bargained that abortion would be the key issue because it appeared to be the concern of activists in the women's liberation movement.

As the major activity of the SWP and YSA in the women's movement, it is important to carefully examine the WONAAC campaign and see whether or not our leadership in that "coalition" was politically correct or not.

The original rationale for the abortion repeal campaign was that abortion was an issue which "affects millions of women in the most immediate way," (Internal Information Bulletin, No. 2 in 1971, p. 6, Women's Liberation Report to SWP Plenum). It was the central issue around which women were moving; the women's movement desperately needed both an issue and a victory to prevent it from turning inward, the campaign could involve women who were not conscious "feminists" in an action that was objectively feminist, that as both an issue and a campaign the women's movement would be confronting the capitalist class as a class, and finally, that the demand had some transitional dynamic, that it undermined the role of the nuclear family, etc.

Masses of working women (or really any women for that manner) simply did not see the abortion question as one so central to their problems in society. While masses of women were opposed to the reactionary and restrictive laws, they were hardly about to chain themselves to the Statue of Liberty to protest them. Due to a whole range of objective and subjective problems confronting the women's movement, ranging from class composition and outlook to low political level, the movement was on the decline, at least temporarily, and no gimmicky short cut was going to resolve the problem. The movement needed a revolutionary strategy, not one of abortion law repeal. Many of the empirical observations and hopes of the leadership, such as the thesis that women would be confronting the capitalist class as a class simply did not materialize. The capitalists correctly realized that abortion repeal didn't particularly threaten them, and they were right. Rather than confronting the capitalists as a class, the SWP's women's fractions were debating Catholic spokespersons on when exactly a fetus becomes a human being. The easiness with which this demand was granted should indicate its lack of transitional character. It no more undermined the nuclear family than does divorce or hippy communes. The nuclear family is a pillar of class society and it will not wither away under capitalism, abortion laws or no abortion laws. The example of Sweden is a good one. Despite the nonexistence of abortion laws the nuclear family is just as strong in Sweden as in the good ol' USA.

The SWP and YSA built WONAAC, and I don't think it's being unfair or exaggerating to say we were WONAAC. We substituted ourselves for a non-existent movement and logically flowing from this it became the sole focus for all our women's liberation work. We restricted ourselves to the single demand of "Repeal the Abortion Laws" and did not raise the free abortion demand, even in our own name. This was carried further when we started adopting the "repeal" slogan in our own election campaigns, witness for example, the women's liberation poster of the 1972 campaign which called only for "Repeal All Abortion Laws."

Let me make clear that I do not think that there is anything, per se, unprincipled about working in WONAAC. There is nothing even wrong with substituting oneself for a non-existent coalition if that be a temporary necessity dictated by political line and objective conditions. But to restrict ourselves, within a group such as WONAAC based around a very minimum, reform demand, to a slogan like "Abortion Law Repeal" within the coalition amounts to, in essence, the political liquidation of the Leninist party within the united front.

Within WONAAC the SWP and the YSA did not press the class issue, but then again, if our goal is an ongoing movement uniting all women as women, why should we? When it became clear that two parades a year were not going to bring masses of people to the banner of WONAAC we began to push petition drives for legislative bills introduced by Bella Abzug. This was carried to the extreme in New York where we saw the obscene spectacle of our comrades organizing people to visit their state legislative representatives in some none too crude lobbying. Is this a revolutionary strategy for the women's movement, comrades?

At the time of the Supreme Court ruling comrades were congratulating each other on the victory WONAAC won. This is absurd. It is time for us to honestly admit that WONAAC was a flop, and even more important, to see the lack of politics which the SWP and YSA put into WONAAC.

We must involve ourselves in the mounting childcare struggles. Such activities as last year's march of 35,000 in Washington, D.C. organized by the National Welfare Rights Organization is the type of activity we should be active in. We must involve ourselves in the struggles against cutbacks and in the struggles of women workers on and off the job.

The SWP and YSA should press the movement to organize around such slogans as "Free 24-hour Childcare Centers," "Free Abortion on Demand," "Equal Pay for Equal Work," "Free Maternity Care." Within the coalitions we should be advancing our socialist propaganda and attempting to recruit the healthiest elements to the banner of Trotskyism on the basis of a firm Marxist program.

Gay Liberation

The gay liberation movement should be of minor concern to the SWP and the YSA. Within the radical movement as a whole it is quite peripheral and is viewed by the vast majority of the working class as irrelevant to their needs and concerns. While of course supporting the democratic rights of gay people and opposing ruling class persecution of homosexuals, the movement as a whole lacks a transitional character and does not warrant much of an intervention in it.

Two years ago the YSA had, de facto, quite a different position. Frank Boehm, then national chairman of the YSA, stated in his Youth Report to the 1971 SWP plenum (which was unanimously approved, naturally) that:

"Hundreds of gay organizations have sprung up on campuses across the country. This movement is bringing the rage of millions of homosexuals who are--and have been for thousands of years--brutalized and murdered out of the closets and into the streets. And the potential size of this movement--because of the number of people it directly affects--is another important point to consider in evaluating the dynamics of this movement. According to Kinsey's study, there are approximately 20 million homosexuals in this country. And this does not even begin to include the millions of people who, because this society is so repressive, actively suppress their homosexuality, but who can and will be drawn into this movement. At the YSA convention we noted in the political report that the gay liberation movement was a significant and unprecedented movement which is further evidence of the scope and power of this radicalization to propel new forces into action." (Internal Information Bulletin, No. 2 in 1971, p. 29)

Comrades seemed to feel that the workers would move because they're women, young, Black, Chicano, and gay. Do people still feel this way? Do comrades feel there exists the objective basis for a gay movement uniting gays? Let's see some analysis from the National Executive Committee!

Antiwar Movement

The entire world Trotskyist movement recognizes the exemplary work of the SWP and YSA in building the American antiwar movement. The "Bring the Troops Home Now" demand was both principled and correct and was the demand which was able to mobilize broad masses against Washington's imperialist aggression in S. E. Asia. At the same time, the struggle with the Stalinists over the question of immediate withdrawal, concretized in the fight over this demand, was a valuable contribution of American Trotskyists to the defense of the Vietnamese revolution.

There were additional areas of tactical and principled disagreement within the antiwar movement in which the position of the SWP stood way above anyone else on the left. Our position towards draft resistance, tax resistance, electoral action, mass action, and trashing and the forces we put into antiwar work were key to the continued vitality of that movement over the seven year period.

However, criticisms have been raised of the way the SWP and YSA conducted itself within the antiwar movement by the International Majority Tendency. First and foremost is the refusal of the SWP and YSA, particularly since 1969, to raise more advanced slogans within the context of building the united front-type antiwar movement. The May 1967 issue of the Young Socialist shows an antiwar demonstration in San Francisco in which we carried banners in our own name which read "Defend the Vietnamese Revolution" and "Break with the System of War, Racism, Strikebreaking." Slogans such as "Victory to the NLF" and a propaganda campaign waged in association with it would have distinguished the Party and YSA as the subjectively anti-imperialist wing of the antiwar movement, attracted those elements developing higher forms of political consciousness, and would have decreased the dependence of the movement on the liberal wing of the ruling class. At the same time, it would have laid the groundwork for the solidarity actions which today are so vitally needed.

Let me make clear that I am not counterposing slogans such as "Victory for the Vietnamese Revolution" to "Out Now." Nor am I counterposing special propaganda campaigns, anti-imperialist contingents, etc., to the mass antiwar movement. The mass antiwar actions around the immediate withdrawal demand were vitally needed, and the Party played a most admirable role in building them. But what was also needed, within the context of building the united front, were other forms of Vietnam solidarity activity, ranging, again, from contingents and banners to leaflets and press coverage.

The Party began an educational campaign about the role of Soviet and Chinese Stalinism about the time of the October 1972 accords. This should have been done years ago. Our job should not merely have been the best antiwar activists, important as that is, but also political educators.

The exclusive campus antiwar orientation of the SWP and YSA diminished the impact the antiwar movement could have had. Rather than orienting the movement to the working class, the rationale given was that the first priority was to establish an antiwar base on campus. Not understood was the plain-to-see fact that campus antiwar actions could best be sustained by clear community links and an orientation to the masses. The orientation of the SWP and YSA is most clearly revealed in the lack of emphasis given to trade union and GI antiwar contingents and formations.

While the Accords undoubtedly represent at least a modest setback to the Vietnamese revolution in relation to what could have been hoped for early last year, the situation can in no way be described as a clear cut defeat. In reality, we have a situation of dual power in Vietnam, and precisely because of this there exists the objective basis and concrete need for actions around solidarity with the NLF at the present time. The Trotskyist movement must take the lead in helping to organize such actions.

Our GI work was initially quite good. There are numerous examples we can point to such as the Ft. Jackson 8, Pvt. Petrick, Allen Myers at Ft. Dix with the paper the Ultimate Weapon, Task Force on the West Coast, GI Civilian Alliance for Peace, GI Press Service, etc.

As time went on, however, the excuses that the war was the key issue facing GIs, which is correct of course, and that the GI movement cannot substitute for a civilian antiwar movement, which is also formally correct, were used to not work on anything BUT the war and then to abstain from the movement, respectively. With the exception of one or two areas of the country, little GI work was done. Soldiers who wanted to become politically active could go to campus and look up the SMC--or they could join Youth Against War and Fascism's American Servicemens Union.

This tendency increased as Vietnam veterans became involved in the movement. Rather than orienting our forces towards VVAW, recognizing it as a crucial part of the movement and as a sign of molecular working class radicalization, we denounced it as sectarian, ultra-left, etc., refused to work with it in most cases, and counterposed our antiwar formations to it. While VVAW had many of these weaknesses, these weaknesses increased largely due to our not posing an alternative. Our record in relation to VVAW is poor indeed. Rather than working with Vietnam veterans and subjectively anti-imperialist youth we courted assorted liberals and student government bureaucrats. Far too few Vietnam veterans have found their way into our ranks, and a serious leadership would address itself to rectifying this problem.

Chicano Liberation

My remarks on Black nationalism apply in many ways to the Chicano struggle too, although we have to be careful about drawing analogies between the two movements. The Raza Unida Party as an independent Chicano party concretizes much of what the SWP's abstract talk about a Black party is really about.

