

# **YOUNG socialist discussion bulletin**

**Volume 16, No. 3**

October 30, 1972

## **Contents**

DOCUMENTS ON THE CASE OF JOHN ZANELLOTTI

Published by:

YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE

P. O. Box 471 Cooper Station, New York, N. Y. 10003

**25 cents**

CONTENTS

The Case of John Zanelotti	3
NEC Statement on the Case of John Zanelotti	4
Letter from John Zanelotti to Mirta Vidal, dated August 20, 1972	7
"Appeal to the National Convention of the YSA to Reverse the Expulsion of Comrade J. Zanelotti from the YSA."	7
Letter from Tom Burghardt to the NEC, dated March 29, 1972	10
Letter from John Zanelotti to Andy Rose, dated April 11, 1972	11
Letter from Mike Priddy to the National Office, received May 3, 1972	11
Letter from Jim McCaffrey to the NEC, dated May 20, 1972	12
Letter from Mirta Vidal to John Zanelotti, dated May 31, 1972	13
Statement of John Zanelotti to Trial Body, June 10, 1972	14
Letter from Mirta Vidal to John Zanelotti, dated August 9, 1972	16
Letter from Mirta Vidal to John Zanelotti, dated August 25, 1972	16

## THE CASE OF JOHN ZANELLOTTI

John ZanelloTTi was expelled from the YSA on August 7, 1972, by the National Executive Committee, having been found guilty of disloyalty to the YSA, based on his membership in the Workers League. ZanelloTTi has appealed his expulsion to the National Convention.

The letters, statements, and other materials included in this bulletin are documents pertaining to the charges brought against John ZanelloTTi by the National Executive Committee, his trial and expulsion, and his appeal to the National Convention.

In his letter of August 20, 1972, appealing the decision of the NEC, ZanelloTTi claims that "the charges brought against me by the NEC are total fabrications" and that he was expelled from the YSA for "struggling for Trotskyist politics as an oppositionist."

The charges brought against ZanelloTTi and his subsequent expulsion were based on substantial evidence submitted prior to and during the course of the trial, conducted on June 10, 1972, by the National Executive Committee, which conclusively proved that ZanelloTTi was a member of the Workers League. The 1965 YSA convention adopted a motion that: "Membership in, support to, or collaboration with the Spartacist group or the American Committee for the Fourth International group (now the Workers League) is incompatible with membership in the YSA."

ZanelloTTi was not expelled on the basis of his political disagreements, which as a member of the YSA he was free to raise during the discussion period preceding last year's YSA convention. He did so in the resolution "Toward a Mass Working Class Youth Movement; A Resolution on Perspectives," and would have been free to do so again for the upcoming convention. He is not, however, free to function in the YSA as an agent of the Workers League.

ZanelloTTi was expelled for belonging to an opponent organization whose aim is to destroy the YSA, a position ZanelloTTi agrees with, as he stated at the trial conducted by the NEC.

In his letter of appeal ZanelloTTi further confirms his political agreement with the sectarian Socialist Labor League of Gerry Healy in Great Britain and its U. S. satellite, the Workers League, making even clearer his contempt for the YSA. In a frantic tirade against the Trotskyist movement, he charges that the YSA, the SWP, and the Fourth International are in a state of "crisis," have "abandoned dialectical materialism," and uphold "revisionist theories."

In his appeal, ZanelloTTi fails to differentiate himself in any way from the Workers League and he does not deny his membership in the Workers League. He does not present any evidence contradicting the evidence presented at the trial. He does not offer any evidence that the trial was conducted in an unfair or undemocratic manner. He does not present any evidence that he, as a member of the YSA, was denied the right to express his political views and attempt to win support for them during the appropriate time for discussion.

The NEC recommends that the convention uphold the action of the NEC in expelling John ZanelloTTi and will ask the pre-convention plenum of the National Committee to present a motion to the convention that the NEC's decision be upheld.

National Executive Committee  
October 26, 1972

NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE STATEMENT  
ON THE CASE OF JOHN ZANELLOTTI

During preconvention discussion for the 1971 convention, a resolution entitled "Toward a Mass Working Class Youth Movement: A Resolution on Perspectives" was submitted by six members of the YSA who declared themselves the "Minority Tendency." This resolution was published in Young Socialist Discussion Bulletin Vol. 15, No. 5 (pages 9-11).

In March, 1972, the National Office received a letter from Tom Burghardt, a cosigner of the resolution under the name Tom Peterson, who was dropped from membership after the convention for inactivity and non-payment of dues. In this letter he indicated that he was the author of the Minority Tendency resolution and was a member of the Workers League at the time that the resolution was written.

Upon request of the National Office for more information about the functioning of the Minority Tendency, Burghardt submitted a written report to the National Executive Committee stating that the Minority Tendency resolution was written by members of the Workers League in the YSA, in collaboration with and under the leadership of the Workers League. Those YSA members named by Burghardt as Workers League agents, in addition to himself, are: Dave Durstan, Upper West Side YSA; Dick Merrill, Boston YSA; Carol Merrill, Boston YSA; Larry Kerry, Brooklyn YSA; and John ZanelloTTI, Washington D.C. YSA.

Based on this information the National Office initiated an investigation of the comrades named by Burghardt as Workers League agents. All four comrades, when asked, denied the allegations. The fifth cosigner (Dave Durstan) was dropped from membership in the YSA earlier this year for inactivity and non-payment of dues and could not be reached.

No corroborating evidence has been found in the cases of Dick Merrill, Carol Merrill, and Larry Kerry. No charges have been brought against them.

However, in the case of Comrade ZanelloTTI, two additional reports submitted to the National Office confirmed ZanelloTTI's membership in the Workers League. These reports were submitted by Mike Priddy and Jim McCaffrey, both members of the College Park YSA and former members of the Workers League prior to joining the YSA. Priddy was a member of the Workers League from June, 1971, to the end of that summer and joined the YSA in October, 1971. McCaffrey was a member of the Workers League from October, 1970, to December, 1971, except for a brief period in early 1971, and joined the YSA in May, 1972.

The reports from these two comrades, along with Burghardt's statement, make the following allegations about ZanelloTTI's political activity since becoming a member of the YSA.

(ZanelloTTI joined the YSA in mid-June, 1971, as an at-large member in Columbus, Maryland, as recorded in the minutes of the June 16, 1971, meeting of the NEC.)

ZanelloTTI was a contact of the Workers League during the summer of 1971 and was contacted at least once by members of the Workers League during that time. On the last week of August, 1971, after having joined the YSA, ZanelloTTI sold the Bulletin, organ of the Workers League, on the corner of 14th and Park, N.W. in Washington, D.C., along with other members of the Workers League, including Mike Priddy.

