

YSA

DISCUSSION BULLETIN

Vol. 10 No. 1
January 1967

CONTENTS

Antiwar Resolution
(NEC Draft)
Submitted January 17, 1967

20 cents

YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE

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

YSA

DISCUSSION BULLETIN

Vol. 10 No. 1
January 1967

CONTENTS

Antiwar Resolution
(NEC Draft)
Submitted January 17, 1967

20 cents

YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE

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

ANTIWAR RESOLUTION

(NEC Draft)

I. INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

Since the United States government began bombing north Vietnam over two years ago, the Vietnam war has been the central issue in world politics. It is one of the largest wars in the history of the world and is already in many respects larger than the Korean War. It has spurred an international antiwar protest movement that continues to grow while the imperialist powers, the workers' states, and the colonial countries all focus their attention on this question.

Vietnam is presently the central confrontation between imperialism and the world socialist revolution, testing the relationship of forces between these two antagonists of the twentieth century. In this sense Vietnam is similar to Spain in the 1930's where all political forces were tested and where the outcome meant either a socialist Spain and a defeat for fascism or, as it turned out, a fascist Spain and an open door to World War II.

American aggression against north Vietnam is an attack on a workers' state, the first attack of such magnitude since the Korean War, and U.S. intervention in south Vietnam is an attempt to crush a popular revolution for land reform and national independence. This aggression is part and parcel of imperialism's global strategy of seeking to dominate and police the world in the interests of the capitalist system by crushing the colonial revolution and eventually rolling back the workers' states.

American aggression in Vietnam is primarily motivated by the political need for imperialism to maintain south Vietnam as a link in a ring of strategic bases encircling China. The inspirational effect an American defeat would have on revolutionaries around the world is also a motivating factor for U.S. imperialism.

Although the ruling circles in this country are in agreement on the overall strategic aims of American imperialism in the world and in Asia, there are tactical differences over the present course in Vietnam -- differences deep enough to create a permissive atmosphere for the antiwar movement. The sustained resistance of the Vietnamese people, which is the most important component of the international antiwar movement, and a never-ending escalation that risks a confrontation with China and the possibility of nuclear war with the USSR has created real doubts among a section of the ruling class about the wisdom of the present policy in Vietnam. These differences also exist on an international scale and have made it difficult for Johnson, unlike Truman during the attack on Korea, to convince the rulers in the other advanced capitalist countries to furnish troops.

The extent of the differences within the ruling circles is exemplified by the dispatches written from north Vietnam by Harrison Salisbury, an Assistant Managing Editor of the New York Times. Salisbury, one of the first Western newsmen, authoritative in the eyes of the ruling class, to get into north Vietnam, has written article after article, sharply exposing President Johnson's lies about civilian bombing in north Vietnam. The impact of these articles is adding substantially to the already growing doubts and confusion about the war.

The Vietnam war is another confrontation in the post World War II period in which the American rulers are forced to test their capacity to deal with popular revolutions at a time when the basic relationship of forces vis-a-vis the world socialist revolution is becoming less favorable to them. The conjunctural defeats of the colonial revolution in the past couple of years particularly in Indonesia, Algeria, and Brazil has emboldened the American imperialists to take their present course in Vietnam.

If Vietnam is a test for American imperialism it is an even greater test for all segments of the world socialist movement and the governments of the workers' states. It is a test of their ability to defend the Vietnamese revolution.

Moscow's ruling circles, whose line is followed by most of the world's Communist parties, have not conducted an aggressive defense of the Vietnamese revolution. In the interests of their long-standing policy of peaceful coexistence between the USSR and western imperialism, the Soviet bureaucrats place their narrow "national" interests above the world revolution.

They have the power to halt Johnson's escalation in Vietnam if they choose to do so. American escalation in Vietnam is limited solely by the risk of a major confrontation with the Soviet Union. This is indicated by the pattern of U.S. escalation which is marked by acts of aggression followed by pauses to measure Chinese and Soviet response, and when no resistance is met, the aggression is stepped up. American capitalism is not at present in an extreme economic or political crisis that would make the rulers willing to risk a nuclear showdown over Vietnam with the USSR. If the USSR were to carry out a more militant defense of Vietnam they would in all likelihood be able to force the U.S. to halt its continued escalation.

