

INDOCHINA PEACE CAMPAIGN- NYC
c/o Michael Stout
126 Macdougall Street, #1D
New York, New York 10012

Jim - Bill

[IPC]

June 24, 1975

Dear Friends:

This mailing has two parts. First is a proposal for the future of IPC prepared by the NYC chapter which was 'expelled' by the Standing Committee and Santa Monica Resource Center. Included with that proposal are two posters our chapter has just produced and are putting up in New York, indicating concretely how some of the ideas in our paper can be carried out at this time.

Second is an open letter from the Indochina Solidarity Committee (ISC). This letter is the position of the five ISC members who are in our chapter of IPC, and is a reply to the slanders and lies being spread by two former ISC members who were recently kicked out of the organization. Other members of our IPC chapter do not necessarily agree with all of the positions taken in the ISC letter, but the chapter unanimously supports the continuation of ISC as it is now constituted. This letter is included with our chapter's proposal for future IPC work because the Standing Committee and Resource Center have used these slanders to the fullest extent in an attempt to rally support for their "expulsion" of our chapter, and to avoid principal political struggle on the most important issues of the day-- the future of IPC and Indochina and anti-war work.

This is our second mailing since the Issues Conference. It comes at a time when we are told National has conducted its poll of chapters and only one (Detroit) opposes the "expulsion" of New York. It also comes at a time when there is increasing demoralization and apathy within the IPC network. We have conducted some serious investigation within IPC since the Issues Conference, talking at length with 15 chapters throughout the country. IPC national has offered almost no programmatic direction and work since the day the Indochinese Liberation Forces won. In addition they have changed their "focal point" from Indochina to a full scale attack on our chapter, individual members and friendly organizations, based entirely on fiction and distorted and fabricated facts. Because of this, many people understandably view the prospect of a national meeting where two opposing political directions will be clearly and thoroughly struggled out as harmful to future work. However, people are also concerned with the gutter level of slander posing as political dialogue coming out of the National Resource Center and understand more clearly that they have been lied to about recent developments in New York.

Increasingly it is becoming clear that the dry river bed of IPC practice-- the Resource Center closed, the imposition of beauracratic discipline, the folding up of IPC chapters-- is not because leadership is waiting for the network to get itself together and map out the future, but because their future is already being implemented. THEIR FUTURE is: Tom and Jane on the cover of PEOPLE MAGAZINE, the end of mass Indochina work except by the dedicated few who have Vietnam in their blood, and the attempt to focus sentiment against war and for revolutionary change on the '76 elections to ensure the careers of aging movement heavies. Like the headline in People Magazine read: "HAYDEN AND FONDA REJOIN THE SYSTEM; SEE TOM AND JANE RUN- FOR THE U.S. SENATE." What you see is what you get!

This packet is also meant to correct weaknesses in our response letter to the Standing Committee's "expulsion" of our chapter. On the whole we felt our response was correct and helped to clarify our practice and dealt adequately with our democratic rights within the organization. However we also felt that our response was far too apologetic about our work and did not boldly put out our political differences with national and our view of the future. After weeks of discussion in our

chapter, we feel these weaknesses have been overcome in our position paper on future IPC work.

One weakness in our response to the SC's "expulsion" is our chapter's relationship to the Revolutionary Union (RU). National has tried to paint the RU as the evil communist hordes taking over the left, and our chapter as one of its victims. In their latest Newsletter they continually referred to our chapter, ISC, and probably anyone else who agrees with us as the "RU group".

The basis of unity in our chapter is not agreement with the RU, but 1) Solidarity with revolutionary Indochina, and 2) build and defend the movement to oppose imperialist war. Several members in our chapter politically agree with the RU, and one is an RU member. At the same time there are other members who have disagreements with the RU.

