

SPARTACIST

NUMBER 10

MAY-JUNE 1967

10 CENTS

ANTI-WAR SELLOUT

The war in Viet Nam and the movement against it have proven critical tests of the program and principles of every ostensibly revolutionary organization. To the extent that any group has wavered in its revolutionary obligation to *state what is*, or has substituted maneuvering and petty organizational diplomacy for working-class politics, it bears responsibility for whatever defeats and betrayals occur here and in Viet Nam.

Nominal Revolutionaries

The Socialist Workers Party and the Young Socialist Alliance, as the largest organized, nominally revolutionary tendency in the anti-war movement, have played a singularly pernicious role, and bear unique responsibility for its present domination by right-wing forces. The recent history of the SWP-YSA has been one of unbridled opportunism, rotten compromises and organizational maneuvering, surpassed only by the reformist Communist Party with which they are presently in a bloc.

The SWP-YSA decision to become involved in anti-war activities was precipitated by the April 1965 March on Washington, which turned out an unexpected 15,000 protestors. The murder of Malcolm X in February of that year had left the SWP in a state of suspended animation, in need of a movement over which they could enthuse and in which they could submerge, to re-appear as a "revolutionary" party only during election season.

"New" Popular Front

The political basis for the SWP's participation in the anti-war movement was soon evolved—the concept of a "single-issue" movement. This "new" theory strikingly parallels the "peoples front of all democratic forces" developed by Stalinism in 1935, and is predicated on the illusion that a large multi-class peace movement, with no specific program, can "pressure" the imperialist government of the U.S. into ending the Vietnamese war or, by logical extension, any war. Any attempt to place the war in a larger framework, to relate it to other aspects of capitalism, is considered "divisive" by the SWP.

The first obstacle to the SWP's Single Issue Society was the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). Although they lack a clear class analysis of the war, the

SDS'ers include the struggle against war as part of a perspective for general social change. Instead of educating these militants to a revolutionary class consciousness, the SWP abdicated its responsibility as an allegedly Trotskyist party in favor of destructive tactics designed to place themselves in the most influential positions in the movement. They invaded local committees, packing their meetings, voted down "multi-issue" projects and even destroyed a number of committees. Their peculiar brand of opportunism came to the surface during the New York City elections, when their members fought against and often defeated attempts by anti-war committees to support the SWP's and Progressive Labor's candidates—on the grounds that to abandon the "single-issue" was divisive!

"In the Name of Unity"

The first major test of how far the SWP-YSA was willing to go to implement their "pop-front" strategy came during the NYC preparations for the October 1965 International Days of Protest. Almost forty anti-war and political organizations formed the Fifth Avenue Peace Parade Committee, under the aegis of pacifists A. J. Muste and Dave Dellinger. SANE (Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy) demanded a single slogan—"Stop the War Now"—and a "respectable" speakers list, and threatened to leave the committee if not supported. The entire YSA-SWP fraction capitulated in the name of "unity," and refrained from introducing their own slogans. Only the Spartacist representatives walked out of the committee; remaining were Progressive Labor, Youth Against War and Fascism, and the American Committee for the Fourth International. [See SPARTACIST #5]

At the first (and last) National Conference of the National Coordinating Committee in Washington D.C. in November 1965, the SWP-YSA began its organizational drive for control of the national anti-war movement. The NCC was composed mostly of independents new to the movement, including many SDS'ers; the DuBois Clubs and other CP-oriented youth also participated. Since the YSA had already started maneuvering on local levels, the conference opened with all sides geared for a giant organizational fight. A vicious

(Continued on Page 5)

**SPECIAL EIGHT-PAGE SUPPLEMENT INSIDE —
Class Struggle Road to Negro Freedom**

HEALY AT LIÈGE AND PEKING

Capitulating to the Maoist version of Stalinism, the Healy-Banda leadership has taken the Socialist Labour League through a qualitative step in its degeneration. A recent headline in the SLL Newsletter (14 Jan. 1967) calls for: "Conditional support of 'Red Guards'—the duty of every revolutionist." The article, written by Banda, reveals exactly what the SLL supports: one section of the Chinese bureaucracy striving, against a less verbally "militant" section, to strengthen its own bureaucratic rule. Although Banda, like Mao, spouts the verbiage of "working class" and "proletarian revolution," he cannot help but reveal his betrayal of working-class aims.

Banda manages a gentle criticism of the SLL's newfound "revolutionary" hero: "There is little doubt that in this struggle the opposition has been aided, involuntarily, by some of the extravagant, improbable and Utopian ideas of Mao Tse Tung; by his refusal to repudiate Stalin, his support of the Soviet intervention in Hungary, his acceptance of 'socialism in a single country' and his hare-brained schemes of 'backyard furnaces' and 100 percent communism. No doubt excesses will be committed in the present campaign."

But he insists that "the choice is clear and unavoidable," a choice for Mao and the Red Guards.

For a Trotskyist to label these as "excesses" etc. is a gross betrayal of the very foundations of Trotskyism. In creating the Fourth International, Trotsky fought to prevent Stalinism from destroying the Marxist program—but Banda, a "reconstructor" of the FI, is ready to dump this program, if only Chairman Mao will let the SLL jump onto his Stalinist merry-go-round.

