

14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014

January 22, 1973

TO MEMBERS OF THE POLITICAL COMMITTEE

Dear Comrades,

Attached for your information are three articles from the January 20 issue of the Daily World, the issue which was distributed at the recent antiwar demonstration in Washington, D.C.

Comradely,

Lew

Tactical flexibility urged for united antiwar action

By MATTHEW HALLINAN
Chairman, National Peace

Commission, Communist Party
During the last week of December, an agreement was reached by the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice (PCPJ) and the National Peace Action Council (NPAC) jointly to sponsor a mass demonstration in Washington on Inauguration Day, Jan. 20.

While the necessity for this united action has generally been understood in the peace movement, a number of activists, including some of the best and most dedicated people, have had some serious reservations about it.

Some of the opposition to the united action arises out of bitter experiences in the past with the Trotskyite-dominated NPAC.

Some organizations, such as the Vietnam Veterans Against the War, have been so burned by C that they have come to oppose, almost on principle, any united action with the Trotskyites. While Communists are the first to sympathize with these sentiments, we must also point out that in politics you cannot choose your allies on the same basis as you choose your friends in everyday life.

It is not the honesty and decency of your allies that brings you together but rather the viciousness and barbarism of your common enemy. The question is not how bad are the Trotskyites but, rather, will certain forms of unity with them under certain conditions help to compel U.S. imperialism to end its oppression in Vietnam?

However, most of the dissatisfaction with the agreement for a united demonstration stems not from a general hostility to the Trotskyites but instead from the conditions imposed upon PCPJ by NPAC in order to obtain unity.

All of the organizations affiliated to PCPJ, in fact almost all of the organizations in the coun-

try outside of NPAC, recognize that the demand which corresponds best to the present situation is "Sign the Treaty Now."

This demand brings out the fact that there now exists a simple and concrete way to end the war. It has the virtue of reminding the American people that a major factor in Nixon's reelection was the promise that he was about to sign this agreement. Also, the demand to sign the agreement effectively exposes the lie that the war continues because the North Vietnamese backed away from the agreement at the last moment. This demand is the demand of the liberation forces in Vietnam. It is the demand of the world forces struggling to end U.S. aggression, and it should be the central demand of the U.S. peace movement.

However, for reasons I cannot discuss here, the Trotskyites are opposed to the treaty and, therefore, to any demand that the treaty be signed. They steadfastly refused any joint action under the banner of "Sign Now." While people are free to carry "Sign Now" placards and banners at the demonstration Jan. 20, and speakers can articulate this demand from the platform, the demands of the lead banner of the march are restricted to "Stop the bombing—end the war now."

An unprincipled concession?

Some honest peace forces were upset by PCPJ's decision to accept those conditions. Their anger and frustration with the Trotskyites kept them from seeing the situation in its proper perspective.

First, the leadership of PCPJ had to ask itself what the consequences would be of not accepting these conditions. It would have meant that there was no simple mass response to Nixon's election betrayal and to the unprecedented genocidal bombings of the North. It would have meant three (PCPJ, NPAC,

PL-SDS) or perhaps four separate demonstrations in Washington, a fact which in and of itself would have made impossible a broad and massive mobilization on Jan. 20.

The leadership of PCPJ correctly judged that such a development would be a disaster.

What is at stake Jan. 20?

The actions of Jan. 20 are extremely important. The Inauguration Day actions are a challenge to Nixon's attempt to interpret his election victory as a mandate for continuing the war.

They are the first opportunity the masses have had to express their outrage over the cynical election fraud which Nixon pulled on them. A broad and massive response by the same forces is essential in order to expose Nixon's isolation on the war issue and to temper the desperation which appears to be spreading in certain high administration circles.

A massive turnout Jan. 20 is required, likewise, to pressure a hesitant and vacillating Congress into action. These actions will be seen, both here and abroad, as a test of strength between the administration and the anti-war forces in this country.

Under these circumstances, the issue of what slogans are on the lead banner is not the central one. Indeed, the mass of the American people are not even aware of this debate over slogans. In their minds, "end the war now" means "sign the treaty now." People are going to Washington because they understand that the peace forces must make a show of strength. And they are right.

