

PARTY BUILDER

Gus

SWP Organizational Discussion Bulletin

Vol. VI No. 6

August 1970

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
FINANCING A NEW BRANCH by John Staggs, Atlanta	3
PHILADELPHIA WOMEN'S LIBERATION REPORT by Paula Reimers	5
NEW YORK 1970 ELECTION CAMPAIGN REPORT by Mike Arnall	9
AN ELECTORAL ORGANIZATIONAL METHOD WE SHOULD CONSIDER by Joe Johnson, Denver	14
NEW YORK MILITANT LABOR FORUM REPORT by Sara Johnston	15
DENVER ANTIWAR REPORT by Al Rosenthal	17
BOBER TOUR: REPORT AND EVALUATION by Berta Langston, New York	18
EDUCATION: NEW MEMBER THROUGH CADRE by Marian E. Thelen, Boston	22

30 cents

Published by

SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

873 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003

blank page

FINANCING A NEW BRANCH

by John Staggs, Atlanta

The Atlanta branch was constituted a little over a year ago with eight members. We ran a modestly-financed election campaign for mayor of Atlanta, along with our national office sustainer of \$7.50 per member per month, and rent of \$60.00 per month for a three-room headquarters. The average pledge to the branch was \$20.00 per comrade per month.

Today we have a branch of 22 members. Our campaign for three state offices has taken on a much wider scope with a much greater financial backing. Our national office sustainer has remained at \$7.50, which we have paid regularly. We have a larger, more expensive headquarters with better office equipment. We have also begun to take on a part of the sustaining expenses for two fulltime workers. Our average pledge is now \$30.00 per member per month.

Much of our progress toward becoming a branch that can take on all of its financial obligations has come about through application of the basic ideas in Judy White's plenum report. [See "New Financing of the Expanding Party," in Party Builder Vol. VI No.1.]

In forming a new branch, there are general political tasks which must be taken on. In order to achieve these goals it takes a certain minimum physical effort and a corresponding financial outlay. The goals that a new branch can reach have to be set up realistically, and they must correspond with the most basic political necessities. That is, projections for a headquarters, phone, basic office equipment, organizer's expenses, and national office sustainer, must go hand in hand with projecting the need for regular political activity in the area.

In setting a sustainer to the national office, the most important thing is to set a level per comrade that can be met regularly. This is important so that the national office can expect a regularized payment, and also so the branch financial director can project the national office sustainer as a regular monthly expense. A new branch of 15 to 25 members obviously can't start out at \$15.00 per comrade per month. For a branch this size, \$7.00 to \$10.00 is a considerable national office sustainer, while still having enough to operate and expand locally.

The basis for meeting the goals you have set is, for the most part, the sustainer. A solid sustainer base is not achieved automatically; it can only come about when every member of the branch is conscious of its importance. Explaining the need for a sustainer base is part of presenting the entire financial picture of the branch.

We have always said that giving a sizable sustainer is a political obligation as important as any assignment a comrade might have. As Judy White's report states, the branch leadership has to be very conscious about making comrades' assignments clear to them, including the decision about who will be a fulltime worker for the party. A small branch can't afford to pay for many, or in some cases, any fulltime people. Any comrade or number of comrades who take it upon themselves to be "fulltime" and live by borrowing and skimping usually not only fail to contribute fully to the branch in its overall political functioning, but can also literally destroy the financial base of a branch. In this situation, comrades who are working have the additional strain of personal loans, etc., which make it hard for them to pay their sustainer on a regular basis. Those who aren't paying any sustainer are subsidized by the branch for their pledge to the national office, and by individual comrades through personal loans.

A branch functions with the combination of physical labor and other materials which cost money. The budget of a small branch must out of necessity be devoted to those basic material items which make it possible for the comrades to do fruitful work when they get off their daily jobs. What the branch leadership has to do is figure out what finances are available to be put toward sustaining a fulltime functionary and, if it is possible, assign a comrade or comrades to be on fulltime. Any other comrade who doesn't get a job is actually taking money away from the branch as if they were assigned to fulltime positions by the branch membership. The labor time these extra "fulltimers" provide is not as useful to the branch as the financial base they could provide if they were employed and paying regular sustainers. We cannot substitute labor for financial support.

Because the assignment of giving a regular sustainer is especially crucial to a small branch, comrades who take a flip-pant attitude toward this assignment cannot be considered as good candidates for other assignments, even though such comrades have considerable "time" available to do work.

Once comrades are able to pay sustainers, then you have to get reasonably high pledges that can be paid regularly. To do this, leading comrades must make pledges that can be used for comparison. In general, we have found that comrades who take home \$75.00 a week can easily give \$10.00 a week to the movement (SWP and YSA together). This has been established because several people who only bring home that much give more.

In order to carry out these types of policies, the treasurer should be a respected and leading comrade in the branch. The person must be in close contact with the organizer, and in constant collaboration with the branch leadership. In many cases, this means being on the branch executive committee. The treasurer must give regular reports to the branch executive committee and the branch membership; this gives comrades a good feel for what the financial situation is. The main purpose of reports to the membership is to emphasize the importance of the branch finances. Included in the regular reports is the display of a large chart showing the sustainer pledges and any debts comrades have to the branch in terms of their sustainers. This device has helped us keep our total sustainer debt down to less than \$150.00 for the last six months.

In order to set financial priorities and plan expenses for the next month, the branch treasurer must estimate the income realistically. This cannot be accurately done without regular weekly sustainer payments by each comrade. When income is regularized, then it can be utilized to its fullest extent. A branch cannot operate without knowing when money will

come into the treasury.

The branch treasurer should be able to keep close watch over all branch departments. In order to estimate what financial outlay will be necessary for the next month, the treasurer must work in collaboration with the campaign director, antiwar director, Militant sales director, forum director, and bookstore agent to work out budgets for expenses. Militant sales, forums, the summer school, and the bookstore can all be money-making functions. Expenses in these areas must be cut to a minimum in order that these branch functions at least break even, or make profits. Campaign expenses must be estimated; the antiwar and women's liberation movements should never be subsidized. After these expenses are estimated, the treasurer should participate in setting priorities on what is most important.

Office supplies used by other organizations (antiwar, women's liberation, the YSA, etc.) should be kept track of. These organizations should be billed systematically by the party for these supplies -- mimeograph supplies, paper, stencils, envelopes, and stamps, etc.

PHILADELPHIA WOMEN'S LIBERATION REPORT

by Paula Reimers

The women's liberation movement in Philadelphia began with the organization of consciousness-raising groups in the fall of 1969. These groups were in general small groups which were in isolation from one another.

Some of the women in these groups called a women's liberation conference for March 21, 1970 to bring the activists together and to reach new women. Despite extremely limited publicity gotten out in a short period of time, nearly 500 women showed up for the opening of the conference, thereby demonstrating the tremendous potential appeal of women's liberation.

An unfortunate sidelight was that the conference's main speakers were a number of women from the Rat Collective and a few other ultraleft groups from New York. Their highblown rhetoric and their line that men are the only major cause of women's oppression tended to drive a large number of women, coming around to investigate women's liberation, out of the conference early in the day. By day's end only 150 to 200 of the original participants remained for the workshops, nonetheless showing a tremendous interest in the burgeoning new movement.

Most of the women involved in the movement are very serious and politically healthy. Most are new to politics, recently radicalized and brought into activity by the women's liberation movement. Most fortunately missed the "benefit" of association with SDS in its dying days.

Women's Liberation Center

The Women's Liberation Center (WLC) was established after the conference to facilitate communication among the various groups in the city, primarily consciousness-raising groups. The initial conception of the center was as a formation to help set up new consciousness-raising groups, supply literature and information on women's liberation and coordinate the activities of the various groups. In short the WLC was seen as a coordinating body, open to all groups and individuals, non-exclusionary. It was not set up as a new "organization" which would develop its own political line and orientation for the women's liberation movement.

As with all new experiments in a new movement there were birth pangs. It became clear fairly early that the coordination of consciousness-raising groups alone could not provide a sufficient basis for giving the center a life of its own.

The development of the anti-abortion law activity, which developed an organiza-

tional form in Women United for Abortion Rights, tended to extend the scope of the center's activity and gives a clue to its potential. Around the action, through the building of demonstrations, significantly large numbers of new women were brought around the center, sort of like a movement center.

In periods where there are no actions or activities in which large numbers of women -- through their consciousness-raising groups, other organizations or as individuals -- can become involved in day-to-day activity, the number of women (particularly newly interested in women's liberation) who consistently come around the center falls off. In such instances, as would be expected, pressures build up from time to time to try to find a shortcut around the problem. In the case of the WLC in Philadelphia a brief excursion was made into getting a "program" for the center.