They should first of all make it explicitly clear to American imperialism that the Soviet Union is ready to come to the immediate assistance of China if the latter is attacked. The USSR's failure to do this has placed a question mark over Soviet solidarity with China and provides the basis for America's calculated escalation that may lead to an attack on China.

Secondly, north Vietnam should be furnished with whatever it needs in the way of technicians and anti-aircraft power to make their country into what Fidel Castro calls a "graveyard for American planes."

Thirdly, a calculated "counter-escalation" should be initiated to match, step by step, the continued escalation of the war by the American government. Johnson's present policy of continued escalation is a probing action and is possible due to the absence of serious resistance from the Soviet Union and China. If each time the United States took a new step in escalating the war, the Soviet Union were to respond with an action of similar weight, it would remove the question mark that now exists over how far the U.S. can go before the Kremlin will act.

Fourth, the Soviet regime should consider the defense of the Vietnamese revolution as its foremost task and initiate a campaign around the world to organize as large an antiwar movement as possible. This would substantially strengthen movements in other countries as well as involve millions of trade unionists in countries like Italy and France where there exist mass Communist parties.

The Chinese regime has also carried out a narrow and ineffective campaign against the aggression in Vietnam. They maintain the sectarian policy of refusing to join in a united front in defense of Vietnam with countries and parties who do not line up against Soviet "revisionism." One of the consequences of this policy is to leave unchallenged Moscow's assertion that it supports a united front. By agreeing to join a united front the Chinese leaders could expose the hypocrisy of the Kremlin's assertion as well as put pressure on them to defend the Vietnamese revolution north and south, and China itself.

The brutality of U.S. aggression in Vietnam on the one hand and the failure of both Peking and Moscow to formulate a truly internationalist perspective on the other hand has generated currents of dissent and independence both inside and outside the Communist parties of the world.

Cuba and north Korea have published a join communique calling for a united front defense of Vietnam and there are indications that there is growing pressure, especially among young people, in Eastern Europe for a more aggressive campaign against the war. For example, nearly 10,000 Yugoslav students recently demonstrated against U.S. bombing attacks on north Vietnamese civilians. The use of tear gas and water hoses by police to break up the demonstrations can only serve to widen the cleavage between the youthful antiwar fighters and the Yugoslav regime.

The outspoken positions of Jean Paul Sartre and Bertrand Russell, which implicitly differ fundamentally with those of

Moscow, has led to a debate within the radical circles of Europe. The International War Crimes Tribunal with which both of these men are associated has attracted considerable attention in Europe and is putting pressure on the Communist parties both in Western Europe and in the workers' states.

This differentiation from the Moscow and Peking lines was also manifested at Liege, Belgium, in October when nearly 4,000 socialist and communist youth from all over Europe came to express their solidarity with the Vietnamese. Many of these youth came despite the violent opposition of the Communist party leaderships in their countries, and some were expelled from Communist party youth groups for participating.

This demonstration is a good example of the general growth and development of the opposition to the Vietnam war among young people in Western Europe -- an opposition that at this point surpasses the antiwar opposition in Eastern Europe. This can be seen in the formation and growth of the French Jeunesse Communiste Revolutionnaire (Revolutionary Communist Youth). The J.C.R. is a communist youth group formed after the leadership of the Communist party expelled a number of CP youth for their refusal to support capitalist candidates and which is leading an aggressive campaign against the Vietnam war.

With the exception of Japan where the Socialist party has been actively involved in the anti-Vietnam war movement, the social-democrats have made a miserable showing against the war. They either support the war outright as does the Labor party leadership in England or remain aloof from the organized movement criticizing it for its position of immediate withdrawal and its non-exclusionist policies as does the Socialist party in this country.

The world Trotskyist movement with its consistently internationalist approach has on a world scale been the foremost defender of the Vietnamese revolution and the most persistent campaigner against the war. We have helped to move the rank and file of the communist and social-democratic organizations because of our position against the war. An open confrontation between our ideas and those of these organizations has won valuable forces to revolutionary socialism.

The tactics of each national antiwar movement varies according to the level of political development. For example, in Japan where the labor movement is actively behind the antiwar struggle, the tactics employed differ from this country where the trade union movement is not yet involved and the political level is lower. Our orientation here is toward building a mass movement to bring the troops home now which is the best defense and display of solidarity we can offer the Vietnamese people.

II. SITUATION IN AMERICAN ANTIWAR MOVEMENT

Accomplishments

The antiwar movement in the United States emerged two years ago as a reaction against the bombing attacks on north Vietnam. Since then the movement has grown considerably and gone through numerous experiences.