The chapter does, however, stand up for the RU's practice around Indochina. The RU and its supporters have continuously taken up anti-war work and struggled openly as to how this should be done. They have participated in coalitions and demonstrations that IPC has called or joined, linking Indochina work up with the day to day struggles of the people here in the U.S. There are certainly similarities between our line and that of the RU around the questions of Indochina and war, because we have consciously tried to sum up our work and the work of the anti-war movement, to examine the concrete conditions in the U.S. and the world, and struggled out conclusions that are similar, and we think correct. While IPC national would like people to believe in the "Big-bad RU" hogwash, in reality the RU has in reality contributed to our ability to take up Indochina work in the best possible way.

One final note. While this position paper on future IPC work is only a draft subject to review, criticism and change, we feel that it lays a firm basis for work around Indochina and taking up the question of opposing future wars in general. While we hope that it will be taken seriously and struggled over by all IPC chapters at the upcoming national Conference, it will be the basis for our work in the future, whether we are in IPC or not.

The cards have all certainly been layed out on the table. The two roads are clear: either we follow Tom and join the system, or we continue to oppose the system that is the root cause of all oppression and exploitation. We hope that people will seriously consider our proposal and struggle with us around it, within or without the IPC network.

UNITY- STRUGGLE- UNITY!

NYC- IPC

PROPOSAL ON THE FUTURE WORK OF IPC

This paper is being submitted to all IPC chapters to argue the continuation of mass Indochina and anti-war work as the correct way forward for the organization. We are looking forward to struggle and criticism of the paper.

The best place to begin is by asking the question; "What is the best possible unity we can reach and build on as an organization?" Though expressed differently by people, it was generally agreed at the Issues Conference that the war in Indochina was an imperialist war of aggression. Though the Indochinese people have dealt a grave blow to US imperialism, they have not destroyed the system which must constantly turn to war to redivide the world for greater and greater profit. Now that the Vietnam war is over, there is still a need for IPC to continue as a national organization doing mass work around Indochina and preparing for the next imperialist war. For the foreseeable future it is vital that we teach the lessons of the recent war as they relate to the lives and day-to-day struggles of the American people. It is also necessary to build the friendship and solidarity of the American and Indochinese people, through a concrete material aid program which will focus on the reconstruction of Vietnam. As a mass, anti-war organization, it will be possible to develop a network of people to take action when the US again becomes the aggressor in other parts of the world.

Following is some of our analysis of the past and present along with concrete ideas as to work to be done...

About the Past

Before we can project the future we must make as accurate an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of our past work as possible. Today there are two general ways in which the past work of IPC is summed-up and the future projected. One, represented by those who have been in national leadership of IPC during the last year -- the standing committee and the national resource center -- is that the strength and historic importance of IPC is the building of a United Campaign structure to do direct Congressional constituency work to end the war.

Implicit in this analysis is that the constructing of this United Campaign Congressional Strategy (UCCS) played the pivotal role in ending the war -- specifically that it was the success of the UCCS that allowed the PRG to win in the spring of 1975. As it was projected by Tom in his letter explaining his Senate campaign, the continuation of the UCCS analysis is the only realistic and pragmatic proposal for actually changing the American social and political system today, or in the foreseeable future.

The second sumup of past work, represented historically by New York, but also at different times by chapters and individuals throughout the country, is that IPC was the only national anti-war organization in the past 2½ years who saw clearly the need to continue work to support the just struggle of the Indochinese peoples against continued US imperialist aggression. IPC was united and built around support for Indochina and opposition to US aggression and war at a time when the anti-war movement as a whole disbanded. This is not to deny that strategically and tactically there was a narrowing of IPC work nationally by late 1974 to precisely the kind of United Campaign Congressional Strategy that the Santa Monica Resource Center was advocating nine months earlier. However, this narrowing was a profound weakness of IPC, which has lead us today to the denial of a need or ability to do mass work around Indochina and into the Democratic Party and the 1976 elections.

