

# YOUNG SOCIALISTS AND THE FIGHT AGAINST THE VIETNAM WAR



young socialist  
discussion bulletin  
Vol. 12 25¢ 1968

# YOUNG SOCIALISTS AND THE FIGHT AGAINST THE VIETNAM WAR



young socialist  
discussion bulletin  
July 1968 25¢ 1968

This draft resolution on the fight against the Vietnam war was written for the national young socialists convention to be held in Chicago at the University of Illinois (Circle Campus), November 30 - December 1, 1968. It was drafted by the National Executive Committee of the Young Socialist Alliance.

Similar resolutions and discussion articles will deal with other activities in which young socialists are involved. These initial draft resolutions along with any others submitted to the convention will be discussed and the general political perspectives outlined in them will be voted on.

The resolutions are being circulated prior to the convention to assure the fullest possible discussion on political perspectives and activities before the convention meets.

Young socialists from around the country are invited to participate in the written discussion and urged to attend the convention. Contributions to the discussion and inquiries should be sent to the Young Socialist Alliance, Box 471, Cooper Station, New York, New York 10003.

## YOUNG SOCIALISTS AND THE FIGHT AGAINST THE VIETNAM WAR

American Young Socialists have been leaders in the antiwar movement since it began with the April 17, 1965 March on Washington to End the War in Vietnam. The historic fight against the imperialist war in Vietnam has been one of the most important areas of activity for us since that time.

Over the past several years the antiwar movement has had an impact on the American people far greater than many, even active participants in the movement, realize. Tens of millions of Americans see a concrete alternative to the war policies of the ruling class in the demands put forward by the antiwar movement. While the war itself, and its effects at home, create doubts and confusion among millions, the organized antiwar movement can articulate the opposition of these millions, and help them clarify their own thinking on this question. The statements of antiwar leaders, and the leaflets and pamphlets distributed by the millions, have educated and convinced large numbers of Americans about the need to oppose the war, and have offered them a way to do it.

The antiwar movement has also, through its policy of nonexclusion, dealt heavy blows to the witch hunt mentality and anticommunist hysteria that existed in the 1950's and even into the early 1960's. Because the capitalist class uses anticommunism as a justification for its aggression abroad, this achievement of the antiwar movement has weakened the ability of imperialism to mask its true aims.

Moreover, the very existence of the movement itself, in the middle of a shooting war, has reaffirmed the basic right of opposition to the government's war policies. The rulers of this country would like nothing better than to outlaw all

dissent and opposition during a war, but the antiwar movement has made that impossible. And it will be even more difficult in the future to convince the American people that it is somehow "illegal" to oppose the government in time of war.

The movement on an international scale has served as a catalyst of the growing radicalization that is taking place. The first political act of many young people is the decision to join in an antiwar march, or to attend a meeting of the antiwar movement. Once involved in the movement, many begin to see that the war is not an isolated "mistake" of foreign policy, but it is a part of a perfectly consistent imperialism that is willing and ready to intervene in any country of the world. This role of the antiwar movement as a catalyst in the youth radicalization was most clearly demonstrated in France, where united actions against the war in Vietnam were able to draw together young radicals into a powerful revolutionary movement. It is important to remember that it was government repression of a student demonstration against the war in Vietnam that touched off the chain of events of last spring in France which culminated in a general strike of more than ten million workers.

Above all, the antiwar movement has the potential to mobilize the American people on a scale that can force an end to the war waged by the United States against Vietnam. The example of the successful opposition of the French masses to the Algerian war proves that it is possible to force an end to an imperialist war. To accomplish this in the United States would be an accomplishment of historic importance, and it is this perspective that we should keep foremost in mind when organizing and leading the antiwar movement in action.



## Vietnam and the World Revolution

Since February of 1965, when Lyndon Johnson opened his second term in office by ordering the bombing of North Vietnam, the war in Vietnam has been the central focus of world politics, and of the international revolutionary struggle.

Revolutionaries in colonial countries have watched Vietnam carefully and have understood that Vietnam is the battle-ground for the entire colonial revolution. As Che Guevara wrote in 1967, "There have been limited confrontations on all continents...but obviously, at the present moment, the contradictions are centered in the territory of the Indochinese peninsula...."

The workers' states -- countries where capitalism has already been overthrown (Cuba, China, North Korea, the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries) -- have been divided on how best to deal with American aggression in Vietnam.

The imperialists have also been divided on how the problem should be handled, although they do not disagree that it is the most pressing problem they have to deal with.

The Communist, socialist, and other radical movements in the capitalist countries have also been forced to clearly develop, explain, and take action on their positions on the Vietnam war and the international antiwar struggle.

What is there about the brutal conflict in that small country that so dominates the entire world political scene?

Following World War II the focal point of the world revolutionary struggle shifted from the industrialized countries to the colonial world. Capitalist economies were severely shaken by the economic crisis of the 1930's and the devastation of the war itself. But, through the combination of the absence of revolutionary leaderships capable of taking advantage of the situation to make the revolution, and massive economic transfusions to Europe by U.S. capital, the capitalist economies were able to survive the crisis and stabilize themselves.

But imperialism could no longer maintain complete control over the colonial world. From 1945 on the colonial revolution erupted in country after country, from Indonesia to the Philippines, and from Algeria to the Congo. The first great breakthrough since the Russian Revolution was achieved with the success of the Chinese Revolution in 1949. In 1954 the French were defeated by the Vietnamese at Dien Bien Phu. In 1959, under the leadership of Fidel Castro and Che Gue-

vara, the Cuban Revolution was successful. Today it is the Vietnamese Revolution that is fighting towards final victory.