The antiwar movement should be viewed within the general objective framework marked by the Negro struggle, divisions within the ruling class, rising prices, economic problems facing American capitalism, and new stirrings in the labor movement.

Many people in the movement underestimate what the anti-Vietnam war movement has accomplished and it's our responsibility to present a clear picture of this.

First, the antiwar movement has helped to prevent the re-establishment of wartime hysteria and to roll back most of the witch hunt atmosphere that existed in the 1950's and even into the early 1960's. This is demonstrated by the wide acceptance of non-exclusionism, and the outspoken attitude of some university professors. In addition the movement has undermined the legitimacy of the anti-communist myth created and fostered by the ruling class, has set a precedent for opposition to and questioning of government policy, and has helped shake public confidence in the government. As this process continues, it becomes progressively more difficult for the Administration to clamp down on any protest movement.

Secondly, it has been the principal catalyst in generating the significant current radicalization in this country.

Thirdly, the antiwar movement in the United States is an important stimulant for creating antiwar movements in other countries. To have a large and militant antiwar movement in the United States, which has for so long been viewed abroad as a homogeneous mass of reaction, has been a genuine inspiration.

Fourthly, the organized antiwar movement, despite its small size relative to the general population, has had an impact far greater than most of its participants realize. Its visibility and the scope of its activities has forced millions of Americans to note that an organized opposition to the war does exist. This has helped stir up doubts and questioning about the war among millions of people. The movement also serves to articulate and furnish clarity to the masses of people who have vague doubts and feelings about the war. Leaflets, pamphlets, books, speeches, etc. that tell the truth about the war find their way into the hands of thousands of people.

The grass roots effect of the war and the antiwar movement

is manifested by the fact that the militant wing of the Negro struggle is playing a more and more active role in the opposition to the war. It is also indicated by numerous individual G.I.'s who are defying the war in one way or another. Many of them have received literature from or heard about the antiwar movement.

Most important are the effects that the antiwar movement is having on the labor movement. SANE's creation of a trade union division which brought 6,000 people to the Madison Square Garden rally in New York, is a conscious attempt to open avenues to and create a dialogue with the labor movement.

The Chicago trade unionists conference for peace in Vietnam held in December, where close to 300 mid-western trade union officials and activists came together to talk about the war, is symptomatic of the discussion that the antiwar movement is helping to stimulate within the labor movement.

Most significant is the conflict that is developing between Walter Reuther and George Meany -- a conflict that has made possible the expression of antiwar views in the unions. This rift reflects in a distorted way the influence of the antiwar movement and the war on the ranks of labor, and is an indication that the militant, organized antiwar opposition provides elbow room for trade unionists who are cautiously taking the first steps toward open activity against the war.

Fifth, emerging at the beginning of the war and continuing to grow as the war grows larger, the organized antiwar movement has been able to sustain and prepare itself to take advantage of openings in the labor movement and collaborate with the militant wing of the Negro struggle. The fight in the antiwar movement, as a movement, to maintain its independence from class collaborationist politics has been decisive for its sustained existence and continuous growth. The failure of the movement to maintain this independence would have in all probability meant its absorption into Democratic party politics, losing its effectiveness and the possibility of reaching broader layers of the population.

Sixth, the organized antiwar movement has been a testing ground for the various currents of the socialist movement. From our point of view, it has been an opportunity to test our principled positions and our strategy to advance and build the antiwar movement. At the same time it has provided opportunities for advancing the program of revolutionary socialism and winning new members. On both of these scores we have fared well.

Our major opponents in the antiwar movement, the W.E.B. DuBois Club and the Communist party youth, have not been involved in the movement as long as we have and are not as integrated into it. However, their participation in the Chicago student conference is an indication that they do not

intend to ignore it. They are becoming more involved in the movement now in the hopes that they can help channel it into liberal capitalist politics as the 1968 elections draw near.

The sectarian groups -- Spartacist League and the Workers League (formerly American Committee for the Fourth International)-- are for all practical purposes not involved in the antiwar movement.

Youth Against War and Fascism, in the few places that they exist, participate to a limited extent in the organized antiwar movement, but their small size and sectarian politics prevents them from carrying any influence.

The Progressive Labor party, although somewhat larger than these groups, participates in the organized movement only in a few areas, primarily through S.D.S.

