By Alex Harte

NEW YORK — Eighty-three independent voices, including figures from the literary and academic world and from the anti-war and student movements who have endorsed the Socialist Workers Party majority ticket as a means of registering their opposition to the Vietnam war.

The statement of endorsement appeared as an eleven-inch by two-column display ad in the Oct. 28 issues of the widely read New York weekly, the Village Voice. It was also slated for publication in the Nov. 1 New York Times.

Among those endorsing the SWP slate are Warren Miller, author of "The Cold World," 90 Miles from Moscow, and "The Language of Magazines." He was also joined in the endorsement by the noted literary critic Matt Tannenbaum and by John Yeiens, who did the translations from Russian in Tannenbaum's "Homework" and who is also a member of the New York City ticket.

Meta Signers

The ad was signed by Paul Krassner, editor of the Realist, the free-lance, underground magazine which has gained a big campus following.

It was also signed by John Wilcock, columnist for the Village Voice and writer of the widely used travel guide, "Mexico on $5 a Day.

Another signer is Tana de Garay, who covers education for the New York Post.

Representatives of the academic world who signed include Dr. Ephraim Asch, professor of City College Prof. Emile Capouya of the New School for Social Research, and Prof. William H. McNeill of Columbia.

Consultants were Dr. Allen Krebs, director of the Free University; John Garver, part-time, retiring-treasurer of the Free University; and an attorney at Drew University.

New Yorkers: Vote Now

NEW YORK: The Socialist Workers Party will be on the ballot along with the United Labor Party. The two parties' candidates for each congressional office will be alternated down the row.

The Board of Elections originally lumped the right-wing United Labor Party, the SWP and SLP on a single line. This was protested and the SWP and SLP in the State Supreme Court whose Appellate Division ruled that independent Taxpayers should have a line of their own, but left the "SWP and SLP on a single line. This is blatant discrimination, the suit specifically states that each candidate shall have a line of his own on the ballot.

By Hal Vorb

BERKELEY, Calif., Oct. 24 — In the face of blatantly uncontrollable student violence, Berkeley and Berkeley city authorities, a new march on Oakland has been called for Nov. 20 by the Berkeley Vietnam Day Committee which plans to stage "five continuous days of protest against the war in Vietnam," it has been reported. The significant development, the VDC and a local police force to turn back a streetfighting, fire-spacing, and "peaceful" march, which had already attracted VDC demonstrators.

He said that the city had now had a peaceable parade that was over, and that the Oakland police, the Berkeley police, the head of the march was charged with the Bayside, group, and a massive blockage of the march, was reported.

The proposed "national march" on Oakland that was projected for Oct. 8 but rescheduled to Nov. 20 to allow time for mobilizing full support, will be conducted not only to oppose American intervention in Vietnam but also "to demand an end to Federal and local support of the protest movement."

Oakland Mayor Tom Keiter has appealed to Gov. Edmund G. Brown to declare illegal the use of the Berkeley campus of the University of California to organize the march. Berkeley's mayor, Wallace Johnston, made this startling statement: "No... again must Berkeley have to cope with the turbulence, the danger to life and property, the public inconvenience, and the staggering cost of police protection involved in a mass parade."
Another Betrayal on Vietnam

By Harry Ring

Cuba continues to firmly press its revolutionary foreign policy, particularly in its determined effort to deliver Cuban Foreign Min-
ister Raúl Roa to the United Nations as a representative of the Cuban people and to our country. The USA statement released by I. W. Lee also complained about the ousting of Cuban delegates from the United Nations and the General Assembly of the United Nations on the issue of Vietnam.

The Cuban people, Dr. Roa declared, remained resolute in their defense of their national sovereignty and socialist views. The Cuban government accused the USA of attacking against US imperialism which has dominated and exploited the world in peace and declared it could be set back only by a united, resilient struggle against anti-imperialist forces.

While the US became more vocal, he stressed Cuba’s view of the importance of the conference of anti-imperialist forces of Asia, Africa and Latin America which will convene in Havana next Jan. 3. He said the tri-national congress “will con-
vincingly demonstrate the will of the nations to defend their interna-
tionalist instrument.” The present USA government, however, has dropped the demand for U.N. intervention in favor of “support” for the current administration policy in Vietnam.

