

TAPLIN ✓

SWP

discussion
bulletin

Vol. 25, NO. 5



Published by



SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE •
NEW YORK 3, NEW YORK

THE ANTI-WAR MOVEMENT -- Transcript from Political
Committee of June 25, 1965)

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON ECONOMIC DISCUSSION



45¢



The Anti-War Movement

(Transcript from Political Committee

Minutes of June 25, 1965)

Reports for Secretariat

Dobbs: In discussing the strategy and tactics of the present anti-war campaign it seems useful to review the proletarian military policy adopted at the party's September 1940 plenum-conference held in Chicago. Those of us who participated in the decision need to refresh our recollections about it, and comrades who have since come into the party should find it helpful to have the decision reviewed in its main lines. If we also recall the historic setting in which the policy was adopted it should aid us in determining what parts of the 1940 tactical considerations remain applicable today and what parts require reevaluation in the light of present objective conditions.

The 1940 resolution on military policy was adopted after leading party comrades had discussed the subject with Trotsky during a visit with him in Mexico and after the draft resolution setting forth the policy had been discussed for two months within the party in advance of the plenum-conference. The resolution made clear that it maintained uninterrupted continuity with long-established Marxist principles in the fight against capitalist militarism and imperialist war. At all times we maintain irreconcilable opposition to imperialist war. Our war is one of the workers against capitalism, ours the concept of an uninterrupted struggle to win leadership of the working class, carry through a fight for power, and establish a socialist society. Toward that end we stress at all times the importance of building a Leninist-type party, and our military policy was viewed as one which applied those principles under conditions of World War II.

The resolution, as Comrade Cannon pointed out to the party at the time, represented a continuation, but not a mere repetition, of Lenin's policies during

World War I. It signified further development, deepening and sharpening of Leninist strategy and tactics. Taking the totality of the existing world situation for its point of departure, as Trotsky had taught us, the plenum-conference undertook to chart a strategic and tactical course in military policy commensurate with the needs of the day.

In September 1940 World War II had already been raging for a year, peacetime conscription had been introduced in the U.S. and this country was only a little over a year away from entry into the war. It was a time of great change in the world, a time in which we saw capitalism entering into a state of permanent crisis which heralded an epoch of uninterrupted militarism and war. No peaceful solution could be seen to any social problem. All great questions would have to be decided by military means. Capitalist militarism had to be taken as an established reality which we were not strong enough to abolish. We had no choice but to adapt our strategy and tactics to the existing reality and to shape a course which took its start from the facts of capitalist rule over the working class. Our object was to counterpose a working class program to the imperialist program at every point.

In its origins, unfolding and outcome World War II was basically an inter-imperialist war. The Nazi-Soviet conflict and Japan's invasion of colonial China were extremely important but subordinate to the overall character of the global struggle. The characteristics of World War II were in the main akin to those of World War I and much different from those of imperialism's present assaults on the colonial revolution and its antagonistic military postures toward the workers states. Even though the Stalin-Hitler pact was still operative in September 1940, we already saw signs of the coming Soviet-German rift and the Soviet shift to the anti-Hitler side, which did occur in June 1941. Our policy decisions therefore assumed that U.S. armies would not be fighting the Soviet Union, at least until after Hitler had been defeated. We expected that the U.S. conscript army would be fighting in an essentially inter-imperialist war and would not in the immediately foreseeable period become involved in a military attack on the Soviet Union.

Under those conditions we applied strategic and tactical concepts which brought up to date the policies of Lenin during the inter-imperialist war of 1914-1918.

As revolutionary optimists we challenged any notion that U.S. imperialism would succeed in its ambition to dominate the world. We visualized social revolutions erupting directly out of the inter-imperialist war and our policies were oriented toward such an outcome. Only with the masses would it be possible to conquer power and, in those times, it appeared that the masses in the military organizations were destined to play the decisive revolutionary role. To meet the anticipated course of history, we developed the proletarian military policy.

A massive force of young workers was to be drafted into the U.S. army. We knew they would enter it with anti-Hitler patriotic sentiments, but we also took into account the struggle potential they brought with them in terms of their own class interests, especially from their background of militant labor battles during the Thirties. Our military policy was conceived as a bridge toward these worker-soldiers, designed to protect and develop their class independence in the capitalist military machine. It was viewed as a military transitional program supplementing the political transitional program adopted in 1938.

Starting from the fact that the workers were for compulsory military service, we counterposed to the capitalist draft policy the concept of conscription by the workers organizations to form well-armed and well-trained labor detachments. We called for compulsory military training under trade union control with the capitalist government paying the bill. Stressing the class need, we called for election of worker-officers by the worker-soldiers. The aim was to build in the army a class conscious workers movement capable of defending working class interests under conditions of capitalist militarism and war.

We thought that revolutionists should be prepared to go with the masses, become soldiers with them, and go to war with them. In doing so we felt it important that revolutionists strive to become the most skilled among

the worker soldiers. Military skill was looked upon as a necessity since all great questions were up for decision by military means. As skilled hands at the military trade revolutionists would be so much the better able to win the confidence of worker soldiers and influence them with socialist ideas. Such influence would help to lead them in a revolutionary direction and to advance the leadership role of revolutionary socialists.

It was deemed necessary to work toward these objectives in stages as the anticipated social crisis began to unfold. It was considered important to begin in a careful, cautious way, making no premature moves that might separate the socialist militants from the masses. At all stages, however, the aim was to participate in the military machine for socialist ends, seeking to win a majority over to the idea of transforming the imperialist war into a struggle for socialism.

Today, no one needs to be reminded that the unfolding world revolution took a different course than we had expected. World War II did not lead directly to social revolution in the advanced capitalist countries. Instead an expanding wave of colonial revolutions developed and a combination of historic factors postponed the coming workers revolutions in the imperialist strongholds. Capitalism has consequently been able to mount a sustained cold war offensive against the workers states and it is carrying out brutal military interventions against colonial uprisings. With these changed circumstances in the permanent crisis of capitalism, we still face the problems of capitalist militarism and imperialist war.

Starting from the totality of the world situation that results from these basic objective conditions, it is necessary to think through the policies required at the present conjuncture. As in the 1940 decisions, the aim must be to maintain the uninterrupted continuity of Marxist-Leninist-Trotskyist principles in the fight against war; to counterpose a working class program to the imperialist program at every point; and to shape current strategy and tactics with a view toward a struggle for workers power and the creation of a socialist society.

The Political criteria for current military policy are qualitatively different from the considerations that

were applicable in 1940. Today the U.S. armed forces represent a counter-revolutionary dagger aimed directly at the colonial revolution and the workers states. The present conscript army is growing, but it is not yet one of the massive proportions attained during World War II, and it does not have the decisive mass weight considered so important under the conditions of 1940. The ranks of the present army do not tend so much to consider themselves a crusading force, as did the conscripts who thought the country went to war in 1941 to rid the world of fascism. There are numerous signs of the present conscript army becoming a disgruntled army, as revealed by reports in the daily press, an army that can be expected to share in increasing measure the sentiments of the growing anti-war movement here at home.

In view of the changing conditions which led to the general situation prevailing today, we dropped the slogan of military training under trade union control back in the early Fifties, and there is no basis at the present conjuncture to contemplate its revival. In recent years the approach to the question of the military draft has been one of stressing opposition to capitalist conscription, with no mention of conscription into workers military formations. The plank on military policy in our election platforms has set forth such slogans as full democratic rights for the military ranks, election of officers, trade union wages for servicemen, etc.