ZanelloTTI joined the Workers League at a meeting of its Baltimore branch at which both he and Mike Priddy were present. His membership was taken up under a special point, separate from other membership applications, and branch members were told that his membership was to remain a secret since his assignment would be to act as an agent of the Workers League in the YSA.

In late August or early September ZanelloTTI attended a Workers League educational conference in the Catskills, in New York State, where he met with Tim Wohlforth, National Secretary of the Workers League, and other members of the Workers League to discuss his activity in the YSA. Jim McCaffrey also attended this conference.

On the second week in November, 1971, ZanelloTTI attended a meeting at the Workers League headquarters in New York, to discuss the resolution and the activities of the Minority Tendency in the YSA with leaders of the Workers League, including Tim Wohlforth and Lucy St. John. Tom Burghardt was present at this meeting.

On the basis of these allegations from various independent sources, the NEC voted at its meeting of May 30, 1972, to charge ZanelloTTI with disloyalty to the YSA based on his membership in the Workers League.

\* \* \*

The decision to bring charges against Comrade ZanelloTTI was based on the YSA policy, adopted at the 1965 YSA convention, which states: "Membership in, support to, or collaboration with the Spartacist group or the American Committee for the Fourth International group is incompatible with membership in the YSA." (The American Committee for the Fourth International is the predecessor to the Workers League.)

This motion was passed by that convention in response to the cases of several members of the YSA who had been functioning as agents of the Spartacist group and the American Committee and who were appealing to that convention for a

reversal of disciplinary measures taken against them by the New York local and the NEC.

These members had developed differences so deep that they found them irreconcilable with carrying out the democratically arrived at decisions of the majority and chose instead to violate those decisions by publicly carrying out a line counter to that adopted by the majority.

It became clear that membership in those two organizations had led these YSAers to carry out, over a period of time, a consistent pattern of calculated and deliberate violations of discipline, under instructions from the Spartacist and American Committee groupings, which demonstrated their disloyalty to the YSA. Furthermore, it was evident that under those circumstances, the only purpose of Spartacist or American Committee members in the YSA was, not to build the YSA, but to destroy it--to create havoc within the YSA and to use it as a ground for recruiting YSAers to their own organizations.

For that reason the convention voted, not only to expel those members, but also to set a policy that membership in the Spartacist group or the American Committee is incompatible with membership in the YSA.

The American Committee for the Fourth International was originated by a group of YSA and Socialist Workers Party members who in the early 1960s developed fundamental differences with the YSA and the SWP on several major questions, including our analysis of Cuba. They continued to develop a totally sectarian line and eventually split from both the YSA and the SWP to form the ACFI and launch the Bulletin, in the pages of which they carried slanderous attacks on the YSA, the SWP, and the Fourth International.

Since their departure from the YSA they have carried out a consistent campaign to attempt to destroy the YSA, and have repeatedly stated this intention in the pages of the Bulletin for seven years.

The Workers League is in political solidarity with the so-called International Committee of the Fourth International led by Gerry Healy's sectarian Socialist Labour League in Britain. The "International Committee" states that it is at "war" with the Fourth International and all its sympathizing groups, whom they call the "Pabloites," which include in this country the Socialist Workers Party and the Young Socialist Alliance. The Newsletter (now the Workers Press), organ of the SLL, has charged the SWP with having "capitulated to imperialism" (August 20, 1966, Newsletter.) Of James P. Cannon, one of the founders of the world Trotskyist movement, they say that "He had decided to sell out to the Stalinist bureaucracy and the imperialists." And in the same article they state that, "The Socialist Labour League is out to destroy Pabloism and its SWP accomplices. There can be (sic) and, we repeat, there never will be a compromise on these questions--the fight will go on until we destroy the Pabloites and the revisionist SWP." (Sep-

tember 3, 1966, Newsletter.) Similar statements abound in the Workers League press.

What are the implications of the Workers League and the SLL position on the politics of the SWP, the YSA, and the Fourth International? To them, destroying these opponent organizations is not merely a question of engaging in political debate. They instead use their political differences and frantic accusations of "revisionism" and "capitulation to the imperialists" to justify any and all measures to deal blows against those organizations, physical attacks not excluded.

On November 17, 1966, SLL members, in the presence of Gerry Healy, attacked Comrade Ernie Tate, a member of the Fourth International, for selling a pamphlet criticizing the SLL, outside an SLL public function, injuring him to the point that he had to be hospitalized.

The response of the Workers League to the Tate incident was to publish an article in the Bulletin where Tim Wohlforth defended Gerry Healy and his attack on Tate on the grounds that "Ernest Tate and his political allies represent political scabs of the worst sort."

To make it even clearer that this was no accidental occurrence Wohlforth further stated that the relationship between the SWP and its co-thinkers on the one hand, and the SLL and its co-thinkers on the other, "is symbolized by this confrontation," thus not only attempting to politically justify such practices on the left, but even praising them. We can only reach one inescapable conclusion: that the aim of the Workers League is to destroy the Fourth International and organizations in political solidarity with it, including the YSA.

The question then arises, can a person who holds these views about the YSA, who has such fundamental differences with the YSA, remain a loyal member of the YSA, help build the YSA, and recruit to its program? The answer is obviously no.

Membership in the Workers League is incompatible with membership in the YSA because loyalty is one of the fundamental prerequisites for membership in the YSA.

The YSA is the only youth organization in this country structured along democratic centralist lines. Every aspect of its program has been reached after the freest, fullest possible discussion since its very inception. Democratic centralism allows every member or grouping the right and the opportunity to raise disagreements on any aspect of the YSA's program or organizational policies during the appropriate time designated for this purpose to try to win over the majority to its point of view. Every possible measure is provided to assure that minority viewpoints get an adequate chance to be heard and expressed.

Once all the questions have been thoroughly discussed and debated a decision is reached by a vote. The will of the majority then becomes the official policy and program of the orga-

nization. Disputed points may be raised again, at the appropriate time when discussion is once again reopened. While minorities have full rights to present their views within the organization, the majority also has the right to have its decisions carried out, and the centralist aspect of our organization ensures that the democratically arrived at decisions of the majority are implemented.

Therefore, loyalty to the YSA is not an abstract concept in the YSA Constitution. Loyalty is a basic prerequisite for membership that ensures that each and every member abides by the decisions of the majority and agrees to build the YSA and carry out its program.

As the NEC statement on the expulsions of Nancy Adolphi and Ken Simpson (Documents on the Cases of Nancy Adolphi and Ken Simpson -- YSA Internal Information Bulletin) states: "It is not correct, however, that one can have any political ideas whatsoever and still be a member of the YSA, so long as one refrains from breaking discipline. There are limits, because we understand that a person can have disagreements with the YSA so basic, so fundamental, that she or he would find it impossible to loyally build the YSA. One cannot be a member of the YSA and advocate support for imperialist war. One cannot be a member of the YSA and support racism. One cannot be a member of the YSA and advocate the destruction of the YSA."