The Cuban government also stressed that the US, in its attempt to isolate its allies and have them return to the peace table of the UN, has been found to be not fulfilling its obligations and therefore its position is untenable.

The US government has been more vocal and has been accused by the Cuban government of making statements about Cuban personnel and its allies in the UN.

The Cuban delegate also accused the US of having “sent a truce for the peace in our city, and the UN has seen that the Cuba is the only one that is willing to negotiate a cease-fire that would benefit the people.”

The Cuban government stated that Cuba’s foreign policy is not based on the US government’s statement that Cuba is not interested in negotiating a peace in the UN and that it is ready to negotiate on the understanding that the US recognition of Cuba is based on the UN resolution of 1947.

The Cuban government also stated that the US government is not interested in negotiating a peace in the UN and that it is ready to negotiate on the understanding that the US recognition of Cuba is based on the UN resolution of 1947.

The Cuban government also stated that the US government is not interested in negotiating a peace in the UN and that it is ready to negotiate on the understanding that the US recognition of Cuba is based on the UN resolution of 1947.

The Cuban government also stated that the US government is not interested in negotiating a peace in the UN and that it is ready to negotiate on the understanding that the US recognition of Cuba is based on the UN resolution of 1947.

The Cuban government also stated that the US government is not interested in negotiating a peace in the UN and that it is ready to negotiate on the understanding that the US recognition of Cuba is based on the UN resolution of 1947.

The Cuban government also stated that the US government is not interested in negotiating a peace in the UN and that it is ready to negotiate on the understanding that the US recognition of Cuba is based on the UN resolution of 1947.
Seek to Smear Anttiwar Efforts

(Continued from Page 1)
of anti-draft activity, such as the burning of draft cards, suits the men who engage in it to government policy. If all men opposed to the war cannot or will not engage in active, if the movement becomes centered around such activity it will be easier to discredit the organization of individuals with a highly developed sense of self-discipline. In addition it would be foolishly for the military. It is simply a matter of force, dedicated and active members to almost certain long jail terms, while a few dedicated and active people who are not otherwise specifically needed to organize the mass sentiment which will determine the outcome of war and which has barely begun to form.

It can be argued that programs for conscientious objectors do not involve the risk of imprisonment. That may be so, and in any case the right of individuals to refuse to be drafted for this illegal war should be defended. But these programs cannot be an effective way to win the support of the millions to the war, and they cannot have any appreciable effect on the war. Even if relatively large numbers of young men were able to pass conscientious objector's status, the authorities would simply raise the draft quotas by a fraction of a per cent, so all these men needed for the military. While Wadsworth, the War Department's recent statement that young men who object to the war might be given the opportunity to serve in the Peace Corps as is indicated enough that the acceptance of the government is not seriously worried about losing its military strength as the whole war effort赖于 conscientious objector's action. The idea of challenging draft enforcement is advanced as a means which the antia war movement can utilize to broaden its influence and to appeal to wider sections of the public.

But these programs of conscientious objector's action and defiance of the draft can have no direct appeal to the millions already in the armed forces and who are much with it regardless of what they think about the war. They can have no direct appeal to the millions of draftable young men who simply will not be willing to go for conscientious objector's status, who can't feel the induction center, decent and who reject the alternative of going to jail even if they are genuinely opposed to the war. These programs can't even match the thousands of young people who are against the war, and who would rather go to jail than go into the armed forces. Even these conscientious objectors are divided and probably will not be effective.

When the U.S. was still in the early stages of the war, and before the war, when not many people were even aware of the war, and before they had been talking about the war, and when those opposed to the war appeared to be a tiny minority, it would be easy to think that dramatic action, by a few individuals, could be all it needs to do something about the war. At least it was something and called to attention a role that was being largely ignored. This was the beginning of the movement.

The idea of mass opposition to the war right here in the U.S. has proved to be impossible. The teach-ins and demonstrations are having a profound effect, but the war is coming through, and a great majority of Americans are based about it, are question- ing it, and millions are opposed to it.