The struggle in the colonial countries, which most often begins as a fight for land reform and national independence, can only be successful if it moves against capitalism itself. Imperialism, and the native capitalist class through which it rules, has a vital stake in preventing any change in the status quo, and in preserving its control over the military, political, and economic life of the colonial world. When any movement threatens to involve the masses in militant action, even though it may be directed towards the most obviously needed democratic reforms, imperialism sees that movement, quite correctly, as a direct threat, and moves to stop it. As a result, the colonial revolution is forced to go beyond just limited reforms and proceed in an anticapitalist and pro-socialist direction if it is to be ultimately successful. The imperialists know full well that a successful revolution will put an end to their exploitation of any colonial country, and intervene to the full extent of their ability to defeat that revolution and preserve their right to maintain their profitable relationship with the colonial world.

With the weakening of the European capitalist powers in the Second World War and the increasing dominance of American capital on a world scale in the post-war period, the responsibility for the containment of the colonial revolution -- wherever it occurs -- has shifted to the United States. American imperialism is, in fact, the self-proclaimed cop whose duty it is to maintain capitalist law and capitalist order throughout the world.

For four years the center of the conflict between the colonial revolution and the protector of world capitalism has been Vietnam. The United States is fighting the war in Vietnam for stakes substantially larger than just the territory of Vietnam itself. The imperialists have set a military priority on maintaining a ring of bases surrounding China from which they hope sometime in the future to be able to launch their military campaign to restore China to the "free world" of capitalist investment and trade. Vietnam is a key link in that chain.

Success in Vietnam is also a political necessity in order for the United States to demonstrate to the whole world its ability to play the role it has arrogated to itself. If Vietnam should "fall" to the Vietnamese it would serve as a tremendous inspiration to revolutionaries everywhere. It would confirm the revolutionary perspective that imperialism can be defeated through resolute

armed struggle by the masses in the colonial world. On the other hand, victory for the United States would be a setback for the entire world revolutionary movement.

The worldwide conflict between two antagonistic social forces is centered in Vietnam today. The outcome of the struggle will have a profound effect on the whole next phase of the world revolutionary struggle. It is the understanding of this full significance of the outcome of the war in Vietnam that has guided the participation of the Young Socialist Alliance in the antiwar movement since its beginning. We have understood that to have an incorrect evaluation of the importance of the defense of the Vietnamese Revolution, or to have an incorrect analysis of how to defend it, means going wrong on the major political question of the day.

Internationally, the response of the different tendencies in the radical movement to the needs of the Vietnamese is the acid test for evaluating their program today. Any tendency that fails this test will be repudiated by revolutionaries everywhere.

Moscow and its allied "Communist" parties throughout the world have been caught in a tight bind. Their illusory goal of "peaceful coexistence" with imperialism has led them to press for compromise settlements, and to try to persuade the imperialists to come to an agreement. For the CPs like the Communist Party in the United States, this has meant supporting and encouraging that section of the ruling class, exemplified by Eugene McCarthy, which thinks that the risks in Vietnam outweigh the gains that can be made for imperialism. For the Soviet Union itself, this policy has meant betraying the Vietnamese Revolution by failing to provide the Vietnamese with the kind of military equipment and technical aid that could make it impossible for a single American plane to violate the air space of North Vietnam with impunity, and would make it even more costly than it now is for the U.S. to maintain its occupation of South Vietnam. While some aid has been provided, it is meager in comparison to what is needed and what is available in the Soviet Union, and even so has been forthcoming only because of international pressure on the Soviet bureaucracy. It is clear that Moscow and its supporters would much prefer it if the Vietnamese would accept a "compromise" settlement and stop rocking the boat of relations between the Soviet Union and the capitalist world.

In Europe, where the pro-Moscow organizations have mass followings in several countries, and consequently have the power and authority to conduct mass anti-



FRENCH STUDENTS PROTEST VIETNAM WAR

war actions that could seriously affect U.S. imperialism, they have completely defaulted on the job of leading such a campaign. Instead, they have put forward the nebulous and abstract slogan of "peace in Vietnam," which they counterpose to the demand for the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops, and solidarity with the Vietnamese. They have attempted to divert the struggle from a mass political opposition into sending bicycles, medicine, and other token aid to Vietnam. They have consistently blocked united front protests because of their thoroughly reformist political position and their fear of allowing their members to come in contact with revolutionary students.

The Maoist regime in China, and the groups that follow its line, have not provided a positive alternative leadership for the international campaign in defense of Vietnam. While criticizing the Soviet Union for failing to provide adequate aid, China has followed the same treacherous policy. The Maoists have also consistently refused to even talk about building a united front to aid the Vietnamese Revo-



FRENCH STUDENTS PROTEST VIETNAM WAR

lution. They consider it unprincipled to join in a fight against imperialism with tendencies with whom they disagree on other matters. By this sectarian and abstentionist stance, they provide the Moscow oriented tendency an excuse for not participating in united front actions, and only make it easier for Moscow to avoid giving meaningful support to the Vietnamese.

The Social Democratic tendencies on a world scale have been equally great betrayers of the Vietnamese Revolution. One of the few exceptions has been the Japanese Socialist Party, which has been active in the antiwar movement in Japan. In many countries where they are the ruling party, as in England, they have given open support to the war; elsewhere they have been completely divorced from the antiwar movement, as has the Socialist Party in this country.