Mass turnout—essential issue

Only a united action which combined the organizational and financial resources of both PCPJ and NPAC met the political requirements of the moment. Those who made the issue of the slo-

gan into a question of principle were losing sight of the principle—the duty of the American people to stop the criminal aggression of their own imperialism. Our responsibility is not to profess our loyalty and solidarity with the Vietnamese but rather to do anything and everything that will effectively work to restrain the war makers.

Purity of conscience by the few cannot substitute for the pressure exerted by an organized mass outpouring.

The peace forces must develop the tactical flexibility that will allow us to reach our maximum effectiveness. Compromise on the unessential issues is one feature of this. On Jan. 20, the essential issue was not which slogan is on the lead banners

but rather how massive is the turnout.

This is not to say that the debate over slogans and demands is unimportant.

A struggle must be fought to win all peace forces to see the necessity for raising the demand that Nixon sign the treaty now. NPAC must either be forced to live with a united movement in which this is one of the demands or it must be isolated. It cannot be allowed to continue indefinitely to exercise a veto over the vast majority of those desiring peace.

However, the struggle over differences within the movement must not be carried on in such a way that they diminish the effectiveness of the movement itself. Only U.S. imperialism benefits from that.

Trotskyite friends of Nixon's

tricker

By MIKE ZAGARELL
National Education Director,
Young Workers Liberation League
President Nixon's refusal to
the peace treaty agreed upon
before the elections has set off a
new level of mass opposition to the
Vietnam war. Not since Nixon
first came into office has he stood
so exposed to tens of millions of
people around the world.

Millions of people in the U.S.
now know that this war could have
been definitely over October 31,
the day that was set to sign the
treaty. But it is not over because
Nixon went back on the promise
made before the elections. The
demand to sign the treaty is put-
ting Nixon in the spotlight of world
criticism. This is why Nixon is
now doing everything possible to
make us forget that a peace treaty
was ever agreed upon.

In his opposition to the treaty,
however, Nixon is not alone. He
has found new friends in the Trot-
skyite "Socialist" Workers Party
(SWP) and the Young "Socialist"
Alliance (YSA) which openly at-
tack the peace treaty and refuse
to anything to force Nixon to
sign it.

Throughout the country the
SWP and the YSA are going into
peace meetings and demanding
that the peace movement forget
about the treaty and continue with
business as usual.

While the SWP gives different
reasons than Nixon for opposing
the treaty, the effect is the same:
to take Nixon off the hot seat and
to return the peace movement to
its position before Nixon's public
betrayal. In this campaign the
Trotskyites have already imposed
their position on the National
Peace Action Coalition (NPAC)
and the Student Mobilization Com-
mittee (SMC) both of which they
control, and are now trying to
impose it on the whole peace move-
ment.

Absurd objections

The main argument of the Trot-
skyites is that the Vietnamese are
selling out. The Trotskyites, sit-
ting safely in their comfortable of-
fices, think that the Vietnamese
shouldn't make any concessions.

A Rose, Chairman of the
Young "Socialist" Alliance, states:
"The main points of the agree-
ment, as they can be pieced to-
gether, include significant conces-
sions forced from the Vietnamese.
The terms leave the Vietnamese
revolution in grave danger..."
(Young Socialist, Nov., 1972, p. 5)

The Trotskyite position is not
opposition simply to too many conces-
sions. They oppose any conces-
sion made by the Vietnamese,
even the most minute.

For example, SWP leader Fred
Halstead, speaking of the demand
by the Provisional Revolutionary
Government (PRG) that the U.S.
set a terminal date for withdrawal,
states:

"That's a concession. Where is
the concession? It simply lies in
the period of time between imme-
diate withdrawal and whatever
date is set, two days from now, six
months, one year or whatever.
The U.S. has no right to be in Viet-
nam for any length of time." (Mil-
itant, Oct. 27, 1972, p. 14)

In other words, even if the U.S.
agreed to withdraw troops two
days from now, the SWP would
oppose it. The Vietnamese must
give no concession, not even two
days!

