

DEFEND THE DRV-NLF ADVANCE

For Class War Against Imperialism's War



Puppet Troops Rush Helicopter at Anloc Seeking Escape from DRV Drive.

United Press International

North Vietnamese troops have mounted a major assault on the puppet forces of the South Vietnamese, thus far successful as the South Vietnamese forces have disintegrated in the face of the attack. The *New York Times* of 25 April reports Communist seizure of more than half of three provinces and quotes a South Vietnamese officer's statement that their defeat at Tancanh was "one of the worst days yet for the South Vietnamese forces." But war is a continuation of politics by other means, and the military operation reflects the contradictions inherent in its Stalinist leadership. On one hand the political aim of the drive is to force the U.S. back to the conference table for the hammering out of a new "Geneva Accords"; on the other hand, the assault has materially advanced the cause of the Vietnamese revolution insofar as it has crippled the U.S.-supported South Vietnamese forces. The Stalinists of Hanoi and the NLF are furthermore careful not to embarrass the liberals as the 1972 elections approach, and concentrate primarily on exposing the folly of Nixon's "Vietnamization" program.

For United Communist Defense

Although certainly not intended as such by the Stalinists, one effect of their offensive is to expose the utter bankruptcy and uselessness to any but the liberal bourgeoisie of the mainstream U.S. anti-war movement. Nixon did not hesitate to order massive bombings of the North in an attempt to halt the drive; that his B-52 raids have so far not stopped it is no credit to the bourgeois-led anti-war movement. More than anything else, the Vietnamese now need massive modern military assistance from the "communist" bloc of deformed workers states and

its defenders everywhere. Such assistance can be assured only with a political revolution against the respective nationalist-bureaucratic ruling elites of the deformed workers states—a revolution that will be based in large measure upon the felt need of the workers for dependable defense against imperialist aggression. Thus the perspective of political revolution against the Stalinist bureaucracies means a stand unequivocally in favor of communist victory in all Indochina and against the bureaucratic horse-trading with imperialism which sabotages that victory. In this the U.S. anti-war movement serves as an active obstacle through its subordination to the ambitions of bourgeois politicians, its hypocritical pacifism and social patriotism, its reliance on impotent marches rather than labor anti-war strikes, and its refusal to support communist victory throughout Indochina. An extremely heartening event in Washington, D.C., in which demonstrators picketed the Soviet Embassy for failure to provide ample assistance to the Vietnamese, was scorned by the National Peace Action Coalition (NPAC) when asked its opinion of the action. Of course it could not participate, with its SWP-engineered captivity to the imperialist bourgeoisie!

North Vietnam Endangered

The Vietnamese military successes have been achieved at great potential cost to North Vietnam: much of its precious weaponry had to be moved south in support of the drive. They still lack the modern SAM-3s

continued on page 6

continued on page 3

Break the Two-Party Stranglehold!

The recent uproar over Nixon's non-fulfillment of major campaign promises repeats the seemingly endless cycle in American politics of switching from one capitalist administration to another and back again while the exploitation and oppression of the working masses stand unchallenged and unchanged.

The peculiarity of the present election is only this: the Nixon government now thrashes about for solutions at a time when the U.S. has lost its unchallenged hegemony in the imperialist world, and when discontent over Vietnam, the economic crisis, racial oppression, etc. has reached massive proportions.

The widespread current discontent provides the workers' movement the precondition to break from the bankrupt, bourgeois two-party system

and forge a party of the working class based upon the trade unions around the Transitional Program. But the recent avalanche of bourgeois and "left" assaults on Nixon's policies and exposures of his regime are carefully calculated to channel the revulsion of the masses into the Democratic Party. The bourgeois anti-Nixon crusaders expect the workers to forget their very recent experiences under the Democrats. It was the Democratic Party of McGovern, Chisholm, Abzug and Delius that first involved the U.S. directly in Vietnam and escalated the war to its height under Johnson. The Democrats are a savage, racist party of imperialism which is even more useful to the capitalists than the Republicans, particularly in times of crisis, because the masses retain more illusions about it. The ruling class has relied every time

on the Democrats to drag the workers into imperialist war.

Engels pointed out long ago that elections provide an index of the consciousness of the proletariat. While the votes for both Wallace and McGovern are undoubtedly "protest votes" reflecting disillusionment with Nixon's key policies, the election of any of the bourgeois candidates can only mean continued reliance on the ruling class to solve

George Morris and the CP—

PAGE 4

RECORD OF BETRAYAL

NEW YORK TAXI SWINDLE

Fight Van Arsdale's Sellout with a Class Struggle Program!

For the past sixteen months members of the New York City Taxi Drivers Union have worked without a ratified contract. Drivers continue to work under an agreement—substantially worse than the last contract—which was negotiated behind closed doors by the fleet owners, the city and the Van Arsdale union bureaucracy. Every regressive feature of the present "contract" was acquiesced to or actually initiated by Van Arsdale. For example, in December 1970 he proposed to the fleet owners an "apprenticeship program" under which the new drivers would be hired at 42% of the meter as opposed to the 49% that all drivers got under the last contract. New drivers would work 200 days a year for five years before they were entitled to the 49%. Drivers who didn't work their 200 days would remain indefinitely at 42%. The fleet owners responded to this bonanza—amounting to a 15% pay cut—with an enormous recruiting drive, hiring all new drivers after March 1971 at 42%.

