

JUN 18 1974

Los Angeles, Calif.

June 15, 1974.

Jack Barnes  
National office

Dear Jack,

Should revolutionary socialists demand the impeachment and removal from office of President Nixon? I would answer this question in the affirmative.

The latest poll shows that 52% of those asked were in favor of impeachment and removal from office of the president. While this sentiment remains unorganized for the most part, it does represent a majority. We should not cut ourselves off from such a mass by refusing to make a demand for Nixon's ouster from office.

There is nothing wrong in making such a demand in cases where an unpopular, untrusted or hated public office holder succeeds in turning a huge number of people against him. We demanded the removal of J. Edgar Hoover as director of the FBI when public sentiment for such a move reached the stage where many public figures spoke out for firing him.

We are not responsible for the fact that removal of Nixon would only get the country Gerald Ford, who is no improvement. Or that if Hoover had been removed, someone equally repulsive would very likely have been appointed. The problem of the successor is one that requires an explanation from us. We certainly can cope with that.

What is of primary importance is that a removal of Nixon under present circumstances will be only because of large-scale public demand. It would be looked upon as a victory by masses of people just as Johnson's retirement from politics was forced by the anti-war movement, and explained by us correctly as due to anti-war activity.

In looking upon Johnson's forced retirement as a positive outcome of the anti-war actions, we did not have to take responsibility for his successor. Our position on Nixon should be that we are in favor of his removal and also in favor of the removal (replacement) of all capitalist office holders by those representing the workers and their allies.

We should not base our position on Nixon on the fact that there is no mass organized movement in the field demanding impeachment, if this should be used as an argument to remain neutral, or non-committal. What is important in this respect is not the existence of an organized movement, even though it would be good to have one, but that mass sentiment is undoubtedly in its majority in favor of his removal.

There is one other recent example that I think applies here. We supported the one week boycott of meat that swept the country a year or two ago. There was no large organized movement for this, just a rather small initiating committee. But the idea caught on and received huge support. We did not say that this boycott would bring prices down, a point that others supported. And it was not our responsibility that the action had little or no effect on prices. What it did was to bring masses of people together in a common action, even one of very limited possibilities. We solidarized ourselves with this mass and it was correct to do so, of course, with our explanations of how to act more effectively.

We should not cut ourselves off from the mass sentiment (that is all it is at this moment) for the removal of Nixon. We should be a part of it, explaining just what is required to really solve the problem.

Comradely,



Milton Alvin.