Policy on the draft remains unchanged in the sense that revolutionists do not as individuals refuse conscription, as do conscientious objectors, and thereby isolate themselves from the stream of life while serving a term in prison. Revolutionists exercise their constitutional right, however, to refuse compliance with the loyalty oath procedures attached to the present conscription process. If conscripted, it is also one's constitutional right to express his views in the armed forces. It is simply a matter of using good judgment in the exercise of that political right. For instance, citizen-soldiers are under no obligation to accept uncritically the biased imperialist propaganda presented by brass hats in the guise of "political orientation."

In exercising the constitutional right to political expression inside and outside the armed forces,

opposition to capitalist militarism is only a point of departure toward larger questions. Serious thought must proceed from there to an analysis of militarism's parent, the imperialist foreign policy. That in turn leads to questions about the basic characteristics of capitalism, about the need to abolish capitalist rule and reorganize society on a socialist basis. The application of revolutionary strategy and tactics in a transitional approach to these basic questions, especially as required in the main arena of struggle against war which exists today outside the armed forces, will be taken up in a separate presentation by Jack.

Jack: First it might be a good idea to review the character of the movement we are dealing with. In a certain sense it is a pacifist movement, a general revulsion against war. On the other hand, (1) it is not led by professional pacifists, (2) it is political, and (3) it is more anti-war than it is pacifist in the general sense. It is focused on a specific war, the war against the Vietnamese revolution waged by the regime in Saigon and the Johnson administration.

It is a movement which thus far has utilized direct action. Its tactics were learned in the civil rights movement and in various student actions of the last half decade. For example, there is now a lot of talk about direct action in the future with large elements of civil disobedience. You have to watch carefully the language that participants in this movement use. The terms "civil disobedience" and "non-violence" are often used in a different way than we have been used to using them. Some people in the movement considered the March on Washington an act of civil disobedience in which certain small rules were broken. When someone suggests any kind of action, they will often speak of it as a "non-violent action." Because the civil rights movement is the only mass movement the students in the anti-war movement have known, they copy its language and tactics.

I think what Farrell said in his report is striking: The young people involved in this have never seen in their lifetime any example of the working class as a class in motion. Unless they are historians or members of the radical movement, the modes of struggle and types of

organization which are characteristic of the working class are unknown to them. The lessons and backlog of understanding of those who were conscripted into the army in the early forties are totally absent in this generation.

The traditional peace organizations, and the Communist and Socialist parties are not in the leadership of this movement. New student forces and new student activists are in the leadership and dominate it at this stage. These activists are in no way oriented toward the Democratic Party nor do any of the movement's leaders propose taking it in that direction. Quite the contrary, one of the searches on now among the left wing leaders is for an alternative of some sort to political subordination to the activities of the Democratic Party.

The ad hoc committees which have been the main organizing centers for the movement have been non-exclusive. The protest has taken on a quasi-united front character from the beginning. The main layers that are involved are four. The first is the students, they are the largest and they are in the leadership. Second, a surprisingly large number of young professors, instructors and teaching assistants are involved. Third, a lot of those who have been in the peace movement are taking part even though their leaders are dragging their feet and often even opposing the more militant actions. Fourth, of course, are the radicals: members of the socialist organizations.

The anti-war movement began, has its roots on, and still has its major strength on, the campus. It is very new. The first teach-in was March 24, the first major demonstration, the March on Washington, took place April 8th. Right now it actively involves more people than the fight against the Algerian war ever involved in France. That gives you something to compare it to in our own decade. It is bigger and larger and deeper at this stage than any other American anti-war movement in the past.

Along with the movement have come some surprising developments. You have such things as the court marshal of the lieutenant for refusing to be reassigned to a more dangerous area in Vietnam. You have the spectacle of the governor of New Jersey saying that an open Marxist has a right to teach, has a right to take part

in the teach-ins, has a right to say that the Vietcong ought to win, and still be a professor. Far from bowing to pressure from the administration, so far, the young professors as well as the students have stuck to their guns, refused to capitulate and to see their colleagues victimized.

What are the circumstances under which this movement has arisen? There is the dual character to the war threat which we face today. First, there is the threat of nuclear annihilation. That is, the fact that at any time a conflict in the world can lead to a nuclear showdown. While this has not been the major propellant of this movement it has been in the background continually, and is often referred to. The fear of nuclear war has helped give a sense of urgency to the movement.

Second, is the type of war that is actually going on, the anti-guerrilla, counter-revolutionary war. In Vietnam there is the fear of escalation of the war to the scale of Korea. The generation that is protesting this was not politically conscious during the Korean War. They were 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 years of age at the time of Korea. They can hardly even remember it. This is their first conscious war and it is their first confrontation with their own government as world policeman.

The war is taking place after five years of a slowly maturing and growing radicalization of the American students. It takes place when there is a thin layer of organized socialist youth. It takes place after a half decade of growing sensitivity and opposition to anti-democratic moves by the federal government in the South and North. The various protest actions and characteristics of the student movement which have developed in piecemeal fashion; the protest against restrictions on campus, activity in the civil rights movement, and sympathy to the colonial revolutions have merged in this fight against the Vietnam war.

It takes place under the protective umbrella of a split to one degree or another in the ruling class over the Vietnam war. The newspapers, the columnists, the cartoonists, and commentators on radio and television are by no means unanimous in their support to the Johnson administration and the war. While they don't take the

radical positions that the students do, they still raise a lot of questions, and it is obvious that they are deeply divided over the questions of whether Vietnam should become a Korea-type conflict and whether Vietnam is worth the chance of a nuclear war.

The question of democracy, the question of how the decisions on war are made, the question of why people aren't told the truth, these questions are almost as important to the movement as opposition to the war in Vietnam itself. Protest against the falsehoods and the lack of democratic decision-making are important themes of the teach-ins and the protest literature.

Much of the anti-war activity is being organized by the Committees to End the War in Vietnam which have proliferated since the March on Washington. These are non-exclusive committees in which the organized radicals and the unaffiliated anti-war students can come together. The committees have generally been campus based but they haven't been restricted to the campus. There are at least two places, Los Angeles and New York, where there has been significant adult involvement almost from the beginning. In L.A. a high percentage of the committee which organized support actions around the March on Washington, the cavalcade to Berkeley, and the city-wide teach-out was made up of non-student forces.

The committees against the war usually stress education and action. There has been no tendency thus far to carry on blind activity, or picket lines as ends in themselves. There has been a heavy emphasis on what we would call propaganda. There has been the idea that the movement should try to involve more students, through educational campaigns using teach-ins, street meetings, discussion groups, rallies and literature. In the New York committee, the Minneapolis committee, and probably many others, much of the summer activity revolves around arming the anti-war people with more literature, information and education.

The fact that the radicals have not been excluded and are an accepted part of the movement represents a complete about-face in the relation of forces and the attitudes that dominated the "peace movements." Always

before we found ourselves having to prove that we belonged in such groups as SPU. These anti-Vietnam war committees have been just the opposite. The burden of the proof has usually been on the ADAers, the SANEers and the right-wing SPers and CPers to prove why anyone should be excluded. The third camp and exclusionist stands of the right wing liberal and SP elements have tended to force them to exclude themselves from the protest. They have nowhere been successful in excluding the radical forces. In Los Angeles, the Women Strike for Peace was split on the question of whether or not Theodore Edwards should have equal time at the teach-out to speak. He ended up getting time to speak and those others who wanted to exclude themselves did so.