Counterposed to these tendencies is a rapidly growing force of organizations and individuals who are consciously opposed to the reformism of the Social Democrats, the betrayals of Moscow, and the sectarianism of Peking. This growing tendency is based on a clear understanding of the importance of an international movement in defense of the Vietnamese Revolution. It is within this tendency that Young Socialists in the United States, and our comrades throughout the world, have provided initiative and leadership. It is this movement of revolutionary forces that has inspired and built the antiwar movement.

The internationalism of Cuba places that country alongside of this antiwar struggle throughout the world. The Cubans have openly criticized both Moscow and Peking for their failure to form a united front. Che Guevara expressed this internationalist outlook in the slogan "Create two, three, many Vietnams." Che's picture, along with that slogan, has been carried on antiwar demonstrations throughout the world.

#### The Antiwar Movement in the United States

The international antiwar movement utilizes a different strategy and different tactics in each country, which vary with the political situation of the country involved. In the United States the movement is composed of many groups and individuals with widely varying levels of political understanding. But in the united mass antiwar actions that have been so successfully carried out, it has been made clear that the overriding and unprecedented characteristic of the movement is its willingness to take action against an imperialist war while that war is being fought, as part of the international movement against the war. The antiwar movement in the U.S. is anti-

imperialist in action.

At the same time that the movement is objectively anti-imperialist, it is subjected to tremendous pressures from those sections of the movement that think the war can be ended by strengthening that section of the ruling class that has doubts about the effectiveness of the war in preserving imperialism's place in the world. These class-collaborationist tendencies are opposed to the independent mass actions of the movement. They counterpose to those actions approaches such as supporting liberal Democratic Party politicians, and they counterpose to the demand for immediate withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam the policy of supporting negotiations as a way to end the war. The pressure on the antiwar movement from this side has increased substantially in the most recent period because of the presidential elections and the Paris "peace talks."

The antiwar movement is not homogeneous. Views range from those of the revolutionary socialists on the left to young people who are only beginning to





The antiwar movement is not homogeneous. Views range from those of the revolutionary socialists on the left to young people who are only beginning to



move away from liberal politics and towards independent mass action. In addition, new forces are constantly entering the movement. As a result, disputes and debates on political issues are constantly recurring within the movement. We will examine some of these disputes later on.

The organizational forms of the antiwar movement reflect these political realities. If there were in this country a mass working class party, one not totally rotten with reformism, the fight against the war could be organized by that party and carried out under its political leadership. But because such a mass working class party does not yet exist, the antiwar movement has evolved through independent committees in local areas, and united front formations on the city-wide, regional and national levels.

These independent committees, whether they are known as the Committees to End the War in Vietnam, Student Mobilization Committees, or by a particular event around which they were originally organized, reflect the objective need for an organizational form that brings people together who want to work actively against the war but are not yet ready to commit themselves to one or another political organization. While these committees have their periodic ups and downs, as long as the antiwar movement continues to grow these committees will be an important vehicle for antiwar action.

The united front committees that exist in many areas, and involve other groups along with the student antiwar formations, are valuable because they broaden the possibilities of action, and thus strengthen the student committees. At the same time, the students often provide the initiative for the actions of the united front groups, are usually the left wing of these coalitions, and add militancy and manpower for the united activities.

On the national scale the Student Mobilization Committee is the expression of the militant, student section of the antiwar movement. The SMC has achieved international stature as a result of its organization for the April 15, 1967 antiwar demonstrations, the October 21, 1967 Confrontation at the Pentagon, and the April 26 Student Strike last spring in which more than one million students participated in this country alone.

The National Mobilization Committee, the adult coalition which in the past worked with the SMC on actions, has suffered severe strains as a result of the pressure of the 1968 presidential campaign and the Paris talks. This was demonstrated by the statement of a number of the officers of the NMC, including

Dave Dellinger, a pacifist, in support of the negotiations in Paris.

The recent actions at the Democratic Party convention can be understood in this context. Officers of the NMC participated in demonstrations in Chicago during the Democratic Party convention in spite of the fact that it was clear beforehand that it would be impossible to prevent the demonstrations from being seen as pro-McCarthy actions, regardless of the intent or political position of the demonstrators. We opposed the demonstration for this reason, and we proposed instead actions in commemoration of the bombing of Hiroshima earlier in August, and the actions called by the SMC for October.

Given the context of the demonstration -- occurring simultaneously with the culmination of the McCarthy campaign -- no amount of militancy on the part of the demonstrators could have altered the fact that the demonstration would be seen as an attempt to influence the decision of the Democratic Party. Because the demonstration was relatively small, the cops were able to launch brutal and vicious attacks on the antiwar youth, and to successfully deny them their constitutional right to protest the war. This confrontation, while it did succeed in exposing the completely reactionary and undemocratic nature of the Chicago city government, including Mayor Daley and his cops, resulted in senseless and useless injuries and victimization of hundreds of young people. The lack of clear political direction at the demonstration is shown by the fact that the individual who emerged as the hero of the whole affair was none other than Eugene McCarthy.

If this type of demonstration were to become the norm of the movement, it would discourage the masses of Americans who are against the war from participating in antiwar actions, and it would lead to the demoralization of the antiwar activists.

As an alternative to this dead-end approach, we propose the building of mass actions, in the streets, independent of the politics of the ruling class, and organized in such a way as to make it difficult for the cops to successfully attack it. Through the mobilization of large numbers of Americans, as was done in April of 1968, we can produce victories, not defeats, for the antiwar movement.

