

sds new left notes



Vol. 5 No. 7 LESS TALK, MORE ACTION -- FIGHT RACISM December 10, 1969

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
BOSTON, MASS.
PERMIT NO. 51395

MICHIGAN ST. UNIV. LIBRARIES
SERIALS DEPT.
EAST LANSING MICH 48823



7500 SUPPORT G.E. WORKERS

by John Pennington, National Secretary

SDS led about 7500 people during the Moratorium/New Mobe 'peace' rally in Washington and held a militant and spirited demonstration in front of GE's Washington office, the Department of Labor. Chants such as 'US Out of Vietnam, Support the GE Workers', 'Warmaker, Strikebreaker, Smash GE', and 'No Negotiations, US Get Out Now' echoed in the first national demonstration to clearly link the anti-war movement with the struggles of working people in the United States. In San Francisco over 600 people held a similar demonstration in front of GE's office there.

The War and GE

The nationwide strike of 147,000 GE workers is a real blow to the big businessmen who profit from the war. GE is a gigantic, worldwide corporation with 115 foreign subsidiaries -- which aren't on strike. Cheap labor in shops like these is exactly what GE and other companies are fighting this war to protect. This strike is a greater blow to US rulers than any action the anti-war movement has taken; and the workers know it and aren't swallowing any of the bosses' talk about 'national interest'. In order to build a movement with the real strength to get the US out of Vietnam (not to mention Laos, Cambodia, etc.) we as students in the anti-war movement must build an alliance with the GE workers, and the rest of the US working class -- for working people have the greatest power and need for such a movement. The demonstration at the Department of Labor was vital because it alone in Washington pointed to the need for this alliance.

Why the Politicians Now Call for 'Peace'

The rulers are united around one strategy -- making the highest possible profits; but they have tactical differences about how to do it. Thus, the liberal rulers are now calling for 'negotiations' as a tactic to allow US domination of Vietnam. None of them say that the US should not have a presence in Vietnam, and all of them reaffirm they want to maintain US 'interests' in Southeast Asia. Some want to remove troops from Vietnam only in order to shift them around to Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, etc., to better protect these 'interests'.

The liberal rulers, politicians, and university administrators built the Moratorium/New Mobe in order to sidetrack the growing anti-war sentiment -- in order to obscure what's behind the war. They are trying to build pacifism and the idea that the 'bad guys' (i.e. conservatives like Nixon) made the 'mistake' of getting the US in Vietnam and that they will stop this 'insanity'. A look at history shows that liberals and conservatives alike backed US involvement from the beginning -- the only 'peace' guys like McGovern, McCarthy, etc., want is that 'peace' they've wanted all along -- the peaceful exploitation of working people here in the US and in Vietnam.

The proof in the pudding came out clearly when SDS began arranging for the demonstration at the Department of Labor. We were told by the Washington Police that all permits had to be ob-

tained through the New Mobilization Steering Committee (which included a representative from the 'Revolutionary' Youth Movement II), and this committee decided to give SDS nothing -- no permit, no housing or movement center -- although they made their resources available to every other group in town from Weatherman to Women's Strike for Peace.

We visited the Mobe to ask for reconsideration; they weren't inflexible. THEY OFFERED US HOUSING AND A MOVEMENT CENTER IF WE WOULD CALL OFF OUR DEMONSTRATION AT THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, ISSUE A STATEMENT OF COMPLETE SUPPORT FOR THEM, AND ACCEPT A SEAT ON THEIR STEERING COMMITTEE! We refused.

The complete press blackout of our demonstration from the New York Times to the 'radical' Guardian makes clear that the rulers and their flunkies recognized the importance of our demonstration. We were running the gauntlet when we carried it out. No permit -- over 5000 Mobe marshalls
cont. on page 3

National Council
in
New Haven
See p.3

Students Battle Racist UCLA--see p. 4

Thousands Support GE Workers



Crowd in front of Labor Dept. before demo...



soon swelled to thousands...



militancy grew...



police provocation produces its desired effect

News Roundup...

ccny

Students in the CWSA at City College of New York boycotted one of the school's two cafeterias on Nov. 12 to demand full holiday pay for cafeteria workers, something which was a strike issue last year. The cafeteria, which normally feeds 2000 a day, was shut tight. The campaign at City is accelerating; a broader boycott is planned for early December.

chicago

An SDS picket line was set up outside the cafeteria at U of Illinois Chicago Circle recently. Students were demanding the firing of a racist supervisor in the medical center cafeteria. This supervisor constantly harassed black workers, five of whom were forced to transfer out of the department in the last three months. A good response was received from students, many of whom hadn't know about the issue. Business was cut in half. The administration showed how scared they were by keeping plainclothes cops nearby all day. They hassled students and even threatened arrests. Our chant was: 'Racism attacks unity -- unity smashes racism'.

holy cross

On Nov. 19, SDS prevented the Marines from recruiting at Holy Cross. Previously, due to threatened action, the college had withdrawn the invitation to recruit. Nonetheless, on the morning of the 19th, it was learned that the Marines were in fact on campus and were planning to recruit secretly.

Plans for blocking the recruiter were resumed, on emergency notice, and some 70 SDSers marched on the Naval ROTC headquarters and confronted the recruiters in the office of the commandant, where they were being concealed. The students demanded that they leave, and escorted them off campus.

A campus-wide discussion on the general subject of recruitment and American foreign policy followed, at which SDS reaffirmed its position of blocking the GE recruiters who are scheduled to be on campus Wed., Dec. 10th. Base-building work is being done for that struggle.

by Vito Trimarco
Stephen Maurer

BU SDS SITS IN

About 75 students seized the Boston University Administration building on December 8th demanding: that no GE recruiters be allowed on campus; that injunctions against students fighting GE recruiters be lifted; that all charges be dropped against those arrested in previous militant demonstrations against GE; and that the university sponsored conference on "business in the Ghetto" December 16th be cancelled. Students remained in the building overnight, and support increased steadily. By Tuesday afternoon, however, students voted to leave the building, since they couldn't build for smashing the racist conference if they were all occupying a building. The departure from their offices was only a small comfort to the deans since the campaign has repeatedly held meetings of over 1,000, and there is growing support for SDS's demands supporting GE workers.

north carolina

The strike of black cafeteria workers at UNC is still going on after over three weeks. On Friday, Nov. 21, the full-time workers voted by nearly four to one to affiliate with AFSCME (American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees). The following Monday a group of students, faculty and townspeople issued a demand that the university either force Saga Food Services to come to terms with the workers or terminate their contract. The university's answer (and interests) became obvious the next day -- a picket line of workers and students from UNC and the Malcolm X Liberation University was brutally attacked by the police; four students were arrested and held on charges that changed hourly. Three of the four were released on a bond of \$9700. Wednesday, November 26, the university sought a court injunction to prevent six student leaders and 500 John Does from coming on or in the vicinity of the campus for the duration of this 'action'.

The newly formed SDS chapter at UNC has begun to provide militant leadership for students in this fight. On Wednesday, Dec. 3, a rally sponsored by the Committee to Support the Workers was held. The rally, about 350 strong, led to a march of workers and students to the Administration Building. An SDSer led the group inside; many followed, while the rest picketed outside. Twenty people then decided to sit in, including a union organizer, SDSers, and other students. While chanting and singing, the sit-inners were told that they would all be arrested for violation of the Trustees' Disruption policy. This was met with cheers and jeers. We then decided to leave, and went chanting to the Consolidated University Headquarters. The building was locked just before we arrived; after milling around in the parking lot for a few minutes, we were arrested by Chief Beaumont, head of campus security. Asked to give a speech, Beaumont replied through his bullhorn, 'Ya know, I'm underpaid too.' At this point, many workers and students threw pennies at him.

The SDS National Interim Committee was in the process of urging a nationwide boycott of Saga Food Services when news came of the strike's settlement. The company and the university seem to have capitulated to all the demands, which include promotion from the ranks of black workers, regular pay increases, elimination of split shifts, re-instatement and continued employment of all striking workers, basic job security, two week-ends off per month. The one possible exception is the demand for a base pay of \$2.25, which Saga promises to start in February.

One of the key reasons for this victory seems to be the concrete alliance built between the striking black workers and black students in the area. One of the leaders of the union drive had issued a call in defiance of the injunction for 3000 black students from all over North Carolina to come to the campus in support of the strike on Monday, December 8. Between 500 and 1000 black students came. The threat of this worker-student alliance obviously had a lot to do with the settlement reached that night. This is something there needs to be a lot more of!

berkeley

At UC-Berkeley, SDS has been trying to build a movement to fight the racism in the campus cafeteria. 80 out of 90 workers there are black and all face speed-up, harassment, bad pay and few benefits (like no unemployment insurance). In the last few months workers who have retired, been laid off or quit have not been replaced. In the dishroom, until the end of summer quarter there were two full-time dishwashers. One quit at the end of August. Now there is only one man left with the work. This black worker makes \$2.56 an hour.

SDS has been building a struggle around the demands, 'hire another dishwasher -- end speed-up'. So far we have had two rallies, informational picket lines outside the cafeteria, a march to the administration building and a march to the chancellor's office. The effect of these actions on the workers has been very positive.

BUILD FOR THE NATIONAL COUNCIL

SDS is growing fast and solidly. In the past few months we've led more campaigns around the country than any previous fall. At various schools we're allying with campus workers, fighting ROTC, police institutes, GE recruiters, supporting strikes, and carrying anti-imperialist, anti-racist ideas to students in the classroom. In Washington we led 7500 people in the first national demonstration to link the struggles of working people in the United States to the fight of the Vietnamese.

It is in this context that the upcoming National Council (NC) meeting must be seen. The NC is the 'major policy-making body' of SDS (SDS Constitution); as such, it will largely determine the direction of the organization. It is one of the few times that large numbers of students from all over the country with different ideas and different experiences can get together and try to develop programs for SDS. Relating theory to different people's practical experiences provides the basis for formulating new ideas. Discussions should cover the war, campus worker-student alliance, racism, male chauvinism, the working class, drugs, etc. The NC provides people with a concentrated opportunity to find out what SDS is about and really affect its direction.

The National Interim Committee suggested that the NC be four days, divided into an educational

G.E. (cont.)

continually yelling at people in the 'peace' rally to stay seated -- cops and troops in virtually every building in the area -- could not prevent a picket line of several hundred from starting at 3:00 and growing to between seven and eight thousand at the height of our rally. It was tremendously spirited as were the three speeches which were followed by a chant: 'Rely on the Workers, Not the Mobe; Workers' Power Circles the Globe!'

And just as we were beginning to leave the area a weatherman/cop in the crowd threw a rock through the main window. The cops inside the building started to come out and then waited about five minutes as if waiting for a signal. We continued to leave, and then the cops came out in force -- making sure people moved back from the building into the street. People stuck together and their spirit was militant in the face of this threat, slowly retreating to the other side of the street. And not a moment too soon -- just as the street

conference and a formal resolution-passing National Council meeting. The educational conference -- the first two and a half days -- would mainly consist of workshops (20 to 25 people), giving people a chance to raise their ideas and questions and allowing pretty thorough political discussion. This educational conference would form the basis for a plenary session to consider resolutions and organizational business, and pass programs for SDS.

Not unexpectedly, the rulers recognize what a tremendous opportunity the NC is to further the rapidly growing pro-working class student movement, and consequently have made it pretty difficult to find a place. One SDSer who talked to an assistant dean at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor was virtually assured that the school would be available. A few days later he was told that the higher-ups had vetoed the whole thing, and that he would be 'surprised to know the role the government plays in the running of these colleges'. Apparently the word was spread around by someone because we've been turned down or given the run-around for weeks at a large number of places. Now they've promised us Yale 'for sure'. (We couldn't find any place in the midwest.) Perhaps Yale President Brewster is trying to regain his liberal image after trying to suspend 45 students for fighting to rehire a black campus worker.

opened up, the Yippie/RYM march on the Justice Department swept down from the 'peace' rally, 'mysteriously' leaving almost an hour ahead of schedule.

