

ism is not just a policy which capitalism could stop, as Kautsky maintained against Lenin, and which many believe even today. Several current non-revolutionary approaches require comment.

Negotiations? No friend of the Vietnamese people wants to see hard-won gains bartered away at the conference table. Negotiations are desired by the liberal wing of imperialism, including such worthies as Walter Lippmann and Senator Gruening, who hate the revolution like poison. These people want continued control of Southeast Asia by American capital just as much as Johnson. They disagree only about means, preferring fraudulent negotiations to Johnson's brutal war. Gruening, the noted liberal, was all in favor of sending troops to the Dominican Republic, you remember. The demand for negotiations thus becomes an imperialist weapon against the Vietnamese Revolution, in the quite realistic hope that the Stalinists in both Peking and Moscow can be brought once again to sacrifice someone else's revolution to the national-bureaucratic interests of their respective countries, as they did at Geneva. For alleged socialists to echo this bourgeois demand is a betrayal and piece of great-power arrogance of the worst sort. On the contrary, friends of the Vietnamese Revolution must do all in their power to check imperialism, expose its "negotiations" slogan, and help strengthen genuinely revolutionary elements in Vietnam in their inevitable struggle with the Stalinist leadership.

UN? Some say the UN should step in. But the UN is controlled by the capitalists. If the UN stepped in, they would restore the country to the imperialists, as they did in the Congo, after setting up the murder of Lumumba by Tshombe.

Coalition? Some say the UN should install a coalition government. This would only be one more attempt to stop the revolution. Coalition governments are unstable because they have no real support from the bitterly contending and mutually incompatible classes.

Towards a Labor Party

An alternative to Democratic bondage is a Labor Party, broadly based, with members from the unions and ghettos, employed and unemployed, from all strata of the laboring population. It must be open to all working-class political tendencies. It would be the political party through which working people could finally fight in their own interests. Such a party does not exist yet and it will be a long and difficult struggle to build one. Nevertheless, we have a basis from which to start: the civil rights movement, and the anti-war movement. The possibility

PROGRESSIVE LABOR

Stalin Lives?

The Progressive Labor Party has launched an all-out anti-Trotskyist attack upon Spartacist in their *Statement on the Peace Movement (Challenge*, 2 November, page 7). The PLP Statement used our *Imperialists and Stalinists in Vietnam* (reprinted in this issue of SPARTACIST) as the springboard for the attack. This attack left us at once *regretful, pleased and perplexed*.

We regret the Stalinist content of PL's accusations—what Trotsky once called the syphilis of the working class. There are too few seeking to build a revolutionary movement in America today for us to want PL's potential eaten away and destroyed. We are pleased because, if elements in PL were going to strike out at Trotskyism, they singled out the Spartacist as the most characteristic group in the U.S. bearing the revolutionary Marxist ideas associated with the name of Leon Trotsky. We were perplexed, however, as to *why* this attack was made at this time, when the open activities of our two organizations hardly impinge upon each other—mainly as a result of the overriding effort by PL to isolate itself and its work from Trotskyists. In the past year, for example, Spartacist supporters have been expelled or excluded from the Harlem Defense Coun-

cil, the CCNY May 2nd Movement, and the work of the defense organization, CERGE, all on the grounds of "counter-revolutionary Trotskyism."

Three Little Dots

We would welcome a frank and fraternal confrontation of views with PL on the urgent tasks facing communists, while working together where we agree on particular issues. But it is impossible to consider the PLP Statement as a serious criticism of Spartacist. Typically, the authors of the Statement create a position which we neither stated nor hold: "... *these Trotskyites, in a final display of supreme arrogance only outdone by their stupidity, tell oppressed people to wait...*" This is a plain lie. The authors create another "Spartacist" viewpoint by joining together two (inaccurate) quotations by three dots: some 1200 words were skipped over with these three little Stalinist dots! With this method anything can be "proved" about anyone. No, the reasons behind PL's attack are not to be found in their words.

Why Us?

PL's own *internal* situation indicates the real reason behind the Statement in *Challenge*. Controlling sections in PL appear to be playing a "game" with members who differ with the prevailing line.

We know there are people in PL who believe, as we do, that opposition to a negotiated peace today in Vietnam implies that the 1954 Geneva agreement was a betrayal by the Sino-Soviet leaderships, who were then united. We know there are PL members who think that PL should not have given in to SANE and the liberals over the N.Y. Peace Parade, but instead marched as we did with militant slogans of support to the NLF struggle.

Sectarian Abstentionism

We know there are PL members who gave critical support, as we did, to the Socialist Workers Party's mayoralty candidates despite PL's sectarian abstentionism; who believe that it was correct to call upon the anti-war movement to give electoral support to all anti-war working-class or socialist candidates like Epton, Jose Fuentes, and the SWP tickets, and only to such anti-capitalist candidates; who were disgusted when PL stopped the work of Spartacist supporters for the PLP candidate, Bill Epton, on the "principled" grounds of refusing aid from "counter-revolutionaries."