The struggle against the UCCS as "the Strategy to End the War" and the core of IPC work was protracted and nationwide (by no means limited to NYC), as anyone who attended any IPC national meeting or studied the content of the organizers' schools or reviewed the real work of chapters around the country can tell. From the start the contradiction within IPC was the strategic attempt to end an imperialist war by appealing to the government. At first this was done apolitically. We were told repeatedly how the mass struggle of the Sixties against the war had lead to a unique opportunity to strike a decisive blow at the US ability to continue the war -- pressuring Congress to cut aid

to Thieu and Lon Nol. IPC militants, united in their hatred of imperialism, were convinced to put aside their righteous contempt for Congress and elections and go "All Out for Vietnam" -- just this once. In the rhetoric of national IPC the anti-war movement had become the anti-aid movement; the "weak link" was the Congressional appropriation of money to the Vietnamese and Cambodian dictators; and the UCCS was the only way for Americans to work to end the war and show solidarity. Because NYC-IPC never took up the Congressional Strategy -- rather built Indochina work in the context of the worldwide struggle to defeat imperialism, and with some success brought the Left in our area back into the work to end the war -- Tom Hayden privately characterized the leadership of our chapter as personally "responsible for the deaths of tens of thousands of Vietnamese." When it comes down to it, the struggle in IPC has always been between the correctness of mass struggle to fight the system, on the one hand, and an electoral strategy to reorder the priorities of the system on the other. This difference has come clear repeatedly in resolving how to do Indochina work and analyzing what in fact is the role of Congress in actually affecting change in this country.

2½ years ago we were at the end of an old period of revolutionary struggle in the US; a period led by the Black Liberation struggle and based in the student and anti-war movements. 2½ years ago none of these struggles had been summed-up and lessons drawn very clearly -- particularly the question of why these important struggles had not been able to unite the people and make revolutionary change in the US. For us in the anti-war movement the question was sharply: Why was the war not over and how can we best work towards that end? The answer put forward by national IPC in the UCCS program has been frankly social democratic, never far from today's "radical populism." The Congressional Strategy is built on the illusion that the evils of capitalism can be smoothed over or manipulated so that socialism or social change can be built peacefully and piecemeal. We are told that our allies are the trade union bureaucrats, the "liberal" politicians, churchmen and businessmen; and that contesting for power meant being realistic and focusing on "democratic elections" -- first in 1974, now 1976. These are the same reasons that led sections of the anti-war movement to support McGovern for president in 1972. "Radical Populism", while proclaiming itself vaguely a "broad-based" mass movement, in fact denies that it is the masses that make history. It is a coalition of disgruntled constituencies, important because it represents a grand accumulation of pressure for reform. It denies the need to overthrow the system responsible for oppression and exploitation, the need to analyze the class forces that can in fact end war or make change.

The great lesson of the Indochina war is precisely that the people of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos continued the fight, with the understanding that only with the defeat of imperialism could the war be ended and the fight carried forward to end all exploitation and oppression. The struggle in Indochina, while having different characteristics and different allies as it developed over the last 45 years, never proclaimed reform or a reordering of the priorities of the feudal/colonial/neocolonial system as an answer to anything.

The Populists and Social Democrats were able to lead IPC in the past because they put forward a clear analysis of social forces to rely on at a time of confusion and decline within the "movement." By 1973 and the signing of the Peace Agreement, the spontaneous mass movements of the Sixties had died down; and the sectarianism of the Trotskyist and revisionist leadership of the national anti-war organizations led them to abandon any future Indochina work. (Sectarianism is putting the interests of a small group above the interests of the masses of people, in whatever form it takes.) IPC continued the work and began to analyze the forces which could be called on to take up that work. National IPC looked for a new "constituency" and began "organizing to the Right" -- among the petty-bourgeoisie. Others, including New York, held that the strength of the Sixties was the reliance on the masses of people, and that it was the working class that has the strength and desire to fight to victory against the system.