Students for a Democratic Society (S.D.S.), nationally, has remained relatively aloof from the organized antiwar movement since their April, 1965 March on Washington. This was objectively a result of a shift to the right in S.D.S. away from direct political confrontation with the Administration at its most sensitive point. Now, however, there is a discussion going on within S.D.S. about their orientation toward the national antiwar movement and the Spring mobilization. We should participate in this discussion and with our arguments strengthen the tendency that is pushing for greater involvement. We should encourage them to join with us and other youth groups in united front activity whenever it is possible.

The pacifists have split on the question of the Vietnam war with the right wing taking their traditional "plague on both your houses" line, and the left wing sympathetic to the liberation struggle. The position of the left wing pacifists is an unprecedented one for pacifism, at least in the midst of a war, and has laid the basis for fruitful united front work with them. They have played an important role in the life of the antiwar movement and in the formation of the November 8th and Spring mobilization committees.

The Future of the Movement

First of all, every day the war continues the working class feels the effects more and more deeply. These effects take the form of a rise in the cost of living, cutbacks in public spending, rising taxes, Johnson's attempt to freeze wages, and the threat of imposing more antilabor legislation. The consequences of the war are also brought home by the increasing shipment of relatives and friends to Vietnam and the rising rate of casualties. These war-imposed conditions are beginning to generate a resistance within the ranks of labor which may grow into something much larger. The transit strike in New York, the airline mechanics strike and the electrical workers strike are all symptoms of this mood.

The rift between Walter Reuther and George Meany is also a distorted reflection of ferment in the labor movement and will itself stimulate more motion. It is significant that the Vietnam war is raised as a result of this conflict just as it was the issue that brought over 300 trade unionists together in Chicago in December. This conference was the first time in years trade union officials came together to discuss a major political issue and how they could encourage similar discussions within their unions.

The workers in the draftee army are also feeling the impact of the war. There is a deep going cynicism felt by most American soldiers and a number of them even refuse to go along with military policy.

These openings in the political situation come at a time when the organized antiwar movement has called a major mobilization on April 15 in San Francisco and New York. This mobilization has the opportunity not only to draw in a broader cross section of the population than ever before--including some sections of the labor movement--but more important to affect significantly the political situation in this country. Previous national mobilizations have been extremely important for sustaining the movement by providing focal points of activity or by getting it through rough periods like the November elections. However, the Spring mobilization as it is currently envisioned is more than a focal point or a sustaining action. If the mobilization is anywhere near successful in inspiring a March on Washington-type-of-spirit and in concentrating a large number of people in two cities, the impact will be both visible and significant enough to help stimulate broader sections of the population into more open opposition against the war.

The Spring mobilization, within the framework of the changes that are developing in the objective situation especially in the labor movement, has the potential of bringing new forces into organized and visible antiwar activity that can qualitatively alter the character and scope of the antiwar movement in this country.

The basic contradiction that faces the antiwar movement in this country is that there does not exist a radicalized working class or mass working class political organizations for it to support. As a middle class movement it is limited by its size, by its inability to develop its own independent political alternative, and by the pessimism resulting from the inaction of the working class. The middle class composition and characteristics of the movement are also in contradiction to the generally independent and anti-imperialist direction of the movement as a whole.

As the political tendency which expresses the working class outlook in the antiwar movement we are in constant political conflict with the middle class currents in the

in the movement as well as its middle class character. This can be demonstrated by examining the major disputes in which we are continually engaged.

Electoral Action

As the movement is presently constituted we are absolutely opposed to it taking up, as a movement, electoral politics. As a middle class movement in the absence of any working class political formations such as a labor party or mass socialist party, it views electoral politics within the framework of capitalist politics. It sees its role as that of a pressure group within the framework of either of the existing major parties. At best it might project a Wallace-type third party--which is not a break with capitalist politics. As a working class tendency which does everything in its power to point the way away from capitalist politics and toward independent labor political action, we must fight these attempts to divert the antiwar movement into capitalist politics.

We should urge individuals from the movement to support our socialist campaigns which are independent of liberal or reformist gimmickry like the Committee for Independent Political Action (C.I.P.A.) campaigns, etc. and point the way toward independent working class electoral action.

The 1966 elections were not marked by a large movement in support of "peace candidates." However, the discussion has already begun, around the 1968 elections, about the possibility of a third party or a pressure movement for Robert Kennedy or some other liberal Democratic contender. We must arm ourselves against these proposals and participate vigorously with our ideas in the debate that will increase with intensity as the nominating conventions draw nearer.