The "no concessions" demand
is, of course, absurd on the face of
it. With such a concept, no work-
er could negotiate a parade per-
mit with the police until social-
ism. It is a standard which no peo-
ple in their right minds could
practice and which is not prac-
ticed by the Trotskyites them-
selves. By demanding "no conces-
sions" the Trotskyites show
only that they are prepared to
"fight" on to the last Vietnam-
ese.

The fundamental and most de-
cisive concessions in the 9-point
agreement are made by U.S. im-
perialism. They are agreement to
withdraw all forces from Vietnam,
acceptance of a coalition govern-
ment which puts the anti-imperial-
ist forces in the dominant position
in Vietnam, and an acceptance of
the territorial integrity of Viet-
nam and its eventual re-unifica-
tion. It is precisely because this
agreement is not beneficial to
U.S. imperialism that Nixon now
refuses to sign it.

The point, of course, is not
whether the Vietnamese have
given some concession. The point
is the total effect of the agree-
ment. Does it forward the move-
ment for peace and independence
of Vietnam? The answer to that
question is obvious to everyone in
the world except the Trotskyites.

That is why the whole world is
fighting to force Nixon to sign the
agreement... everyone but the
Trotskyites!

The Trotskyites try to hide

their position by saying that the
Vietnamese have every right to
make whatever concessions they
want, "but the victim's friends
have no right to approve the re-
sults of the crime." (Ibid) In other
words, the Vietnamese can nego-
tiate any agreement with the U.S.
they want. But don't ask the peace
movement to fulfill its responsi-
bilities and impose this agreement
on Nixon!

Chauvinism—Trotskyites' hallmark

The Trotskyites say they sup-
port self-determination in Indo-
china. But it is clear that the Trot-
skyites believe that the Vietnam-
ese should have consulted them
before they supported the treaty.

The Vietnamese have been fight-
ing for over 30 years despite bomb-
ings and mass genocide. Yet the
Trotskyites have concluded the
Vietnamese are "betraying the
struggle."

What could be more absurd
and arrogant!

The real issue

To this day the SWP and YSA
staunchly support Trotsky's long-
discredited theory of permanent
revolution. The basic idea behind
this disproven theory is that so-
cialism cannot be built in one coun-
try. In essence, the Trotskyites be-
lieve that any peace agreement
short of socialism in the U.S. will
be a sell-out.

What this means practically is
that while the SWP and YSA pre-
tend to be for peace they really
are not. That is, they do not be-
lieve the Vietnamese can win
peace and independence until af-
ter the SWP leads a revolution in
the U.S.

This is the meaning of the Trot-
skyite concept that "out now" is
a "transitional demand." To the
Trotskyites, a transitional de-
mand is one which people want
now but which can only be won
under socialism.

The convenient logic of this
position is that any agreement is
a sell-out and that the Vietnam-
ese must keep fighting so that the
SWP can grow like parasites off
the peace movement. Of course,
the SWP rationalizes this by say-
ing that once in power they will
end the war.

Anti-communism

The Trotskyites are embarrass-
ed to attack the Vietnamese free-
dom fighters directly. So they try
to use anti-Communism, particu-

larly anti-Sovietism, to hide the
long-standing hatred for the De-
mocratic Republic of Vietnam (DRV)
and the PRG of South Vietnam.

They do this by implying that
the Vietnamese don't want to sell
out but that they are under "pres-
sure" from the Soviet Union. By
trying as they try to hide their po-
sition under anti-Sovietism, the
full position slips out.

The Trotskyites do not simply
oppose this agreement. They op-
pose any and every agreement
ever made for peace in Indochina.

Fred Halstead states: "On
three occasions since the 1945 Au-
gust revolution and the founding
of the DRV — that is since the Na-
tionalist Revolution took control
of the entire country — the imper-
ialists managed to get back in and
carry on a counter-revolutionary
war. On these three occasions the
imperialists used the cover of a
agreement they had wrested from
the leadership of the movement."
(Militant, Oct. 27, 1972, p. 13)

The position of the Trotskyite
is clear. According to the Trot-
skyites, the Vietnamese are sell-
outs, always were sell-outs and
always will be sell-outs until they
embrace Trotskyism.