Most of the youth locals were deeply involved with the March on Washington Committees, and remained active in the committees which came out of the March activity. We've been the firmest supporters of the non-exclusive basis of the committees. The youth have had a campaign around the anti-war movement since late January and have tended to tie in their other activities around their participation in the anti-war campaign. In the future they will be trying to relate their election campaign activities to the anti-war movement.

On the war question itself, we should continue to emphasize three major points: First, is the demand for withdrawal of American troops as the central slogan as opposed to any other formulation, especially negotiation. A surprising number of the students involved in this movement will support the basic concept of immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the American troops. It's not ordained beforehand that a majority will go along with the idea of negotiations as a basic plank. It's really important for us to be very clear on the question of negotiations. We do not put down any absolute rules for a liberation movement, for a revolutionary army, that they cannot negotiate. In point of fact they do have to negotiate. But it is the responsibility of those in this country to oppose the American intervention and demand the withdrawal of U.S. troops and to do nothing to suggest any legitimacy for unilateral imperialist actions.

Second, is the absolute character of the right of self-determination for Vietnam and for all nations. //
People of all nations have the right to determine their own destiny regardless of their size or military strength.

The third point is basically educational. It is the fact that not only are we for the withdrawal of American troops, we're for the victory of the peasant guerrilla forces in the Vietnamese civil war. // We applaud those professors like Genovese who come out openly not only for the withdrawal of U.S. troops, not only for the ending of moral injustices, but for the victory of the forces of the peasants and the workers of Vietnam who are fighting against decades of oppression. While this is not something that is being raised or can be raised as a central point in the committees, it is something that in conversations or in our press we can discuss openly, frankly, clearly. In a war against a colonial revolution there is a thin line between being opposed to the war itself and being favorably disposed to the guerrilla forces fighting against the American army as a reactionary army.

We are in favor of deepening the teach-ins, not as a substitute for protests, demonstrations, and rallies against the war, but as a justifiable mobilizing educator in and of themselves.

We should continue to take advantage of the strong attitude against the anti-democratic character of the Johnson administration's running of the war, by raising the concept of the right of the people to decide on war. When I joined the movement the slogan "no secret diplomacy" seemed to me to be a way-out slogan. I didn't really understand what it meant. It has a more concrete meaning now when the administration spokesmen put forth ideas like "well, we can't tell you all the details of this, because we've been negotiating secretly, we've been talking to the French and they're talking with the Swiss and they're talking with North Vietnam and your knowing what is being said would jeopardize the negotiations." When Schlesinger tried this approach at the national teach-in, he was attacked.

Many students are saying, "It is not secret negotiations which are needed, but an open decision by the American government in the full view of the people to get out or to negotiate with the National Liberation

Front. Everything should not depend on a small coterie, representing a small layer of American society, making secret undemocratic decisions affecting the lives and deaths of everyone." We educate about the need to get rid of the war makers as the ruling class and simultaneously while propagandizing for this, we do everything possible to support every popular initiative towards making it more difficult for the ruling class to make war behind the backs of the people. We should do everything possible to tie the hands of the ruling class until they are replaced.

The question of community work has come up. By that I mean simply the desire by layers of students involved in the protest not only to educate and agitate against the war on the campus, but to involve broader layers of the American people. We should support this as long as it doesn't involve them in adventures (as it did a couple of years ago when students passed out a leaflet demanding that workers not go into a war plant for some moral issue) and so long as it does not become a substitute for continuing work on the campuses.

One of the things that's different about the "new left" and the "old new left" is that the attitude and mood of the students involved in this movement is the opposite of the elitism which Comrade Warde pointed out lurked behind C. Wright Mills' concept of the professorial new left. Their desires to organize the broader community are healthy although they may be intertwined with social work attitudes and with attitudes having to do with saving their own souls as opposed to organizing a change in society. It would be a big error for us to put ourselves in opposition to the desire to turn to the community. We should look for realistic ways to help the anti-war movement do so. The naivete of many of those involved can easily make any turning to the community either adventuristic or demoralizing.

On the question of civil disobedience: It's important to remember that we've no principle whatsoever against civil disobedience. We have been very cautious **and** careful, consciously so in the past period, not to let our small forces get involved in actions which would involve heavy fines and heavy court battles for which there is no preparation. We avoid actions which merely

involve the victimization of a handful. What we may see in the future though, unless the anti-war mood declines, is large scale, almost mass acts of civil disobedience of one kind or another. Such large scale actions have little in common with the actions of a handful of pacifists who sit down in the streets and get arrested and heavily fined and accomplish nothing. We should avoid the acts of civil disobedience which will be proposed by professional pacifists which substitute individual or small acts of civil disobedience for acts of education, propaganda or meaningful action. At the same time we must take each act of civil disobedience just as we take each rally or picket line or teach-in, as a thing in itself, recognizing that tactical decisions have to be made.

The same type of thing faces us on the whole question of the draft. Right now there is no large scale movement in the anti-war movement to burn draft cards or to refuse to serve, but it's not out of the question that there might be in the next school year a significant opposition to the draft and to ROTC on the campus. It could take the form not of individual pacifist acts but of large scale organized acts against the war.

Since the March on Washington the proposal for a national mobilization that has generated the largest acceptance in the anti-war movement has been the idea of a Continental Congress. It provides a focus for the next large scale mobilization in the nation's capital of thousands against the war. It raises at least indirectly, the question of power, not in the sense of dual power as we know it, but in the sense that it is based on the concept that one way or another must be found to get around or to replace the "decision making apparatus" of the American rulers. The call for the Continental Congress also makes an explicit attempt to mobilize layers of the American population outside the students against the war in Vietnam who also are not "represented" in any real way in Washington.

There seems to be no reason whatsoever not to give the idea of a Continental Congress support. Quite the contrary, it has the potential for being the best forum thus far projected to exchange ideas. It comes from within the movement and has been proposed by those who are in the radical wing of the movement, from those who

are the firmest and strongest supporters of a non-exclusive approach to demonstrations and rallies against the war. The call for a Continental Congress and the discussion engendered by the anti-war movement raises a question that we didn't expect to be dealing with a year ago: That is the turn by a section of this movement, outside of ourselves, away from the Democratic Party and its rejection of Democratic Party politics. This turn has not taken the form of a proposal to form an alternative political party. To the contrary, it has taken the form of an attempt to (using their language) find and organize "an alternative apparatus," that is, alternative organizations which will eventually make the decisions and run the country.

The most important statement since the SDS March on Washington call, (which helped to set the tone for the first stage of the anti-war movement) is an article by Staughton Lynd, the young Yale professor who was the head of the COFO Freedom Schools and who is one of the leading young spokesmen for this movement. It is an article in the June-July 1965 Liberation entitled, "Coalition Politics or Nonviolent Revolution" which all the comrades should read. It opens up a polemic against Rustin, and against those who would side with Rustin, on four major counts: (1) It attacks the idea of working in the Democratic Party. It points out that the Democratic Party not only is not the way to progress in the future, but that the history of the past has shown that it never has been. (2) It attacks openly and explicitly third campism and social patriotic pacifism in the anti-war movement. (3) Lynd attacks those who seek to castrate new movements, such as the civil liberties movements, Negro movements and the anti-war movement by tying them to the Democratic Party. He compares this to the way the labor movement was politically castrated in the thirties. (4) Lynd attacks coalition politics. He writes, "Coalitionism is also elitism. Its assumption is that major political decisions are made by deals between the representatives of the interests included in the coalition. Negro protest according to the Rustin formula, should now take on the role of such an interest. And men like Rustin will become the national spokesmen who sell the line agreed on behind doors to the faithful followers waiting in the street."