In the case of a center established for non-exclusionary coordination, such a shortcut, far from solving the problem, tends to exacerbate the problem. During this last period of temporary decline the Sex and Racism Workshop and the Radical Women's Caucus attempted to get the center as a whole to accept their views of subordination of the independent women's liberation movement to the Black struggle (at they see it).

Our perspective has been to keep the center open to all groups and individuals, and politically non-exclusionary. At first glance the dichotomy of our perspective for the center and that of the Sex and Racism and Radical Women groupings does not seem important to independents, who are reluctant to either initiate or participate in any internal fights in the movement.

To date, however, the center has not adopted a political line of its own. There are two major reasons for this. The first one is our intransigence on the question, which our opponents such as the CP women in the Sex and Racism Workshops and Radical Women's Caucus are not ready or willing to buck. The second is that it soon becomes obvious that such "putsches" within the center do not yield results, but simply threaten to isolate the center from the large numbers of radicalizing women who are not about to choose sides in a fight.

The center continues to have activities, mostly of a holding operation character during the summer, not attracting as many women as during the spring of the year when the abortion actions brought much larger numbers around. We can expect that in the fall, particularly with the revival of mass actions, the center

can break out again to serve as a real coordinator within the movement in Philadelphia.

Abortion Work

The main reason the YSA-SWP represent a force to be dealt with in the women's liberation movement is the work our comrades have done around the abortion issue. Through this work, we have laid the basis for building a broad-based coalition for repeal of Pennsylvania abortion laws with a mass-action perspective, and set a significant precedent for the Philadelphia women's liberation movement as a whole.

From the health care workshop at the March 21 conference, we got a list of women interested in working against the abortion laws. Then we organized a bus to take women to participate in the March 28 demonstration against the New York abortion laws.

In early April, a group of Catholic doctors filed an injunction to prevent Philadelphia's Jefferson Hospital -- which had performed therapeutic abortions -- from performing any abortions, on the grounds that abortion is illegal in Pennsylvania. (The Pennsylvania abortion law was passed in 1860, and was revised in 1939 only to raise the penalties for those performing abortions. The law is very vague and essentially says that illegal abortions are illegal -- without ever defining what is illegal and what is not.) There was quite a bit of publicity about the case, which brought the abortion question to public attention for the first time.

Our comrades brought together a number of independents interested in working against the abortion laws and called a demonstration and rally for April 23, the day the injunction was to be heard. We had less than two weeks to organize the action, at a time when the YSA-SWP were on a campaign footing to build April 15, and major forces could not be assigned to this work. The enthusiastic response of women's liberation activists made the action successful. 20,000 leaflets were distributed in the week before the action -- probably 90% by non-comrades. Women leafleted the antiwar and Earth Week activities, as well as their neighborhoods.

Another important factor was the response of other organizations to the call for an abortion action. We enlisted the support of a very broad and diverse list of co-sponsors: American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), National Association to Repeal Abortion Laws, NOW, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Pennsylvania Abortion Rights Association, a number of consciousness-raising groups, the Episcopal Chaplain of the University of Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania SWP campaign, and others.

Planned Parenthood could not openly support or endorse the action, but volunteered to put leaflets in its clinics and on its campus Earth Week tables.

The action itself was very successful. The press estimated that 300 people attended (our estimate was about 150). There was a good deal of publicity, mostly friendly, on radio, TV, and in the newspapers.

On the basis of the interest generated by the April 23 action, our comrades helped organize a group called Women United for Abortion Rights (WUAR). It is an all-women's group, an outgrowth of the women's liberation movement. It is composed of women's liberation activists and other women who feel that women must lead the struggles for women's demands. The group is single-issue, raising the demands "Free Abortion on Demand," "No Forced Sterilization," "Abortion is a Woman's Right." WUAR has a mass-action perspective, seeking to build coalitions with other groups around specific actions called for the repeal of abortion laws.

WUAR has called two other actions since April 23: another demonstration on May 16 and an abortion conference on May 23. While neither was as large as the first action -- each attracted about 100 people -- both were extremely important in projecting an ongoing perspective of the mass abortion repeal movement and in publicizing WUAR as the key force in initiating mass actions. Each was built as a coalition action and involved new groups and individuals in the planning and organizing.

WUAR, as a group organizing around a women's issue, was able to use the office facilities of the women's liberation center. It was important for WUAR to have a place to organize from. In return, the actions organized by WUAR had an important impact on the center. It became a real coordinating center. When the actions ceased, the basis for a coalition or coordinating center narrowed, and the independents for the most part tended to drift away.

Women United has had some opposition. The Sex and Racism Workshop attacked it saying that legalized abortion is genocide for Black women. It was the independents, not just our comrades, who defended WUAR, pointing to the demand "No Forced Sterilization," and arguing publicly that WUAR supports every woman's right to decide if she will bear a child, without pressure from the state, church, or community. (It is very significant that independent activists took up the political defense of the organization against ultraleft attacks.)

The Pennsylvania Abortion Rights Association (PARA) is WUAR's major critic on the right. PARA's orientation is toward

lobbying and trying to win over friendly legislators. While not openly hostile to mass actions, it does not seek to involve large numbers in the struggle. It is significant that WUAR has been able to involve PARA in coalitions around mass actions by building coalitions broad enough to politically force it to participate. WUAR is participating with PARA in a suit initiated by PARA to have the abortion laws thrown out.

The experience of WUAR has played an important role in the political education and development of the women's liberation movement:

1) It showed that women can play a leading role in struggles around women's demands, and that large numbers of women and men can be organized in active support of these demands.

2) It proved that mass actions can be organized around issues raised by women's liberation, something that was not clear locally until WUAR did it. It also showed that the movement, by organizing masses visibly in support of a particular demand, can be a real political force in applying pressure necessary to win women's demands. This was even acknowledged by the press.

3) Mass actions force the press to treat the women's liberation movement as a serious force, which can mobilize large numbers of women. The news commentator on the NBC-affiliate, Channel 3, said, "It [the April 23 abortion demonstration] represents the first surfacing of the women's liberation movement as a political force in Philadelphia."

4) Such actions can mobilize women to whom women's liberation had previously been an "abstract" and even threatening concept, and show them that the movement is leading the fight for issues of real concern to women. The movement can thus prove its relevance to them and win them to the broader concepts of women's liberation.

5) Mass actions give consciousness-raising groups a concrete women's liberation activity to orient to. The women feel that they can really apply their consciousness-raising experience and make it relevant on a mass scale. We found that many consciousness-raising groups turned themselves into action committees around building an activity. They took leaflets to their neighborhoods, stores, churches, clubs, etc., and really built the action. They began to see themselves as part of a real living mass movement fighting for demands relevant to all women. Many felt, for the first time, the power they had as an organized and visible force.

In short, WUAR has established the validity of a mass action perspective

for women's liberation for a large number of women. It has encouraged other activists to think in terms of mass organizing around other women's liberation issues (such as child care). It has shown that there are things women's liberationists can do when consciousness-raising is no longer entirely sufficient to their political needs.

Antiwar Work

We have been relatively unsuccessful so far in organizing any kind of ongoing women's antiwar formations. It will take more educational work, and the addition of fresh forces to the women's liberation movement, to make such a formation viable.

We were able to organize a women's contingent of 15 or 20 women for the May 30 action.

Campaign '70

There is a great potential for campaign activity in the women's liberation movement, since we are the only campaign that fully supports its demands.

The campaign committee has put out a statement, "Women and Campaign '70," and has reprinted the Equal Rights Amendment article from The Militant as a brochure. Philadelphia NOW has done a lot of work on the Equal Rights Amendment and we hope to make an impression on the NOW membership with that brochure. Women for Campaign '70 and Afro-Americans for Campaign '70 have reprinted Maxine Williams' Militant article on "Black Women and the Struggle for Liberation" as a brochure. It will be important as an educational weapon against ultraleft critics who counterpose the women's struggle to the Black struggle.

We have had campaign speakers at the abortion rallies and the campaign sponsored a women's liberation educational weekend. We will also try to have a campaign speaker at the August 26 women's rights rally. The campaign committee is investigating the possibility of using some of Myrna Lamb's short plays for a campaign benefit in the early fall.

Other Organizations

The Philadelphia chapter of NOW is small -- about 40 or 50 -- but it is probably one of the healthiest citywide women's groups. The chapter and its leadership are generally to the left of the national organization. NOW seems to be attracting a number of young, serious and politically healthy women who are looking for a multi-issue women's liberation group that is taking some kind of action against the oppression of women. (WUAR is limited to the single issue of abortion.) At present, NOW constitutes the nearest facsimile to such a group for a number of radicalizing women.