Unlike the Black population of this country, however, the Chicano people display definite features of national consciousness such as the use of the Spanish language, close ties with Mexico, concentration in the Southwest regions of the US. All of these above factors provide a material basis

for a nationalist movement.

However, there is no evidence to support any contention that the Chicano masses favor the creation of a separate state in Aztlan. The YSA and SWP seem to be playing around with the concept in hopes of becoming popular in some Chicano nationalist circles. An example of this is the poster our comrades in Houston put out for the November 18 antiwar demonstration which gave the antiwar office address as "... 2405 San Jacinto, Houston, Tejas, Aztlan 77002...." While we support the right of the Chicano people to self-determination, we do not advocate it. The SWP and YSA should stress the class line in the Chicano movement and not nationalism. A good example of the latter approach is in our orientation to the Raza Unida Party.

The RUP is a reformist, "nationalist type" party torn between two wings, one which favors being nothing but a pressure group on the Democratic Party, the other wanting a more independent stance. The RUP is not a proletarian party--neither in program, ideology, ties with the organized working class, or origin. It is a reformist party because its program and orientation at this point remain one of the reform of the capitalist system. This doesn't mean, of course, that we should ignore them or spit on them since they don't have revolutionary consciousness yet, but we should be clear about the nature of this formation.

Nonetheless RUP is a positive development in that it represents a break of a section of the Chicano masses with the Democratic Party. Our movement can utilize the tactic of critical support to project a Marxist program for the RUP and dispel petty-bourgeois nationalist illusions. This however has not been the course the leadership has followed.

First I'd like to say a few words on critical support. Critical support is a tactic our movement uses, in general, in relation to other electoral slates of a working class character. We can give critical support to a candidate of the Communist Party, in which case the critical support is overwhelmingly balanced in favor of the criticism. The support we give opponent groups in the working class movement is support designed to smash these organizations. We also give critical support to formations like a labor party, in which case we would carefully balance support and criticism with an aim of helping the development of that formation. The traditional approach of the SWP to critical support of the election campaigns of formations other than ourselves can be found in the Education for Socialists Bulletin, "Aspects of Socialist Electoral Policy." I'd like to quote from Comrade James P. Cannon's speech to the February 1948 plenum of the SWP, published in that bulletin. While Cannon is discussing the question of a labor party, which is not quite analogous to the RUP, he nonetheless makes points which I feel have strong relevance to our discussion. Cannon states:

"We proceed from a principled line. The basic aim of our principled line is to assist the development of

independent political action by the workers and turn it towards a revolutionary culmination.

"We are not the only tendency in the labor movement holding the view that the participation of the workers as an independent force in politics is advisable and necessary. There are two basic questions about the question of independent working class politics which is concretized broadly in this country in the proposal for the formation of an independent labor party.

"There is the reformist conception that a labor party, by its very nature, must necessarily be a reformist party and that reformism is a necessary and inevitable stage of the development of a working class political movement. Against this is the Marxist conception that a reformist stage of working class politics is not necessary and not preferable; we do not advocate that workers pass through a stage of reformism on the road to revolutionary Marxist politics.

"What we do advocate is the revolutionary party of the working class which formulates the program of its historic interests. And this line of ours--the advocacy of revolutionary Marxist working class politics never changes. It persists through all stages of development of the movement. When and if the development of the workers along the lines of political action takes a different turn, a reformist detour, we never accept that as correct, but we adopt a tactical attitude toward it. We never lose ourselves in the reformist political movement of the workers and satisfy ourselves with it.

"In adopting a tactical attitude ('critical support') toward a labor party even though it may begin with a reformist program, our aim always remains the same; that is, to advance the revolutionary program of the working class and to build the revolutionary party." (p. 21)

Cannon continued:

"We do not and never did support the 'labor party' unconditionally. We will not do so in the future. We support it critically. That, I think, should be emphasized at this juncture in our explanations to the party. Our fundamental aim is not in any way changed by our critical support of a prospective labor party or labor ticket, whose program remains yet undecided. Our fundamental aim at all times is to advance our own program and to build a revolutionary party. These fundamental considerations, which are truisms for all of us, should be restated as an introduction to the consideration of the new variants that have made their appearance in the American political scene." (p. 22)

Further he states:

"Under that minimum limited condition--that it really represents the unions engaging in independent political action and not some variation of bourgeois political action supported by the workers, we will give critical support to the candidates in the election. But we heavily emphasize the critical nature of our support and we don't obligate ourselves in advance to give that in every case. It usually depends on the relationship of forces. You can easily conceive of a situation where our strength would be such or the conditions or the issue would be such that we would find it more advisable to run a candidate of our own against a candidate even of a 'genuine' labor party." (p. 23, emphasis in the original)

And still further:

"But if and when this slogan is realized, and if, under the pressure of conditions and the sentiment of the workers, a labor party is formed or is about to be formed--there can be no relaxation at all in our struggle against the bureaucracy. We will turn on the treacherous bureaucracy with no less hostility, with the demand that the program of this party be not simply a refurbished version of bourgeois politics but a program of independent working class politics, and that means a revolutionary program." (p. 23)

Thus, critical support is a tool we use to get out our program. However, the "critical support" the SWP extends to RUP is in reality not critical support but pure and simple support designed to win the good graces of the leadership and ranks of the RUP. Never, ever is a Marxist program projected, a program of revolutionary socialism. Not even in our press, election campaigns, or our interventions by Raza comrades in the RUP.

When elements in the Raza Unida Party begin to see beyond nationalism, begin to see that Black and Anglo workers are also victims of the same system of oppression and injustice, and proceed to attempt to form concrete links with other groups, we reject this as not keeping to the nationalist orientation that the SWP and YSA see as necessary for the RUP.

To advocate a party based on nationality is alien to the entire Marxist tradition and negates the idea that all workers have a common interest in overthrowing capitalism. Any short term gains the SWP and YSA could make under the circumstances would be lost through our isolation from developing, advanced elements.

What is needed is a balance sheet of the Raza Unida Party as it has developed in Texas, California and Colorado. Particularly needed is a critical review of the Crystal City experience whereby the RUP was elected to many school board and municipal positions. In my opinion the class conflicts within the Chicano community and the political dif-

ferences within the movement which will deepen as the crises of capitalism intensify, will spell the disintegration of the RUP over the next period.

Up until late 1972 and early 1973 our movement by and large abstained from the farmworkers struggle. The rationale for this was that the reformist orientation of the Chavez leadership precluded our involvement in that struggle. Obviously this is a poor argument indeed. The grape and lettuce boycotts were important social struggles in their own right and involved considerable numbers of activists coast-to-coast. The existence of the reformist trade union leadership is not a reason for abstention but, if anything, a reason for involvement.

Today most branches and locals intervene in the farmworkers movement, which is all for the good. However, it is done in an uncritical fashion, that is, we tail-end the Chavez leadership down the line. I realize, naturally, that we can't walk into the UFW with a dozen cannons and proceed to blast away. This is particularly so inasmuch as the union and its leadership are currently under attack. However, one can advance criticisms in a comradely fashion. For example, Comrade Harry Ring has an excellent pamphlet out entitled "Cuba and Problems of Workers Democracy." In this pamphlet many good criticisms of the Castro leadership are made, but they are made quite clearly from the vantage point of support for the Cuban revolution and 100% opposition to US imperialism. In other words, we don't call Castro a no-good, counterrevolutionary Stalinist s. o. b. Fraternal criticism can and must also be made of the UFW leadership--on questions ranging from pacifism, to the Democratic Party. Needless to say, these criticisms must be done only in the context of support and involvement in the farmworkers movement.

Student Work

Work among students has traditionally been an important part of the activity of the revolutionary Marxist movement and will continue to be so. From now until the revolution we will continue to get a good percentage of our cadre from the campuses. In the early and mid 1960s, the SWP and YSA's orientation to the campuses was an essentially correct one. But the tactical turn to the campus on the basis of a Marxist program has been transformed into a strategy for revolution. It has been codified in document form in the "Worldwide Radicalization of Youth and the Tasks of the Fourth International," in which the campus orientation is projected for the entire world movement.

The leadership's empiricism reached its zenith around the May 1970 Cambodia-Kent-Jackson strikes. Despite what some comrades may now tell you, the YSA learned two and only two lessons from May 1970. The much heralded anti-war university, whereby students used the facilities of the student government and the school, such as telephones and mimeo machines, to build mass demonstrations and the

democratic decision-making strike councils and mass meetings. The reality of the situation, as anyone who has been near a campus knows, was that these two events occurred on but a few campuses and they were "remembered" only by the YSA.

Here is how SWP leader Jack Barnes described the upsurge at an emergency plenum of the YSA National Committee held in New York City May 14, 1970 /which I attended since I was a YSA organizer at the time--P. G. / . Comrade Barnes explained how we had some of the elements of a pre-revolutionary situation in this country, the "only" element being absent was the entrance of the working class. He said, however:

"We saw the beginning of the very things that make up a pre-revolutionary situation.

"A permanent political change has occurred in this country. The central place where this has taken place is on the campuses. The student movement will never be the same from this moment on, no matter what happens in the evolution of the movement in the coming weeks. All sorts of issues of controlling the university itself, and rules and restrictions on political and social activity of the students will be more easily swept aside. The attitudes and self-confidence of the student population have changed, and the forms of struggle, the mass democratic strike councils, are now an instrument that will be brought into play in new upsurges. And the use of the university as a base of power to reach out and try to link up with the struggles of the decisive social layers of American society has been established.

"In one way, this has been the 1905 of the student movement. The mass student actions have begun forms of struggle which are the only forms appropriate and possible for the tasks ahead. And these forms of struggle were forged over a long enough period of time to be burned into the consciousness of a vanguard layer of students." (YS Organizer, June 10, 1970)

At the convention six months later the main political resolution was entitled "After the May Upsurge: Young Socialists and the Student Movement." Does this document offer any real lessons of May 1970? No. Here is what the document outlined as the lessons radical youth should learn:

"These important new forms of struggle have become permanent acquisitions of the student movement because, while the strike was only temporary, it lasted long enough for the concept of the antiwar university and democratic strike councils to engrave itself in the consciousness of the millions of students who took part. Future upsurges will tend to follow the pattern established in May. In this sense we can say that May 1970 was the '1905 of the student movement'--new organizational forms of struggle emerged and were tested for

the first time, just as the first soviets emerged and were tested in the 1905 Russian Revolution and in 1917 became the organs of the new state power. Universities run by the strike committees will not become organs of state power, but they will emerge again to play a crucial role in helping to organize masses outside the campus into anti-capitalist action....