Hayden also brought a sum up of the Sixties to IPC and that hinged primarily on the

"sectarianism" of the left. We started with Tom's workshop at the Germantown national conference (October 1973) on "How to Argue with the Left" and the concern that IPC actually speak to masses of Americans, not just with the Movement. We end today with Hayden's virulent attacks on New York and his unity with the Democratic Party. In fact, under the cover of speaking to the masses, national IPC is carrying out the sectarian line today. They put their interests first and last, refusing to struggle openly so that everyone can get involved and take part in determining what in fact is the correct way forward. The struggle today is for political leadership of the work -- which line, which set of answers will guide us.

We are today in a new period of revolutionary struggle in the US. The basic contradiction of capitalism, between the working class and the class of employers and owners, is once again the primary contradiction in the US. The working class is rising more and more powerfully against economic oppression and the violence and aggression of the ruling class. US imperialism is in crisis as it has not been for thirty-five years; and the possibility of world war arising out of that crisis grows greater each day. In addition to being able to correctly analyze the reasons for victory in Indochina, the strength of IPC which speaks to the conditions for struggle today is the underlying commitment in the network to doing political work among the masses of people. Mass work in IPC has in fact been defended and undertaken in opposition to the Congressional Strategy and for the purpose of teaching people about the realities of the war and winning Americans to support their Indochinese brothers and sisters in that war. In this new period our tasks center on aiming blows clearly and sharply at the imperialist system, the ruling class and its agents; rallying the broadest support to that struggle, with the understanding that it is only the masses of working and oppressed people in the US -- not Congress and not the "movement" -- who will end war, make revolution and build a new society.

As to IPC's particular contribution to victory in Indochina, the PRG, in an open letter to their American friends this May explained: "In the past two years your demands that the American government put an end to its military involvement, cut assistance and remove the Nguyen Van Thieu group contributed to creating favorable conditions for the liberation of South Viet Nam to be achieved beautifully and completely." We didn't make victory happen. We struggled as best as we knew how to win that victory. The war ended because of the struggle of the whole people in Viet Nam, Cambodia and Laos, under the leadership of the Communist Party and through determined armed struggle to smash imperialism. The strength of the US anti-war movement was the extent to which it took the issue of the war and resistance to it out to the masses of American people and people opposed the war and supported the Indochinese against the exploitation of reactionary governments. In the course of that work many Americans did come to see the system of imperialism as the cause of the war and took up the fight against that system.

The vision of the future offered by the national leadership of IPC -- a separate, scholarly friendship association trying to weedle concessions from the US government, disassociated from ongoing revolutionary struggle in this country; and the location of "burning issues" or new focal points to plug into a UCCS, and new "liberals" to unite with to reform bourgeois democracy is dead wrong. We need to cast away the illusions about the nature of the system and take up Indochina work firmly in the context of the struggle against imperialism.

IPC's old political line was: 1) End Aid to Thieu and Lon Nol. Implement the Peace Agreement. 2) Solidarity with Indochina. 3) Build and Defend the Anti-War Movement. Within IPC today there is unity and experience based on our common work of the past for a new political line: 1) Solidarity with Revolutionary Indochina and 2) Build and Defend a Movement to Oppose Imperialist War.

WHAT INDOCHINA WORK IS POSSIBLE AND CORRECT TODAY?

The central lesson of the war is that where people fight back consistently against imperialism, seeing the actual contradictions and class forces and uniting people based on that analysis, as the Indochinese did, they will win. It was the mass struggle of the Indochinese people, supported by the large numbers of working people around the world that led to victory in Indochina. It is still necessary to maintain this broad-based mass work to accomplish the tasks of rebuilding Indochina, building friendship, solidarity and vigilance between our peoples; and teaching the lessons of the war so they can be used in struggle today.

National IPC maintains that the need and ability to do mass work around Indochina ended with the war, rather we should mine the Congressional Strategy for a few last nuggets (recognize the PRG and implement Article 21) and build museums. This is a serious mistake. During 1973 and 1974, when Indochina was not the issue on the headlines or the lips of millions of Americans there was mass work for IPC to do -- about political prisoners, continued US aggression in the form of aid and advisors, and the just struggle of the Indochinese people against imperialism. There is today the same need for a living, growing organization to take up the tasks which the defeat of imperialism in Indochina push forward.