Instant Stalinism

Needless to say, Healy's devotees, the American Workers League, formerly ACFI, junked their original correct interpretation of the events in China as soon as the SLL Newsletter printed Banda's pledge as a left Maoist. The Wohlforthites had originally analyzed the purpose of the "Red Guard Frenzy" as a bureaucratic attack on all opponents: "The mobilization of the Red Guard is thus aimed at both the right and the incipient left. . . . By appealing to nationalism, just as Stalin did, the CCP leadership hopes to divert the attention of the masses from their growing problems." They saw the end result of this "frenzy" as anti-proletarian: "The smashing of 'Western' art, the destruction of all evidence of

improvements in the living standards of the masses, all in the name of the 'great proletarian, cultural revolution,' are completely reactionary moves, and cannot fail to alienate advanced workers all over the world." (Bulletin, 26 Sept. 1966.)

Since the sneaky Wohlforth discreetly avoids any mention of this earlier position, we must attempt to discover, in his later, SLL-influenced analysis, reasons for this sudden shift: "But Mao's line has not been one of capitulation to imperialism either. It is essentially for this reason that we give him our support." (30 Jan. 1967.) However, this centrist sophistry cannot explain away ACFI's correct analysis of 26 September: "But the fact is that the Chinese have been long on words and very short on deeds. It is not that we advise responding to every imperialist provocation. But the Chinese have not drawn the line anywhere. . . . We can almost see the glee of the imperialists over the genuine appeasement with which their provocations have been met."

Wohlforth, is it possible that your vaunted "Marxist method" led you to reverse your position on 30 January because the SLL had, only two weeks earlier, printed its very first analysis of the events in China, an analysis diametrically opposed to the first Bulletin handling of those same events? Could it be that your vaunted "method" consists of the air mail post between London and New York and that it leads you into political falsification? Such "method" has nothing in common with Marxism—it is a disgusting embodiment of sheer opportunism and theoretical bankruptcy.

SLL Capitulation Expected

The SLL's capitulation, unwelcome as it is to those attempting to rebuild the FI, comes as no surprise to those, like the Spartacist League, who have had to fight against Healy's bureaucratic Cominternist organizational maneuvers. If the politics of a group such as the SLL remain formally "correct" while the organizational practices of its leading clique increasingly degenerate into Stalinist gangsterism, this contradiction must inevitably set up a tension urgently in need of resolution: either the rotting leadership must be thrown out or the political life of the organization will be increasingly contaminated. The sectarian provocation committed at Liège in October 1966 by the Healy-Banda protégés, the British Young Socialists (YS), indicated

SPARTACIST

A Bimonthly Organ
of Revolutionary Marxism

EDITORS: James Robertson;
Managing, Helen Janáček;
West Coast, Geoffrey White;
Southern, Joseph Vetter.

Subscription: 50c yearly. Bundle rates for 10 or more copies. Main address: Box 1377, G.P.O., New York, N.Y. 10001. Telephone: WA 5-2426. Western address: P.O. Box 852, Berkeley, Calif. 94701. Telephone: TH 8-7369. Southern address: P.O. Box 8121, New Orleans, La. 70122. Telephone: 288-6403.

Published by the Central Committee of the Spartacist League. Opinions expressed in signed articles do not necessarily represent an editorial viewpoint.



Number 10

May-June 1967

that this second alternative was being realized.

Liège Sectarians

The Liège demonstration was called by the Jeunes Gardes Socialistes of Belgium (JGS), a youth group influenced by the Pabloist United Secretariat (USec). The demonstration of European socialist and communist youth groups had two objectives: for immediate and unconditional withdrawal of American troops from Viet Nam and against the imperialist NATO alliance. The YS appeared at the anti-imperialist demonstration carrying a banner in support of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution. When the Stalinist Belgian Communist Youth (BCY) were confronted by this banner the group withdrew, although the BCY ranks had originally overridden their leadership to force participation in the demonstration.

The reason for this provocation is clear. The YS discovered that the USec had taken the initiative in working with some young Stalinists who might be pulled away from their leadership. The Healyites' solution to such a challenge was to disrupt this working arrangement with a slogan designed not to educate the Stalinists but to drive them away. Thus the Healyites revealed their inability to politically confront an opponent, to prove through struggle and debate the correctness of their positions and to win over advanced elements from other groups. Instead they offered only a show of sectarian "revolutionary" activity.

However, the Healyites were not the only unprincipled participants at Liège. The USec advanced a defense of their Liège role which by its denial of the vital right to criticize others in a common action is reformist and anti-Trotskyist. Pierre Le Grève defended the USec forces, maintaining: "The principle should have been recalled that it is impermissible in a united front demonstration for certain participants to arrogate to themselves the right to impose slogans which a participating tendency considers inadmissible." (Quoted in *World Outlook*, 27 Jan. 1967.)

Trotsky might just as easily have been describing the rotten politics of Healy's sectarianism and the USec opportunism when, in 1932, he wrote: "The mistakes made in the policy of the united front fall into two categories

Insistence on this type of "principle" helps only to maintain the divisions within the workers' movement. A united front is designed precisely because significant sections of the working class are still controlled by reformist leaderships—its aim is to help free them from that control. Trotsky called in the 1930s for the German CP (KPD) to form a united front with the Social Democrats against a fascist threat to the working class. The Stalinist KPD leadership refused, for reasons similar to Healy's, to work with the "unprincipled" SPD leadership.

More Falsification

His insistence on such "principle" is not Healy's only falsification of Trotskyist positions. In the manner of a Catholic priest, he also quotes Trotsky's descriptions of historically specific con-

ness to fight and the correctness of their programmatic positions.