"Multi-issue" vs "Single-issue"

Like most of the disputes in the antiwar movement such as the fight for non-exclusion and for immediate withdrawal of troops, the question of "multi-issuism" will continually come up in some form or another.

The dichotomy between the "multi-issue" and "single-issue" orientations for the antiwar movement is often a smokescreen created by reformists without a political organization of their own who want to create such an organization; or even more common it is an attempt by some elements to form reformist pressure groups that will divert the movement into Democratic party politics. Those who attempt to get the antiwar movement to adopt a program of social reform are objectively building a bridge to reformist electoral politics. In other words they are pointing away from, not toward, independent working class political action in the broadest sense.

However, the connections between the antiwar opposition

and genuine struggles by the working class and Negroes against inflation, higher taxes, antilabor legislation, racism, etc. are something qualitatively different from the attempt to turn the movement and its organizations into a middle class based reform movement. The Vietnam war cuts deep politically, raising many fundamental questions about our society, about imperialism and the state--questions that have not been posed as profoundly since the labor struggles in the 1930's and 1940's. It is natural that as the various class and minority struggles increase they will gravitate towards the deepest and most fundamental question in American politics today--and we should do everything possible to encourage this.

It is natural that many new radicals in the antiwar movement would like to see the movement fundamentally change society. Its inability to do this will lead many of these youth into reformist politics and some to revolutionary socialism.

Some proponents of a "multi-issue" orientation for the movement are also strong opponents of mass demonstrations. They would have the movement blunt the sharp and direct confrontation with Johnson's imperialist policies through massive mobilizations. These direct confrontations with the Administration remain the most important common denominator for mobilizing the most people against the war and for building the movement.

The Draft

The class divisions within the antiwar movement are also evident on the question of the draft. We view seriously the possibility of building the antiwar movement into a mass movement and therefore determine our tactics on the draft according to their effectiveness in mobilizing the working class.

The capitalist draft is the means by which the ruling class obtains the men they need to fight their wars against the rising colonial revolution and the workers' states. It is part and parcel of America's imperialist foreign policy and consequently we are opposed to it and call for its abolition.

Our disagreement with many middle class students and radicals on this question lies in our view that a campaign against the draft or to reform the draft is not an effective way of building a movement to end the war. The two major approaches suggested by those who want to wage a campaign against the draft are; 1) individual acts of civil disobedience against the draft and 2) lobbying liberal congressmen to reform or abolish the draft.

The first approach might be considered if it would generate a mass movement that would not go along with the draft. However, a few isolated acts of conscience against the draft,

no matter how sincerely motivated are ineffective in mobilizing mass support against the war. The working class will not go along with a proposal that means stiff jail sentences and connotes cowardice and draft-dodging.

The second approach is merely a means of trying to divert the movement into the familiar groove of "pressure politics" on liberal capitalist politicians. We cannot go along with any proposal that would sacrifice the movement's present anti-imperialist thrust in order to link it up with capitalist politics regardless of the label.

The radicals and students who push for an antidraft campaign feel the limitations of a middle class movement and are searching for ways to overcome this relative sense of powerlessness. A campaign against the draft however, does not open an avenue of effective action. The best approach is to build a "bring the troops home now" movement that can take advantage of the openings that are developing in the labor movement. This is the road toward creating a mass movement that will help to end the Vietnam war and strike a blow against all forms of American militarism including the draft.

Although an antidraft campaign is not an effective way of building a mass movement against the Vietnam war we should make our opposition to the draft clear and explain the origins and purpose of it. Furthermore, we should be a part of campus activities that oppose university complicity with the draft. University complicity with the draft as well as all other aspects of the war is a reflection of the subservient role played by universities and colleges in the interests of American imperialism. The draft issue can be an important bridge for bringing people into the antiwar and radical movements.

We are also opposed to the racism and class prejudice, products of capitalist society, which are reflected in the Selective Service System. The II-S student deferment is an example of how the wealthier, more privileged strata of youth who are able to attend college are deferred from military service while working class and Negro youth must go and fight. Although there are no reforms that can improve the draft, the purposes of which are reactionary, we unconditionally oppose II-S as a blatant form of racial and class prejudice.