What might have happened if we had kept the rally going a while longer is that we would have been between the cops and the Yippie/RYM leadership, and some weatherman/cops could have picked a few fights while some others threw rocks through windows and then the uniformed cops would have come out to break up the demonstration and the next day's headlines around the country would have VIOLENCE OF QUARRELLING S.D.S. FACTIONS MARS NATION'S LARGEST PEACE GATHERING!!!

Things didn't work out for the rulers this way, so they were forced to keep quiet about our demonstration. We should take this as a tremendous victory! They had to keep quiet because this demonstration made clear that SDS is alive and kicking harder than ever, contrary to what the media have been saying about us since last June's convention. And they had to keep quiet to preserve the idea

Chapters should initiate membership drives and elect delegates (one for every five national members) or make plans to vote by caucus of those present. Proposals the NIC knew of deal with: Campus Worker-Student Alliance and the War; Racism; Male Chauvinism; and Drugs. A resolution will be introduced on the GE strike as well. Some chapters are already writing up discussion papers for the NC and New Left Notes. Facilities will be available for mimeographing proposals which don't arrive until the last minute. If possible, however, people should send resolutions, etc., in to the national headquarters by Dec. 20th. If people can print up copies of discussion papers on their own it would be easier -- run off at least 2000. We can't promise to mail everyone copies beforehand because Christmas mails may mean they'll never get them.

The NIC decided to hold a second National Council meeting next month on the west coast due to the tremendous financial burden it would be for people who weren't delegates to come all the way to the east coast. As many people from the west as possible should come to New Haven, but it was felt that a second NC around the end of January would involve at least twice as many west coast people, and a fair number of people from the east would be able to make it as well.

Register at Woolsey Hall, Yale University. For information, call 203/432-1826.

that the anti-war movement is something irrelevant to working people.

Of course, they said plenty about the Justice Department action. This 'demonstration' was a set-up. With a permit it arrived at Justice, whereupon no one attempted to give it any leadership, not even to give one short speech. Police rebuffed a few people who took down the US flag. And finally a few other people (the weathermen come in handy in all situations) threw some rocks through windows and the cops systematically loaded the whole area with teargas and then moved on to other areas where people had gathered after the day's activities. The 'radicals' got everyone gassed and that's what kind of alternative they are, a lot of gas -- is what the papers said. The leadership of this demonstration didn't seem to have anything in mind except creating this situation.

Seizing the Initiative

Our approach to the rulers' bid for the movement was to seize the initiative in Washington,

cont. on p. 10

IRANIAN STUDENT ASSOCIATION-PRESS RELEASE

The National Interim Committee extended fraternal greetings to the Iranian Student Association last September. Since then we have co-sponsored two demonstrations with them (in New York and San Francisco) against the Shah and US imperialism.

The secret police of Iran, 'Savak', commits new murders against Iranian people every day. During the past year, the police terror has been intensified by the mass murder of Kurdish patriots in the western part of Iran, arrests of several political groups, and arrangement of secret military trials. Savak has now extended its campaign of terror beyond the borders of Iran, intimidating members of the Iranian student organizations around the world. The following is a list of the employment of this new tactic.

1. Arresting and questioning of students who return home from abroad during summer vacation and threatening them in various ways to stop them from engaging in political activities.

2. Oppression of the families of students who are active in the Iranian student movement outside of Iran.

3. Imprisonment and trial of some students who have been active in anti-government activities, upon their arrival in Iran.

4. Collaboration of the police of western countries with Savak to oppress the Iranian students who are politically active in the country they reside in. The following are examples of this:

- an order to close down the Iranian students association in Vienna by Austrian police
- an order of deportation for Bahman Nirouman, a secretary of the confederation, which was reversed
- an order by the Austrian police for the deportation of Esmail Salem, an active member of the Viennese students union
- decision of Austrian police to deport three Iranian students because of their participation in a march against the war in Viet-Nam
- prosecution of several Iranian students who demonstrated against the Shah's visit to Germany in 1967
- prosecution of three Iranian students who participated in the protest against the Shah's visit to the US in October 1969
- oppression of the members of the Iranian Students Association in the US by immigration authorities
- renewal of student visas for three months, instead of the usual six, in Italy

All of these actions taken by the police and authorities in other countries have been within the framework of collaboration with the Iranian secret police, Savak. They are at the further oppression of the Iranian people who are fighting against imperialism and feudalism in Iran. The Confederation of Iranian Students is asking all progressive forces to join in the campaign to fight the reactionary attacks of the Iranian government against its movement.

Germany, Nov. 7, 1969

NIC BLASTS RACIST ATTACK

The SDS National Interim Committee condemns the cold-blooded murder of Fred Hampton by Chicago police, and the vicious attack on Los Angeles offices of the Black Panther Party. These racist attacks by the government are an attempt to convince black people that they can't fight back and to increase the racism of whites.

To oppose these racist attacks, to protest is not enough. The most serious answer is for us to escalate efforts to build an anti-racist, anti-imperialist movement, a movement that opposes the racist oppression of black people. Black people are attacked all the time as campus workers, as potential victims of university expansion, through ROTC and racist courses, etc.

Hypocritical liberals, in and out of government, have set up a chorus 'bemoaning' the attacks. These liberals never fought racism. In fact, they are tied to the government in a thousand ways -- directly or indirectly. The government guns down black people, and these liberals shed crocodile tears and try to use these murders as arguments for liberal fake cures like 'black cops', etc. Their job is to divert people's anger into liberal schemes that only disguise - and therefore aid - the imperialists who are attacking black people.

December 7, 1969

GROWING SDS NEEDS MONEY

We have had so many requests for new pamphlets, more New Left Notes, more buttons, posters, leaflets, speakers, etc. that we have to expand. We received \$10,000 in donations, memberships, and New Left Notes sales, in the past month! But the question of expanding SDS activities is a serious one. To build the National Council meetings, and to meet demands of a growing SDS, we want to raise \$15,000 more before Xmas. That means having membership drives, selling more New Left Notes, selling non-member subscriptions (now \$5) especially as Xmas gifts. Everyone could pledge something to SDS each month. Give a fund-raising party this week! We rely on the people to support SDS literature that should help people's struggles.

UCLA SDS Supports Black Worker

by Jim Prickett, UCLA, NIC

On November 19, the Asian Radical Movement (ARM), supported by SDS, occupied the office of \$25,000 a year boss Adolf Brugger, demanding that he rehire Charles Bargaineer, a militant black worker who had been fired for refusing to submit to racist harassment in the cafeteria. After an eight-hour sit-in during which Brugger postponed two appointments and made a variety of pseudo-concessions, the UCLA administration called the cops and had the demonstrators charged first with kidnapping (maximum sentence: the death penalty!) and later with false imprisonment and conspiracy to commit false imprisonment -- both felonies.

The demonstration is a significant breakthrough for the student movement at UCLA, and not merely because it is the largest mass arrest in the history of this campus. More important, it is the first time that students have been arrested fighting around concrete, pro-working class demands, and it was led by a militant third world group. But the fight is a long way from being won, mainly because of our own errors and shortcomings.

Building the Struggle

At the beginning of the quarter, two black people were fired by UCLA. One was a professor, whose firing lasted only a few days and who had the support of the administration, the faculty, the majority of the students, and even much of the press. The other, Charles Bargaineer, was ignored by everybody, including, at first, members of SDS. Our early response to the firing indicates that anti-working class feelings are still strong in SDS: our outrage and class hatred should have gotten us to contact Charles immediately, discuss a leaflet with him, and start the campaign. Our first leaflet appeared two weeks after the firing.

After we finally talked to Charles and got the first leaflet out, the campaign became our main focus. SDS circulated a petition, canvassed the dorms, held rallies, put out leaflets, and wrote an article for the Daily Bruin. We noted that the firing cut to the heart of the system of intimidation in the cafeteria: Charles was fired because he insisted on taking his legal break. And on the same day that Charles was fired for fighting back, a 65-year old woman was forced to work eight

straight hours without even a break for lunch. We also argued that fighting around this firing was the best way to fight racism. Black and brown working people are systematically kept down -- lowest paying jobs, lousiest working conditions, first fired, last hired, etc. This super-exploitation is the basis of racist ideas like black people are lazy, inferior, etc. While the ideas must be fought, the key to fighting racism lies in fighting this material super-exploitation of black and brown working people. And we pointed out that workers and students have a common enemy -- the big businessmen who own and run the factories and universities.

Although completely silent on our campaign to rehire Charles Bargaineer, the Daily Bruin (DB) carried a front page story on working conditions in the cafeteria. 17 out of 20 workers refused to talk to the DB, fearing that they would be fired. The DB's editorial came out against a wage increase, and called on the bosses to remedy conditions to forestall a 'nascent but growing rebellion' on the part of the workers.

Throughout the campaign, SDS was plagued by internal weaknesses. Several times we held marches through the cafeteria with only ten mem-

cont. on p. 10



On Friday, December 5th, the UCLA administration called a 'Grievance' Committee during work time for all cafeteria workers to 'air their grievances'. The workers knew that the 'Grievance' Committee was an attempt to channel their growing fight against the oppressive conditions in the cafeteria into a talk session that would accomplish NOTHING. Instead, the meeting, which lasted for four hours (through peak dinner hours) was turned into a real step towards organization by the workers. The phony 'Grievance' Committee, which told us it could do nothing about wages, was exposed for what it was -- a sop to keep workers in line.

Mexican workers, the majority of workers in the cafeteria, took leadership of the meeting, voting to admit students because students had fought on the side of workers. They fought the racist attack on the black and Mexican workers (unskilled, they deserve lower wages, etc.), and fought attempts by students to split the workers by saying that all honkies were not to be trusted. The Mexican workers said, 'We do not want to be divided along racial, sex, or age lines.' The workers called for a Worker-Student Alliance against the bosses. A Mexican worker said that the SDS and ARM (Asian Radical Movement) members who took part in the sit-in should be defended by all the workers because they were fighting for better conditions for workers and firing them would

hurt all the workers. He also said that if it weren't for the SDS and ARM agitation, the bosses never would have called the meeting.

Grievances were raised -- more demands than grievances. All sections of the workers participated. The low wages and the need for unemployment insurance were the main ones brought up.

The workers then told the man from the 'Grievance Committee' to stop chairing the meeting. They set up their own committee made up of six full-time workers and four part-time workers, including two SDS members. These student workers were elected on the basis of ties with workers and speeches supporting them in the meeting. The workers' committee will consult with the rest of the workers, determine all the demands, and act on them.

This is a real advance in the Campus Worker-Student Alliance. The workers have taken the lead in fighting the bosses and in fighting bad ideas like racism, male chauvinism (women spoke out and were represented on the committee) and other attempts to divide students from workers. They want students to fight with them against the bosses.

Although there were many political and tactical mistakes in our previous campaign, especially around the question of developing close ties with Charlie Bargaineer, the black worker fired earlier, the main results were excellent. Our determination has shown the workers that we are seri-

ous. We were surprised by the militancy and class-consciousness of the workers at the meeting -- our anti-working class attitudes run deep. Many of us thought the workers would fall for the 'Grievance Committee' as a real way out, or that workers would be afraid to fight. The opposite was the case -- they led in exposing the committee, even though they have more to lose (jobs) than we do.

Now we must make real ties with these workers, our allies. We must fight our own fear of the people, explaining to workers and students that the CWSA is an important step in defeating US imperialism. It is crucial that we co-ordinate our programs and tactics with the workers. If not, no matter what we say, it is not an alliance. We started by having a party the day after the meeting - for students and workers - where we got to know the workers better and discussed the campaign. But we still don't raise our ideas enough or spend enough time with the workers. We have gotten approval from the workers for new demands to fight over. People in SDS besides those who have campus jobs are beginning to meet the workers. This is a good start and must continue if the CWSA is to grow.