Although basically reformist, NOW has been actively receptive and eager to build mass actions and to work in coalitions with other groups around specific actions (including the SWP). NOW has actively participated in the abortion actions and is an integral part of the coalition to build a mass march and rally on August 26 around the slogans, "Free 24-hour Universal Child Care Under Community Control," "Free Abortion on Demand," "Equal Opportunity in Jobs and Education," as well as the Equal Rights Amendment.

Opponents

The Communist Party has not intervened publicly in a real way in the women's liberation movement. They send a few women to NOW meetings, but they do not come out openly as a tendency. They are also deeply involved in the Sex and Racism Workshop. Even at their public forum series, when they had a panel on women's liberation, they did not present a line for the movement.

There are a few women in PL, Labor Committee, and Workers League on campuses in the area, but to date they have all abstained from any form of participation in the women's liberation movement.

Recruitment

To date one comrade has been recruited directly out of our work in the women's liberation movement, specifically around the work of WUAR. Our intervention and its successes to date have enhanced recruitment possibilities, both among women in the women's liberation movement, and others who are not in that movement but follow its development.

A periphery is being built through our work and we are generally considered the leading tendency in the movement. We are identified primarily as the principal builders of the mass-action, left wing of the women's liberation movement. Our current tasks are to expand our activities and to consolidate a periphery and make recruits to the revolutionary party and youth.

NEW YORK 1970 ELECTION CAMPAIGN REPORT

by Mike Arnall

Through the 1970 campaign the ideas of our movement have reached more people than at any other time in many years. New York's candidates have spoken on nearly every major campus in the state, dozens of smaller ones, and at many schools and rallies outside New York. The candidates and campaign spokesmen have brought our ideas to no less than 59,000 people at meetings and rallies and to literally millions more on radio and television.

As a result of campaign tours and followup work, the new Long Island and Utica locals have been formed, and a former local in Albany has been re-constituted. In New York City, ten YSAers have been recruited directly as campaign endorsers, and many more have been influenced by the campaign to join the YSA.

The campaign has produced 155,000 printed leaflets and brochures, 80,000 stickers, 9,000 posters, 8,200 buttons, 60,600 miscellaneous printed items (endorser cards, stationery, etc.) and 220,000 mimeographed leaflets on every topic from high school rights to the crisis in transportation and housing to the Arab revolution.

Through June 30 the campaign raised over \$10,000.00. Of that figure, 30% represents direct contributions, 22% represents fundraising benefits, 13% represents literature and button sales, 11% represents \$1.50 per month levies paid by each member of the YSA and SWP, and 7% represents honorariums. While raising this amount was a major accomplishment, there is no doubt that even more money will be raised in future months with one improvement in the campaign operation. All the categories, but especially contributions, honorariums, and literature sales, will yield significantly more money simply because a single comrade on the staff will have as his major assignment the financial management of the campaign. Just as in any branch, financial opportunities slip by, proper contact with contributors is not maintained, and money is not raised during political upsurges if no one is in central charge of fund management.

As of June 30 we had 1,181 endorsers and campaign contacts distributed throughout the New York area with significant numbers in New Jersey and other states as well. Prominent supporters of the campaign include: Myrna Lamb, author of The Mod Donna; Prof. Melvin Leiman, Harpur College; Louis Sicilia, New Yorkers for Abortion Law Repeal; Anselma dell'Olio, founder of the New Feminist Theater; Jack Rothschild, businessman; Rev. Kenneth Sherman, Buffalo political activist; Ruth Gage-Colby, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; Andrew Schoenholtz, Jewish Peace Fellowship; Evelyn Frankford, N.Y. Radical Feminists;

Carl Nichols, ex-N.Y. State Chairman, Black Panther Party; Harriet Sachs, National Organization of Social Workers; Janice Pratt, National Organization for Women; and Wayne Dugger, Earth Day Committee of SUNY at New Paltz; Hector Flores, Young Lords Party; and Andy Stromberg, President, Graduate Student Body, Yeshiva University.

Fewer than one half of the endorsers are in colleges and high schools. This imbalance is a reflection of the New York City YSA's very small campus base. The steps necessary to enlarge that base are now in progress. The campaign's ability to reach proportionately more campus activists will be improved as we progress, and, of course the campaign will be one of the primary tools the branch and local will use in the process.

Predictably the largest campus concentrations are on those campuses where there are YSA fractions or locals, with Harpur College (75), SUNY at Albany (38), New York University (24) and Bard College (18) leading. There are 65 high school endorsers.

While only 122 people listed themselves as "Young Socialists" in support of the campaign, 449 are "Women" endorsers. One of the primary tasks for the fall activity is the opening of a women's support group. Through the candidates' work in the women's movement and the campaign women's liberation classes, we have a periphery of women supporters who view the campaign as an excellent means to build the movement around the correct demands, educate about the necessity of mass, independent action, and counter bourgeois political figures trying to drain the strength of the movement into their own election campaigns.

More discussion of endorser activity follows under the appropriate sections.

Third World Campaign Activity

Clifton DeBerry's upstate New York tour enabled our ideas on Black control of the Black community to reach many Third World student groups. Key activists from Syracuse and Utica endorsed the campaign and subsequently invited Miguel Padilla to speak to their groups. Two youth groups in Harlem, the Harlem Youth Federation and the Third World Revolutionists, have endorsed the campaign, and the Revelationists are composing a skit to dramatize the role of the Black political party in the struggle for Black control of the Black community.

Clifton went to Augusta, Georgia with Linda Jenness to investigate the police killings there, and on his return reported his findings to a meeting of New York City endorsers, to meetings of

several Black student organizations, and on two Black radio stations.

Miguel toured Puerto Rico in May and spoke to MPI and FUPI activists. This tour and his experience at the Chicano Youth Liberation Conference will form the core of talks to be given during the fall tours.

The Paul Boutelle campaign in Harlem's 18th Congressional District opens yet another avenue to counterposing the formation of a Black party to the "New Politics" of liberal Black Democrats like Charles Rangel, Adam Clayton Powell, Herman Badillo, and Shirley Chisholm. Campaign endorsers are working with the candidates and community groups in Harlem to set up a series of "meet-the-candidate" rallies, where all the candidates for office in Harlem will be invited.

Major efforts to involve Third World campaign endorsers in building the October 31 antiwar demonstration have already begun.

Antiwar Campaign Activity

On panels and at rallies, Kipp Dawson publicly confronted Governor Nelson Rockefeller and "peace" candidates Richard Ottinger, Paul O'Dwyer, and Bella Abzug on their views on Vietnam. Mrs. Abzug, candidate for the 19th Congressional District, has publicly and angrily claimed that the SWP campaign is "following" her.

A major axis of Kipp's and Clifton's March tours of upstate New York was to build April 15. During the tours, Kipp helped build a student strike then going on at SUNY at Albany, and Clifton worked with antiwar activists in Utica to plan their successful April 15 march and rally.

During the May events, the candidates spoke to thousands of students in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island. Ruthann Miller toured the Syracuse region of New York and worked with students at Hamilton-Kirkland College to build their strike there. Campaign endorsers sold the May issues of The Militant and manned literature tables at campuses and at candidates' speaking engagements. Campaign endorsers on two campuses also arranged a series of liberation classes for the candidates.

On Long Island, Hedda Garza's name became a household word during May. In addition to being a scheduled speaker at several rallies, she was usually added to the agenda at any meeting she attended. At Nassau Community College, she participated in the strike and used her press time to expose the school administration's attempts to undercut the students' struggle.

Women's Liberation Campaign Activity

Ruthann Miller was the coordinator of the March 28 People to Abolish Abortion Laws rally in New York City. She participated in building the August 1 Women's Abortion Project demonstration against administrative restrictions designed to prevent the implementation of the liberalized New York abortion law. She is the New York City coordinator of the August 26 National Women's Strike. A member of Redstockings, she and Kipp Dawson have been invited by radio and television interviewers in major cities to speak on women's liberation. Both candidates have participated in the two New York City meetings of the Congress to Unite Women, and in the second of them confronted Bella Abzug as she attempted to secure the endorsement of that group for her campaign.

One of the most successful projects on this side of the campaign has been the classes sponsored by the women supporters of the campaign. [See Party Builder Vol.VI, No. 2.]