Recently, the Trotskyites have
not hesitated to pull out all the
stops in their slanders against the

PRG. At the very moment when
Nixon and General Thieu are
spreading the lie that the PRG
intends to murder its opposition,
a settlement is reached, the Trot-
skyites join in telling of how Trot-
skyites were "murdered by Stalin-
ists in the Viet Minh" because
they opposed the leadership of the
liberation movement. (Ibid)

New standards

It is now clear that the Trotsky-
ites, while participating in the
peace movement, have no real de-
sire for an immediate peace set-
tlement.

It is precisely because of this
position that the Trotskyites have
been declared renegades through-
out the world peace movement.

Of all the nations in the capital-
ist world, our peace movement in
the U.S. has the greatest respon-
sibility. It is time that we begin
to examine new and higher stand-
ards in the peace movement.

By Dynamite Hallinan

President Nixon's betrayal of his election peace promises have shaken peaceloving peoples everywhere.

As the dust from shattered illusions finally settled, a sense of anger and outrage has once again arisen among the American people. And while there is a strong resolve to act, to do something — anything — to restrain the unspeakable horrors committed in our name, there are at the same time a number of gnawing questions which arise at every meeting of peace activists. What can we do? We have marched, confronted, resisted, electioneered, and nothing has worked. What can we do that will be really effective?

Indeed, one of the problems of the peace movement over the years has been its search for the simple answer — trying to find the one action, the one tactic or the one agency (church, army, Congress, Supreme Court) that could do it all. This rigidity of tactical approaches, generally reflecting the lack of experience and youthful character of the leading anti-war forces, has been a serious obstacle to unfolding the broadest possible anti-war struggle in this country.

The search for the single effective measure that can end the war is based on a failure to understand the nature of the forces pursuing this war. It is based on a lack of understanding of U.S. imperialism. If the war policy were simply an insane whim of a Johnson or a Nixon, then a single massive effort could sufficiently isolate them and force them to retreat. But the Vietnam war has been and continues to be the policy of the dominant sections of U.S. imperialism — the same monopoly forces which exercise control over most of the mass media, dominate the two major political parties, control decisive sections of the trade union leadership, and have their hands directly upon the levers of state power. While it is true that the ruling class is divided over the war and that the division is growing, it is wrong not to see that the war is the policy of the dominant forces within that class.

The war itself involves issues that go way beyond the particular stake of U.S. imperialism in South Vietnam, or in Southeast Asia for that matter.

The war in Indochina is of global significance. It is a test between the forces of national liberation and world socialism on one hand and U.S. imperialism on the other. U.S. imperialism has thrown its massive military and material strength against the valiant peoples of Indochina who have the active support of the national liberation movements and the socialist forces throughout the world.

In this kind of struggle there is no single front, no single decisive battle, but rather a prolonged test of strength. U.S. imperialism has thrown incredible military and material resources into the battle, which are capable of committing the most awesome brutalities, while at the same time pursuing a flexible and sophisticated world-wide political effort to confuse and divide the forces sympathetic to Vietnam.

Under these circumstances the peace forces in this country must be geared to struggle as long as it takes to achieve the signing of a peace treaty and, beyond that, to assure its implementation.

The Vietnamese use every weapon, every tactic, every form of struggle, every potential ally, every human resource, and they will use them over and over again until the U.S. aggressor is forced to retreat.

Just as the Vietnamese people have heroically fought for their freedom for more than a quarter of a century, the American people must face their own test of endurance: to fight as long as necessary to win peace. There can be no excuse for demoralization, for inactivity.

We are called upon to do our part — to do that which we are able to do — and to do it the best way we can. Those who argue that, because we cannot end it once and for all, we should therefore do nothing, are playing the game of the warmakers. Our job is to throw every force we can into this struggle, to complement the strength of the Vietnamese people, the socialist camp, the world forces arrayed against this war. The Australian dock workers cannot alone compel U.S. imperialism to end the war, but their action is another weight thrown into the scales of this historic struggle. And, I might add, a very important one.