FIGHT RACISM! BUILD THE C.W.S.A.!

by Barbara Hertz, UCLA

Fordham Students Fight ROTC

by Chuck Dugan, Fordham

The movement to abolish ROTC at Fordham has been growing both in numbers and in political consciousness for the last four years. From a pacifist movement, objecting to the 'pure' university's 'taint' of conciliation with the colossal 'blunder' of Vietnam, it has come to see clearly the imperialist nature of the war and that ROTC isn't an exception to the university's 'neutrality' but simply a more blatant example of its function -- service to the small group of businessmen who benefit from the oppression of people at home and abroad. Militancy has increased as more and more students are becoming aware that the university administration is the enemy of the student movement and that it will not give in without a real fight.

fight racism

On November 12th, in the context of the SDS National Day of Action against Racism and Imperialism, over 100 students from the Committee to Abolish ROTC seized and barricaded the administration building's south wing which houses the offices of the university's top executives. We said that ROTC should be abolished because it is an important tool in the oppression of people around the world and ROTC-trained officers are used to put down the just rebellions of black people in this country. The administration immediately sealed off the building as a crowd of 200 students gathered in support, many of whom wanted to join us in the building. Two attempts by campus guards to break through the barricades were fought back before the administration announced that the city police were being called and any student who attempted to leave the building before they arrived would be picked up by the campus guards and turned over to the city police for arrest. It was decided to leave before the city cops arrived but to resist any attempts by the campus guards to turn us over to the police.

The result was a half hour battle between hundreds of students and the campus guards, leaving seventeen guards injured, six students arrested, and the administration in a fit of panic. The Dean of Students was so overcome with rage that he originally charged the students arrested with felonious assault, criminal mischief, inciting to riot, and criminal trespass -- three felonies and one misdemeanor. These charges were so blatantly absurd that he had to reduce them to one felony

and two misdemeanors. The administration has since obtained warrants for the arrest of sixteen more students.

The struggle had many good aspects. One was that it sharply raised the issue of the war and how the universities help it. This is especially important now that all the phony administrators who are fighting to keep ROTC, etc., claim they're for the Moratorium and 'peace'. Liberal politicians, businessmen and their cronies in the universities are trying desperately to divert the anti-war movement -- we can only defeat this by waging struggles on campus that concretely hurt their efforts to control Vietnam and oppress people everywhere and expose them for what they really are.

why militancy?

Another positive aspect of the struggle was that it enabled us to take a large step toward defeating pacifist ideas. Pacifism is one of the major weapons of the ruling class's latest ideological offensive against the student movement. Every congressional liberal who ever voted for arms appropriations for the imperialist army while leading marches 'against' the war is now telling the student movement that we must reject violence in all its forms. We feel that it is not violence in itself which is good or bad, nor is the initiator of violence always wrong and the defender always right. The question is: violence for what purpose? The violence of the Vietnamese people in overthrowing US imperialism and its Saigon puppets is justified. Likewise the rebellion of black people against their oppression and the violence of the student movement in fighting racism and imperialism are justified. It is US imperialism's violent exploitation and oppression of the people of the world that is wrong.

The administration tries to appeal to pacifism with lies about 'unarmed' guards and vicious, brutal demonstrators wielding lead pipes and buckets of scalding water. We have exposed pacifism as a weapon not of the people but of the enemies of the people. The members of Fordham's board of trustees, such as W.R. Grace and Mr. Olin of Olin Mathieson Corp., who run the university, need the organized violence of the police and the US Army to maintain their system of exploitation from which they reap huge profits every year. W.R. Grace has extensive land holdings

in South America while the peasants there don't have enough land to survive on. He needs the US Army to protect his property when those peasants rebel as they have done time and again. Mr. Olin recently found he needed the police to help break a strike of more than 2000 black workers at his Winchester arms and munitions plant in New Haven. It's no surprise that such men need the university to train Army officers and cops (Fordham is starting a new police institute).

major weakness: no cwsa

The struggle had one very serious weakness, the failure on the part of SDS to develop a campaign in support of the struggles of campus workers. Thus, while we said that we wanted to fight ROTC because it helped the ruling class tighten the screws on working people all over the world, especially in Vietnam, we failed to put that into practice right at home where the administration is exploiting workers in the University's cafeteria, offices, library and maintenance crew. Although some of us have jobs and talked to the few workers we know about the actions of the twelfth, that struggle took place basically in isolation from the day-to-day oppression that campus workers face at the hands of the same administration that is responsible for the presence of ROTC. This was an excellent opportunity to point out the connection between imperialism and the racist exploitation of workers, especially black and latin workers, here in the United States. However, since we hadn't begun to fight the exploitation of campus workers, we failed to make that connection in a forceful and concrete way.

Another result of this weakness was that SDS tended to submerge itself in the Committee to Abolish ROTC, in which we played a leading role. In other words, without an independent SDS campaign which could really demonstrate our pro-working class politics, SDS became merely the most militant and politically coherent group in the Committee to Abolish ROTC. That in itself is good, but not good enough.

The struggle against the Administration and ROTC must continue and grow even sharper, but the only way to build SDS on an unshakeable political basis is to build the Campus Worker-Student Alliance.

Merritt Action Supports Workers

by Mo Kaplan
Richard Cates
Larry Meyers

On November 4th, Merritt Junior College SDS had a rally inside the cafeteria in support of campus workers around demands of: No Unpaid Overtime, No Forced Overtime, Scheduled Breaks and a portable ramp and knobs for the stove on the snack bar.

Between 100 and 200 people participated in the rally, which began with an SDS speaker talking about campus working conditions. This was followed by speakers on Racism, the Administration, and Campus Worker-Student Alliance. The president of the school, a representative of the Boss (the School Board), approached the speaker's chair and was confronted with the facts of the brutal oppression and racism at Merritt. First Dr. Smith announced that 'this is an illegal rally' and everyone should leave the cafeteria and move out to the basketball courts to 'discuss the issue'. Our response was that everyone concerned (cafeteria workers, students, etc.) was there and he should answer the charges right there where the workers could hear.

Dr. Smith tried to separate workers and students. He told the cafeteria workers that if they had any grievances they could come up now individually and talk to him about them. We responded by saying that we would react in a mass way. Frustrated and defeated, Dr. Smith turned his back on the people in the cafeteria and walked out to the basketball courts alone.

75 to 100 angry SDS and CWSA supporters then proceeded to Dr. Smith's office where we confronted him with our demands for better working conditions.

Merritt College is a two year junior college located in the fringe of the North Oakland ghetto, eight minutes away from U of California-Berkeley. Of the 8976 students using a condemned, 18-year old high school building, roughly 45% are black, 40% white, and 2% chicano, all working class.

This quarter the SDS chapter began a fight against police science in an attempt to expose

the myth that Merritt 'serves the needs of the community'. However, we decided that it was important to build a pro-working class student movement (in practice), and to begin immediately! We decided that the best way to do this and to counter the effects of the recent attacks on SDS -- the Weathermen's assaults on the people and the liberal rulers' attempt to obscure the nature of the war and mislead the anti-war movement through the Moratorium -- was by allying with the workers on our campus. We felt that the objective conditions for a campus worker-student alliance (CWSA) were ripe at Merritt, and subsequent events bore this out.

Three SDSers had already been working in the cafeteria and snack bar. Through talking with campus workers, we soon began to learn of the miserable conditions that these workers faced every day. They are forced to work overtime because there are fewer employees this year than there were last year, but still the same amount of work. And this forced overtime is unauthorized by the Administration and therefore unpaid! There are twelve black women and six white women working in the cafeteria. Their low wages are a result of racism which

hurts all workers -- the low paying jobs that black people must take in order to survive enables the bosses to keep all workers' wages down.

The school's only woman matron is black and is forced to work up to two hours overtime without pay. She must clean all the women's restrooms plus the gym and do custodial work. The custodial work is the equivalent of any male custodian, but her 'classification' of matron means that she gets paid much less. Not only do the bosses make a lot of money from this super-exploitation, but it also has the effect of separating her from the male custodians. This means that the women and the male custodians can't fight effectively against the boss.

We talked to workers whenever possible about SDS and the CWSA. We told them that we wanted to put out a leaflet about their working conditions and hold a rally the following week. At first, the workers were hesitant and distrustful. But after

consistently talking with them, they saw that we were for real and not just playing games. They became more friendly and were quite responsive in discussing the leaflet and the idea of a rally to build support among students for their grievances. In fact, twenty workers we talked to liked the leaflet so much that they suggested we hold the rally in the cafeteria so they could hear it!

The leaflet also met with great success among students. Most were shocked by the conditions and felt that something should be done about them. The response was the most favorable ever received by an SDS leaflet on campus.

At the beginning of the quarter we viewed the CWSA as a long-term project, and this prevented us from implementing it correctly. We found out through practice that the CWSA is the clearest issue for exposing the workings of imperialism and fighting against the administration on the side of workers.

We still have a long way to go but we feel confident that the CWSA will be built by having faith in the people and daring to struggle and daring to win.



SDS supports campus workers

BASE-BUILDING

SDS Fights GE at Michigan State . . .

by Sarah Parker
Suzy Taylor Michigan State University

At Michigan State University in East Lansing on November 10 and 11, SDS picketed against a recruiter from General Electric. For three days prior to the demonstration, we leafleted the campus explaining that the recruiter was a scab and that we should support the GE workers by throwing him off campus. We demanded that the recruiter not recruit and that campus employees be granted a 7¢ wage increase. (The second demand came from the fact that the university was bargaining 'in good faith' behind closed doors over an unsettled wage demand from the strike of campus workers earlier in the fall.

On Monday we picketed and then moved into the placement center with about twenty supporters and twenty onlookers. The University had hidden the recruiter and so we went to Shingleton, head of the placement bureau, and demanded he tell us where the scab recruiter was. With four cops behind him, he said that he did not think the recruiter was a scab, nor did he recognize the strike. While we were chanting 'Workers yes, GE no, scab recruiter has got to go', the cops and Shingleton tried to move us away from his office. We resisted and fighting broke out. We broke through the cops and into the office, but decided that there wasn't much point in staying and left a note saying we'd be back the next day. After putting out another leaflet we returned the next afternoon to picket. The President of the University appeared and wanted to give a prepared speech. We shouted questions at him. He said we must not attack any workers or students. We pointed out that it was he who was attacking 147,000 workers and their families by allowing the recruiter on the campus. We did not allow him to say anything else, so he left, and we marched into the placement center. Unable to find the recruiter, we marched around the center once and then left to have a meeting to discuss the action.

The following day the student newspaper carried an editorial calling the workers in this country fat, rich, and powerful, and calling SDS a joke. But obviously the Administration did not think our attempt to build ties with working people was such a joke -- they had a student from

Central Michigan University who had come down to help and a student from MSU arrested on phony charges of assault and battery. A number of students were interested in seeing just how 'fat and rich' the workers were, so some of us went to Edmore where there is a GE plant -- the workers are on strike over 41 grievances. We told the workers about our struggle at MSU. They agreed that the recruiter was a scab, and they talked about how the press had distorted many of their own experiences. One student asked a worker if there were any black people there and he replied that there were five but 'GE does not like to hire them... and they have the worst jobs.' The workers are very determined and their unity is terrific; the picket lines and the union hall are tremendously well organized and well disciplined. They have a very clear understanding of what the struggle means and what they stand to win or lose. One of the other effects of the visits to Edmore is that of fighting cynicism among students. The workers' agreement with our action and their strength and unity in struggle is tremendously encouraging.

weaknesses in our approach

But our struggle is on campus, and so we sat down to evaluate the action and figure out what to do to continue the fight. The first question was why the action had not drawn more people. We think that this was in part due to all the bad publicity SDS has received over the past six months, the result of the Weathermen's antics around here (painting on walls) and in other parts of the country, like Chicago Oct. 8-11 (see NLN, 1 Nov 69). Another problem was our failure to clearly connect the fight against the GE recruiter with the fight against the war. The recruiter was on campus to recruit people who would continue the exploitative (and therefore profitable) activities of GE -- GE workers make on the average \$6500/year while GE makes billions in profits off their labor. The same men who run GE also have an interest in controlling Vietnam -- to exploit its cheap labor (the maximum wage in Saigon is \$1.40/day!) -- and it is these same men against whom the Vietnamese are rebelling. Because the main concern of most students is the war, it is a very serious

and arrogant mistake to not fully put forward and explain our position on the war and how the strike of the GE workers is part of the same fight being waged by the Vietnamese. Not explaining this connection resulted in the State News being able to say that SDS was off doing its thing while others were fighting against the war.