The future of the National Mobilization Committee is unclear. It is not certain that it can return to its role as a national antiwar coalition, with the participation of the student section of the movement. What is clear, however, is that after the elections, if not before,

the antiwar movement on a national scale will create some organizational structure in order to coordinate the actions of the movement. Whatever form this structure takes, it will be the student wing of the movement, through the independent antiwar committees on campuses and the SMC, which will be the most dynamic and radical force within it.

GIs and the Antiwar Movement

The increase in antiwar sentiment and activity within the armed forces has brought the whole question of the relationship of the antiwar movement to the GIs to the fore. This is a question that has been discussed in the movement since its inception. The attitude of the antiwar movement has developed consistently towards an understanding of the importance of the soldiers as a social force with the potential power to stop the war. When the movement first began, the predominant line of thinking was that of the traditional pacifists who self-righteously accused individual soldiers of being "guilty" of sharing responsibility for the war. This attitude was the result of their view of opposition to the war as an individual act of conscience, some kind of personalized rebellion, rather than an essentially political act, based on a political analysis, and requiring a judgment as to how best to win over majority support for one's position.

But as the antiwar movement drew in large numbers of young people who saw bringing the troops home as a realizable political goal, and consequently were searching for possible allies of the predominantly student movement, the attitude toward the GIs began to change.

As is true of all the major political disputes within the antiwar movement,

the evolution of the discussion was guided by objective events on the one hand, and the conscious participation of the socialist wing of the antiwar movement on the other hand.

Our position, put forward since the antiwar movement's inception, is that GIs are a crucial sector of the society to orient toward because of the tremendous leverage they have by virtue of their strategic role in society. To illustrate: while the ruling class can afford to continue the war in spite of demonstrations by a hundred thousand students, it would be impossible for them to ignore a similar action by a hundred thousand soldiers.

We think that the antiwar movement will have a profound effect on the GIs if the attitude of the movement is one of convincing soldiers that their interests are the same as those of the antiwar movement.

Imperialism needs a large standing army to be able to respond to threats against its interests all over the world, and it must draw upon the working class as a whole for manpower. GIs enter the army with the same doubts about the war as most civilians have, and many are openly opposed to it. While the ruling class likes to create the impression that draftees are removed from social conflict and immune to pressures and appeals from other sectors of society, this is simply not true. American soldiers are in touch with their families and friends, with the news of antiwar protests as reported in the news media, and are often in direct contact with antiwar organizations through the leafletting by antiwar groups, and widely circulated GI-oriented newspapers. In addition, there is an increasing number of active antiwar soldiers who are in contact with a wide layer of other

GIs.

Our position on the armed forces and antiwar work directed towards soldiers has been presented to the antiwar movement by young socialists active in antiwar committees and to the movement as a whole through pamphlets and in the Young Socialist and The Militant. The YSA published a pamphlet, GIs and the Fight Against War, in 1967. In his introduction to the pamphlet Fred Halstead wrote, "More and more the U.S. military force in Vietnam is composed of citizens who have enlisted under the hot breath of the draft. These are not mercenaries who have sold their souls. They are U.S. citizens who have a right to think for themselves and who do not lose that right because they are forced to don a uniform."

Important developments have convinced large numbers of antiwar activists of these views. The first major development was the case of the Fort Hood Three, which broke in the summer of 1966. These three soldiers refused to obey their orders to go to Vietnam and were court-martialed for it. This case received wide coverage in the press and was actively supported by the organized antiwar movement. The importance of the case was that it made clear that, just like everywhere else, there was substantial opposition to the war within the army, and this opposition was symbolized by the three soldiers involved.

A second very important case was that of Howard Petrick, a member of the YSA, who was drafted into the army and continued to express openly his antiwar and socialist views. For this he was threatened with court-martial. Because of the defense effort that was launched the army brass was forced to back down from this threat, and Petrick was given

an undesirable discharge from the army which is now being appealed. The Petrick case posed clearly the question of civil liberties and the right of free speech for soldiers. Petrick, unlike the Fort Hood Three, was not charged with disobeying an order. The pamphlet entitled Free Speech for GIs, published by the Committee to Defend the Rights of Pfc. Howard Petrick, convinced many antiwar activists that there were many GIs opposed to the war, and encouraged other soldiers to fight for their legal rights to discuss the war and to disagree with the war policy of the government.

Currently, an important legal defense is being built for two GIs who have been threatened with court-martial. They are both members of the Young Socialist Alliance. Allen Myers, stationed at Fort Dix, New Jersey was charged with violating a post regulation by distributing a leaflet prepared by the Philadelphia SMC. Walter Kos, at Fort Bragg, N.C., is being charged on a similar basis for passing out a GI newspaper. These cases deal with the constitutional right of GIs to distribute antiwar literature. Defense of these cases, and others like them, can concretely show that the antiwar movement has the same interests as the GIs.

The defense cases mentioned here are only several of what has been a whole series of cases involving soldiers who have been persecuted for opposing the war. Others include the cases of Andy Stapp, Howard Levy, Ronald Lockman, and many others that are less well known.

While these cases were early indicators of the fact that the army was not monolithic and immune to pressure, developments in the past year have shown that significant numbers of GIs oppose the war and many are making their views known.





the antiwar movement on a national scale will create some organizational structure in order to coordinate the actions of the movement. Whatever form this structure takes, it will be the student wing of the movement, through the independent antiwar committees on campuses and the SMC, which will be the most dynamic and radical force within it.

