

8

Anti-War Activism

—KENNETH J. HEINEMAN

Shortly after the end of World War II, U.S. President Harry S. Truman, with bipartisan support from Congress, organized labor, intellectuals, Hollywood, and the news media embraced a policy of communist containment. First in Western Europe, and then in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the United States provided diplomatic, economic, and, on occasion, military aid to countries resisting Soviet Russian and communist Chinese expansion. Three times in the course of what journalist Walter Lippmann dubbed “the Cold War” (1946–1991), the United States and its communist rivals—as well as their proxies—faced off in major military engagements: Korea (1950–1953), Indochina (1965–1975), and Afghanistan (1979–1989).

In spite of the bipartisan consensus on U.S. Cold War foreign policy in the 1940s and 1950s, there remained pockets of dissent across the ideological spectrum. Republican isolationists, Democratic liberals who were uncomfortable with allying with anti-communist dictators, and disaffected radicals voiced their opposition to the policy of communist containment. The deepening crisis of the Vietnam War in the 1960s swelled the ranks of such critics.

In 1960, undergraduates and faculty at Lake Forest College, an exclusive suburban Chicago school, established the Student Peace Union (SPU). The Student Peace Union took a “Third Camp” position, meaning that its members regarded the United States and the Soviet Union as equally at fault for perpetuating the nuclear arms race. By 1963, the SPU had grown from 100 members to 3,500 and had established affiliates at Harvard and the University of Chicago.

Shaken by the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis and the prospect of a nuclear Third World War, the SPU asserted that Cold War Democrats—rather than the Soviets—were the chief threat to world peace. In what would become a distressing pattern for Cold War Democrats in the 1960s, Republicans almost always received less faculty and student-activist criticism. There were at least two reasons for this phenomenon. First, most SPU members came from either Democratic or socialist households. They therefore expected better behavior from their “family” elders. Second, conservatives,

when they even entered the mental world of progressive activists, were regarded as beyond redemption given their purported racism and militarism.

Another activist youth organization appeared at the beginning of the 1960s—one that demonstrated greater appeal and staying power than the Student Peace Union. In 1962, the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) held its founding convention in Port Huron, Michigan. Tracing its ancestry to the 1930s-era Student League for Industrial Democracy (SLID), SDS initially advanced a social democratic critique of U.S. capitalism and opposition to overseas military intervention. University of Michigan activist Tom Hayden wrote SDS’s founding document, “The Port Huron Statement.”

While SDS initially organized at elite schools such as Chicago, Harvard, Michigan, and Swarthmore, it spread to less academically prestigious campuses, including Penn State and Kent State. SDS was an organization of middle to upper-middle-class liberal arts majors from predominantly secular Protestant and Jewish households. Few Catholics and African Americans could be found. One-third of SDS’s members were “red diaper babies,” the children of 1930s socialists and communists. The remainder overwhelmingly came from Democratic families. These demographic features meant that the media-designated “generation gap” of the 1960s could more accurately be described as a civil war among factions of the Democratic Party and the Left.

With the escalation of the Vietnam War, the peace movement grew but became more internally divided. Two tracks of anti-war protest soon emerged. The first protest track was campus-based and, on more than a few occasions, witnessed violent confrontations with university administrators, law enforcement officials, and representatives of the military and corporations involved with defense contracting. A second protest track largely existed off-campus, often among established white-collar professionals and intellectuals. These activists sought through nonviolent rallies, petitions, and political mobilization to move the Democratic Party away from its Cold War foreign policy.

Much contemporary news media and subsequent scholarly attention focused on the first protest track. The specter of military service in Vietnam after graduation—or after flunking out—fed the ranks of campus peace protestors, as well as contributed to youthful alienation from a Democratic Party committed to the policy of communist containment. Further, dissenters were disturbed by the mounting American and Vietnamese casualties and frustrated that the war continued without reaching a successful conclusion. The emphasis of the American news media on images of seemingly pointless death and destruction in Vietnam also eroded public support for the war and boosted protest ranks.