Another weakness of our work was that at first it lacked any mention of GE's racist practices. Racism is something much more than the idea that black people are inferior, or that they're lazy, or that they're savages, etc. All these ideas stem from the systematic oppression of black people, from the fact that, as the worker at Edmore said, black workers have the hardest time getting jobs and when they do, get the worst ones. The ideas that arise from this material basis (which provides over \$22 billion in profits for the bosses each year) divide the working class, pitting white against black. It is absolutely essential that racism be raised whenever possible and fought directly.

Overall, most think that the action was a progressive one. MSU SDS previously was very isolated. The action established our connection to the working class. It strengthened new people in many ways. The students saw who the cops were serving, and what kind of position the President of the University has and what he must do. The question of free speech was raised in terms of letting the President speak when there are 147,000 workers on strike and he is hiding a recruiter.

We are presently (Nov. 26) writing a leaflet to the Lansing community and campus workers explaining what happened in Washington and on campus. We hope to use this leaflet, especially on campus, to get to know campus workers and begin to build a campus worker-student alliance. We are continuing to go to Edmore and are bringing new people with us to talk to the strikers. A General Electric recruiter is returning on Jan. 29, and the trial will be coming up on Jan. 14, so we will probably be building around them both, especially to find the recruiter and throw him off this time. We are attending Moratorium meetings and other anti-war groups to find out what they are doing, and talk about imperialism, and get to know the people.

And at Boston University

by Don Arthur Vicki McCloskey Con Brown
Cheryl Christian Fred Fisher

On Tuesday, November 18, BU SDS organized a demonstration in support of the 147,000 striking GE workers. The purpose of this demonstration was to confront and expose Joseph Bertotti (manager of educational relations and recruiter for General Electric), who was the featured speaker at a BU-sponsored conference to discuss 'how and if business should recruit 'the critical generation'!

Following an SDS-sponsored 'speak out', 100 students marched to the conference room loudly chanting, 'WARMAKER, STRIKEBREAKER, SMASH G.E.!' and 'WORKERS YES! G.E. NO! BOSS BERTOTTI'S GOTTA GO!' As we attempted to crash through the police blockade at the conference, Staton Curtis, dean of student affairs, led an attack of Boston plainclothesmen on the rear of the group. Dean Bernard Meckel, mod-squad dean of students, attempted to hide among the demonstrators after he himself had called the police. The myth of deans acting in students' interests was successfully exposed as a number of students screamed together, 'Don't try to hide with the people now, Meckel. Stand with the pigs where you belong!'

At this point, the demonstrators marched outside to rally with 300-400 students who had been wary of entering the building because 30 more Boston police had arrived. The crowd voted to go back to confront Bertotti. Facing this new threat, the deans arranged to have two students question Bertotti and have his answers broadcast to the hundreds of students standing outside. However, BU-GE could not allow itself to be exposed. First, they sent an executive posing as Bertotti to divert our attention. Then, faced with students' exposing questions, they refused to turn on the microphones.

A week later another strike-breaking GE manager, Herbert H. Meyer, came to BU. Although it was the beginning of Thanksgiving Vacation, over 200 students took part in a demonstration attack-

ing Meyer in support of the GE strikers. We rallied outside the doors of the conference and as we turned away, were viciously attacked by more than 50 cops wielding both clubs and mace. Many people defended themselves; 24 were arrested and five seriously injured.

The Crimes of G.E.

We held these demonstrations to expose the crimes of GE. GE makes \$25,000 per year in sales receipts off each worker, yet the average employee receives only about \$6,500 of that a year.

Even the government has said that it takes \$10,000 a year for a family of four to live moderately. While the workers are demanding only that their wages keep abreast of the skyrocketing cost of living, the company is offering such a meager increase that workers' real wages will continue to fall. GE also wants to steal away the clause in their contract providing automatic wage increases in proportion to rises in the cost of living.

Like all bosses, GE uses racism and male chauvinism to divide workers and increase its profits. Black workers and women workers are

continued on p. 11



BU SDS SUPPORTS GE STRIKERS--FIGHTS GE RECRUITERS

The Song My Incident

page 7

by Ed Galloway, NIC

'US infantrymen have killed 128 communists in a bloody battle massacre.' With these words Stars and Stripes reported an event that more than a year and a half later was revealed for what it was -- a genocidal massacre of nearly an entire Vietnamese village. On March 16, 1968, US soldiers invaded and destroyed the village of Song My, killing over 500 unarmed Vietnamese. The only US casualty was a black soldier who shot himself in the foot to avoid participating in the slaughter.

High government officials, Senators, University administrators, the press, etc., all are shocked and outraged by the event. They claim that Song My is an accidental atrocity, an 'American Tragedy' (Time magazine), an 'isolated aberration' (Pentagon official), 'a single incident in a brutal war' (Newsweek).

Song My No Accident!

We disagree. The incident at Song My was not an accident but rather a continuation of America's policies in South Vietnam. One example of this policy was the strategic hamlet program initiated in 1965 in which whole hamlets were destroyed, the occupants moved into concentration camps, and those who resisted often shot. Another example of American policy in Vietnam was the destruction of Ben Tre, a city of 35,000, in February 1968. In this incident 85% of the city was destroyed, and thousands were killed. An army officer explained the action by saying 'We had to destroy Ben Tre in order to save it.' (Boston Globe, 17 Feb 68). All these incidents expose the nature of the war for what it is -- a genocidal war against the people of Vietnam.

Just as Song My is no 'accident', US involvement in Vietnam is no mistake. It has been a long standing policy: from the massive aid given to the French effort against the Vietnamese, to the creation of the dictatorial Diem regime, to massive troop intervention, the US has clearly and consistently acted to squash the attempts of the Vietnamese to fight their oppression.

America's presence in Vietnam is the result of its economic interest in keeping Vietnam and all of Southeast Asia open to American investment. American business needs both the resources and the cheap labor (maximum wage in Saigon is \$1.40 a day) of these areas to make large profits now and in the future. But the people of Vietnam have fought back against this last attempt to keep them in the slavery they have known for years. Because the vast majority of people in Vietnam are fighting to throw the US out, the government has been forced to 'destroy' in order to 'save'.

The Role of Liberals

Liberal politicians now are using the incident at Song My to try to blame the war on Nixon and other conservative 'hawks'. They try to pose the problem in terms of personalities and make the people think that the problem is evil men -- not the system that oppresses people around the world -- and that they are the ones who will bring 'peace'. But their long-standing support of the war (from the Gulf of Tonkin resolution to arms appropriations) and their proposed solutions give the lie to their crocodile tears. What the McGovern, McCarthys et al mean by 'peace' is the peaceful exploitation of the people of the world, the 'peace' that existed before the Vietnamese began fighting back against US business and its puppet landlords, when business could move into Southeast Asia with no resistance. It is a 'peace' that will free US troops to go to other 'hot spots' where other people are fighting back against their oppressors -- what, after all, is the purpose of 'Vietnamization' of the war but to enable the US to shift its troops to Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, etc.?

By pretending to be for 'peace', these liberals hope to obscure the fundamental fact that the war in Vietnam is the direct product of big business's need to find cheaper labor, raw materials and markets, and that they themselves are in fact part of the small group that benefits from imperialism. It is this small group of men who are responsible for Vietnam and all its Song My's.

But this in no sense relieves the men involved in the Song My massacre of their responsibility for what they did. While liberals try to hide their own responsibility by blaming the massacre on racist, kill-crazy GIs, we must not let the fact that they are the real cause excuse what those soldiers did. It was racist murder, plain and simple. When ordered to do such a thing, a GI can have only two decent responses: refuse the order, or, in the words of the father of one of the soldiers, 'I would have turned around and shot the one who ordered me to do it.'

Build Struggles on Campus

Our response must be to intensify our efforts against the war and racism on campus. The men who run universities have a deep interest in the war and in serving the interests that profit from it: through ROTC, counter-insurgency, biological and chemical warfare, etc., the university very directly supports the war and the system that oppresses people around the world and at home.

Universities and schools in this society also teach and practice racism; this is one reason why massacres like Song My take place. If US working people see their third world allies as 'gooks', slaughters like Ben Tre and Song My can be rationalized. This racism must be smashed.

We must build a movement on campus that concretely fights the ways the university attacks the people. We must reject the calls of liberal politicians and university administrators for 'peace' and their expressions of 'outrage'. For example, the very administrators who call for 'peace' viciously exploit campus workers and when students and workers fight back, try to squash them. Instead we must build a movement that allies with the people who have the most power and most need under this system -- working people. Such a movement is the only way to fight against Song My and all the future Song My's that may occur.

Radcliffe CWSA Fights Male Chauvinism

by Sarah Glazer, Harvard-Radcliffe

This fall 15 Radcliffe students got campus jobs in Radcliffe's kitchens and dining halls. In getting to know the workers there, we were told about a number of grievances, among them that women cooks are paid 90¢ an hour less than men cooks for the same work. We thought that it was very important to fight this blatant example of the extra oppression women face, and have started a campaign around it and some other grievances at Radcliffe.

In only one of the three kitchens at Radcliffe are men employed as cooks. In the other two, women have complete responsibility for preparing all meals, a very clear case of women doing the same work as men but getting lower wages. The legal loophole that Radcliffe has created to pay unequal wages is to call the men 'chefs' and the women 'first cooks'. Both the men chefs and women cooks think that this is unjustified and that all should be getting 'chef's' wages.

To start building this campaign, a group of Radcliffe students went to the supervisor of the kitchens to ask why the male chauvinist wage differential exists. Her answers were incredible. She said that 'the men have greater responsibility because the women are insecure and look to the men for advice and support'. She also said that the women's income is only supplemental to their husbands', so it is unimportant anyway. Armed with information like this, we planned a demonstration at President Bunting's office for the following day.

Campaign demands

About 90 people went to Mrs. Bunting's office with the following demands:

1. An end to the male chauvinist wage differential between 'chefs' and 'cooks' by raising the women's wages.
2. An extra cook to be put on when there are 'special dinners' and two menus must be prepared at once.
3. A second dishwashing machine in one of the kitchens.
4. Plastic dish racks (for dishwashing machines) to replace metal ones which are scalding hot and very heavy.

5. The repair of unsanitary dish washing machines (which means that workers must run dirty dishes through two or three times).

At this demonstration, Mrs. Bunting pleaded ignorance of the facts and said that she would look into the situation and respond within a week.

Bunting's "women's liberation"

This confrontation was important in exposing Mrs. Bunting, a self-proclaimed liberal crusader for women's rights. She says that she was one of those responsible for the clause in the 1965 Civil Rights Act that promised equal wages for women and is a vocal proponent of discrimination against women in professional work. But she obviously doesn't care at all about the oppression of most women in this society -- about working women like the cooks in her own college.

Many students at Radcliffe see Mrs. Bunting as their ally in fighting against the oppression of women. She plays up this illusion to the hilt, pretending to be the compassionate mediator between Radcliffe students and the dominating, male-oriented influence of Harvard. (Women students attend Harvard classes, but Radcliffe still maintains a separate administration and dormitory facilities.) Radcliffe students are also reluctant to confront Mrs. Bunting with any kind of militancy, because she hides behind the male chauvinist image of the kindly, sensitive, and rather helpless woman here in the midst of the university. It is necessary to expose her as the college administrator who uses male chauvinist ideas to make extra profits in the Radcliffe kitchens, and then uses these ideas again to protect herself from any attack.

One week after this demonstration, Mrs. Bunting came out with a justification of the wage differential which said that the men 'chefs' do more work than the women 'cooks'. This was a blatant lie. Although the kitchen that the men work in feeds more students than either of the others, there are on the average twice as many cooks working there. We wrote a letter to the school newspaper refuting her statement and planned another demonstration at her office.