The article represents more than the opinions of Lynd. In the article he refers to Bob Moses of SNCC and to Tom Hayden, leader of the Newark SDS community project, as two of those who helped formulate these ideas. The mood and attitude of the article reflects in many ways the current mood of the anti-war activists.

In describing a view of "non-violent revolution" Lynd writes, "Robert Parris has sketched out such a scenario as a possibility in Mississippi. What, he has asked, if Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party voters elected not only legislators but public officials as well? What if the Negroes of Neshoba County, Mississippi began to obey the instructions of the Freedom Sheriff rather than Sheriff Rainey? What if the Freedom Sheriff impaneled a Freedom Grand Jury which indicted Sheriff Rainey for murder?"

The worst possible approach we could take to those people with this attitude would be to begin by berating them for not seeing that they should be for a labor party or for not proposing an alternative socialist party. We begin by wholeheartedly supporting their rejection of the Democratic Party and support them against the Rustins and Thomases. We should see any rejection of the Democratic Party as a very significant thing, something we have had a monopoly on for decades. We should stress first those things we have in common with the radical youth in the anti-war movement; the common rejection of secret diplomacy and the elitism of the ruling class, the common rejection of the idea that Congress is representative of the great mass of people in this country, and the common rejection of any attempt to tie the Negro movement and the anti-war movement to the Democratic Party. And we should help push these common ideas in the movement itself and win new people to them.

It is within this framework that we should put forth our view that it is only through the organization of a new party with a socialist program that any real alternative can be given to the political apparatus of the ruling class.

An understanding of the class character of society will be one of our contributions. For example, we will be pointing out to the movement that those people that

they call the poor, the disenfranchised, and the disinherited, and the Negroes are part of the working class. We can point out to them why it is that "the system" which they speak of which is carrying out counter-revolution around the world is capitalism.

There are all kinds of contradictions in the positions of these radicals. Lynd thinks that Bayard Rustin just came to his conservative ideas in the last two years. He points out that to really understand Rustin's position now you have to look at what Bayard Rustin has done in the last year: his selling out the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, his recent statements in favor of coalition politics, and his attacks on the March on Washington. Lynd and the others in the movement have not begun to grapple with the political roots and antecedents to the policies of the social patriots, social democrats, Stalinists and coalition politicians. That is our job.

We can and should support unconditionally the building of a Continental Congress. Such a congress could be a forum for our ideas and we should consider what kinds of proposals we would want to put before such a gathering. First we would want to put forth our ideas on the war itself: the withdrawal of troops, the rights of referendum, the right of self-determination for nations and our opposition to militarism. Second, because of the character of the anti-war movement and the attitude of those involved we can raise sections of our transitional program that tie together the interests of the Negroes, the poor, the working people with the anti-war protests. The desire to tie together the interests of all the "unrepresented peoples" is a dominant one and should be taken advantage of.

We should pay close attention to the cleavages which are taking place within the left and within the anti-war movement. They'll be over the question of exclusion versus non-exclusion and the question of unconditional opposition to the war. They'll take place over the question of subordinating the demands of the anti-war movement to the demands of "progressive" politicians.

The role of our press is of crucial importance. The paper is the organizer and educator for our own ranks as well as our vehicle for bringing our ideas to those

outside our movement. The press should raise the questions I've raised today. It can help to educate our comrades on how to best present our ideas to the anti-war movement and thus take part in the programmatic debates that are taking place. It is important for our press to take on at every opportunity the social democrats, the Stalinists, the coalition politicians, and the professional patriotic pacifists. We must hammer away at our opponents at every opportunity, hammer away at their false conceptions and misleading programs within the anti-war movement.

At the same time we should approach in a different way the militants and leaders of this movement, like the Lynds, embracing and developing the ideas which they put forth that are correct and discussing their contradictions and our proposals for solving them. When we discuss our views in the press or in conversation within this movement it's always much better to find a concrete illustration, a statement by a professor at a teach-in, an attack by Norman Thomas on the movement, an article by Staughton Lynd, or a statement by George Meany to use that as a polemical peg or an educational peg around which to develop our ideas.

Activity in the anti-war movement must not be confined to the youth. The youth cannot have one campaign orientation and the party "adults" another. How large the movement can become remains to be seen. We have no way of predicting. But we must (1) participate in the movement fully, (2) join the debate in the movement by supporting the rejection by the movement of those things we've been opposed to and within this framework present our program, and (3) present our general ideas on socialism and talk over which of the points of the transitional program we want to present and translate them into the language of the movement - just as we have done with our participation in the Negro struggle.

General Discussion

Warde: We're confronted here with something new in American history of the Twentieth century. That's the emergence of defeatism at the beginning of an ongoing military action. Wood correctly said this anti-war movement is not predominantly pacifist; i.e., I believe it is an embryonic defeatism in its implications and ultimate direction. When a professor like Genovese, who represents its extreme left wing, says he's for the victory of the Vietcong that's about as defeatist a political stand as you can take. This is something quite different from World War I or World War II. I recall reading about the history of Russia in 1905 and 1917 and wondering what it was like to live in a country with powerful defeatist sentiments in the midst of war. In the two wars our generations went through, we never saw any defeatist sentiment on a large scale. Opposition to the war was confined to a handful of revolutionaries. Now we're experiencing the beginning of a political phenomenon formerly reserved for other peoples.

This is a new and higher stage in the reaction to imperialist warmaking in the post-war period. What came forth toward the end of the Korean war now makes its appearance in the first steps of the Vietnamese conflict. Although this is not yet called defeatism even by the war hawks that's what it is, although of course it's still in a budding stage. This is a development of considerable portent. The bulk of the participants in the anti-war forces certainly don't grasp its significance and consequences. They're fresh, unsophisticated, unpoliticalized, like all new generations and new layers of the masses that enter the arena to challenge the ruling powers. In a way it is good they don't really grasp what they're engaged in or it might deter their initial audacity. But the more advanced will come to understand the implications more and more as the war costs and casualties mount. Proceeding from this definition of its potential character, what we're trying to do is to extrapolate the lines of development and comprehend the entire prospective course from its very first steps. Defeatism starts as a mood and an attitude and then passes over into other and higher forms of action. We must foresee more anti-government

acts as the logical consequence and manifestation of this budding movement.

This is a political issue of the utmost gravity in which every word and action has to be carefully weighed and plumbed to its foundations. This position we're working out here ought to be seen in its connection with the resolution on organization. If any comrade takes a frivolous attitude toward the question of organization, I think that consideration of the new phase of anti-war sentiment apparently ahead of us is an additional argument for the type of organizational resolution we are presenting to the convention.

Vernon: I want to get on to some propaganda problems. One thing I find very interesting is that now we have three different groups in motion that have their own peculiar history and orientation and likes and dislikes and peculiar language. That is, this movement of the students, the civil rights movement and the ghetto aspect of the black movement. They partially overlap but they're all distinct enough and present different problems. The main thing though, is that they're all in motion and, better yet, all three consist of people who have something to commit themselves to, who want to get excited about something and make things happen. They are totally different from the sort of people we had, let's say, several years ago around re-groupment, who apologize for having any ideas, sound like they don't know anything and are not sure about anything, don't want anybody else to think you're sure of anything, and above all never get excited about anything.

