

YSA

DISCUSSION BULLETIN

Vol. 9 No. 7
February 1966

CONTENTS

1. Resolution on the Negro Struggle by
Mellina Jones and Ron Ginther p. 1
2. A Revolutionary Perspective for the
Antiwar Movement (minority resolution)
by Lawrence Shumm p. 7

25 cents

YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE

YSA, BOX 471, COOPER STATION, N.Y., N.Y. 10003

YSA

DISCUSSION BULLETIN

Vol. 9 No. 7
February 1966

CONTENTS

1. Resolution on the Negro Struggle by
Mellina Jones and Ron Ginther p. 1
2. A Revolutionary Perspective for the
Antiwar Movement (minority resolution)
by Lawrence Shumm p. 7

25 cents

YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE

YSA, BOX 471, COOPER STATION, N.Y., N.Y. 10003

RESOLUTION ON THE NEGRO STRUGGLE

by

Mellina Jones and Ron Ginther

A New Stage in the Negro Struggle

A new stage in the Negro struggle was recorded at the Washington Conference where the whole Southern delegation, led by the delegation from the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, put forward the slogan, "Freedom Now -- Withdraw Now", dramatically symbolizing their recognition that the problem of racial discrimination is intimately bound up with the other great social problems besetting society.

The YSA, claiming to be the foremost advocate of the slogan "Withdraw Now", found its main point of support in this powerful plea by the Southern delegation but refused to support this and thereby revealed the crisis of policy in the YSA.

The growing struggle for black freedom in this country, seeking alliances with the antiwar movement, the ranks of organized labor, and the whites who live in poverty, is an expression of the inherent crisis of American capitalism and is rapidly creating the foundation for a mass revolutionary movement in the U.S.

But the YSA stands apart from the freedom struggle, and has nothing to offer it politically. This refusal to intervene results directly from the YSA substituting an idealistic and ephemeral "black nationalism" for a Marxist analysis of the Negro struggle, which would reveal that the race question is more complicated and, in fact, unique in the historical struggles of oppressed peoples, and may not be equated to the problem of oppressed nations.

The need for, and creation of, all-black organizations in the struggle against double exploitation and race discrimination are dictated by the conditions of segregation in the United States. But there is a sharp difference between organizational methods and political solutions and perspectives. When All-Black passes over from a tactic to a principle, proletarian solidarity and revolutionary internationalism vanish.

Historically, black organizations in the U.S., rather than being basically "nationalist" in perspective, have been powerful radical or revolutionary organizations directed against the barriers excluding the Negro from American society: Negroes in the Abolitionist movement and the Civil War, the Black Reconstruction, Southern Populism, the Niagara Movement and the

rise of the NAACP, Randolph's Negro Socialist movement of the 'twenties, the March on Washington, 1940, etc.

It is not the revolutionary, but the more conservative traditions of black unity which intrigue the YSA. The cry of "black nationalism" has become an ideological cover for substituting a bourgeois separatist solution to the Negro question for a revolutionary integrationist solution. It has become a rationale for a sideline sectarian approach to the civil rights movement -- a wastebasket into which the YSA discards that living movement which is unique to the United States and the key to the American Revolution.

From slavery onwards, racism has always been essential to the capitalist system. Today, Negroes are an integral part of the proletariat as a whole and its most oppressed section, and are on the move -- militant, growing constantly more radical, miles ahead of the more privileged white section of the class.

Potentially a great force to provide the leading cadres of the American Revolution and spur the quiescent white workers into action, the Negro proletariat is today the most effective voice of the unemployed, underpaid and overworked -- black and white. The YSA cry for self-determination, i.e., an invitation to separatism, would split off the most dynamic sector of the class and doom both to sterility.

The Ghetto Revolts

In 1964 and 1965, this country experienced a series of "riots" in the black ghettos, from Harlem to Watts. Watts residents interviewed subsequent to the uprising indicated that they were tired of living on meager welfare handouts or slave wages; tired of endless police harassment; tired of being confined to the slums of the city. They were not fighting to preserve the ghetto and their segregated existence, but neither were they fighting simply against segregation; they were fighting against conditions they suffer as the most exploited section of the working class. The YSA insists that by yelling "Whitey," Negroes transform their working-class revolt into a "black nationalist" struggle, and thereby become more revolutionary.