The depth of the unpopularity of this war has not yet been matched in American history. The government's greatest effort is the great task of the antia war movement, and of course. Nothing should be allowed to di- minish the importance of the task.

The lives of thousands of U.S. G.I.'s and countless Vietnamese women and children depend upon it.

In this context the anti-draft "campaign" is a diversion, tendi- ngs away from the real issue of getting that small portion of the population which is ready to accept pacifist philosophy or chal- lenge the enforcement of the draft law. It is the simple fact that one demonstra- tion by soldiers in Vietnam voicing the demand "We Want to Go Home!" will do more to end the war than a thousand students in jail.

The withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam is also the only real goal of the anti-draft movement. This is the sentiment of the majority of the population, which has been built, and around which the anti-draft movement has gathered. The sole purpose of this movement. Stated simply — Bring the GIs home from Vietnam and the war will end. And this sentiment is understandable if one understands the true situation — even by people who have no moral opposition to the war.

It cuts right through the right wing's argument about the "good" nature of the movement. Instead of ana- loguing the troops in Vietnam, their right-wing detractors analogue the armed forces or about to enter them, and they are right about them - they are in a just war. It appeals directly to the draft-age youth, who are the ones who have made the draft calls necessary.

The draft-age youth, or men in the military services, have the right to express opinions about the Vietnam war. They do not lose these rights when drafted and should exercise them. They have the right to know the truth about Vietnam, and the antiwar movement has a right to make that truth available to them. Soldiers and sailors have the right to vo- te. Surely they should have the right to discuss the issues, including the most important issue in national politics today, the Vietnam war. They should have the right to hear these issues de- bated, to debate themselves, to advocate opinions, to disagree with the administration's foreign policy.

They should have the right to organize meetings on this ques- tion, to invite speakers, to adapt positions. And surely they should have the right to demonstrate, as their predecessors in the U.S., armed forces did in the huge going-home movements which forced the demobilization of the armies after the Second World War.

The slogan, "Bring the GIs Home from Vietnam Now!" is the slogan of the movement's future. The goal it must achieve. It is also the slogan around which the movement can be built right now, while it is still appealing largely to student radicals, because it clearly distinguishes those who raise it from those who raise only misleading demands such as "negotiate," that even President Johnson can claim to agree with as he sends out the bombardments for another napalm raid.

The slogan, "Bring the GIs Home from Vietnam Now!" contains, at one and the same time, the broadest popular appeal and the sharpest confrontation with the warmakers.

...Berkeley Students Set Protest

By Dan Styrion

A nationwide subscription cam- paign and local student organiza- tions of The Militant and the Young Socialist to introduce these two socialist publications to over 1700 new readers. The campaign will end December 15. For one dollar you can get six issues of the Young Socialist for six months and The Militant for four.

The Young Socialist is a bi- monthy magazine of politics and current events and is aimed at young people and all those active in the civil rights and antia war movements. Articles dealing with the realities of American involvement in the Congo, the Dominican Republic, the war in Vietnam, interviews with Isaac Deutscher and Malcolm X have appeared in previous issues.

The Militant gives news and analysis from a socialist viewpoint into the antiwar and civil rights movements, world revolutionary developments, the labor movement, and contains other features of interest to new and old radicals. This special combination offer, turn to the subscription blanks on page 2.

Scoreboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Quote</th>
<th>Subscribed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ann Arbor</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York (uptown)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totals</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>1,311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two Speeches By Malcolm X

Two Speeches By Malcolm X

An African Document: UNITA

The Road to Freedom in South Africa

This is the second in a series of speeches by Malcolm X, delivered at the UNC-Wilson Center in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, on September 20, 1964. The first speech, delivered at the UNC-Wilson Center in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, on September 20, 1964, was entitled "The Truth About America." This speech is one of the most important speeches by Malcolm X, and it is a powerful defense of the African liberation struggle.

The speech begins with a call for unity among African Americans, and it goes on to discuss the role of the African diaspora in the struggle for freedom. Malcolm X emphasizes the importance of solidarity among African peoples, and he argues that the struggle for freedom is not just about winning political power, but about creating a better world for all Africans.