This time she had 'unbreakable appointments' and wasn't around, but we confronted J. Boyd



SDS CONFRONTS MRS. BUNTING

Britten, Radcliffe's administrative vice-president. He could not defend any of the administration's supposed 'justifications', and ended up by saying, 'There's a long tradition of this sort of thing and you shouldn't try to fight it.'

We are now challenging Mrs. Bunting and Mr. Britten to a public debate about the male chauvinist wage differential.

There are some difficult problems we have encountered in building this campaign, problems of male chauvinism among all students at Harvard and Radcliffe. It has been difficult to win students to the idea of using militancy in this fight. Although there have been as many men as women at our demonstrations, many Harvard students don't see a male chauvinist wage differential as a serious issue. Also, few Harvard or Radcliffe students see a fight against Radcliffe's separate administration in serious terms. The Radcliffe administration pushes the idea of being a weak step-sister, and it is difficult to win students to see Radcliffe as the exploitative boss that it is.

Despite these problems, many more students (especially at Radcliffe) are becoming angry about the wage differential and want to fight such discrimination.

Fight For Open Admissions

by Chris Prendergast
Howie Sirota

Open admissions is the availability of a seat in a tuition-free, four-year college at choice, either 'directly' vocational or 'indirectly' vocational, should a student decide on college at all. In its co-optive 'Master' Plan, City University of New York admits to a 'growing and potentially dangerous' unemployment problem existing side by side with a large number of job vacancies, 117,000 in teaching alone by 1975. This plan would extend the racist and anti-working class high school tracking system to the college, which today assumes the role high schools played thirty years ago, that is, as a cutting edge by which the bourgeoisie prepares for, yet rationalizes poverty and underemployment: 'Well, they didn't meet the educational requirements for work, so it's their own fault if they starve.' As we know, it is exactly this social fragmentation of the working class which forms the basis for working class acceptance of bourgeois ideology; were not the working class objectively divided into skilled-unskilled, educated-uneducated, etc., there would be absolutely no grounds upon which to accept such fantastic ideas as 'racial superiority' and 'watch out for #1', etc.

Open admissions performs two functions in this regard -- it poses an alternative to the current selective and competitive admissions policy which only further cripples working class unity and secondly, it brings together in an immediate sense teachers, high school and college youth into a programmatic struggle in behalf of workers generally.

A Valid Reform Struggle?

The vast majority of post-college positions represent nothing more than different levels within the working class, e.g. from rapidly diminishing semi-skilled labor to college-trained workers such as teachers. For the most part, college training does not take one out of the working class. Secondly, in opposing educational skill centers and the like, we are demanding training for specific job openings, primarily in education, health and service fields, jobs that meet the workers need for an improved standard of living.

Thirdly, open admissions, directed at both municipal and state governments as well as college administrations, exposes the class nature of the university and the State. Engaged in the matter of educational reform, students presented with a pro-working class outlook and in struggle with revolutionaries will begin to see the entire structure in a class way -- will see that their struggle is in content identical to struggles of workers and other oppressed peoples.

Fourthly, the sectors of the working class most affected by changes in the categories of jobs are the black and Latin sectors. The demand, then, is anti-racist in character. Black and Latin social workers, for example, will be more apt than their relatively more 'secure' co-workers of today to fight on the job after graduation and ally themselves with their clients, opposing the racism of the Welfare Department. The demand steamrolls, providing opportunity for struggles in the future.

Finally, in building alliances with workers, the demand allows us to demonstrate that SDS is an organization of students that looks to the needs of workers and is in unison with workers in demanding decent public education for their children.

The attainment of open admissions will not put an end to imperialism or class exploitation. Nor will it destroy all formulations of bourgeois ideology. However, no reform struggle will. Open admissions, in common with all reforms, has its favorable and unfavorable aspects. However, this is not the major point and it does not tip the scales against the demand. We must continue our struggle against pacifism, individualism, etc., both in the classroom and without. But we must always strive to win students to wage struggle on behalf of the working class, to ally themselves with that class. This is the overwhelming benefit of open admissions.

Change In Labor Force

Were the university merely the playground of the sons and daughters of the bourgeoisie - i.e. if it were true that a B.A. was an admissions ticket into the ruling class - the demand would be obviously counterevolutionary. But the tripling of the college population since 1945 indicates that the US job market, due to the permanent arms economy

and the expanded social services required to keep the reserve army of labor and sections of the working class at subsistence, forced the capitalists to prepare working class youth for technical and semi-professional jobs in medical and service sectors, and in the bureaucracy (social workers, etc.). Statistically:

- from 1942 to 1965 the industrial working class per se decreased from 51% of the entire labor force to 42%. (US Statistical Abstract, 1967)

- by 1980 an increase of 250,000 jobs is expected in white collar sectors and, simultaneously, a decline of 75,000 in manufacturing. (The Master Plan, 1968, NYC)

- between 1960 and 1975 nationally, increases of 11.4% to 14.8% and 14.8% to 16.9% are expected in technical-professional and clerical categories; no change in sales and craftsmen-foremen, at 6.4% and 13% respectively; and declines in operatives (18.2% to 16.9%), and non-farm workers (5.4% to 4.1%). Service workers will increase from 12.2% to 13.8%

- in NYC from 1960 to 1970, semi- and unskilled job categories declined by 80,000; increases, however, were registered in skilled (25,000) and clerical (35,000) and technical and professional (80,000) (Manpower Outlook, 1960-1970)

- in NYC, from 1960 to 1965, white collar employment increased by 13% while blue collar decreased by 5%. (Times, May 1969)

This is the point: certain kinds of jobs are being eliminated, others created; increasingly, some years at college are required for the latter; it is therefore in the interest of the working class, especially its most oppressed sections, that tuition free college training be fought for: (1) it is a struggle which could result in a concrete, material concession for the working class, and (2) from the struggle students learn lessons regarding the class partisanship of the State and the university, and, in the campaign, they find themselves in alliance with other sectors of the population, e.g. teachers and high school students, thus breaking their mistaken feelings of exclusiveness and destiny.

Now, the bourgeoisie, organizing the means of production, designates education as a cutting-stone or criteria for kinds of work; it does not order construction of new school buildings to increase the bourgeoisification of the working class, as some have maintained. This is not a materialist analysis but one verging on the idealistic. It is not the ideas of the bourgeoisie that maintain their domination as a class but their ownership and control of the productive forces and the state. The ideologies which spring up from and obfuscate the social relations of capitalism give the world view of that ruling class, but it is a world view which need not create public education for its discrimination; these ideas are passed on early enough via the family, jokes, 'common knowledge', TV, etc. Male chauvinism, US nationalism, are equally virulent among high school dropouts as college students. 'Bourgeois ideology' is not 'taught' to people, but it has a material base in the position in the social structure/institutions people occupy.

Analogously, why did the 1954 Supreme Court decide to abolish segregated education? -- because black children would miss out on bourgeois thought, or because segregation in one geographic area, the South, was incompatible with a literate and technical work force required by the bourgeoisie nationally? If it is the latter, then we must not allow the bourgeoisie, via selective admissions, to pick and choose its technical and professional workers, and unhampered to propagate the illusions of 'professionalism'; instead we must organize these students to fight with the working class against that false consciousness and against selective admissions. It is through that alliance and that struggle that students can be won over to pro-working class politics.

Popular Arguments Against

1. 'The university is a center of bourgeois ideology -- why should we want anyone to attend college?'

It is true that the university fosters 'bourgeois ideology' -- so does every other institution in this society, including the factory! Lenin perceived that even the trade union struggle leads (without the intervention of socialists) to the fostering of bourgeois ideology among the working class. Bourgeois ideology permeates the entire society -- you cannot 'run away' from it, for instance by telling people not to come to the university. The logic of this argument dictates that we should tell workers to

flee the factories since the factory also fosters bourgeois ideology, and is objectively a call for a 'counter-institution' encompassing the entire country, 'free' from the taint of bourgeois ideology. Drawing a false distinction between 'opposing' open admissions and 'merely' not fighting for it is ludicrous, and brings to mind the famous dictum 'to merely talk about the nature of the good society without attempting to make the existing society good, is, in effect, to justify the present state of affairs'.

2. 'Even if it is true that post-high school education is needed for many new jobs, it's the bourgeoisie's job to train its work force, why should we do it for them?'

This argument is fallacious in that it denies the capitalist system's need for a 'reserve army' of unemployed and underemployed to depress all wages, and concomitantly is a call for the ruling class to somehow circumvent objective economic laws and provide full employment at a decent level for the working class. An analogous situation is that the working class must receive the value of labor power, i.e. the amount necessary to reproduce itself as the working class; otherwise it will 'die out'. The bourgeoisie has not paid this 'subsistence wage' to the world proletariat for 20 years (Latin America), although in the last analysis it would at some point in the future have to, or face the prospect of losing the source of its profit -- the labor of the working class. Would the proponents of the argument that we should wait for the bourgeoisie to institute full employment also like us to sit back until the ruling class 'comes to its senses' and raises the wage payments to the super-exploited sector of the working class.

3. 'Open admissions means taking high school students out of the working class and 'de-fusing' their struggles.'

That a college degree necessarily takes one out of the working class is a myth which should have been shattered by the existence of social workers' and teachers' unions and their struggles as 'municipal workers' against the city. To establish this mistaken definition of 'professionalism' fostered at the university is in fact true, that college trained workers are different from the workers generally and will ally themselves with the bourgeoisie. This is properly the line of administrations, not SDS. (Some students, of course, will set up their own business or become executives; this is true. The point is that the university is quickly becoming a technical training center despite its emphasis on liberal arts programs. Brooklyn College, whose graduates constitute 40% of all teachers in New York City, is in fact a teacher training institute of this type.)

Following on the heels of the 'out of the working class' argument is its logical opposite, that if open admissions is conceded, then the system will still use its garment rack-pushers, 'only now they'll all have Ph.D.s.' The contradictory assertion, often given by the same person, indicates the lack of a consistent, political analysis which concludes that open admissions is anti-working class. No such thing exists. The fear that we are exposing more and more people to bourgeois ideology, that we 'do their job', that we are 'taking people out of their class' are groundless arguments. Being exposed to sophisticated bourgeois ideas does not remove one from the working class. One's adherence to that ideology may remove him from struggle, but it is our job as revolutionaries to be there to organize and sharpen that struggle.

Conclusion

Under socialism the university as we know it will not exist, although its exact form can not be specified. Following this, one cannot conclude that college training in some abstract way is unnecessary, that 'even doctors learn nothing at school, only during internship, during practice'. Under capitalist organization of production, education as a condition must be met before one takes a specified job. The job market is changing, semi-skilled work is declining at a great pace, professional and service work and the bureaucracy are increasing. Therefore, just as the completion of high school means an improved standard of living over non-completion, so some college is required for these newer jobs. To fight so that the working class is prepared for those jobs is not to sacrifice one's class for individualist advance, but is to, in a class way, fight for a concrete concession for the class as a whole. Open admissions is a valid reform struggle, raising the question 'which class does the university serve?', and, given SDS leadership, can educate students as to the class nature of the state.

Against Open Admissions

All around the world (France, Italy, Argentina, China, etc.) working people have been at the heart of the movement fighting for the liberation of all peoples. Right now the working people of Vietnam are carrying out the most intensive struggle in the world against US imperialism. In this country it is black workers who are fighting hardest against the bosses -- on the job (auto and transportation strikes, for example) and in their communities (welfare fights and ghetto rebellions). Even on the campuses, if we make an honest appraisal, some of the biggest fights against the ruling class have grown out of black campus workers' fights against their bosses. So the key thing that we must win students to realize is the leading role of the working class. It is in regard to precisely this question that organizing around open admissions fails so badly.