Other Campaign Activity

During the upsurge in the New York high school rights movement, the campaign was able to intervene in a leadership capacity. Miguel Padilla spoke at several meetings of high school activists and was finally co-opted, along with two other non-high school campaign supporters, onto the official citywide student government subcommittee which drafted the High School Bill of Rights. At a Board of Education hearing on the Bill, Miguel was cheered several times as he gave unqualified support to the Bill and labeled the Board racist, paternalistic and undemocratic.

The campaign has intervened in the defense of the Arab revolution in five states and Washington, D.C. Jon Rothschild, the main campaign spokesman in this area, has debated many opponents of the Palestinian struggle for liberation, including the national vice-chairman of the Socialist Party and a spokesman for the Brooklyn College Hillel Foundation.

Candidates were invited to speak at many Environmental Teach-ins. On April 22, the campaign supporters intervened in New York City's mammoth Earth Day. The campaign booth sold \$700.00 worth of literature, including 1,000 black balloons with the slogan "Capitalism Fouls Things Up" on them. The balloons were mentioned many times in the press and on radio. After April 22, it was a common sight to see one of our ecology buttons on the lapel of a passer-by.

During the recent air pollution crisis in New York, the campaign held a

press conference in front of the Con Edison building in New York City. Campaign supporters offered a "breath of fresh air" from a tank of oxygen to onlookers, sold Militants, and passed out campaign literature. Kipp's talk on ecology is one of the campaign's most popular, and at Hunter College her remarks on the bourgeois politicians' answers to the pollution problem made fellow panelist Richard Ottinger squirm -- to the cheers of the student audience.

Media

To date the campaign has accumulated 17 hours and 19 minutes of radio and TV time:

	<u>Radio</u>	<u>TV</u>	<u>Total</u>
News Spots	14 min	22 min	36 min
Editorials	35 min	3 min	38 min
Interviews	12hr35min	3hr30min	16hr15min
Total	13hr24min	3hr55min	17hr19min

Approximately one-half of the interview time was acquired on the tours in the upstate region. The other is "equal time," mainly in the New York City area. Approximately three-fourths of the news spot time was obtained outside of New York City. All of the editorial time was gotten in New York City within the last six weeks when we have waged an organized campaign to answer as many editorials as we could.

Having an organized approach, constantly finding ways of reminding comrades of the importance of radio and TV time, and since the primaries putting a fulltime person in this assignment, have yielded excellent results. While a suave, experienced approach in developing media contacts is desirable when trying to get "inherent interest" coverage, only a knowledge of FCC regulations, daily searching of the papers, and persistence in pinning down program directors is necessary to obtain "equal time" coverage. It is the latter which will constitute the bulk of what candidates receive, at least in the large cities. Everyone who deals with the media in a campaign should get the FCC Rules and Regulations Part 73, Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act, and the FCC's "Use of Broadcast Facilities by Candidates for Public Office" reprinted from the Federal Register, Vol. 31, Number 86, Part II, dated May 4, 1966.

Editorials are constantly played on radio and TV and letting them slip by is unprofessional. While candidates cannot answer because of equal time provisions, a campaign supporter can. Usually the station will allow the supporter to give the address and phone number of the campaign headquarters. We receive as many mail and phone inquiries (average of 6) after a two-minute editorial played 8 times as we do after a half-hour candidate interview. Even though most editorials go unanswered,

the station will resist getting into a constant dialogue with the SWP campaign. However, one editorial reply per station every month or six weeks is what we estimate the New York campaign will get.

Call-in shows (not reflected in the above chart) are another avenue of access to the media. These shows are on at all hours, deal with political topics, and have audiences of thousands of all ages. At a political crisis point particularly it is worthwhile for candidates and supporters to get on these shows with our views. Many ploys can be used to get on for a length of time and to start a real exchange with the show host or other callers. One is for the caller to say he wants to read an article from the paper and get the host to comment on it. A Militant article on women's liberation or The war or the economic situation can be the basis of a long political exchange.

In New York City the press has covered most of our major news conferences. We use the time-honored system of delivering by hand the press announcements to all the important newspapers and stations, then following up with calls to see if someone is assigned. Also, any reporter or editor who has any contact with the campaign thereafter gets all our press releases.

In New York our press releases have gotten the least coverage. Our best means of getting coverage when we have a position statement is to have a candidate call it in to a radio or TV station for a news broadcast.

In addition the candidates have been interviewed in many papers in upstate cities and on campuses throughout the state. Women's liberation has been the angle for getting "inherent interest" interviews in New York City. The New York Times interviewed Ruthann and Coronet magazine interviewed both Ruthann and Kipp.

The Communist Party

After the Democratic primary, the CP announced their slate of four candidates. José Stevens, running in the 18th Congressional District, announced at the opening press conference that he would drop out of the race if a "progressive people's coalition" would field a candidate. At the time, Adam Clayton Powell, the incumbent, who had been defeated in the primary by Charles Rangel, was trying to pull together a group of supporters to back his "independent" candidacy. Harlem rent strike organizer Jesse Gray, backed by the CP and also defeated in the primary, finally joined Powell's campaign.

The CP would like to be able to support this coalition of would-be Democrats and thereby guide as many radicalized or disaffected Black voters as possible back into the Democratic Party. Stevens' main requirement for CP support

was that the coalition have a working class "core" (not "program" or even "base"). Presumably this could mean as little as having a few CPers involved in the campaign and including the CP's major reformist demands in the coalition program. However, Powell is still a strong political force in Harlem, and therefore does not need the CP to mount a strong campaign. Thus, there is little reason to believe that the coalition, dominated by Powell (even in his occasional role as insurgent against the party machine), will give the CP enough left cover to withdraw their own candidate. Whatever course they take, our campaign has already begun to counter them. Miguel Padilla has debated José Stevens on a Black radio station, and further radio appearances and public meetings are planned.

While offering to support the people's coalitions, the CP, in the same breath, is urging Daily World readers to vote CP this year. The reason that they give is that last year's votes for Lindsay were wasted -- he would have won anyway! CPer Sarah Jones writes that "there have been and may very well be times when it is vital to vote for the 'lesser evil.'" But this year they want to get 50,000 votes, so that they can be on the ballot in 1972 "without the labor of getting signatures." By the time the New York SWP campaign had gotten 21,000 signatures for the statewide slate and finished most of the paperwork, the CP had only gotten 5,000 signatures!

More important though is the political pressure of our campaign on their forces. Our movement's campaign to expose them in their back-handed support to capitalist politicians has led them to back up and this year encourage their members to vote CP.

Through its former Freedom and Peace activists and some independents the CP is also trying to revive a Freedom and Peace type formation. Called "People's Platform," the group has held several meetings to organize a program and perhaps candidates for the 1970 elections. The meetings have been dominated by CPers and YWLLers.

Fair Ballot Committee

The fair ballot fight is an integral part of our campaign. The candidates attempt to discuss the case and its political ramifications in their speeches and media appearances.

One of the effects of the present stage of the radicalization is that civil liberties issues receive support from sources which have been since the mid-1940's relatively dry. We expected in New York that we would receive support from many radicals and liberals of prominent reputation. We proceeded to consolidate them as endorsers of the coalition asking three, David McReynolds, Ruth Gage-Colby, and Luis Fuentes to be the officers.

We were so successful in this attempt that we decided to try to get support from several NDC-type candidates. We composed a letter protesting Governor Rockefeller's and Attorney General Lefkowitz's role in opposing our case to liberalize the election laws, asked the candidates to sign and also to become endorsers of the coalition. (See The Militant of July 17, 1970.) One by one these politicians signed the letter, in good part to differentiate themselves from the Republican incumbents. Finally, we got all of the statewide Democratic slate to sign the letter. Other bourgeois politicians also signed, including Republican Senator Charles Goodell, considered by all to be a "Rockefeller man." Two of the politicians, Richard Ottinger and Jesse Gray, did become sponsors of the coalition, but the letter was the tactic which gained us support we had not expected. We released this letter to the media and were able to add even more coverage to what was already a well-publicized case.

The next step we took was to approach the Democratic Party clubs in New York City to get their leaders' permission to do informational fund mailings to the membership. The response was overwhelming, the leaders of the reform clubs agreeing to send the mailings out at their expense and allowing us to make oral presentations at their meetings.

The case has been ruled on favorably at two levels of the court system and now awaits a US Supreme Court hearing in October. By publicizing the Rockefeller administration's heavy-handed attempt to defeat the case, we will win further support and financial contributions. In October, when the case is heard, we will make a large offensive to get media coverage, capitalizing whenever we can on the fact that interest will be high on campaign-related issues.