He also discusses the role of the United States in the struggle for African independence, and he criticizes the U.S. government for its support of colonialism and imperialism. Malcolm X argues that the U.S. should be working to support African liberation, and he calls for an end to U.S. military aid to the apartheid regime in South Africa.

This speech is a powerful call to action, and it is a reminder of the importance of solidarity in the struggle for freedom.
Malcolm X Speaks

Johnston and the Restons fear, in spite of their protests that it is a "total modification" of Johnston's position in the...and to the conference table. This argument has a deadly logic: if the...is to achieve "peace" in the shortest possible time through a...forces, the best means to employ...military force, including nuclear bombs. That was the argument presented by "Isolationist" World War II by murdering over 200,000 Japanese civilians at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Is this a...convinced of the fact that the...is to be got behind the U.S. war effort and bring...and the Vietnamese revolutionaries to their knees and thus to the...in Korea? How can you justify being...in Vietnam and...and you are...to going to be nonviolent in...as if you were in...How can you...and the Chinese were fighting the...and you are going to...for nossa independence...for nossa independence. Now, how can you...as Richard Nixon...in the Communist Party...of China. How can you deny your own...in a bloody battle. So I cite those various revolutions, brothers and sisters, to show you that you don't have a peaceful revolution. You don't have a turn-the-other-cheek revolution...with the other-cheek revolution...the only revolution in which the goal is love...revolution in which the goal is love...that you'd be raising your hand to question...a man who...serious. The white man knows what a revolution is. He knows what...and the black revolution is world-wide in scope and perspective. The white man's kind of revolution is sweeping Asia, is sweeping Africa, is sweeping its...in Latin America. The Cuban Revolution...the revolution...the revolution...it is in Asia, revolution is in Africa, this last he says is a sham. But...the revolution in Latin America. How do you think you'll...you when you...is that revolution?...you, you wouldn't understand...Revolution is bloody, revolution is...and not the talking kind. The white...in a country...and not the peace kind. The...in Latin America...to withdraw from Latin America...is going to be withdrawn from Latin America...in Latin America. What is it? He...in Latin America. What is it? He...Revolution in Latin America. How do you...in Latin America. What is it?
Facts on Hugo Blanco

The following letter was sent to the National Guardian by Peru's former labor minister and opposition leader Hugo Blanco, following the recent coup and arrest of President Manuel Rodríguez. The letter was published in the Guardian on March 23, 1968.

In the aftermath of the coup, Blanco was arrested and held for several days before being released on bail. He subsequently fled Peru and went into exile in Mexico, where he has remained ever since.

Blanco's imprisonment and subsequent trial were part of a broader campaign by the regime to suppress all political opposition and maintain its grip on power.

The Guardian's coverage of the coup and its aftermath was critical of the military and supportive of the democratic opposition.

The newspaper's editor, Guy Hershberg, and other journalists were subsequently arrested and imprisoned for their reporting on the coup.

The Guardian's reporting was widely praised for its bravery and uncompromising stance in the face of repression.
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DIED FOR WORKERS RIGHTS

Albert Parsons - Labor Martyr

By Harriet Talas

Albert Parsons was born June 24, 1854, and was hanged November 11, 1887, in Chicago. His name is familiar to students of human emancipation and uncompromising opposition to capitalism. He was also a leader of the radical and socialist figures in the years following the Civil War.

Parsons was born in Texas where he became a printer and eventually became a leader of the St. Louis Spectator. After a while his paper began to lose circulation and he became "weary of the ugly politics." He was an active advocate for the ideas of the national government and for the economic and social power of the plantation owners.

A Republican

Because of his Republican affiliations, Parsons was granted a special pardon which included all such political prisoners, such as chief deputy collector. On November 11, 1886, he moved through Texas and met later married Lucy Parsons, a young Filipina. After his marriage, he had to have been one of those who arrested and blackened by himself, who had been convicted of murder.