Fear of Struggle

The Healyites' provocation at Liège destroyed the possibility of an educational struggle designed to set those wavering Stalinist youth against their reformist leadership. (Their criminality is similar to that of the German CP in the early '30s, when it raised abstractly correct slogans on the order of "Down with the Social Democratic Murderers of Luxemburg and Liebknecht," thus driving the SPD workers back into the arms of their leaders.) A sharp, educational and anti-Stalinist basis for struggle would have been the slogan which the Spartacist League raises when with Stalinist youth in anti-war actions: "No New 1954 Geneva Sellout of Viet Nam by USSR-China!" The BCY youth were prepared, by their participation in a united front in defense of the Vietnamese Revolution, to be brought, by the implications of such a slogan, into opposition to their own sell-out leaders. But the Hungarian Revolution slogan was a deliberate provocation, entirely outside the framework of the Liège issues.

The SLL at one time was able to wage a struggle against the revisionists through an entry into the British Labour Party youth organization, the SLL won a significant section of that youth to the Trotskyist program. But the leadership has now reduced the SLL and its International Committee to the position of maintaining itself in a bureaucratic fashion, attempting, through the use of ultra-left, pseudo-revolutionary intransigence or of opportunist *khvostism* toward Mao—a Stalinist with élan—to create the illusion of serious struggle. Their ultra-leftism ("an infantile disorder," Lenin called it) is the complementary face of their adaptation to Mao. Both the opportunism and the ultra-leftism give the SLL the impression of struggle and shield its members from feeling the necessity to actually struggle for hegemony of the working class.

SLL as Maoist

The severity of the SLL's political degeneration can best be seen in its opportunist handling of two theoretical questions concerning China: the source of bureaucracy in a workers state and the means for eliminating that bureaucracy. Their positions on these questions are best summed up in Banda's own words. The source of the bureaucracy, according to this ignoramus, is purely subjective: "Softened by an easy life, accustomed to their creature comforts, dazzled by the privileges of their cousins in the USSR and yearning for 'tranquility' and an end to struggle and sacrifice, these people

(Continued Next Page)



CULTURAL REVOLUTION in China—an East European view.

ies. In most cases the leading organs of the Communist party approached the reformists with an offer of joining in a common struggle for radical slogans which were alien to the situation and which found no response in the masses. These proposals partook of the nature of blank shots. . . . The second type of perversion bore a much more fatal character. In the hands of the Stalinist bureaucracy, the policy of the united front became a hue and cry after allies at the cost of sacrificing the independence of the party." (What Next?)

Healy Wiggles

Several months after the demonstration Healy attempted a theoretical explanation of what had happened at Liège. This pseudo-Trotskyist claims that there could have been no united front because . . . the groups confronting the YS at Liège do not have the "principled positions" Trotsky had. As proof, he offers up the reformist sins of their leaders! (Newsletter, 7 Jan. 1967.)

ditions in Germany as though those were absolute, general definitions—in order to prove that there could have been no united front at Liège because a united front must in all cases be composed of "a mass communist party and a mass reformist organization representing millions of members."

Certainly, there were no "mass" organizations at Liège. But there were some 4000 militant socialist youth, who, through principled tactics, could be the path to a mass revolutionary party on the morrow. Only if the Trotskyist parties struggle along with sections of the working class—whether on issues such as industry attempts to freeze wages, government attempts to destroy independent unions or the imperialist attack on the Viet Nam revolution—can the class vanguard be pulled away from its reformist leaders and prepared for the development of soviets, the united front in its highest form. In such struggles, the real communists (Trotskyists) must prove their willing-

... HEALY

want an end to the Sino-Soviet conflict and the conclusion of a compromise with U.S. imperialism." (Newsletter, 14 Jan. 1967.) Equally subjective is the "cure" for bureaucracy: "The best elements led by Mao and Lin Piao have been forced to go outside the framework of the Party and call on the youth and the working class to intervene," (21 Jan. 1967) and "... it is the youth who constitute the main attack in the movement against bureaucracy. The youth instinctively hate bureaucracy, they detest this type of party which stifles criticism and creative thought, and it is against this that the youth react." (28 Jan. 1967.)

Because the SLL has emphasized subjective conditions as essential in the development of such a bureaucratic crisis, they have confused one section of that bureaucracy (i.e., "the best elements led by Mao and Lin Piao") with the workers state itself and thence drawn the conclusion that a criticism of Mao and his Red Guards is a counterrevolutionary attack on the Chinese Revolution.

SLL as Stalinist

In other words, these "Trotskyists" have put themselves in the curious position of those Stalinists of the 1930s who responded to Trotsky's criticisms of Stalin by labelling Trotsky a "completely ruined fascist and counterrevolutionary." A striking comparison emerges between today and the Third Period, when those "friends of Soviet Russia" mistook Stalin's words for revolutionary deeds and therefore construed Trotsky's criticisms as proof of his counterrevolutionary intentions. So today the SLL and ACFI, friends of Mao's Peoples Republic, take as proof of Mao's "revolutionary sincerity," his phrasemongering and sectarian abhorrence of any "deals" with the Russian bureaucracy—even the demand for a common front in aid of the Vietnamese revolution.

These "Trotskyists" of the SLL might just as well listen to the words of Mao's forebear, an equally "sincere" man: "The second question concerns the task of combating bureaucracy, of organizing mass criticism of our shortcomings, of organizing mass control from below. One of the most bitter enemies of our progress is bureaucracy. . . . The Communist bureaucrat is the most dangerous type of bureaucrat. Why? Because his bureaucracy is masked by the title of Party member. And unfortunately we have quite a number of such Communist bureaucrats. . . . How is this evil to be combated? I think that there is not, nor can there be, any other way of combating this evil than by organizing control by the Party masses from be-

low, and implanting inner-Party democracy. What objections can there be to rousing the fury of the Party masses against the corrupt elements and allowing them to throw these elements out?" These words were delivered by Stalin to the Eighth All-Union Congress of the "Leninist" Young Communist League, 16 May 1928.