Part of Van Arsdale's agreement was a staggering 48% fare increase—proclaimed a major victory by the union leadership. Whatever victory the fare increase meant for the fleet owners, for the drivers it meant shrinking business and smaller tips as a taxi ride became a luxury too expensive for working-class and even many middle-class people. One justification the fleet owners used to sugar-coat the increase for the drivers was the "dime." Under the last contract the fleet owners paid 5¢ for every fare out of their cut of the meter into the union health and welfare fund. Under the current "contract" the fleet owners pay 5¢ while the driver also contributes 5¢. Since there is no ratified contract, however, the money goes into the bosses' banks rather than into the union fund. When the union rations out benefits it must go begging to the owners for a bit of the \$11-million-a-year dime rakeoff. As under previous contracts, part-time drivers (more than half the industry) pay the union dues and the dime but get no benefits.

Rank-and-File Coalition

Opposition to the Van Arsdale leadership within the union is centered primarily in the "Rank-and-File Coalition." The Coalition has justly demanded the elimination of the 42% feature of the "contract," the return of all the dimes to the union, payment by the owners of all benefits and proportional benefits for the part-timers. But that's all. The Coalition has refused to oppose the fare increase. It seeks to increase the drivers' share in the present piece-work system (to 60% of the meter) but does not fight against the system itself, which forces drivers to drive like maniacs, compete ruthlessly with fellow drivers, and refuse service to outlying areas. Only the replacement of the piece-work system by an hourly wage can improve these conditions. Just as teamsters fought for and won the abolition of the payment-by-mile system in favor of the hourly wage, so the taxi drivers must fight to replace the piece-work commission with an hourly wage, including full payment for time spent "shaping-up" and for time lost due to breakdowns and repairs.

Unionize the Gypsies, Expropriate Fleet Owners!

The Coalition refuses to take any position on the "gypsies" or the medallion system. In New York City it cost \$14,000 to get a medallion which entitles one to drive a "Yellow Cab," cruise the streets and pick up passengers. In ghetto areas where Yellow Cabs were seldom to be seen, "gypsy" cabs and fleets were organized for the price of a "Car Service" sticker. The fare increase won many regular Yellow Cab patrons over to the gypsies, and the economic crisis not only pitted Yel-

low Cab drivers against each other with new intensity but also pitted the gypsies against the Yellows. Hostility increased when the non-unionized gypsies scabbed on the Yellow Cab strike last year. The antagonism reached such a pitch late last year that some gypsies were physically attacking Yellow Cab drivers who ventured into ghetto areas. An ominous contributing cause to the gulf between Yellows and gypsies is something which leftists inclined to capitulate to simple union patriotism would prefer to ignore—that is, racism. This hard fact makes more imperative the common organization of Yellow and gypsy drivers. The racism feeds the antagonisms and makes a common union more difficult to achieve; reciprocally, the counterposed interests of the two groups flowing from the lack of common struggle feeds the racism.

Cops Out of the Taxi Industry!

Medallions are issued by the Police Department which supervises and regulates the industry and licenses and screens drivers. The police armed fist of the state serves the taxi owners gratis as managers, foremen and personnel directors. The Yellow Cab industry must be taken out of the hands of the Police Department and the fleet owners. The medallion system must be abolished. The City should take over the Yellow and gypsy fleets without compensation to fleet owners but compensating the owner-drivers fully for whatever they have paid toward a medallion and cancelling their outstanding debts. The entire industry, gypsy and Yellow, must be unionized under a closed shop with a central union hiring hall and dispatch system, with union regulation of safety standards, working conditions, hack lines, etc. Hourly wages should be set at parity (at least \$4 an hour) with other transit workers. A full pension program after twenty years should be established. To combat unemployment—falling most heavily on blacks and Latin minorities—we must struggle for a shorter workweek at no loss in pay. To fight inflation we demand a full cost-of-living escalator clause.

Phony Militancy and the Phony Left

At the April 1971 membership meeting the drivers greeted Van Arsdale's attempt to shove his rotten contract down their throats by physically driving him from the meeting hall. This time Van Arsdale prepared for the semi-annual membership meeting of 12 April 1972 by organizing isolated, sporadic "wildcat" actions around the single issue of the 42% commission—one sure issue to pit older against new drivers. In the scattered wildcats some drivers lost a week's pay as drivers in other garages picked up extra business. Van Arsdale hoped that these strikes would divide and demoralize the ranks so they would accept his settlement as the best obtainable. Despite this tactic aimed at deflecting the drivers' dissatisfaction away from the union bureaucracy, Van Arsdale was unable to control the April 12 meeting, which broke up in violent disorder. A Rank-and-File Coalition agenda motion (to limit Van Arsdale's speaking time and move on to discussion of how to obtain a decent contract) was ruled to have lost despite clear majority support, and goons supporting the leadership started hurling chairs. Despite the Rank-and-File urging to continue the meeting, it ended in pandemonium. Only a city-wide strike over the entire contract can defeat the greed of the fleet owners and the treachery of Van Arsdale.