In the article "Black Revolt in Los Angeles," in the Sept.-Oct. Young Socialist, David Herman characterizes the Negroes as we have above as "the most oppressed section of American workers." However, in an earlier paragraph, we read: "Although the question of nationality for Afro-Americans is still unresolved, the people of Watts showed clearly that they do not intend to join this American society and that black nationalism is a very strong current in the ghetto." But if they are part of "the most oppressed section of American workers," and they "do not intend to join this American society," there is nothing for them but -- the socialist revolution. The concept of "nationalism" leads us to the unrevolutionary, diversionistic, and Stalinist idea of

separatism; either "back to Africa," or else the creation of black states in Dixie.

The Ideology of Black Nationalism

"Black nationalism" is an unscientific term because it can mean different things at different times. It may mean the completely reactionary philosophy of separatism as espoused by Elijah Muhammad; it may mean "a tendency to form all-black organizations"; it may be used to characterize a revolt against the (white) capitalist power structure; or it may mean solidarity with oppressed colored people in the colonial world -- e.g., the internationalism that Malcolm X identified with shortly before his death.

In an "Interview with Malcolm X" that appeared in the Young Socialist last year, Malcolm was asked to define black nationalism. He answered:

I used to define black nationalism as the idea that the black man should control the economy of his community, the politics of his community, and so forth. But when I was in Africa in May....So I had to do a lot of thinking and reappraising of my definition of black nationalism.... And if you notice, I haven't been using the expression for several months. But I still would be hard pressed to give a specific definition of the overall philosophy which I think is necessary for the liberation of the black people in this country.

In other words, Malcolm was beginning to see that "black nationalism" was inadequate as a philosophy of Negro liberation. Malcolm learned this from his own experiences -- not from the YSA. Evidently we haven't learned it yet, since we continue to promote black nationalism.

The Southern Movement

The YSA insists on bending and twisting facts to fit this theory. There is not the slightest element of black nationalism in the Southern movement; so, reasons the YSA, the Southern movement is not revolutionary, but simply a reform movement. This "method" is the reverse of Marxist method. Concrete analysis shows the objectively revolutionary character of the Southern movement against the police state and proves the viability and interventionist thrust of the integration demand.

SNCC is not a black nationalist organization, and this is one of the most progressive things about it. As evidenced by its publications, SNCC is deeply concerned with the problems of all unorganized, unrepresented workers. SNCC is looking beyond race, seeking the cause of racism and poverty in this country.

The following current radical developments in the South point up the revolutionary direction of the integration movement.

Development of a Southern Labor Party. The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, which grew out of SNCC, is becoming, out of necessity, an independent political party. It is based on and led by (mainly at this point agricultural) workers, and it has allied itself with a self-defense organization, the Deacons. Having gone through the experience of the Atlantic City Democratic Convention and the Congressional challenge, the MFDP has gone on to function as an independent party of working people. Although they haven't dropped the name "Democratic," none of the militants in the MFDP think of themselves as "Democrats."

What is felt and thought in MFDP is openly expressed in the Lowndes County (Alabama) Freedom Organization. Also spawned by SNCC, the LCFO is launching the independent "black panther" party, which explicitly rejects the old parties.

Further on self-defense: "Non-violence" is now understood by those in the movement to be strictly a tactic, and furthermore one that is becoming outmoded. Individual self-defense has always been recognized as a necessity, and with the growth and popularity of the Deacons, organized self-defense is clearly on the order of the day. Martin Luther King is becoming the symbol of a historical era -- the infancy of the Southern freedom movement.

The MFDP, organized by the student leadership of SNCC, has now developed a proletarian leadership. As these organizations develop a clear class program, and create their own self-defense groups, they become the basis for dual power in the South.

Opposition to the war in Vietnam. Antipathy to the Vietnam war is widespread among Negroes, and has been expressed in the South. The McComb branch of the MFDP issued a statement asking Negro mothers not to send their sons to Vietnam. This was printed in the MFDP Newsletter. John Lewis has on several occasions spoken critically of the war. But the real bombshell was the statement released in January by SNCC, taking a stand of opposition to the war and support to those student protesters who have resisted the draft. Following this occurrence came the statement by Julian Bond and his ouster from the Georgia Legislature.

Previous to the SNCC statement, MFDP representatives, in a demonstration of solidarity with the student antiwar movement, participated in the SANE march and the NCCFV convention in Washington last Thanksgiving. Now antiwar demonstrations throughout the South are being planned for February.

Having been beaten, tear-gassed, shot and bombed by white Americans to keep them "in their place," Negroes identify with the Vietnamese, whom white America is attempting to keep "in their place."