Following U.S. President Lyndon Johnson’s decision to bomb North Vietnam in February 1965, the Swarthmore SDS mobilized 300 protestors, representing one-third of the college’s student body. After Johnson introduced combat troops into South Vietnam in March 1965, the national SDS organized a Washington, DC, peace rally of 15,000 in April 1965. At a larger November 1965 anti-war rally in Washington, Carl Oglesby, the national president of SDS, moved beyond criticism of Johnson’s escalation of the Vietnam War. Oglesby condemned Cold War Democrats since Harry Truman for trampling upon the nationalist aspirations of Africans, Asians, and Latin Americans in the name of communist containment.

Campus-based anti-war groups spent much of 1966 in educational and organizational activities. Such preparation work paid off in 1967 as students and some faculty participated in two major protests. In the first protest wave, SDS tried to prevent Dow Chemical recruiters from meeting with student job-applicants, because the company manufactured napalm that the U.S. military used in Vietnam. At schools such as Wisconsin and SUNY-Buffalo, a few hundred SDS members blocked access to Dow recruiters and engaged in running battles with police officers. SDS and university officials accused each other of instigating violence. Carl Davidson, the national vice president of SDS, contended that whatever student-generated violence might come from such protests was morally justified given Dow's role in the Vietnam War.

The second significant student-led anti-war protest of 1967 took place in October when 100,000 youths marched on the Pentagon in order to "Confront the Warmakers." For the first time in American history, student radicals faced off against U.S. soldiers and U.S. marshals. The American news media did not know what to make of protestors who claimed that their harmonic energy would levitate the Pentagon and excise its evil spirits.

By 1968, SDS had grown to 100,000 members and figured prominently in many campus protests against university military research, the draft, and the Vietnam War. In the spring of 1968, Columbia SDS, protesting university military research and racist policies toward the neighboring black community, seized campus buildings. Inspired by the intense New York-based national news media coverage of the Columbia confrontation, thousands of campus activists attempted to take over buildings at their universities.

President Johnson emerged from the spring of 1968 a broken man, unwilling to stand for re-election and seeking ways to extricate the United States from Vietnam. The North Vietnamese Tet Offensive in January 1968, while ultimately a U.S. military victory, had been a public relations and political disaster at home. Johnson had been dismayed by the sight of academics, clergy, journalists, and suburban middle-class professionals—nearly all of which were Democrats—turning against him and American Cold War foreign policy. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s public stance against the war in 1967, followed by his assassination in the spring of 1968 which sparked riots in over 100 cities, only added to Johnson's sense of despair.

Johnson also faced a serious challenge for re-nomination from New York senator Robert F. Kennedy who criticized both the Vietnam War and student radicals. Kennedy's stance attracted the support of many Democrats weary of campus disruption and a seemingly unending war. Johnson's decision not to seek re-election, and Kennedy's assassination in June 1968, paved the way for vice president Hubert Humphrey to receive the Democratic presidential nomination.

In that summer of 1968, nearly 15,000 protestors answered the call by SDS founders Tom Hayden and Rennie Davis, among others, to gather in Chicago and disrupt the Democratic National Convention. With 525,000 U.S. troops in South Vietnam and some 30,000 Americans killed, radicals were out of patience. Their goal was embarrass—Humphrey whom radicals correctly regarded as an unrepentant Cold Warrior.

While the resulting battles between Chicago police officers and student radicals did not prevent Humphrey's nomination, the televised images of youth battling

police disgusted millions and undermined the Democrats at the polls in 1968. At the same time, many college-educated suburbanites blamed only the Chicago police for the violent street clashes and vowed to wrest control of the Democratic Party away from its anti-communist labor and political leaders. Among such Democratic activists was Molly Yard of Pittsburgh, a future leader of the National Organization for Women (NOW). By 1968, women's rights activists and civil rights leaders had also become central players in the anti-war movement and the issue was no longer the preserve of college students. Not only did well-known civil rights figures like Martin Luther King, Jr., decide to speak out against the war, but so also did feminist icon Gloria Steinem and famous movie actress Jane Fonda.