GIs and the Antiwar Movement

The increase in antiwar sentiment and activity within the armed forces has brought the whole question of the relationship of the antiwar movement to the GIs to the fore. This is a question that has been discussed in the movement since its inception. The attitude of the antiwar movement has developed consistently towards an understanding of the importance of the soldiers as a social force with the potential power to stop the war. When the movement first began, the predominant line of thinking was that of the traditional pacifists who self-righteously accused individual soldiers of being "guilty" of sharing responsibility for the war. This attitude was the result of their view of opposition to the war as an individual act of conscience, some kind of personalized rebellion, rather than an essentially political act, based on a political analysis, and requiring a judgment as to how best to win over majority support for one's position.

But as the antiwar movement drew in large numbers of young people who saw bringing the troops home as a realizable political goal, and consequently were searching for possible allies of the predominantly student movement, the attitude toward the GIs began to change.

As is true of all the major political disputes within the antiwar movement,

the evolution of the discussion was guided by objective events on the one hand, and the conscious participation of the socialist wing of the antiwar movement on the other hand.

Our position, put forward since the antiwar movement's inception, is that GIs are a crucial sector of the society to orient toward because of the tremendous leverage they have by virtue of their strategic role in society. To illustrate: while the ruling class can afford to continue the war in spite of demonstrations by a hundred thousand students, it would be impossible for them to ignore a similar action by a hundred thousand soldiers.

We think that the antiwar movement will have a profound effect on the GIs if the attitude of the movement is one of convincing soldiers that their interests are the same as those of the antiwar movement.

Imperialism needs a large standing army to be able to respond to threats against its interests all over the world, and it must draw upon the working class as a whole for manpower. GIs enter the army with the same doubts about the war as most civilians have, and many are openly opposed to it. While the ruling class likes to create the impression that draftees are removed from social conflict and immune to pressures and appeals from other sectors of society, this is simply not true. American soldiers are in touch with their families and friends, with the news of antiwar protests as reported in the news media, and are often in direct contact with antiwar organizations through the leafletting by antiwar groups, and widely circulated GI-oriented newspapers. In addition, there is an increasing number of active antiwar soldiers who are in contact with a wide layer of other

GIs. Our position on the armed forces and antiwar work directed towards soldiers has been presented to the antiwar movement by young socialists active in antiwar committees and to the movement as a whole through pamphlets and in the Young Socialist and The Militant. The YSA published a pamphlet, GIs and the Fight Against War, in 1967. In his introduction to the pamphlet Fred Halstead wrote, "More and more the U.S. military force in Vietnam is composed of citizens who have enlisted under the hot breath of the draft. These are not mercenaries who have sold their souls. They are U.S. citizens who have a right to think for themselves and who do not lose that right because they are forced to don a uniform."

Important developments have convinced large numbers of antiwar activists of these views. The first major development was the case of the Fort Hood Three, which broke in the summer of 1966. These three soldiers refused to obey their orders to go to Vietnam and were court-martialed for it. This case received wide coverage in the press and was actively supported by the organized antiwar movement. The importance of the case was that it made clear that, just like everywhere else, there was substantial opposition to the war within the army, and this opposition was symbolized by the three soldiers involved.

A second very important case was that of Howard Petrick, a member of the YSA, who was drafted into the army and continued to express openly his antiwar and socialist views. For this he was threatened with court-martial. Because of the defense effort that was launched the army brass was forced to back down from this threat, and Petrick was given

an undesirable discharge from the army which is now being appealed. The Petrick case posed clearly the question of civil liberties and the right of free speech for soldiers. Petrick, unlike the Fort Hood Three, was not charged with disobeying an order. The pamphlet entitled Free Speech for GIs, published by the Committee to Defend the Rights of Pfc. Howard Petrick, convinced many antiwar activists that there were many GIs opposed to the war, and encouraged other soldiers to fight for their legal rights to discuss the war and to disagree with the war policy of the government.

Currently, an important legal defense is being built for two GIs who have been threatened with court-martial. They are both members of the Young Socialist Alliance. Allen Myers, stationed at Fort Dix, New Jersey was charged with violating a post regulation by distributing a leaflet prepared by the Philadelphia SMC. Walter Kos, at Fort Bragg, N.C., is being charged on a similar basis for passing out a GI newspaper. These cases deal with the constitutional right of GIs to distribute antiwar literature. Defense of these cases, and others like them, can concretely show that the antiwar movement has the same interests as the GIs.

The defense cases mentioned here are only several of what has been a whole series of cases involving soldiers who have been persecuted for opposing the war. Others include the cases of Andy Stapp, Howard Levy, Ronald Lockman, and many others that are less well known.

While these cases were early indicators of the fact that the army was not monolithic and immune to pressure, developments in the past year have shown that significant numbers of GIs oppose the war and many are making their views known.



This deep antiwar sentiment, deepened by the controversies in the presidential campaign, and the frustration of hopes for success of the Paris "peace talks," has begun to appear in the form of organized actions of protest by GIs themselves.

Some recent developments include:

\*A demonstration is being organized for October 12 in San Francisco by a group of active-duty soldiers in the Bay Area.

\*At Fort Hood, Texas 60 black soldiers staged a protest against their possible assignment to Chicago to suppress demonstrations outside the Democratic Party convention.

\*In Vietnam, prisoners in the Marine brig at Da Nang and the Long Binh jail near Saigon have staged protests against regulations which they think are unfair (such as saying "Sir" to guards); a major element in this development was rebellion by black GIs against racism in the prisons.

We can expect much larger and more frequent organized expressions of dissent in the armed forces in the future.

One of the most important and effective sustained activities is the publication of various GI antiwar newspapers that have appeared in the last year or two. These papers vary widely in political outlook and in the extent to which they actually reflect the feelings and needs of the soldiers. Two of the best of these papers are Vietnam GI and Task Force.