Receptivity to radical ideas. From the beginning, SNCC leaders refused to succumb to any form of red-baiting. Today the movement is deadly serious about finding a way to fundamentally change their repressive society. MFDP activists read with an open mind all radical literature.

The Permanent Revolution in the Southern U.S.

The motivation for these developments flows from one central fact: the bourgeois revolution has never been carried out in the South.

The theory of Permanent Revolution teaches us that the tasks of the bourgeois revolution in the epoch of capitalist decline cannot be carried out except by the working class. The "permanent revolution" provides Marxist insight into the racial problem in the United States, which remains one of the unresolved problems of the bourgeois revolution.

The Southern structure is not only fundamental to the preservation of the class system in the South, it has also become an integral part of the American political structure as a whole. This means that not one elementary democratic right can be won and secured by Negroes in the South without overthrowing the southern police-state system -- which means overthrowing capitalism in this country. The logic of the struggle demands this conclusion.

The YSA's failure to understand and respond to the radical developments in the South was made pathetically clear at the NCC Convention. The MFDP contingent was there to talk politics. They wanted to discuss what the movements for peace and freedom have in common. The YSA, like the other factionalists at the convention, denied them this chance by keeping the whole convention revolving around secondary organizational considerations. The MFDPers were so demoralized at this turn of events that they held an all-night meeting to discuss whether or not to stay at the Convention, finally deciding to stay. The YSAers, the supposed Leninists, were uninterested in discussing fundamental politics with the most militant representatives of the most oppressed workers in the country!

Worse than that, the YSA did not bother to take an opportunity to express its solidarity with these people. While such a fuss was being made over a new organization that would call for "Withdrawal Now," the MFDPers proposed as a slogan for the Convention "Freedom Now -- Withdraw Now." This was voted down, with YSAers voting against it! Evidently, YSA's new organization will virtually ignore some of the most inherently revolutionary people in the country. Such an organization will be neither broad nor militant, but an extremely narrow, limited, conservative, and white organization.

The fiasco at Washington is a grave warning of deeper errors to come if the YSA continues to hold its theory that black "unity," irrespective of class, can win black freedom, and do this without having to overthrow capitalism, and without the intervention of Marxism.

We propose that the YSA: .

(1) Abandon its theory of black nationalism and recognize

the central revolutionary anti-capitalist content of the freedom movement, particularly in the South.

(2) Begin an active support of and participation in SNCC and the Freedom Democratic movement in the South which will put the YSA in a position to intervene politically in the crisis of leadership in the Southern movement.

(3) Orient towards the ghetto: An all-out national support and participation in the projected Dick Gregory independent political campaign for Mayor of Chicago, which may well become the most significant political development of the era in the North. Join with SDS in its plans for "community organization" in the ghetto and among poor whites, with the object of politicizing this community work and teaching SDS the central political character of the struggle.

(4) Become champions of the connection between the antiwar movement and the Freedom movement.

Submitted February 17, 1966

A REVOLUTIONARY PERSPECTIVE FOR THE ANTIWAR MOVEMENT
(Minority Resolution on the antiwar movement)
by Lawrence Shumm

I. The Crisis of American Capitalism

In their own immediate and powerful way, the Watts uprising, the war in Vietnam, and the antiwar movement in this country, are expressions of the approaching crisis of American capitalism. Underlying this oncoming crisis is the fundamental economic factor: the post-war economic expansion is rapidly coming to an end as the possibilities of new capital investment are being closed off. On the surface there is prosperity, but underneath the contradictions are accumulating for a fundamental economic crisis. The United States is heading into a pre-revolutionary situation.

This is the context in which the antiwar movement is developing: an approaching economic crisis, the massive upsurge of the Negro people, the consolidation of a Bonapartist state, and the attempt of American imperialism to contain and crush the colonial revolution as it enters decisively into its socialist stage. In this context there is no alternative but a revolutionary perspective for the antiwar movement. The linking of the peace movement with the Negro struggle for liberation will provide a link with the working class and a revolutionary perspective. The linking of these two movements will provide the basis for the formation of a mass anti-capitalist party and the building of a broader revolutionary party through a process of fusion and regroupment.

II. Nature of the War in Vietnam and How It Can Be Ended

An analysis of the war in Vietnam and its relation to this fundamental crisis of American capitalism should be the basis for a YSA approach to the antiwar movement. The incorrectness of the present YSA analysis of the war is clearly seen in its policy in the antiwar movement: that the war can be stopped by the growth of a mass movement based on the single issue of an end to the war in Vietnam.