The number of black draftees and casualties for the war are much higher proportionately than those for the rest of the population. Bitterness against this is recorded in the militant stands taken by many Negro organizations and leaders against the draft. When Stokely Carmichael of SNCC urges Negroes to say "hell no" to their draft boards he is expressing a sentiment that exists widely in the ghetto. It also indicates a searching for solutions that will get Negroes out of this racist war and if individual acts of defiance won't

do it other methods will be tried until the most effective are found.

G.I.'s

The question of how the antiwar movement should view the G.I.'s is also a class question. There is a tendency for some students and radicals to look at G.I.'s as mercenaries. The fact is that G.I.'s are for the most part working class youth who have been conscripted into an armed force that does not serve their interests.

From the point of view of the ruling class, a conscript army primarily composed of workers is the least reliable kind of army. The soldiers are that segment of the population who are the most directly affected by the war. The rising rate of casualties, the brutal butchery of Vietnamese civilians and the unpopularity of the war at home are all factors that affect the attitudes of the G.I.

It is very important that the antiwar movement view soldiers as an important part of the population with whom to discuss the facts of the war. In order to have effective communication between the antiwar movement and G.I.'s it is necessary that the movement develop the kind of image that is attractive to G.I.'s. An image of draft card burning, draft dodging, ineffective acts of individual martyrdom, and pacifism is alienating to soldiers.

The most significant aspect of the Fort Hood Three case has been the effect it has had in convincing more sections of the antiwar movement to view G.I.'s as legitimate and receptive recipients of the truth about the war. The fact that the Fort Hood Three are soldiers has made G.I.'s more receptive to the facts about the war and their rights as soldiers.

We defend the constitutional right of all soldiers as citizens to express their views on the Vietnam war. We defend the right of soldiers to receive, read, and discuss materials and information about the war and conversely the right of civilians to distribute and discuss facts about the war with G.I.'s. We sharply oppose any abridgements of these constitutional rights.

Campus Complicity

The campus has been and still remains the central source of activists for the organized antiwar movement. The fresh new forces that continually flow into the movement from the campus are not only the dynamo but the vanguard of the movement.

The campus antiwar movement developed as part of a general student radicalization loosely referred to as the "student movement." This radicalization is a reaction to the

stifling and paternalistic authority of university administrations and has been stimulated by the Negro struggle and the colonial revolution. Students object to tuition hikes, infringements of student organizations, restraints on social life, use of university facilities for military recruiters, compliance of the university with the draft and the war, and general lack of student participation in university policy. These are all struggles against a university system that reflects and serves the needs of American capitalism.

Most of these campus struggles can be linked up in some way with the Vietnam war and the natural tendency for students that begin to move against their college administrations on one or another issue is to gravitate towards the nation's central political question--the Vietnam war.

S.D.S. has been extensively involved in and is looked to as a leader of this student movement but its turn away from antiwar activity after the April 17, 1965 March on Washington has seriously curtailed the potential strength of the campus antiwar movement. We have the responsibility as YSAers and antiwar fighters of identifying ourselves with and becoming a part of the student movement while convincing more students to become actively involved in the fight against the war.

Organizational Aspects of the Movement

For the past two years the main organizational unit of the movement has been the non-exclusive, single issue committees to end the war in Vietnam. We have been the main political force involved in these committees and consequently are a part of the leadership in many of them. Although these formations have been organized both on campuses and in neighborhoods, the campus committees, despite their ups and downs, have been the most viable. As long as the antiwar movement continues to grow, we can expect fresh new layers of students to periodically flow into the independent committees.

The continued existence of the committees, with their single-issue basis reflects the objective need for the kind of organization that brings together people who want to work actively against the war but do not yet want to commit themselves to one or another radical organization. As a result of their activity in these committees many young people radicalize further and do decide to join a political organization. It is from this layer that the YSA has received the overwhelming majority of its new members in the past year.

In addition, there is no contradiction whatsoever between the independent committees and united fronts. On the contrary the participation of independent committees in united fronts enhances both formations. The independent committees add militancy and dynamism to and provide forces for the united front formations while united fronts broaden the possibilities of action for the independent committees and gives a meaningful arena of antiwar activity to every YSAer.

The other major organizational form is the more complex and unstable city-wide united front committees such as the New York Parade Committee, which includes such diverse forces as SANE, pacifists, Communists, socialists, etc. In some cities these united fronts come together only to organize the major national mobilizations whereas in others they are also on-going centers for city antiwar work.