\* \* \*

The NEC constituted itself as the trial body to hear the charges against Comrade Zanellotti. The trial was held on June 10, 1972. The trial body heard testimony from Comrade Zanellotti, Comrade Priddy, Comrade McCaffrey, College Park YSA organizer Steve Sluchan, and Washington D. C. YSA organizer Chuck Petrin.

In his statement to the NEC, presented during the trial proceedings, Zanellotti charges the YSA with having "abandoned the Marxist method," claiming that "this abandonment of Marxism... is leading (the YSA) into open collaboration with the Stalinists and the petty bourgeoisie."

At no time during the course of the trial did Zanellotti attempt to differentiate himself from the politics of the Workers League. In fact, when asked if he was in basic political agreement with the Workers League, Zanellotti replied "Yes." When asked if he agreed with the Workers League position that the YSA is totally reformist and has to be smashed, he replied "Yes." When asked if he believed that a vanguard party exists today in the United States, Zanellotti replied, "I believe that to be the Workers League."

Zanellotti's differences with the YSA are so profound that he admits to being in political agreement with the Workers League, considers the Workers League the revolutionary vanguard party, and believes that the YSA is a revisionist organization in a state of total crisis.

He concludes from this that the YSA needs to be "smashed." Zanellotti's statements at the trial explaining his attitudes toward the Workers League and toward the YSA, even if he were not formally a member of the Workers League, would be unambiguous evidence of disloyalty to the YSA and grounds for expulsion.

Moreover, the National Executive Committee believes the testimony presented to the trial committee confirming that Zanellotti is in fact a member of the Workers League.

The evidence presented to the NEC confirms that the only basis for Zanellotti's membership in the YSA is that of acting as an agent of the Workers League. The purpose of the Workers League in sending agents into the YSA can only be to destroy the YSA and not to build it.

The National Executive Committee finds John Zanellotti guilty of disloyalty as charged, based on his membership in the Workers League.

The National Executive Committee hereby expels John Zanellotti from the YSA.

(Adopted August 7, 1972)

John Zanellotti  
Columbia, Md.

August 20th, 1972

Mirta Vidal  
Box 471  
Cooper's Station  
New York, N. Y. 10003

Comrade Vidal:

Enclosed please find my appeal to the National Convention of the action taken by the NEC on August 7 in expelling me from the YSA.

s/John Zanellotti

APPEAL TO THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE YSA TO  
REVERSE THE EXPULSION OF COMRADE J. ZANELLOTTI  
FROM THE YSA.

COMRADES:

The charges brought against me by the NEC are total fabrications on the part of comrades who are in the YSA at present, and in the case of one comrade who dropped out of the YSA last year.

I was expelled from the YSA for struggling for Trotskyist politics as an oppositionist.

In the statement of August 7 the NEC not only quoted me out of context, but they actually placed words in my mouth which I never said -- such as my intention to "smash" the YSA. In a conscious and deliberate attempt to discredit me they go to the extent of falsifying history and proceed to launch an unprincipled attack on the International Committee and their co-thinkers here in the U. S., the Workers League. This is nowhere clearer than in their resuscitating the totally discredited SWP version of the Tate Affair, and their continuous attempt to portray the Workers League and the International Committee's struggle against revisionism in the Trotskyist movement here in the U. S. A. and internationally as unprincipled.

Comrades will not find the reasons for my expulsion in the NEC statement. Their charges have already been answered in correspondence and the trial itself. The real causes for these attacks on the International Committee and my expulsion can only be understood and found in the present crisis of world capitalism and the resultant crisis in the SWP-YSA and the United Secretariat. This crisis in the Party and the YSA is a

direct result of having abandoned dialectical materialism on the part of the leadership. This is clearly expressed in their blindness to the crisis and their abandonment of the perspective for power around the labor party demand, instead opportunistically chasing after any movement which rises out of the crisis of the middle class.

The accusations, slanders, and expulsion come under conditions of a sharp turn in the whole international situation. The first anniversary of Nixon's August 15th measures shows more clearly than ever that they have solved nothing for capitalism. On the contrary they have sharpened the contradictions of capitalism even more. The subsequent devaluation of the dollar -- for the first time since the 1930's -- has likewise shown its inability to solve anything fundamental. The price of gold keeps rising, having reached the highest mark so far two weeks ago. The capitalist crisis now more than ever dominates everything, preparing the ground for tremendous class actions and struggles. The crisis capitalism faces today is far greater and deeper than the one it faced in the 1930's, Nixon's decision to refuse to honor the dollar with gold is an admission of the complete bankruptcy of U. S. capitalism. What this means is that much of the capital in the world is completely fictitious, having no value whatsoever. A situation like this threatens at any moment to stop the productive, distributive and trading process itself. American Can Corporation's decision to shortly close nine of its plants stands as a first warning. We can expect the devaluation of the Japanese yen in an attempt to regain the edge in some of the markets they have lost.

In this period there is only one way for the capitalists to restore value, and this is to drive the working class back to the conditions of the 1930's and worse. Nixon's Pay Board (with the full backing of McGovern & Company) and his bringing pressure to bear on the European capitalists forcing them to attack their working classes is only the first step. However, the capitalists are not dealing here with a demoralized and defeated working class, but a class strengthened by years of prosperity and determined to hold on to what they have. This is why major class confrontations are inevitable. They can no longer be avoided but must be prepared for now!

These developments require a confrontation and settling of accounts with all the issues raised in the history of the Trotskyist movement. First and foremost is the struggle of Trotskyism against Stalinism. We now exist under conditions where the question of power itself will be raised, and Trotsky's struggle against Stalinism becomes of prime importance to all the new forces entering into the struggle. If the lessons of Stalinism are not fought out and understood in time, the working class will face new defeats which could very well prove to be the end for the human race.

At the same time all the questions related to the development of revisionism from out of the Trotskyist movement must also be discussed and understood. The new developments

require this, and the new forces coming into the movement demand it! This discussion cannot be suppressed, it is and will continue.

First and foremost is the question of the 1953 split in the Fourth International which led the SWP, the SLL, and the OCI to form the International Committee. The 1953 split centered around the issue of constructing mass Trotskyist parties, and today when this becomes an absolute necessity we have to go back to this split and what it represented. In taking up this question we have to turn to two comrades in particular in terms of how they see this split, what it was about. Comrade Pierre Frank states: "In fact 'Pabloism' is an invention dating from 1952-53, when it was used to explain the split. This concept represented an incorrect extrapolation of the policy advocated by the Fourth International at the time."

On the other side we have Comrade Hansen's statement: "While proclaiming adherence to Trotskyism, Pablo today stands on such concepts of 'centuries of degenerated workers states' and the possibility of Communist parties 'reforming' themselves, which he advanced some two decades ago which helped precipitate the factional struggle and split of that time."