"The May strike revealed more clearly than ever before the increased social weight and power of the student movement in today's neo-capitalist society. The impact of the students' actions, both directly on the government and through their influence on other social sectors, provided conclusive evidence of the decisive role students can play in detonating major social explosions. The May student strike stamped its impression on the entire society, serving notice to America's rulers that they must take account of the reaction of students in any of their future plans.

"The development of antiwar universities confirmed in action the YSA's strategy for the student movement, that is, the use of the university as a base to organize other sectors of the population into anti-capitalist struggle. This proved to be an attractive idea to masses of students once they had gained a sense of their own power in the first days of the strike.

"Finally, the student upsurge graphically illustrated the power of independent mass action." (YSA DB, Vol. 14, No. 4, pp. 2-3)

Did the document explain that there was a lull in the student movement? No. Did it explain that there was demoralization in the student movement? No. Did it attempt to give a real balance sheet of May 1970 instead of painting a rosy, half true picture? Again, No. Here is how the leadership felt events would unfold based on its analysis of the student movement: "... activity since May demonstrates clearly the potential for another upsurge in the near future."

The YSA continued with this ridiculous, distorted picture of reality. In the pamphlet "May 1970: Birth of the Antiwar University" published in November 1971 (one and a half years after May 1970) there is still no indication, anywhere in the pamphlet, that students might have learned some other lessons than the things we initially thought or that there might be a lull. Finally, in January 1972, The Militant admitted that indeed things did seem a bit quiet on campus but at best only the most superficial analysis was given.

What were the lessons of May 1970? What students learned, even if they did not learn it correctly, was that students as such have damned little power to affect fundamental social change. Rather than increasing the confidence of students in their ability to affect change, May lessened

it. The demoralization in the student movement is the result of this simple fact which escaped the YSA leadership. The "Worldwide Radicalization of Youth" document notwithstanding, there does not exist the objective basis for an on-going, independent student movement. The demoralization which the masses of students felt was reflected, in turn, within the politically conscious vanguard of the students becoming increasingly aware that the answer can only be found in the working class. Unfortunately, the YSA learned no such lesson and not only did YSA recruitment slacken off in the whole next period up to and including the present, but the initial healthy feelings of these student radicals for a turn to the working class turned to workerism, sectarianism, economism, and the growth of our sectarian and Maoist opponents largely as a result of the lack of an alternative which only could have been posed by the YSA.

No one is saying that work should not be done on the campuses. But it must be recognized that the way we will recruit the politically healthy activist students is with an orientation to the shops, fields, factories and barracks of the country where the bulk of our generation is to be found. Politically conscious radical students will be attracted by an organization with an orientation towards active work in the working class.

Let me make very clear, although I'm sure it will come up anyway, that no one, least of all the Internationalist Tendency is saying we should rip people off the campus and send them into industry. However, what is needed for the American Trotskyist movement as a whole is a proletarian orientation, and where we do do student work it should be viewed as within that context.

Trade Unions

Despite much potential very, very little work has been done by the SWP and YSA in the trade union movement. All the lessons of "Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialist Decay" by Comrade Trotsky have been thrown overboard. The situation is so deplorable that large branches like Houston with a sizable number of comrades in trade union situations don't even have a trade union fraction. This year's NEC resolution doesn't mention what comrades should do in trade union situations or how we are to go about recruiting young workers to the YSA. The document in fact, mentions the trade unions only in passing.

Whenever the possibility is raised of doing some concrete work in the trade union movement, the leadership rushes to the fore with pious pronouncements about building a "class struggle left wing" in the unions and the spectre of a premature power fight is raised. Presumably, a class struggle left wing will pop into being from thin air, without our conscious intervention and direction.

Over the past year we have witnessed a rise of rank-and-file caucuses in the major trade unions of the nation, some

of them quite sizable and influential. Morrissey's caucus in the National Maritime Union, the United National Caucus in the UAW, Teamsters Rank and File, Steelworkers for Change and the list goes on. The Miller victory in the United Mine Workers is perhaps the best known example of this type of development. In addition, all our opponents on the left have experimented with various caucus groupings, albeit in a totally incorrect manner. And where is the SWP and YSA? Who Knows?!

We need an analysis of these different caucuses and what they represent in a conjunctural sense. For example, the Spartacist League owns and operates the Militant Solidarity Caucus in the National Maritime Union. The MSC is a travesty, looking more like a Mad magazine satire of the left than a serious attempt at trade union work. As a Spartacist caucus it is based around "nothing less" than the full Transitional Program (and every dot, comma, and period therein). However, the MSC received 400 votes in the union election despite the fact that they were running against both the Curran machine and against the liberal oppositionist Morrissey. Does this mean anything? The Workers League too maintains a front group in the trade unions, opportunist and economist to the core. Their "Trade Union Alliance for a Labor Party" apparently has also experienced some minor successes. Does this indicate anything?

Obviously in this period we can't march into our places of employment waving the red flag of Bolshevism and calling upon our fellow workers to organize soviets. But surely the leadership feels some productive work can be done there. A strategy and plan of work is needed in relation to farm-worker support work, antiwar work, women's liberation demands, defense work, etc., within the unions.

We need an analysis of the broader changes occurring within the union movement. We need trade union fractions and trade union work fractions in every YSA local and SWP branch. It is a poor argument indeed that comrades shouldn't worry because if something does happen in the labor movement, somehow, sometime, we'll be there.

Basic introductory pamphlets and books are needed by comrades to give away or sell on the job to contacts. Concerted national campaigns are needed around press sales at plant gates. Trade union work must not be seen as an incidental last place priority but as a key task of our movement.

On colonization, The SWP and YSA should begin a colonization policy to root the cadre of the movement in basic industry. This policy should be a selective one, carefully planned and thought out, and once again, I am not advocating that people be pulled off campus or any other place where productive work can and is being done.

Conclusion

While it is obvious that the ruling class still maintains the power to co-opt aspects of the radicalization and temporarily divert the various movements, the perspective can only be one of heightened economic and social struggles.

Norristown, Lordstown, the Philadelphia general strike, Chrysler, are all signs of the times and signs of bigger things to come.

The contradictions of modern American capitalism are being exacerbated. High school blowouts, anti-cutback actions, struggles in the unions and the communities are taking place today and will intensify in the not too distant future.

It is necessary that our movement foresee this and act accordingly. The opportunities confronting us are many and the potential to lead, influence and recruit from these struggles favorable.

In this contribution I have outlined a critique of the method of the leadership and how this method relates to the various areas of activity our movement is engaged in. To summarize:

1) The YSA and SWP have ceased intervening in the social protest movements on the basis of the Transitional Program. Within the united fronts the SWP and YSA have limited themselves only to those demands already incorporated in the united front. Such an approach is contrary to the traditions of Trotskyism.

2) The SWP and the YSA have been following a course of opportunist adaptation to feminism and nationalism. Rather than intervening in the struggles of women and the oppressed minorities with a firm class struggle line, the leadership has advanced a sectoral method which tail-ends the development of these movements. The muddling over of theoretical questions is a mere reflection of our muddled strategy and tactics for these movements, a strategy which seeks, objectively, to mobilize each social sector around its own given concerns independently from each other and independently from the working class struggle as a whole.

3) The SWP and YSA leadership are abandoning our proletarian orientation. The "strategy of the red university" and

a fixation on interventions into non-proletarian milieus has created the situation of an unhealthy social composition in the YSA and a near permanent orientation to the campuses,

4) On top of everything else, the leadership's politics don't work. Not only are they empiricists, but they're poor empiricists at that. New priorities are needed for the period ahead.

The coming period will be a historically crucial one for Trotskyism, both in this country and around the world. Can the Party and sections of the International root themselves in the working class? Can we develop and apply the Transitional Program in the day to day work of our movement? Can we successfully battle the reformist illusions and program of Stalinism and the social democracy?

The answer to these questions will decide the future of humanity.

The stagnation of the YSA over the past couple of years is a grave warning sign. The situation within the American Trotskyist movement must be reversed. Now, more than ever, a proletarian orientation is needed in both program and action.

The differences being discussed in the YSA today are reflected in the current discussion going on inside the Fourth International. While not 100% correct on everything, the IEC Majority Tendency has a program and strategy far superior to that offered by the "Leninist-Trotskyist" Faction. The process of political maturation of the IEC Majority Tendency as reflected in their recent statement "Let's Discuss Political Differences, Not Old Wives' Tales" is a very encouraging one. I strongly urge a vote for their documents.

The Fourth International today stands at the crossroads. The decade ahead will be anything but a quiet one. It is essential that the American component of world Trotskyism, the Socialist Workers Party and the Young Socialist Alliance, be re-oriented along the road of revolutionary Marxism. It is time to return to the road of Lenin and Trotsky! It is time to return to the road of the Transitional Program! It is time for the SWP and the YSA to change direction, so that united, our International, our Party and our class may lead the oppressed masses to the victorious communist revolution.

December 12, 1973

(Political Counter-Resolution submitted by the Internationalist Tendency of the YSA)

I. Why a Counter-Resolution?

We offer the following political resolution as an alternative to the political resolution presented by the National Executive Committee of the Young Socialist Alliance. We do so at an especially critical juncture in the world Trotskyist movement, recognizing that the context in which we submit our counter-resolution transcends the narrow scope of merely evaluating the performance of the YSA in the past period and projecting a series of campaigns for the next.

This resolution cannot be considered apart and separate from the discussion currently engaging the Fourth International, to which we shall come shortly. While we acknowledge that the YSA (or any youth organization) cannot substitute itself for the revolutionary party, nonetheless we are aware that the tasks of a revolutionary youth organization must necessarily be related to and flow from the political perspectives of the party. Insofar as the Socialist Workers Party has already rejected the perspectives put forth by the SWP Internationalist Tendency in "The Building of a Revolutionary Party in Capitalist America," we find the problem of posing an adequate counter-political resolution a most vexing challenge. We submit, nonetheless, that this political resolution must necessarily be based upon the method, analysis, and perspectives elaborated in the SWP-IT counter-political resolution, with which we have stated our agreement. For comrades' information, this resolution is being sent out as an addendum to the present resolution. We caution that our draft political counter resolution is not a substitute for--but rather an extension of the SWP-IT's political counter-resolution.