What perspective can antiwar GIs and student activists who support them have about future developments in the armed forces? The pressures that produce organized protests among soldiers will continue and intensify. In addition, as draft calls continue at a high rate, more individuals who have some organizational experience in the antiwar movement or in the black struggle will find themselves in the army. Although the U.S. army is not the Tsar's army of 1917 in Russia, it is a certainty that the expressions of antiwar sentiment will expand even more rapidly than in the past years. This additional section of the population opposed to the war adds great social weight to those already protesting and therefore greatly expands the possibility of forcing an end to the war.

The approach of young socialists to this development is clear. We do not advocate, and we don't think others should advocate, that soldiers should deliberately violate military regulations or commit any other illegal acts. Actions that violate regulations subject individuals to victimization by the brass, who watch carefully for a chance to punish and isolate dissenters in the army. Secondly,

illegal acts are neither necessary or effective at this time. The best response from the soldiers who oppose the war will be to actions which they can participate in without being subjected to court-martial or other punishment. Such activities as leafletting, circulating petitions, demonstrating, holding public meetings, etc., are all perfectly legal within army regulations and the U.S. Constitution even though local army authorities may try to stop them. It is through such actions that the largest number of soldiers will become involved in active opposition to the war, and it is this that will have the most powerful impact.

#### The Antiwar Movement, Labor, and the Afro-American Struggle

The antiwar movement is paralleled by, and related to, the struggle of Afro-Americans and the labor movement. While the growing number of strikes by trade unions, and the militant actions of blacks are not explicitly antiwar, the very fact that they occur and are deepening in the midst of the war gives them the effect of weakening the position of American imperialism in Vietnam, and further deepening the crisis faced by the ruling class in this country.

The one thing that has dominated the attitude of the masses of Americans towards the war in Vietnam has been the refusal to sacrifice for the war, and the refusal to subordinate their demands to support for the war.

The standard of living of American workers is being eroded through inflation and tax increases, both of which are intensified by the war. As a result, workers have to fight harder to preserve their standard of living, let alone make any improvements in it. The past two years have seen a sharp increase in strike activity.

The struggle of the Afro-Americans is deeper and more radical than that of the labor movement. Almost every Afro-American organization has taken a stand in opposition to the war in Vietnam. These positions vary from solidarity with the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam (a position taken by SNCC and the Black Panther Party) to a liberal position of calling for an end to the bombing (advocated by the NAACP and SCLC). Some organizations have participated to varying degrees in the actual work of antiwar coalitions during the preparations for mass actions. The various black student organizations that have been formed in the last year or two on almost every college and university campus have also been involved to one degree or another in antiwar actions. In the high schools, large numbers of black students participated in the April 26, 1968 Student Strike.



The mass actions of the antiwar movement have made it impossible for the union bureaucrats and Negro Uncle Toms to use the war in Vietnam as an excuse for not engaging in militant actions. In fact, the pressure has been so great that many have felt it opportune to make statements critical of the war.

The goal of the antiwar movement is to reach out to these layers of the population who, along with the GIs themselves, have the raw power to stop this war, power which the students by themselves lack.

### Issues Facing the Antiwar Movement

The antiwar movement has been, since its inception, the scene of political disputes covering a wide range of questions. We consider the discussions within the antiwar movement to be crucial for the future of the antiwar movement itself, as well as being one of the best opportunities we have for presenting our program and winning recruits to socialism.

Underlying the disputes in the movement is the central question of whether the movement should head in the direction of mobilizing masses of Americans against the war independently of the ruling class and its policies, or whether the antiwar movement should be oriented towards becoming a pressure group for (and consequently being dependent on) liberal capitalist politicians. The socialist wing of the movement, along with many of the activists in the high schools and on the college campuses, have been supporters of the first orientation. The liberals, along with their allies in the Communist Party and other reform-minded groups, have consistently fought for the second approach.

A clear expression of the difference in approach was the McCarthy campaign and its influence on the antiwar movement. The McCarthy campaign, as McCarthy himself stated, was designed to redirect energy used in marches and protests and use it "constructively" to organize support for him in the Democratic Party. There can be no doubt that McCarthy was able to disorient (at least temporarily) many activists who thought they could find the road to peace by supporting the liberal capitalist politician McCarthy.

While McCarthy and his fellow Democrats clearly saw his campaign as an alternative to the mass street actions of the antiwar movement, many activists did not see the contradiction that exists between independent actions in the streets and liberal pressure politics, and they continued to support actions of the antiwar movement while simultaneously working for McCarthy.

Counterposed to the McCarthy campaign and all similar "peace" crusades stands the Halstead and Boutelle campaign as an example of the kind of electoral activity that antiwar militants should support. The Halstead-Boutelle campaign has been the only campaign that has built the antiwar movement rather than competed with it. The candidates themselves, and the program they stand for, urge full support to mass actions against the war. Young Socialists for Halstead and Boutelle have been among the most vigorous supporters and organizers of the antiwar movement.

While the Young Socialists for Halstead and Boutelle have been successful in winning many antiwar activists to the campaign, at the present stage of political development of the antiwar movement it would be a mistake for the movement as such to engage in any kind of electoral activity. The basis of the antiwar coalition is unity in action against the war. Any attempt to involve the movement in electoral activity will split it, and aid only the opponents of mass action.