At the time of the split, Comrades Mandel and Frank stood on the side of Pablo.

The party supported a reunification with what was left of the Pabloite formation in 1963. The reunification took place through an agreement not to discuss the 1953 split and its causes -- what was behind it. Now after nine years of common existence in the same international movement we have Comrades Frank and Hansen still unable to agree on the split. That this disagreement persists and both these comrades are now forced to discuss it publicly for the first time testifies to the importance of the split and the lessons of the issues involved for today's struggles.

The International Committee and the SLL in particular have been constantly singled out as "sectarians" because of their principled position in the period of reunification of insisting that before any unification could take place there had to be an assessment of the 1953 split and the development of Pabloism since that time.

What Pablo maintained in 1953 was that under conditions of a "new reality" and imminent war-revolution the Transitional Program and fight for Trotskyism no longer had any relevance. The Communist parties would be transformed under these new conditions into revolutionary instruments through the pressure of the masses. Liquidating the Trotskyist cadres into the Stalinist and other mass parties in the hopes of encouraging centrist formations which in turn would be pressurized to carry through the revolution was put forward as the abandonment of building independent Trotskyist parties which could actually lead the world revolution.

Later on this method was extended and applied to mass social democratic formations and to the petty bourgeois led nationalist formations in the colonial countries.

There are several things here that must be understood. First Pabloism breaks with the Marxist assessment of capitalism. Using abstract schema of "imminent revolution" (or conversely neo-capitalism) it turns away from the scientific analyses of the contradictory development of the capitalist crisis. Having thus "recognized" objective conditions different from those assessed by Lenin in Imperialism and Trotsky in the Transitional Program the stage is set for the abandonment of Lenin's and Trotsky's whole struggle against Stalinism. The final and logical step is the concrete proposals for completely liquidating the Trotskyist cadres.

The SWP's "Open Letter" stated in 1953: "To sum up: The lines of cleavage between Pablo's revisionism and orthodox Trotskyism are so deep that no compromise is possible either politically or organizationally."

Comrade Cannon stated: "The issues of the factional struggle are matters of principle which put the Trotskyist movement squarely before the question: To be or not to be."

No one can deny the importance of these questions today. We are in a period when we can and must build Trotskyist parties which become mass parties. Today we are in a period when Stalinism's complete counter-revolutionary role means defeat and death for whole sections of the working class. Bangladesh, the Sudan, Ceylon and Bolivia are just a few of these living testaments. Yet today both the party and YSA maintain, through the theory of neo-capitalism, that we are not in such a period and persist on the basis of the theory of the "new radicalization" to liquidate the movement in the middle class protest movements such as Women's Liberation, Gay, nationalism and what have you.

On one question both Frank and Hansen, along with Novack and the rest, agree -- the question of the Marxist method. Joining them on this question we find the OCI, Spartacist, and renegades of all shades and colors. The OCI demonstrated this most clearly when they rejected a motion the British Young Socialists placed before their Essen Conference calling for a struggle to develop Marxist theory. They characterized this as "expressing the idealist position, the abandonment of Marxism, in the name of an ideology which it baptizes as 'Marxist philosophy'."

Comrade Hansen, commenting on this, supports the OCI in this rejection characterizing the position of the International Committee as "typical of the abstract generalizations the leaders of the SLL are fond of."

The OCI sees the revolutionary party as a carrier of a finished program which adds up all the theories and experiences of the proletarian revolution. Capitalist development pushes the working class towards accepting this program in an



"organic" development. With this method the French OCI has found itself fundamentally in agreement with the SWP. Although both organizations have different positions on many political questions, both are in agreement in their hostility and opposition to the International Committee on the basic question of Marxist philosophy, of dialectical materialism. This hostility is clearly expressed in their opposition to the International Committee's insistence that the unity of theory and practice is one consisting of the conflict between them. The revolutionary party is part of the working class as the force struggling against capitalism, but it is the conscious role of that class in conflict against the dominance of bourgeois ideology which is constantly being reformed and re-established after every step forward by the working class.

In What is to be Done? Lenin states:

"The working class spontaneously gravitates towards socialism: nonetheless, the most widespread (and continuously and diversely revived) bourgeois ideology spontaneously imposes itself upon the working class to a still greater degree.

"Hence our task, the task of Social Democracy (i. e. Marxism) is to combat spontaneity, to divert the working class movement from this spontaneous, trade unionist striving to come under the wing of the bourgeoisie, and to bring it under the wing of the revolutionary social-democracy."

Against the notion of a simple and mechanical "relation" between theory and practice, it was this conception which was behind the split at the Essen Conference between the International Committee and the OCI.

When Comrade Novack in Intercontinental Press attacks the SLL and accuses them of "dogmatic sectarianism" he is hitting at exactly the same target as the OCI -- at Marxism. In the same article he paints a picture of the Workers League and the SLL as a regime of unbearable pressure on individuals to accept "philosophical dogma." According to him dialectical materialism "is a voluntary, not a mandatory, aspect of party activity and personal development." In other words if you like it, fine; if not, it doesn't really matter.

What Comrade Novack is concerned with is this: to preserve a position where Marxist theory is not brought into sharp conflict with the practice of proletarian struggle and proletarian subjection to the bourgeois ideology. What this does is throw open the doors to all the bourgeois ideological pressures a-broad in the working class and the petty bourgeoisie. This is what lies behind the party and the YSA's turn toward middle-class radicalism and protest politics.

Trotsky took quite a different position on this question of philosophy. Rather than jeering at dialectical materialism he based everything he did on it. The struggle which he led against the Schactmanites in 1940 was precisely over this question.

Comrade Frank attacks the International Committee for clinging "To every letter, every word, every comma of the Transitional Program" and goes on to say: "... The FI has not indulged in a mere repetition of formulas but has striven to carry the Trotskyist movement forward by offering appropriate answers to the new problems."

Schactman in 1940 sought to offer "appropriate answers" to the "new problem" of the USSR's invasion of Finland and Poland. However, Trotsky saw in this a pragmatic method which simply tossed out all the historical, theoretical development of Marxism -- all the letters, words and commas -- in favor of immediate impressions. These impressions in turn reflected the class pressures of the bourgeoisie through their middle-man -- the middle class.

It is this break with the Marxist method which lies behind the revisionism of the Pabloites. And it is only through taking up a struggle for dialectical materialism as part of building the revolutionary party that we can prepare the cadres for this new period of gigantic class battles. It is not a "matter of taste" as Comrade Novack would have us believe, but an absolute necessity!

This means that the critical question is the role of the revolutionary party bringing socialist consciousness into the actual struggles of the working class that are now developing under these new conditions after the August 15th measures. It is not enough to "reflect" the present stage of consciousness of workers or middle class. No force other than the conscious revolutionary party will be "forced" by circumstances to play this conscious revolutionary role. This is why all revisionist theories, including the current theories of the YSA and SWP leadership, mean an abdication of leadership and the theoretical -- and not too far behind the concrete proposals -- liquidation of the party.