II. The Context of the Debate in the International

The Ninth World Congress saw the entire Trotskyist movement recognizing the qualitatively different nature of the period opened up by the events of May-June 1968 in France. The increasingly worsening crisis of the international imperialist system; the resumption of the revolutionary struggles in the colonial countries; and the growing crisis of the bureaucracies of the degenerated workers' states, all gave rise to the characterization of the period as one of a new rise of world revolution. The Congress also recognized the appearance of a new youth vanguard on a world scale, including millions of students and young workers, who could be:

"...mobilized for anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist, and objectively revolutionary causes. And within this new youth vanguard the influence of the old traditional leaderships of the workers' movement is in rapid decline,

if not, in some places, virtually vanishing." (E. Germain, "Report on New Rise of the World Revolution," Intercontinental Press, July 14, 1969, p. 697)

The emergence of this new mass vanguard, the nature of which is so harshly criticized by the leadership of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction was not an invention of the European leaderships; rather, the entire Fourth International (including the component parts which now comprise the LTF) took note of this vanguard in 1969.

This period, contrary to that which had existed previous to 1968--in which the epicenter of the world revolutionary process was in the colonial countries--saw the ascent of the proletariat in the advanced countries move onto the center of the political scene and what could be termed "classical" forms of the proletarian revolution. Accompanying this recognition of the shift of the epicenter was the rise of the objective possibilities for the intervention of Trotskyist sections, making both possible and necessary the transformation of the International from essentially propaganda organizations into organizations capable of launching initiatives on a decisive scale among the working class. As Duret states:

"Propagandism dominated during the whole period in which objective conditions prevented us from taking initiatives that would be actually capable of winning over broader sectors than those organized by the revolutionary Marxists. Propagandism was thus characterized by the defense of the Trotskyist program. It is necessary to emphasize, however, that this propagandism can be supplemented with a defense of the immediate demands of the masses. Thus, even when one takes initiatives that add defense of the Trotskyist program to support for immediate demands, one still remains fundamentally in the realm of propaganda, even if one is immersed in the mass movement.

"A break with propagandism means that we take initiatives in the broad vanguard that lead quite broader layers--through their experience--to an anti-capitalist consciousness. This process of maturation of the consciousness--in a strictly defined sense--of broad layers obviously cannot be launched on the basis of propaganda alone. This does not imply that we are saying it is necessary to renounce propaganda. No. But it is necessary to do more than just that." (A. Duret, Some Questions of Method Concerning the European Document, IIDB, Vol. X, No. 18, pp. 26-27, all emphasis in original)

* II-See SWP Discussion Bulletin, Vol. 31, No. 18, July 1973--"The Building of a Revolutionary Party in Capitalist America."

The essence of the turn of the Ninth World Congress, then, represented by both the New Rise of World Revolution and by the Resolution on Latin America, spoke to the absolute necessity to transform the sections of the International, within the context of the situation, of a new rise of world revolution. Any changes, any alterations in the world situation must be seen within the context of this fundamental tendency of the period, which remain valid today. This includes the "detente" agreements worked out by imperialism and the Moscow and Peking bureaucracies, which have only a limited significance in the context of the tendencies named above.

Contrasted to this view is that held by the supporters of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction (LTF), which markedly differs both on the nature of the period and of the turn made in 1969. At the time of the Ninth World Congress, the SWP leadership could support the theoretical premise that the period had changed in a qualitative sense for the Fourth International, and did indeed affirm that the period was one of a new rise of world revolution (for example, the international report given at the 1969 YSA convention). Yet in 1969 the leadership fought the attempt at concrete implementation of this correct analysis in Latin America, and since that time have systematically criticized the work of the European sections, centering mainly on the IMG in Britain and the former Communist League in France. This apparent contradiction between the theoretical acceptance and the criticism of the practice of the decisions of the Ninth Congress can be easily seen.

Since the Congress the SWP leadership has maintained that the differences then revolved around: those for a supposed guerrilla warfare and against the construction of Leninist parties in Latin America (the International majority); and those against this alleged guerrilla warfare strategy and for the "Leninist strategy of party building" (the component parts which now constitute the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction). For a time the SWP leadership, specifically Comrade Hansen, was able to sell the idea that this was the essence of the differences. But as more and more European sections began initiating mass work on their own, that is, began implementing the decisions of the Ninth World Congress, more and more criticisms began coming from the SWP leadership, differences which could not be explained in terms of guerrilla warfare.

It is obvious now that the differences which are the basis for the present chasm in the International existed in 1969, but did not become readily apparent until the sections in Europe implemented the line of the Congress. The differences are much more fundamental than a dispute over guerrilla warfare as a strategy or a tactic. As Comrade Mary-Alice Waters says of the debate: "The discussion of European perspectives and orientation is not fundamentally about Europe. It is about differing approaches to and perspectives on party building" ("A Criticism of the United Secretariat Majority Draft Resolution on 'The Building of Revolutionary Parties in Capitalist Europe'--an Initial

Contribution to the Discussion," IIDB, Vol. X, No. 3, p. 27).

The differences are indeed over varying approaches to party building, but they are more: they center on the nature of the period, the role and function of the party, and the nature and function of the Transitional Program. To the comrades of the LTF, the Transitional Program serves an essentially programmatic function, independent of both the period and of the forces available to the party. The transitional demands will spontaneously be raised by the masses in struggle, and as such provides for a progressive liquidation of the specific role of the vanguard party.

For our part, we see the Transitional Program as having an essentially dual function: it must on the one hand be capable of producing a qualitative change in the consciousness of the masses, producing the revolutionary class consciousness of the proletariat; it must as well be able to respond to the need for strengthening the forces of the revolutionary party, i.e., the recruitment of cadre.

The International presently stands at a crossroads. It can either maintain its present perspectives, outlined in the New Rise of World Revolution, and codified in the resolutions of the International Majority Tendency, or it can turn away from this orientation and accept the leadership of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction, which opposes the every line of the IMT yet makes no proposals for our sections in either Latin America or in Europe. They have as well yet to put out a world political counter resolution, which should call into question the seriousness of their faction. Having a platform of predominantly organizational criticisms, the LTF poses itself as an alternate leadership to the International without proposing any political orientation for the sections of the International.

When the differences are clearly defined, and they touch upon issues of fundamental significance, it is incumbent upon those interested in the development of the International to take sides. To this end, the Internationalist Tendency declares its unequivocal support to the positions of the International Majority Tendency, as specifically defined in "The Building of Revolutionary Parties in Capitalist Europe," the resolutions on Argentina and Bolivia, and the statement of the 19 IEC members. We base our analysis of the tasks facing revolutionary youth upon the method contained in these documents. What is more, the questions which face the entire Trotskyist movement in the United States requires that we predicate this resolution upon the acceptance of the political resolution of the Internationalist Tendency of the Socialist Workers Party, "The Building of a Revolutionary Party in Capitalist America," without which it would be impossible to outline any perspectives for the present period in the YSA. This resolution, presented as a counter resolution to the YSA NEC Draft Resolution, extends the method of the political resolution of the SWP Internationalist Tendency to the tasks presently facing revolutionary youth.

III. The YSA and the Youth Radicalization

It has been some time since the unabated euphoria of the late 1960s through May 1970 has been expressed by the YSA leadership, and for good reason. On many occasions it was stated that we were in the midst of the "biggest, the deepest, the broadest" radicalization in history. Comrade Jack Barnes himself had noted that "there will be no reversal of this radicalization before the working masses of this country have had a chance to take power away from the American capitalist rulers" (Towards an American Socialist Revolution, p. 108). But it was not long before this view had given way to cold, hard reality. Elsewhere Comrade Barnes had warned:

"The scope of our expansion program, the character of the activities we engage in, the character of our planned geographic expansion, the size of the effort to increase the circulation of our press and our literature, the perspectives we have for the growth of the youth movement and the character of the presidential campaign we project for 1972, would all be part of a Pollyanna-like pipe dream if they were not firmly rooted in an accurate political evaluation of the objective situation." (SWP Discussion Bulletin, Vol. 29, No. 1, p. 13)

Barnes was correct in his warning, but for months there was no analysis of an obviously changed situation. The pat phrases about "deepening and broadening" could suffice for awhile, but definitely could not last forever. Finally it was suggested that the student movement was in a "lull," although it was never specifically spelled out what objectively constituted a "lull."

The irreversible radicalization of the '60s had for all intents and purposes been reversed, and so that the analysis made, in the Worldwide Youth Radicalization and the Tasks of the Fourth International, could survive objective reality, new categories began to replace the old and became the mainstay of YSA "theory." There was a time when we were told that because there exists significant consciousness around this or that general concern, there exists a movement; if there occur some demonstrations by partisans of those concerns, these movements were independent and in the streets; if there are a lot of these demonstrations, then we have a mass independent movement in the streets which is objectively anti-capitalist. However, these categories came to be replaced by the following general "analysis": Even though there are no longer any mass movements around (a fact which would seem to signal the demise of the theory of the unabated radicalization), the radicalization was nonetheless actually deepening and broadening, as never before, but the concrete expression of the radicalization is a "lull."

This very cogent description of the reality of the decline of the mass movements was to pass for an analysis while the march of events called for more. In fact, neither the

SWP nor the YSA leaderships had ever made a correct analysis of the social nature of the radicalization of the 1960s, and the consequent inability of these leaderships to understand and explain the evolution of the student movement since May 1970 is directly related to this fact. It is instructive to reflect a moment on the question of whether the past political perspectives of our movement stood the test of time. What has happened to the "mass independent feminist movement," the "mass student movement," the "incipient mass movements for gay liberation and ecological reform"--all of which were supposed to be deepening, at the center of the radicalization, each backing up and pushing forward the others, etc.? When we ask where all these movements have gone; when we ask the fate of these movements; when we ask how and why these movements declined and deteriorated, in total and complete contradiction to what the leadership had projected, we are asking some very basic questions about the way the YSA leadership misunderstood the process of the radicalization.