As president of the Central Labor Council, Van Arsdale calls for demonstrations against the wage freeze and inflation while he gives the fleet owners a 48% fare hike and his own members a 15%

pay cut. Like Meany's exit from the Pay Board, Van Arsdale's token demonstrations are only stunts to build support for a Democratic presidential candidate who will follow the same policy toward labor as Nixon. While we must demand that labor quit the Pay Board, we must express no confidence that Meany and his ilk will not climb eagerly back on the Pay Board—especially under a Democratic administration.

Both Democratic "friends of labor" and the Republicans voted together to give Nixon the power to freeze wages, break the dock strike, etc. Labor can fight the wage-freezing, strike-breaking union-busting policies of both parties only by organizing its own party, a labor party. Such a party would be based on the trade unions and on the struggle to replace the friends of big business like Van Arsdale and Meany with a leadership dedicated to the interests of workers as a class. Every governmental body from the Pay Board to the Taxi Commission, from the cops to the courts, is used against the workers in any conflict between labor and capital. Workers must fight for a government that serves our interests—a workers' government.

The "revolutionary democratic socialist" International Socialists and the "revolutionary communist" Progressive Labor Party have tailed uncritically after the thoroughly reformist program of the Rank-and-File Coalition. The Workers League went one better, tailing after Van Arsdale and the fleet owners in opposing the legalization of gypsies and in defending the cop-run medallion system! (see *Bulletin*, 10 April 1972) The WL stand is hardly surprising given its support a year ago to the New York police "strike" and its enthusiasm for police career ambitions among taxi drivers (see 31 January *Bulletin*, "Youth Demonstrate to Protest Freeze of Police Hiring"). For all the verbal enthusiasm expressed by the WL lately over prison rebellions, its position on police as "workers" logically would lead them to consider prison guards as a legitimate part of the labor movement. On the taxi issue, the WL's real appetites are equally apparent: in order to appeal to white workers on the basis of backwardness and hostility to the black "gypsy" drivers, the WL supports the cop-run medallion system which screens out ex-convicts from employment in the Yellow taxi industry! The fake lefts like the fake union leaders must be swept aside in the struggle for workers power.

ABOLISH THE 42% COMMISSION. Return the "dime." Fleet owners to pay all benefits. Proportional benefits for part-timers.

REPLACE COMMISSION SYSTEM WITH AN HOURLY WAGE. For a shorter work week with no loss in pay to fight unemployment. For a full cost-of-living escalator to fight inflation. Roll back the fare.

UNIONIZE THE GYPSIES. Expropriate the fleets. Abolish the medallion system and Taxi Commission. For a union hiring hall and union control of safety and working conditions.

FOR A CITY-WIDE STRIKE TO FIGHT FOR A BETTER CONTRACT. For union democracy. Replace Van Arsdale with a leadership based on a militant class-struggle program.

FOR A GENERAL STRIKE AGAINST THE WAGE FREEZE. Break with the parties of big business, for a labor party based on the unions; toward a workers' government.

FOR LABOR STRIKES AGAINST THE WAR—for immediate unconditional withdrawal of U. S. from Southeast Asia—Victory to the Vietnamese revolution. ■

IS Prepares to Desert Vietnamese Struggle

The North Vietnamese offensive of the last month has put ostensible socialist groups to a test of their revolutionary worth. International revolutionary solidarity demands the fullest military support to the victory of the DRV/NLF offensive, despite its bureaucratic leadership which endangers that victory. The International Socialists have failed the test miserably and exposed themselves as anti-communist social-democrats.

For a number of years the IS (then called the Independent Socialist Committees) under Hal Draper refused to call for immediate unconditional withdrawal from Vietnam. Ann Draper, then a leading ISC trade unionist, voted with the CP for a "Negotiations Now" position in Trade Union SANE. This at least was consistent with the ISC's Shachtmanite theories regarding the Stalinist countries as a new kind of exploitative regime in many ways worse than capitalism. (Shachtman himself by the 1960's was defending the U.S. intervention in Vietnam and the invasion of Cuba!) But as the war dragged on, the slogan "Military victory to the NLF" became popular on the left, and the IS, adapting itself accordingly, picked up the slogan. In its own terms, this meant taking the side of an imperialist bloc (Soviet Union—China—North Vietnam) in an inter-imperialist war—but no matter, since for the IS popularity comes before politics.

Today, however, the slogan becomes more embarrassing to the IS since the war is obviously no longer being waged primarily by the NLF

guerrilla forces but rather by the North Vietnamese army with direct Soviet involvement. So the IS is pulling back. Formally, the position statement in every issue of *Workers Power* still stands: "... in Vietnam we support the victory of the NLF over the U.S. and its puppets." But in a series of recent propagandistic efforts the slogan does not appear.

The IS editorial, "Nixon, Mao Deal Over Asia" (*Workers Power*, 3-16 March) ended with a section titled "For the Third Camp." The section stated in part, "To the degree that the U.S.-China detente means a short-term relaxation of tensions in the area, it should be welcomed." No mention of the need for "Military victory to the NLF," no denunciation of the Chinese stab-in-the-back to the DRV/NLF. "Relaxation of tensions" is an imperialist euphemism for a rotten deal with the Stalinist bureaucracy controlling the workers states to halt the class struggle.