This illusion comes from the lack of an adequate conjunctural analysis and the lack of understanding that this war is decisive to the future of American imperialism. There are many reasons why the war in Vietnam is looked upon by the American ruling class as being decisive:

- a) It is the key test of whether or not the United States can stop the spread of the colonial revolution.
- b) The ruling class wants large areas of Southeast Asia, and Asia as a whole, open to American domination and economic exploitation. The need for new areas and opportunities for capital investment, underline the importance of this war.

- c) The war in Vietnam is necessary preparation for an assault upon the Chinese Revolution.

All of these elements point to the fact that American capitalism has a fundamental and possibly desperate stake in this war.

How, then, can this war be ended? If crushing the Vietnamese revolution is fundamental to the economic and political interests and strategy of American capitalism, then it is clear that the type of "peace only" movement projected politically and organizationally by the YSA cannot end the war. To the contrary, such a policy can only imprison the peace movement and destroy its revolutionary impact and potential.

If the peace movement is to end the war in Vietnam, then it can do so only by linking itself to other struggles, mainly the Negro revolt, and eventually to the struggle of the working class as a whole for socialism. Unless the National Liberation Front can defeat U.S. troops on Vietnamese soil, the only domestic force that can bring an end to the war is the working class, in the course of its coming struggle for survival and state power.

At the present time the most exploited section of the American working class, the Negro workers, are in a state of great ferment and explosion. The only road for the peace movement is to link up with the Negro revolt. These united forces and their joint political expressions will eventually shake other sectors of the proletariat into action.

It has always been a fundamental Marxist concept that there can be no peace under capitalism. Yet, at a time when the United States is fighting a desperate war in Southeast Asia, we are told by the YSA leadership that peace is a "single issue" and should not be connected in life to all the problems, crises, and struggles in the United States. This is a long step back from a revolutionary perspective, and a step towards reformism.

III. The Washington Convention

For a concrete and close look at YSA policy in the antiwar movement it is necessary to take the Washington convention as a point of departure, for it was at this convention that the present character and future potential of the movement were revealed. The most important fact to be noted here is that instead of playing a Leninist vanguard role of deepening and radicalizing the existing level of consciousness of the peace movement, the YSA's role at Washington was that of carrying on a demoralizing and utterly sectarian struggle over secondary organizational issues. Organizational maneuvers in the peace movement were substituted for the necessary political intervention.

The Washington convention saw the YSA attempt to imprison the antiwar movement in a "single issue" orientation while the entire non-Stalinist left-wing of the movement wanted to raise the struggle against the war to a higher level, find the correct road, and above all, to connect the peace movement with other issues and

struggles, and with the need for a fundamental social change in the United States. By plunging the convention into bitterness and incredible factionalism (witness the innumerable caucuses!) the YSA disrupted this attempt to deepen the understanding of the movement, alienated itself from almost everyone, and was the only tendency at the convention to block the serious attempt by the MFDP and other forces and individuals to connect the issues of peace and freedom.

The justification that the YSA gives for its actions at Washington and after is the need to keep the peace movement from being sucked into coalition politics and the Democratic Party. This is a noble goal, but the reality and truth is that by keeping the peace movement isolated from other social problems, the YSA leaves the antiwar movement no choice but to follow behind or around the Democratic Party - because independent anti-capitalist politics is only possible on the basis of understanding the interrelationship of all social problems and the understanding that it is capitalism which produces them. The role of the YSA should be to deepen and articulate these growing anti-capitalist ideas and sentiments.

The Washington convention of the antiwar struggle was the first convention of a young movement intensely seeking a correct political perspective and the ways to build a mass movement to end the war in Vietnam. The over 600 full and alternate delegates who came to Washington looked upon the convention as an important opportunity for political discussion and clarification. In opposition to this need and this desire the YSA carried on an organizational maneuver which plunged the convention into a bitter and demoralizing struggle from beginning to end. It was left to others to break through this organizational confusion and discuss the important political questions.

The first major organizational maneuver of the YSA was the leaflet distributed before the first session on Thursday, November 25, calling for a separate workshop to discuss the setting up of a separate national organization of the independent committees. The workshop was to take place at the same time as the workshop scheduled by the NCC on the organizational future of the antiwar movement. The YSA not only disregarded the forms of the convention set up by the NCC (in which the vast majority of the delegates had confidence) but was also attempting to set up a new national organization before the delegates as a whole had an opportunity to discuss the problems involved.