To this day, the leadership of the YSA has not provided answers for these questions, but persists in clinging to their mistaken assumptions in the face of an ever more pungent reality. Such is the nature of the article last May by Comrade Andy Rose, entitled "State of the Student Movement." In what can only be termed a futile attempt to turn iron into gold, Comrade Rose tries to explain the "lull" in the student movement, going so far as to say "the truth is that there has been a significant shift in the mood on campus. Since May 1970 there has in general been less student activism than in the preceeding period" (ISR, May 1973, p. 12, emphasis in original). This is a promising beginning, but the promise ends there, for nowhere in the article is there an analysis of the objective roots of the "student movement" of the 1960s; there is no basis for a critical evaluation of the tasks now facing the YSA, within the context of the changed situation. Instead, Comrade Rose serves up the same descriptions and categorizing contained in the Worldwide Youth Radicalization and the Tasks of the Fourth International. As such the article does little but reaffirm the mistaken analysis of that document as well as the narrowly empiricist methodology underlying that analysis.

We should therefore like to trace the objective basis of a student movement; whether or not it actually existed; the social nature of students; and the root of the error which caused the incorrect analysis to be originally made and since then defiantly upheld. We in no way purport to exhaust these matters, but we do think such an analysis is both necessary and desirable. All the more so, since no such analysis is forthcoming from the National Executive Committee.

a. The objective basis

For an entire period after the Second World War, the world situation was characterized by the absolute hegemony of U.S. imperialism. Through its technological and productive superiority, the dependence of the lesser capitalist

states upon the aid of U.S. capital, and the monopoly of the American dollar, the U.S. bourgeoisie was able to maintain a distinct productive advantage relative to the other capitalist states. This in turn gave rise to the ability of American capitalism to allow for at least a maintenance of, and in some cases an increase in, the real wages of the American working class. This economic boom, characteristic of all the imperialist states after 1945, was doubly true for the economy of the United States.

The direct result of this economic prosperity has been the relative political passivity of the industrial proletariat, a passivity inspired to no small extent by a labor aristocracy and bureaucracy quite willing to sacrifice the interests of the majority of the working class--largely unorganized--for the interests of a well-organized and privileged minority. While the standard of living did increase in this economic boom, it was largely confined to an increase in consumption of "luxury" consumer goods, a situation which left major problems of health, housing, and education largely unsolved. These problems most directly affect layers other than the white industrial working class, layers which because they are largely unorganized, have been unable to benefit from the expansion of the post-1945 period.

This backdrop of the post-war economic expansion is necessary to fully understand the development of the "youth radicalization." It is only necessary to add that except for conjunctural downturns along the lines of the 1958 recession, the expansion after the war continued uninterrupted. This gave way in turn to theories which "explained" that the class struggle, especially in the United States, had essentially disappeared, and that this seemingly endless prosperity could end all the social evils of capitalist society.

It is instructive to note in this regard that the document which the YSA leadership projects as the basis on which the Fourth International is to intervene into the class struggle, the Worldwide Youth Radicalization and the Tasks of the Fourth International, contains a description of the change in the structure of the universities, recognized by nearly everyone as a product of the post-war economic expansion, and then projects a strategy for "youth" (read students) based upon this analysis/description. That the leadership of the YSA still defiantly holds to the analysis and projections outlined in this document can mean but one of two things. Either the leadership maintains that the expansion will continue along the same linear lines as that which caused the radicalization of the '60s. A position which becomes more untenable every day. Or they must recognize that the method employed in the analysis, made in the youth radicalization document was a narrowly empirical one, which began by dividing up society on the basis of relative activism rather than by starting scientifically with an understanding of the relation of different social layers to the means of production, and proceed from there. We have yet to receive the World Situation Report by the LTF, so it remains to be seen whether the economic anal-

ysis which the LTF will be pushing will maintain that the same expansion will be continuing in the next period. However, we think that rather than appear utterly ridiculous, the YSA leadership will hold to the mistaken analysis and projections of the Worldwide Youth Radicalization and the Tasks of the Fourth International, even though the contradiction between what was projected and what the reality is becomes more and more glaring.

We take as a point of departure the misconception of the "student movement" which the YSA leadership, most recently, through the medium of Comrade Rose, maintains. Any students struggling around any issues for any period of time around any program--this is what constitutes the student movement for the YSA leadership. This generic use of the term "student movement" is convenient, for it can serve as "proof" that the student movement still exists by merely pointing to all the struggles which have been going on over the past period. However, using this definition of "student movement," one could say that there has always been a student movement, for students have in every period struggled around issues which affect them. But moreover, by using the definition in this way, the leadership robs it of any precise meaning, and only serves to confuse certain criticisms of the Worldwide Youth Radicalization and the Tasks of the Fourth International made by the European comrades, and papers over the specific features of the development of the radicalization in Europe which differed from the situation in the United States. It is necessary, therefore, to review the course of the radicalization in the United States to understand where the leadership goes wrong.

b. The course of the radicalization in the U.S.

While we do, of course, acknowledge that a radicalization of a large layer of youth occurred on a world scale in the 1960s, we also maintain that because of exceptional circumstances, most notably the war in Vietnam, this radicalization took a different form in the United States than it did in France, Mexico, Japan and elsewhere. The motor forces that precipitated the radicalization in most of the countries outside the U.S. included the "generational turnover" that Trotsky describes in the Transitional Program, together with the internal contradictions of the post-war period (expressed in various equations: myth and reality, prosperity and poverty, reform and reaction) and catalyzed to a large extent by a certain identification of students and other youth in the advanced industrial countries with the struggles of the colonial and semi-colonial masses. Within this context clearly discernable student struggles did occur around curricula reform, regulation of personal lives, and a host of other issues. It is axiomatic that students, as a relatively privileged layer of society, have the sufficient leisure time, access to revolutionary literature, and secure economic situations to propel them into actions before layers of the working class move. Students from the German universities furnished much of Marx's original cadre in the 1840s, to cite merely one example.

How did the radicalization in the United States differ from the other countries? As we said before the war in Vietnam was the central differentiating factor. Indeed, it is impossible to make a case that a "student movement" per se never existed in the U.S. What did occur was a massive anti-war movement, composed in the main of students, which included within its ranks an increasingly large layer of radicalized students, students who went beyond merely protesting the war itself and acquired at first an "anti-imperialist" consciousness, and later a concrete identification with the domestic struggles of the working class. The students who comprised the American anti-war movement were, by and large, the products of post-war prosperity. They were not motivated so much by what we shall call a "quantitative" alienation from American society, i.e., material deprivation, but more by a "qualitative" alienation, that is, a disgust with the disparity between the rosy myths of American society (equality, individual freedom, abundance for all, democracy, benevolent foreign policy, etc.) and the harsh realities of the society: poverty, discrimination, stifling of culture, foreign interventions, etc. This can be loosely defined as a crisis of bourgeois ideology. The students of the 1960s were indeed a product of a different set of social conditions than their parents, and enjoying as commonplace the material well-being that most grew up with. Many rejected both material well-being and the traditional values reinforced by that well-being.

An identification with the oppressed, the underprivileged, the downtrodden did occur. In the early '60s most of this sentiment was channeled into the civil rights movement and such do-good diversions as the Peace Corps and social work. What transformed an inchoate scattering of episodic struggles into a genuine movement was the Vietnam war. The anti-war movement, during the course of its existence, produced a variety of spin-offs, including the revitalized feminist movement, the gay "movement", the youth culture milieu,

Despite sporadic struggles around specifically student issues (dorm rules, curricula changes, course content) a coherent and consistent student movement never emerged from the anti-war movement. Because the war was the major factor in coalescing the youth radicalization in the U.S., it quite naturally followed that once the war slipped from center stage, the conjunctural radicalization spawned by it dissipated and passed into history.

The inexorable linear dynamic of the American student radicalization with its current "lull" is, then, but a fond wish of the SWP and YSA leadership, based on an empirical misunderstanding of the real nature of the radicalization of the 1960s as it developed in the United States. Students will again revolt, most probably on a higher scale than previously, for they have been revolting for centuries. The new rise of the youth radicalization, however, will occur in the context of the radicalization of the American working class as a whole; it can only be defined by its relationship to this radicalization; and it will not then be a student

movement.

c. The social nature of students redefined

The orientation of the YSA to the "student movement" required certain modifications of Marxist theory, notably in a redefinition of the social nature of the student milieu. For the YSA leadership, students had come to take on the role Marx had assigned to the working class. Proceeding from an initially correct recognition of the changed nature of the university, it became necessary to "adjust" the historically proven role of the student milieu, to impute to it qualities which it had never had, nor could it ever have.

It became an article of faith that because of the "factory-like" atmosphere of the university, students were becoming more like workers; that students had inherent ties with the rest of their generation; that "alienation" in the university was only quantitatively different than that expressed at the point of production. Since the YSA leadership exhibits much confusion on this question, it is valuable to briefly state how we analyze the social nature of the student population.

Students in general are not particularly closely attached to nor always explicitly defined by their class backgrounds, while at the same time they have yet to take permanent jobs and stabilize their lives as "adults." Relatively rootless and in transition from a defined background to an undetermined future; representing a variety of class backgrounds and heading for a variety of future occupations, students are a heterogeneous layer with no uniform class interests. Even when students come from working class families, their aspirations impel them toward rising out of their class. They have no specifically defined relationship to the means of production, and even though many students eventually become part of the working class, this fact does not qualitatively change their nature while they are students. By virtue of the fact that they are all students, they do have some common interests. These are the "student issues" which are directly related to the university itself. While these issues often provide for intense struggles on the university, these issues are easily co-opted and as such tend to collapse almost as quickly as they arise.

Because the social labor of the university is intellectual in nature, and because students lack a direct class location, they are predisposed to the ideological influence of classes that are on the ascent in their society. Perhaps more than any other segment of society, students will fight for a body of ideas without having their own immediate interests at stake. A social force that presents a serious potential for creating a new society will win a sizable portion of the student milieu to its banners by investing their idealism in its historic project. Large numbers of students identified with and supported American workers during the militant mid-'30s, while at the same time large bodies of students provided shock troops for Hitler's and Mussolini's successful

crushing of the workers movements in Germany and Italy.

The radicalization of students takes place from the outset on an ideological plane, and is a very different process than a working class radicalization. A working class radicalizes from the self-defense of immediate economic interests born out of necessity. For the majority of the working class the process moves fully onto the political and ideological plane only when the question of state power--in a revolutionary situation.