A year later, in 1969, movement attentions were suddenly consumed with a dramatic trial in which the so-called "Chicago Seven," Tom Hayden, Davis, and five other radical activists stood accused of fomenting the rioting that accompanied the 1968 Democratic National Convention. But rather than unify movement activists, as the Chicago Seven trial proceeded internal tensions over tactics grew more glaring and large anti-war organizations such as SDS split apart. One faction, called the Revolutionary Youth Movement (or Weathermen) believed that terrorist acts were acceptable strategies for ending the war. A second faction, influenced by the Maoist Progressive Labor Party, saw the anti-war issue as too limited in scope and sought to go into factories and organize white workers into a revolutionary vanguard that would overthrow American capitalism. It is worth noting, however, that the anti-war movement had grown far beyond SDS and that the majority of protestors, including many who stayed in SDS embraced nonviolent activism.

The greatest uprising of anti-war activists took place in response to the slaying of four Kent State students by the Ohio National Guard on May 4, 1970. Four million students had gone on strike nationally there to protest U.S. President Richard Nixon's decision to bomb Cambodia despite his campaign promises not to take the war into neighboring countries. However, once it became clear that the incursion into Cambodia was not going to lead to escalation of the Vietnam War, such massive student protests evaporated.

In fact, after 1970, the anti-war movement more broadly was losing steam for a number of reasons. First, President Richard Nixon introduced a policy of "Vietnamization," steadily replacing U.S. troops with South Vietnamese forces. Vietnamization reduced American casualties and draft calls, as well as lessened the prominence of the "war issue" in national politics. Second, Nixon instituted the lottery in 1969, which, by eliminating college deferments and assigning young males a number based upon their birth dates, reduced student anxiety. With lowered troop levels in Vietnam, students knew that they were not going to be drafted if they were among the four-fifths of youths who had a lottery number higher than 80. The 1970 Cambodian incursion had re-ignited student fears of military escalation of the war, but only briefly.

The anti-war movement of the 1960s and early 1970s demonstrated one area of great strength: the ability to recruit America's best educated and most prosperous. Many such recruits found (or would find) employment in the nation's "culture"-making professions, exercising enormous influence within the news and popular

media, advertising, and universities. Given their education and sources of employment, such activists had their opinions amplified more loudly than their actual numbers justified.

Paradoxically, however, the very strength of the anti-war movement proved to be its greatest weakness in the electoral arena. Working-class whites and southerners resented seeing "their" party taken over by a "cultural elite" that, they believed, held patriotism and moral conservatism in contempt. No Democrat could expect to gain entry into the White House without distancing him or herself in the general election from the protest movements of the 1960s. At the same time, no Democrat seeking the presidency could win bi-coastal primaries without appealing to the activist voter base that came out of the anti-war and women's liberation movements of the 1960s.

The cultural legacies of the anti-war movement and 1960s protest were just as complicated and profound as their political legacies. For instance, while the radical campus tide receded after 1970, student support for lifestyle liberation remained high. A 1972 Minnesota poll of students showed that 62 percent did not believe state governments should criminalize gay intercourse. Sixty-five percent of the public thought otherwise. In 1973, a Gallup Poll reported that 34 percent of youths supported the legalization of marijuana, compared to 7 percent of their elders. Other surveys concluded that by 1972 half of America's youths between 18 and 25 had smoked dope, compared to just 4 percent in the early 1960s. College students helped drive those numbers upward, with 70 percent of students at the University of Kansas having smoked marijuana.

CARL DAVIDSON, *The New Radicals and the Multiversity* (1966)

Carl Davidson, a Penn State graduate and son of an auto mechanic, attained the vice presidency of the Students for a Democratic Society on the basis of this 1966 exhortation for increased anti-war militancy in the nation's Heartland. In 1967, campuses outside the elite institutions of the East and West coasts heeded Davidson's call to disrupt violently, if necessary, the efforts of Dow Chemical representatives to recruit on campus.