In its article "Thieu Regime Totters," (*Workers Power*, 14-27 April) the IS again "forgot" to call for victory to the DRV/NLF. Instead, the article advertised the SWP's April 22 popular front demonstration and boasted that LBJ was forced to stop the bombing in 1968 "because of the failures of his policies in Vietnam and the

strength of the anti-war movement at home." In reality it was the 1968 Tet offensive which shook Johnson, not the powerless pop-front protest movement of the SWP and IS.

In Los Angeles the IS has explicitly demonstrated its abandonment of the Vietnamese struggle. The latest IS leaflet is headlined "All Out—April 22" and ends with the statement "We stand in opposition to all forms of class society, both capitalist and bureaucratic 'Communist,' and in solidarity with the struggles of all exploited and oppressed people." But what about the North Vietnamese offensive? The leaflet says nothing of that! The next step—critical support of the "democratic" capitalist side—is not far away.

By coincidence, the IS had planned a forum in Los Angeles on Cuba on April 21, when the war issue was sweeping the UCLA campus. The Spartacist League and Revolutionary Communist Youth attended to discuss the IS theories of Stalinism. The speaker refrained from a class characterization of the Cuban state. When a Spartacist member raised the question of the class nature of the Cuban state, linking the issue with the IS leaflet on Vietnam and demanding, "Do you

continued on page 7

The Origins of World War III

The current military and economic realignment of world forces taking place in the wake of the collapse of undisputed U.S. hegemony among the rival imperialisms brings again to the forefront the great question of the attitude of the working-class movement toward inter-imperialist war. The six-part class series now in progress will

RCY CLASS SERIES

For information—time/place/reading list, contact

San Francisco

JOHN 658-8014 or SUSAN 548-8685

Bay Area

examine the causes of the two previous World Wars and the strategies advanced by the various currents of the socialist movement; those which led to betrayals of the working class and the strategies of the Bolsheviks calling for irreconcilable class struggle in wartime as well as in "peace" time.

Continued from Page 1

... Against Imperialism's War

(which the Soviet bureaucracy has eagerly bestowed upon bourgeois Egypt to gain advantage in the Near East), which could clean much of the U.S. bombing offensive from the Vietnamese skies. The danger of strangulation of North Vietnam, the most secure base of the Vietnamese revolution, increases in proportion to the relative Soviet successes in diplomatic maneuvering with the capitalist states in the Near East, Europe and with Japan. If domestic political imperatives prevent an emboldened U.S. from attempting a major MacArthur-style invasion of a lightly-defended North Vietnam at the Red River delta, the possibility is very real that the Soviet Union may feel its stakes in Vietnam are not worth the risk and abandon grudging aid for complete and open betrayal by acquiescing to a maritime blockade. The Spartacist League pointed early to the necessity, through political revolution to unseat the bureaucracy, for a united communist bloc stretching from East Berlin to Hanoi, as it warned also of the real danger of the U.S.-China detente in which the Vietnamese would be the probable first victims. In the mid-1960's the SL demonstrated in front of the Soviet UN mission in New York under the slogan "Soviet Nuclear Shield Must Cover DRV, China" to expose the Russian Stalinists' abject betrayal of elementary solidarity against imperialism.

Bureaucratic Zigzags in China

The developments in China over the past half-dozen years, especially edifying to left-wing Maoists, provide an excellent illustration of the methods of bureaucracy in a workers state in the face of imperialist threat. A split developed in 1965-66 in response to the fear of U.S. invasion of China felt by all wings of the bureaucracy in the light of the dramatic U.S. escalation in Vietnam.

Liu Shao-Chi, Chou En-Lai and others appear to have argued within the nationalist bureaucratic framework for an attempt at a limited detente with the Soviet Union to increase military aid to Vietnam in response to the U.S. assault which both wings recognized was aimed primarily against China. Mao and Lin Biao held that China could hold off both the U.S. and the Soviet Union through "peoples war" and alliances with the "Third World." Shortly after the purge of Liu and his supporters in the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" the Maoist thesis was shattered as China became increasingly isolated even in the "Third World," especially after the entire bureaucracy's policy in Indonesia had led to a rightist coup and the massacre of hundreds of thousands of unprepared cadre of the pro-Chinese PKI. The bureaucratic-utopian notion that, in effect, B-52's could be stopped by peasant bamboo spears gave way with the purge of Lin and others to moves toward a policy of leaning on the U.S. against the Soviet Union. The necessity to remove the bureaucratic excrement upon the workers states was never more clearly apparent; the reality of Chinese policy provides a wretched contrast to the often revolutionary and anti-bureaucratic impulses of Maoists outside China. They must either degenerate into open apologists for a Chinese version of the infamous Nazi-Stalin collaboration, or discover the road of Trotsky and the Left Opposition.

- For immediate unconditional U.S. withdrawal from Indochina!
- Military victory to the DRV/NLF; For the Vietnamese socialist revolution!
- For labor strikes against the war!
- Smash the wage controls!
- Build a labor party, struggle for a workers government! ■

Fight for Socialism, Down with Liberalism!

RCY Walks out of SDS

One hundred supporters of the Revolutionary Communist Youth, youth section of the Spartacist League, walked out of the March 30-April 2 SDS National Convention chanting "Fight for Socialism, Down with Liberalism!"