Given the social nature of students it follows that the politicization of students is in reality determined at all time by factors outside the university and most preeminently by the overall political situation at any given time. As such,

"...the student and youth movements cannot really be analyzed except in their relationship to two points of reference: the workers movement (political composition, degree of activity and mobilization) on the one hand, and the vanguard organization on the other hand (implantation, development; in this case the relationship between the movement and the vanguard can also be a relationship of forces). It is only by always specifying the variations in the relations between the youth movement, the workers movement and the vanguard that one can give a concrete analysis of the student movement and define political initiatives for it." ("A Contribution to the Discussion on the Worldwide Radicalization of the Youth", International Information Bulletin, p. 23, emphasis in original)

IV. The Tasks of the YSA

a. The nature of the period

The draft resolution of the NEC describes a series of international events which have occurred over the past period, but neither attempts an analysis of the significance of these events, nor, as is obvious from the perspectives it outlines, draws the correct political conclusions from the changed international situation." An analysis of the period is necessary to have an objective basis from which the program is to be derived. Presently within the International there are two divergent analyses of the world situation, and represent differences which become apparent when the discussion moves onto political perspectives for our sections to follow in the next period. We should like to outline our view of the present period, explain how it contrasts with that of the NEC (which supports the positions of the LTF), and how the program we outline flows directly from this analysis.

Although the minority in the International has not documented its position, we gain an idea of their general analysis from Comrade Jack Barnes' report on "The Unfolding New World Situation," published in the SWP bulletins this past summer. According to Comrade Barnes, the

"detente" agreements between the United States and the USSR and China constitute the axis of a fundamental turn in the world situation, the most important turn since the cold war. The present situation in Vietnam is, they tell us, the most obvious and telling manifestation of this "detente."

The Vietnamese revolution has been "set back," and this affects the other revolutionary struggles all over the world. The LTF, of course, denies that the rise of workers struggles in the advanced sector is not taken note of, but the fact that they project the "detente" as the pivotal object of a fundamentally changed world situation belies the real essence of the "detente" as seen by the LTF: the overall situation of the world revolutionary process is in decline; the European Perspectives is apocalyptic; there will be periods in Latin America when the masses can win significant concessions from the ruling classes, "including," as Barnes himself maintains, "greater democratic rights on the political arena," ad nauseum.

The International Majority Tendency, on the other hand, does not see the "detente" of 1973 as the turning point in the world situation. We maintain, as we did in 1969, that the new period was opened up by May 1968 in France. We maintain that rather than the peaceful coexistence deals worked out by Nixon and the bureaucrats of Moscow and Peking being the fundamental axis of the world situation, the rise in workers struggles, the crisis of imperialism on a world scale, and the worsening of the crisis of the bureaucracies in the workers states represent the fundamental tendencies for the next period. We hold this to be true for a number of reasons.

It has been noted above that the period after World War II was chiefly characterized by the economic expansion of the imperialist powers. This expansion was made possible by the massive capital investment by the United States to rebuild war-torn western Europe and Japan. The fact that the U.S. was the main supplier of capital for the reconstruction of western Europe insured the absolute productive advantage relative to the other capitalist countries in the imperialist alliance. The ability of capitalism to expand production after the war allowed for the contradictions of the capitalist mode of production to be temporarily attenuated in the post-1945 period. This in turn caused the shift of the political focus in the revolutionary process to the colonial sector, and accounted for the political passivity of the proletariat in the advanced countries throughout the period up to 1968. Further, this situation determined the course of the radicalization of the 1960s, which took place in the main outside of the industrial working class.

These factors, which gave rise to the period of expansion and its corollary, relative class peace in the advanced countries, are in rapid decline, and provide the groundwork for the real new world situation, which opened up in 1968.

The absolute productive advantage which the U.S. held in the past period has completely vanished; the relative

economic superiority which the American bourgeoisie maintains within the imperialist alliance is rapidly eroding. The reconstruction of western Europe and Japan after the war has turned against the U.S. in the form of a noticeable increase in inter-imperialist competition. The U.S. is suffering from a permanent balance of payments deficit, caused by a consequence of factors not the least of which was the increased productive capacity of its imperialist rivals. The international monetary system has completely collapsed, reflecting the loss by the U.S. of the dollar monopoly.

All of these factors point to the obvious conclusion that the period of economic prosperity and of political quiescence of the proletariat in the advanced imperialist centers is coming to an abrupt end. The changed economic situation for the bourgeoisie is reflected in the changed political situation for the imperialist bourgeoisie, most notably in capitalist Europe. Since 1968 the number of struggles of the working class have mounted and the simultaneity of these struggles throughout Europe has increased as in no other period previously. All countries have seen an increasingly militant series of strikes and workers struggles which have on many occasions led to objectively posing the question of power, and have coincided to place major countries of capitalist Europe on the eve of a pre-revolutionary crisis.

The perspectives for capitalist Europe must take into account the tendencies cited above. The same is true in the United States. While it is true that the working class in the U.S. has yet to move on a decisive scale as its counterpart in Europe is presently doing, it must be recognized that the fundamental tendencies at work in capitalist Europe over the next period are also at work in the United States. The major factor in the development of capitalist Europe over the past five years has been a consistent rise in workers struggles commensurate with the increase in the inter-imperialist contradictions of the international bourgeoisie. But the difference which this rise in combativity represents with regard to the proletariat in the U.S. is not one of quality, but one of rhythm.

The outline of the perspectives for Trotskyist youth over the next period begins with the analysis of the world situation. Within this framework the situation in the U.S. must be discussed. Over the next period, the projections which are made by the revolutionary organization must be explicitly predicated on the recognition that the next period in the United States will be characterized by an economic recession, which will halt the quiescence of the industrial working class in the U.S., in contrast to the past period. The ruling class is finding it necessary to openly attack the living standards of the entire working class, as well as waging campaigns against the right to strike, bargain, etc.

What this concretely means is that the immediate next period will see an explosive thrust of workers struggles, set in motion in reaction to inflation, unemployment, the deterioration in the standard of living, cutbacks in social services, etc., and the recession will aggravate these

already existing tendencies. The revolutionary party should not only take note of this fact, but should also make preparations for these events by thoroughly shifting its policies to meet the reality of the situation facing it in the next period.

It should be apparent that the shift in the objective situation necessitates an accompanying shift of the policies of the SWP and YSA. But just as with their inability to recognize the realities of the student radicalization of the 1960s, so too is the leadership unable to see the reality of the working class in the U.S. and the objective possibilities which exist for establishing a base within the working class. The perspectives outlined by the Internationalist Tendency of the SWP, in their counter-resolution-submitted to the SWP discussion, has correctly noted that the main task in the coming period is to begin a policy of implantation into selected industries to prepare for the realities of the period ahead. As the IT resolution states, the strategy for the party over the next period:

"...must be to unite the struggles of the working class and its allies in preparation for a challenge to the bourgeois state. This perspective enables the party to put forth a program which is based on the needs of the working class as a whole and combines the raising of political demands in the working class with intervention in the movements of the peripheral layers in order to turn them toward solidarity with the working class." (SWP Discussion Bulletin, Vol. 31, No. 18)

Revolutionary socialist youth must, in this period, base themselves upon the above-mentioned analysis of the tasks facing the movement as a whole, for the tendency in the coming period will be away from sectoral fragmentation of struggles (a feature characteristic of the 1960s) and toward major struggles among the working class with the proletariat becoming the primary political focus. The development of the class struggles in the United States will inevitably show, as it has in Europe, that in a period when the working class struggles are on the ascent, it is impossible for an organization to build up strength in layers peripheral to the working class without, at the same time, being involved in the working class struggles themselves. The period ahead will reveal that as the struggle of the working class intensifies, the peripheral layers will increasingly look to the working class for leadership. Only if the revolutionary organization is implanted in the industrial proletariat can it provide leadership to these peripheral layers.

The major task of the SWP over the next period should be a strategic turn toward the advanced layers of the industrial working class through a policy of implantation. The YSA should make the same turn toward the working class, but on a different level. It is not meant by this that the YSA should abandon the campuses to immediately colonize the factories, or for that matter pull anyone presently on the campus out of that milieu. Implantation is a political question, not a mere administrative chore.

Because of an originally forced and later self-imposed isolation from the working class, the SWP has progressively abandoned work among the class to the point that it is almost totally absent from the unions and the struggles of the working class. According to the 1973 political resolution of the SWP majority, we are waiting for a left-wing to emerge, bringing "new opportunities" for intervention, before we will intervene in the unions. It should not have to be said, that to expect a left-wing to develop without the intervention of the party-- and then think that by going into the plants after it has developed--the party will be able to give a left-wing political leadership--is more than subtle spontaneism, it is crude empiricism. If a left-wing does develop in the unions over the next period, that party which has been in the unions giving leadership to the day-to-day struggles of the workers will be the one to which the class will give its allegiance. If the need to turn away from the nearly exclusively student orientation was needed in the past period, it is doubly the case in the present situation. By recognizing and paying lip service to the fact that a recession is on its way and still refusing to turn toward the working class, the SWP is becoming more and more of an anachronism.

But a turn to the class, which in the coming period even the SWP leadership may find empirically necessary, cannot be divorced from the program with which that intervention is to be made. That the present program of the SWP is both incorrect and inadequate has already been documented by the counter-political resolution of the SWP Internationalist Tendency, and we could only repeat what it says.

The point we wish to make here is that the major difference between the present leadership of the SWP and YSA and that of the Internationalist Tendency revolves fundamentally around the recognition of the need to make the turn toward the working class, a recognition which for us is grounded in a scientific analysis of the objective possibilities for establishing a real base inside the working class in the next period.

b. Strike support work

The turn of the YSA to the working class will be primarily achieved through the establishment of conjunctural organizations which arise out of the need to defend and popularize the struggles of the working class among students and peripheral layers. Such organizations, besides calling attention to the struggles of the workers, could serve as a platform from which to expose the class nature of society, the nature of bourgeois education, etc. We contrast to the practice of the SWP and YSA leadership, which usually entails the uncritical tail-ending of the trade union bureaucracy, conjunctural organizations, primarily strike support committees, which would be an adjunct to the overall intervention into the class struggle of the revolutionary party.

Strike support committees would play an important role

in advancing the class struggle and would gain allies for the working class among the student milieu. Through this work the more politically advanced students would come to see the working class as the historically progressive class, and in part could serve as a buffer against right-wing or fascist demagogery (which historically gets its base first on the universities), and would result in the recruitment of the best militants to the politics of the Fourth International.