The employers and their henchmen, the police, press, courts, etc., were the enemy of an opportunity to violently attack the labor and radical movements. Parsons along with seven other innocent men were charged with the crime and were placed on trial for their ideas.

Arrest Warrant

While a warrant was out for his arrest, Parsons went into hiding. However, when the trial day arrived, Parsons entered the courtroom and gave himself up saying, "I do not expect to leave this place alive. But I cannot bear the thought of knowing that my comrades were here and were to die like this. And I was in the company with whom they were, so that I am innocent as I am." He was tried and eight of the seven were allowed a final speech and the accused become the first people to be killed by the police in a total of eight hours. Speaking beyond the courtroom, he described the meaning of capitalism and traced the struggle against it.

In this final address he said, "I am a socialist. I am one of those, although in a wage slave, who feels that it is wrong — wrong to myself, wrong to my neighbor, and unjust to my fellow man — for me to undertake the struggle against those who are perpetuating slavery by becoming a master and an owner of property.

"My Crime"

"This is my crime. I have been false, I have been untrue. I have been a traitor to the institutions that exist today in capitalism.

"Neither I nor my colleagues here have violated any legal right of American citizens. We stand upon the right of free speech, of free press, of public assemblies, unobstructed and undisturbed. We stand for the constitutional right of self-defense, and we defy the prosecution to rob the people of America of these dearly bought rights.

"Do you think, gentlemen of the prosecution, that you have settled this case with my lifeless body to poach all your friends? I think not, I have something to say as to whether or not the constitution is understood at the dictation of monopoly and corporations and their hired tools."

The year 1896 found the eight-hour movement at its height, especially in Chicago. Strikes were frequent. In May of that revolutionary year there occurred the events of the famous Haymarket Massacre. The attacks on the headquarters of the employers and their police led to protest meetings. At one of these meetings, Parsons had been one of the speakers, a bomb was hurled by someone whose identity has never been conclusively proven.

"The employers and their henchmen, the police, press, courts, etc., use the bombings as an opportunity to violently attack the labor and radical movements. Parsons along with seven other innocent men were charged with the crime and were placed on trial for their ideas."

[The leadership of the Cuban revolution had been acutely aware of the dangers of bureaucratism and dogmatic thinking among those fighting for liberation. The leadership of José Antonio Echevarría and his men were courageous, but morally weak, as to suppress three lines! Just because these three lines represent an ideological expression of José Antonio Echevarría's way of seeing the world will have something to say as to whether or not the constitution is understood at the dictation of monopoly and corporations and their hired tools."

The year 1896 found the eight-hour movement at its height, especially in Chicago. Strikes were frequent. In May of that revolutionary year there occurred the events of the famous Haymarket Massacre. The attacks on the headquarters of the employers and their police led to protest meetings. At one of these meetings, Parsons had been one of the speakers, a bomb was hurled by someone whose identity has never been conclusively proven.

"The employers and their henchmen, the police, press, courts, etc., use the bombings as an opportunity to violently attack the labor and radical movements. Parsons along with seven other innocent men were charged with the crime and were placed on trial for their ideas."

[The leadership of the Cuban revolution had been acutely aware of the dangers of bureaucratism and dogmatic thinking among those fighting for liberation. The leadership of José Antonio Echevarría and his men were courageous, but morally weak, as to suppress three lines! Just because these three lines represent an ideological expression of José Antonio Echevarría's way of seeing the world will have something to say as to whether or not the constitution is understood at the dictation of monopoly and corporations and their hired tools."

Castro on Falsification of History

Questions and Answers About Socialism

Socialists claim that the United States is an imperialist power which goes for economic domination. Why is it that the United States in Vietnam is costing the government in the United States a great deal of money and profits American businesses get from their investments in Vietnam? We observe that view the American big business — like every other ruling class — is motivated fundamentally by its economic interests, and that the government acts in the interests of the big capitalists. In this late stage of the evolution of capitalism in the U.S., many of the largest corporations have interests in foreign countries. Total U.S. owned assets in the rest of the world, including American owned businesses, stock, and bonds, is a loss amount to nearly $100 billion now. Because government investment is growing rapidly, at the rate of about $6 billion a year.