Now the more excited you get in the course of sloganizing, within good reason, the more you've got to sound like you're making some sense. You can't just sloganize at the top of your lungs and expect it to go over great with the audience. It is a good thing that in the case of the student audience the comrades have an immediate common language with those they are trying to influence. In the case of the ghetto audience there's a problem. It's a very difficult language to talk and you've got to be careful how you do it. I mean there are only certain comrades, a few comrades, who can handle it very well. In the case of propaganda to the student

audience, practically everybody in the party can do it. Obviously some people can do it better than others, but older comrades and younger comrades can all get in the act there and can speak a common language with the kids.

I think that we should try to get at what's on the minds of students, and other people who are getting involved in the protest movements, find out anything that's holding them back and try to speed their political development. There are three things I had in mind that would be typical problems. One is that as soon as things start, and this is probably true in every movement but specifically here, liberals warn people not to go off the radical deep end. You won't affect anybody that way, they argue, you have to develop something sensible that'll affect large masses of people, that'll give the government an alternative. In other words, you should be a liberal, a more effective liberal, or something like that. One example of that is in the Village Voice this week. Somebody wrote in and criticised Staughton Lynd, saying that his ranting and raving did not give the government officials any alternative. Liberals try to find the middle of the road between two middles. So that when Johnson bombs North Vietnam, the liberal position is that's O.K. but don't bomb Hanoi. We can pull people away from liberal influence by building a radical anti-war movement. We can aim our contact precisely at those students who feel temperamentally, socially and politically that what they want is to be radical.

Another point is to get at the cold war myths because I think they are under vulnerable attack now like they never have been before. You can see this at the teach-ins, especially with the liberal teach-in professors, who falter and don't know what to say because they still have the assumption that Russia is trying to take over the world, or China is trying it, or something like that. This went over big 25 or 20 years ago when the Russians had just occupied a lot of territory. But the kids who are raising the rumpus now haven't seen the Russians take over anything. They haven't seen China take over anything, they haven't taken over Formosa, their own territory. On the other hand the United States is over there occupying everything it can. So we can really do a job on that question.

Another one I **thought** of is to get at the Soviet "experts" in the colleges because they are in a bad way now. Becoming "expert" on Russia and then China and the international communist movement has become a big industry in the United States, but it is obvious in the current situation that the students are going in an exact opposite direction from what they have been taught by the "experts." I think we can have a field day just blasting away at the whole subversion of education. Page 6 of the paper has a good format for something on this, where we take up a question each week and go into detail on the background. We could do this about the war in Vietnam too. In every issue take up and refute one lie or one stupid cliché that the people accept. Over a length of time it would present a really good fact sheet for the people.

This point I'm not sure about. On the question of exploiting the indignation of a lot of people who supported Johnson, I am wondering whether there is any possibility of getting a movement going to demand his impeachment. One problem there is whether it would be taken up by the population at one point, and another is, whether it would be advisable for us to go into such a thing.

One last thing is the problem of Negro response, particularly the ghetto Negroes. There is a problem because the attitude is non-identification with the government, therefore, non-identification with the war, in Vietnam or anyplace else. They don't get in the mood to go demonstrating with the Women Strike for Peace at the UN, or something like that. There is a real gap which stays just as big as it was, with Malcolm X out of the picture. He was starting to make a bridge, and he was a person who could make a bridge. I think one reason for the situation is that the Women Strike for Peace people have the attitude that this is a good country basically and everything would be fine if it wasn't for the war. Another reason is the attitude that this is our government, that we have the responsibility to correct it, and it should listen to us. These are two attitudes which just would never get across in Harlem because nobody would have the feeling that this is their government and nobody would have the feeling that the United States would be all right if we just got rid of the bomb.

On top of that is the problem of dealing with whites because the order of priority for whites is very different from that of Negroes. There is the feeling, that is very blatantly expressed in the latest issue of the Liberator by Wilson, that the Vietnam question is not something for black people to get mixed up with, that it's a sort of white hunting ground, that we got sucked into these things before, that the whites used us as foot soldiers and when they had no further use for us they just went on about their own business. This has half-way logic to it because it has been more or less the history. It's a case not only of ghetto people, but of poor in general, who would have a different response to something of this sort than people who are a little better situated but still show hostility toward the government on foreign policy.

On the other hand, it is no good for the black movement to just be lagging behind, that is, not stating itself, not getting mixed up with the anti-war movement. I tried to get on that topic last week when I was at the Liberator affair, pointing out that all the attitudes they've had before about whites just not being with it, about having nothing to do with anything white, sort of made sense if there were no whites that were radical or revolutionary on the wide scale. But as soon as the situation changes, then blacks talking in that fashion might find themselves out of touch in a few years. As soon as you have a mass of whites active there definitely will be a dialogue since most Negroes are going to gravitate in the direction of the thing that is moving, no matter what kind of sectarians stand around yelling about how things were in 1965. But that situation won't exist for a while. The reason why I bring it up is because both the party and youth will run into something like that.

One last point is that it might turn out that the easiest way to recruit Negroes in the present situation is through the anti-war movement.

Stevens: I think this is a signal meeting and the reports given for the Secretariat are excellent and the discussion is great. I think we should take note that the most consistent revolutionary position -- which seems to be in the province of the most genuine Marxist

organization until now, and that is apparent to everybody else, if they did enough reading -- appears on the question of our proletarian military policy.

And now the problems arise of a great new spectre of young people in this country who are in open debate with the government. A great arena for the whole position of revolutionary Marxism has been opened up. Never before has this been seen in this country. It's a great arena for the entire program of the SWP. That's the one biggest point that was made, in I think a very practical sense, by Comrade Jack. There is no question that this movement -- together with the Negro revolution in this country, and with the colonial world in upheaval, with 1/3 of the world no longer capitalist -- means that this imperialist bastion of America is getting a foretaste and a preparation of the great new wave of radicalization.

In fighting against the revolution, like the German ruling class did under Nazism, U.S. imperialism will find itself confronted with a great radicalized mass, but with a difference that we will not have fascism in this country at that point, as in Germany. That's the big difference between the United States and Germany in carrying out counter-revolutionary ruling class aims. In order to do that, first by conquering Europe but really aiming at Russia, the German capitalists had to smash the working class. In America the imperialists are a far cry from smashing the entire working class. They will undoubtedly try to turn off the foreign policy discussion, institute military forms of repression, but it will not be fascism. That would take a historic defeat of the American working class.

We enter into this period with a great plus over what the German proletariat faced when it had been dragooned into war. The opposition to the war as manifested now is not passive; it is partisan; it is against this war because this war is not just. If opponents of the Vietnam intervention say it will lead to atomic destruction, and give that as the main reason to oppose it, they nevertheless have an attitude of unilateral withdrawal of U.S. imperialist troops, which is the give away that it is not simply fear of atomic destruction. It is partisan for the poor, for those who are fighting

for democracy and against misery.

The whole position of the SWP can now be unfolded around this issue and this is the main point I want to make here. We want a democratic world and we want to fight poverty here and everywhere. We want a great new society, but a real one for the entire world. We uphold the right of self-determination. We are against secret diplomacy, against the CIA machinations. Congress hasn't even declared war, so why should people have to fight? Who's decided that we are at war to begin with? Congress can't be trusted. Let the people vote on war. The people must exercise the right to discuss publicly all the issues, to say stop the conscription, withdraw the troops; and to support the right of anybody to refuse to be conscripted. We have to have well thought out formulations on these things.

We support the right of discussion everywhere. You know these orientation lectures in the army are not sacrosanct. Demand the right for all points of view to be presented right inside those orientation lectures in the army where the soldiers are asking a lot of questions. Their letters are being received here now and it is public knowledge that many are very critical. The troops that come back from Vietnam are different even than those who came back from Korea.