These are some of the questions which must now be discussed in the YSA, the SWP and internationally. I was expelled for fighting for what I consider to be the only revolutionary politics, the only Trotskyist politics, and demanding a principled discussion of our program and history. I urge the National Convention to overturn the decision of the NEC and that I be readmitted into the YSA as a member in good standing.

Fraternally,  
s/John Zanelotti  
August 20, 1972

Tom Burghardt  
San Francisco, Calif.

March 29, 1972

Dear Comrades of the N. E. C. :

The document "Towards a Mass Working Class Youth Movement: A Resolution on Perspectives" was drawn up and signed by members of the Workers League in the YSA.

The signers of the document were: Tom Burghardt, (Peterson) Lower Manhattan YSA, Dave Durstan, Upper West Side YSA, Dick Merrill, Boston YSA, Carol Merrill, Boston YSA, Larry Kerry, Brooklyn YSA, and John Zanellotti, Washington D. C. YSA.

I do not intend to speak for anyone but myself. I have not been in contact with these people since last November and I have absolutely no idea what they are now doing. They are not loyal members of the YSA and their sole purpose for remaining in the YSA is to wreck it. I broke with the Workers League when this became clear to me.

There were a number of circumstances that led me to join the Workers League. I had a number of disagreements with the YSA that I did not have when I first joined. The most serious disagreement concerned our policy towards the trade unions, and our work within them. Around the second week of October I joined the Workers League. It was my intention to leave the YSA.

Upon joining the Workers League I had a number of discussions with Tim Wohlforth, Lucy St. John, Juan Farinas, Dennis Cribben (O'Casey) and Pat Connolly. The conversations centered around my political views, why I joined, what I would do.

One day in the last week of October, I had a conversation with Wohlforth, and he informed me that it had been decided by the P. C. / of the Workers League that I was to write a document for the next YSA convention along with others who were in the YSA and the League. He said that since the League had the correct analysis of the situation it would be necessary to "take the struggle for Marxism into the convention, and win a majority of YSA comrades to our perspective." That turned out to be a cynical lie! I worked on the document and two weeks later, the second week in November, a meeting organized by Wohlforth was held in the Workers League headquarters in New York. In attendance at the meeting besides the six members of the Tendency was Tim Wohlforth, and Lucy St. John. Wohlforth had made all arrangements and contacted all members of the Tendency about the meeting.

I was chosen to be leader of the Tendency and to handle all correspondence with the YSA National Office. In reality the real leadership of the Tendency was Tim Wohlforth and

the Political Committee of the Workers League.

The document was written and submitted to Tim Wohlforth. The final draft was given back to me by Wohlforth after it had been considerably altered. It was typed, corrected, and ready to be printed. There was a second meeting in New York about a week later of Durstan, Kerry, myself, and Wohlforth. It was an organizational meeting at which we were told how we should conduct ourselves during pre-convention discussion, and to bring our arguments up on the floor as much as possible.

After the discussion on the Chicano resolution was over-- in Lower Manhattan-- to say the least I was demoralized. I was disgusted with myself and by this time with the Workers League. I went up to their headquarters around Nov. 27 and again talked to Wohlforth. I told him I was disgusted and did not feel we could get a majority of delegates. He cynically said something to this effect, "Majority? Our task is to smash these reformists and to smash the YSA." After the shock wore off, I got up and told him to go to hell and started to leave. His parting words to me were, this is a direct quote, "Leave, but remember this--we're gonna fucking get you in one way or another, somewhere and sometime, we're gonna fucking get you." Naturally, I took this as a physical threat and quickly left, never returning. That and a series of personal problems led me away from politics. Three months later I left for California--and again became involved in politics! Except for the people named, those are the only YSAers in the Workers League that I personally know of. Hints were made that there are people in the Midwest, but who and where was never made clear.

Fraternally,  
s/Tom Burghardt

John Zanellotti  
College Park, Md.

April 11, 1972

Andy Rose  
YSA National Office

Dear Andy,

Last Sunday night Comrades Petrin and Sluchan informed me of the accusations made against myself and the other comrades by Tom B. I hope this brief explanation in regard to my past association with some of the comrades involved will help to clarify this situation.

I first came in contact with one of the New York comrades, Larry, in April of last year. At that time we had a general discussion on what was happening on the left, and in particular

the student and antiwar movement. I had just known Larry for about two hours or so, and there was not any discussion of any oppositional views in regard to the YSA. It was just a general discussion. I gave the comrade my address and phone number and he gave me his. I was interested in keeping in touch since he also told me that during the summer he might go to Europe. During the summer there was not any communication between us.

In September I called him, and again we had a general discussion, and also discussed several aspects of what I believed was happening in the antiwar movement, and other areas of YSA work. At this time Larry also expressed his opinion in regard to what he felt was happening in the YSA.

Larry contacted me in late October-early November. We had a rather detailed discussion, and it was at this time that I became aware of the intentions of other comrades to submit a document for the coming convention. I was asked to participate in the drafting of the document, and I agreed. From what I understood at this time there were one or two other comrades interested in this. However, I was never in contact with any of these other comrades, by phone or otherwise. During this entire period when the document was drafted, I was in contact with only one person, Larry. The first time I met one of them was in Houston.

I was informed that one of the comrades was to draft the major part of the document, and upon its completion a copy was forwarded to me by mail by Larry. Upon receiving the document and having studied it, I wrote some comments down, and also submitted for the consideration of the other comrades a small section dealing with the international economic situation.

I was never up in New York at any time, and consequently I have no idea where the document was written. The time I was supposedly in New York, I was in fact down here.

At the time I felt the document should have been submitted as a contribution to the internal discussion, and not as a counter-resolution. I had some reservations, but felt that over-all it raised some very important questions, and for this reason I supported it.

During the internal discussion period there was not any communication between myself and the other comrades. Several differences arose during this period. I broke with the other comrades for all practical purposes, and the only time I spoke with Larry again was in Houston. This was on Wednesday. I told him where I stood in regard to the other comrades and the document. The next day I ran into one of the comrades from Boston and repeated the same things I told Larry the day before. It was also at this time that I learned that the comrades had been expelled from the SWP, and had also withdrawn their support from the document. When I met Larry I also asked him if the other comrades were in Houston. He didn't know. He had tried to get in touch with comrade

Dave, but apparently both Dave and Tom had dropped out of circulation. The last time I saw Larry was at the campaign rally in Houston.

Since the convention there has not been any communication whatsoever between myself and any of the other comrades who had signed the document.