For government plays a very important role in maintaining domestic stability and the big business, since it provides an outlet for profits that are continuously accumulated by the capitalist, if profits are not invested, recession results.

There are other advantages of the capitalist state of development — much higher profit rates, lower cost of labor, lower wages, etc. The important conclusion is that the ruling class has interests in maintaining and increasing the war. Nothing can eliminate its long run need for expanding foreign investments to maintain the American capitalism itself.

One of the main requirements for expanding foreign investments is political stability — of a certain type. Businesses need to be assured that their investments will be expropriated wholesale and that countries will remain relatively independent of American companies can put up higher wages. The need for nationalism — especially if the international situation becomes profitable, and the compromise between national and international goals and the permanent end of a "favorable climate" for foreign investments — such as co-
curred in Russia, China, Cuba, etc. — is in essence a blow at the heart of American imperialism.

Is the U.S. is so economically powerful that it can force any of the weaker (and some of the not so weak) governments to do what it wants to do? No, it is not. It is by making a socialist revolution and nationalizing and planning their economies.

Every successful social revolution in Vietnam would demonstrate that their national independence, land reform, social revolution

The government has an other important direct interest in Vietnam. It has turned South Vietnam into a pseudo militarized base. It has constructed this base in order to help the small country, and began this program of immense scale in an era of the cold war. The South Vietnamese government is the United States' major military base for counterrevolution throughout Southeast Asia.

The U.S. is the major military power over the world.

So the states for American capitalists in Vietnam are much higher than merely its current interests and profits in South Vietnam. The capitalists take a considerable stake in the Vietnamese war because it is the socialist revolution — so do revolutionary socialists.

It is a logical conclusion that the U.S. government will never withdraw from Viet Nam, while the U.S. government will get too high and force a withdrawal when the war is the loss of support for the present American policy of the government at home — rather than the cost in dollars.

—Herman Porter
Socialist Campaign Letters

[This column is on open forum for all representatives on subjects of general interest to our readers. Please keep your letter brief. Where necessary they will be abbreviated for space. All letters are subject to publication, names being withheld unless authorization is given for such.]

Really Impressed

New York, N. Y.

Dear Mrs. Garza,

I heard you speak on Channel 1 Sunday afternoon. You were the only one who really made sense and I enclosed $50. Thank you for a refreshing, honest presentation.

A.H.

Much Impressed

Crystin, Pa.

A few nights ago, we heard two of your representatives on the radio and were much impressed with what they had to say. We would like to receive all available information and literature on the Party, and would inform by them we could do so by writing to you. Thank you.

Mr. and Mrs. R.B.

Interested in Socialism

Bronx, N. Y.

I am interested in the Socialist Workers Party. I would appreciate it very much if you could send me any literature available on the organization and the upcoming election.

Could you please tell me the difference between your party and the Socialist Labor Party of Mr. Haas.

S.R.

Wants to Participate

Brooklyn, N. Y.

Please send a free copy sample of The Worker - the weekly newspaper standing for the program of the Socialist Workers Party. Socialism is the only way to a better living. I am very interested in this subject and would be interested in participating in campaign activities.

B.M.

Learned Lesson

Brooklyn, N. Y.

Although I am a senior in high school and therefore cannot vote, I would like to all I can to help your campaign. I have learned through experience in the last election that to work for candidates such as a Ruy or Lindsay is to work for capitalism and all the evils that come with it. The only way to advance socialism is to work for socialist candidates.

I can work anytime on weekends and weekdays and would be willing to do any work that is needed.

C.G.

About These Letters

In place of our usual column of letters from our readers, we have available for a selection of letters received by the New York Campaign Committee of the Socialist Workers Party. The letters are in response to television and radio broadcasts by the SWP candidates and from a wide distribution of election platforms. The committee reports that the mail response is the largest for a municipal campaign in recent years.

Solid Support

New York, N. Y.

Enclosed $23 campaign check for being on front page election issue.

M.R.

Takes Issue

Williams, N. Y.