The best way to both take out the lessons of the war and build solidarity at this point in time is to build a national Material Aid Campaign for the Reconstruction of Indochina. Enclosed are two posters reflecting some thoughts on the focus of that campaign. Material aid to rebuild Indochina can be built as mass work on a significant scale today, not by appealing to guilt or charity, nor at this time by focusing on implementation of Article 21, but based on the solidarity of working and oppressed people struggling against all oppression and exploitation.

Reconstruction in Vietnam means workers, young and old, building schools, factories and farms; working not to profit the rich but to meet the needs of the people. The reality of work and who it serves, of the struggle for jobs, housing, education and income to care for your family is one that reflects the daily concerns of the American people. We would focus the campaign on one or several specific factories, plantations, or housing projects and take it out to factories, neighborhoods and schools in America as well as to individuals and the general public. The Material Aid Campaign work would be built among students, sections of the petty-bourgeoisie which have come forward in the anti-war and national liberation support movement, as well as workers. Probably the greatest enthusiasm for this work would be among young people from different class backgrounds. While the campaign would have a specific focus (a factory, etc), any number of specific projects could be undertaken -- for instance day care centers in New York City collecting to build centers in Viet Nam, communities in the US "adopting" sister communities in Indochina.

We can think of no more concrete way of building the friendship between the American and Indochinese people, of providing a focus for the dissemination of information, propaganda and cultural exchanges than a national, mass material aid campaign. This work would be the best context to raise the just demand for reconstruction assistance from the US government and would be a powerful vehicle to push for the recognition of the PRG, DRVN and GRUNC by the US. The building of this campaign would bring forward new fighters against imperialism and would lay the basis for work brigades and trips to Indochina for those engaged in different on-going struggles, not merely as a reward for past commitment. Finally, the development of mass work around Indochina is the best guarantee that continued vigilance against US attack and subversion of those revolutions will be met with the strongest unified resistance.

If Indochina work continues merely as Congressional pressure or scholarly friendship without roots in the masses of American people, it will be impossible to contribute to the defense of the hard won victories in Indochina. We specifically do not propose a separate US-Indochina Peoples Friendship Association. During the war solidarity with

Indochina meant support of the just war of national liberation against imperialism. We do not project Indochina work because we hope the Vietnam War will be an issue in the 1976 elections. We know that the ruling class will draw its own lessons from the war and attempt to salvage its deteriorating position. A separate friendship association can at best satisfy curiosity and provide resources for those interested in the war. The proposal from Santa Monica is 1) tied in to the Congressional Strategy thinking, both by treating the war as a bad "foreign policy" choice and proposing work to pressure Congress about revolutionary Indochina; 2) Eliminates any discussion of what is actually going on in Indochina, that is social and political revolution, a complete reorganization of society to reconstruct the country; 3) Reads like the Women's Pages of a metropolitan newspaper, having nothing to do with sharp, ongoing struggle against the system. Solidarity with Indochina has nothing to do with the careers of movement people or with the Right, the agents of the ruling class in this country. It has everything to do with the struggle for freedom, independence, against war and the imperialist system that causes war.

WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO OPPOSE WAR TODAY?

We recognize that the anti-Indochina war movement was successful because we mobilized the just and massive sentiment of people against that unjust war of aggression. War is never in the interest of the vast majority of working people in America, it is always the sons of the working class that have to go and die. We can and must mobilize that sentiment again as the imperialists prepare to launch a new war to enrich themselves and bring untold suffering to the vast majority of people. As long as there is imperialism, as long as production is for profit and the world divided and redivided by the capitalists to ensure that profit, there will be war. Our tasks today, while there is no war, are aimed at fighting the particular aspects of aggression and imperialist crisis that threaten war. US militarism and saber rattling and the depression and tightening of exploitation here at home are the mass issues of the day. When war does break out our tasks will change. On one hand we should support all just wars against imperialism, waged by nations for liberation and self-determination. On the other hand there will be massive protests against unjust war waged by the imperialists to oppress the people. We must mobilize this sentiment to fight against the war; but we must not deceive the people while waging this fight. We must boldly put forward that there will be no lasting peace without the destruction of imperialism. Whoever wants a real and democratic peace must also fight against the system responsible for war. WE WILL MAKE WAR ON THE WAR MAKERS!