I consider Tom B.'s accusations to be total fabrications--the reason and motives behind them I can't begin to guess at this point. I will gladly cooperate and aid in any way possible any body that the local or the National Office may entrust to investigate this whole matter. I would greatly appreciate some further communication from you in writing or by phone, or by contacting the Washington, D. C. or College Park local YSA organizer.

Comradely,  
s/John Zanellotti

cc: Chuck Petrin  
Organizer, Washington, D. C. YSA  
Steve Sluchan  
Organizer, College Park YSA

Mike Priddy  
College Park, Md.

YSA National Office  
New York

I first came into contact with the Workers League when they intervned at a University of Maryland SDS meeting in the third week of May, 1971. I attended one of their class series the following week where I met John Zanellotti for the first time. John did not take part in any of the discussion that night.

After the meeting we made arrangements to start selling the Bulletin regularly in D. C. In the first week in June 1971 Steve Diamon, Larry Rosen, John and myself sold the Bulletin at the unemployment office in D. C. Steve Diamon, who was a national committee member of the Workers League and has since been expelled, told me that I was not to mention John's name to anyone because he was a contact of the YSA. After this sale I never saw or heard of John until the end of August 1971.

I joined the Workers League in the middle of June. During the next month the leadership of the Balitmore branch informed the membership that the Workers League had several contacts in the YSA, and that the YSA would be attempting to colonize College Park in the fall. This was supposedly learned through the YSA contacts.

After the International Committee summer camp in England was over the College Park fraction was instructed to reestablish contact with John, Jim McCaffrey who at that time was the College Park fraction leader and who has also since been expelled contacted John who agreed to meet us. It should be noted that it was at this time that my differences with the party began to surface and I was removed as fraction head and not allowed to deal with John.

In the last week of August 1971 John met me at the University of Md. campus where we then drove down to sell the Bulletin at 14th and Park, N. W. in D. C. After selling John went to a WAPAC meeting with three W. L. 'ers (including myself) and an independent woman. John did not vote with us or with the YSA but rather remained silent throughout the meeting. Afterwards, the five of us held a discussion about our intervention. I expressed disagreement with the intervention and certain political questions; I even raised the question of my resignation that night. While driving back to campus with John we talked quite a bit about the YSA. He expressed the need to take up a fight with the YSA's revisionism and the crisis it posed for youth. He urged me to remain in the Workers League.

The next night John attended a branch meeting in Baltimore. He was accepted into membership on a special motion; that is, he would not be expected to carry out the regular work of a party member but rather keep us informed of the YSA's activities in College Park and D. C. I would like to make clear that John was definitely brought into membership that night but is it unclear how long he remained a member or whether he may still be a member. I was told by the Baltimore organizer, Tim Stocks, that John resigned the next day because John could not work out his differences with the party over Cuba. However, I could not be sure since I resigned the next day.

After I submitted my resignation to the Workers League I did not have contact with either the party or John for the first two weeks in September. Towards the end of September, when it became clear that I was moving towards the YSA, Tim Stocks contacted me and asked to meet with me. I agreed and we argued for a long while about YSA politics. At the end of the discussion I asked Tim whether John was still in the Workers League, whereupon Stocks quickly told me that John had resigned the same day I had and that they were no longer in contact with him. I firmly believed at this time that John was no longer in the Workers League or in contact with them. In the third week of October I was driving over to the campus on a Sunday morning and I spotted John walking with the two Workers Leaguers, Brian Henry and Jim McCaffrey. At first I felt that this could have been a personal visit since John had been friends with them before he joined the YSA, but I remembered that College Park fraction meetings were held Sunday mornings. The following Wednesday at an SMC meeting I confronted John with what I saw, telling him that I was intending to join the YSA and I

had to know what his status with the Workers League was. He claimed that they had wanted to discuss his resignation with him as they had done with me. He said that his differences with the League were greater than he had thought and that he had been wrong about the YSA. I accepted his explanation and I decided not to tell anyone in the YSA what I knew about John; I was content to drop the whole thing.

In the third week in November, after I had joined the YSA, John approached me privately and informed me that there was a minority platform for the upcoming YSA convention. He said that he had a copy and that I could read it if I didn't show it to anyone else. I read the document and I became suspicious over its intent and I informed Steve Sluchan that John had a copy.

At pre-convention discussion the first week in December John reported on the Minority Tendency's position. In several instances John directly quoted from two of Tim Wohlforth's pamphlets. John did not reveal the sources he was quoting from but I and several other comrades recognized the passages that night. My suspicions came back and this time I felt I had to tell someone what I knew about John. At the Cleveland NPAC convention last December I told Barbara Chis (D. C. SWP organizer), Chuck Petrin (YSA organizer) and Steve Sluchan about John.

John has been made aware of the charges I have made against him but he still associates with me in a friendly manner. I have been told that John has denied my charges and claims he doesn't understand why I was saying those things about him. But he has not said a single word to me about what I have said or even asked my why I've said them.

s/Mike Priddy  
College Park YSA

/Received May 3, 1972/

Jim McCaffrey  
College Park, Md.

May 20, 1972

To the National Executive Committee of the Young  
Socialist Alliance,

I have just recently joined the YSA on the College Park campus of the University of Maryland. Before joining the YSA, I was a member of the Workers League. I was a member of the Workers League from Oct. 1970 to Jan. 1971. I rejoined the Workers League in late March of 1971. I resigned from the Workers League in late Nov. 1971 only to withdraw my resignation three days later. Finally, I offered my resignation to the Workers League again in Dec. of 1971. Realizing they wanted no discussion about it and would not accept it

I did not attend a College Park organizing committee meeting. I was then expelled. Now that I have joined the YSA, I feel that I should tell you, the national leadership of the YSA, in writing, what I have already told the local leadership, that since Sept. 1971 one YSA comrade, whose name is John Zanellotti, has been working as a Workers League agent within the YSA, first in the College Park fraction of the DC YSA local and now in the College Park local. As of Dec. 1971, John was a member of the DC organizing committee of the Baltimore branch of the Workers League.

In Oct. 1970 the Workers League began a class series on the College Park campus. John came to either the second or third class. John gave the impression that he was a member of the YSA during a discussion he had with one of the leaders of the Workers League. I do not recall if John came to any more Workers League class series in 1970. In March 1971 the Workers League formed a Committee for a General Strike on the College Park campus, in response to the US invasion of Cambodia. John became an active member in the committee. The Workers League began another class series after the Committee for a General Strike completely collapsed. Around this time John told us in the Workers League, that he had been disciplined, for either three or six months, by the YSA, for selling the Workers League paper The Bulletin, at George Washington University, a local DC university. John started attending these class series on a more regular basis than the previously mentioned class series. He showed particular interest in the Workers League critique of the SWP-YSA. John joined the Workers League contingent in the April 24 anti-war demonstration in DC. He also attended the separate Workers League rally held on April 24, after the Workers League split off from the main march route. About this time the Workers League became interested in getting John to join the Workers League and act as a Workers League agent in the YSA. This was proposed to John. He said that he would not feel right in staying in the YSA if he joined the Workers League. We, in the Workers League, did not press the question of John joining the Workers League and acting as a Workers League agent in the YSA too hard.