Those who support Halstead and Boutelle are only a part of the total number who oppose the war and are willing to join in actions against it. Many militant antiwar activists are opposed to any electoral activity, others support the Peace and Freedom Party, liberal Democrats, or the Communist Party campaign. For any antiwar group to make support for Halstead and Boutelle a condition for joining an antiwar demonstration, or belonging to an antiwar committee, would only reduce the numbers that would participate.

### "Single-Issue Vs. Multi-Issue"

The antiwar movement and the struggles of labor and Afro-Americans are all part of a deepening, interconnected, mass struggle against imperialism. As the working class and black struggles increase in intensity, they cannot avoid dealing with the most pressing question in American politics today -- the question of the imperialist war in Vietnam. We encourage the deepening of these struggles and work for it in every way open to us.

However, advocacy of a "multi-issue" program for the antiwar movement by the liberals and the reformists has nothing in common with these real struggles. Rather it is a smokescreen designed to hide a rightward move away from mass action against the war, and a confrontation with the ruling class on that issue. When a grouping, led by pacifists and the Communist Party, under pressure from the McCarthy campaign and the Paris talks, wanted to blunt the edge of antiwar protest, they walked out of the Student Mo-

bilization Committee saying they objected to its single-issue approach. They organized the "Radical Organizing Committee" which has yet to "organize" much of anything. Rather than building a "multi-issue" mass movement, they were successful in creating nothing more than a small, ineffective, reformist organization with no clear perspective and an almost non-existent following. Young Socialists are always ready to discuss and act on multi-issue programs. We think our program of revolutionary socialism is the answer to the world imperialist crisis. We do not, however, advocate the antiwar movement adopt this program because only a sector of the movement could accept it and such advocacy would weaken the mass anti-imperialist thrust of the antiwar movement.

### The Draft

How to oppose the draft has long been a point of debate in the movement. As the opposition to the war grows, anti-draft sentiment will increase as well, and should be encouraged. It is necessary, however, to distinguish between two kinds of political activity that have both been referred to as "antidraft." The first, which we support and participate in, is the massive and militant demonstrations aimed directly at draft boards and induction centers. Picket-lines, street rallies, and educational leafletting in front of induction centers are also important parts of antiwar and antidraft activity, when the approach to the draftees is clearly one of support for them, rather than antagonism and hostility.

However, there is a second type of opposition to the draft that is quite different from mass actions. That is the focus on the individual who, as an act of conscience, refuses induction and consequently submits to prison or exile. While we support the legal rights of these men, and are opposed to their imprisonment, we do not advocate such an act because as an individual act it is completely ineffective in helping to mobilize the masses of Americans opposed to the war. At this time refusal to be drafted or to go to Vietnam is not a mass phenomenon, but the act of a few individuals without mass support. Various attempts by different groups to organize antidraft "unions" of draft resisters have invariably failed, even though antiwar and antidraft sentiment is on the rise. This is the clearest indication of the ineffectiveness of this kind of activity. The fact is that refusal to be inducted subjects individuals to long jail terms from which they are isolated from the fight against the war. Thus the government is successfully able to imprison some of the most militant and determined antiwar fighters. Such an individual act also provides ammunition to those oppo-

nents of the antiwar movement who charge that the movement is made up of people who oppose the war because they themselves don't want to fight.

### Withdrawal Vs. Negotiations.

The question of whether the antiwar movement should call for the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam or whether it should support negotiations has been one of the most thoroughly discussed questions in the movement. The debate has been rekindled by the Paris "peace talks." The socialist wing of the antiwar movement has consistently fought for the withdrawal position, making it clear that the United States has absolutely no right to negotiate anything in Vietnam.

The opposition to this has come from those who want to lead the antiwar movement in the direction of a pressure group for liberal politicians who are for negotiations but cannot accept the demand for immediate and unconditional withdrawal.

The demand for withdrawal has the most appeal to American soldiers and their families who know that GIs continue to die while the Paris talks stalemate -- and who remember that negotiations dragged on for years while American soldiers continued to fight and die in Korea.

The talks in Paris are an attempt on the part of the Johnson administration to take the steam out of the antiwar movement and co-opt the demand of liberal critics of the war.

The clear-cut demand for withdrawal is the clearest expression of support for the right of the Vietnamese to determine their own future, and is at the same time the demand that can most successfully mobilize masses of Americans in opposition to the war.

### Mass Action

The key to the growth and effectiveness of the antiwar movement to date has been its ability to draw out large numbers of people in militant street actions against the war in Vietnam. It has been the impact of tens and hundreds of thousands of Americans visibly opposing the war that has done the most to shake up the rulers of this country, and to help push into motion wider layers of society. There are, however, sectors of the antiwar movement who, for various reasons, are made uncomfortable by these mass actions and proclaim that "mere numbers" are meaningless. In this category are the pacifists who think that they can wield a greater influence in a smaller movement, and who see political acts in terms of the individual rather than mass



action. Also in this camp are those ultraleft political groups who cannot see that the mass antiwar movement is, through its actions, objectively anti-imperialist, and who think that smaller but "more radical" actions would have a greater impact. Also at various times lining up in opposition to mass action are the liberals and their allies in the Communist Party who oppose mass actions because they contradict their line of electoral activity on behalf of liberal capitalist politicians.

The success of the antiwar movement, its continued ability to mobilize large numbers of Americans against the war, and the impact this movement has had, stand as the best refutation of the position of those who oppose mass action.

#### Role of Young Socialists

The Young Socialists, as part of the international socialist wing of the antiwar movement, have a special obligation to build the American part of the international movement in defense of the Vietnamese Revolution.