Trotsky on Bureaucracy

In contrast to these empiricists who seek to locate the trouble essentially in the desire for "privileges" of corrupt bureaucrats, Trotsky analyzed the historical conditions for both the cause of and relief from bureaucracy: "In other words, the source of bureaucratism resides in the growing concentration of the attention and the forces of the party upon the governmental institutions and apparatuses, and in the slowness of the development of industry. . . . It is unworthy of a Marxist to consider that bureaucratism is only the aggregate of the bad habits of office holders. Bureaucratism is a social phenomenon in that it is a definite system of administration of men and things. Its profound causes lie in the heterogeneity of society, the differences between the daily and the fundamental interests of various groups of the population. Bureaucratism is complicated by the fact of the lack of culture of the broad masses. . . . The struggle against the bureaucratism of the state apparatus is an exceptionally important but prolonged task, one that runs more or less parallel to our other fundamental tasks: economic reconstruction and the elevation of the cultural level of the masses. . . . In the last analysis, the question will be resolved by two great factors of international importance: the course of the revolution in Europe and the rapidity of our economic development." (*The New Course*, 1923.) Trotsky emphasized in addition the need for greater dependence on the Soviets and on the working-class cadres within the party in order to hold down the growth of bureaucracy.

Chinese Bureaucracy

Today this basic historical analysis defines the situation in China, a situation intensified because there is not now, nor has there ever been, workers control in China. The roots of bureaucracy—low economic development and lack of aid from the international proletariat—now threaten the workers state and thereby the position of the bureaucracy itself. Forced by objective conditions, the leading section of the bureaucracy has reacted cynically to its own bureaucratic existence and dully, belatedly and imperically to its economic and social causes. The Mao-Lin Piao faction has labeled everyone else in sight a bureaucrat, assuming with the gall appropriate only to top bureaucrats that their own crimes

won't be noticed, hoping that such labels and the Thought of Mao Tse-tung will scare away the results of bureaucracy. To the economic and international factors which threaten the Chinese workers state (and cause bureaucracy), the Maoists have reacted in fits and starts, zigs, then zags. From the alliance with the national bourgeoisie in 1949, to the nationalization of private industry in 1953, to the Great Leap Forward of 1958-59, to the re-institution of private peasant holdings in 1961, to the present introduction of army units into the fields and factories, Mao has been attempting bureaucratically to "aid" the objective economic needs of the Chinese workers state. From their betrayal of the Vietnamese revolution in the 1954 Geneva Accords, to their decision to develop a nuclear striking force, to their alliance



Socialist Current photo

UNITED FRONT demonstration to free Hugo Blanco marches through London.

SOCIALIST CURRENT A MONTHLY BRITISH MARXIST JOURNAL of LABOUR OPINION

single copy — 10c 12 issues — \$1

Now available from:

SPARTACIST
Box 1377, G.P.O.
New York, N.Y. 10001

with "progressive" bourgeois governments like Pakistan and Indonesia, to their present verbal denunciation of imperialists and revisionists, the Maoists have reacted empirically to the problems confronting any revolution sealed off in one country.

For an imperialistically retarded and deformed country like China, industrialization necessarily requires sacrifice from the population. If the state is to avoid struggles such as the one falsely posed by the Maoists as "economism," the sacrifice must be decided upon by the workers through their own organs of power. Furthermore, such sacrifice, even when decided upon by the workers themselves, can only be a holding operation, awaiting aid from

(Continued on Page 7)

... ANTI-WAR

(Continued from page 1)

three-day fight over the structure of the NCC ensued and dominated the conference. The YSA's ploy was the creation of an Independent Caucus, based on "independent" committees built around the slogan "Bring the Troops Home," and the fabrication that radicals were fighting for "withdrawal" against the moderates for "negotiations"; however these positions were never counterposed and never put to a vote. The "Independent Caucus" in its motion to the final session completely *dropped* the "Bring the Troops Home" slogan to *conciliate the CP'ers and others who would not accept it!* The SWP, having chosen to fight organizationally, was thoroughly smashed by its opponents.

No Fight for Program

Part of the problem for a centrist organization like the SWP in maintaining a "Popular Front" coalition is that it must openly sacrifice for "unity" the one weapon with which it can combat political opponents—its principled *program*. The political struggle is reduced to the small change of maneuvers, deals, compromises and intrigues. The game becomes one of *avoiding* the expression of political differences. And each compromise must be taken back to the membership as a "victory," with an endless pathetic facade of rationalizations and dishonesty.

To further strengthen its "pop front," the SWP began wooing the Stalinists in debates across the country, emphasizing in *The Militant* that the only *real* difference between "Trotskyists" and Stalinists was the question of Democratic Party coalition politics. At the SWP's NYC Memorial meeting for their young comrades shot in Detroit in May 1966, the *Worker* was prominently featured for sale at the rear of the SWP Hall! The turning point came, however, when the DuBois Clubs' membership began to dwindle in the summer of 1966. With an eye toward picking up some of these youth, the SWP in October announced its support for the campaign of Herbert Aptheker, running as an "Independent Peace Candidate" for Congress in Brooklyn. Aptheker's program contained not a word on the withdrawal of troops from Viet Nam and said nothing about breaking with capitalist-Democratic Party politics. This maneuver was palmed off on the SWP-YSA membership as "principled support to a working-class candidate," despite the admitted disagreement with *every single plank* of Aptheker's program. In addition, the SWP refused to support the independent candidates who *did* run on socialist and/or labor party platforms and who called for withdrawal of troops from Viet Nam—e.g.,

Leslie Silberman, James Weinstein and Progressive Labor's Wendy Nakashima.