Aside from the organization of committees to defend and support the struggles of workers, there should be assignment of YSA members to do support work for the party fractions in the unions. (We caution here not to look at where the party is now, for we are basing the tasks of the YSA on the assumption that the SWP IT political counter-resolution would be implemented by the party.) This will become especially important as more left-wing formations begin to develop, and fractions of comrades in the plant and outside the plant will be indispensable for the coming period. This has been the practice of the European sections and would be beneficial for the SWP and YSA to follow this policy, if it did any union work or work in the working class as a whole.

c. United Farmworkers support

As was mentioned above, the general policy of the YSA concerning strike support work is that of being the crassest tailenders of any struggle's present leadership; to provide "truthful" reporting in its press; to never criticize any policy taken by that leadership (so as not to appear "sectarian"); and to remain silent when it comes to offering any concrete political proposals for the struggle. A brief look at the support work for the UFW is a good case in point illustrating the wrong approach to support work for working class struggles.

Because the struggle of the agricultural workers in the field fields did not have widespread popularity among the student milieu, the YSA for years had little to do with the United Farmworkers, and had little coverage of the struggle in the press. When the YSA finally decided that this was a profitable arena for work, that is, after all the other "mass movements" had collapsed, it intervened in its typically tail-endist fashion.

Already having a ready-made schema for any and all struggles that would arise in this radicalization, the YSA saw the fight of the agricultural workers as only a Chicano nationalist struggle, instead of recognizing that another fundamentally class issue was also involved--union recognition. The YSA opted for uncritical endorsement of the Chavez leadership, regardless of the politics involved. Thus when Chavez aligned himself with the Immigration Department against the undocumented workers, the Militant printed only an article by La Raza Unida Party leader Corky Gonzalez, not as the line of the SWP or YSA, but as the line of LRUP. Only by knowing about the uncritical support that the SWP and YSA gives to every position of

LRUP could one figure out that the article expressed the line of the SWP and YSA. The YSA leadership leads YSAers to posture themselves as the best builders of the UFW support pickets, not as young communist militants showing class solidarity with the struggle of the agricultural workers, regardless of the present leadership of the union. As such, the intervention of the YSA into the support work for the UFW leads to the political subordination of the YSA to the Chavez leadership of the UFW.

While the picket lines were still marching in the fields, the YSA said nothing about the necessity of self-defense against physical attacks by the goons of the bosses and Teamster leadership. The YSA said nothing about the necessity to build militant union solidarity in the food processing industries, which fully coincided with Chavez' lack of initiative in that area.

We are, of course, not against the use of economic boycott in principle, and the specific features of the struggle of the agricultural workers presents many practical problems regarding ordinary picket tactics. However, the practical possibilities of actually carrying out a successful economic boycott is in all frankness questionable. Yet not only is this concept not even raised, much less critically examined, in our press, Chavez' perspectives for economic boycott are seen as a superlative means of struggle.

Totally absent as well from the press is the fact that the Chavez misleadership of the UFW hamstring the workers by using the economic boycott as a substitute for and in counter-position to involving broad working class solidarity. A perspective which does not go over well with Chavez' liberal friends. By not criticizing the class-collaborationist policies and pacifist leanings of the Chavez leadership, the YSA divorces itself from the real interests of the agricultural workers, and only exhibits grovelling opportunism before the present UFW leadership.

A correct approach would combine militant class solidarity with political criticism of the policies of the Chavez leadership. This approach would require marching in the picket lines of the farmworkers, but under our own slogans which not merely show our support for the union pickets and the economic boycott, but that are also designed to heighten the consciousness of the workers and supporters, and help lead to their break with Chavez. A fundamental aspect of this line of intervention would be first and foremost to raise transitional demands emphasizing the need for labor solidarity with the strike and boycott, the need for the unions to break with the capitalist parties, and for self-defense of the strikers both on and off the picket lines. Moreover, we should seize events such as the murder of the picket to explain why a policy of nonviolence in the face of ruling class violence can only lead to the destruction of the union.

Our interventions should correctly explain the nature of the struggle as one of ruling class attacks upon a union and

why the alliance with the liberal bourgeoisie leads into a blind alley. Unless this is done, the YSA will be totally discredited when the workers learn empirically through their own struggles and defeats that the Chavez leadership is a rotten class-collaborationist one. The identity of the YSA with the policies of the Chavez leadership will hardly sit well with the militants of the Farmworkers union who will be looking for a leadership alternative to that of Chavez.

d. Indochina solidarity

One of the most serious errors made by the YSA leadership in the past period has been its abandonment of activity around the Indochinese revolution. The draft resolution assures us, on page 8, that "the YSA's defense of the Indochinese revolution will continue," and that we will "take advantage of every available opportunity to oppose the intervention of U.S. imperialism in Indochina", but the resolution outlines not one specific proposal about how this "defense" of the revolution in Indochina is to be carried out.

Grossly overestimating the effects of the signing of the Accords--based partly on their analysis of the "detente", but mainly on their position that because the VCP is "Stalinist" it is counter-revolutionary through and through--the leadership put the anti-war movement in cold storage at the last YSA convention. The immaturity of this move was seen almost immediately, and left the SWP and YSA in a relationship of forces vis-a-vis the CP which had not been seen for five years. Thus on the January 20 mobilizations the slogans of the CP received equal weight with the YSA's slogan of "Out Now."

We contend that the lack of intervention by the YSA on an explicitly anti-imperialist basis laid the groundwork for the situation in the anti-war movement immediately after the Accords were signed. The consequent lack of initiative and inability of the YSA to mobilize the anti-imperialist vanguard in solidarity is commensurate with their past refusal to actively build the anti-imperialist wing of the anti-war movement, and their total abstinence in the area of solidarity since the accords were signed.

For our part, we support the general analysis of the conjunctural situation brought about by the Accords contained in the Steme-Walter resolution presented at the December IEC meeting, and the criticisms made by the SWP IT political resolution. From these analyses it is clear that the YSA leadership should not have dismantled the anti-war apparatus. Rather, the YSA should have oriented their anti-war work to the changed situation created by the disengagement of U.S. troops and the signing of the Accords, no longer posing the question simply as one of direct involvement of U.S. troops, but instead should have oriented towards mobilizing the anti-imperialist vanguard in active solidarity with the NLF.

These actions would by necessity be smaller than the mobilizations around immediate withdrawal at the height

of the anti-war movement, but the changed situation called for a changed orientation, which the YSA leadership refused to lay the groundwork for, or implement since the Accords were signed.

The possibility of a reintervention by U.S. imperialism looms high on the agenda, but the exact nature of this intervention is not clearly apparent. We should therefore be prepared to wage major campaigns against reintervention of men or materiel into Indochina. However, the YSA should not restrict itself to raising this demand solely, but must intervene into the united front with slogans calling for "Victory to the NLF", "Solidarity Until Final Victory", etc.

The YSA should not wait around to see what develops, but we should in the next period organize actions of solidarity, hoping to mobilize the anti-imperialist vanguard in these actions. We should address ourselves to the question of political prisoners in South Vietnam, the continued role of imperialism in Indochina, etc. Within the context of the major offensive by the NLF sometime next year, these actions assume an overriding priority for the YSA. Solidarity actions would not only provide the basis for a renewed response to a renewed intervention by U.S. imperialism, but would also serve to cut the maneuvering room of the bourgeoisie in their escalation of the war. The role the YSA can and should play in organizing these actions will recruit the militants from the anti-imperialist vanguard to the banner of the Fourth International, the only true defenders of proletarian internationalism.

The effectiveness of waging such solidarity campaigns has been demonstrated in Europe by the fact that the biggest demonstration in Europe against the war in Indochina was held in Milano after the Accords were signed! The internationalist responsibilities of beginning a solidarity campaign should be apparent. If the YSA leadership defaults on this and does not respond to this situation, it would be tantamount to a betrayal of the revolution, and would taint the record compiled by the YSA during the earlier phases of the anti-war movement.

In a period when the working class is under economic attack by the bourgeoisie, it is imperative that it receive a political explanation as to why the struggle of the Vietnamese revolutionaries is not only not in opposition to their interests but rather is in consonance with them. For those who have not surrendered to economism it is ABC that they present political explanations to the workers for the major political events not only domestic but of international events.

e. Defense work

An elementary test of revolutionaries is internationalism, and an elementary test of internationalism is the carrying out of consistent solidarity campaigns and defense work. Two major areas of defense work the YSA has been involv-

ed in in the past period have been the defense of the former Communist League in France and defense work around class struggle prisoners in Chile. A consistent feature of all the defense work of the YSA has been an attitude toward defense work which borders on liberalism.

The ex-Communist League defense

When the Communist League was banned after the June 21 action, the YSA correctly initiated united front proposals for protesting the ban and for the release of Alain Krivine and Pierre Rousset. But while the initiation of these united fronts was a correct first step, there are many things which should have followed.

First, even though the YSA initiated and supported the demands of the united front, it had a responsibility as a supporter of the Fourth International to complement this support of the united front demands with slogans of its own, designed to educate the people marching on the picket lines as to the nature of the June 21 action (why the disruption of the Ordre Nouveau was both correct and necessary, and completely within the traditions of the working class movement), and about why the Communist League had been banned (the fact that beside the action of June 21 the League had played a leading role in the anti-Debre mobilizations earlier in the year). It is correct to launch and support united front defense campaigns when any organization of the left is victimized. When that organization is a section of the Fourth International, the responsibilities of the YSA take on added importance.

The approach outlined above, which should have been the guideline for the YSA's intervention into the united fronts that were called around the country, was incompatible with the factional interests of the YSA leadership, who refused to carry out a basic act of internationalism incumbent upon any organization claiming to be Trotskyist. Even though the YSA is only fraternally related to the Fourth International, it purports to be in political solidarity with it. Yet when the largest section of the International undertook an action which the YSA leadership disagreed with, the leadership refused to carry on an adequate campaign of defense of the action itself, restricting their slogans to civil liberties demands. Some comrades even toyed with the idea that the YSA was the best defender of democratic rights to the extent that they were for the right of the fascist Ordre Nouveau to exist! In fact, many comrades who actually brought signs showing solidarity with the action taken by the Communist League were either told to put the signs down, or were later reprimanded for these "indisciplined" acts.

Second, the fact that a section of the Fourth International had been banned, opened up an important opportunity for the YSA to begin a propaganda offensive against the Voorhis Act, which prevents the Socialist Workers Party from officially affiliating with the Fourth International. The

fact that this was not done reveals the YSA's attitude toward internationalism. It is probable that the leadership did not want to be identified with the "terrorist International", and an International which did not balk at coming to the defense of the action of June 21.