Putting forward the demand of open admissions reinforces all the bad ideas that the rulers have thrown at us for years. One of the main things that the big businessmen who run the university pound into the heads of middle class college students is that we are superior, we are the elite. As a result, students do tend to feel that they are superior to working people because they can read the Iliad in classical Greek, or can quote some doubletalk from Marcuse 'proving' that the working class doesn't mind being exploited! In addition to being taught how 'sensitive' we are, we are constantly taught how 'uncultured' the working class is. We are taught in political science that workers are stupid beer-drinking fascists (e.g. 'It is the working class that supported George Wallace.' Actually, Wallace's main base of support was in the petit bourgeoisie.). Or in sociology we are taught that the working class is responsible for racism. White workers, not the boss who does the hiring, are the source of racist hiring policies; it is white workers, so we are told, who support the KKK. The boss runs the business, finances the KKK, and prints the racist newspapers, yet we are told (e.g. Kerner Commission report) that it is everyone but he who is responsible for the oppression of Third World people!

The result of all this indoctrination is that students have strongly ingrained anti-working class attitudes. Putting forward open admissions does not help combat these bad ideas, but strengthens them, along with student chauvinism. It says, in effect, that the trouble with working people is that they haven't had the same opportunity to learn as we have, i.e. that they aren't enough like us. Despite all the good intentions of those who put forward open admissions, engaging in such struggle will build a student chauvinist movement rather than a pro-working class movement.

The question of building illusions in the student movement about student superiority and the working class should not be looked on as 'another one of those abstract illusions'. This particular 'abstract illusion' has been largely responsible for many of the anti-working class aspects of the movement. For example, this June, some 'leaders' of the movement at Berkeley made a deal with the city to take over some apartments from which working people had been evicted. Instead of fighting the evictions as had been done by SDS elsewhere (Harvard and Columbia), students were told to accept the evictions and make the apartments into

housing for 'revolutionary youth'. The question of building bad ideas about the working class and the relation of the student movement to it is not an abstract question. It will determine in the long run whether the movement will serve the rulers or the workers.

No help for working people

People in SDS have raised the demand of open admissions primarily as a response to the special oppression that black and brown working people face in this country. Since the bosses systematically discriminate against black and brown workers and since these workers are forced into the hardest and lowest paying jobs, by winning the demand for open admissions, it would be possible, supposedly, for the most exploited section of the working class to escape super-exploitation.

It's true that many working people who might manage to get into the university through open admissions and become teachers, technicians, welfare workers, managers, and professionals would be better off, materially, than the bulk of working

people (assuming, of course, that they won't be flunked right out of the university, as they are in the junior colleges in California, where only 2% graduate). But helping a few individuals 'get ahead' isn't the same as helping the working class, helping workers in general. 'Lifting' working class people, Third World or white, into lower or higher levels of managerial or professional positions means one of two things. Either there will be a slightly smaller number of workers, in which case the bosses would exploit even harder to maintain their profits. Or open admissions would result in a slight change in the class background of those with college training, but new workers would be found to replace the old and the exploitation of the working class would continue as before. Open admissions, even if won, would not serve working people, black, brown or white.

Well, maybe people will learn things that will help them serve the working class at the university. But this raises the question of the class nature of the university.

University Must Serve the Boss

At Berkeley there have been two main obstacles to organizing a pro-working class student movement (apart from our own weaknesses!). First, there are the anti-working class ideas that students have (largely taught at the university). Second, students do not see the class nature of the university. Students at Berkeley see a lot of things wrong with the school. They see that the courses are not 'relevant' to what they are doing, they see that frequently there is racist content to their courses. But when all is said and done, students do not yet see the university for what it is -- an institution owned, controlled, and operated by the same big businessmen who run the country.

We have seen clearly at Berkeley that when anything happens here the Regents don't like, they are willing to use virtually every means (including hundreds of police and thousands of National Guardsmen) to make sure that the university functions so as to serve the interests of the Regents (big businessmen). And what would one expect that the interests of such Regents as Ronald Reagan and Norton Simon (Chairman of the Board of Hunt's Foods, one of the largest exploiters of Mexican-Americans in the State) be? They make sure (at the point of a gun, if necessary) that the university teaches the racism and anti-working class ideas that will prevent students from allying with workers. For example, the head of the Department of Educational Psychology at Berkeley writes articles with systematically distorted data, including miscalculations, to 'prove' that black people and working people in general are genetically inferior to middle class whites. Research that is done on campus is frequently aimed directly at exploiting workers, such as the present research on a grape-picking machine that will be used to try to break the grape strike.

At Berkeley, one of the most important jobs of SDS is to show students that the university is a place which is used by and for the rulers, at the expense of the working class. This being the case, it is legitimate to ask what it is that is being taught at the university that should be opened up to everyone. Pig training? Racism? Counter-insurgency? Which courses should be taught to more students? If we in SDS continue to insist that the university oppresses people, students will ask us, 'Well, then, why should people come here? Why have open admissions to such a rotten institution?' Good questions indeed. People will not believe both that the university is bad and that more people should come to it. In practice, demanding open admissions is saying that there is something basically good about the university -- an implication that runs totally counter to our efforts at exposing the class nature of the university. All the fancy rhetoric in the world will not obscure the contradiction between fighting for open admissions and showing to students that the university must, under capitalism, serve the rulers and not the people.

In Alan Spector's article in favor of open admissions (NLN, June 30), he concluded by saying that any struggle was co-optable and that it was silly to say that we should oppose open admissions just because it's co-optable. Now this is, in general, true. But we had best be extraordinarily wary about putting forward programs that are not only co-optable but are the same as those put forward by those who run the country. In California, for example, the ruling class is really pushing college education for everyone through the tremendous de-

velopment of the junior college program. And in many factories around the area the majority of young workers attend these junior colleges in a futile attempt to escape the working class. The School of Education at Cal advertises openly for more Third World students; there would be nothing better than black teachers in rebellious ghetto schools, black foremen and supervisors in the plants, black pigs in the streets. What is it that the ruling class tells us is the problem of black people? Not enough education, they say. Not racist exploitation, that is not the problem, just a small fluke in the educational system. Putting forward open admissions does not open up the possibility of being co-opted -- putting forward the strategy of open admissions is openly doing the ruling class's propaganda for them!

It is vital for the student movement to put forward demands that can be won and can concretely help oppressed people. It is vital to demonstrate the strength of the people by winning. But the only guarantee that the people of this country have for a better life is building a broad and powerful working class movement.

The key thing that we can do in SDS is to build an alliance between workers and students. Supporting open admissions won't help to accomplish that. Instead, it would direct students away from allying with the working class and thus away from the only force capable of making real changes.

by Dave Wolfensohn
Bob Wetmore Berkeley

In order for SDS to grow it is vital that a good literature program be developed. Pamphlets and flyers will serve to strengthen our ideas and present these ideas to those new to the movement in a clear way. As our struggles sharpen and issues are raised in a mass way, good pamphlets will be an excellent means of presenting SDS. This is extremely important in isolated areas where SDSers have less contact with other chapters. Build a good literature program! Build SDS! Help us to produce more literature by sending your ideas and criticisms to Students for a Democratic Society, 173a Massachusetts Ave., Boston, Mass. 02115.

I order — PAMPHLETS and — BUTTONS, plus 15% for postage, for a total of \$_____.

- Campus Worker-Student Alliance (15¢)
- 'Reserve Liberal Training Corps', by Berkeley Radical Arts Troupe (5¢)
- Statement on the Split in SDS (from NLN) (5¢)

AVAILABLE SOON (15¢ each)

- Racism
- Revolutionary Youth Movement
- Welfare and the Working Class
- Why Ally with the Working Class
- Male Chauvinism

BUTTONS

- SDS (10¢)
- Fight University Bosses - Ally with Campus Workers (25¢)
- US Out of Vietnam Now - No Negotiations (25¢)
- Fight University Attacks on Black People - Smash Racism (25¢)

Bulk orders over 100 available at 1/3 off. Postage must be paid on all orders.

Build SDS
Sell NLN

UCLA (cont.)

bers, about half the hardcore membership of SDS. Only a few went canvassing. These problems came to a head on November 12, when we postponed our planned action and instead held a long discussion about the weaknesses of the campaign. We decided that it was crucial to build for a major confrontation, set a week from Friday as the deadline, and began daily canvassing on campus.

At this point, ARM came into the campaign with their own leaflets, petitions, and timetable, calling for a march on Brugger's office on Wednesday. ARM gathered almost as many signatures in a week as we had gotten up until then, and we nearly doubled our own total in the week before the demonstration.

On Wednesday, following the rally, 70 people marched into Brugger's office to demand that Charles Bargaineer be rehired. Brugger first said that he did not have the power to grant that demand, then admitted that he could grant it but would not. Although the original plan was to present Brugger with an ultimatum and then leave, people decided that it would be a good idea to stay.

The role of CASE

After it was clear that we were serious, a number of phony radicals, centering around a group called the Committee for Awareness in Social Education (CASE), funded by the Ford Foundation and the administration and including 'Communist' Party ('C'P) and 'Revolutionary' Youth Movement II ('R'YM II) supporters, began to surface. They tried at first to scare us, saying that we would all face life sentences if we did not leave. Cliff Fried, of the 'C'P, called us 'left adventurist' and urged the Coalition, a group dominated by CASE, to issue a leaflet attacking us. None of these individuals had a word to say about the campaign while we were circulating the petition, but suddenly they had a great deal to say about how they opposed our tactics even though they supported our goals.

After the arrests were made, the Coalition called a press conference ostensibly to support our politics but actually to attack our tactics. It was a real error to not keep some people out of jail, since it left the field open for the 'C'P and others to attack us while they pretended to defend us. While we were behind bars, the CASE-'C'P-Coalition group put out an 'Ad Hoc Defense Committee Newsletter' with an explicitly anti-working class political line. The Newsletter explained that the 'workers have expressed their own feelings of powerlessness' and 'thus thirty students felt impelled to take action'. This position sees workers as weak, needing moralistic and missionary support from students, while we believe that workers are the only group with the power to make important change.

While we were in jail, SDSers from Cal State Los Angeles and UC-Irvine came up to leaflet and help raise bail. Their presence made our original error of not keeping people out far less serious. When we got out, none of the working SDSers were fired, and the response from fellow cafeteria workers was fantastic. Workers making \$1.80 an hour had raised money for bail, were offering to buy us lunch, and in less than two hours, 35 workers signed a letter to the Daily Bruin supporting the ARM/SDS campaign. The last of the letter was, 'Victory to the Workers'.

At this point we made a critical mistake. One of the defendants suggested that we broaden the movement by setting up an ad hoc committee to defend campus workers because of the general hostility to SDS in some quarters. We felt uneasy about it, but no one really spoke against it, and the proposal carried.

The CASE-'C'P-Coalition group showed up at the meeting with their second strategy: if you can not scare people out of a campaign, you 'broaden' the issues, make them more grandiose, and thus tacitly abandon the campaign. CASE argued that we should fight on all the major grievances; get the workers to prepare a list of grievances and then we students, the major force for change, will win those demands for the workers. We should

have realized that we did not have the base to defeat those attractive but deadly ideas.

During the debate, CASE leaders won over Charles Bargaineer by playing on his good aspect of wanting this fight to benefit all workers. Charles came out against continuing the fight to get his job back, saying that he would never come back (we knew that; the important thing was to force the administration to give in), and that the fight should shift to wages and working conditions. At that point, we had to abandon the campaign in deference to Charles's wishes.

That this happened represents a very serious criticism of our work. We failed to get to know Charles well and work out with him what the next best thing to do would be. As a result of not having close ties with him, we were unable to further build the campaign.

Right after the meeting, intense demoralization set in, but actually the situation is good. When this campaign began, cafeteria workers were afraid to be quoted anonymously in the Daily Bruin; now forty have signed a public letter supporting ARM and SDS's campaign. At the opening of the quarter, only SDS was thinking about campus workers; now, it is the major issue on campus. And the University is scared -- Charles was fired simply for taking a break, but none of the SDSers in the cafeteria -- who missed a full day's work because they were in jail for sitting in at the boss's office -- were fired.