Since SDS' break from New Left populism in 1969 in favor of a subjectively revolutionary pro-working-class orientation, RCY (formerly RMC) and the Spartacist League had been the Trotskyist left opposition within SDS, fighting the rightward drift of SDS under Progressive Labor leadership. RMC had consistently posed the need for a non-exclusionist, openly socialist youth organization based on a working-class program of transitional demands, counterposed to PL's economist, social-worker approach. RMC's principled struggle within SDS drew around it many former PL supporters. The founding of RCY as the youth section of the Spartacist League was in large measure due to the experience and cadres won by RMC by its political struggle in SDS.

SDS' political degeneration, in retreat from the positions taken at the 1969 split, was qualitatively deepened in the period preceding the last convention. PL's own right turn in favor of class collaboration was reflected in a new, profoundly liberal line for SDS: the "Anti-Racist Textbook" campaign. RCY denounced the deliberate separation of the issue of racism from capitalism and the class struggle. SDS' new single-issue orientation abandons the struggle against the material oppression and exploitation of blacks and other minorities in favor of empty moralism in alliance with academic liberals—the ideologues for the liberal wing of the ruling class—against academic reactionaries.

In between SDS convention sessions—during which RCY intervened to present and argue for its counter-proposal "Out of the Classroom and into the Class Struggle!"—RCY members attended an expanded RCY National Committee plenum.

Read the RCY NEWSLETTER
May-June Issue on SDS Split

BOOK REVIEW:

George Morris and the CP—

RECORD OF BETRAYAL

REBELLION IN THE UNIONS, a handbook for rank and file action, by George Morris; New Outlook Publishers, 1971.

The unwary student or trade unionist reading *Rebellion in the Unions* might not see it as a wholesale attempt at distortion designed to hamstring rank-and-file opposition and tie it to the very labor bureaucracy and ruling class it seeks to fight. Yet under the guise of "revitalizing" the labor movement, long-time Communist Party "labor editor" George Morris sows confusion, and more.

His main proclaimed concern is the struggles against class collaboration, anti-communism and racism in the labor movement. He bemoans the labor bureaucracy's links with the CIA, its reliance on the capitalist state to bail it out of difficulties with the ranks, and support for the "wrong" Democrats in the elections. He rails against Lovestone and Meany and concentrates heavy fire on Joseph A. Beirne, CWA president, as an opponent of strikes and a company unionist in the Thirties. The "progressive" veneer is pretty thin, however; throughout this incredibly inconsistent and self-contradictory book, Morris covers up both his own past and the record of CP betrayals, slanders revolutionary critics and builds the basis for a repetition of the very evils he opposes.

Though you would never know it from the blurb on Morris' previous works or from the book itself, Morris authored another work in 1945 with a different slant but the same method—a pamphlet entitled "The Trotskyite 5th Column in the Labor Movement," in which he attempted to demonstrate that the "Trotskyite disrupters" (who wanted to continue the class struggle and fought the CP's patriotic "no-strike" policy) were the direct agents of the Nazis. A comparison of the two "works"—of the CP's record then and its goals now—is even more instructive than the contradictions of *Rebellion in the Unions* itself.

Morris denounces the class collaborationism of "most" trade union bureaucrats that led them to support a war in Vietnam until it became too unpopular for them. "If the policy is to make the trade unions partners to capitalism, then it inevitably leads to partnership with imperialism and all its crimes against the people at home and abroad." He cites the support of the British labor aristocracy to British imperialism in the last century. He condemns the "American Century" and the drive "to line up the unions for the 'world leadership' march" which led to red-baiting after World War II, claiming that the CP opposed a "labor aristocracy" and its identification with U.S. imperialism.

Pro-Capitalist, Anti-Strike

In 1945 Morris' tune was a bit different; more like a screech, in fact: "in their attitude to the war, the Trotskyites hardly conceal their anti-war sabotage. Every issue of their weekly paper, the *Militant*, denounces the Allied powers as 'imperialist'.... To give their splitting and pro-Hitler policy a 'socialist' tone, they shout loudly that management and labor cannot possibly have a joint interest...." As to the post-war drive "to line up the unions" Morris complained, quoting the *Militant*, that the "Trotskyites" were trying to wreck that, too: "Allied unity has always been

distasteful to them."

The Communist Party was the most consistent class collaborationist force in the labor movement before, during and after World War II (except for a brief interlude after the Hitler-Stalin pact). The diplomatic needs of the counter-revolutionary ruling elite in the Soviet Union dictated and still dictate the politics of the Communist Parties. After surrendering the German workers to the Nazis without firing a shot in the early Thirties, the Stalinist bureaucracy called for diplomatic alliances against fascism with the "democratic" imperialist countries. To please the "democratic" imperialists, who were panting in anticipation of Hitler's inevitable drive to destroy the Soviet Union, Stalin ordered his CPs in those countries to quell the class struggle as much as possible and collaborate. Since the CPs had become instruments of the Stalinist bureaucracy rather than of the international working class massive class struggles in Spain, France, the U.S. and elsewhere were deprived of revolutionary leadership and led to the imperialist slaughter as the Stalinists hid their treachery behind the banner of the October revolution.