Finally, the YSA, since the initial spurt of activity in late June and early July, has done little if anything in the way of defense work for the former Communist League. Many League defense fractions around the country have not met for three months, and specific actions of protest have not been scheduled since July. The role of the YSA and the SWP in the defense of the ex-Communist League has been a scandal in the International. The Chicago branch of the SWP refused to schedule a demonstration the week of the conventions in December because "it would conflict with the schedule."

The factional interests of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction have precluded a militant campaign of defense of even the legality of the former Communist League, not to mention the action of June 21 itself. The building of the "war chest" with which the SWP leadership hopes to fight the leadership of the Fourth International superceded the elementary duty of internationalism.

Chile defense

On the question of Chile defense work, the YSA fares little better than it does on defense of the ex-League. While we do not criticize the initiation of united fronts for defense of political prisoners in Chile, we do criticize the abysmally low level on which the YSA intervened into these demonstrations. Defense of political prisoners is itself a test of internationalism, but common liberals can and do defend freedom for political prisoners in Chile. It is the responsibility of the revolutionary organization to provide a political explanation for the coup which goes beyond just the slogans of the USLA.

Especially the organizations affiliated to the Fourth International should wage special campaigns in defense of the revolutionary militants in Chile, most importantly those who took up arms against the coup. The YSA could carry "Free Luis Corvalan" signs, but refused to carry signs solidarizing themselves with the PSR and the MIR, who were involved in the resistance against the Pinochet coup. Thus, the YSA, intervening on the level of the civil liberties demands, differentiated themselves from the Stalinists only by name.

The policy of the YSA should have been the initiation of united fronts to defend political prisoners, but to intervene into these demonstrations not as the USLA but as the YSA, providing a political answer to the coup in Chile. In these demonstrations, the YSA should have had banners explaining that the armed road is the only road to revolution, that it was the policies of the CP and SP, "peaceful

road to socialism", that paved the way for the coup, etc. But it should also organized, where possible, special campaigns in active solidarity with the armed resistance to the coup by the militants of the PSR and MIR. It should have organized material aid to the workers resisting the coup, it should have organized tours for the militants of the revolutionary organizations who had warned of the coup and had tried to arm the working class to fight. At this time a special campaign for the freedom of the Chilean Trotskyist leader Luis Vitale should be launched with at least the same vigor that was put into the campaign for Corvalan.

It will no doubt be protested by the YSA leadership that the Militant and Young Socialist were present at the demonstration, which explained the YSA's (rather the LTF's) position. Distribution of the press, however, is not sufficient for revolutionary organizations. They must be seen with their own banners and signs which identify them as such. Otherwise, the Trotskyist blend in (rather well) with the Stalinists and liberals.

The special campaign of the Fourth International to provide militant solidarity and material aid to the armed resistance should be an overriding priority for the YSA in the next period. The failure of the leadership to do this will add but one more card to the deck of parochialism which is so characteristic of the YSA today.

f. Watergate and the Political Rights Defense Fund

The Watergate scandal has created a grave political crisis for the bourgeoisie in this country. The widespread distrust in the bourgeois government causes not a small bit of concern in the ruling class, and how to deal with this crisis has been a major topic of debate in ruling class circles. Precisely because the Watergate revelations and the outcome revolve around "constitutional" issues, however, the intervention which the revolutionary organization makes into this situation must be carefully examined.

It is perfectly correct for the YSA to exploit the situation created by the Watergate revelations to its own benefit. Having said this, it is our opinion that the orientation toward the Political Rights Defense Fund, which the YSA leadership is pushing as a major campaign for the next period, reeks of a fetish for bourgeois legality, and in fact plays into the hands of certain sectors of the bourgeoisie.

It is the most far-seeing sectors of the ruling class which are involved in the impeachment maneuvers. They want to channel the cynical distrust which wide layers of the population have expressed into an attack upon Nixon individually as a scapegoat for all the evils of capitalist democracy. It is for this reason that there is so much talk of impeachment, and so much emphasis on the Nixon "dirty tricks." At the same time when the bourgeoisie is attempting to prove that the governmental structure of American bourgeois democracy is "flexible and just" to an ever-increasingly distrustful

working class, the YSA makes its major intervention into the political dislocation of Watergate a legal suit.

We are not opposed to using the courts for our own ends, but such tactical orientation must flow from a concrete of the particular situation. Given that showing the goodness of the system is becoming the major subject of ruling class propaganda, and that the "bad" politicians are constantly getting their licks through the courts, the suing of "Nixon and the Watergate Gang" in the bourgeois courts takes on a different character than it would at some other time. The overall impact of the PRDF campaign can be nothing more than the sowing of illusions in the court system, and indirectly, in bourgeois democracy itself.

The YSA, in using a legal suit to "expose" the tricks of the Watergate Gang (although the Ervin committee did a much more thorough job), ignores the maneuvers of the ruling class, and poses the PRDF approach to others interested in fighting the repression of capitalist democracy. The leadership opts for a few pieces of silver, in the process abandoning a class struggle approach to exploit the Watergate crisis.

It is obvious that in a situation such as Watergate, that the question of impeachment would come up. We understand that impeachment of the president or anyone else changes nothing about the system of capitalist democracy. We should be neither for nor against impeachment--we are for the working class taking power, and we are against the bourgeoisie holding it, regardless which capitalist happens to be in power. Understanding this, we should not be identified with the assorted sundry of liberal impeachment coalitions that have arisen or will arise. This would only serve to further enforce the illusions that the masses already have in the government. However, these coalition meetings and demonstrations--if any are called--will provide an arena for the intervention of the YSA on the correct program, explaining not that the courts are the best way to fight victimization by the ruling class, but rather that working class self-defense, extra-parliamentary self-defense, is the way to fight repression under capitalism.

We should, on a propaganda level, explain that the ruling class has and always will use methods to repress the left; that any and every bourgeois party does the same; that the courts are not the place to fight repression, but that the courts, like every other institution of bourgeois society, is a tool of the exploiters to use against the exploited; that to end this type of repression what is needed is a socialist revolution.

Raising the concept of independent political action by the working class is an important part of the intervention into the unions, but we should be careful not to fall into the position of tailing the bureaucrats who for their own reasons will doubtless raise the same idea. We must seize the opportunity of the distrust in the government to patiently explain to the workers that state intervention into the unions is a tool which tomorrow will be used as a bludgeon against them, etc.

The American ruling class is counting on its political maneuvers (convicting and/or removing individual politicians from office) and its propaganda offensive (all major newspapers calling for impeachment, the same ilk explaining how impeachment of Nixon would show the stability of the American governmental system, etc.) to weather the Watergate crisis and bridge the gap of confidence that has developed. The revolutionary organization must do everything to prevent the gap from being bridged. By suing the government in the bourgeois courts, no matter how revolutionary one may sound or claim to be, the YSA does little to widen this gap, but rather objectively assists the ruling class in this task.

g. The "energy crisis"

The "energy crisis" is the latest fraud the bourgeoisie is attempting to put over on the working class. The Militant has correctly pointed out that in their rush for super-profits, the major oil interests are deliberately holding back oil supplies. Hoping to avoid blame for the upcoming recession, the capitalists are blaming the lack of oil and energy reserves for the rise in unemployment. They hope to divert the attention of the American working class away from their own rotten treachery by attempting to foist the blame onto the Arabs for the crisis at home.

Despite the essentially correct analysis of this latest bourgeois maneuver, the YSA leadership once again fails to draw any political conclusions. The Militant offers not one political slogan and it fails to put forth any political line. It restricts itself to an economic analysis only, which is not the purpose of the press. The tasks of the YSA would be to mercilessly expose the "crisis" through propaganda around transitional demands. "Open the Books" (in lieu of Watergate) would be a very popular slogan and would expose the super-profit motives behind the "crisis." As the unemployment rate rises toward a projected 10% for next year, the slogans "30 for 40"--"Jobs for All" become important ones. On a different level the call for "Nationalization of the Oil Industries under Workers Control" would offer a lasting solution to the energy shortage, and should be raised as a central propaganda slogan during this period. The energy crisis has to be seen for what it is: an attempt by the ruling class to shift the blame for the recession which is around the corner onto the backs of the Arab countries. Mere economic explanations and the selling of the press, if all it has are economic explanations, are not enough, they must be coupled with a political intervention into the class struggle.

In strikes that arise in the next period around issues that are related to the energy crisis, we must be there to intervene on a political basis and offer concrete proposals for the strike, linking the energy crisis fraud to the transitional demands named above.

Some Nader-related groups have already developed in response to the energy crisis, and have called for inspection of the oil company books. We should intervene into these

groups wherever possible and raise our political solution for the crisis.

On campuses where school closures could cause widespread discontent we must also intervene, proposing political solutions to these problems, and exposing the universities as accomplices in the robbery of the working class. We should tie this in with an explanation of the recession, of the unemployment that awaits graduates of all schools, and of the source of the cutback in services. The YSA must not wait around to "see what develops"; it must take advantage of the situation now, since it can see what is coming, and initiate and lead struggles around this energy crisis. Tactics such as rent strikes and the setting up of tenant committees in protest of shortages of fuel are not to be passed over. No Sacrifices for Capitalist Profits.

V. Conclusion

It is obvious that the differences presently disputed in the Fourth International are not of a conjunctural nature, but touch at questions as fundamental as the nature of the period, the role of the party, the nature and function of the Transitional Program, and the use of military operations in the construction of the party. The current discussion can only be

viewed favorably, for it allows the cadre of the Fourth International to be educated on the real differences which exist politically, and not on the basis of organizational horror stories, the foundation of which seem to be made of sand.

As is evident from our resolution, the differences which divide the Internationalist Tendency from the present YSA leadership are not of a small nature, but represent the international differences as they apply to the United States.

The coming World Congress will set the line for the official sections and those groups fraternally affiliated with the Fourth International to carry out in the period between then and the Eleventh World Congress. Given the analysis of the new rise of world revolution in the period immediately before us, the functioning of the Fourth International as a democratic centralist International becomes an overriding political priority, which the documents of the majority outline. It will be the responsibility of every organization which supports the Fourth International not only in words but in deeds, to loyally carry out the decisions of the Tenth Congress. The theme of the Young Socialist Alliance over the next year should be concretized in: To the International!

December 12, 1973