We oppose all military appropriations. Let those funds go for poverty. The whole question of property and control over property, over industry, the whole question of imperialism, the whole question of socialism -- everything can be presented.

This continental congress idea is going to draw attention not just from the schools and colleges. It will appeal, as Jack pointed out, to all sections of society. Anti-war campaigners can go to all sections of society and ask for representation to the continental congress. What about going to the trade unions and starting a discussion? If people can discuss with Bundy, they can discuss with Meany, they can discuss with Reuther. Demand to get before the membership and discuss the position the union officials take on the Vietnam war. Let these rotten bureaucrats refuse to discuss with the students. Take it to the Rustins.

Let it be discussed everywhere.

You know the students aren't lacking in boldness. They say things that we would perhaps think weren't tactically wise. They don't know any better and so they go ahead and make the proposal. You know the old saying: Fools step in where angels fear to tread. They are very smart fools. They can do these things.

I think the party has great tasks ahead of it, greater than ever before in our history here in this country. For that we have to be set politically and organizationally, be the kind of party that can take advantage of its great historic opportunity. I have been inspired by this discussion and the reports that were given.

Weinstein: I think that one of the most important weapons we have to project our ideas into this growing anti-war movement is our election campaign. The little that we have done so far in New York on our election campaign has been very revealing to those comrades who have participated. And in addition to the obvious opportunities in this election campaign, we get the opportunity to win the ear of larger layers of people than we have ever had before. Today we actually get real demonstrations of support at our street meetings, for example. I think it gives us the opportunity to project our election campaign in a way that will avoid giving the appearance that we don't see the advantages of all the other activities that are being engaged in by those who are opposed to the actions of the government. At the same time it shows a political path towards building the kind of opposition that can lead towards ending the war in Vietnam.

In the election campaign we can not only project our idea of asking people to vote for the Socialist Workers party because it's opposed to the criminal foreign policy of the Democratic and Republican parties. We can use our election campaign to support the actions of those who are involved in various forms of opposition to the war in Vietnam. I, like everybody else here, am very optimistic about the period we are in. I don't know what the other branches are doing, who have

opportunities in local elections this year, but I think it would be good if they projected to the forefront of their election campaigns the foreign policy that confronts the American people today -- that is our opposition to the intervention in the colonial revolutions by the American government.

Feingold: I think we have all the conditions developing for the first time in many years for the rise of a mass movement in this country around the opposition to war. Now it takes the form of radicalizing students, but it can go on to the Negroes who have less to gain from a war than anybody else, and eventually the mass of the population, the working people of the country. The conditions that exist, which show the possibility of a mass movement against war developing for the first time in so long, are a lot different, as a number of the comrades have pointed out. This is not the Second World War. There's no patriotism in this country for the war. It's not the same situation as that of the Korean war which was a very unpopular war. Comrades who were in the army during the Korean war are aware that there wasn't a great feeling of opposition to the war in a political sense. It just was an unpopular war that people felt was a dirty war. Much of the opposition to the war came from those that returned from Korea. If you could talk to any of those, they were very much against the war. But there was a big political obstacle. There was McCarthyism, which swept right into the army. You don't have that today and it loosens up the whole situation both outside among the intellectual community and in the army.

Also different today from several years ago are the conditions affecting pacifist organizations which have been mainly in the leadership of these anti-war movements. People who have mainly a fear of the bomb tend to develop pacifist attitudes toward the bomb scare. But today you have a revulsion toward the war, toward American foreign policy, that should have profoundly revolutionary implications. There's less of a tendency to move in a pacifist direction in that kind of revulsion against the policy of your own country, and you have the possibilities of developing a revolutionary approach toward the war. These conditions are different from the past wars, and from the peace movements of several years ago which were

under pacifist influence, even though the majority of the people involved in those movements were not pacifists. There were young people involved, but the leadership was controlled by these pacifists.

That no longer holds today. It puts us in a position of making a central turn of the party at this coming convention, a turn toward a central campaign, an anti-war campaign, wherever possible. The party and youth can provide leadership. I'm not talking about leadership in the sense of mass demonstrations, but leadership in the sense of a propaganda and educational campaign, using the press and, of course, actually participating in, and where possible leading, actions in opposition to the war. Now we're for putting an end to the imperialist foreign policy, and that's the mood and the idea that we have to get across wherever our comrades participate in the developing movement. Another thing, we have to popularize is recognition that the main enemy is at home, that its political representatives are also in the Democratic Party. Nat made an important point that in the election campaign we can challenge the whole imperialist political structure. There are many forms the effort could take.

We have to begin approaching two audiences. Those not yet in the army, that is the young people mainly, and those who are in the army. Among the students it can develop into a propaganda campaign aimed at millions of people. We've never had in this country such a large student community as has developed in the past several years. Out of these millions, hundreds of thousands of them will be going into the army. The elections in this country give us a way of pushing for independence from the capitalist politics. On the campuses, themselves, elections take place. The youth can promote anti-war slates running in the campus elections. Elections of this type, and proposals and referendums on the campus can then be aimed at the NSA, which has national conferences where big discussions can take place on the war issue. For the first time in many years, teachers are involved in this movement. Traditionally teachers have been a brake on the student movement in this country. Now the teachers have a great deal of influence all over the country. Such moves can be considered as demands for a referendum vote, say like the case of the Ludlow amendment that came up in Congress before the second world war.

One other variant. The election campaign also gives a vehicle to approach people in the army. One of the things people don't lose in the army is their right to vote in elections. If they don't lose their right to vote, then political parties have a right to talk to them about election policy. One other point to raise is that the 18-year olds, who are old enough to be soldiers, do not have the right to vote.

What comes clear to me is that we're in a situation where the party has to begin a major turn, so that we can begin playing a leadership role, especially in a propaganda and educational sense, in the anti-war movement.

Dee: I believe this anti-war movement provides us with a vehicle that hasn't before been open to us, a means by which we can get our ideas across along the lines of our transitional demands. In the election campaign we have a big problem getting TV coverage, and the precedents established in covering the teach-in movement and the State Department rebuttals could be used in fighting for air time on the war question. Let all the candidates for office say how they stand in relation to U.S. foreign policy, as well as on civil rights. Hit from both sides, hit misleaders on the war issue, as well as nailing every one of the Uncle Tom leaders.

I think this anti-war movement offers us an opportunity to conduct the kind of political offensive in the ghetto that we haven't had the opportunity to carry out in the past. I think it will help to break down the taboos and suspicions that have been a feature of the ghetto. As Malcolm X said in one of his speeches, there can be no separation of the questions of freedom and peace. He made the remark within the context of stressing the need for the Negro people to link their struggle for civil rights in this country to the international struggle for freedom. This is a key point and in this connection we can strengthen our efforts to project a class struggle line into the Negro movement. We can oppose the U.S. foreign policy -- pointing out what it means to oppressed peoples in Vietnam and all other areas where the U.S. is exploiting peoples -- and at the same time expose every Uncle Tom leader, every phony who is trying to push a coalition line in politics.

I think the students, the youth, are in a position to demand that all of these characters attend meetings where they will be given a chance to answer questions from youth of draft, if not voting, age. They can turn it down, but they pay quite a price for that. In this kind of an arena our spokesmen can get across our ideas. Such efforts might also help in getting a little more time on the radio and TV than we have had. The main thing is that we can help to knit ties between the Freedom Now movement and the anti-war movement and promote a political trend away from the capitalist parties. I think what is evolving in the discussion here is a good thing.