In the U.S., the CP fought to keep working-class organizations tied to Roosevelt and the Democrats. The party used the selfless organizing zeal of many CPers to provide a left cover for the CIO bureaucrats' efforts to get the confidence of the workers in order to limit the struggle to reformism. During the war the CP was the most ardent advocate of class peace and collaboration. Besides supporting the no-strike pledge to the bitter end, the CP was the only force in the labor movement which outspoke backed Roosevelt's repeated attempts to impose a vicious labor conscription law (hailed by the Nazis as a trick from their bag). Although labelling the Trotskyists "fascists" for maintaining the Leninist position of class struggle against all the predatory imperialists, the CP consistently forgot to mention that these "Trotskyite fascists" unconditionally defended the Soviet Union throughout the entire war.

In *Rebellion*, Morris never once even mentions the CP's position on World War II, its total support for the Roosevelt government (including betrayal of blacks to Roosevelt's Dixie-Democrat friends), or its line for class peace after the war as well, to allow the "partnership" of the U.S. and USSR to develop into a permanent division of the world. Earl Browder, since discredited (his name appears nowhere in Morris' book), set Stalin's line for the entire CP, including Morris: "If J. P. Morgan supports this [Anglo-Soviet-American] coalition and goes down the line for it, I as a Communist am prepared to clasp his hand... we frankly declare that we are ready to cooperate in making capitalism work effectively in the post-war period.... We communists are opposed to permitting an explosion of class conflict in our country when the war ends... we are now extending the perspective of national unity for many years into the future" (from the CP's January 1944 National Committee meeting). This should be enough to dispel the notion that the CP's class collaborationism was motivated by the "holy war" united front against fascism; it was solely for the purpose of supporting the Soviet bureaucracy, which wanted nothing better than class peace everywhere in return for capitalist promises of safety within its own borders. This position was taken in the face of the most massive and politi-

cally conscious upsurge in U.S. labor history, beginning with the miners' strike of 1943 and culminating in the unparalleled strike wave of 1946. The CP attempted to continue its wartime strikebreaking policy during this strike wave, but was eventually swept up in it itself, in the rear.

When the bourgeoisie, in its drive to institute the "American Century" of U.S. world domination, had to turn on its erstwhile Soviet allies, a campaign of anti-communist hysteria was necessary at home both to subdue the militancy of the labor movement and subordinate it to the new "cold war" foreign policy. In *Rebellion*, Morris sees the adoption of the cold-war stance by the CIO as a key turning point, which coincided with the beginning of the current class collaborationist policies, and led to red-baiting in the labor movement and later to support for the Vietnam war and all the other well-known evils.

Anti-Communism Nothing New

But this "turn" was really nothing new. It was a shift in line by the trade union bureaucracy of the CIO and AFL in keeping with its thoroughly established policy of toeing the ruling class line on politics and foreign policy. It was a "turn" for the CP—against them—for which they had prepared not only by their class collaboration but by their own red-baiting as well. In 1945, having claimed that "Trotskyites" were no longer a legitimate current in the labor movement and "have been swept out of every decent political or labor organization as so much vermin," Morris ran off at the mouth with examples of "Trotskyite disrupters" popping up everywhere fomenting strikes as in Michigan, where only "an eleventh hour intervention of responsible C. I. O. and A. F. of L. leaders saved the key war state from a disastrous general strike..." etc.

CP Unites with Red-Baiters

In *Rebellion*, Morris repeatedly counterposes the "progressive" CIO to the "reactionary" AFL until the cold-war "turn" changed all that and paved the way for the 1955 merger sponsored by anti-communists like Arthur Goldberg. Yet at the end of his 1945 pamphlet, Morris appended an article by Thomas J. Flynn, executive assistant to Teamsters international president Daniel J. Tobin, uncritically endorsed in the text and purporting to show how "labor" had learned about the "Trotskyites." After pointing out that "Trotskyites cannot be good union men because they do not believe in the principles of unionism nor do they believe in the American form of government or the American flag," Tobin's flunkey concludes, "The Trotskyites were wrong in Russia. They are wrong in the United States. Fortunately, Trotsky is now dead. Unfortunately, too many of his followers are not."

Daniel J. Tobin was a determined opponent of industrial unionism, one of the most reactionary upholders of old-line craftism in the AFL, and a notorious red-baiter. The opinions in his article appended by Morris flowed from the success of Trotskyists and others in the struggle for militant industrial unionism in the Teamsters union, in the 1934 Minneapolis general strike, led by Trotskyists and others in Drivers Local 544, it was Tobin who red-baited the leadership, giving the cue for "commie scare" to the local bour-

geosie. The 1934 Minneapolis strike, which coincided with the Toledo Auto-Lite strike and the San Francisco general strike, was part of the workers' initial upsurge for industrial unionism. That struggle was anathema to Tobin and others in the old AFL, who fought might and main to reverse the tide. Tobin and the bourgeoisie sustained their persecution of the Minneapolis leaders until Local 544 was finally destroyed and the government had railroaded 18 Trotskyist leaders and unionists to jail for opposing the war (with Tobin's boundless help in supplying "witnesses"). That this wartime "conspiracy" trial laid the foundation for the later cold-war persecution of the CP is an elementary lesson in class politics which the likes of Morris will never learn. To this day, a hallmark of Stalinism is its betrayal of left-wing opponents in the labor movement to the class enemy. The CP supported the first Smith Act jailings (the "Minneapolis 18") as it had earlier supported the passage of the Smith Act, the reactionary law which the government later used against—the CP.

CP Betrays Itself

When the time came to red-bait the CP, the policy of class collaboration extending more than a decade had trained the CP to see surrender as struggle. William Z. Foster, later to replace Browder, had the method well mastered in 1941: "During the past few months reactionaries of all stripes—business-as-usual-ists, open shoppers, fifth columnists—taking advantage of the fact that the trade unions have agreed not to strike during the war, have been delivering a ferocious offensive against workers and their organizations.... If successful, this anti-labor drive would sharpen the class struggle, weaken national unity, and undermine the whole war effort.... Labor's best protection against such reactionaries is to intensify greatly its war work on every front, to be-

and betrayal exemplified by the no-strike pledge. Many workers, demoralized by CP betrayals, regarded the anti-CP aspiring bureaucrats as more militant. Morris excoriates Beirne—correctly—for his company union past. But the CP's policy had saddled unions with a chief characteristic of company unions—the promise not to strike. In unions like the UAW, the NMU, and others the present bureaucracies seized control largely on the basis of revulsion in the ranks at CP policy. The bureaucratic regimes which came to power in the cold-war period—assisted by the demoralization of workers by the CP's own policies—retain their stranglehold over labor to the present day.

Seeks New Bloc with Bourgeoisie

But today, Morris says he's against class-collaborationism, anti-communism, political subservience to the bourgeoisie, and the rest. Has the old boy changed? Hardly. "We have yet to see acceptance of labor leaders into cabinet positions, or their assignment as ambassadors to a country with more than two million population," whines Morris in *Rebellion*, dreaming of a new day of popular-front crumbs from the capitalists. Morris has a good word for the popular front government of Chile, where the CP helps Allende keep the mass movement within capitalist legal channels, setting it up for the mounting reaction, and for Ceylon, where the government shoots down "ultra-leftist" radical youth in the streets.

His support for labor's "political independence," his central political slogan, is a mass of contradictions. On the one hand, "The Democratic Party is a political arm of capitalism, as is the Republican," says Morris, almost as an afterthought (p. 157), but on the other hand, "the absence of real independence and of a class approach in political activity takes the dynamics out

how better on 'Vietnam issues').

The Record on the Labor Party

Morris points out that "labor or third parties had a short life in the United States because old party politicians often take over the issues on which the independent parties ride. The Democrats under Roosevelt absorbed several... [such parties] or substantial movements for them...." It's surprising that Morris should mention this, since the CP opposed all these movements more vigorously than anyone else in the labor movement except the most reactionary bureaucrats. After the miners' strike of 1943, the massive upsurge of strikes against the no-strike pledge, and Roosevelt's attempt to impose labor conscription, even the most compromised bureaucrats, who had only a year earlier labeled the miners "fascists," and who clearly depended on Roosevelt politically, hesitated to call for his re-election. The CP had no such qualms. It was the first element in the labor movement to call for a fourth term! Morris makes much now of "independence"—i.e., choosing from among many oppressors rather than being "frozen" in one party—yet the CP fought to a split in the American Labor Party (a gimmick to get socialist-voting workers in New York to back Roosevelt) for unwavering support of Roosevelt against even such "independence." The upsurge in the second half of World War II, culminating in 1946, saw the breakaway of John L. Lewis and many labor conferences calling for a labor party, yet the CP waited until it could support the pro-capitalist liberal Wallace—from Roosevelt's government—on a "peoples party" ticket in 1948 that had minimal "labor backing" by comparison! Since the Progressive Party was designed to have Roosevelt's program, the Democrats easily absorbed it. Said Morris at the time, "Liberals who favor further advances along the Roosevelt path to 'make capitalism work' won't get us sore. On the contrary, they have and will continue to find us among the most vigorous supporters of every step."

Morris' complaint (supposedly aimed against the labor bureaucrats) that labor parties fail because of lack of "labor backing" is really an excuse for attacking the left, staying in the two-party system, and for ducking the issue of why capitalist third parties fail. In *Rebellion*, Morris omits any specific mention of the Progressive Party experience, preferring to deftly interchange the words "new," "third" and "peoples" with "labor" party (the official CP program is more consistent; it favors a "peoples party"). Third parties seeking to reform capitalism fail because the Democratic Party is stronger and in a better position to deliver on the identical reformist promises. Pro-capitalist third parties indeed do help "make capitalism work"—usually by undermining themselves and strengthening the two-party system. As the Trotskyists pointed out at the time, the class nature of a party is not determined so much by what class supports it (the Democrats have plenty of "labor backing"), but by what class it supports in its program, politics, etc. Morris to the contrary notwithstanding, only a party which is controlled by labor (based on the trade unions) will be viable and supportable as a working-class alternative.