1970 NEW YORK STATE CAMPAIGN FINANCIAL REPORT

January 5 - June 30

Income

	<u>Jan</u>	<u>Feb</u>	<u>March</u>	<u>April</u>	<u>May</u>	<u>June</u>	<u>Total</u>
Honorariums	---	48.10	167.80	301.65	320.00	50.00	887.55
\$1.50/mo. levy	78.50	146.50	260.50	130.00	284.35	363.50	1263.35
Contributions	605.50	897.46	585.80	183.75	124.86	739.40	3136.77
Benefits	6.00	754.22	116.00	586.06	205.21	736.07	2403.56
Lit/Buttons	1.00	70.80	108.28	914.85	231.63	189.43	1515.99
Miscellaneous	23.08	135.41	51.57	133.08	42.50	20.50	406.14
Loans	110.00	5.00	40.00	320.50	570.00	---	1045.50
Total	824.08	2057.49	1329.95	2569.89	1778.55	2098.90	10,658.86

* * *

Expenses

	<u>Jan</u>	<u>Feb</u>	<u>March</u>	<u>April</u>	<u>May</u>	<u>June</u>	<u>Total</u>
Candidate/staff expenses	300.00	1000.00	425.00	1541.00	470.00	1973.00	5709.00
Lit/Buttons	---	229.49	117.90	300.00	---	---	647.39
Travel	.60	281.51	221.01	224.75	145.50	196.01	1069.38
Phone	---	---	86.52	---	---	9.95	96.47
Benefits	34.90	254.10	45.50	346.14	61.48	178.20	920.32
Stamps	68.00	112.90	47.00	132.94	132.00	169.92	662.76
Office supplies	18.36	6.93	21.20	15.50	8.50	18.81	89.30
Miscellaneous	108.55	74.28	37.44	282.35	56.95	125.30	684.87
Loans	---	45.00	---	122.85	10.00	---	177.85
Total	530.41	2004.21	1001.57	2965.53	884.43	2671.19	10,057.34

Total Income	\$10,658.86
Total Expenses	<u>10,057.34</u>
Balance	\$ <u>601.52</u>
Money Owed to Campaign	\$ 3084.85
Balance on hand	<u>601.52</u>
Total Assets	\$ <u>3686.37</u>
Bills Campaign Owes	\$ 3811.14
Loans Campaign Owes	<u>867.65</u>
Total Debt	\$ <u>4678.79</u>
Total Debt	\$ 4678.79
Total Assets	<u>3686.37</u>
Deficit	\$ <u>992.42</u>

AN ELECTORAL ORGANIZATIONAL METHOD WE SHOULD CONSIDER

by Joe Johnson

La Raza Unida Party of Colorado is using an election campaign organizational method that has proven to be of great value. With some modifications it could be extremely helpful to our election work.

La Raza's campaign organizer, Priscilla Salazar, pointed out in an early news conference that La Raza Unida would not be having just one nominating convention like the Republican and Democratic parties in Colorado, but rather would have a whole series of nominating conventions in every city and area where there was Chicano support. They have had nominating convention meetings in Pueblo, Denver, Alamosa and Ft. Collins as of July 24, and more are planned. These "conventions" have been very successful with a constant gain in size and militancy.

These nominating conventions have also produced a lot of publicity for La Raza Unida. Each convention was given big coverage in the local papers and, generally, statewide as well. The militant Chicano party has thus received almost as much if not more publicity than the Republican and Democratic parties because of the "many convention" method.

The SWP should consider the possibility of using the many convention method in its electoral work. No mistake should be made about these nominating conventions. They are not the convention of a Leninist democratic-centralist organization, where basic program is hammered out after a full internal discussion, etc., etc. But rather, these nominating conventions are more like mass rallies of the party where an already formulated program is put forward in popular form. And they are given wide coverage by the capitalist press because they are called nominating conventions and are organized "like" the capitalist parties' nominating conventions.

In the SWP the many convention method of nominating could be used on two levels. First, statewide, where there are a number of YSA locals and party branches in one state (happily a growing situation). California, New York, Ohio, Illinois and Washington state come to mind (many more should be possible before 1972). Second, on a national level where whole states take the place of cities.

These nominating conventions should be widely and nationally advertised (as well as telling the national press that we are going to do it -- you know, tell them you are going to do it, do it, and then tell them you have done it!). National and local candidates (it's not always necessary to have the presidential and vice-presidential candidates at the conventions to speak, for they may and can be on other national or international tours), should be featured speakers at these conventions. For example, the nominating convention in Minneapolis for the state of Minnesota may have a keynote speaker from the state of California as well as the speeches of the candidates for statewide office from Minnesota; the presidential and vice-presidential candidates would come through on national tours at another time.

The SWP at this time has, in addition to its strength of correct program, some new organizational strengths. We are stronger in more areas than any other party or political grouping outside of the capitalist parties. We must use these new strengths. The "many nominating conventions" can be one way of using and showing to the world our wide geographical support. While showing our broad US-wide strength this organizational method must be centralized from the national office in order to succeed -- this ability to centralize is also one of our great strengths.

NEW YORK MILITANT LABOR FORUM REPORT

by Sara Johnston

The weekly New York Militant Labor Forum has been an important party institution since the late 1950's. The gradual development of the Militant Labor Forum into what it is now -- the only consistent weekly forum in New York for the expression of radical ideas and questions in the movement -- is closely linked with the growth and expansion of our party. In keeping with the deepening radicalization taking place and our increasing role in many areas of struggle, there are new opportunities for expanding the size of forums and for utilizing speakers from a broader milieu. It is our responsibility to take full advantage of these opportunities.

An analysis of forums in New York during the last six months (January through June, 1970) revealed too much inconsistency in the building of weekly forums. The attendance at forums had been noticeably subject to change, alternating from a low of 55 people to a high of 135. The attendance of independents, understandably, varied a great deal. But the sporadic attendance of comrades was even more startling. The number of comrades attending ranged anywhere from 12 to 65.

This analysis, having pinpointed a series of correctable problems, revealed the need for a well-functioning forum committee that would not only come up with projected ideas for forums, but would also be made up of people who could play a role in the building of these forums. Such a committee has recently been formed consisting of ten comrades: two very experienced party comrades, representatives of the women's liberation, antiwar, Third World and high school fractions, two comrades who play a role in leaflet composition and mailings, and the YSA and SWP forum directors. A team of this type is proving to be quite successful.

The fraction representation is extremely helpful in providing a well-rounded forum program covering the important political questions in each area of our work. To be most effective, the topics of forums should coincide with the needs of the fractions and current political questions.

The fraction representative also plays a role in gearing his or her fraction into building all forums, but most specifically the forum dealing in that area of work. This is being done by means of regularized leaflet distribution in key areas, extra forum mailings to key contacts and paste-ups.

The two experienced party members play an important role in the forum committee. By helping to provide for a full discussion on ideas and in helping to sift out the most important topics

for forums.

The forum leaflet composition is handled by two comrades, one with obvious artistic talent who is responsible for the electro-stencil mock-up, and another who is able to keep a large amount of well mimeographed leaflets ready for distribution at all times and to help put out the regular forum mailing.

The SWP forum director is responsible for 1) reporting the tentative schedule to the branch executive committee for their and the branch's consideration and approval, 2) making the necessary arrangements for speakers at the forums, 3) keeping up the necessary correspondence with contacts for speaking engagements, 4) and coordinating the forum committee by making sure that all areas of building the forums are being done.

The YSA forum director's role is to politically motivate the forums in the YSA meetings and to involve YSA comrades in leaflet distribution, etc.

One of the first things the committee dealt with was the character of the forums themselves. A larger layer of speakers outside our party is willing to participate in debates and symposiums. Three main types of effective forums were discussed: 1) forums with a comrade giving the presentation; 2) forums utilizing prominent speakers outside of our party; 3) debates and symposiums using both comrades and outside speakers. After thorough discussion we agreed that a mixing of these types of forums, leaning somewhat heavily toward the debates and symposiums, would provide for an effective series of forums. It was strongly felt that debates were generally most effective because of their ability to draw not only comrades, but whole layers of people interested in hearing an exchange of ideas.

Weekly political motivation in both the branch and YSA meetings, along with the involvement of fractions in the actual building of the forums has greatly increased the participation of comrades from an average during the last six months of 36 to an average of 75 in the last month.

The average total attendance at the forums has also grown qualitatively from the six month average of 94. The average attendance at the forums since the inception of the forum committee, although for only the month of July, has been 166.