The US is no longer the top dog imperialist power it was at the end of World War Two. By 1950 the US had consolidated its economic domination over the other capitalist powers in Japan and Europe and established colonial or neo-colonial control over the entire underdeveloped world. The forces to first challenge this world hegemony were the blows struck by the establishment of socialism in Eastern Europe, China, Korea and later Cuba; and the rise of national liberation struggles throughout the world. This challenge led to total victory throughout Indochina this spring, a blow which weakens US imperialism and multiplies the determination to fight back of the peoples of the world suffering imperialist domination.

Today, more than at any time since WWII, the challenge to US imperialism is much broader and deeper than simply the resistance of nations struggling for independence. Japan and the Common Market countries are increasingly competing with the US for control of natural resources, labor power and markets throughout the world. Moreover, the main contender with the US for hegemony throughout the world is the Soviet Union. Whether it is oil from the Middle East, Russian steel mills in India or oil refineries in France, the Soviet Union is driving aggressively into areas of the world where the US once stood in total domination.

US imperialism is driven to make profit, greater and greater profit. Because the US is getting its ass kicked out of countries around the world and faces economic and military

competition to function in the rest of the world, it faces a crisis -- a crisis of profit. Unable to increase super-profits abroad and facing a pile-up of excess goods at home, the capitalists shut down or slow down production, throw people out of work, onto unemployment and welfare lines and raise prices to make larger and larger profits off the backs of working people here in the US. So we have crisis today, a heightening of the contradictions inherent in the functioning of the system. We face concretely a depression at home and the threat of war abroad; war to settle questions of competition, to redive the world and ensure the flow of profit for one group of capitalists, at the expense of the people.

The US is driving and being driven towards war, as best we can tell with the Soviet Union over competition for the Middle East and Europe, who's industry depends on Middle Eastern oil. In response to crisis and depression a workers' movement is rising throughout the US, leading strikes and resistance to layoffs, cutbacks -- refusing to pay for capitalism's crisis. Ford threatens to invade the Middle East for oil and says Americans have to "bite the bullet;" the US is training troops for desert warfare and sending ROTC back on campus and setting up military recruiters outside unemployment centers. At Ft. Benning, Ga., June 15, Ford said: "Today's realities have increased rather than reduced our need for a solid, conventional fighting force and for strong infantry soldiers." The US has reinforced its troops in Europe by two mechanized infantry divisions, one armored division and one armored cavalry brigade and added a total of 48 new combat battalions to the US Army. The Soviet Union is in the midst of an agricultural crisis and short of capital to fully utilize technology in production in general. Soviet troops in Eastern Europe have been beefed up 50-70%; and the Soviet military is training for tactical nuclear war -- Russian tanks are equipped to "button up" and escape radiation and all division-sized units have equipment to "clean" vehicles contaminated by radioactivity. Russia wants naval bases in Portugal, Lybia, Somalia and Vietnam and is running around the world to line up possible allies, proposing a "Collective Security" pact in Southeast Asia to replace SEATO and the US. Once again the working and poor people of the world are being asked to take up arms against each other and give their blood so the imperialists can make more profit.

WHAT IS THE PROGRAM OF WORK AGAINST WAR AND WHY NOT A NEW ANTI-WAR ORGANIZATION TODAY?

