

Statement by Paul Eidsvik - to be appended to Minutes of January 10 meeting of the Fort Hood Three Defense Committee executive committee.

I feel that I have to state more specifically my opposition to the two motions I voted against at the January 10 Executive Committee meeting.

I have been a staff member (in addition to being one of the original organizers of) the Fort Hood Three Defense Committee since its beginning in June, 1966. I entered the committee and became active in it because of its unique approach and attraction to soldiers, and because I felt a moral obligation to defend and raise funds for the defense of Jimmy, Dave and Dennis. I felt that the best possible legal and public defense of the Fort Hood Three must be built.

Our intention was to build the kind of defense effort that would gain the greatest possible support in the movement as a whole and in the general public.

We adopted a statement of aims which included three general points:

1. To provide funds for the legal defense of PFC James Johnson, Pvt. Dennis Mora and Pvt. David Samas, three members of the United States Army who have refused to serve in Vietnam because of their belief that the war there is illegal, immoral and unjust.
2. To publicize and gain support for these three G.I.'s, not only among the public at large, but also among servicemen and those facing the military service. To publicize the reasons for the three G.I.'s stand and keep the public informed on developments in the case.
3. It is the position of the committee that citizens generally and servicemen as citizens are free to exercise their rights of freedom of thought conscience and expression. The committee will defend these rights.

Upon this basis we proceeded to raise funds and obtain sponsors for the committee. More than \$20,000 has been raised on this basis, and over 250 prominent individuals -- Professors, Attorneys, etc.-- became sponsors of the committee -- with the understanding that the committee they agreed to sponsor would operate according to this statement of aims. The sponsors no doubt have divergent views on how to end the war, and on the draft, but they all agree that the three G.I.'s should be defended and that their case should be publicized.

A decision to undertake organization of anti-draft activities and calling of an anti-draft conference goes far beyond the limits of the statement of aims. In effect, this decision turns the Fort Hood Three Defense Committee, a committee set up to defend the three G.I.'s, into a general antiwar and anti-draft committee. If this action is carried out, the FH3DC is no longer a defense committee -- but something far different -- something which may abrogate the trust the very broad list of sponsors and our contributors have placed in us.

I feel that such an action -- a change in the very basis upon which the committee will operate -- can be made only with the full consultation of the sponsors and contributors.

I feel that such an action cannot be taken by a decision made late at night after most of the Executive Committee members had left the meeting, with the Secretary, Dave Dellinger, unable to attend, and with the co-chairman, A.J. Muste, out of the country.