No one in the Workers League made contact with John from June 1971 until August 1971. I was in Baltimore at the time, but was in contact with Workers League members in College Park. I returned to the College Park area in late Aug. 1971 as an organizer of the DC Organizing Committee of the Baltimore Workers League. I soon made contact with John. After two or three discussions with John I asked him whether he would like to join the Workers League and form an opposition in the YSA. He agreed. He said he agreed with the Workers League critique of the Aug. SWP convention. When Mike Priddy resigned from the Workers League and joined the YSA soon after John joined, we told Mike that John had also resigned over the question of Cuba. This was a lie, John had no disagreements with the Workers League and never resigned nor was he expelled. John sold the Bulletin in DC and in Baltimore. Soon after John joined the Workers

League, John went with us to New York for a Workers League educational weekend in the Catskills, where John met and discussed with Tim Wohlforth and other Workers League agents in the YSA the question of opposition in the YSA. It was soon after this that John began writing a draft copy of an opposition paper to be presented to the YSA Convention to be held in Dec. 1971. The last I knew before my expulsion was that John was to go to New York to finalize the opposition paper before the YSA Convention. As far as I know the Workers League had their agents in YSA locals in New York and also Boston. What is interesting though is that some of the things John told us in the Workers League about himself turned out to be lies. He told us, in the Workers League, that he was a member of the YSA for three years, though he really did not join, as I understand, until June 1971. He also told us in early 1971, as I mentioned earlier, that he had been disciplined by the YSA for either three or six months for selling the Workers League Bulletin at George Washington University. This would not be possible if he was not a member of the YSA. This in general is what I know about John Zanellotti and his relationship to the Workers League.

Comradely,  
s/Jim McCaffrey  
College Park YSA  
May 20, 1972

P. O. Box 471 Cooper Station  
New York, N. Y. 10003

May 31, 1972

John Zanellotti  
College Park YSA

Dear John,

At the May 30, 1972, meeting of the National Executive Committee the following motions were passed:

1) That the NEC charge John Zanellotti with disloyalty to the YSA, based on his membership in, support to, and collaboration with the Workers League. This is in violation of the 1965 YSA Convention decision that: "Membership in, support to, or collaboration with the Spartacist group or the American Committee for the Fourth International group is incompatible with membership in the YSA." (The American Committee for the Fourth International is the predecessor to the Workers League.)

2) That the NEC constitute the trial body.

3) That the trial be held on June 10, 1972, in New York City, beginning at 2 p. m.

These motions were passed in accordance with the provisions made by Article IX of the YSA Constitution, which states:

"Section 2. Any member or body of the YSA may bring charges against any member for violation of the Constitution, program, or policies of the YSA."

"Section 3. Written charges shall be presented to the accused member in advance of the trial."

"Section 5. The NC or NEC may decide to act directly in a case in which event its intervention shall supercede any local proceedings."

Charges have been brought against you by the NEC on the basis of evidence submitted to the NEC in the course of an investigation conducted by the National Office. This evidence included the following specific acts:

1) You collaborated with the leadership of the Workers League in drafting a resolution entitled "Toward a Mass Working Class Youth Movement: A Resolution on Perspectives," submitted during the pre-convention discussion period preceding the 1971 YSA Convention, and participated in at least one meeting with members of the Workers League to discuss said resolution.

2) During the last week of August, you sold the Bulletin, organ of the Workers League, on the corner of 14th and Park, N. W., in Washington D. C.

3) On that same day, you participated in a meeting of the Washington Area Peace Action Coalition and later attended a meeting with four other members of the Workers League to discuss the Workers League intervention at that meeting.

4) The night following the WAPAC meeting, you attended a meeting of the Baltimore branch of the Workers League at which you were voted into membership. This was done under a special point, separate from other membership applications, and branch members were informed that your membership was to remain a secret since your assignment would be to keep the Workers League informed of YSA activities.

The exact location of the trial will be determined at a future time and you will then be notified at once. Your presence is required at the trial. If there is any reason why you will be unable to attend the trial at the scheduled time please notify the National Office immediately so that other arrangements can be made.

Comradely,  
s/Mirta Vidal  
YSA National Secretary

cc: Steve Sluchan, Organizer, College Park YSA  
National Committee

STATEMENT OF JOHN ZANELLOTTI, JUNE 10, TRAN-  
SCRIBED FROM TAPE OF TRIAL PROCEEDINGS/

First of all, I think that it is significant and says something about an organization, when in a period of mounting class struggle and in a period when the international working class is preparing for one of the greatest battles in history with the bourgeoisie, the leadership of both the party and the YSA, I think are thrown into crisis. And I think it's a crisis which they can neither understand nor even begin to analyze. Now, I think the move on the part of the leadership to expel comrades who have been, or who are, in opposition to the present course that the YSA is following is part of this crisis. I think it is much easier to expel, or even transfer politically, any opposition which raises what I feel are very important and necessary questions; questions that have to be answered. I think there is a history to this in the party and the International, I think beginning with the expulsions of the opposition in the '61-'64 period and some further expulsions after that.

I think, as I said before, that the charges made against me by some of the comrades, and if I'm correct, by one individual who is, at present, outside the YSA, are totally and completely false. These charges: I consider them nothing but fabrications. And I consider those comrades involved with this liars, who seek to advance their positions by having an oppositionist expelled.

Now, I think this state of affairs is only possible in an organization which has abandoned Trotskyism, and is now thrown into crisis by the forward movement of the working class, in its inability to meet the challenge posed by history. That is, of leading the working class to power. Now the United Secretariat itself is in a new crisis. But no discussion is held, the few questions of theory are shoved under the rug; the Marxist method is abandoned for what seem to be the greener pastures of the middle class; the strategy of the Transitional Program, which in this period means the defeat or the victory of the working people, is thrown out the window in favor of reform demands, which I feel are designed to appeal to and satisfy the petty-bourgeois radicals and liberals and no one else. References to the Transitional Program are made as if it were a museum piece, when, in reality, it is today when it takes on its full meaning.

Now, I think that the base of this abandonment of Trotskyism is that the YSA has abandoned the Marxist method. The perspectives of the New Radicalization, and the necessities which the crisis of the system poses before the working class, that is the building of its own party, are two diametrically opposed perspectives. I feel, that whereas the theory of the New Radicalization begins with pragmatism and surface impressions, the perspective of fighting for the independence of the working class and its own party begins with the movement of the working class, as a class, over issues which reflect the fundamental fight over surplus value, over the capitalist system itself, and fights for the students and or-

ganized workers, unemployed, and a section of the middle class, to be rallied around and behind the working class, in its class organization, the trade unions.