The increase in attendance of non-comrades is due to a number of factors: 1) publicity has been increased, with consistent usage of free announcements in local papers; 2) paste-ups being done

every week 5 to 7 days before each forum along with regularized leafleting in areas receptive to radical ideas. The topic of a forum is an important consideration in deciding additional leafleting and paste-up areas for that week; 3) additional mailings to key contacts besides the regular forum mailing; 4) the forum mailing list is now being constantly evaluated, weeded out, and replenished with a new list of names; 5) comrades being generally more conscious of bringing not only themselves but contacts.

Financially the gains brought in by these weekly forums have been in the area

of \$1,000.00 during the last six months, a very positive aspect of the forums' functioning. As a result the projected increase in the size of forums carries with it an increase in the income for the branch's budget.

Usually the attendance at forums during the summer months declines somewhat in contrast to months when campuses are open. The success of the summer forum series, resulting from the implementation of the forum committee, points toward an extremely successful series for the fall and throughout the rest of the year.

DENVER ANTIWAR REPORT

by Al Rosenthal

Immediately after the May events, we saw the old coalition, the Rocky Mountain Peace Action Council (RMPAC), heir to the Colorado New Mobe, as the focus of our antiwar work. It soon became clear, however, that the student activists who built the May demonstration of 20,000 as well as the new layers of antiwar militants, who were at first attracted to RMPAC, were drifting away.

There were two interrelated causes for this. Student participation in RMPAC was on an individual basis -- there were no student groups to carry out RMPAC decisions on the campuses. Strike leaders hesitated to form even strike committees on their own campuses during the upsurge. With the exception of Metropolitan State College (where we have a YSA comrade), our size, our lack of campus comrades, and the absence of even one fulltimer prohibited our forming SMC chapters or antiwar committees on the college and high school campuses.

RMPAC soon became the familiar organization of a dozen veterans of old antiwar actions who had failed to take a role in the May events. As such, it was useless.

The branch decided that the best course of action would be to contact all the real antiwar leaders in the area and feel them out on the question of a fall regional conference. Such a conference we projected as including the new student and labor antiwar activists, endorsing the fall action proposal that we anticipated would come out of Cleveland, and forming a viable coalition which would affiliate with the national coalition being put together in Cleveland.

The responses so far have been excellent. The major antiwar leaders, along with the Crusade for Justice and La Raza Unida heads, are enthusiastic about such a conference and the idea of October 31. We plan to hold our first "provisional steering committee" meeting this coming week to build for the conference.

Labor participation in the conference and October 31 remains a question mark. During early and mid-June several meetings with labor leaders sympathetic to the antiwar movement occurred. We pointed out that the Cleveland conference would probably endorse a fall action proposal and some persons indicated support for such a course.

The head of the Colorado AFL-CIO, who previously helped us out getting in touch with antiwar unionists, is solidly enmeshed in the Democratic Party. Seeing October 31 as conflicting with electioneering for liberal Democrats, he will oppose October 31 and use the bureaucratic machinery to counterpose "peace politics" to mass action. Nevertheless, a few significant labor leaders can be expected to endorse the action.

Our intervention in the labor movement this summer will take the form of attempting to put through AFSCME-type resolutions in the unions, linking up such actions with the fall conference and October 31. Our hope is to mobilize enough labor antiwar activists to bring a significant participation to the fall conference. We have a YSA trade unionist whose major assignment is carrying out this work.

A perspective such as the one outlined above entails not having an August 6-8 action, which could only come about as a result of the sole efforts of the branch and YSA local. It does not necessitate neglecting the Chicano Moratorium, since several mailings will be going out in the next few weeks which can include notices of and leaflets for this action. In addition, our comrades at the Boulder campus will be building for the Moratorium.

The indications are that the Crusade for Justice and La Raza Unida will participate in the conference and fall action.

BOBER TOUR: REPORT AND EVALUATION

by Berta Langston

Late last fall, the party decided it would be politically advantageous if we cooperated with other forces and individuals in an effort to bring Arie Bober or some other spokesman of the Israeli Socialist Organization to the United States for an extended speaking tour. With the heightening of tensions in the Middle East, interest in the area was becoming more widespread, extending beyond radical circles. It was felt that a tour by an anti-Zionist Israeli would be an effective means of reaching this more general audience as well as strengthening and informing the already considerable sentiment in support of the Palestinian liberation movement among radicalizing youth. That rarity in this country -- an Israeli Jew who opposed Zionism -- was bound to be able to get a wider hearing than radical US speakers can. Further, his first-hand knowledge and experience would lend authority to his criticism of Zionism and his exposé of US-Israeli complicity, and his background would make it more difficult for the Zionists to discount his analysis as "Arab propaganda" or to write it off as "anti-Semitism." In addition, the tour could lay the groundwork for defense efforts in the not unlikely event that the Israeli authorities undertook massive repressive action against the only anti-Zionist organization in Israel.

The goal of the project -- to influence the largest possible audience regarding a particular issue -- determined its form: a committee with broad sponsorship and clearly, narrowly delimited aims. Such a committee can gain the widest possible hearing and attract the widest possible spectrum of support from individuals who hold divergent and even conflicting views on many issues but who agree with the basic proposition of the committee.

As is true of all such formations, there are various levels of agreement and commitment among the sponsors and supporters of the Committee on New Alternatives in the Middle East. Some are pure civil libertarians, concerned about the actual limitations on freedom of speech imposed by the pro-Zionist media. Some are partisans of the Arab revolution. Most, no doubt, fall somewhere in between. But all have their own reasons for supporting such a committee.

We also have our reasons for supporting such an undertaking. It offers the opportunity to reach a wider audience with ideas important to us than we could reach by ourselves. It gives greater access to the funds necessary to finance such a tour. When -- as is often the case -- we do most of the actual organizational work, it brings us into contact with individuals we could not reach in any other way, many of whom will be ready to work

with us in future activities and some of whom are potential recruits to Trotskyism. Moreover, the work we carry on in such committees wins us the respect of broad layers as organizers and builders.

When we collaborate with such a committee, we do so with the expectation that we will have to do most of the work. The responsibility for the success of the committee will fall largely on us. In general, the committee's sponsors will have neither the time, inclination nor ability to do much of the actual organizational work. So we assume the obligation to do it when we decide to collaborate in such an undertaking.

Because we have the reputation for scrupulous handling of funds in such committees and of never using them as "fronts" the way the CP, PL, YAWF, etc., do by sneaking in extraneous issues and committing sponsors to statements and actions which go beyond the stated and limited aims and to which they never agreed, the individuals with whom we first discussed the suggestion that a committee be formed to tour Bober responded with enthusiasm. Noam Chomsky wrote a letter inviting sponsorship of CONAME which was sent to some 100 prominent individuals, many of them Jewish. Much to our gratified surprise, more than 50 responded favorably. We had anticipated some change in attitude among independent intellectuals, paralleling the general shift among radical students on the Middle East issue, but we had not expected the change would be so marked. It was an encouraging indication of the kind of reception Bober would receive.

Once the committee was established, the real work began -- organizing the tour, securing speaking engagements and honorariums, publicity, building meetings. In view of the considerable interest manifested when the tour was first announced -- some \$500.00 in honorariums was secured as a direct result of a single form letter mailed to various university departments selected almost randomly -- it might well have been possible to arrange a financially successful tour without substantial participation by SWP and YSA locals. But a politically successful tour -- one that spoke to activists and mobilized partisan attitudes -- was impossible without our initiative at the local level. As the main purpose of the committee was to stimulate an ongoing discussion, not simply to edify academicians and scholars, it was practically necessary for us to arrange and organize the bulk of the speaking engagements.

Although it has been several years since we participated in such a relatively large-scale tour (the last one was

the Alexander Defense Committee's tour of Franz Lee in 1966) it is certain not to be the last. And the experiences of the Bober tour can be, and should be, examined not only for their value for the future tours of this kind but also for more limited tours.

Bober toured from April 1 to July 10. The center is still lacking reports from two cities; at least four other reports did not contain all the information needed, so the following statistics are not final.

Some 6,500 people attended 42 campus meetings, 21 community meetings and seven receptions. Audience size ranged from 20 to 300. Millions of people were exposed to Bober's views through eight TV interviews (including the coast-to-coast "Today" show) and nine radio interviews. There were nine news conferences, with uneven results; at least, the reports on them were uneven. The most significant press coverage so far has been three excellent pieces by the Boston Globe's columnist, David Deitch. Articles have also appeared in a number of "underground" papers including the Great Speckled Bird and the Liberated Guardian, as well as in a number of campus papers. The Associated Press put out a fairly long -- and accurate -- story following the New York City press conference. Although none of the New York papers carried the story, we have received clippings from several papers around the country and the English language Egyptian newspaper in Cairo. Several interviews have still to be published. One major bourgeois publisher has indicated serious interest in a book by Bober.