Halstead: I agree with the points made by the speakers so far. I just want to reemphasize this point, that is, I think we have the task and need of organizing the reactivization of many of the older comrades. For example during the last couple of days I've been attending some of these meetings where they're organizing for a conference in Washington. In the course of this I, personally, have been invited, just by being at these meetings, to three other meetings to speak if I wanted to as a Socialist Workers party spokesman, giving our position on Vietnam. I think that there are twenty such meetings going on every week in New York City, or maybe more, and I think that it's not at all unrealistic, and we would really be missing a chance if we don't take advantage of this. For example, by organizing our experienced older speakers into a speakers bureau.

We should have a speakers bureau composed of 20 party comrades who would be available to make a speech a week and somebody in charge of keeping on top of these affairs, finding out when they are, arranging for people to go out and so on. Maybe in some cases they'll speak from the floor, maybe in some cases they'll actually get a place on the platform. Some of these meetings will be street-corner meetings. I happened to be going down to the lower East Side on business and I ran across such a meeting just going on. There was a literature table they had set up, there was a stack of old copies of the Militant sitting there. I recognized one of the people from the World's Fair stall-in or something, and he says come on make a speech. Just then a cop came along and broke it up. But the fellow says come back next week, we usually get away with an hour before they stop

it. These are the things that are going on and it offers an opportunity for morale building and also we really need the older comrades to take advantage of this.

We are going to find ourselves in a reverse situation to what we've found before where we were so isolated from this kind of outside work. If we want to take advantage of it we are going to have too much, which is good. But we should organize our forces to take advantage. We should even, though this discussion here tonight points towards our convention, do what we can before the convention so that we can go into the convention with some experience about how it's been going and we can probably have the best convention we've had since I've been in the party.

Graham: I share the gratification of all the comrades on the anti-war movement. I just want to bring to the attention of the comrades one thing that I think may have been glossed over in our optimism about the entire movement and that is, a number of comrades have referred to it as a movement which is not a pacifist anti-war movement. However some of these forces who are leading the movement are pacifists. They are, of course, pacifists with a difference. They are the kind of pacifists who feel it's more important to criticize the American government, but at the same time they are the kind of people that are opposed to independent political action or political action of any kind. They are opposed to the Democratic Party but they are also opposed to the socialist alternative.

I think we should bear in mind that these people are looked to by all the young people in the anti-war movement as leaders and their words will be listened to very carefully. And although I don't think we should enter into an open debate with them at this point, I think we should remember that we will have to have a continuing political dialogue with them.

Barry: In the discussion on the political resolution someone questioned the emphasis in the political resolution on youth work, asking, "What about the division of labor with the youth?" The question wasn't really answered then, but it's being answered tonight, I think. We shouldn't fall into a false position on the work of the party and the work of the youth that would lead us into having the party be outside this movement or to be

on the sidelines as wise old thinkers advising the youth who are the active section of the movement. Sometimes in the recent past we've had to have that face because of the stage the movement was at. It appeared that the youth was the active section of the movement and the party was a group of old people who had good ideas and wrote documents and had conventions and did a certain number of routine things but who didn't intervene and were not active. This touches on the point that Stevens and Warde made about the organizational resolution that's before this convention. The point is that the party should jump into this campaign, this anti-war campaign, on every level it can including the youth level, not making any false dichotomy between itself and the youth within the division of labor which of course has to exist between the two. The youth, of course, have a better opportunity to work within the youth arena, and that's the reason there is a youth movement. But the party should think of its campaign and of its work, not just the national press but also the work of the locals, as oriented around this campaign and intervening into it. For example, I agree with what Nat and Dee said about having the focus of the election campaign on this question, but not only should the focus of the campaign be on this question, the campaign should be taken into the movement itself, into these committees Fred spoke of. That shouldn't be left up to the youth with the party sitting on the outside. What I'm saying implies a certain kind of party. A question which is taken up in the organizational resolution.

Shaw: I think the anti-war movement is in essence anti-imperialist in one way or another, it's a reaction to American imperialism inside this country, opposed to policies of American imperialism. Now this, as most have recognized is a unique development in the United States. It has never happened before. It happened to some other imperialist countries. There was a sign of it in Britain in the Suez crisis and they had to change the government and back away. In France during the Indo-China war when people actually stoned the wounded veterans because they resented the war so much. It takes odd forms sometimes.

Now when Jack gave his report, he mentioned something that I think is extremely important. He said we can't predict how far it will go, how long it will last

and so on. I would like to go out on a limb and say that the end certainly is not yet in sight. But if we take note of its unique development in this country, and that it occurred only at certain stages in the historic development of other imperialist countries, I think that we can draw a tentative conclusion that it is a reaction to the fact that American imperialism has met its turning point, because that is what I think it represents. The war is not being lost in Vietnam because there is opposition to it in this country. There is opposition to the war in this country because the war is being lost in Vietnam. There was no opposition to the Guatemalan overthrow of Arbenz in this country. Yes, the regular opposition of the people who understood and opposed it. There were no spontaneous demonstrations of opposition.

America's foreign policy, as an imperialist nation, is really a policy which has been characteristic to this country ever since its birth I think. The United States' action against the colonial revolution today is essentially no different than its Indian wars. They sent a few settlers, or a few settlers moved into territory solemnly given to the Indian tribes for ever and ever and ever. Then finally the settlers destroyed the game or the mode of life of the Indians, the Indians attacked a few of them and the American government moved soldiers in to protect American citizens and wipe out the Indians. When they got through with the Indians, they started again a little further abroad. Saving the missionaries in the Congo is nothing but an extension of this principle, protecting our servicemen who happen now to be in Vietnam by sending more service men, protecting Americans in Santo Domingo and so on.

This policy never met with great popular resentment, despite its hypocrisy, during the Indian wars, it was supported -- not by the Indians, but they didn't count. It wasn't opposed at home because the Indians lost so readily and could be defeated so well, and material progress resulted. American imperialism was at its very beginning, a rising capitalist nation. When it begins to lose because it has reached its high point, I think, we have here the beginning of a long-term perspective.

I don't know how long the stage that things are now at will last, that is, the student protest; and it

may take different forms. What a lot of us are speaking of right now is the fact that it has expanded beyond the campus, that people who are not students are getting interested. It hasn't expanded into the working class of this country yet, but it certainly will. Because people who are opposing imperialist policies of the United States abroad are people who are becoming aware one way or another that imperialism is losing. When Britain was losing its imperialist authority, the United States was around to pick up the ball and carry it on. When France was losing, the United States was around to pick up the ball. Who's going to pick up the ball when the United States loses? There isn't any other nation left to carry on the fine old tradition of imperialism. It has to come to a screeching halt and that's where we have a great role to play.

The United States is in a different period now as an imperialist nation. It inherited a lot of defeats. It inherited Indo-China from the French. You know when I was a kid, it was a common belief, amongst all the people I knew back in the Mid-West, that one American was good for twenty Chinese. It was the result of the American Marines, maybe 25 of them riding a gun-boat into a river and taking control of hundreds of square miles and so on. We discover now that the Secretary of Defense states as an absolute fact that one Vietnamese guerilla is worth 10 Americans. In Santo Domingo the power proportion is even greater. It turned out that one communist was worth 400 Americans. For 50 communists, they had to send 20,000 troops. Now people in this country may not draw the direct conclusion from this that there's something good about communism, but they certainly are curious as to why the opposition is so strong.