The abandonment of the campaign was a defeat for SDS, and a victory for CASE and the people who finance CASE (Ford Motor Company and the UCLA administration) but it is not the final battle. We will win if we dig in and increase our ties with the workers, overcome our anti-student attitudes ('these rich bastards can't be won to supporting workers') and build a base among the student body. The exploitation of the workers on campus is not, unfortunately, an issue that will disappear, and neither will our determination in fighting against it.

G.E. (cont.)

and this led to a terrific success. This is an important lesson to be applied on the chapter level. SDS is leading fights around the country: supporting a strike in Tallahassee, Florida; siding with campus workers at UCLA; fighting ROTC and the nation's central police institute in Minneapolis; stopping GE recruiters at Michigan State and Boston University; smashing ROTC at Fordham. The extent to which we've been successful on campus has been the extent to which we've been willing to seize the initiative and provide leadership to the many students who want to fight the war, racism, male chauvinism -- to fight the universities' attacks on the people. The demonstration in Washington showed that people are more open than ever to joining us -- it's up to us to reach them.

Seizing the initiative doesn't necessarily mean seizing a building. We should seize the initiative politically, making the most of the rulers' mistakes and providing leadership to the students on our campuses. We shouldn't hesitate to fight for the leadership of honest people misled by RYM, the New Mobe, etc. And when the administration attacks us with an article in the school newspaper, a letter to students, a memorandum, or whatever, we should issue a reply. They're the only ones that lose through the interchange.

What Now for SDS?

Another lesson of this demonstration is that SDS has not been doing enough to oppose the war, leaving many honest people to be misled. We should use the demonstration as a model on campus, linking the issue of the war to the struggles of campus workers, to throwing GE recruiters off campus, etc. Relating the war to other issues can only strengthen people's understanding of it and broaden our base of support. And we should set up anti-war committees wherever possible -- seeing the war not as just another issue, but as an important question which should broaden the political understanding we develop in our other campaigns.

Generally, in spite of weaknesses like this, we're in a terrific situation. We've grown from a damaging split to be stronger than ever, and we've begun to build a real alliance with working people in practice. Many of us have jobs on campus and friendships with the campus workers, and at most campuses we've initiated campaigns raising their immediate grievances and supporting their struggles. More and more we're overcoming our timidity and anti-working class ideas. At some campuses we meet with workers regularly to discuss plans

for building the campus worker-student alliance.

We've begun to correct the mistaken go-slow approach of waiting for the workers to go on strike or to find out 'spectacular' grievances, talked about in the November 1st issue of New Left Notes, making CWSA a mass issue at Yale, U. of Chicago, UCLA, Harvard, Merritt, Columbia and others. At these schools, everyone is talking about the conditions of campus workers and about the working class in general -- a situation which forces the administration to talk about things, and which can't work to their advantage. We should develop CWSA to this point at all other schools, involving the workers as much as possible every step of the way. A real alliance means winning masses of students to ally with workers, so we have to make CWSA a mass issue; and doing this also gives the workers more of a basis to take us seriously.

But we must begin to take the next vital step -- planning actions with the workers that we carry out together. If we don't, there will be no real alliance and we'll just be all talk. So we should meet with workers NOW, and where we don't know them well enough to meet with them we should get to know them well enough. If this alliance is to be built we're going to have to involve workers in it, and accept their leadership more and more. This may mean going together with workers to talk to a boss we have just yelled at or chased around campus, but most workers will be more militant than this. These joint actions will be at a much higher level strategically than seizing a building with only students. An example?: Library workers might want to organize a slow-down while we organize students to come in and check out as many books as possible and turn them all back in immediately. Similar things could be worked out with buildings and grounds workers, cafeteria workers, secretaries, etc.

CWSA Must Fight Racism

In developing the CWSA thus far we've been weak in fighting racism; this is true in most of our campaigns. Often we've hardly raised the racist content of grievances we've fought over, and where we have done this we haven't really taken students' racist attitudes head on -- countering racism as an ideology as well as striking a blow at its material basis.

Within SDS we haven't done enough to develop the fight against racism and, not surprisingly, haven't done nearly enough to get to know black and other non-white students and win them over to radical ideas. First, every chapter should discuss and evaluate what it is doing to fight racism; if we're doing little or nothing non-white students



won't take us seriously -- for good reason! And secondly (we should do both NOW) we should set aside time to discuss our relations with non-white students on campus. Some good questions to ask would be: Have we made a special effort to canvass non-white students about our activities? How many of us know any non-white students well? Do we make as much effort when talking with non-white students to win them over to our politics? Are we using the nationalism of non-white students (which developed as a result of racism) as an excuse for not getting to know them and trying to win them over? Are we self-critical about our own racism?

National Council

At a meeting in Chicago, the National Interim Committee discussed these questions and many others (report in next NLN) and made plans for the coming National Council meeting. This should be one of the largest and best meetings SDS has ever held -- over 1000 people present from around the country. It should help us to consolidate and develop this growth, especially through the educational conference which should consist primarily of workshops. We'll have a chance to exchange experiences about how to build SDS on a chapter level, discussing resolutions in relationship to practical experience. Chapters should discuss the issues before us now and elect delegates, or decide to vote by chapter caucus at the meeting. These discussions will help make this NC more useful. As part of building for the NC chapters should have membership drives. Many people who come to our meetings will join SDS, and we can win over many more. Membership, like all others, is a political question.

Letters

Dear Brothers and Sisters,

The statement entitled 'A Critique of CWSA' which appeared in the last issue of New Left Notes (Nov. 1) is to be welcomed in the sense that it represents the beginnings of serious and critical political and ideological struggle in the pages of NLN. Many of the questions it raised deserve serious consideration and discussion by all SDS members. There are, however, two brief points I would like to make in connection with the statement.

The writers of the statement say the CWSA 'attempts to thrust student radicals into an impossible dual role. Neither fish nor fowl, neither worker nor student, conducting a year-round work-in and having little time left to organize students, the hapless SDS part-time worker would seldom succeed in organizing in either area.'

That view strikes me as pretty mechanistic; it's sort of like saying a worker couldn't possibly organize anything in his community. Because if he tried, he would be something between a worker and a neighborhood organizer. In other words, there is usually a whole set of complex relationships in which people are involved with the capitalist system that are within and derived from the over-riding division between those who own and those who don't. People who work and go to school are not 'neither workers nor students'; they are, if words mean anything, both workers and students. This, of course, does not say very much; what kinds of ties would such a person have with other workers and with other students? What kinds of struggles would he attempt to build? Those kinds of questions would have to be answered before any useful knowledge would emerge; but it is not enough to say 'dual role' or 'neither this nor that'.

Those questions lead to a second point. The writers of the statement seem to believe that the whole idea behind CWSA is that students will organize workers. National Secretary John Pennington points out in the same issue of New Left Notes that 'Our goal can't be to organize the workers. First, we can't do it; and second, they can do it themselves.'

Dear Brothers and Sisters,

I'm thankful to Steve Fraser, Philadelphia Labor Committee, for his full page article in NLN of Nov. 1. His article, 'The Week of June 16', exposes the underlying right-wing nature of the Labor Committee, Discussing a Labor Committee campaign for a City Council seat in Philadelphia, Fraser writes,

The platform of the Alliance (our newly formed political party) includes the obvious. 100,000 low-rent housing units. 33 new schools. Thousands of well-paying, productive jobs rebuilding a city turned junkpile. \$100 minimum wage with escalator clause. Adequate health, welfare, and transportation budgets. Repeal of the Wage Tax.

Is it possible to have an economic plank in a Philadelphia election campaign that makes those proposals feasible? Absolutely. There is an accessible and massive source of funds (up to \$400 million worth) available to the Philadelphia budget without taxing working people a nickel more and without taking away a penny from useful investments or other expenditures; real estate income. A second major source of funds is the hundreds of millions now being poured out annually in debt-service to bankers through bondings of the city government and various public authorities. Punitive tax rates on several forms of extortionate consumer credit income would add hundreds of millions to tax revenues. Rhetoric about power, local control and self-determination to the contrary, the candidate/movement who does not propose to attack such sources of revenues is refusing to offer the oppressed in this city a nickel's worth of improvements in matters such as

CWSA is presently viewed as a strategy for building a working relationship with a sizable group of service workers in this country, and as a step towards a larger and longer-range alliance with off-campus service workers and production workers. Tactically, this has meant two things up to now: (1) Getting campus jobs in order to build ties with these workers, raise our politics with these workers, and learn from these workers the issues they are ready to struggle around; and (2) Actively supporting the struggles of these workers and initiating student struggles over outstanding examples of exploitation and oppression of campus workers. Obviously, there may be times when students in carrying out these tactics will inspire campus workers to undertake a militant trade-union struggle. But the occasional occurrence is not the same thing as students organizing workers. Part-time student workers may indeed organize other part-time student workers as part of this strategy; but even that is not the same thing as students organizing workers. Some SDS people have full-time campus jobs; as such, how could anyone object if they attempted to organize other full-time campus workers into full-fledged trade union struggles? That would call for a longer-range perspective, and there are probably better places to develop that perspective, but at any rate it has nothing to do with the idea of students organizing workers.

It would be a good thing if the strategic questions raised by the writers of the statement as well as the views of the proponents of the CWSA could be discussed at length in NLN prior to the December National Council, at which time the NC would evaluate the CWSA in theory and practice and decide if CWSA should be the main strategy of SDS.

Fraternally,

Ed Clark, New Orleans MDS, PLP

housing, medical facilities, education, mass transit, expanded jobs, etc.

How wonderful! The Labor Committee has discovered a way for capitalism to meet the needs of working people: tax or eliminate real estate income and debt service to bankers for municipal bonds 'without taking a penny for useful investment' by the ruling class. 'Power' is 'rhetoric'. Fraser again says (earlier in his article),

The basic problems of the US economy as an economy are inflation, underemployment, low wage rates, shortages of housing, hospitals, schools, etc. All of these problems together have only one solution. We have sufficient wealth being poured down the sinkholes of war and aerospace production, real estate, industrial and government stock and bond speculation, bureaucracy and other criminal practices to create enough new productive jobs to begin meeting all of the outstanding material and related needs of the working and unemployed population. To accomplish this means appropriating banking and corporate incomes presently invested in waste.

Fraser has come up with a scheme for finding money to meet the needs of the working class by redirecting 'wasted funds' away from 'sinkholes' like war and bond speculation and into 'useful' productive jobs, all under capitalism. But if this can be done, why doesn't the ruling class institute these programs now and eliminate class struggle?

The answer, Fraser suggests, is that the members of the ruling class are 'insufferable mental invalids, as Fraser calls the ruling class candidates opposing the Labor Committee in the election, or 'demiwits'. In fact, the real difference between the working class and the big bosses is not one of intelligence. The ruling class makes profits by keeping the wages of workers low, and the only real gains which workers have won is by fighting for them, and not by arguing that funds should be taken from landlords and

BU (cont.)

given the worst jobs at the lowest pay. This division between black and white workers, and men and women workers, sets them against each other instead of against the boss.

When the going gets rough, GE uses the government's cops, courts and army to smash the Vietnamese and anyone else who fights against their exploitation. They supply materials such as helicopter engines and machine guns for the war. At home, they call out cops to break strikes, as in Lynn, Mass. and Burlington, Vt., where police escort scabs across picket lines and attack strikers. GE strikers are fighting the same bosses as the Vietnamese.

Boston University is owned and controlled by big businessmen -- the board of trustees. These rich men run the school in their own interest. They need students to look down on workers and fear them: the last thing they want to see is a united movement of workers and students, blue collar and white collar, black and white, against their exploitation. The university is not a neutral institution. It attacks its own workers on campus and is very important in helping other bosses oppress their workers -- the GE recruiters being but one example.

One way the university helps big businessmen and hurts students is by the ideology it teaches. We learn that there is no working class, just a vast uncultured 'middle class' whose only needs are a second car and a color TV. Or if we are taught anything about working people, it is usually that they are the main problem with society, that they're the ones responsible for racism, the war, etc. -- the polished and sophisticated rulers certainly don't approve of all these horrible things. These anti-working class ideas (and the rest of the pro-imperialist, racist ideology taught) will really hurt us when we graduate and only benefit the people we work for. Most students will become teachers, social workers, white collar workers. If we fall for these ideas, we won't organize fights for better pay and working conditions, nor will we ally with other working people in the community against the school board, the landlords, etc.