This means, above all, mounting massive protest actions, independent of the

politics of the ruling class. Within that movement we want to fight for the correct positions on the questions discussed above, in order to enable the movement to be most effective. The political fights that we have conducted have been decisive at certain political crossroads for the continued growth of the antiwar movement.

Our antiwar activity is at different levels. Young Socialists are activists in the antiwar committees on campuses and in high schools throughout the country, and often are in elected positions of leadership. As antiwar activists and leaders we want to continue to be the best builders of the movement, the most serious and enthusiastic campaigners for the antiwar committees. Unlike some elements of SDS, and groups like the Du Bois Clubs, we have absolutely no fear of becoming "over involved" in this movement because we understand its overriding historical importance and the opportunities it presents to win young people to socialism. Without the spark provided by the Young Socialist Alliance, antiwar actions in the past would have been smaller and much less effective.

As the socialist wing of the movement we have intervened at crucial times with our political program. We have presented our position in the antiwar organizations as well as through our publications such as the Young Socialist and our pamphlets, all of which are important parts of our antiwar activity. Young Socialists have often been the initiators of proposals for mass actions which might otherwise not have occurred.

In short, our political and organizational participation in the movement has been decisive in building mass independent antiwar actions, and this will be true in the future as well.

What can we expect will be the evolution and development of the antiwar movement in the next period? The remainder of the 1968 election campaign will take place under the absolutely unprecedented condition of mass opposition to a war in process, and to the policies of both the Republicans and Democrats toward the war. While there will inevitably be a development of support for Humphrey as the "lesser evil" the Democratic Party will be unsuccessful in its goal of returning antiwar youth to the fold. Nixon and Humphrey will be forced to engage in a campaign where they will have to face antiwar demonstrators at virtually every stop. Many of these actions will be quite large, and Young Socialists, in collaboration with other groups such as the Student Mobilization Committee, will want to join in initiating such actions and participate wholeheartedly in them.

# 8.3 国際反戦会議

ANTI-WAR INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

1950年8月3日  
安保反対  
ATPO解体  
トナム

10月1日  
共同行動  
勝ち取る

安保沖繩  
トナムを環太平洋諸  
国に反対



The Student Mobilization Committee, along with other sections of the international antiwar movement, has called for an International Week of Solidarity - against the War in Vietnam and with American GIs, from October 21-27. In some areas actions will be held on November 2. While the coalitions of antiwar groups that have organized such actions in the past have been strained by political divisions accentuated by the McCarthy campaign and the Paris talks, these coalitions can be revitalized and new ones built on the basis of the unprecedented support that antiwar actions will receive this fall. The Student Mobilization Committee actions will also be the opportunity for the antiwar movement to make major steps forward in the direction of strengthening ties with GIs who oppose the war. A major feature of activities this fall will be attempts to organize the kind of actions that soldiers will want to participate in.

We can be confident that we will be successful in rebuilding and strengthening the antiwar coalition in preparation for actions this fall. We can also be confident that these demonstrations will be large and militant, and will express the repudiation by the antiwar movement of the policies of Humphrey, Nixon and Wallace. One key factor in this process will be continuing to build the Student Mobilization Committee. Through the SMC's initiative large, militant actions will be built. This means that one of the main tasks of the YSA will be build-

ing SMC on a national scale.

Following the elections we can expect that there will be opportunities to organize mass actions on an unprecedented scale. As the war continues, there can only be growing antiwar sentiment and an increased willingness on the part of broader layers of the population to join in these protests. On this basis we can take the initiative in drawing together broad coalitions to organize these actions independently of the machinations and manipulations of the ruling class.

As long as the war continues the objective base for an antiwar movement will exist in this country. This movement has already had a profound impact on the American political scene -- an impact that cannot and will not be forgotten. The antiwar movement has made permanent and irreversible changes in the political consciousness of large numbers of Americans, and has helped set in motion forces that will not be easily quieted.

With the line of action presented in this report we can build a movement capable of bringing the war to a halt. And insofar as we are successful in building such a movement we will strengthen the international revolutionary movement of which we are a part, and bring closer the time when we will be able to abolish the cause of war itself -- capitalism -- and begin to construct a socialist America.



# ATTEND THE NATIONAL YOUNG SOCIALIST CONVENTION CHICAGO NOV. 29-DEC. 1, 1968

A National Convention of young socialists from throughout the United States will be convened in Chicago over the Thanksgiving weekend. It will meet in the midst of a year of unprecedented revolutionary activity—from Prague to Paris, from Vietnam to Bolivia, and from Columbia to Berkeley. The Convention will discuss: the international revolutionary youth movement; the Vietnamese revolution and how to defend it; the 1968 election campaign waged by the Young Socialists for Halstead and Boutelle and the Young Socialist Alliance; the Afro-American struggle for the right to self-determination; the perspectives for the revolutionary socialist youth movement in this country, and the fight for a socialist America.

Reports will be given at the Convention by representatives of revolutionary socialist youth abroad, by antiwar and socialist GIs, and by participants in the Afro-American struggle, the antiwar movement, and campus rebellions across the country.

If you are interested in attending the Convention, fill out the coupon below.



Young Socialist Alliance  
P. O. Box 471, Cooper Station  
New York, New York 10003

... I plan to attend the Convention. Please send me details on housing, transportation, etc.

... Please send me a set of the discussion bulletins prepared for the Convention, and bill me.

... Send me more information on the Convention.

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... State ..... Zip .....

**BETTER FRED THAN DEAD.**  
**VOTE SOCIALIST WORKERS' IN '68.**  
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY  
YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE

