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The anti-Vietnam War movement in California

The war ain’t over . . . Ask somebody who fought it. The war ain’t over until you don’t have to live with it anymore.

Ron Kovic, in an interview by David Harris for Rolling Stone
David Harris
Our War
1996

Twenty-five years ago, on April 30, 1975, America ended its two-decade reign of terror in Vietnam. The reign exacted a dreadful toll on Southeast Asia, leaving three million dead (including one million civilians\(^1\)), four million wounded, “and ten million displaced from their homes. More than five million acres of forest and croplands were laid waste by eighteen million gallons of poisonous chemical herbicides. The U.S. military exploded more than fifteen million tons of bombs and ground munitions in a country less than half the size of the state of Texas.”\(^2\)

“There are other reminders of the costs of [what the Vietnamese call] the American War: continuing generations of babies born deformed because of the effects of the chemical defoliant Agent Orange and farmers and children who are killed and maimed by unexploded bombs and mines.”\(^3\)

In some ways, America did not fare much better. “From 1964 to 1972, the wealthiest and most powerful nation in the history of the world made a maximum military effort, with everything short of atomic bombs, to defeat a nationalist revolutionary movement in a tiny,

---

\(^1\) “Vietnam War” on Britannica DVD 99 (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1999).
peasant country—and failed.”

The cost of this massive failure was staggering. As the U.S. military machine butchered its way through Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, it expended nearly sixty thousand American lives, garnered 303,000 wounded, including 14,000 who were completely disabled and nearly half a million that suffered post traumatic stress syndrome. The war cost America probably $200 billion and generated vast social unrest. The cost to America’s collective psyche is incalculable.

This paper will recount a small part of the anti-Vietnam war movement in California. I will include a brief account of the development of the movement as a whole, but my primary focus is the movement as it developed and flourished in and around large metropolitan regions, such as the San Francisco Bay area and San Diego, where there is also a strong military presence. I will also discuss draft resistance and the GI antiwar movement in California, movements that, like the overall peace movement, grew as the body count in Vietnam climbed, and that, perhaps more than any other factor, helped end what was one of the most grisly chapters in the story of human evolution. Finally, I will consider whether “we’ve kicked the Vietnam syndrome once and for all,” as President Bush proclaimed triumphantly after the shooting-fish-in-a-barrel slaughter called the Gulf War.

During America’s reign in Southeast Asia, “there developed in the United States the greatest antiwar movement the nation had ever experienced . . . .” Indeed, the anti-Vietnam war movement became “the largest domestic opposition to a warring government in the history of modern industrial society” and “was perhaps the most successful antiwar movement in

---

history.” Moreover, because of its influence and deep roots in a long tradition of peace activism, “The . . . movement was at once a product of history and a process that made history.”

The anti-Vietnam War movement was an outgrowth of the overall peace movement. The peace movement was made up of members from pacifist groups such as Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom and the War Resisters League; religious groups such as the Quaker American Friends Service Committee; civil rights groups such as the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee; disarmament groups such as Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; Old Left groups such as the Communist Party (the Stalinists), the Socialist Workers Party (the Trotskyites) and the Socialist Party (the Social Democrats); and student-campus groups such as the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS).

The peace movement (and all antiwar movements thereafter) adopted an enduring icon, the peace symbol, “designed in 1958 by the (British) Direct Action Committee Against Nuclear War; it represented the semaphore signals for N and D: nuclear disarmament.” The symbol was prominently displayed at the April 1963 Easter Peace Walk at the UN Plaza in New York, organized to support the nuclear test ban treaty. Some marchers at that walk also carried signs protesting the U.S. presence in Vietnam, which may have been the first public denunciation in America of a war that had already been raging for eighteen years.

The anti-Vietnam War movement, a loose but at times extensive association of organizations and individuals, “involved only a few dozen organizations in 1960, over twelve hundred a

---

10 Tom Wells, The War Within, 579.
11 Charles DeBenedetti, An American Ordeal, 2.
13 Ibid., 8.
The movement grew and flourished because of the passions and commitments of millions of supporters. Moreover, movement members were educated about the history of Vietnam and the U.S. role in it, and students were very knowledgeable about their universities’ complicity in carrying out research to aid the war machine. Moreover, although the movement waxed and waned, reflecting U.S. government lies and escalating terrorism in Vietnam, core members cared deeply about both America and Vietnam, and many were willing to put themselves in the line of fire of criticism, physical assault, and police and military savagery.

The “Port Huron Statement of the Students for a Democratic Society” is a seminal document generally recognized as one of the foundations of the anti-Vietnam War movement. The Statement, prepared in 1962 in Michigan on the shores of Lake Huron, was authored primarily by future California Senator Tom Hayden and Robert Haber, at that time young college students “attempting to develop an entirely new ideology for what was to become the New Left movement.” Although the Port Huron Statement only mentions “the Vietnams” once—as nations that should be granted sovereignty and admission to the United Nations—it was a call for political activism and advocated a “participatory democracy” in which an informed citizenry rules itself.

The “Freedom Rides” and non-violent tactics of the Civil Rights Movement informed the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), which played a major role in antiwar activities throughout the sixties. However, it was the Free Speech Movement (FSM) at the University of California at Berkeley that first empowered many in the antiwar movement. The FSM exploded in the fall of 1964 when U.C. Berkeley officials banned on-campus tables used for political
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education and solicitation of funds for off-campus political causes such as civil rights initiatives. “Using tactics borrowed from the civil rights movement, the students disrupted the university, which, in turn, called out the campus police. More students became involved; protest escalated; off-campus police were called; mass arrests led to a student strike.”

Eventually, the FSM was successful in forcing U.C. Berkeley to reverse its ban.

“The students at Berkeley were the first students of the sixties to commit civil disobedience against their own university. . . . [This] established the pattern for direct action that would characterize student protest throughout the nation for much of the decade. The emotional impact of Berkeley on students nationwide was electrifying. Students realized, probably for the first time, that they had power, and that power could make a difference.”

The FSM had such impact that the President’s Commission on Campus Unrest (the Scranton Commission), reporting to President Nixon on student upheaval in 1970, called this pattern, or scenario, “the Berkeley invention”: a relatively small number of student activists began a protest over one or more issues involving matters beyond the university (civil rights, disarmament, etc.). . . . The most distinctive aspect of the Berkeley invention, reported the commission, was that the “high spirits and defiance of authority that had characterized the traditional school riot were now joined to youthful idealism and to social objectives of the highest importance. This combination moved the participants to intense feeling and vigorous political activism and provoked from state or university officials reactions and overreactions that promised to keep the movement alive.”

The FSM was instrumental in establishing California as a strategic locale in the overall antiwar movement. Many national organizations based in Washington, D.C.—New Mobilization
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Committee to End the War in Vietnam, National Peace Action Coalition, National Coalition Against War, Racism and Repression, for example—had representatives, coordinators, and steering-committee members in California, as evidenced by the letters the organizations mailed out to its West Coast members. Much of the literature coming from Washington mentioned San Francisco as one of the major areas for demonstrations. Moreover, major broadcast and print media covered antiwar demonstrations in Berkeley, Oakland and San Francisco. Although media editors focused on the scattered violence at the demonstrations and often considered certain demonstrations unworthy of coverage because no violence was expected, media coverage of antiwar activism—although initially biased in favor of official government policy—was essential. 20 “Demonstrations are used to popularize organizations and their ideas, raise money, extend membership potential, offer psychic rewards to participants, and send a message to the government. Few of these goals can be accomplished without adequate . . . coverage by the media, especially television.” 21

The “teach-in” was an early and temporary means of mobilizing antiwar sentiment. In response to Operation Rolling Thunder, the sustained rather than isolated bombing of North Vietnam, forty-nine faculty members of the University of Michigan organized an event that included “lectures, rallies, seminars, movies, and folksinging lessons.” 22 At U.C. Berkeley, mathematics professor Stephen Smale “organized a small anti-war march to coincide with [that] first teach-in at the University of Michigan in March 1965.” 23 The teach-in caught on and spread to more than a hundred campuses. “The grandest of the teach-ins” occurred at U.C. Berkeley on

21 Ibid., 18.
May 21-22, 1965, where an event called Vietnam Day lasted thirty-six hours and drew thirty thousand people.\(^24\)

The Berkeley teach-in was the birthplace of Vietnam Day Committee (VDC), headed by undergraduate student Jerry Rubin and Smale. On a VDC flyer advertising a May 21, 1966 protest at U.C. Berkeley, we read about some of the goals of the VDC, representative of many of the goals of the antiwar movement in general:

\>

For a year the Vietnam Day Committee has played a part in bringing national and international attention to American intervention in Vietnam. We have been engaged in building a movement to protest the American attitude of suppressing instead of encouraging national movements for self-determination. . .

This protest meeting was conceived of as a way to deepen the understanding of those of us who are opposed to the war, and as a way of continuing to show that the American people have not consented to this war. The anti-war movement in the United States has been given the task of saving the honor of the American people. If we are silent now, we are giving our consent, and sharing the guilt.\(^25\)

VDC was a considerable force in antiwar activities during 1965, building support for a nationwide movement, proselytizing its antiwar ideology through flyers and letters, and organizing major demonstrations to oppose the draft, stop busses of inductees from reaching the Oakland Induction Center, disrupt embarkation of troops from the Oakland Army Terminal, and prevent troop trains from arriving at the Santa Fe Station in Berkeley.


\(^25\) “WHY ARE WE DEMONSTRATING?” VDC flyer, 1966 (Social Protest Collection, Bancroft Library, box 2, folder 2:18a).
The VDC “STOP THE TROOP TRAIN” demonstration on August 12, 1965 was one designed to disrupt trains bringing troops to the Santa Fe Station in Berkeley before embarking to Vietnam via the Oakland Army Terminal. VDC stated on the flyer promoting the demonstration that “We are not demonstrating against the soldiers. We consider the soldiers to be our brothers—brothers who have been conscripted against their will and forced to kill by a government which has forgotten how to tell the truth. We want to stop the war machine and tell the soldiers what is really going on in Vietnam.”

Although demonstrations of this type were unsuccessful in stopping the trains or changing the minds of most soldiers, they did generate publicity, which was important. In fact, VDC generated so much publicity that Ronald Reagan, in a speech at the Cow palace in 1966, tied the FSM and “activities of the Vietnam Day Committee” to a “report of the Senate Subcommittee on UnAmerican Activities” charging that U.C. Berkeley “has become a rallying point for Communists and a center of sexual misconduct.”

VDC organized International Days of Protest for October 15 and 16, 1965, which was the largest national protest to date. In Berkeley, “After a campus teach-in during the evening of
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26 “STOP THE TROOP TRAIN” VDC flyer, 1965 (Social Protest Collection, Bancroft Library, box 2, folder 2:18a).
October 15, as many as fifteen thousand young people began to walk to [the Oakland Army Terminal] where four hundred riot police awaited them.” The march ended peacefully with the protesters turning back, but “the next afternoon, about five thousand youthful demonstrators attempted the same march only to be met again by Oakland police and this time, by marauding Hell’s Angels as well. The later waded into the crowd producing scores of injuries and arrests” and telling the protesters to “go back to Russia, you fucking Communists.” The war at home was heating up as much as the war in Vietnam.

David Harris, a California native and then a nineteen-year old student at Stanford University, recounts another march a few weeks after the International Days of Protest.

... we marched to the [Oakland] border, where a line of Oakland police were waiting in riot gear, and held a rally on the Berkeley side, where we were watched by the combined Oakland and Berkeley police, plus a delegation of Alameda County Sheriff’s deputies. Perhaps five thousand people attended, not counting cops, and some two hundred of those had driven up from Stanford, about equal parts students and faculty.

Harris participated in the Civil Rights Movement in Mississippi in 1964, but the march he describes above was his first protest against the war in Vietnam. Like many activists, his activism was just beginning. “A decade of demonstrations followed: in front of federal buildings and outside napalm plants, induction centers, military bases, defense laboratories, troop depots, boot camps, airport gates, university auditoriums, think-tank campuses, assorted courthouses both state and federal, and both the Pentagon and the White House.”

In the fall of 1966, when he was student body president at Stanford, Harris wrote to his local draft board refusing to carry his draft cards and refusing to obey any of their orders. He

28 Melvin Small, Covering Dissent, 48.
31 Ibid., 49.
eventually paid for his draft resistance in 1969 by having to leave his pregnant wife, Joan Baez, to spend two years in federal prison.

Although white males dominated the antiwar movement, women did participate. For example, the Women’s March Committee and VDC advertised “Women: March Against the War,” an all-woman march to the Oakland Induction Center on Feb. 23, 1966. “As women who are deeply concerned about the illegal and immoral war in Vietnam, we demand: that the United States Government bring our husbands, sons, and brothers home now. That our government recognize and negotiate with the National Liberation Front for the withdrawal of U.S. troops. Self-determination for the Vietnamese people.”

Women Strike for Peace (WSP) members were very active and important in the antiwar Movement in California. One member stated: “We know that we are effective because we can see it; we often escort young men directly from the buses to Draft Help to be counseled before they enter the [Oakland] induction center—this in spite of the attempt by induction officials to herd them quickly into the building. We are often thanked for being there.” The Berkeley-Oakland WSP, in a pamphlet pointing out the race and class inequalities of the Selective Service System, stated that a typical Vietnam draftee is “young, often working-class, often black; while his board . . . is overwhelmingly old, middle-class and white.” The WSP also helped the LA GI Civil Liberties Defense Committee with financial contributions to fund GI resistance work. The LA WSP “filed suit against the Selective Service Director Lewis Hershey and California educational authorities for failing to provide information about draft law alternatives in the high schools, as mandated by Selective Service regulations.”

---

VDC died out due to internal strife, but not before being one of the main subjects of a Grand Jury report in the County of Alameda. The report detailed the large number of criminal prosecutions, a series of arrests, and many demonstrations requiring police supervision, which have been directly related to activities on the Berkeley Campus of the University of California and which have had a profound impact upon Alameda County government. This impact has been reflected in added court costs and congestion, extensive costs to County and local police agencies, and numerous police operations which have resulted in the dilution of the services otherwise available for local community protection.34

The report also recommended that U.C. Berkeley “consistently and firmly enforce all University regulations” and “take appropriate disciplinary measures” in order to maintain “law and order on the Campus”; forbid “the use of University facilities for unlawful off-campus action”; “extend full cooperation to local authorities in the investigation and/or prosecution of criminal cases which originate on the Campus”; “provide for the reimbursement of county and city government when conditions on or related to the University Campus require extraordinary law enforcement or other local government services”; and work with the State Legislature to “enact new legislation to improve University control over outsiders coming on and/or using University property and facilities for purposes unrelated to the educational goals and functions of the University.”35

The Grand Jury report lists the costs to the Berkeley and Oakland Police Departments and the Alameda Sheriff’s Department for the FSM and VDC protests in 1964 and 1965 as $137,554.07. Of course, these costs were a pittance compared to the billions spent in Vietnam on a war that was every bit as illegal and vastly more destructive than the demonstrations at home by those who opposed it.

35 Ibid., 143.
Many individuals and organizations carried on the struggle after VDC dissolved, and many were very active in trying to disrupt the busses bringing in new inductees to the Oakland Induction Center, second largest in the nation. Mark Allen Kleiman “had been organizing around draft issues for a year and a half in Berkeley, organizing antidraft demonstrations, doing draft counseling, [and] having almost daily demonstrations at the Oakland induction center,” an example of how much time and effort some were willing to invest in trying to stop the war.\(^{36}\)

In the early years of the anti-Vietnam War movement, protesters were usually orderly, well dressed, and well-groomed middle-class individuals and students who often wanted to work within the system to end the war. In California, “[t]he January 1967 human be-in in San Francisco’s Golden Gate Park made a purposeful attempt to link Berkeley [antiwar] activists with counterculture enthusiasts.” Although the more conservative elements of the antiwar movement thought this link would alienate the middle-class protesters who gave the movement credibility, the link greatly increased the numbers of young people involved in the movement. As the Harris polls revealed, the number of college students identifying themselves as “radical or far left” nearly tripled from 1968 to 1970, increasing from 4 to 11 percent, to about 770,000 students.\(^{37}\)

“On April 15, 1967, the national Spring Mobilization to End the War in Vietnam . . . [was] a tremendous success”\(^{38}\) during which “marchers overflowed from the sixty-five thousand seats in Kezar Stadium into Golden Gate Park,” helping make the event “the largest

---


demonstration of its kind in American history.” The San Francisco Spring “Mobe,” as it was called, was typical of many of the larger antiwar events, incorporating a march, a “peace fair,” performances by major music groups—folksinger Judy Collins, Big Brother and the Holding Company, The Quicksilver Messenger Service, and Country Joe and the Fish—and talks by celebrities such as Robert Vaughan (star of “Man from Uncle), Mrs. Martin Luther King, Eldridge Cleaver, David Harris, and Georgia State Legislator Julian Bond. The list of sponsors on the brochure promoting the Mobe included people like Harry Belafonte, Stokeley Carmichael, Noam Chomsky, Allan Ginsberg, Linus and Ava Pauling, Dr. Benjamin Spock, and Howard Zinn.

During early 1967, David Harris organized a group called The Resistance to oppose the Selective Service System. The name was a nod to the resistance to fascism in World War II, fascism that many observed was creeping into America. Members of The Resistance organized a Resist the Draft day for October 16, 1967 during which they and others would “publicly and collectively return their draft cards to the Federal Government at the Federal Building” in San Francisco. During the rally, about four hundred young men turned in their draft cards. The Resistance was therefore contributing “to a grass-roots movement of more than half a million young men who violated various Selective Service laws.” The Resistance, however, felt that draft resisters who made a point to return draft cards (not burn them), “pledge to refuse induction, stay in this country, stand trial, and go to prison,” would have more of an effect than the draft evaders.

41 Tom Wells, The War Within, 269.
“Stop the Draft Week” (STDW) was one of the most violent of the West Coast antiwar demonstrations, occurring the week of October 16, 1967. Organizational meetings were held to “prepare those considering non-violent civil disobedience,” and some protesters expected to be arrested for “non-violent sit-ins at the doors of the [Oakland Induction] Center.” The goal of STDW was to shut down the Oakland Induction Center “where, for the first time, armed troops and riot-control police wreaked havoc on active nonviolence.” On “Tuesday morning—Bloody Tuesday, as it came to be known—the police were waiting; they attacked the demonstrators with clubs and mace and dispersed them before midmorning. . . . [O]nlookers expressed shock at the degree of police violence, especially toward newsmen.” The violence “hospitalized over 20 people. . . . [O]n Friday, 10,000 protesters confronted 2,000 Bay Area policemen at the center, provoking a melee that spread violence over a twenty-block area of downtown Oakland.”

Members of STDW and the overall antiwar movement knew that federal and local governments provoked and even participated in much of the violence during STDW and other demonstrations. Such actions were designed to generate a bad image for the movement:

43 “STOP the DRAFT WEEK flyer, 1966 (Social Protest Collection, Bancroft Library, box 2, folder 2:8).
46 Charles DeBenedetti, An American Ordeal, 196.
It was the undercover agents, of course, who were the most “militant” of our group. They proposed that we throw sharpened darts at the cops, and they supplied the base radio for our walkie-talkie operations. As many demonstration leaders have since learned, our opponents were not only club-wielding uniformed policemen, but their rock-throwing agents-provocateurs as well.47

Of course, violence against individuals and organizations of the antiwar movement was not limited to the police or the Hell’s Angels. In 1966, “On 6 March the San Francisco headquarters of the Du Bois Clubs was destroyed by at least ten sticks of dynamite. . . . In early April the VDC headquarters in Berkeley was demolished in a bomb explosion that injured four students.”48 This violence was probably a reaction by pro-war citizens or government agents or their hired thugs against what they saw as traitorous actions against official U.S. policy.

Stop The Draft Week was under investigation by an Alameda County Grand Jury concerned that local anti-war activists might engage in Watts-like violence. Succumbing to rumors circulating in government circles—rumors that may have been generated by FBI and other government agencies—Alameda County District Attorney Francis Coakley noted in a letter to the general counsel of U.C. Berkeley that “a report from the United States Senate Internal Security Committee indicated that the control of the anti-Vietnam war movement was in the hands of communists and other extremists.”49 This is the same Grand Jury that, on January 28,

47 Terence Cannon and Reese Erlich, “The Oakland Seven” in Ramparts, April 1969, 35.
48 Charles DeBenedetti, An American Ordeal, 152.
1969, indicted the Oakland Seven, a group of activists—Frank Bardacke, Terry Cannon, Reese Erlich, Steven Hamilton, Bob Mandel, Jeff Segal and Mike Smith—arrested during STDW protests. The indictment “specified ten acts which it alleged to have been performed in furtherance of the conspiracy.” The prosecution focused on the issue of protesters violating the rights of the federal government to run without interference a business—the induction center—and on the rights of citizens to drive freely on public streets.\(^{50}\)

Community support for the Oakland Seven took the form of organizations such as Stop the Draft Week Defense Fund and Stop the Draft Week Defense Committee. Such organizations generated much support for the men indicted, informing the public that “The indictment is part of the attempt by the government to intimidate and stop the anti-war movement . . . .”\(^{51}\)

During the trial, the Oakland Seven defense “maintained that the overt acts specified in the indictment were either rights exercised under the First Amendment or legitimate preparations for defense against police violence.”\(^{52}\) Two instructions to the jury proved crucial to the outcome: “One permitted the jury to take into account the beliefs of the defendants about the legality of the Vietnam war and of the Selective Service Act. The second instruction was to the effect that a


\(^{51}\) STOP THE DRAFT WEEK DEFENSE FUND flyer, 1968 (Social Protest Collection, Bancroft Library, box 2, folder 2:8).

person is not guilty of a crime if he acts under an honest, reasonable belief that what he is doing is legal.” The jury acquitted the defendants.

The trial of the Oakland Seven was the only trial of those selected for study in Law, Morality and Vietnam—which included the Cantonsville Nine, the Fort Hood Three, David Henry Mitchell III (who failed to appear for induction), and David John Miller (the first person indicted for burning a draft card)—in which all the defendants were acquitted. Interestingly, David Mitchell III did not refer to his actions as civil disobedience, preferring to call them “civil challenge,” a challenge taken up by many who refused to participate in a system of governance that broke its own laws in perpetrating hideous atrocities in Vietnam.

Some of the STDW organizers had visions of revolution dancing in their heads, but marching against armed, angry and often frightened law enforcement officers mostly resulted in chaos. However, even though antiwar protesters learned in Oakland that the soldiers of the state comprised an insurmountable obstacle, and non-violent or even armed revolution was a pipe dream in the face of so much power, many people carried on their protests hoping to circumvent that obstacle rather than confront it directly.

There was more violence in the antiwar movement after STDW, but the vast majority of activities were peaceful because of the commitment of the activists to non-violence. The May Day Tactical Manual includes a brief history of non-violence and mentions that “Cesar Chavez and the United Farmworkers Organizing Committee consistently broke injunctions and picketing laws as they organized California farm workers and used nonviolent civil disobedience including sit-ins and shop-ins to enforce the grape and now the lettuce boycott.” The manual also

---

describes the extensive organization and planning required and implemented for major
demonstrations.

Nationwide, “Almost one hundred antiwar vigils took place weekly during late 1967.”

Some of these activities targeted major corporations and universities profiting from the war.
Stanford University was targeted because of its ties to the defense industry through its Applied
Electronics Laboratory (AEL). In the Vol. 1, No. 1 issue of UNCLASSIFIED, Stanford students
addressed this link and stated their reasons for occupying the AEL:

We have chosen to occupy the Applied Electronics Laboratory . . . both because it is symbolic of campus
involvement in the military and because the research actually carried on there in the Systems Techniques
Laboratory (STL) is military research. That laboratory researches electronic warfare such as radar
jamming used in the bombing of Laos and Vietnam, and is involved with the proposed anti-ballistic
missile system. 56

In May of 1967, Stanford undergraduate and graduate students issued a statement discussing
their “campaign to democratize the university.” Many Stanford students felt that they were
denied their right to “a major role in making university policy.” In order to exercise their rights
they organized a sit-in at “President Sterlings office to protest the University Administration’s
decision to provide facilities for and administer the Selective Service Examination.” The students
opposed the examination

because it discriminates against those who by virtue of economic deprivation are at a severe disadvantage
in taking such a test. The white middle class has had the education which will enable it to do well on the
test. Thus, those less privileged, Negroes, Spanish-Americans, and poor whites, must fight a war in the
name of principles such as freedom and equality of opportunity which their own nation has denied
them. 57

Stanford, a bastion of white male privilege, was not immune from the effects of the antiwar

55 James Kirkpatrick Davis, Assault on the Left, 35.
56 UNCLASSIFIED, vol. 1, no.1, mid 60s), 4 (New Left Collection, Hoover Institution, box 46).
57 “WE WILL NOT FIGHT IN VIETNAM AND FURTHER WE WILL NOT BE CONSCRIPTED INTO THE
MILITARY” flyer, 1967 (New Left Collection, Hoover Institution, box 46).
segment of the Chicano Rights Movement, which pointed out “the similarities between the US war on Asian peasants and conditions for people of color at home.” The literature of this segment included that of the Stanford students of the Movimiento Estudianti Chicano de Aztlan (MECHA), who promoted antiwar activities while sending this message:

Because of the alarming situation which now exists in Viet Nam and especially since the chicano is over-represented in the armed forces and casualty lists and at the same time under-represented in the universities, we of MECHA . . . wholeheartedly support the October 15th Moratorium [against the Vietnam war].

Early in 1966, “The antiwar movement at Stanford was . . . embodied by the Stanford Committee for Peace in Vietnam (SCPV). . . [which] consisted of about two dozen students, faculty members, and people from the surrounding suburbs, each more or less fitfully active against the war.” SCPV got word from an employee at United Technology Center (UTC) in Sunnyvale (about ten miles south of Stanford) that UTC received a subcontract from Dow Chemical to develop Napalm-B, “a thicker jelly that would stick more tenaciously, ignite more reliably, and burn more intensely.” After meeting with Barnet Adelman, the president of UTC, who ignored arguments about the immorality of napalm use, SCPV began leafleting UTC employees at the napalm test site in Coyote, south of San Jose. Some employees were sympathetic, but SCPV was informed that, although many UTC workers “were opposed to making napalm, . . . the plant had been turned into a virtual police state. Their conversations were being spied on, and even their personal reading matter was being inspected surreptitiously.”

---

59 “STANFORD STUDENTS AGAINST THE WAR” flyer, 1969 (New Left Collection, Hoover Institution, box 47).
60 H. Bruce Franklin, “Burning Illusions: The Napalm Campaign” in Mary Susannah Robbins (ed.), *Against the Vietnam War*, 63.
61 Ibid., 70.
By March, Dow rewarded UTC with a contract to produce napalm bombs. The production facility was in the port of Redwood City. At a Port Commission hearing to discuss the sublease to UTC of unused storage tanks owned by Standard Oil,

Olive Mayer, an engineer from Redwood City who had inspected the [Nazi] gas ovens at Belsen, calmly stated: “As a professional engineer, I knew that other members of my profession planned and engineered these ovens as execution chambers. The manufacturer’s name was proudly displayed over the door of the ovens. Engineers had to calculate the number of victims to be accommodated, means of ingress and egress, how many to be executed at one time, etc. Local government and professional people had to be involved in providing for the manufacture of these ovens, just as you commissioners are now called upon to make a decision concerning a napalm factory.”

Sadly, the commissioners granted the sublease so the Redwood City Committee Against Napalm launched an initiative drive to overturn the commission’s decision. In the meantime, *Palo Alto Times* launched an attack against the campaign, stating in its April 20, 1966 edition:

> While there may be some question about the use of napalm in warfare, it is not a question to be decided by the voters of Redwood City or any other municipality. . . . It is easy to see what would happen if every city were to be allowed to make its own decision as to what war material is acceptable to its citizens. The people of Sunnyvale could vote on whether Polaris missiles should be manufactured by Lockheed. The people of Palo Alto could vote on whether electronics equipment for guided missiles should be built in the city. The citizens of San Francisco or Oakland could vote on whether their municipal port facilities should be permitted to load materials of war, such as napalm and atomic weapons, onto ships headed for the war. The result would be chaos.

The *Times* did get it right, in a sense: chaos would ensue if the citizenry became involved in decisions affecting their lives. Such involvement could create a slippery slope leading to something called democracy, a situation the *Times* writers apparently thought a dangerous threat to the freedom of American corporations to develop, manufacture and profit from hideous weapons of destruction used in an illegal and appalling war.

There were many protests and arrests at and near the napalm plant. “The small city was in

---


turmoil for months. . . . On 3 May over three thousand people gathered in [Redwood City] for a rally that featured Senator Wayne Morse and SDS leader Tom Hayden."64 There was an “Anti-Napalm Vigil” at UTC Monday through Friday from noon to 1:00 P.M. and from 7-8:00 P.M.65 On May 28, protesters “launched the national campaign against napalm with a rally and a four-mile march through downtown Redwood City and out along the causeway to the gates of the napalm plant. . . . Despite a virtual news blackout before the event, thirty-five hundred people, including many families with small children, showed up.”66

Superior Court Judge Melvin Cohn killed the anti-napalm initiative when he disclosed that the Port Commission and Standard oil had secretly canceled the old sublease and arranged a new one. This voided the initiative signatures and established a six-day period to draw up a new petition. The campaigners realized that, even if they could perform the miracle to get enough signatures and file the petition in such a short time, the Port Commission could simply create a new sublease contract. Soon thereafter, it was learned that

Judge Cohn was a personal friend of Barnet Adelman, president of UTC, and that their children attended the same Sunday school class. . . . We had been forced to recognize that judges—like port authority commissions, city attorneys, police officers, FBI agents, newspapers, and armies—were there to do whatever corporations required of them.67

Anti-napalm demonstrations were not limited to Redwood City or UTC. “In late May, four middle-class housewives in San Jose . . . blocked trucks loaded with napalm for seven hours outside a trucking company.” The empowered women then “moved on to an enormous napalm bomb storage facility in the nearby town of Alviso. There the bombs were to be loaded on barges

64 Charles DeBenedetti, An American Ordeal, 153.
65 “AUG. 6TH PROTEST” flyer, 1966 (Social Protest Collection, Bancroft Library, box 2, folder 2:35).
67 Ibid., 74.
for transportation to Port Chicago, the main West Coast arms shipping post.” The women stalled the loading for an hour and the barge for a day while dressed in “high heels, stockings, gloves, and pearls.” The women anticipated arrest, were arrested, and gained national attention for their exploits. Their activism was part of a very successful anti-napalm campaign that focused attention on corporate collusion in the war and enhanced the national campaign against the chief manufacturer of napalm, Dow Chemical.

There were many significant antiwar demonstrations in California throughout the rest of the sixties and the early seventies, often reflecting major developments in the war such as the Tet offensive (1968), the policy of Vietnamization (1969), the My Lai massacre (1969), the invasion of Cambodia (1970), the Kent State killings (1970), and the invasion of Laos (1970). After the invasion of Cambodia, “Stanford University students battled police in the worst rioting in the school’s history.” After Kent State, “about 1.5 million students left classes, shutting down about a fifth of the nation’s campuses for periods ranging from one day to the rest of the school year. . . . Governor Reagan closed the University of California system for five days. . . . It was easily the most massive and shattering protest in the history of American higher education.”

Shortly thereafter, “George Winne, Jr., walked onto Revelle Plaza at the University of California, San Diego, doused himself with gasoline, lit a match, and performed an act of self-immolation while holding a sign that said: ‘In the name of God, end the war.’”

All together, there were eight acts of self-immolation in America in opposition to the war. Self-immolation had occurred three other times in California. Hiroko Hayaski, a thirty-six-year old Japanese-American Buddhist of San Diego died October 12, 1967. Housewife Florence
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Anne Weills, former wife of *Ramparts* editor Robert Scheer and companion of Tom Hayden, says of Reagan: “He was making war on us. They were strafing the university with tear gas, and we were students. . . . I remember at the end of that People’s Park, they brought in the National Guard. . . . We just became increasingly alienated and radicalized.” David Obst, an active antiwar protester, was on campus holding a press conference with former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark, who had just returned from North Vietnam.

As Ramsey took questions from the press, we heard the dull rumble of an approaching helicopter. Soon the noise was deafening. As we all rushed outside to see what was happening, the chopper let loose a cannonade of tear gas. They were spraying the campus. The first barrage fell neatly upon the assembled press, sending them gasping and swearing back into the room. I became somewhat hysterical, pointing at the sky and yelling, “See! See! That’s what we’re fighting! That’s what we’re up against.”

The antiwar movement suffered from increasing alienation, radicalization, fragmentation, and outright violence among some of its segments. However, this was partly because “The U.S. government greatly exaggerated the antiwar movement’s internal divisions. Through the use of

---

dirty tricks and agents provocateurs, government bodies fanned the strife. The movement’s schisms were not totally self-generated.\textsuperscript{73}

In spite of these problems, massive California demonstrations were organized under the auspices of the Vietnam Moratorium Committee and the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam. In San Francisco on November 15, 1969, maybe one hundred fifty thousand people marched in a steady drizzle, “the largest single gathering ever on the west coast,”\textsuperscript{74} and an event not even covered live by TV networks.\textsuperscript{75} On April 24, 1971, upwards of two hundred thousand marched again in San Francisco, setting another new record for attendance on the West Coast.\textsuperscript{76}

\textsuperscript{73} Tom Wells, \textit{The War Within}, 3.  
\textsuperscript{74} James Kirkpatrick Davis, \textit{Assault on the Left}, 155.  
\textsuperscript{75} Melvin Small, \textit{Covering Dissent}, 54.  
\textsuperscript{76} Tom Wells, \textit{The War Within}, 497-498.
In San Diego, students from San Diego State College and University of California, San Diego, accounted for a large part of the antiwar sentiment directed at Camp Pendleton, the 11th Naval District Headquarters, the Selective Service System office and the Army recruiting office. Antiwar marches to the naval headquarters were occurring as early as 1965. The San Diego Union reported that a march on October 16, 1965 coincided with “‘Viet Nam Day’ protests at the University of California at Berkeley,” and that statements made during the march “were signed on behalf of the Students for a Democratic Society, the group that sponsored the march during an event called ‘International Days of Protest.’”

One of the most high-profile antiwar demonstrations in San Diego was not conducted by students but by sailors. The aircraft carrier U.S.S. Constellation was scheduled to begin its sixth tour of Vietnam in 1971, but nine sailors refused to go and organized an informal vote, asking area citizens to approve or disapprove the carrier’s scheduled sailing for the South China Sea. More than fifty-four thousand San Diegans voted in the . . . balloting, including sixty-nine hundred men and women on active duty. Eighty-two percent of the civilians and 73 percent of the people in service voted for the Constellation to stay home. The ship sailed nonetheless, but not before nine sailors held a press conference at a local church and publicly refused to go.

The sailors “were arrested and flown out to the ship. One elected to stay with it. The other eight were given ‘general discharges under honorable conditions,’” a surprising coup for the
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The *U.S.S. Constellation* incident inspired the S.O.S. (Stop Our Ship) movement aboard other carriers, among them the *U.S.S. Coral Sea* in Alameda. There, “sailors defused bombs and attached stickers to them reading ‘Repaired by SOS’”80 Also in Alameda, an “act of sabotage crippled the *U.S.S. Ranger* as it was about to depart . . . for Indochina. A paint scraper and two twelve-inch bolts were inserted into the ship’s reduction gears, causing nearly one million dollars in damage and forcing a three-and-one-half-month delay for extensive repairs.”81

The incidents described were highlights of the massive uprising in antiwar sentiment within the military, discussed more fully below. However, equally massive draft resistance accompanied this uprising.

In October of 1967 there were organized draft-card “turn-ins” all over the country . . . . By mid-1965, 380 prosecutions were begun against men refusing to be inducted; by mid-1968 that figure was up to 3,305. At the end of 1969, there were 33,960 delinquents nationwide.

In May 1969 the Oakland induction center . . . reported that of 4,400 men ordered to report for induction, 2,400 did not show up. In the first quarter of 1970 the Selective Service system, for the first time, could not meet its quota.”82

“Many who could not get themselves to return their draft cards to the government found the courage to refuse induction when called. Monstrous draft-case backlogs soon confronted U.S. attorneys. They could not keep up with the avalanche—and increasingly tired of trying to.”83 Moreover, “juries became more reluctant to convict antiwar protesters, and local judges . . . were dismissing charges against demonstrators in cases where two years before they almost certainly would have been sent to jail.”84
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Ron R. Bay was a draft lawyer during the seventies “working with the Los Angeles Selective Service law panel. [He] was involved in assisting young men in avoiding the draft, and trying to get out those who went in.” A young law clerk working with Bay found that an old clause was probably mistakenly included in revised Selective Service laws in the early seventies. The clause stated that “‘no person may be inducted for ninety days after the enactment’ of this law,” which occurred in 1972. Bay saw a young man inducted during the 90-day period, so Bay and his associates sued the Selective Service System for violating their own law. The case was lost at the District and Appellate Court levels, but Supreme Court justice William O. Douglas heard the case, agreed with Bay, and “boom—all drafting stopped in seven Southern California counties.”

One draft resister defended himself in a federal courtroom in San Jose by claiming that the routine torture used by U.S. soldiers made the war “a violation of the Nuremberg precedent.” The defendant “wanted to call a recently discharged army sergeant as witness. . . . As part of a hearing to determine its admissibility, the judge listened to some of the sergeant’s testimony while the jury was out. . . . The sergeant admitted to using torture himself against the Vietnamese, under orders from superiors.” The sergeant discussed the use of an army field telephone generator to conduct electrical impulses to the testicles of prisoners. “Did the men in the sergeant’s unit have a saying about this procedure? Yes they did. And what was that? ‘Dial him up,’ the sergeant said, ‘and he rings.’ The judge ruled that the sergeant’s testimony was irrelevant and barred it from court.”

The Los Angeles Free Press “Shaft the Draft” column answered the questions of potential
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draftees that were often misinformed about their rights. A December 19, 1969 issue listed
thirteen draft-counseling operations in the LA and San Diego areas. The paper also ran creative
ads from “the Missionaries of the New Truth, the Church of the Universal Brotherhood, and the
Padua Order offering ordination and possible draft exemption.”

Much of what turned out to be an enormous GI antiwar movement evolved in California.

This movement

had a major part in the Vietnam experience. Never before in modern history had the American armed
forces faced such widespread internal resistance and revolt. Often at great personal risk, hundreds of
thousands of soldiers, marines, airmen, and sailors dissented and disobeyed military commanders, in
order to speak out for justice and peace. Their struggle hastened American withdrawal from Indochina
and played a major role in finally bringing that tragic war to an end.

. . . Reenlistments in 1970 fell to the lowest on record, and ROTC enrollment dropped two-thirds
from 1968 to 1972. Military manpower during those years declined 40 percent, while the number of
young men filing for conscientious-objector status reached record levels. By 1972, the last year of the
draft, there were more conscientious objectors than draftees. [Furthermore, the] government reported that
15,000 men refused induction in 1971, 100,000 did not appear for their physicals, . . . and [d]esertion and
AWOL rates reached to staggering levels. . . . For every one hundred soldiers in 1977, seventeen went
AWOL and seven deserted.

Fort Ord, near Monterey and home to forty thousand soldiers, was the location of an MDM
(Movement for a Democratic Military) “armed farces day” on March 16, 1970. The activity was
partly a parody of Armed Forces Day, “traditionally the day when the Pentagon Brass puts on its
John Wayne version of the military machine.” MDM organized the GI-led march and rally to
invite “the People on base to talk with their brothers and sisters enslaved in the war machine and
to express their support and solidarity for the GI movement.”

Fort Ord was also a rallying point for Private Billy Dean Smith, accused for the 1967
“fragging”—military jargon for assassination of officers and career soldiers with a fragmentation
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grenade—in Vietnam of “two white officers . . . after enduring months of harassment for having a ‘bad attitude.’ Typically, white officers read any black soldier’s expression of black cultural nationalism as a ‘bad attitude.’”

Smith, an outspoken opponent of the war before the fragging, was held on flimsy evidence in solitary confinement in the Fort Ord stockade for over fifteen months. Local Vietnam Veterans Against the War (VVAW) members organized marches and rallies at the fort, and Smith promised “to stay in this hole just as long as it takes to expose the racism of the war and the UCMJ (Uniform Code of Military Justice). They’ll never break my spirit!”

The GI antiwar movement disseminated its sentiment partly through underground newspapers. Active-duty service men or veterans published The Ally in Berkeley; Task Force, Marine Blues, Final Thoughts (Fort Hamilton), The Oak (Oakland Naval Hospital), and Eyes Left! (Travis AFB) in San Francisco; Up Front and About Face (Camp Pendleton) in L.A.; As You Were (Fort Ord) in Monterey; and Duck Power in San Diego. “Only three GI underground papers existed in 1967, but by March 1972 the Defense Department reported that about 245 had been published, and that [some of them] had a circulation of 5,000.”

In 1967 “near Berkeley, Andy Stapp founded the first national organization for GI resistance, the American Servicemen’s Union. Stapp’s paper, The Bond: Voice of the American Servicemen’s Union, published in Berkeley by a coalition of active-duty soldiers, veterans, and civilians . . . was nationally and internationally distributed; directed specifically to GIs, it claimed a circulation of more than one hundred thousand by 1971.”

“The emergence of VVAW in 1967 had a profound impact on the antiwar movement . . .

---
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VVAW transformed the movement by placing veterans in the forefront of the nationwide struggle to end the Vietnam War. . . . The film footage of veterans casting their medals and ribbons onto the steps of the Capitol in 1971 became a crucial rallying symbol for the antiwar movement, forever etching itself into the minds of millions of Americans. Moreover, VVAW filled a leadership vacuum in the movement, a void created during the late 1960s with the collapse of several key antiwar coalitions.95

A Southern California chapter of VVAW published a monthly newspaper called Favorite Sons that targeted President Nixon’s proposed appearance at the Republican nominating convention in San Diego in 1972. The newspaper stated that “Veterans bring the reality of imperialism home. We actively participated and our credibility cannot be disavowed.” Facing the potential of “massive demonstrations” from “the thousands of indigenous antiwar activists in southern California,” the convention was relocated to Miami, an action that gives merit to the many arguments that recognize the significant influence of the peace movement and that set the stage for Ron Kovic’s attempt to be heard during Nixon’s acceptance speech, dramatized in the movie Born on the Fourth of July.96

In 1971 “Approximately 150 VVAWers were arrested in San Francisco when they attempted to enter the Presidio to join a memorial for the dead of all wars. . . . VVAWers . . . ‘napalmed’ a Christmas tree decorated with war medals in Berkeley” and “seized control of . . . a hospital ward at Travis Air Force Base . . . .”97

In 1972, VVAWers often “directed their energy toward the time-consuming and thankless pursuit of freeing political prisoners” such as Billy Dean Smith. In Southern California, VVAWers participated in defense committees, planned rallies, raised money and distributed fliers. . . . In Long Beach, VVAWers spoke at high schools and volunteered two hours a day to work at the local VA hospital. . . . On April 19, VVAWers occupied the U.S. Naval Reserve Center in North Hollywood for seven hours. Two days later, fifteen members turned themselves in as ‘war criminals’ at the 11th Naval

95 Michael Bibby, Hearts and Minds, 2.
97 Ibid., 138-141.
District Headquarters in San Diego. . . . Sixteen San Francisco veterans took over an air force recruiting office. . . . [and] VVAWer Gary Alexander, carrying an American flag, led a crowd of eight hundred people through Fresno . . . in an action at the Federal Building. . . . Four hundred people attended an April 19 VVAW rally at Fort Ord . . . to demand an end to intensified bombing. 

As the war wound down and finally ended, so did the protests. The U.S. had finally lost the war. Or had it? “Contrary to what virtually everyone—left or right—says, the United States achieved its major objectives in Indochina. Vietnam was demolished. There’s no danger that successful [nationalist] development there will provide a model for other nations in the region.”

However, the war did provide lessons:

Whatever system of governance prevails in a country, it can function only so long as it is tolerated by the public. The Vietnam War made it clear that a war cannot continue if the people do not acquiesce. Broad segments of the public took action to oppose that war, overcoming the difficulties of collecting the necessary factual information. The Vietnam experience showed that it rests with the citizenry to play the role of backstop when Congress does not act on its own to restrain an administration.

This phenomenon of citizens taking action against the horrific abuses of their government and its corporate paymasters is a “crisis in democracy,” a crisis that threatens the power structure responsible for enormous crimes against humanity and the environment. The crisis produced the “Vietnam syndrome,” “a disease with such symptoms as dislike for war crimes and atrocities.” Contrary to what then-president Bush claimed after the Gulf War, the Vietnam syndrome is stronger than ever. The Gulf War mobilized hundreds of thousands of Americans opposed to the war, a vast outpouring of antiwar sentiment vastly under-reported by the press in order to minimize its influence. Furthermore, the portion of the population that viewed the Vietnam War
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as “fundamentally wrong and immoral,” and not merely a “mistake” was still seventy-one percent in 1990, “despite the massive efforts undertaken” to overcome that sentiment.\textsuperscript{102}

Was the war merely “a mistake born of noble intentions, not a crime born of sinister ones”?\textsuperscript{103} If a person can believe that noble intentions spawned a “mistake” that caused monstrous devastation of the peoples and lands of several small countries in Southeast Asia, one should just as easily be able to posit that human butchery and environmental destruction must be the elements that inform that person’s sense of nobility. Based on these elements, the Vietnam War was noble indeed. Of course, the planners, purveyors and defenders of the Vietnam War have to rationalize their actions by shrouding them in the usual patriotic raiment (“noble intentions” being a favored phrase), rendering them palatable to themselves and the masses, whose fears and ignorance are usually easily exploited and sustained by relentless propaganda pandered by corporate media that act as lapdogs to the elite.

The Vietnam War was a truly hideous crime against fellow human beings, ourselves, and the planet. The war was a violation of national and international law and, by any measure, a massive violation of human morality. It was also like a malignant cancer that spread far faster and more extensively than the communism it was supposed to check. The cancer was not an offspring of human sinisterness, but of a pervasive human neurosis revealed in arguments favoring the idea that humans are inherently warlike, and, therefore, war is inevitable and, indeed, one of the epitomes of human achievement. This myth is the fuel that feeds the fires of self-righteousness and delusions of grandeur manifested in the perverse doctrines such as Manifest Destiny used to conquer and enslave those who happen to get in the way of “progress.”

\textsuperscript{102} Noam Chomsky, \textit{Rethinking Camelot}, 61.
\textsuperscript{103} Adam Garfinkle, \textit{Telltale Hearts} (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1995), xi.
The anti-Vietnam War movement in California was a significant factor in the overall antiwar movement and in ending the war. However, when the Vietnam War finally ended, it was not, of course, really over. The death squads in Central America, the virtual genocide in East Timor, the invasions of Grenada and Panama, the Gulf War, the razing of Yugoslavia and many other brutal interventions are the grisly legacy carried on by U.S. military machinery that rages ever on. It is up to all of us to never rest until these and all similar events are only a gruesome memory in the far distant past.
Appendix I – Chronology

1958   Peace symbol designed

1963   First public denunciation of Vietnam War

1962   Drafting of the Port Huron Statement of the Students for a Democratic Society

1964   Free Speech Movement at U.C. Berkeley

1965   Operation Rolling Thunder

             Teach-in at U.C. Berkeley

             Vietnam Day Committee formed

             Stop the Troop Train demonstrations

             International Days of Protest

1966   Oakland Induction Center demonstrations

             Redwood City Committee Against Napalm formed

             National campaign against napalm launched

             Four California housewives block napalm shipments

1967   Human Be-in, San Francisco

             Spring Mobilization to End the War in Vietnam

             The Resistance formed

             Resist the Draft Day (national draft-card turn-in)

             Oakland Stop the Draft Week

             Self-immolation of Hiroko Hayaski, Florence Beaumont and Erik Thoen

             American Servicemen’s Union formed

             Vietnam Veteran’s Against the War formed

1968   Tet Offensive
1969  Oakland Seven indicted

Vietnamization

Governor Reagan sends the National Guard to Berkeley

Massive Moratorium and Mobilization in San Francisco

1970  Moratorium and Mobilization

Kent State killings

National student strikes

Movement for a Democratic Military formed

Fort Ord demonstration

1971  *U.S.S. Constellation* sailors refuse to sail

Stop Our Ship movement

1972  Fort Ord demonstration supporting Private Billy Dean Smith

1975  Last Americans evacuate Vietnam
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### Appendix III – Glossary of Key Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent Orange</td>
<td>A mixture of herbicides sprayed by U.S. forces in Vietnam to destroy forest cover and food crops. Agent Orange contains dioxin, a toxin linked to birth defects and cancer. The herbicide is called Agent Orange because it was stored in containers with orange stripes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Right Movement</td>
<td>Mass movement starting in the late 1950s that used nonviolent protest actions to end racially segregated public facilities in the South and help achieve passage of the Civil Rights and Voting Rights Acts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious Objector</td>
<td>A classification the Selective Service System granted to those who opposed war on religious, moral or ethical grounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Speech Movement</td>
<td>U.C. Berkeley student movement for freedom of personal and political expression on campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom Rides</td>
<td>Attempts by activists to integrate public transportation facilities in the South.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI Movement</td>
<td>Anti-Vietnam War movement of current or former members of U.S. armed forces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State killings</td>
<td>The killing of four Kent State University students by National Guard troops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napalm</td>
<td>Thickener used to gel gasoline for incendiary bombs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Huron Statement</td>
<td>New Left manifesto laying out ideology of a participatory democracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Thunder</td>
<td>The initiation of continuous bombing of North Vietnam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-immolation</td>
<td>Suicide by burning oneself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit-in</td>
<td>In the Civil Rights Movement, a form of non-violent protest during which blacks occupied seats in racially segregated establishments; used by members of Free Speech and antiwar movement as a form of organized protest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach-in</td>
<td>A form of lecture-discussion-debate used to educate and raise awareness of important issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tet Offensive</td>
<td>Major communist offensive that shattered the illusion that America was winning the war.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam Syndrome</td>
<td>Public opposition for war or concern for nationalist sentiment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamization</td>
<td>The withdrawal of U.S. troops and the support of South Vietnamese forces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>