I feel that the theory of the New Radicalization clearly reflects the pragmatist method, when it sees various sections of the population, particularly the students and the petty-bourgeoisie, moving in reaction to various aspects of their alienation in multiclass movements around national and democratic demands. Now, it views the movement of the working class as primarily subordinate to, and as a result of, this radicalizing process. Workers start becoming radicalized as gays, women, Blacks, but we don't really see them as being radicalized as workers.

Now, it has been this abandonment of Marxism, which I feel today is leading our organization into open collaboration with the Stalinists and the petty bourgeoisie. I think this is nowhere clearer than in the antiwar movement. The struggle is no longer one of irreconcilability between us and the Stalinists and the Social Democrats of all stripes, but one of reconciliation at all costs, and this under the guise of defending the Vietnamese Revolution, and the gains of the working class in this period, is not by organizing peace groups, but by organizing the working class into a labor party around the fight for the Transitional Program, and the seizing of power.

I think we have seen the results of our great work in the antiwar movement. We have seen, to the point where in Washington, D.C., for example, in order to maintain collaboration with the Stalinists and liberals, we even went so far as to support a prayer vigil. I think, you know, is this our Leninist-Bolshevik perspective? And I think this wasn't just a mistake, but a reflection in a very concrete way of what it means to abandon dialectical materialism for pragmatism. We now go scurrying even after the witch-doctors of the twentieth century, namely the Church.

I don't think it is enough to react to the movement of the American working class, to reach into one's bag of demands and pull out something which is appropriate. Which we do, for example, in calling for a labor party while at the same time refusing to take up the struggle in the unions, the factories, and the schools to build it. We refuse to recognize the fight and fight to understand that a strategy within the American labor movement can only be developed on the basis of an international perspective. This is why the recent developments are not seen within the framework of this international perspective and the revolutionary character understood. Thus we can call for a labor party while really, essentially, refusing to do any work in the trade unions.

The party, along with the YSA, refuses to see this new crisis of capitalism which is forcing the bourgeoisie to attack the working class and declare war, trade war, on Europe. Because, I think, along with Comrade Mandel, we view the economic problems of American capitalism as simply brought

about by the Vietnam War and the strength of European capitalism.

I think the truth of the matter is that the economic problems are caused by the contradiction in capitalism as a system which find their highest expression in the United States itself. I think it is this which has forced the American bourgeoisie into a conflict with the colonial masses which lies behind Vietnam and the conflict with the colonial masses, which forces it into a conflict with the workers in Europe. I think that what this means is also that Nixon is forced into a confrontation with American workers, at the same moment he faces a tremendous movement of workers and peasants in colonial countries in the development of a revolutionary situation in the United States. I think that, understood this way, we can confidently fight for American workers to take up the political struggle in a revolutionary way. We can link the struggle for a labor party with a socialist program and develop both in a bitter fight against the labor bureaucrats.

Lacking international perspective, I think the party and the YSA do not do this. We either abstain altogether from the labor movement, or put forward demands which in no way pose the question of socialism. We limit our approach to what the labor bureaucracy is already doing, or what can at best be only educational proposals. We do not go beyond the bounds of the trade union bureaucracy.

As Trotskyists, are we fighting for an international perspective, or are we proceeding in any sense from a national one? One of the articles in The Militant once put it this way: "Any real program to fight inflation must begin by calling an immediate halt to this war, and for a stop to this wasting of the nation's resources." Do we begin from the question of the resources of the nation, do we pose as the best fighters for national interests or as the most uncompromising internationalists? These are questions which both, I think, the party and the YSA leadership have to answer. I think they can no longer be avoided. These questions will have to be answered.

Now one cannot simply parachute into the working class at the moment which seems most opportune for fruitful work; unfurl the banner and expect millions to follow, which is essentially what Comrade Novack is putting forward. I think it is necessary to go through an agonizing and difficult and bitter fight to turn one's forces, no matter how small and how minute, toward the working class. Fight with all the history and theory of the movement to develop a revolutionary foothold in this class, and construct a Marxist cadre in this way. I believe this is the only basis on which we can build our cadre and build the revolutionary party.

I think both the party and the YSA have abandoned this fight for the get-rich-quick schemes on the campuses. This is not Trotskyism but the result of its abandonment. But the

leadership is quiet. Where is Mandel with all his great theories? He keeps quiet on a lot of things these days. What does the party have to say when the Argentine section openly embraces the Social Democracy, and one wing embraces terrorism? Oh yes, we are told that this is really not conducive to building the revolutionary party, but where is the answer that tells us why this came about in the first place?

At the last party convention, Comrade Mary-Alice Waters went into this big run-down about how really major differences no longer exist in the United Secretariat. Why then all this backstabbing and unprincipled combinationism which we see today in the International? I think that Pablo has left the International but his method is still the innkeeper of the United Secretariat. I think a conscious and theoretical struggle must be waged against Pabloism, and what he represented, and what he represents today. I think this cannot be done without a struggle to understand from the standpoint of Marxist philosophy, the real source of revisionism of Marxism which lies at the heart of Pabloism.

This, however, I don't think is just a mere historical exercise. Only through the sharpest struggle against the presence and influence of bourgeois methods of thinking inside the working class movement itself can dialectical materialism be developed and the movement prepared for the correct orientation in this new situation.

Thus, it is not just the past struggles against revisionism but the struggle to deepen that fight today, that inoculates the movement against revisionist methods and thereby makes possible the construction of a mass revolutionary party. This I consider, above all, a daily theoretical battle against those pressures to which Pablo and the present leadership of the United Secretariat, the party, and, to an extent, the YSA succumb to. Trotsky once said of the Third International, it has taken the road of reformism at a time when the crisis of capitalism definitely places the proletariat revolution on the order of the day. Today this can be said of the United Secretariat.

Regardless of what happens here, I will remain a Trotskyist, and will continue to fight as a Trotskyist, if not in the YSA, then outside of it.

P. O. Box 471 Cooper Station  
New York, N. Y. 10003

August 9, 1972

John Zanelotti  
College Park, Md.

Dear John,

At its meeting on August 7, 1972, the National Executive Committee voted to expel you from the YSA. Enclosed is a copy of the statement adopted by the NEC.

If you wish to appeal this decision, your written appeal must be received in the National Office by August 24, 1972.

Sincerely,  
s/Mirta Vidal  
YSA National Secretary

cc: College Park YSA Organizer

P. O. Box 471 Cooper Station  
New York, N. Y. 10003

August 25, 1972

John Zanelotti  
Columbia, Md.

Dear John,

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter appealing your expulsion from the YSA to the National Convention. The Convention will be held November 23-26, at the Sheraton-Cleveland Hotel in Cleveland, Ohio.

Sincerely,  
s/Mirta Vidal  
YSA National Secretary