In your broadcast plus questions today I decide take exception to many of your answers. With special reference to your remarks concerning Mr. Goldwater I believe your remarks were illusory. Your information to your audience about the Viet war was short of the truth. Do you not understand that South Vietnam could not defend itself against the Vietcong? Do you not understand that the Vietcong overrunning of South Vietnam would ultimately mean that all Asia would become Communist? With this situation the U.S. would be subject to attack.

You are employing people to be used in building schools, hospitals and many other media. Do you not understand that 75 per cent of the adult unemployed are now unemployed.

My feeling is that a person in your position could be better equipped factually before attempting to speak in public and a few more questions on knowledge of hearing scholarship speakers in public, I beg to conclude by saying these speakers, to all of them, evade the truth.

Obviously I cannot give you my name or address.

C.P.

School Assignment

Bronx, N. Y.

I would appreciate very much being mailed a copy of your literature as I am doing a research and taking some of your literature for my Social Studies class.

I am also interested in Mr. DeBerry and I was wondering if you could also send me a DeBerry for Mayor button.

B.P.

Wants to March

Bronx, N. Y.

I just heard the program on channel 12 "Who speaks for New York" very interesting. Please send me your information material also about the march against war in Vietnam.

Mrs. R.K.

Liked Speech by Camejo

New York, N. Y.

I was very impressed with the speech of your candidate for Council President on Channel 21 last night. May I please have literature on your party’s platform in this election for mayor.

S.M.

D.C. Listener

Washington, D.C.

I have recently observed a number of debates in Vietnam in which members of your group took part. This includes the radio debates last night on WAAF. I’m much impressed with your viewpoint. Please send further information.

M.D.

Interested in Vietnam Stand

Flushing, N. Y.

I heard Clinton DeBerry speak on television. I suggested writing to The Militant for a copy of his editorial on the war in Vietnam. Would you kindly send a copy to me at the above address.

Jersey Booster

Rid Bank, N.J.

Being a resident of New Jersey, there isn’t much I can do to help the New York campaign (I intend to distribute literature for the New Group), but I can throw a few cents your way. Enclosed is a check for $3.

A.E.

Orders Button


Please send 100 "Vote for SWP and End the War in Vietnam" buttons. Enclosed is a check for $8. Thank you.

D.S.

Possible Subscriber

Anamosa, Conn.

Please send a copy of The Militant along with a subscription form to me.

T.B.

Wants Vietnam Statement

Orangeburg, N. Y.

On a broadcast by Mr. Clinton DeBerry, Socialist Workers Party candidate for mayor yesterday, he said that you have available copies of an editorial on Vietnam that was written in your last edition. I would appreciate it if you could send me a copy of this editorial.

H.A.O.

Thought for the Week

"While air power is so vital to the U.S. war effort in Vietnam, there is a need for a large increase in manpower. In the last 10 years air power has now produced an increase in manpower to the point where air power could jeopardize the political war. Air raids have been stepped up. However, in recent weeks, with offers of a couple of hundred dollars a day by fighter bombers carrying high explosives and napalm. At the same time Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge Jr. has been urging the people to win the minds of the people - a difficult task made harder by the fact that some of these people may be the innocent victims of the bombing raids." - Dispatch to the Oct. 27 New York Herald Tribune.
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A UNIQUE COMBINATION

For a limited time, THE MILITANT and the YOUNG SOCIALIST are offering a special joint combination offer.

For only $1 New readers may obtain a four-month subscription to THE MILITANT, which is published weekly, and a six-month subscription to the YOUNG SOCIALIST, a magazine which appears every other week.
Young Socialists Speak Against War in Vietnam

By Herman Porter

OCT. 26 — The acquittal of Khe Sanh massacre victims on Oct. 17 by Judge Mrs. Viola Liuozza is an outrage and a crime which must be condemned by all non-violent workers in the United States and the world.

The U.S. government and its papers have been ridiculing the trial. It was a travesty of justice and a violation of the rights of the accused. But the jury refused to acquit on even the most trivial charge.

The trial was a farce. The jury was not impartial. The judge was biased. The evidence was not presented. The defense was not allowed to present its case. The trial was a travesty of justice.
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