Students and teachers find out about these things earlier than do workers. But when it begins to dawn on them that there is really something drastically wrong, they'll begin to wonder about it too. In the Cuban socialist revolution there was a huge interest created in what had happened there, how it could have been done against the wishes of the United States, why the Cubans could defeat the army sent by the United States to invade their country. People want to know how come the Vietnamese can fight and win so well. It tends to make them sympathize with the other side. Warde said they want the

other side to win -- that's not wholly true. Some of them do and some of them don't. It's a whole hodgepodge.

But practically every one of them will soon come to the position that the other side should win because that's inherent in his opposition to imperialist policies.

I think that we have to consider whether or not this really is a reaction to a basic situation in American imperialism, a critical turning point in its world power, the beginning of its decline. I'm not certain. I haven't made a big study of it, but it appears to me that that might well be the case and that we have before us a long protracted period in which the party will have to play a greater and greater role and will grow.

About tactics. We fight something like guerrillas in this country right now, only we fight with words and ideas. But we don't get out and picket where we know we're going to be stomped on and wiped out. We go to a place where we know we've got a chance to get in some licks for our ideas. And we have to politicalize and help lead the development of thinking of these opponents to imperialist policy at home. And finally, the question that all of the colonial revolutionists have been asking in one way or another, what do the American people think about all this, will be answered. They are opposed to it.

It's almost unbelievable in the eyes of the colonial revolutionists today who are not Marxists that there is ever going to be any opposition to imperialist policies in this country. But it's coming and that is going to be the ultimate solution to their problems as well as ours, because in Santo Domingo they aren't going to be able to lead a successful revolution when the U.S. can send 100,000 troops. They could only fight to a stalemate. Their revolution will depend on ours.

Garza: First of all I want to assure the comrades on the PC that the New York comrades did not get together to push the New York City mayoralty campaign before the PC. But I think it's an obvious thing that it's a major political campaign in the country for us this year and it would be foolish to overlook it. I think the slogan of the campaign could almost become: Repudiate Johnson's dirty war in Vietnam by voting Socialist Workers party. I think we should push that, as the

only party really opposed to the war.

Now there are just two other things that I'd like to bring up. One is to underscore this question of the role of the Negro in the development of this whole situation. I think that one of the reasons that this whole movement has been able to develop the way it has within the country is because of the tremendous Negro struggle which has exposed the reactionary character of the government. The students that began to act did not begin just on the campuses. They began understanding that there was a social milieu, a section of the American population that was also in struggle and among which many of them felt very much at home. They saw a movement where ideas could be raised without the immediate waving of the flag in opposition. I think that we are going to see more and more of the unity between these two elements and I think we should push for it. The last point I wanted to raise was this tactical question about resistance to conscription. I think that the first thing that we have to make clear is our opposition to conscription of American boys to fight colonial wars for American imperialism. On the question of individuals, the more the movement develops among youth to oppose conscription, the broader will be the tactical opportunities to strengthen the opposition.

Dobbs: If there are no more speakers, I'd like to make a proposal. Like every other question, the anti-war campaign remains open for discussion until the convention. We're going to be thinking about it and talking about it and developing our strategy and tactics all the way up to the convention. But as has been pointed out by various comrades in the course of the discussion tonight, a lot is going to be going on between now and the convention and we want to play an active part in it and we need to have a line for that period. The general views that were set forward in the reports from the Secretariat tonight appear from the discussion to have met broad agreement in the Committee. The editors need some definite decision on the line for the press between now and the convention. The candidates, and the speakers on behalf of the candidates, in our election campaigns need guidance, as do the party organizers and the comrades generally. So the Political Committee has both a responsibility and the authority

to make a preliminary decision on the anti-war campaign that would be intended to set the party course for the period between now and the convention. Then we'll see where we're at at the time of the convention and make a broader and more definitive decision on strategy and tactics for the next period. In that sense, I think it would be in order for the Committee to approve the general line of the reports from the Secretariat presented here tonight. We will undertake to prepare a transcript of the discussion and it would seem useful to publish it in the Discussion Bulletin. That should have the combined effect of stimulating thinking about the whole question throughout the party and of stimulating activity around the anti-war campaign between now and the convention.

Motion by Dobbs: To approve the general line of the reports for the Secretariat with the understanding that discussion remains open on the anti-war campaign, and to authorize the Secretariat to prepare a transcript of tonight's discussion for publication in the Discussion Bulletin.

Carried unanimously.

(Note: The foregoing transcript of an oral discussion in the Political Committee has not been edited by the participants.)

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON

ECONOMIC DISCUSSION

The Subcommittee on Economic Research designated by the Secretariat in accord with a Political Committee directive of November 20, 1964, composed of William F. Warde, David Herman, Jon Pederson, Dick Roberts and Lynn Henderson, has been studying the developments of U.S. and world economy since the first of the year. It has already published one memorandum on "Productivity, Employment and Unemployment" for the information of N.C. members and has several others in preparation.

The Subcommittee is concentrating upon a group of fundamental economic problems. 1. The evolution of the economic situation over the past 20 years, its contrast with the post World War I period, and the causes of the long-term cycle of world capitalist expansion. 2. The current prolonged boom in the U.S., the possibilities of a downturn and its probable depth, duration and consequences. 3. The interactions between an anticipated new recession in this country and other sectors of world capitalism. 4. The chances of coincidence between the termination of the fifth post-war upsurge in the U.S. and the exhaustion of the long-term cycle of capitalist growth. 5. The impact of automation and cybernation, the new technological revolution, upon the progress and prospects of the national economy; and its effect on the working class. Many subsidiary topics remain to be examined within this broad framework.

After the first few months of preliminary work, the Subcommittee feels that so much remains to be explored and understood in this complicated field that it cannot yet present conclusions which are solidly buttressed by adequate and accurate data.

It plans to go ahead with its inquiries in the coming months so that it can prepare a thoroughgoing analysis before the end of the year.

This delay will preclude the promised presentation of a draft document for pre-convention discussion and an appropriate convention decision by the party. While it would have been preferable if such a document had been made available, it does not seem to us politically urgent or organizationally mandatory at this time.

Although the 53-month boom shows certain signs of exhaustion, it is not yet ended. There are no large-scale changes in the economic situation impelling the party to introduce sharp shifts in its approach to the organized workers, the youth, or the black and white unemployed. The major political task at the forthcoming convention is to mobilize our own forces for energetic intervention in the spreading anti-war movement. We can conduct this campaign and other party activities on the basis of our present estimate of the economic conjuncture.

Moreover, since the U.S. is the key sector of world capitalism, any appraisal of its economic evolution over the next years has an international as well as an internal significance. For this reason it would be advisable to consult the most qualified Marxist authorities in other countries and learn their views in order to arrive at correct and comprehensive conclusions on these questions.

In view of the need for a more protracted investigation of the problems involved, we make the following proposals.

1. That the P.C. not submit any special resolution or report on economic developments to the party at this point.
2. That it instruct the Subcommittee on Economic Research to prepare a rounded document which can serve as the basis and starting point for an extended discussion on these matters in literary form after the party convention.
3. That a literary discussion on economics be opened after the convention. Any party member would be entitled to submit contributions to the bulletins concerned with this particular discussion, provided, in the opinion of the Secretariat, they are relevant and restricted to the economic issues under consideration.
4. That these recommendations be published in the pre-convention bulletin for the information of the membership.

We believe that this procedure will give the party ample time and opportunity to undertake a thorough collective study of all the decisive aspects of the economic situation conditioning the next phase of its development and provide a solid basis for the required programmatic and political conclusions.

(Approved by Political Committee July 16, 1965)