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for the precedent it set.” Those are the basic premises of this book of essays. Those “witnessing” in this volume include not only some who were imprisoned during the war, but others as well. For instance, children of parents who had that experience, while they were not in the camps themselves, were nonetheless affected. As Jeni Yamada writes in her essay, “Legacy of Silence (II),” “I didn’t live the camp experience. But I didn’t escape it either,” and her essay continues to explain that observation. Erica Harth, the editor of this volume, did “experience” the camp as the young white daughter of a first-grade teacher at one of the camps and she adds her “witness” to this collection as well. Other contributors, eighteen in all, add important perspectives as they address a variety of questions about that experience: “What stories do we want to make known now? How do we begin to think about the implications of the internment for the era of the ‘war on terrorism’? What strains of American life run through and beyond the wartime history? How can unlearning and coming to speak on the internment help us to further the causes of social justice and human rights in the twenty-first century?” Even those who had no personal or family connections to the internment can discover that there are important emotional and political connections and anyone reading this volume is forced “to come face to face with one of the most significant betrayals of American ideals.”

It is important that students read these essays in order to keep historical memory alive and engage in “dialogue, reflection, [and] active engagement with the issues” involved. Teachers will serve their students well if they take up the challenge to do this. All of the essays are appropriate for middle and high school students and present such a wide variety of perspectives on the topic that teachers would have flexibility in how they might use them in their classes.
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The intrusion of the Vietnam war into the 2004 presidential campaign demonstrates, if such evidence were further needed, the staying power of the most divisive military conflict in the nation’s history since the Civil War. In Antiwarriors, Melvin Small of Wayne State University provides an overview of the antiwar movement of the Johnson and Nixon years.

Several themes emerge. Although dozens of organizations sprang up to protest the war in various ways (and the author categorizes them nicely), they were much too amorphous and ill-structured to have much “organization” to them. Dues were nonexistent, there were no membership rolls, and leaders often quarreled bitterly among themselves over tactics and strategy. Moreover, groups advocating peaceful civil disobedience were unable to exclude more radical and fringe elements ready to be
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arrested or to provide a comic or bizarre flavor to demonstrations. Group leaders often fretted that such misbehavior undercut their support with the wider public that sympathized with the antiwar efforts but not with clownish or violent demonstrators. Effective coverage by the media was absolutely essential to keeping the movement alive, but all too often the news outlets, particularly television, focused only on the unruly or zany minority of demonstrators, ignoring the peaceful and decorous majority and creating the impression among viewers that all demonstrators were unruly hippies or lawbreakers.

Small draws a distinction between the two presidents: Lyndon Johnson “was too much of a civil libertarian to launch the all-out war against dissenters that President Nixon began.” The latter cleverly argued that demonstrations stiffened the resistance of the North Vietnamese to meaningful peace negotiations, while at the same time he employed agents provocateurs to infiltrate and incite antiwar organizations to the extremist tactics he could then denounce. The author also stresses an often overlooked fact, that senior policymakers in the two administrations who were charged with pursuing the war themselves had children bitterly opposed to the conflict, and he suggests that such family dinner table arguments turned some of the parents into serious doubters.

As one participant in the movement concluded, it became “the focus of our lives ... the center of everything,” and movement leaders were convinced that they had forced the government to cease escalating the conflict and to make peace. Opponents argued that the antiwarriors only prolonged the war “because many Americans skeptical about the war were disturbed about associating themselves with what appeared to be repulsive hippies and unpatriotic radicals.” The truth, Small maintains, lies somewhere between. While the movement did not end the war directly, it most certainly contributed to two major presidential decisions, the first in March 1968, when President Johnson made his stunning post-Tet announcement not to seek re-election and to begin peace negotiations. And in the fall of 1969 President Nixon decided not to retaliate militarily when the North Vietnamese failed to respond to an earlier American ultimatum to soften their negotiating positions or else. Small argues that both men, contrary to their public pronouncements, were obsessed by the power of the movement and its allies in Congress and the media.

For those interested, there are only two mentions of John Kerry here; one discusses briefly his eloquent testimony to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1971. But the author notes that membership in Vietnam Veterans Against the War had reached 20,000 by 1972, and it is “likely that hundreds of thousands of other veterans ... privately shared the views of the VVAW.” Present-day students should know this, to say nothing of Kerry critics, who have tried to portray him as something of a lone aberration in the Vietnam years.

Small’s prose, if not sparkling, is workmanlike enough, and he turns up memorable phrases from the movement. Antiwarriors would serve as an extremely useful supplement to U.S. survey courses as well as courses on the Vietnam war. Sociologists who study the structure of mass movements should find the work of interest as well.
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