Perhaps the single most important factor for the student power movement to keep in mind is the fact that the university is intimately bound up with the society in general. Because of this, we should always remember that we cannot liberate the university without radically changing the rest of society. The lesson to be drawn is

Source: Carl Davidson, "The New Radicals and the Multiversity," in Massimo Teodori, ed., *The New Left: A Documentary History*, Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1969, pp. 323-335.

that any attempt to build a student movement based on "on-campus" issues only is inherently conservative and ultimately reactionary. Every attempt should be made to connect campus issues with off-campus questions. For example, the question of ranking and university complicity with the Selective Service System needs to be tied to a general anti-draft and "No Draft for Vietnam" movement. The question of the presence of the military on the campus in all its forms needs to be tied to the question of what that military is used for—fighting aggressive wars of oppression abroad—and not just to the question of secret research being poor academic policy. Furthermore, the student movement must actively seek to join off-campus struggles in the surrounding community. For example, strikes by local unions should be supported if possible. This kind of communication and understanding with the local working class is essential if we are ever going to have community support for student strikes.

If there is a single over-all purpose for the student power movement, it would be the development of a radical political consciousness among those students who will later hold jobs in strategic sectors of the political economy. This means that we should reach out to engineers and technical students rather than to business administration majors, education majors rather than to art students. From a national perspective, this strategy would also suggest that we should place priorities on organizing in certain kinds of universities—the community colleges, junior colleges, state universities, and technical schools, rather than religious colleges or the Ivy League.

CARL OGLESBY, *Trapped in a System* (1965)

The son of a southern-born tire worker and one-time Kent State student, Carl Oglesby ascended to the presidency of the Students for a Democratic Society. At this anti-war rally in the fall of 1965, Oglesby argued that the Vietnam conflict was more than a misguided product of President Lyndon Johnson's administration. Rather, the fundamental problem was a Cold War Democratic Party that had stifled revolutionary movements since the presidency of Harry Truman and which differed little from the equally anti-communist Republican Party.

Seven months ago at the April March on Washington, Paul Potter, then President of Students for a Democratic Society, stood in approximately this spot and said that we must name the system that creates and sustains the war in Vietnam—name it. Describe it, analyze it, understand it, and change it. Today I will try to name it—to suggest an analysis which, to be quite frank, may disturb some of you—and to suggest what changing it may require of us.

Source: Carl Oglesby, "Trapped in a System," in Massimo Teodori, ed., *The New Left: A Documentary History*, Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1969, pp. 182-188.

We are here again to protest again a growing war. Since it is a very bad war, we acquire the habit of thinking that it must be caused by very bad men. But we only conceal reality, I think, by denouncing on such grounds the menacing coalition of industrial and military power, or the brutality of the blitzkrieg we are waging against Vietnam, or the ominous signs around us that heresy may soon no longer be permitted. We must simply observe, and quite plainly say that this coalition, this blitzkrieg, and this demand for acquiescence are creatures, all of them, of a Government that since 1932 has considered itself to be fundamentally *liberal*. The original commitment in Vietnam was made by President Truman, a mainstream liberal. It was seconded by President Eisenhower, a moderate liberal. It was intensified by the late President Kennedy, a flaming liberal. . . . They are not moral monsters. They are all honorable men. They are all liberals.

But so, I'm sure, are many of us who are here today in protest. To understand the war, then, it seems necessary to take a closer look at this American Liberalism. Maybe we are in for some surprises. Maybe we have here two quite different Liberalisms: one authentically humanist; the other not so human at all. Not long ago, I considered myself a liberal. And if someone had asked me what I meant by that, I'd perhaps have quoted Thomas Jefferson or Thomas Paine, who first made plain our nation's unprovisional commitment to human rights. But what do you think would happen if these two heroes could sit down now for a chat with President Johnson and McGeorge Bundy? They would surely talk of the Vietnam war. Our dead revolutionaries would soon wonder why their country was fighting against what appeared to be a revolution. The living liberals would hotly deny that it is one: there are troops coming in from outside, the rebels get arms from other countries, most of the people are not on their side, and they practice terror against their own. Therefore, *not a* revolution. What would our dead revolutionaries answer? They might say: What fools and bandits, sirs, you make then of us. Outside help?

Do you remember Lafayette? Or the 3,000 British freighters the French navy sunk for our side? Or the arms and men we got from France and Spain? And what's this about terror? Did you never hear what we did to our own loyalists? Or about the thousands of rich American Tories who fled for their lives to Canada? And as for popular support, do you not know that we had less than one-third of our people with us? That, in fact, the colony of New York recruited more troops for the British than for the revolution? Should we give it all back?