Clearly the university wants to smash any attempt to build a pro-working class student movement. The administration uses two basic tactics: first, liberal deans to pacify and second, the courts and cops to intimidate. Deans like 'hip' Bernie Meckel, posing as the students' friend, and BU president Christ-Janer, say they're for 'peace' in Vietnam in an attempt to cover the real cause of the war (big business's attempt to control Vietnam) and the university's role in it. But when students support GE workers in their fight against imperialist companies like GE, the administration exposes its true interests: after our first demonstration, the university obtained a restraining order naming ten people (including seven SDSers) which prohibited any further demonstrations against BU or GE. Despite the restraining order we had another demonstration against a different GE boss (Meyer) on campus. This time all pretense was thrown to the wind -- police with the help of fink Meckel, who pointed out at least two students to the cops, brutally attacked student demonstrators and bystanders.

The only way to fight repression in this or any other form is to build a stronger base and fight harder. SDS can not allow itself to become an isolated, elitist band. Only by winning masses of students to pro-working class politics can an effective fight ever be waged against imperialism, male chauvinism, and ruling class repression. We have found that sectarianism, the greatest block to base-building, can only be defeated by raising our politics with the entire student body.

businessmen and distributed somewhere else. Better wages, working conditions, etc., can only be won through struggle; and even these gains will be lost to the ruling class counterattack sooner or later, unless the workers organize to take control of the bosses' state and construct a new one in their own interest.

In his article, Fraser is quick to make fun of real struggles which have been waged against the ruling class, implying that any struggle short of demanding the Labor Committee's plan for reorganizing capitalism (to eliminate the 'criminal' elements) is anti-working class: 'Welfare recipients campaign, in effect, for cuts in school budgets for their own children... the programs submitted by...PL, etc., are nothing more than a radical version of Mailer's recipe -- more power (an illusion) to local popular groupings... grab what you can for you and your own, no matter who you knife to get it... time for revolutionaries to declare which side they're on -- blacks or whites? employed or unemployed? taxpayer or welfare recipient? Only fascist demagogery stands a chance of holding that mess together.'

Only a far right-wing grouping, given the lessons of escalating class struggle against US imperialism at home and around the world, can reconcile imperialism and the people through expansion of imperialism's 'new productive jobs'. In a tight spot at an SDS meeting, Labor Committee members occasionally say, Well, of course, these things can't be won under capitalism -- but their practice contradicts this. Their goals are to be accomplished 'without taking a penny from useful investments or other expenditures of US imperialism'. At Queens College (the Labor Committee stronghold, consisting of about twelve members), their actions follow true to their politics. They opposed SDS hold-

ing a rally to break a racist court order banning groups of seven or more from holding meetings to discuss the SEEK controversy. This wasn't surprising -- after Fraser writes that WSA and RYM have a 'common commitment to the liberal cause celebre (the second crusade against racism).'

The Labor Committee's 'criticism' of a NYC University budget cut was that much-needed programs were cut back. Their leaflets offered no criticism of the nature of the university, except to criticize the SEEK program for developing black nationalist ideology (this is correct, but such criticism becomes racist when not accompanied by attacks on the university as a whole). They have opposed Campus WSA as being a waste of time, instead putting forth programs (currently revolving around the Post Office and transit affair) which they say would unite the oppressed population of New York City, but in fact wouldn't offer a chance in hell for struggle against the ruling class.

The fact that a handful of Labor Committee members have been jailed for a short period of time in Philadelphia does not mean, as Fraser says, that the city fathers persist in fearing that the kind of programmatic alternatives offered by the Labor Committee threaten to result in a mass, city-wide fighting movement, uniting students, trade unionists, and ghetto dwellers'. In fact, the ruling class has many reasons for jailings and frame-ups, including intimidation of radicals and breaking organizing efforts. In this case, it is much more likely the ruling class wanted to intimidate the masses of workers and students into not struggling than they feared the Labor Committee -- given their politics, the ruling class has nothing to fear.

Sincerely,
Herb Bleich Queens C.

Students Sit-In Against Harvard

by Ellen Messing

Bob Mathews

Cheyney Ryan

Soon after school began this fall, several students in the Harvard-Radcliffe SDS Campus Worker-Student Alliance Committee discovered that a pay differential exists between black and white painters on Harvard's buildings and grounds crew. In conversations with painters, students learned that fifteen months ago, Harvard had instituted a 'painter's helper' category which was supposed to be used for the training of 'culturally deprived' workers, but was in fact used for hiring black painters at lower wages to do the same work as journeymen. The university justified paying blacks less for doing the same work by invoking all the old racist myths of black inferiority, slowness to learn, etc. The painters suggested that we raise the issue of the painters' helpers in a mass way among students, so we started a campaign by presenting the administration with our demands -- that all 'painters' helpers' be promoted to journeymen, that the pay differential be abolished, and that there be no layoffs as a result.

The day after we presented our demands, the administration called a press conference at which they responded to our accusations of racism by saying that the helpers situation was not their responsibility, that the helpers were unqualified, etc. When it became clear that the sixty or so students from SDS and H-R Afro American Society saw through their arguments, they tried to split the students by bringing in a black personnel officer. He immediately tried to silence many students by refusing to talk to SDS; then he attempted to pacify the black students by covering up his role in the administration by saying he was a black man first and working for Harvard second. Unfortunately for Harvard, many did not fall for this trick.

The next day, a non-obstructive sit-in was held in the office of Ernest May, Dean of Students. May's continual lies and evasions convinced many students that only a more militant tactic would win anything from the administration. The following week, a group of black students - the Black Students for Action (BSFA) - decided that they would hold an obstructive sit-in in the administration office, and asked for SDS support. The result was that the next day over 100 students marched into May's office, and when he tried to leave they linked arms and held him in. For over half an hour he shouted threats of severe punishment over a bullhorn, but students were chanting so loudly that he couldn't be heard. The BSFA then decided that Dean May should be released, and he was led out of the building. After some discussion, the students then decided that they would sit-in non-obstructively for the rest of the day.

Harvard's racism

The painters' helpers issue is a prime example of how racism is used to depress the wages of both black and white workers. When the helpers category was initiated, administrators hired blacks and justified their lower wages by appealing to supposed black inferiority. In recent months, now that the category is established, the administration has begun to hire whites, also at lower wages. The result is that black and white painters' helpers do the same work as journeymen for 86¢ an hour less, netting Harvard \$20,000 a year. The

The editor wishes to apologize for forgetting the last section of Fred Gordon's article on base-building at Northeastern University in the last issue of New Left Notes. It is continued here where it was left off.

'exception' to a generally good system. In this sense, our waiting for the 'perfect issue' sprung from an unwillingness to really expose and attack the oppression of campus workers generally and the oppression of all workers in this country and around the world.

2. We should find grievances that all workers feel intensely and that no workers would oppose our agitation around. We must make very sure that we have talked to the workers at length about what we're doing, but our main job is to go to the students.

3. Demands must be small enough to be winnable and must be seen by most students as just. We must explain them in terms of connection of the university to the exploitation of workers all over the world, to the War, and racism. If the demands are won, students will realize that they have the strength to win and workers will view us more seriously. If we lose, we should expose the bosses' excuses,



students demand end to racist pay differential

major point which we have tried to convey to people is that racist hiring practices are not just the result of bad attitudes on the part of some administrators, but in fact find their origin in the substantial profit the university makes by paying the workers less. It is crucial to get this idea across to students, many of whom think that racism is just the attitude of people like George Wallace that blacks are inferior.

In self-criticism

In fighting against this racist wage differential, we have made many errors because of our own racist attitudes. When the administration brought their black personnel officer into their press conference, some students reacted in a racist way by jeering at him and not relying on the ability of other students to see through him. In general, SDS students have been wary of talking to black students about this issue - or any other - and few people in SDS have gotten to know any black students. This fear of black people must be fought, and so must another racist attitude - that of 'Let's Wait for Afro' or 'It's up to the black students to fight racism'. SDS should take the lead in fighting the racism of white students and winning them to support the struggles of black people. In this case we must win students to seeing the importance of fighting the administration on this racist pay differential.

Another problem has been anti-working class ideas. Students, both in and out of SDS, do not generally take the problems of working people very seriously; in the past, they have even been used to break strikes. We must make much greater efforts to show how students and workers have a common enemy and why students should support working people. This involves really fighting the myths we're taught about how well off workers are, how we're much better than the 'unwashed multitudes', etc. While many students are sympathetic, we still do not have the base we had when we fought ROTC and expansion last spring. Our efforts to build support among both students and workers must really increase if we're going to stage a winning campaign.

The administration, of course, realizes that racist and anti-working class ideas among stu-

show students just how outrageous and exploitative the boss is, and build a bigger campaign to win the just demands.

With this understanding, we scrapped our first campaign and formulated new demands around one cafeteria where conditions were particularly bad. The demands are:

1. That Mrs. Cardoza (one of the bosses) either cease harassing and intimidating cafeteria workers or be fired. She orders workers to do three or four tasks at the same time. When a worker tries to carry out one order, he is attacked for not carrying out the other two or three. Mrs. Cardoza insults workers, calling them dirty and lazy no matter how hard they work.

2. That two additional full-time workers be hired immediately in Churchill Cafeteria with no cut in the number of part-time and student workers. The cafeteria is understaffed; workers are forced to rush around in order to get everything done. Very often, workers are ordered back to work in the middle of their breaks, despite the fact that their pay is docked for the whole break. The only way to stop the breakneck pace of work is to hire more workers.

dents are some of its best weapons. They contend that workers are happy here (despite the fact that painters' wages at Harvard are \$2 less an hour than outside Harvard). The administration spreads the notion that it is the union, and the union alone, which should be raising the painters issue, and that the painters themselves should be complaining, conveniently ignoring the fact that the union has tried to get the painters promoted, with no luck, and is sympathetic to what SDS is doing. Furthermore, workers who have complained about their wages have been met only with threats and harassment. And the administration plays to the hilt the notion that racism is not the fault of liberal college administrators, but of ignorant, beer-bellied workers who don't want to see the blacks get ahead. Yet it was the Harvard administration which instituted the helpers program, and it is the administration which profits from the program, not the white workers. The sentiment of many of the workers is summed up by the remark of one white journeyman: 'They (the administration) set up the program to exploit both black and white.'

Now the administration is threatening twenty students with disciplinary action for holding Dean May in his office. The university hopes to squelch this fight with repression, and it is important that SDS respond strongly.

But in its acts of suppression, the University exposes increasingly to students how much it wants to keep the wage differential and how necessary it feels it is to keep students from fighting on the side of workers. The university uses racism and male chauvinism to keep the wages of all its workers low; a successful fight against this one blatant case of racism would set a precedent the university really doesn't want to see. Through struggle, the administration's smokescreens will be shattered and its true nature exposed. The militancy of students up to now and the sympathy of many others indicates that, with lots of base-building and struggling with students over racist and anti-working class attitudes, such a struggle can be won.

3. To help eliminate unsafe working conditions, rubber safety mats must be installed throughout the entire kitchen. Because of speedup, there are many accidents on the job. Workers have to rush in order to get the work done. The floors are often wet and slippery and many workers have been hurt. One worker slipped with a tray of boiling water and was burned badly.

These demands have been formulated by talking to workers and seeing what things workers felt were needed most. When they were formulated and put in a leaflet, we went around and talked to the workers again. Only one worker, the bosses' fink, disliked the demands. Some thought that they were good, others thought they were terrific.

We then wrote up a petition and got 400 students' signatures on it in four days (before handing it in to the head of the university food service). We are now trying to talk to as many students as possible, making it a mass issue on campus, and also talking to all the workers we know about the campaign. Thursday we are going to go into the cafeteria and have a rally to build an alliance between the students and workers there.