but *composed only of socialists* with no other object than the establishment of a society based upon the common right of access to all the wealth that is in and on the earth by all mankind. This is what really distinguishes us from all other professedly socialist organizations.

Has it all been in vain, then? Have our efforts of fifty years been wasted? Despite the seeming lack of interest in the masses for the introduction of a new and higher type of social system, we feel that our struggles have certainly not been wasted. If only because the history of the last fifty years has proved our case conclusively; that capitalism has floundered through depressions, recessions, strikes, lockouts, riots and wars and that these evils are inherent to capitalism and cannot be remedied within capitalism; if only for this, the fact that we are still intact and are still stating the socialist case, was our first fifty years worthwhile. History has confirmed our position and has demonstrated clearly that the allocation of limited time and even more-limited resources (by socialists) to anything short of the struggle for a classless, wageless, moneyless society is to engage in chasing rainbows and tilting at windmills.

HARMO

THE W. S. P. AND THE WAR IN VIETNAM

The participants in the interview were Dave MacNeil of WCRB and Harry Morrison of the World Socialist Party. The complete interview appears in The Western Socialist, No. 2-1965. It is a statement of our attitude to war, in general, as well as the war in Vietnam.

Q: Perhaps tonight we should deal with the attitude of the World Socialist Party to the question of war, in general, and the war in South Vietnam, in particular.

A: Well, war is always a timely topic because I don't remember a time in my lifetime when there wasn't war going on someplace in the world and this embraces a period of a good half century. Among the many things I've noticed about wars is the fact they all seem to be justified by all sides concerned on the basis of fighting for truth, honor, religion, and the protection of one's womanhood. The guilty nation or nations are always those we are fighting against, and vice-versa. In other words, no nation seems ever to have started a war if we are to go by the propaganda of all nations. And another thing I've noticed is that Christians always seem to be fighting against Christians; Moslems against Moslems; Buddhists against Buddhists and so on. Furthermore, Democracies are frequently allied with Dictatorships and so-called Communist nations ally themselves with avowedly Capitalist governments to fight against other Communist-Capitalist alliances. It must be pretty confusing for those who believe the propaganda but who try to reason it through.

Q. Yes, it does get confusing, but what do you have to say about the business of the war in Vietnam? Is the World Socialist Party in favor of having our government negotiate a settlement with the Communists? You know that there's quite a debate going on now on that subject and all political factions seem to be found on the different sides of the argument.

A: That's a good question because we are going to be able to bring out our differences with all other organizations — no matter what they happen to call themselves. But I'd like to point out, first, that there are two good legal reasons why America shouldn't be involved in the Vietnamese war. True, America is not the only breaker of the laws but this question deals with America and anyway, according to the general concept of law, the breaking of the rules by one party, does not constitute justification for doing the same by another party. The Geneva Convention of 1954 laid down rules on Vietnam. It banned military help from outside nations and it restricted military advisers from any country to a total of about 663. Almost from the very beginning America had thousands of soldiers fighting there on the Government side under the name of advisers and in the past year or so, particularly since early 1965, America has been calling a spade a spade, carrying on bombing raids against North Vietnamese and Laotian territory which were originally tagged "retaliatory" but which have recently been conducted without even that camouflage. But this is only one part of the illegality of American participation on this war. The United States Constitution makes war the province of Congress. There is supposed to be a declaration of war by Congress before America can become involved directly in a war. So American capitalism gets around this first by calling her soldiers, advisers, then by calling her action "retaliatory"; and finally by dropping all pretense while she drops her bombs. It is interesting to recall how shocked Americans were when the Fascist and Nazi and Bolshevik dictatorships did this sort of thing.

Q: So this means, then, that the World Socialist Party agrees with those who demand that America should begin negotiations immediately. And of course, as I have pointed out, you do have plenty of company there with all shades of political opinion represented.

A: Well, not exactly. Just because we call attention to the open violation of the law by America doesn't mean we find it necessary to instruct our capitalist rulers on proper procedure. It is *their* law they are violating. It is *their* nation, *their* system, and *their* war. Sure, most of the lives and limbs that are being lost are those of the working class and of Vietnamese peasants. But as long as capitalism exists there will be wars and the question of where they will be fought, when, and how, will always be determined by the capitalist governments whether so-called Free or so-called Red.

Q: But surely you must admit that there is an immediate and a pressing problem in South Vietnam. There are people being killed and the question seems to be whether it will be wiser to step-up the action—even against the threat of an all-out general nuclear war — with the object of improving American bargaining possibilities; keep on doing what we have been doing; or trying to negotiate right away and withdraw. How can you socialists feel that this is not a problem for you as well as for everybody else?

A: Well, what would *you* say is the reason that America is involved in that war in the first place?

Q: I would say that America is interested mainly in preventing the further spread of Communist control, that we are anxious that small countries shall be able to live in peace without fear of conquest by the Communists.

A: Well, certainly the official argument is that America seeks to protect South Vietnam from Communist rule, that "we" want to help the South Vietnamese to remain free. But the truth is that America is fighting a war with Red China, in particular, for control of the markets and sources of raw materials of Southeast Asia. Neither South Vietnam nor North Vietnam could exist as "free" nations with big power blocs like China, Russia, and America involved in a competition for world power. I would like to read from a recent article in our journal, The Western Socialist, on the subject of American foreign policy: "There is nothing within South Vietnam that is worth fighting about, but a glance at the map reveals its strategic value as a base of operations for the eastern trade; whoever controls it has the key to the entire ocean route from Japan and Korea down to Australia and New Zealand. This is a prize the big capitalist powers cannot afford to lose in their race for profits." (From an article entitled *"Our Foreign Policy"* in *WS-No.* 5, 1964.)