By carrying on an organizational maneuver of this nature before the convention had an opportunity to discuss the objectives of the antiwar movement and the organizational forms flowing from them, the YSA began to be looked upon by the vast majority of the delegates as an organization carrying on a disruptive activity that could lead to a serious and demoralizing split in the antiwar movement. There is no other way in which YSA activity at the convention could be viewed.

The depth of the hostility that was generated towards the YSA was great. The other important issues and workshops were

pushed into the background and the secondary organizational struggle became the center of the convention. This turn of events demoralized the majority of delegates and especially irritated the delegation from the MFDP who had to be convinced by Staughton Lynd and others on Thursday night to remain at the convention. This was one of the most serious consequences of YSA intervention at the convention: disruption of the attempt to link the issues of peace and freedom.

What the YSA was putting forward at Washington in its organizational proposals was that the NCC become a loose, rather meaningless coordinating committee and that the independent committees form a new national organization. In contrast to this, the vast majority of the delegates, including the independents, looked upon the NCC as a viable vehicle for struggle and political discussion and felt that it needed to be strengthened and made more effective for building a mass movement against the war. There were good, very valid reasons for this feeling and it was a catastrophic tactical blunder for the YSA to continue to push for a new national organization throughout the convention. The major reason was that the objectives of the antiwar movement were uncertain and the delegates resented any attempt to force an organizational form upon them. First politics, then organization.

Since the Washington Convention, YSA literature has emphasized the political basis for the demand of withdrawal, but YSA intervention was made on an organizational basis. If it had been placed in a broader political context and had been pushed with tactical sensitivity, the correct demand of withdrawal could have gained wide support at Washington. By its political conservatism and organizational crudeness, YSA activity actually turned people away from this demand.

IV.) Sectarianism, Organizational Practice and Maneuvering

In its work in a mass movement, a revolutionary organization must be able to make a flexible adaptation to the moods, level of consciousness, needs and desires of the various elements involved. The Trotskyist movement in America has a proud record of tactical sensitivity and principled and flexible organizational work in mass movements.

The Washington Convention saw this record seriously damaged. The organizational intervention of the YSA at the Convention and the setting up of the national caucus proved to be a very divisive and demoralizing factor and did not lead to a unity of the antiwar movement and did not correspond to the mood of the independents who have a suspicious attitude towards centralized organization, factionalism, and the attempt to settle organizational questions before the political questions have been adequately discussed and settled.

The YSA's intervention in the antiwar movement has lacked

the required tactical sensitivity and principled organizational basis. Above all, the YSA did not have a valid political orientation from which sensitivity could logically flow.

V. The Marxist Concept of the United Front

Besides its political weakness, YSA policy in the antiwar movement to create a centralized national membership organization, is a serious retreat from the Marxist principle of the United Front. The United Front means separate organizations acting together on a minimum program while maintaining their freedom of program and action. To force different organizations and currents to completely subordinate themselves to a national organization based on a minimum issue, runs against this concept and can be disastrous in the attempt to unify the diverse elements of the antiwar movement.

The only realistic and viable organizational basis for the cooperation of, and political exchange between, the diverse currents of the antiwar movement is the United Front. This is the only basis for the healthy development of the antiwar movement.

Whatever the maneuverings of the Stalinists, the NCC has developed on the basis of the United Front. This is the framework in which the YSA should work and which it should attempt to preserve. It is the only basis for development of an effective antiwar movement. The present organizational activity of the YSA is one that can only lead to split and demoralization.

VI. The Nature and Direction of the Peace Movement

The intervention of the YSA in the antiwar movement has been going on for some time. The contrast and contradictions that have been produced in this period are those of a peace movement developing in a radical direction and a politically conservative YSA engaging in disruptive organizational maneuvers. The left-wing of the peace movement has come to realize that the antiwar movement must be connected with other social problems, such as racial discrimination, colonial oppression, poverty, etc.

At the Washington Convention these forces made an attempt to articulate this understanding and move towards anti-capitalist action and politics. What they lacked was leadership and direction. The tragedy of Washington is that the YSA failed to provide this leadership.

The overwhelming feeling at the Washington Convention and in the peace movement as a whole was and is that a radical social change is necessary in this country. This was evident at Washington to anyone who attended the workshops and large meetings and made a serious attempt to talk with the large number of unaffiliated independents who came to Washington

to discuss politics and not organization. The feeling is not just that the question of peace is connected with the other great social problems of our era, but that these problems can only be solved through a radical change in the American social system. This is a very exciting development and means that these forces in the antiwar movement are on the verge of socialist conclusions. It is the task of the YSA to articulate these sentiments and give them the necessary direction.