Organizational Judo

However, the reformist CP has a great deal more experience than the erstwhile Trotskyist SWP at the game of organizational judo. In San Francisco, the Stalinist forces in the Spring Mobilization Committee have voted down any reference to withdrawal of troops in the Mobilization call, in favor of a negotiations position. In New York, YSA'ers are being excluded from committee posts, and the SWP has resorted to sending in "secret" YSA'ers—to avoid an open fight with the Stalinists!

The SWP went to still greater lengths to please its "allies" in the coalition. When SANE called an anti-war rally for 8 December to ask "Mr. President" to scale down the war because it was "making a mockery of the Great Society," the SWP's only reaction was to publicize the meeting and refrain from any criticism of its line, thereby implicitly endorsing it. When the NYC Spartacist Local Committee called a picket line of the SANE rally, Jack Barnes, SWP city organizer stated, "We think you are in error."

Excerpts from Spartacist Call to PICKET NYC SANE RALLY

SANE, the government's loyal opposition in the anti-war movement, has called for a rally, Thursday, December 8, to "End the Vietnam War." Their transit ad asks, "Are our sons' lives being wasted in Vietnam?" And further, "The war still goes on. And by now, the mass of South Vietnamese people couldn't care less."

This rally completely and deliberately obscures the fundamental character of the Viet Nam war—a naked, ruthless intervention by U.S. imperialism to interrupt and drive back a social revolution in Viet Nam, a revolution that is the *only* road to freedom for the Vietnamese working masses. There can be no neutrality in this fight. We are not simply for stopping the war, but rather are for the *victory* of that revolution. To call only for a disengagement of forces acts against the interest of the revolution and implies confidence in the integrity of U.S. imperialism to keep such a bargain.

Any position less than the immediate, unconditional withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Viet Nam lends objective aid to the U.S. doctrine of armed intervention against social revolutions throughout the world!

The reaction of *The Militant* was somewhat more explicit: "ANTI-SANE—A manifesto was issued by the Spartacist League, an ultra-left grouplet, calling on people to picket the SANE Madison Square Garden rally to End the War in Vietnam Now because of

defects in SANE's program. Maybe the name bugs them too." (12 Dec. 1966) Then, on 19 December, to again attack Spartacist, *The Militant's* managing editor, Barry Sheppard, set up the straw man of the ossified, irrelevant Socialist Party as the internal menace on the right. Thus he sought to hide the SWP's accommodation to the powerful liberal-establishment organization, SANE, the real right wing of the movement. Sheppard continued, "At the other extreme, another sad thing occurred outside the rally. The Spartacist League, a sectarian, ultra-left grouplet, staged a picket line of 15 people on the other side of the street, denouncing the rally as a 'left cover for imperialism.'"

Militant United Front

The right-wing domination of the anti-war movement has had the effect of driving away large numbers of more radical activists, including national SDS and several revolutionary socialist organizations. The radicals have become increasingly disgusted with the demonstrated ineffectiveness and simple pacifist-liberal approach of the movement. In New York this reaction has resulted in an anti-imperialist united front formed to intervene as a Revolutionary Contingent in the actions on 15 April. Its principal political thrust is for the defeat of imperialism in Viet Nam and around the world, for the victory of the NLF and the immediate, unconditional withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Viet Nam. Among the fifteen to twenty groups which participated in the first meetings of this united front were the Committee for Independent Political Action, Free School of New York, U.S. Committee to Aid the NLF-SV, Spartacist League, ACFI, Communist Party USA-Marxist-Leninist, Black Mask, Resurgence Youth Movement and IWW, as well as many independents and individual members of DuBois clubs, SDS and anti-war and veterans' committees.

The first action of the group was to attend the New York Peace Parade Committee meeting to demand that time be allotted for radical anti-imperialist speakers for the 15 April rally. At one point, James Bevel, the Spring Mobilization's national director, was shouted down as he attempted to race-bait the group with the remark, "You can't be very radical if you're not black." The time question was finally forced to the floor, amidst cries from the aging Stalinists of "CIA," "provocateur," "police agents" and even "beatniks." The vote was 65 for the united front's demands and 84 opposed, with a sizeable number of abstentions. Every SWP and YSA member in the room voted with the Stalinists, SANE, Reform Democrats against the anti-

(Continued Next Page)

... ANTI-WAR

imperialists! Fred Halstead, SWP and Parade Committee spokesman, when asked his position on victory for the NLF, coolly replied, "I'm personally for bringing the troops home. But as for victory for the NLF, I don't know; I'm not Vietnamese."! The SWP and their class-collaborationist allies see as a provocation the vital demand that the Soviet Union and China *increase* their military aid to North Viet Nam and the NLF. We ask: would the U.S. continue to bomb North and South Viet Nam with impunity if Hanoi and Haiphong were protected by SA-3 missiles and MIG-21 jet fighters instead of the 10-year-old equipment they presently receive? (At present, the Iranian dictatorship receives more MIG-21's from the USSR than does North Vietnam!) Progressive Labor's ridiculous Maoist contribution to this question is to call on North Viet Nam to *reject* even token Soviet aid since acceptance lends a "respectable cover" to Kossygin-Brezhnev. (*Progressive Labor*, February-March 1967) We as revolutionaries call on the Soviet working people to throw out their "leaders" and the counterrevolutionary bureaucracy they represent, and replace them with workers' democracy, so that the industrial and military might of Russia's non-capitalist planned economy can be placed at the disposal of the Vietnamese revolution, instead of being used as a lever to betray it.