Revolutions do not take place in velvet boxes. They never have. It is only the poets who make them lovely. What the National Liberation Front is fighting in Vietnam is a complex and vicious war. This war is also a revolution, as honest a revolution as you can find anywhere in history. . . . But it doesn't make any difference to our leaders anyway. Their aim in Vietnam is really much simpler than this implies. It is to safeguard what they take to the American interests around the world against revolution or revolutionary change, which they always call Communism—as if that were that. . . .

Can we understand why the Negroes of Watts rebelled? Then why do we need a devil theory to explain the rebellion of the South Vietnamese? Can we understand the oppression in Mississippi? Or the anguish that our Northern ghettos make epidemic? Then why can't we see that our proper human struggle is not with Communism or revolutionaries, but with the social desperation that drives good men to violence, both here and abroad?

ROBERT F. KENNEDY, *What Can the Young Believe?* (1967)

The brother of slain Democratic president John Kennedy, and a former U.S. Attorney General, Robert Kennedy grew increasingly disturbed by mounting casualties from Vietnam, as well as escalating campus and urban unrest and broke with President Lyndon Johnson in 1967. Weighing the feasibility of challenging Johnson in the 1968 Democratic presidential primaries, Kennedy sought support from the Americans for Democratic Action, an organization born in 1947 of the Cold War that, like the New York senator, was revising its commitment to communist containment.

More and more of our children are almost unreachable by the familiar premises and arguments of our adult world . . . What are they dissenting from—and what do they tell us about ourselves? They begin, of course, with the war in Vietnam. We are not talking about all our young people; after all, Vietnam is a young man's war. The men who fight and die there, with bravery and endurance equal to any in our history, are young. There are others, as I have seen on many campuses, who are in favor of escalation . . . But when a hundred student body presidents and editors of college newspapers; hundreds of former Peace Corps volunteers; dozens of present Rhodes scholars question the basic premises of the war, they should not and cannot be ignored.

These students oppose the war for the brutality and the horror of all wars, and for the particular terror of this one. But for our young people, I suspect, Vietnam is a shock as it cannot be to us. They did not know World War II, or even Korea. And this is a war surrounded by rhetoric they do not understand or accept; these are the children not of the cold war, but of the thaw. Their memories of communism are not of Stalin's purges and death camps, not even the terrible revelations of the Twentieth Party Congress, or the streets of Hungary. They see the world as one in which communist states can be each others' deadliest enemies or even friends of the West, in which communism is certainly no better, but perhaps no worse, than many other evil and repressive dictatorships all around the world—with which we conclude alliances when that is felt to be in our interest.

Even as the declared foreign policy of our government is to "build bridges" to this new communist world, they see us, in the name of anti-communism, devastating the land of those we call our friends. However the war may seem to us, they see it as one in which the largest and most powerful nation on earth is killing children (they do not care if accidentally) in a remote and insignificant land.

We speak of past commitments, of the burden of past mistakes; and they ask why they should now atone for mistakes made before many of them were born, before almost any could vote. They see us spend billions on armaments while poverty and ignorance continue at home; they see us willing to fight a war for freedom in Vietnam, but unwilling to fight with one-hundredth the money or force or effort to

Source: Robert F. Kennedy, "What Can the Young Believe?" *The New Republic*, March 11, 1967: 11–12.

secure freedom in Mississippi or Alabama or the ghettos of the North. And they see, perhaps most disturbing of all, that they are remote from the decisions of policy; that they themselves frequently do not, by the nature of our political system, share in the power of choice on great questions shaping their lives. . . .

It is not enough to understand, or to see clearly. Whatever their differences with us, whatever the depth of their dissent, it is vital—for us as much as for them—that our young feel that change is possible; that they will be heard; that the cruelties and follies and injustices of the world will yield, however grudgingly, to the sweat and sacrifice they are so ready to give. If we cannot help open to them this sense of possibility, we will have only ourselves to blame for the disillusionment that will surely come. And more than disillusionment, danger; for we rely on these young people more than we know: not just in the Peace Corps, though the Peace Corps has done more for our position around the world than all our armed forces and foreign aid; not just in civil rights, though our youth have done more toward a solution of that problem than all the power and panoply of government; we rely on our youth for all our hopes of a better future—and thus, in a real and direct sense, for the very meaning of our own lives.

JANE FONDA, *Broadcast Over Radio Hanoi to American Servicemen Involved in the Indochina War (1972)*

Movie star Jane Fonda made national and international headlines during the Vietnam War when she travelled to North Vietnam and spoke out against the U.S. military presence there. Although the anti-war movement came to see Fonda as a hero, she became one of the most reviled of all celebrities by much of mainstream America as well as U.S. military.

This is Jane Fonda. During my two week visit in the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, I've had the opportunity to visit a great many places and speak to a large number of people from all walks of life—workers, peasants, students, artists and dancers, historians, journalists, film actresses, soldiers, militia girls, members of the women's union, writers.

I visited the (Dam Xuac) agricultural co-op, where the silk worms are also raised and thread is made. I visited a textile factory, a kindergarten in Hanoi. The beautiful Temple of Literature was where I saw traditional dances and heard songs of resistance. I also saw unforgettable ballet about the guerrillas training bees in the south to attack enemy soldiers. The bees were danced by women, and they did their job well.

Source: Jane Fonda. "Broadcast Over Radio Hanoi to American Servicemen Involved in the Indochina War," August 22, 1972.—The following was submitted in the U.S. Congress House Committee on Internal Security, Travel to Hostile Areas. [HR16742, 19–25 September 1972, p. 761]

In the shadow of the Temple of Literature I saw Vietnamese actors and actresses perform the second act of Arthur Miller's play *All My Sons*, and this was very moving to me—the fact that artists here are translating and performing American plays while US imperialists are bombing their country. . . .

It was on the road back from Nam Dinh, where I had witnessed the systematic destruction of civilian targets—schools, hospitals, pagodas, the factories, houses, and the dike system. . . . One thing that I have learned beyond a shadow of a doubt since I've been in this country is that Nixon will never be able to break the spirit of these people; he'll never be able to turn Vietnam, north and south, into a neo-colony of the United States by bombing, by invading, by attacking in any way . . . every bomb that is dropped only strengthens their determination to resist.

I've spoken to many peasants who talked about the days when their parents had to sell themselves to landlords as virtually slaves, when there were very few schools and much illiteracy, inadequate medical care, when they were not masters of their own lives.

But now, despite the bombs, despite the crimes being created—being committed against them by Richard Nixon, these people own their own land, build their own schools—the children learning, literacy—illiteracy is being wiped out, there is no more prostitution as there was during the time when this was a French colony. In other words, the people have taken power into their own hands, and they are controlling their own lives.

And after 4,000 years of struggling against nature and foreign invaders—and the last 25 years, prior to the revolution, of struggling against French colonialism—I don't think that the people of Vietnam are about to compromise in any way, shape or form about the freedom and independence of their country, and I think Richard Nixon would do well to read Vietnamese history, particularly their poetry, and particularly the poetry written by Ho Chi Minh.

UNITED WOMEN'S CONTINGENT, *March on Washington Against the War (1971)*

The longer that the Vietnam War continued, more and more women became involved in the anti-war movement. The following is a flyer that calls for a massive women's march against the war. This march was endorsed by politically radical and liberal women alike.

On April 24, peaceful, massive demonstrations for immediate withdrawal will take place in Washington, DC and San Francisco. Women—from campuses, Black, Puerto Rican, Chicano and Asian-American groups, trade unions, religious groups,

Source: Flyer. United Women's Contingent: March on Washington Against the War, April 24, Documents from the Women's Liberation Movement. An Online Archival Collection Special Collections Library, Duke University. <http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/wlm/united/>.

the women's liberation movement—will join together and march as a united women's contingent. Last August 26th, the 50th anniversary of women's suffrage, tens of thousands of women poured into the streets to demonstrate for our right to control our lives. On April 24th, we will take the strength of women, which we showed to the world last August, and link up with all other people who say this war must end now.

... There are many reasons why it is essential that we relate to the April 24 demonstrations as women. First, women have played a leading role in the antiwar movement since the first teach-ins and demonstrations. Yet the press and media imply that the antiwar movement is led entirely by men. This is a misconception that must be corrected. We have participated in and been key organizers of every antiwar march, just as we have been perhaps the most effective force in every movement for social change, in the history of the world. . . .

Women in this country are challenging the right of the U.S. government to wage a war of slaughter and destruction in Indochina while it denies the needs of women at home. One million children are left uncared for, while their mothers work, because there are no child care facilities. Seven thousand women die every year of illegal abortions. Millions of dollars of profit is made every year by paying women less than men in the exact same job. Thousands of women are shut out of higher education because there's not enough money to provide scholarships and loans. We are told that there is no money for child-care centers or for abortion services; that the economy cannot meet the demands of women for equal and decent jobs; that high schools and universities cannot provide equal education for women. All this while Nixon spends billions of dollars on bombs, B-52s and "Vietnamization."

... Recent polls show that 78% of the women in this country want an end to the war. We must galvanize that antiwar sentiment into mass participation of women to activate them into the planning and participation in them demonstrations. The action of our sisters around demands for the control of our own lives, combined with our outrage at the latest action of the U.S. government in Southeast Asia, indicate the potential for the largest participation of women ever, in the April 24th demonstrations. . . .

PARTIAL LIST OF N.Y. ENDORSERS OF THE UNITED WOMEN'S CONTINGENT (Organizations listed for identification purposes only) MYRNA LAMB playwright; BARBARA LOVE Gay Liberation Front; MAE MASSIE Civil Rights Director for IUE; SUSAN MILLER Episcopal Peace Fellowship; WOMEN'S STRIKE COALITION; KATE MILLETT feminist writer; LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY WOMEN'S LIBERATION FRONT; PAULINE ROSEN Women Strike for Peace; BARBARA DANE folksinger; GLORIA STEINEM feminist writer; BETTY FRIEDAN feminist writer; QUEENS COLLEGE WOMEN'S LIBERATION; COLUMBIA WOMEN'S LIBERATION; N.Y.U. WOMEN'S LIBERATION; HOFSTRA WOMEN'S LIBERATION; RENEE BLAKKAN Guardian; MYRNA BURKHOLDER Women In City Gov't; RUTH GAGE-COLBY Women's Int'l League for Peace & Freedom; ELIZABETH FISHER; APHRA writer; DORIS L. SASSOWER Professional Women's Caucus; DOROTHY ELDRIDGE N.J. SANE; SARAH DOELY Church Women United; LUCILLE IVERSON Radical Feminists; CLARA DE MIHA Jeanette Rankin Brigade Rank and File—and others.

9

The Asian American Movement

—DARYL J. MAEDA

The Asian American movement emerged from the political ferment of the late 1960s and was formed when Asians of various ethnicities in the United States banded together to fight for racial justice. Although Asians had been in the United States in large numbers since the mid-1800s, they had not previously formed strong interethnic coalitions; instead, various Asian nationalisms had divided Asians in the United States, and the few multiethnic alliances they did form were fleeting. Because of numerous bans on Asian immigration enacted from 1875 through 1934, by the mid-1960s the majority of Asian Americans were native-born citizens and most Asian American youth spoke English and were immersed in American popular culture. Some Asian Americans were drawn into the social movements of the 1960s—including the civil rights, Black Power, and anti-Vietnam War movements—and many others became convinced that fundamental changes were necessary to achieve justice for Asians and other people in the United States and abroad.

The Asian American movement was a loosely organized coalition of groups and individuals spanning the nation, with epicenters in major cities on the coasts and in college towns. It addressed issues including education, housing, healthcare, workers rights, culture, and the war. Three points distinguished the movement from previous modes of politics among Asian Americans: first, it pulled together Asians of various ethnicities by arguing that Asians, regardless of ethnicity or national origin, shared common experiences of racism in the United States; second, it sought to build alliances between Asian Americans and other people of color in the United States; and third, it conceptualized the linkage between Asians in the United States to those in Asia as one of a shared relationship to U.S. imperialism rather than common biology or culture.