That is the way we must see our tasks. Everything we do in this country has an effect on the overall struggle. Every demonstration, every resolution by a labor union, church or civil group, every leaflet or pamphlet handed out, every letter written or protest made is a factor that will contribute to the end of this barbaric war.

tion for the anti-war forces. The test of the effectiveness of any anti-war tactic or action is the degree to which it expands and broadens the base of the anti-war movement; the degree to which it enlists the activities and expresses the sentiments of millions. The only power we can throw into the struggle against U.S. imperialism is the power of organized masses.

We are just now recovering from the devastating effects of an orgy of sectarianism in the anti-war movement. A large section of the newly radicalized youth — the traditional "shock troops" of the peace movement — completely lost its perspective. Frustrated by the difficulties in mobilizing masses, a large section of these forces developed a number of very harmful approaches, all of which served to narrow the anti-war movement. For some, the goal of ending the war was replaced by the goal of overthrowing imperialism. Hence, tactics were geared for radicalizing the activists rather than reaching out to broader sections of the American people. For others, "bringing the war home" became the main thing, so tactics were geared solely for confrontation with the government and not for their impact on masses. Different levels of struggle were not properly combined, but pitted against one another. Anything resembling a united front policy was purely accidental.

Sectarianism, however, is clearly on the wane in the anti-war movement. The most serious difficulty we face in this regard is the stubborn opposition of the

SWP-NPAC (Socialist Workers Party-National Peace Action Coalition) forces to the struggle to force Nixon to sign the peace accords. Because of their sectarian attitude on the relationship between the struggle for socialism and ending the war (SWP believes a coalition government betrays the cause of socialism), because of their anti-communism and chauvinism (the accords were drawn up by "the Stalinists and not by the Vietnamese people," and so are a "sell-out," etc.), they have failed totally to see that the existence of these accords has changed the whole situation, and that the demand for Nixon to sign them has now become the central demand of the movement.

While we Communists are fighting for united action by all peace forces, and recognize the necessity of certain kinds of compromises in the interest of unity, we must reject the position taken by SWP-NPAC that "sign the treaty now" be excluded from joint actions. This position seriously jeopardizes any continuing unity between NPAC and other peace forces.

While sectarianism and disunity have created serious problems for the anti-war movement, the most serious failure has been the inability of the organized peace forces to actively involve Black, Brown and white working people in the struggle to end the war.

Largely because of their class background, even the advanced peace forces have been slow to develop a full understanding of the class nature of imperialism. As a result, they have not effectively linked the struggle for peace to the daily problems of oppressed and working people here at home. Reliance upon moral appeals has made the struggle for peace seem divorced from the rising activity of working people to combat the war-related decline in their standards of living.

However, growing numbers of peace activists, particularly those around PCPJ, do recognize this weakness and are trying to correct it. The problem is that they cannot do it alone. They need help from those who have roots in the newly emerging shop and community movements.

We must recognize that masses of Black, Brown and other oppressed people and working people in general, will not express their opposition to the war in the same manner that white students and middle-class elements have. New kinds of actions, demands and coalitions are required to accomplish this.

In New York, there are discussions already under way by leading activists in the tenants' movement, day-care center movement, PTAs, teachers' rank-and-file, city workers rank-and-file and others, about the possibility of joint action on the war. The war and the urban crisis are inseparably linked and the struggle to change the spending priorities of the government are natural forms through which working people can be brought into active opposition to the war.

The key to building a peace movement with the muscle to compel U.S. imperialism to retreat is to make the struggle for peace an integral part of the daily struggle of working and oppressed peoples to defend their living conditions.

For this to happen, the struggle for peace must cease to be the task of the peace movement alone but the concern and struggle for peace must become the central task of every progressive and demand of every people's movement.

Hallinan is the secretary of the National Peace Commission of the Communist Party and its representative on the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice.