The following article is the first of a series that will analyze Progressive Labor Party's breaks with Maoism and its present policies and activities.

By TONY THOMAS

The Nov. 1971 issue of Progressive Labor magazine announces the complete repudiation of Maoism and of support to the Chinese government by the Progressive Labor Party (PLP), which for nearly 10 years has been the largest and most important Maoist organization in the U.S. Articles in previous issues of PL magazine and the PL newspaper, Challenge-Denfajo, have criticized the Chinese government's actions in Ceylon and Pakistan and the proposed Nixon trip to China. But this new series represents a clear break from previous critiques and reverses PLP's analysis of China and Maoism. China's Cultural Revolution, 1966-69, was a coordinated mass movement of workers, peasants, and other oppressed classes in China, rejection of the Chinese bureaucracy, and attacks on the Chinese government. It was warmly welcomed by truly revolutionary Marxists around the world. PLP's most recent statement, "Road to Revolution I," published in the PLP's second anniversary of Chairman Mao Tse-tung's third anniversary of Chairman Mao Tse-tung's death, said "The thought of Mao Tse-tung is the summary of the experiences of the Chinese revolution. It points the way for the revolutionary process everywhere." (Revolution Today: U.S.A., pages 198-99)

However, as far back as 1967, PLP began to take positions at variance with the Mao bureaucracy. These did not offer a revolutionary Marxist alternative to the reformist policies of Maoism. Rather, most of these differences stemmed from opposition to the revolutionary implications of the nationalism of oppressed peoples, an increasingly sectarian attitude to any united action with the "Soviet revolutionists." However, on none of these questions did PLP ever explicitly state that its views differed from the Chinese leadership's, nor did it openly attack Mao's bureaucracy until the last few months.

One of the most obvious points of disagreement was over Vietnam. In 1967, PLP adopted the view that the North Vietnamese and National Liberation Front of South Vietnam leaders "backslide" into "revisionism" when they agreed to negotiate with the U.S. (Vietnam, Defeat U.S. Imperialism, p. 20).

PLP further argued that the Feb. 1968 Tet offensive in South Vietnam, which dealt a heavy blow to the U.S.-Saligon military effort, was "a lot of wheeling and dealing... a lot of scheming instead of revolutionary struggle. . . . The Tet offensive was just part of a sellout maneuver to pressure Johnson. . . ." (p. 29) After PLP did not attack the Chinese CP at the time, these positions were clearly contrary to those held by the Chinese government.

For a long time, the PLP has taken a second attitude toward "revisionism" aid from the U.S.S.R. being sent to North Vietnam. It opposes such aid on the grounds that it will deepen the "revisionism" of the NLF and the North Vietnamese government.

Now in its most recent statement, PLP took much further and charges that "throughout the period of bitter back and forth polemics," during the Moscow-Peking debate, "the Chinese continued to maintain effective unity of action with the Soviet Union in defining the Soviet aid." (Nov. 1971 PL, p. 42, original emphasis)

Furthermore, the Chinese Maoists are accused of foramishing the Vietnamese ultralefts from recklessly attacking trains carrying Russian aid to Vietnam. PLP states that the Chinese organized a movement developed against Soviet aid to Vietnam. Shipments of aid "were delivered secretly by left forces in the GPCR (the "provisional revolutionary solution"). The purpose of these actions was to show revolutionary solidarity with the oppressed nations and to expose the machinations of the revisionists. . . . Only the direct, violent international support to the U.S.-controlled PLA [People's Liberation Army] was able to put a stop to this movement." (Nov. 1971, PL, p. 17, emphasis added, from an article entitled "Road to Revolution II")

Nationalism

Since early 1969, the PLP has been officially opposed to all forms of nationalism—whether of oppressed or oppressor nations—even though this is contrary to the stated position of the Chinese CP leadership. A June 1969 PL statement indicated: "For many years, we in the Progressive Labor Party held to the idea of two types of nationalism: revolutionary and reactionary. But a look at world reality shows there's no such thing. Nationalism is either the path to oppression by an outside imperialism or the road to capitalism from socialism." (Revolution Today: Nationalism and the Fight Nationalism)" edited dated June 1969 published in the PLP pamphlet Nationalism and the Fight Nationalism.

Maoist nationalism and revolutionary nationalism like Malcolm X, who they once hailed, were now branded as capitalist "sellouts." The Chinese Maoists have maintained a different attitude toward nationalist struggles. First, a prominent part of their strategy is support to nationalist coalitions in the colonial world who they have friendly diplomatic relations with. This is justified on the basis of the reformist-two stage theory of revolution developed by Stalin which held that the national democratic forces—usually led by or including capitalists—before socialism (the second stage) can be won.

In addition, the Chinese CP gives overwhelming support to the movements of the nationalist struggles of oppressed peoples for the purpose of extending a revolutionary base in the struggles and to provide Peking with support.

PLP has rejected the two-stage theory at least since 1969. The Aug. 1969 Progressive Labor Party statement was wrong for Communists to advocate two-stage strategy. Communists have no right to support bourgeois nationalist or liberation movements that do not openly proclaim socialism as a goal."

In more recent statements, PLP attacks outright and falsifies Lenin's position of extending support to the national liberation movements of oppressed nations and nationalities. It further states: "From the point of view of Lenin, a struggle of the oppressed people, there is no way to sell out a struggle for national liberation by a left paper. It is just a sellout in its very conception." (Nov. 1971 PL, p. 60)

PLP's attacks on the Maoist leaders came in the wake of Peking's support and aid to the Pakistani government in its genocidal repression against Bangla Desh.

The May 1 Challenge-Denfajo carries an article opposed to the Pakistani rulers entitled "Pakistanis Bosses Use Workers. It attacks Cheo-Chen-lai for Continued on page 22
BANGALI DENG-A-REVOLUTION IN EAST PAKISTAN, Speaker: Samuel Kakul, East Pakistani student activist in NYC, at 11:00 a.m., 409 Hunter, Room 413, followed by discussion in the Hunter Social Forum. Between 11:30 a.m. and 12:30 p.m., 418-419 Hunter. Between 2:00 p.m. and 3:00 p.m., 409 Hunter, Room 314.
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half of the committee members stayed overnight to live in the prison. In the process, they were in aTLerated work environment. Other members agreed to arrive early in the morning.

The attack
But as it turned out, none of the plans laid the previous day went for naught. Soon after 4:00 a.m., shortly after 3:00 a.m., Kunzlster—arrived at 9:15 a.m., only to find the outside gates of the prison were closed. Phantoms with shotguns were everywhere. National Guardsmen were driving up in trucks.

The 1,000-member assault force es­
trenched the prison going toward the lib­erated area. However, the two-hour fight against police, some members of the committee broke down in tears. A lot of jorneters were separated and finally rescued.

Efforts to protect the Attica massacre on Monday included a rally of several hundred people at the University of North Carolina, one another down town, and a gathering of over 2,000 students by the student government, to listen to Kunzler.

A group of doctors and lawyers led by Professor Schwartz tried to gain entrance to the prison on Tuesday morning with a court order. They wanted to check out medical facilities and also legal aid to the inmates. The court also ordered the reporting of all prisoners who were allowed inside the gates the previous evening during daylight hours.

A subsequent hearing on Tuesday before the same judge who issued the order for their entry, the prisoners litigiously talked about the "dangers of "bobby traps" and bombs" which were already against the group. The judge thereupon meekly complied and denied entry to the group.

The National Liberation Front, a group of Black doctors claiming responsibility for the prison uprising, insisted to be allowed inside the prison to in­spect the medical facilities. The beating and possible killings (the eight inmates "missing" could easily turn up as deaths) going on in Attica right now are unambiguous, since there is no access to the prison by the public. For the inmates, the prison authorities have the last word. They are the judge, jury and prosecu­tor. They control, except in times of revolt, the lives of the inmates to the outside world.

To show how much they care about the hostages, Rockefeller expressed such concern that out that 40 had gotten out alive. He didn't expect any of them to live. And ensuring their lives was not his purpose. He was out to es­
tablish "law and order," and if any­body needed its achievement, then so be it. Rockefeller is callous, ruthless and brutal. These are not justifications for the prison massacre and to defend those in­mates still alive, demonstrations, ra­ileges, support and defense. Prisons are­
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the financing of studies on the fu­ture. Today East Pakistan is an anti­communistic Southeast Asia seems to indi­cate that the world may still find it proper to apply a program diametrically op­posed to that of the Provin­cial Rev­olution. As far as the United States policy is concerned, it can only help reduce the importance of the Paris peace talks.