Halstead and the SWP, as ex-Trotskyists, are familiar with this position. But in order to preserve the spurious "unity" of the coalition, they make themselves indistinguishable from the pacifists—who deplore *all* wars, revolutionary and imperialist alike—and the liberals, whose real concern over the war is to "save face" for U.S. imperialism. For the SWP as a "Marxist" organization to oppose polarization and political clarification, in the name of "unity" with the friends of imperialism, is a gross betrayal. In this struggle the coalitionist, single-issue line of the SWP-YSA has served simply as an *obstacle*.

ACFI Rewrites Its Past

In an article entitled, "The Peace Peddlers: SWP-CP-Pacifist Cabal Join Imperialist Camp," in the *Bulletin of International Socialism*, (13 Feb. 1967) organ of the "Workers League" (formerly ACFI) Tim Wohlforth discusses the origins of this coalition. The article covers up ACFI's own dirt in several important areas. He claims that "the first product of this new coalition was the Nov. 5-8th [1966] demonstrations" and that the old "umbrella" slogan was the SWP's "Bring the Troops Home Now." He also claims that the *Bulletin* has fought "since the beginning" for

"the victory of the National Liberation Front"; he neglects to mention that in the October 1965 demonstration his organization not only marched under the discipline of the Parade Committee, but refused to carry even *unsigned* Spartacist placards, demanding "Immediate Unconditional Withdrawal of All U.S. Troops" and "Victory for the Vietnamese Revolution—No Negotiations." Wohlforth himself signed the Parade call that claimed the war in Viet Nam "is not necessary for [U.S.] national security" and demanded the removal of "all foreign troops"—i.e., North Vietnamese, as well as imperialist.

Wohlforth has done still more rewriting of ACFI's past. In August 1965 the *Bulletin* anticipated the SWP's social-patriotic approach by several

months, with a front page declaration, "Bring the Boys Home!" (Vol. 2, No. 13) That issue and its Special Supplement reek with pacifist and social-patriotic formulations. The war should be stopped, they declare, in order to "launch a real war on poverty here." The article concludes with the demand of "Not one more American life in defense of reaction abroad." *Nowhere* in that *Bulletin* or supplement does the ACFI express any sense of partisanship with the forces fighting against the U.S. in Viet Nam. Nor was this article simply a "mistake." Representatives of this conciliatory little group hit an all-time low in December '65 when they signed the statement asking "Where is the Voice of the President for Peace on Christmas?"

To Wohlforth and his supporters we in turn ask, where was *your* voice in December 1966 when the NYC Spartacist League and other militants picketed the SANE rally? Your organizer stated, "We have other commitments for that night." Could not one person be spared to picket the enemies of the Vietnamese revolution?

Thus the ACFI has sought to conceal its zig-zag course, thus clearly revealing its unprincipled *centrist* character.

Anti-Capitalist Struggle

The principal effect of the predominantly reformist-pacifist ideology of the anti-war movement is the obscuring of the class nature of the Viet Nam war—an imperialist intervention to crush a social revolution—and the concomitant fostering of political concepts that operate entirely within the system and act to prevent the drawing of anti-war militants and sections of the working class into active political criticism of and confrontation with the U.S. bourgeois state.

What then is the purpose of the anti-war movement? As a movement it has been predicated on the notion that sufficient "pressure" can persuade the bourgeois government to act against its own class interests. The completely unrestrained escalation of the last two years is testament enough to its utter ineffectiveness. As Clausewitz observed, "War is a continuation of politics by other means." The war in Viet Nam is inseparably connected with the social system that gave rise to it.

Militants must realize that the anti-war movement inherently lacks the political cohesion found *only* through programmatic agreement at once revolutionary, proletarian and internationalist that is required to wage a struggle against the capitalist system. While continuing to work in the anti-war movement, radicals should orient toward and join the revolutionary organization whose program *does* provide the basis for such a general struggle, the Spartacist League. ■

CLASS STRUGGLE

Bilingual (French & English)

Trotskyist Journal
(mimeographed)

Published Monthly by
Voix Ouvrière

Sample copy—50c

Order from: **SPARTACIST**

Box 1377, G.P.O.

New York, N.Y. 10001

Spartacist Local Directory

AUSTIN. Box 8165, Univ. Sta., Austin, Texas 78712. phone: GR 2-3716.

BERKELEY. Box 852, Main P.O., Berkeley, Calif. 94701. phone: TH 8-7369.

CHICAGO. Box 6044, Main P.O., Chicago, Ill. 60680. phone: 281-4296.

COLUMBUS. Box 3142, Univ. Sta., Columbus, Ohio 43210.

DETROIT. Box 1021A, Detroit, Mich. 48232. phone: 831-8133.

EUREKA. Box 3061, Eureka, Calif. 95501. phone: 442-1423.

HOUSTON. Box 18434, Eastwood Sta., Houston, Texas 77023.

IOWA CITY. phone: 351-2192 (or contact Chicago).

ITHACA. Box 442, Ithaca, N.Y. 14851. phone: AR 7-1619.

LOS ANGELES. Box 4054, Terminal Annex, Los Angeles, Calif. 90054. phone: 654-8109.

MISSISSIPPI. (contact New Orleans)

NEW ORLEANS. Box 8121, Gentilly Sta., New Orleans, La. 70122. phone: 288-6403.

NEW YORK. Box 1377, G.P.O., New York City, N.Y. 10001. phones: National Office—WA 5-2426; Uptown—781-8722; Downtown—447-2907.

PHILADELPHIA. Box 1827, Wm. Penn Annex, Philadelphia, Pa. 19105.

SAN FRANCISCO. (contact Berkeley)

SEATTLE. phone: EA 2-5165 (or contact Berkeley).

WASHINGTON, D.C.-BALTIMORE. (contact New York)

YOUNGSTOWN. (contact Columbus or New York)

... HEALY

(Continued from Page 4)

victorious revolutions in more advanced countries—revolutions which themselves will be vastly accelerated by the experience, example and aid of a Chinese proletariat ruling in its own right.

Workers Control

The Maoists, of course, have tried every maneuver they could envision: student youth, red prayer books and military enforcement of production allotments. But they have fearfully avoided workers control, the only alternative which could promise to extend the revolution. The reason for their fear is understandable: workers control would have as one of its immediate outcomes—the ousting of the *whole* bureaucracy, including Mao himself.

Thus, Mao represents another extension of the criminal usurpation of Stalinism. The actions of the Maoists ultimately constitute the main internal danger to the Chinese Revolution. Because they disrupt the economy through bureaucratic mismanagement and waste, disrupt other revolutions and

attack the Chinese proletariat, the Maoists objectively aid the attacks of U.S. imperialism on the Chinese revolution.

Thus aid to the Chinese revolution signifies in addition to military defense against imperialist attack, ruthless criticism of this Bonapartist clique at the head of the Chinese workers state and the call for its removal through a political revolution of the workers, given direction by a Marxist-Leninist vanguard party. The Russian leadership now threatens to betray the other workers states in exchange for a “friendly” deal with the imperialists. Aid to China thus signifies a similar call for removal of the Russian bureaucracy. Only in these ways can the Chinese workers state be strengthened and its industrialization safeguarded against the constant aggression posed by world imperialism.

This is the program the FI called for in Russia and it is the program all Trotskyists should call for today for China. But clearly it is not the program of the SLL. To this day the Healy group has never been able to explain how the class forces involved in the Chinese revolution led to a deformed workers state—a characteriza-

tion which they simply borrowed from others. Never having understood the historical developments, they now see the bureaucrats as able to wage a fight against themselves. This pseudo-Trotskyist SLL excuses Mao's overall bureaucratic character and applauds his “progressive” line or his “best element” quality, both necessary aspects of Stalinist rule.

Liquidationism Next

In other words these applauding ex-Trotskyists have abandoned any proletarian perspective in the Chinese workers state for the “privilege” of supporting a section of the leading bureaucracy which has helped deform the state. At the same time they have not yet degenerated to Pablo's position which dismisses the need for a Leninist party. The SLL still calls for the formation of a section of the FI in China. But on what base?—on the Red Guards, “the force upon which the Fourth International will surely be built!” (*Newsletter*, 4 Feb. 1967.) In other words, they wish to be “revolutionary advisers” to Mao, to do what this “hero” is doing, only to do it a “little bit better.” They resemble the SWP in its fatherly advice to “Fidel” and Juan Posadas in his hysterical empathizing with the complete menagerie of such heroes.

This kind of centrist verbal cover was not sufficient to prevent Pablo from following the logic of capitulation through to the eventual destruction of his party. Unless Healy is ousted by those elements in the SLL and IC which want a perspective of international struggle, the SLL and IC will follow a course similar to that of the USec and Posadist groups and will end up liquidating the party as did Pablo.

Open Political Struggle

Healy generalized his sectarian wrecking tactics at Liège to a denial of the Leninist struggle for the united front in action; i.e., the Healyites have lost the possibility of building a revolutionary party in the face of mass Stalinist or reformist parties. Healy's prior theoretically rudderless response to the Chinese revolution has led to his pathetic inability to distinguish a political revolution against the Stalinist bureaucracy from the massive purge the Maoists are now unfolding. From theoretical weakness it proved a short step for opportunist elements like Banda to push the SLL into giving essential political support to this purge under the slogan, “Defend the Red Guards.” These departures by the Healy group from revolutionary politics signal the transformation of the unclarified civil war between Healy-Banda-Wohlforth and ourselves into a clear-cut political struggle between counterposed tendencies. ■

... WELFARE

(Continued from Page 8)

could not win and decided to support the Kailin slate as a “realistic alternative.”

To complete this tragi-comic sequence, the initiators of the original split with the Militant Caucus provoked another split by refusing to accept the R&F Committee discipline when it did not *fully* adopt their position for the Committee's election program. Thus the original R&F slate split into two separate slates, presenting the union's membership with the spectacle of three left slates running on overwhelmingly parallel programs. The result of this fantastic sectarianism will undoubtedly be that all three groupings will garner only a fraction of the votes that a united slate would have and that many militants will be repelled from joining any group. Unfortunately, the Militant Caucus, the one group which played a principled role throughout, will also suffer in the general disenchantment.

Militant Caucus

Despite these setbacks to the entire militant wing of the union, the Militant Caucus intends to continue its fight to win the membership of the SSEU to a program that can win real gains for staff and increase the union's fighting strength. Their program, as extracted from recent leaflets, is briefly as follows:

—A repudiation of the Mage contract, particularly the provisions ac-

cepted before fact-finding which so cripple the union that *any* contract incorporating them is unacceptable. These include the No-Strike, “Management Prerogatives,” and compulsory arbitration clauses.

—Rejection of so-called “professionalism” in favor of “ONE MILITANT UNION IN WELFARE,” including clerks; elimination of the college degree requirement for caseworkers; orientation toward the labor movement, particularly towards a powerful fighting alliance of all unions of City workers.

—A cost-of-living escalator for both workers and clients, reduction of case-loads and job security through sufficient hiring, with a 30-hour work week to enforce this.

—Alliance with client organizations for a united struggle against the City; not just “a more humane welfare system,” but JOBS for clients.

—A Labor party to represent the interests of workers in the fight against political issues such as “Tri-Partite” (See SPARTACIST #6).