One of the major political problems of the antiwar movement has been the vacuum created by the absence of a national organization or center with authority. The N.C.C. which emerged in the summer and fall of 1965 might have become such a center. However, this was prevented by its negotiations position and its failure to become a genuine united front. At the November, 1965 N.C.C. convention we politically opposed the ineffective and unprincipled line of the N.C.C. and supported the formation of the Bring the Troops Home Now Newsletter which counterposed the line of immediate withdrawal. By the time of the November 8th mobilization most of the movement accepted the line of immediate withdrawal, the November 8th Mobilization Committee was established, and the Newsletter had gained wide circulation and was drawing militant activists closer to its outlook.

The formation of the November 8th Mobilization Committee and later the Spring Mobilization Committee are hopeful signs pointing toward the establishment of a national center. The Spring Mobilization Committee is a very broad united front which is attempting to broaden out even further. It does not, however, solve the problem of creating national coordination for the militant, campus-based wing of the movement.

The biggest step along this line was made at the Chicago Student Conference in December where united front coordination of youth organizations operating out of the Spring Mobilization Committee office was agreed upon for the April 15 mobilization. What exactly will come of this remains to be seen, but it is a promising step. It provides an opportunity for taking the united front approach directly onto the campus for the Spring mobilization, where we can have discussions with members of the DuBois Club and S.D.S.

With the formation of the Student Mobilization Committee, the opportunity projected by the Newsletter for so long of building a broad, militant campus-based national formation is much closer to reality. The N.C.C. did not play any role in the formation of the Student Mobilization Committee and even the future existence of the N.C.C. is in question.

United Front

The united front has been one of the most important forms of struggle for the antiwar movement. It has involved the CP in formations and actions with other currents with which it would previously have nothing to do. This has been a very

fruitful and educational experience for all concerned. Besides strengthening the antiwar movement, it has made it much easier to spread and popularize the program of revolutionary socialism.

YSA

The YSA participates in the antiwar movement on three levels--the first two levels are in the independent committees and the broad united front formations. The third level is our role as socialists.

As a result of our active participation as builders and militants in the antiwar movement since its beginning we are more and more identified as the socialist wing of the antiwar movement. We have never made any attempt to have "secret" members and our members who are antiwar leaders are also known as YSAers. Our press has played an effective role in bringing socialist views into the antiwar movement and in the last two years we printed and sold about 24,000 pamphlets on the Vietnam war. This should be viewed as an integral part of our antiwar work.

The united fronts where the YSA participates as an organization in its own name has made every YSAer, including those who are not in antiwar committees, members of the antiwar movement. As avowed socialists and members of the YSA we can speak and write for the antiwar movement in our own name.

Not only are we the socialist wing of the antiwar movement in this country but we are part of the international socialist wing of the opposition against the war. In this role we have worked shoulder to shoulder with antiwar fighters from Canada and Western Europe and have been in the vanguard of trying to internationalize the American movement.

As a result of our participation in the antiwar movement our program of revolutionary socialism has become one of the major currents within the radical movement as a whole. This is reflected in the continuous growth of the YSA.

Tasks

This general political evaluation dictates the tasks the YSA will be carrying out in the next period. It is in no way a list of detailed activities that locals should undertake. Whether locals organize teach-ins, campus war crimes tribunals, student strikes, campaigns against CIA recruiters, etc. are decisions that are up to local evaluation based on an assessment of the needs and possibilities on the specific campuses and in the area. What may be perfect for one area to implement our general tasks may be out of the question in another area.

The general tasks are:

- 1) Campaign to build the April 15th Spring Mobilization;
- 2) Continue to propagandize for and educate the antiwar movement to the program of immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam;
- 3) Continue to fight for non-exclusion in the antiwar movement;
- 4) Become involved in the struggle against campus complicity with the war;
- 5) Continue to fight to keep the antiwar movement out of capitalist electoral politics and to prevent it from being converted into a multi-issue reformist movement while encouraging all connections between genuine class and minority struggles and the antiwar movement;
- 6) Continue to work in and build the independent antiwar committees and the united fronts and encourage these formations to reach out to new segments of the population;
- 7) Continue to take advantage of openings in the labor movement and the Negro struggle;
- 8) Take advantage of the unprecedented opportunities for socialist propaganda work and increase the activities that we carry out in our own name in order to more clearly establish ourselves as the socialist wing of the antiwar movement.

January 1967