The key political question that forcefully asserted itself at the Washington Convention and now comes to the forefront more and more is the connection between peace and freedom. The demonstrations against the war in Vietnam throughout the South on February 12-13, backed politically by the SNCC statement on the war, made this connection visible and very real. They also brought into sharp focus the inability of the YSA to understand this connection.

VII. Peace, Freedom, and the American Revolution

In her report to the Bay Area YSA conference Kipp Dawson stated: "We must keep in mind the fact that the antiwar movement was born and is growing in a period of general economic prosperity and the corresponding high rate of living for the working class, which has bred extreme conservatism in the trade union movement. This means that the movement has developed largely without the support or influence of the working class, and almost solely among one layer of the population: the students."

Aside from the one-sided analysis of the deepening economic contradictions of American capitalism, the glaring omission in Kipp's statement is that there is a section of the American working class which is in motion and ferment. For five years the Negro struggle has been shaking this country. Negro workers comprise that section of the working class which is forcing and leading this country into a pre-revolutionary period.

The Negro struggle is the key to the American Revolution and without an understanding of this question, no revolutionary organization can develop the program and strategy to lead the coming American revolution. The basic source of error in the YSA's work in the antiwar movement is an incorrect theoretical understanding of the nature and importance of the Negro struggle.

The YSA cannot link the peace movement and the civil rights movement because its orientation towards black nationalism means turning away from active political and organizational initiative and intervention in the Negro revolt. The YSA has the perspective of the "Holding Operation": saving and building the cadre for the upsurge of the organized sector of the working class. All other areas of struggle are placed in a secondary position.

VIII. The Character of the YSA: Where Is It Headed?

The rise and rapid growth of the antiwar movement within the

last year is a dramatic expression of the approaching crisis of American capitalism and demands of the YSA a correct Marxist analysis and intervention on the basis of a revolutionary perspective.

The intervention of the YSA at the Washington Convention lacked a revolutionary perspective, had strong overtones of reformism and centrism, and because of its political conservatism, the YSA was cut off from the entire left-wing of the antiwar movement. In fact, YSA activity at the Washington Convention set the YSA against the entire left-wing of the antiwar movement.

This is a serious development for it expresses a trend towards the abandonment of Marxist analysis and a revolutionary perspective. Unless understood and checked, this development will signify a deepening political sickness in the movement, and the YSA will not be able to play the role that a Leninist youth organization must undertake. For Marxists, theory and program are serious, life-and-death matters. Unless the YSA can seriously analyze and review its incorrect and almost catastrophic policy in the antiwar movement, its total degeneration may easily follow.

The political conservatism and sectarianism that have marked YSA intervention in the antiwar movement are not accidental. They are not the result of a temporary aberration in applying Marxist method. They flow out of the inability of the present YSA leadership to make an adequate conjunctural analysis of the crisis of American capitalism, and a fundamental failure to understand the dynamics of the coming American Revolution. The result is political conservatism and a growing inability to deal with rapidly erupting events. A hardening sectarianism takes the place of a flexible intervention into the living movement.

What does a conjunctural analysis of American capitalism mean? It means applying Marxist method to the current economic and political situation of the U.S., and basing the strategy of the YSA for the coming period upon it. Unable to analyze the fast approaching economic crisis of American capitalism, and unable to respond in any kind of adequate manner to the massive upsurge of the Negro people, it comes as no surprise that the present YSA leadership does not understand the nature of the war in Vietnam and the movement in this country against it.

American capitalism is rapidly heading for a fundamental crisis. Capitalist economics, the Negro revolution, and the volcanic upheavals of the colonial peoples are the key factors in this approaching showdown. Yet, without any serious attempts to back up their claims, the YSA leaders tell us that we are still essentially in a conservative period.

The intervention in the antiwar movement has shown that the present YSA leadership is in motion towards reformism. Lacking any valid theoretical or organizational connection with the

working class, the YSA, as a petty-bourgeois formation, has been moving rightwards, and the present intervention in the antiwar movement is accelerating this trend.

The essential question to be asked at this convention is whether or not the YSA is fulfilling its responsibility for leadership of the radical youth, and helping in the formation of a Marxist-trained cadre. In evaluating the role of the YSA since its birth it becomes clear that its role has largely been one of abstention from struggle, and a growing political conservatism. The orientation towards black nationalism and the emphasis on a single-issue peace movement are expressions of an inability to apply Marxist theory, and an alarming trend away from a revolutionary perspective and towards reformism.

Submitted February 18, 1966