—The SSEU to take a stand against the war in Viet Nam and for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all U.S. troops.

—The principled unity of all left-wing forces within the SSEU, and the formation of a democratic disciplined organization of militants.

The Spartacist League fully supports the struggle of the SSEU Members for a Militant Caucus to educate and win the membership to this program. ■

CRISIS OF LEADERSHIP:**SSEU ELECTIONS**

New York City: On the eve of elections in the Social Service Employees Union (SSEU) the Mage leadership—only a year ago mistakenly believed to be idealistic, militant and progressive—stands widely discredited and divided. The gap between leadership and membership, developing for some time, has in recent sharp struggles between the City and union become apparent and explicit. In these struggles, which include a brief January strike and a projected February city-wide work stoppage, the leadership was tested and found wanting by a majority of the membership.

The three-day January strike, which the City had hoped would result in destruction of the SSEU as an effective instrument of struggle, ended instead in a stalemate. While the union came out intact, the strike resulted in not a single gain for the membership, nor a contract; moreover, the union accepted provisions severely impairing its ability to struggle and was badly shaken and demoralized.

Because they had been hoping to avoid a strike, the leadership refrained from exposing the City's intentions and defining essential bargaining demands. Nevertheless, when a last-minute strike was called, the membership responded enthusiastically, with the strike 85-90% solid among caseworkers.

Panicked Leadership

A strike is not won by a fighting membership alone. The leadership, as organizer of the struggle and the membership's representative in bargaining, plays a key role. From the beginning Mage, not the City, was panicked by the strike. While making major concessions to the City in the vain hope of securing equal concessions from it, Mage promised each day of the strike would be the last. The City had each day only to wait another day while withholding an offer. After the third day Mage called for a return to work and the referral of all "unsettled issues" to "fact finding"—though the "unsettled issues" included wages, workload, job content, contract enforcement, hours, leave, and demands to benefit clients!

That the strike ended prematurely was made plain three weeks later at the Non-Residence Welfare Center. Workers there, whose caseloads averaged 50% higher than the old contract limitations, refused new cases; seventeen were immediately suspended. All work stopped at the center. The City proceeded to lock out the workers and

announced they would not be paid. The issue was plain to every welfare worker in the City: the right to enforce contract provisions. But to the City, planning to solve its financial crisis on the backs of its employees, the penalties are crucial. They are needed to discourage workers from struggle against the City's job freeze and Departmental reorganization designed to squeeze out the union.

**Spanish publication of
the Spartacist League
ESPARTACO**

Box 1377, G.P.O., New York, N.Y. 10001
12 issues — 50c

Write for issue no. 1, free.

Issue no. 2 contains articles on MR-13, Texas farm strike, and Santo Domingo (cont.). Issue no. 3 discusses populism and Marxism, racism and the class struggle, and Santo Domingo (concluded).

Though the leadership barely managed to obtain majority votes—65 per cent on the strike and 55 per cent on the work-stoppage settlements—the actual alienation of membership from leadership was far greater, and was subsequently revealed in what were essentially two no-confidence votes. The leadership's attempt to place the autonomous million-dollar Welfare Fund, a potential source of enormous patronage, under direct control of the President was rejected overwhelmingly. The next meeting eliminated special speaking privileges for officers at meetings.

Divided Leadership

The leadership entered the pre-election period divided and in a state of crisis. In addition to the "official" incumbent leadership slate, a second slate headed by John Kailin is projecting its candidates as "untarnished" and more militant than Mage. The candidates of the Kailin slate are not "untarnished" but have been a prominent part of the leadership for several years, in particular supporting and defending the strike and work-stoppage sellouts.

The forthcoming April elections would seem to provide the SSEU's membership with an extremely timely opportunity not only to analyze recent struggles and assess the leadership's role in them, but also to select a different kind of leadership. Given the widespread discredit of the present leadership and its own division, the opportunity would appear ripe for a genuinely militant opposition slate to

win a significant section of the vote and perhaps even an office or two.

Divided Left

Unfortunately it appears that this opportunity will not be realized. Shortly after Mage's election last year a grouping, the "SSEU Members for a Militant Caucus," was formed to oppose the new leadership's reformist policies. It based itself on a broad militant program and opened its ranks to all tendencies and individuals on a democratic disciplined basis. However, before the strike a section of this group with no programmatic differences broke away to form a second group, the "Rank and File Committee," ardently supported by the then American Committee for the Fourth International (ACFI). From the beginning, the Militant Caucus sought to heal the unprincipled split and initiated a campaign for the unification of the two groups. This campaign embarrassed and eventually evoked an evasive but tentative response from the R&F group. The Militant Caucus suggested that the two groups at least run a joint election slate with each grouping retaining the right to express its own program while supporting the common slate. Such a joint campaign had an excellent opportunity of using the leadership's collapse to emerge from the elections with a sizeable unified organization of militants—a genuine caucus—able to continue the struggle and win in the future.

"On the Other Side"

At this point the following statement appeared in ACFI's *Bulletin of International Socialism*: "We warn Spartacist: there is presently a war going on between the revolutionary Trotskyists represented by the International Committee and the revisionist agents of capital represented by the SWP-German-Frank Pabloite formation. You are on the other side in this war. Henceforth we will have no relations with you." Subsequently the R&F Committee, despite internal opposition, put forward its own slate and refused united action with the Militant Caucus during the election. With the failure of a unified campaign, the large CIPA (Committee for Independent Political Action) grouping decided to abstain in the elections, instead conducting an "educational campaign" of "Tax the Landlords." Other militants, not yet fully conscious of the decisive nature of program, felt that a divided left

(Continued on Page 7)