Perhaps the most revealing indication of the impact of the tour is the repercussions within Israel and from the Zionist oriented groups and press here. A full scale attack against the ISO and Bober is being waged in the Israeli press, with frequent articles deploring the freedom permitted Bober to spread "anti-Israeli" views in the US. A bill is now being considered by a key Knesset committee which would permit revocation of the citizenship of any Israeli who "slanders" the state abroad. Since the Israeli government fully appreciates the conclusions world public opinion would draw about "the only democracy in the Middle East" if the bill were passed, it will probably be defeated at this time. Apparently what has driven the Israeli ruling class up the wall is Bober's impact on Jewish Americans, especially young Jews.

The US Socialist Party's pro-Zionist Youth Committee for Peace and Democracy in the Middle East has attacked CONAME, its sponsors, Bober, and the SWP-YSA in the pages of New America and in the August issue of Commentary, the leading journal of the intellectual Jewish establishment in this country. And reports from the branches confirm that the fears of the Israeli and US Zionists are not unfounded:

one of the most successful aspects of Bober's visit has been his influence on young Jewish radicals. Several applied for membership in the YSA following Bober's speech. His talks intensified the doubts and uneasiness about Zionism and the Israeli state prevalent among radical Jewish youth.

Our crucial role in organizing the tour helped to solidify our relationship with Arab students. They recognized and very much appreciated our role in the tour. A number have expressed hopes and even proposed that this kind of work will continue and be expanded.

Perhaps the largest layer of people who evinced serious interest in the tour came from the general antiwar movement. This was true especially toward the end of the tour after hostilities erupted in Jordan and the administration made increasingly frequent noises about possible US intervention in the Middle East. These antiwar activists felt that their knowledge of the Middle East -- which they considered likely to become the next big trouble area -- was at best inadequate. Many were vaguely "anti-Israel" only because of US support to Israel. Bober received a number of invitations to speak before "peace councils" and other groups that had, up to then, concentrated their attention solely on the war in Vietnam.

This interest in the struggle in the Middle East was not confined to students and young people, although they comprised the largest section. In New York a number of non-campus groups who in the past had remained impervious to requests for speaking engagements from various committees we were involved in, virtually battered down the door in their zeal to arrange meetings for Bober.

The intense interest in the Middle East can perhaps best be seen by the response in New York. We had serious misgivings about the possibility of arranging a successful tour in New York during late June and early July -- relatively few students attend summer sessions, funds for honorariums are unavailable, and most non-campus organizations simply close down for the summer. So it was with a good deal of trepidation that we set out to try to secure a few speaking engagements that might also, hopefully, produce a few dollars.

As it developed, the most difficult chore was not in cajoling various groups to sponsor meetings, but rather in remaining firm in the decision to spare an exhausted Bober by refusing sometimes tempting speaking engagements. (We remained firm unless the honorarium offered was substantial enough to make a dent in our deficit, in which case Bober and we agreed it was in the best interest of all to accept.)

The New York tour ran from June 7 to

July 10 (with five days out for a speaking tour in Boston). Because I am more familiar with the New York tour than any other, and because it was longer than the others, I want to into a little detail about it to indicate the range of interest and response. The following were the New York meetings:

American Humanist Society -- 75 (figures indicate audience size); NBC-TV Today Show, 15-minute interview; WCBS, 30-minute radio interview; Columbia University, sponsored by the New University Conference, SDS(PL), YSA, SMC, CONAME -- 275; Reception, sponsored by Carey MacWilliams (Nation editor), Murray Kempton, Rashed Hussein (Palestinian poet) and Kennet Love for journalists and writers -- 40; Debate with leading spokesman of the Jewish Liberation Project -- 200; American Committee for Middle East Understanding (National Council of Churches) luncheon -- 40; New School for Social Research, sponsored by Sociology Department -- 100; Press conferences attended by AP, UPI, Reuters, Channel 5-TV, New York Times, Tass, The Militant, International Socialists; CONAME meeting at the Church Center for the United Nations -- 150; Great Neck Forum -- 250; Syracuse, New York, sponsored by the Syracuse Peace Council and International Student Club of Syracuse University -- 150; Militant Labor Forum -- 225 (largest forum this year); Videotape of debate at Nassau Community College -- to be shown to all classes; New York University, sponsored by the New University Conference, Strike Coordinating Committee, YSA, SMC, CONAME -- 225-250; WBAI -- 30-minute radio interview on Dave Gelber show; branch educational; Ethical Culture Society -- 200; Liberation School in New Haven -- 300; Appearance on WMCA-radio Barry Gray show.

In addition there were individual interviews with reporters from the National Observer, Liberated Guardian, The Militant, Liberation News Service, Guardian and Ramparts. Squeezed into this not-overcrowded schedule were several private receptions and interviews, meetings with groups of Israelis, supporters of the Palestinian liberation movement, new-left formations, anarchists, antiwar activists of various organizations, anti-Zionist groups, etc. In the course of these meetings, formal and informal, CONAME representatives met a large number of influential individuals in Jewish organizations, Arab groups, campus clubs, antiwar committees, community groups, new-left circles, and civil liberties groups, as well as a number of prominent writers and media people, many of whom may prove valuable allies in the future.

Audience size at most of the meetings far exceeded the expectations of the sponsors. At many, there was standing-room-only; at several, people had to be turned away.

If only from the rather ludicrous and frantic reaction of other tendencies, we could judge the tour a significant political success. At the Columbia meeting, for example, SDS(PL) was pushed into sponsorship by the Arab students and a Palestinian faculty member with whom they had established a firm relationship. The PLers apparently were unaware of Bober's views when they agreed to help organize the meeting. Bober's talk in general, and specifically a reference to Trotsky, made them aware of their error. In their effort to correct the faux pas, the PLers entered into a bit of spontaneous "revolutionary" competition with other assorted Maoists present and vied with each other as to who would be the loudest in denouncing the ISO as a Zionist, petty-bourgeois organization which worked among students instead of workers.

In general, our work in support of the Bober tour enabled us to get a hearing among groups of people previously inaccessible to us, many of whom are potential recruits; it opened up areas for continuing fruitful political activity; it enhanced our standing with Arab groups; it once again impressed the radical movement with our ability to carry off an action.

Nevertheless, there were some major deficiencies in the tour, some unavoidable, but some due to errors that reduced the effectiveness of the tour and caused a serious financial problem.

The Kent-Cambodia-Jackson events erupted in the middle of the tour and resulted in the cancellation of a number of meetings and loss of some honorariums. Pressure from Zionist sources was much more intense than the pressure usually encountered in such tours, and it resulted in the loss of some potentially lucrative speaking engagements.

But it is important to remember some of the mistakes we made, and to draw the lessons from them so they can be avoided in the future.

The tour, which we quite reasonably anticipated would produce a substantial financial surplus for the committee, has instead, to date, produced a substantial debt. In addition, the political impact could have been significantly greater than it in fact was.

Perhaps the two most widespread and easily avoidable errors were:

1) Most areas did not attempt to secure speaking engagements and honorariums until the tour was almost upon them;

2) in many cases, efforts to build meetings were inadequate.

To organize a successful tour in an area does not require the commitment of substantial forces for an extended period. It does, however, require close attention and advance preparation. Most campus and community organizations have limited funds for honorariums, which they usually allocate early in the semester or season. If one comrade is assigned for a week or so a couple of months in advance of the arrival of the speaker to energetically pursue possibilities of honorarium-paying meetings, the financial quota can be met and intensive work on the tour is then unnecessary until a couple of weeks before the speaker arrives. This early pursuit of paying meetings itself generates interest and, often, publicity, as well as establishing valuable political contacts.

Then, a couple of weeks before the tour actually begins in the area, work on building it should start. There should be an intensive effort to break into the media, public meetings should be publicized, and informal meetings with important contacts should be arranged.

An attempt should always be made to get as many organizations as possible to co-sponsor meetings in order to maximize audiences and income. At the same time, though, we should never rely solely on any other organization or individual to build these meetings. They should be urged and helped to do so, but in the last analysis our own forces are the only ones we can fully depend on. Work in building meetings, of course, gives us the political benefit of being recognized as the builders of the tour.

Each branch and local should assign someone to work on the tour and he or she has to be supported, advised and helped by the branch organizer and executive committee, who should always keep abreast of the progress in preparations for the tour. This is especially important when

the tour coordinator is inexperienced in this kind of work.

Furthermore, the tour coordinator should keep in close contact with the national tour coordinator. Letters from the center should be answered promptly, and tour reports and proceeds should be sent to the center immediately after the tour.