(Continued on Page 15)

TURN THE ANTI-WAR MOVEMENT INTO THE ANTI-CAPITALIST MOVEMENT! ■

(reprinted from *DID YOU VOTE FOR WAR?*, a publication of the Bay Area Vietnam Committee)

Los Angeles

Since no explicit demands emerged out of the heat of the Los Angeles riots, the analysis in our Chicago leaflet and our support the summer before to the people of Harlem under police attack were indirectly generalized by the press. Thus a nationally syndicated column date-lined Los Angeles report-

ed:

"Others said that the action [the Watts uprising] was ultimately controlled by an organization with the sinister-sounding name of Spartacus, a heretical Communist organization that seems to be present wherever there is serious trouble in big cities." ■

II. The Struggle for Militant Leadership

From the beginning the Chicago civil rights struggle has exhibited, in specific instances, a high degree of participation on the part of the Negro working class. The first school boycott of 1963 was highly successful, and placed the Mayor Daley machine in a serious bind. Both token gestures, like the removal of the "Willis-wagons" the summer before, and rigid intransigence had the danger of heightening the level of consciousness and participation. Thus the second boycott took on special importance: for while the first boycott represented a "petition to our leaders," the second implied a development in the movement beyond the leadership, program and tactics tolerated by the bourgeoisie. Those who, during the first boycott, received the "grievances of the Negro community" with paternalistic patience were driven to rally their kept leaders and kept press to smash the second. With the success of the second school boycott, for the first time in Chicago, large masses of Negro people rejected the leadership of the official movement. Only on a localized basis had this happened before.

Early Leadership Fails

But from the beginning the crisis in leadership has infected the Chicago civil rights movement. The Rose Simpson—CORE dissident militants—left YPSL grouping represented the only radical class-conscious tendency that could have bid for city-wide leadership. A move for leadership was never attempted because of a deep-seated blind activist streak, a strong fear of "Red-baiting," and generally a fear of political struggle beyond the demand for elementary rights. Later these forces formed the Metropolitan CORE Chapter where, with the exception of a few minor projects, they hibernated for a year and a half before their emergence at the May 1965 HUAC hearings demonstration.

Un-American Hearings

The House Committee had as its prime purpose in "investigating sub-

versives" the intimidation of the civil rights and peace movements. While established "leaders" were calling for quiet and dignified picket lines the Chicago Committee to Stop HUAC, made up of the activists of Metropolitan CORE, SNCC workers, supporters of the IWW, ASOC, and Spartacist, proposed direct action that would bring the HUAC hearings to an end. The morning after the demonstration, lead headlines in the daily press read, "PICKETS STORM RED PROBE; HUAC PICKETS BATTLE COPS; MOB STORMS HEARING, TURNED BACK AT DOOR; PROTESTERS HURL COPS TO GROUND IN MASS ASSAULT." The YSA and W.E.B. du Bois Clubs were conspicuously absent from the attempt to end the hearings, the success of which set the pace for the summer to come.

Willis—A Living Provocation

An advisor to Mayor Daley was reported to have said in mid-May of this year that the civil rights movement could not materialize over 100 supporters at a picket line. Thus, Willis was retained as superintendent of schools by the Chicago Board of Education. The retention of Willis the man was only an indication that the Board again would make no concessions. At first the Negro leaders, with Al Raby at the fore, planned to respond to this provocation with a week-long boycott. With the announcement that the city would obtain a court injunction, SNCC and CORE wavered, and the leadership in deference to the "law" called off the boycott when the courts granted the injunction.

Toward New Leadership

From the beginning of this summer's demonstrations there was dissatisfaction with both the leadership and the program of the civil rights movement. One expression of this dissatisfaction was the *Committee to Make Daley Jump*, which urged, in a leaflet, active solidarity with the taxi strike then in progress. That this proposal did not receive support revealed the ir-

. . . **PLP**

(Continued from Page 7)

We know there are PL members who are sickened by attempts to apologize for the Comintern's "Third Period" sectarian splitting of the German working class, which opened the road to power for Adolf Hitler. Moreover, we know that there are PL members who are becoming increasingly aware that something is basically wrong with China's foreign policy, which proclaims treacherous capitalist politicians like the late Nehru, Sukarno and Prince Sihanouk as its friends and allies. China's pursuit of a counter-revolutionary policy abroad, in turn, puts in question the political nature of the Mao regime itself.

Finally, for some PL members it is but a step to realize that contemporary Trotskyism is nothing but an extension of the program of Lenin and Trotsky which culminated in the October Revolution — a *working-class* revolution whose degeneration under Stalin and later brought it down to the political level of the peasant-based and deeply contradictory revolutions in Yugoslavia, China and Cuba.

An Amalgam

What better way for an uneasy leadership to silence such currents within PL than to link them to a pro-imperialist and white chauvinist parody of the ideas of Spartacist, and then slyly to link Spartacist to the U.S. State Department. Spartacist will certainly survive this attack, but Progressive Labor may not. The authors of the PL Statement show themselves adept at the language, not of Marxist political thought and polemic, but of the political police—the language of provocation, calculated lies, and frame-ups. But the Stalinized Communist Parties in the days of the Moscow Trials had large numbers and great, if already debased, authority to compel acceptance of virulent anti-Trotskyism.

PL's Choice

Those days are long gone. If the leaders of the few hundred who make up PL persist in their anti-Trotskyist course, they will shrivel into another isolated Maoist sect, competing with the several already existing, irrelevant little bands of self-appointed defenders of the Chinese-Albanian-Stalinist faith. The choice is PL's. ■

—Resident Editorial Board

remediable weakness of the leadership. And the crisis of leadership was directly responsible for the elemental, unorganized outbursts which ensued. The sharp decline in struggle in the wake of the riots makes compellingly clear the need for principled revolutionary leadership. ■ —Bob Sherwood