Although we can surely say that imperialism breeds war and that the specifics of the crisis in US imperialism today point towards war, we cannot project a program of work against war with the same sureness and clarity as we can around Indochina. This comes from two reasons. Primarily because war is not yet on us, nor so imminent that it is a question focused and clear for the masses of American people. There is a lot of talk about war by the ruling class and media -- Korea, the Middle East, Angola, Portugal, the Middle East again -- but the particulars of the next war have to come clearer before mass work on a national scale is going to be possible.

The second reason we cannot project a specific program of work against war is that we do not understand well enough the concrete conditions of the world today and how that shapes and guides our work. We don't have to wait for war to break out to organize ourselves, however. We must prepare ourselves and our organization to take up the real tasks that will face us as contradictions heighten and the struggle against imperialism intensifies.

A central aspect of the work of the IPC network in the next period should be study of theory and the concrete conditions of the world in order to take up the real tasks that face us. National IPC suggests that a correct, comprehensive understanding of what's going on around the world is not very important to a reevaluation of our work here in the US. Indeed, a world wide or historical perspective on struggle does not strengthen an electoral strategy, it discredits it. Even ongoing, vital Indochina work has been severed from the network by national leadership because Solidarity with Indochina and the lessons of that war and resistance to it teach revolution, not reform. We see three

areas of study to be key:

- 1) what is the precise nature of imperialism, of the causes of war and economic crisis, and of the need to support just and oppose unjust wars?
- 2) what is the main enemy of the working and oppressed people of the world and specifically of the American people and what is the correct appraisal of the forces and peoples engaged in revolutionary struggle around the world?
- 3) what are in fact the lessons of the Vietnam war, specifically of resistance within Indochina, in America and throughout the world to US aggression.

Our chapter in New York has begun this process of sumup, both by struggling out the most correct way to take out our Indochina work over the past three months and through regular and disciplined study about the lessons of the war and situation in the world today. We don't have position papers or a program of work yet, or they would be included with this paper, but we have formulated questions which we intend to pursue which we put forward here:

- a) If Indochina and the national liberation struggles against US imperialism are not the "focal point" or main contradiction in the world today, what is? The contradiction between the US and the Soviet Union? The struggle of the working class against the Bourgeoisie within the capitalist countries? The struggle of the peoples of the world against the two Superpowers, the US and Soviet Union?
- b) How can the behavior of the Soviet Union be explained? What analysis besides Social-Imperialism (Socialist in words and imperialist in deeds) explains Russia's support of Lon Nol and refusal to support the Cambodian revolution; requests for naval bases in Vietnam and a "Collective security" pact for Southeast Asia; expansion of Soviet bases and military throughout the Middle East and around the world; the Soviet stand with the US to oppose the Third World nations at the recent United Nations conferences about the Law of the Seas and the exploitation of natural resources, etc?
- c) Is imperialist contention over the oil resources of the Middle East and the industrial base of Europe the most likely theater for war today? (Not, say, the escalation of armed struggle in the Philippines to another "Vietnam" or a new stage of US aggression in Korea.)
- d) Why couldn't the student movement or the Black liberation struggle by themselves make revolution in the US? What is the relationship between the rising workers' movement and the overall struggle against US imperialism, Indochina work and the building of a powerful anti-war movement?
- e) What is the correct United Front strategy and program against war and imperialism in the US? In times of peace how could such campaigns as i) freeing all US colonies and neo-colonies ii) ending all US military aid and alliances iii) withdrawing all US troops from foreign countries iv) dismantling all nuclear weapons be carried out to actually preserve peace? What alliances and campaigns against imperialism at home serve the same purpose? When war does break out how do we best mobilize the masses of working and oppressed people in the US to support just wars of national independence and revolution against the system. How do we discern and isolate the main enemy, determine and mobilize our allies, choose the forms of struggle and organization and develop propaganda and agitation? Specifically, what is the role of Congress and "liberal" Congressmen? Who's interest do such institutions serve and what precisely moves them to take action which objectively aids the people?