In this connection, everyone should remember that long-distance telephone calls are expensive and usually unnecessary. CONAME's phone bill was \$600.00; much of this communication could have been carried out by mail.

At the beginning of the organization of a national tour, financial quotas are accepted by the localities. This is a serious obligation. If for any reason it appears that an area will not be able to fulfill the quota, the center should be notified immediately. If an area discovers that the financial prospects are not as good as was initially believed, it may be necessary to reschedule some parts of the tour. This is an additional reason why serious attention must be given to the tour announcement as soon as it arrives and efforts to secure honorariums should begin at once.

An extended national tour is a major project -- and offers a major opportunity -- for the party and youth. It should not be regarded as a routine matter or as an onerous burden added to an already heavy workload. Rather, it should be viewed as a unique chance to reach out to layers that cannot be reached otherwise, to consolidate gains, to demonstrate the party's and youth's capabilities, and to generally advance our propaganda work. High priority must therefore be given to it, for we cannot make the maximum possible gains if it is handled in a perfunctory or routine way.

EDUCATION: NEW MEMBER THROUGH CADRE

by Marian E. Thelen, Boston

Our rapid expansion over the past year or more and our perspective of continued recruitment have left our old system of education obsolete. It is no longer sufficient to have educationals for all YSA comrades with the YSA meetings and educational for all SWP comrades with the branch meetings. We currently seem to have two major problems in education: we have not clearly defined our priorities; and we lack educationals for the more advanced comrades. The structure suggested below is not a curriculum for ten years of education. It is presented as a basic schema which comrades could use to clarify some of the current confusion and to involve comrades at all educational levels in learning about our movement.

The four suggested educational levels should not be viewed as strictly chronological. Which classes a comrade would attend would be determined jointly by himself and the head of the educational committee, the organizer, or whichever comrade the local puts in charge of this. Generally all new members would be expected to attend the new members classes, but they could certainly attend also the fundamentals of Trotskyism classes. There would probably be a great deal of overlap between the fundamentals of Trotskyism classes and the problems of history and current events; and between the problems of history and current events and study groups.

These classes are specifically for a major YSA and SWP center. Areas which have new YSA locals and/or in which there is no party branch would have to emphasize the new members and fundamentals classes and have the others only if they have the resources.

This structure does not include contact classes. They should be on "What Is Marxism and the YSA." This includes the basic works of our movement, our program on the major issues of the day, and general discussion of the world. However, whatever sort of contact classes the local has would not change these suggestions for education of comrades. Even if some of the same works or topics are discussed in the new members or fundamentals of Trotskyism classes, comrades at this level will still benefit greatly from learning more about these subjects.

Classes should not be held at the same time as the YSA and SWP business meetings if it is possible to avoid it. Most comrades do not have the patience to concentrate on both a class and a meeting in a short time. Also, there are innumerable fraction meetings and discussions of a few comrades which take place around the business meetings and often prevent comrades from attending classes. However, if it is necessary to schedule some of the classes around the

meetings, the fundamentals of Trotskyism classes should be before the YSA meetings and the problems of history and current events educationals should be before the party meetings. A large number of YSA comrades may be attending these latter classes, and they should be able to know exactly when they will start.

This structure does not involve the summer school. It is projected only for the school year. The new members classes should be continued all year. Also, any comrades who wish to start or continue study groups in the summer should be encouraged.

Level I -- New Members Class

Orientation to the YSA. These classes would be to give comrades a basic idea of the YSA's program and organizational principles. A sort of survey course in the YSA. These educationals should be taught by comrades who are quite familiar with the material and who know how to explain our politics in simple terms at the same time making it interesting. These should not be used to train comrades to give classes. Some possible topics would be:

- Socialism on Trial
- Marxist economics
- Dialectical materialism
- The Fourth International -- Transitional Program
- The Fourth International -- Colonial, Political, and Social Revolutions
- Black and Chicano struggles
- Women and the family
- Vietnam and the antiwar movement
- Organizing the YSA

Some of these topics could well require more than one educational.

Suggested Readings: Socialism on Trial, Introduction to Marxist Economics, Introduction to the Logic of Marxism, Transitional Program, Dynamics of World Revolution Today, Case for an Independent Black Party, Problems of Women's Liberation, Vietnam and World Revolution, Organizing the YSA.

Level II -- Intermediate YSA Classes

Fundamentals of Trotskyism. The purpose of these educationals is to give comrades a working knowledge of the theory and history of the international Trotskyist movement. They must be oriented at the same time to theory, history, and to questions which comrades face in their daily work. These really are not separable. An understanding of Left Wing Communism, State and Revolution, Marxist economics, Black liberation, the nature of the Second International, the degeneration of the Soviet state, women's liberation, and the Fourth International is

what comrades need in their daily activity. While questions of current importance can be brought up in these educationals, their purpose is to transmit to new comrades 120 years of revolutionary socialist experience. The series should run throughout the school year. It should be divided into general areas each of which would include several classes. Suggested topics, material to be covered, and reading:

A. Marxist classics: Communist Manifesto, State and Revolution, What is to be Done?, Wage, Labor and Capital, Value, Price and Profit, Anti-Duhring, etc.

B. The Russian Revolution and the Internationals: Europe and the First International; the Second International; the Bolshevik Party -- history and nature; the opponent tendencies in Russia before and after the Revolution; Russia 1900-1917 (1905); February revolution; February to October; the civil war and war communism; the Communist International -- founding and philosophy; development and bases of the bureaucracy; Lenin's relationship with the bureaucracy; Trotsky's political disagreements with the bureaucracy and anti-Trotskyism; degeneration of the Soviet state and the Comintern; Chinese revolution; German revolution; Trotsky's exile; Spanish civil war; Hitler takes power; World War II; Founding and program of the Fourth International; Chinese Revolution of 1948; Europe after the War; Split and reunification of the Fourth International.

Suggested Readings: Trotsky, History of the Russian Revolution, Permanent Revolution, Revolution Betrayed, The New Course, Critique of Fundamentals of the Draft Program of the Communist International, Whither France?, German pamphlets, Transitional Program; Other authors: Reform and Revolution, From Lenin to Stalin, World Revolution, Documents of the Fourth International.

C. American Trotskyism: Background -- 19th century, SLP, SP, IWW, International Workingmen's Association, effect of the Russian Revolution, Communist parties, Left Opposition and expulsion, 1930's -- CIO and the Minneapolis strikes, Musteites, Socialist Party, formation of the SWP, Minneapolis trial, Burnham-Schactman-Abern split, post-war strike wave, reaction of the 1950's, Cochran split, formation of the YSA, Wohlforthites, Spartacists, history of the YSA, the 1960's.

Suggested Readings: First Ten Years of American Communism, History of American Trotskyism, Struggle for a Proletarian Party, In Defense of Marxism, etc.

D. Black and Third World: History and analysis of the position of oppressed nationalities in the US; Colonial revolutions and their significance; Cuba; Vietnam; Malcolm X; Why a socialist revolution for Blacks and Chicanos.

Suggested Readings: Malcolm X, Leon Trotsky on Black Nationalism and Self-Determination, Critical Remarks on the National Question (Lenin).

E. Women's liberation: History of women and society; the current struggle; why socialist revolution is necessary to end women's oppression.

Suggested Readings: Engels, etc.

F. Opposition tendencies today -- history, program, strategy: FL; the old SDS; Wohlforthites; Spartacists; RYM; Ultraleftists.

Suggested Readings: mostly their documents and press.

Level III -- Advanced YSA and SWP

Problems of history and current events. These are individual educationals or short series on current events, questions of strategy, and historical events which have not been covered before but are important. The purpose of these educationals is to build on the fundamentals of Trotskyism a wide-ranging understanding of the world -- past and present. There should be several types of subjects: historical -- Paris Commune, Zimmerwald, Indonesia, Chinese revolution, etc; strategy -- the protective laws for women, the Hatfield bill, defense of the movement; current events -- Palestine, strike wave in Italy, Northern Ireland. These classes should be taught by comrades who have a special interest in and knowledge of a field.

Suggested Readings: to be assigned by teacher.

Level IV -- Advanced SWP

Study groups on specific works or topics. These would be serious discussions, in depth, to have comrades become experts on some area of work. The groups could be led by a comrade very familiar with the topic. The groups could last from a month to several months depending on the comrades and the topics. Examples of this type of group: Capital; Mandel's Treatise; Trotsky's History; the causes of the degeneration of the Soviet state; Paris Commune; transition from feudalism to capitalism; dialectical materialism.