STRUCTURE

IPC has two tasks for the next period. Primarily to build mass solidarity work to further the friendship between the Indochinese and American people. Secondarily to develop the theory and practice to build mass work against war as the crisis of imperialism drags the world towards war. Although IPC cannot become a new anti-war organization today, we should not undertake our work in isolation from the growing movement of working people which can in fact lead successful struggle against imperialist war. IPC should

participate in the next period in struggle against imperialist aggression and war as it arises around the country -- to support the Palestinian people, oppose the Shah of Iran or against ROTC for instance.

We may be facing a transition period of six months, a year or more before a developed program of work against war, a political leadership and a national structure which meets the needs of a new organization can be fully developed. Until that time we should maintain a loose national structure, rejecting a top-down national discipline. Chapters should function democratically with political and programmatic unity coming from practice and study and struggle over our work and not by edict from a national office or a "representative" coordinating body. We will be a mass organization, with people taking on the work and uniting around the program, not around a single political line or around a hazy anti-imperialism. This is not to suggest some organizational cover for a grand coalition of "revolutionary-minded" folks. The ideological and programmatic struggle must be much more intense than ever characterized IPC nationally in the past. Our concern is uniting around the most concrete, effective work, not promoting unity for unity's sake.

To maintain cohesion and development of chapters we need: a disciplined correspondence, a serious internal newsletter which promotes the struggle of ideas for work nationally, a schedule of travelers, and regular regional and national meetings. These meetings should be of two kinds, open, hopefully full membership meetings and meetings of representatives of chapters or regions depending on the tasks. Meetings between chapters should be both for study, discussion and struggle over ideas and political direction and for the purpose of coming to unity around specific tasks and aspects of the work.

Throughout this transition period the creation of resources cannot be left to a single chapter and we should use and share the best and clearest materials we can create or adapt. Two sets of resources should be developed in common for use nationally, however. The posters, buttons, audio-visuals, etc that promote the Material Aid Campaign to Reconstruct Indochina should be used as commonly and broadly as possible and developed together. Also, a public newsletter to disseminate the ideas, discussions, struggles and programmatic suggestions that arise from our study and work over the next months will be invaluable as a propaganda tool and method for sharpening and clarifying the work and ideas. The publication would continue reporting the situation in Indochina, discuss the question of war and popularize the program as it is developed and taken up.

There will have to be some centralization of tasks -- the publication of a newsletter, production of Material Aid resources, scheduling of meetings and travelers and coordination of national work cannot be left to spontaneity. Also the regular convening of meetings of chapter representatives is a valuable tool and leadership should be encouraged and developed. Our trouble in the past was not that we had leadership, but too often we had the wrong leadership. However, as tasks become the responsibility of one or several chapters or representative bodies they will be to facilitate, not legislate the political struggle and development of program.

* * * * *

One final note: Given the bankruptcy of national leadership to date and the consequent misdirection and denial of full discussion and struggle within the IPC network, it may well not be possible to maintain IPC as the organizational form to either build solidarity with Indochina or develop an anti-war network to meet the concrete needs of US imperialism in crisis. Our chapter feels that there is much to be gained by taking up the struggle for the future within IPC, and that the best way to carry out the work is by rebuilding the IPC network politically and programmatically. However, we also see that concrete steps have been taken to dissolve IPC and construct new organizational forms already. Specifically, National IPC would like people to come to the Ann Arbor meeting to be faced with only two alternatives: endorse the Populist/reformist/electoral focus of Hayden and

Arlook and the severing of Indochina work from the network or leave the organization -- at least you can join the Friendship Association. We have correctly presented this paper on the future in the context of the particular struggle for the future of IPC, thinking that great unity is yet possible. But the future of the work and the future of IPC are not necessarily the same thing. The questions are in fact: "Who wants to fight against war? Who wants to build the friendship between the Indochinese and American people into a material force against the system that caused that war?" Whether or not it is possible to rebuild the IPC network per se, we urge you all to optimism -- to take up the work and build the struggle -- because, in fact, it is the future that counts, not an organizational form which gets stuck in the quagmire of the past.