The Trade Union Bureaucracy

The labor movement today is dominated by an oppressive trade union bureaucracy, the function of which is to keep labor locked into the capitalist system through reformist policies, suppression of militants, etc. This concept is completely foreign to Morris. Throughout the book he always draws the distinction, historically and currently, between "most" trade union leaders, the reactionary bureaucrats, and "some," the progressive. For Morris, the chief difference between the "progressives" and the "reactionaries" is their willingness to work with the CP ("anti-communist" doesn't refer, of course, to the baiting of militants to the left of the CP) and mouth a few phrases for "peace" and "against racism." ("There can be no equivocation on racism anymore than on... strikebreaking" moralizes Morris; but the CP favored strikebreaking in favor of black community coalitions with the likes of Lindsay and the Ford Foundation.) The CP's "progressive" unions have always been substantially identical to the "reactionary" ones. The CP ran Curran's NMU—until he turned on them—with a bureaucratic fist of iron. Today, District 65 in New York masks its bureaucracy under a thin democratic facade: it left the AFL-CIO and joined the ALA without a single membership discussion or vote! Usually

continued on page 8



GM Sit-Down Strikers Oppose 1937 Injunction—Stalinist Leadership in Auto and Other Unions Channelled Massive Wave of Labor Militancy into Support of FDR and No-Strike Pledges.

come an ever more dynamic force in our national unity" (Foster, *American Trade Unionism*, p. 292). The CP mouthed phrases about the dangers of capitulation—and capitulated. At the CIO convention in November 1946, it supported the policy declaration that "we resent and reject the efforts of the Communist Party or other political parties and their adherents to interfere in the affairs of the CIO." Morris wrote at the time that this was "the long sought-for answer of the CIO" to the demands for a reactionary red purge. The CP "always favored a statement telling the world the CIO isn't Communist," said Morris (*Daily Worker*, 19 November 1946). Little wonder that when Morris and the CP "fought" anti-communism they lost, immediately after this declaration, in lock-step with each new cold-war Truman aggression, the purge began, until all the Stalinist-led unions were expelled from the CIO, union militants and "reds" of all stripes driven from their unions and jobs and the labor movement purified for capitalism for more than a generation. The CP fought only where it had bureaucratic control assuring automatic majorities.

Fundamental to the CP's ruin in the unions was its reputation for both undemocratic control

of political action even if it is waged for a labor-endorsed liberal in the Democratic or Republican party" (p. 32). What's left of an "independent class approach" waged in "the political arm of capitalism"? Morris complains that "the start has to be made sometime" and that Meany is "working to hold the unions within the two-party system," yet he rails against all attempts to call for a break with the two-party system as "premature" because they lack "labor backing." Thus the Chicago "Rank and File" Conference in 1970, which Morris and the CP regard highly, endorsed a labor party "in principle," but since such a thing was "not in the cards" it "declared its support of any Democratic and Republican candidates who merit it by the records on domestic and Vietnam issues." By such a policy, the entire labor bureaucracy, "progressive" and conservative alike (as Morris points out, even Beirne says he's for "independence") has been in the Democratic party since Roosevelt, backing Kennedy, Johnson, Humphrey and now choosing amongst Lindsay, Muskie, Jackson, etc. Needless to say, the CP helped out on most of these (Goldwater was a threat to "peace" and Humphrey, coming straight from the Johnson administration, was still some-

Continued from Page 1

Break the Two-Party Stranglehold!

problems which only the workers themselves can solve.

McGovern: "Clear Cut" Imperialism

McGovern's record reveals his real allegiances. The man praised by the Communist Party as "clear cut" on the war has voted against repeal of the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, voted for the 1967 Vietnam war appropriations, and supports NATO and SEATO. He supported compulsory arbitration in the recent dock strike; he favors the anti-union "right to work" section 14B of the Taft-Hartley Act and supported the enabling legislation which permitted the viciously anti-labor wage-"price" freeze. His promise to get out of Vietnam within 90 days of election conditional upon a release of POWs is as reversible as Johnson's "peace" campaign against Goldwater during which Johnson had already planned the first massive bombing of Vietnam, and as reversible as Nixon's promise to have ended the war by now. If the ruling class deems it necessary to expand the war further and can keep the working class captive of the bourgeois parties and their supporters in the trade unions, McGovern will be more vicious than Johnson or Nixon before him—promises be damned!

Wallace: Fascist Danger?

Wallace is a populist-racist demagogue who appeals to the "little man," but not a fascist about to occupy the Chancellor's seat, as the Stalinists of the CP and the "Trotskyists" of the Workers League would have us believe. In fact Wallace has toned down his 1988 slogan "there is not a dime's worth of difference between the two parties" in order to play his card in the Democratic primaries. Wallace's "protest" vote indicates nascent fascism to about the same degree that McGovern's "protest" vote represents a nascent liberal third party. Fascism, to which the bourgeoisie resorts to preserve its rule in times of total social breakdown, is characterized by dispensing with all bourgeois-democratic forms in order to attack

the working class and destroy its organizations—principally the trade unions—as possible institutions of struggle. George Wallace is no more a fascist than was Senator Joseph McCarthy; the fake left's walling about "fascism" is only a cover for spreading "lesser evil" illusions.

Wallace's entire strategy is to pressure the Democrats and Republicans from the outside and the inside in order to shift the whole spectrum of bourgeois politics to the right. The CP's cry of an imminent fascist threat from Nixon, thus building up the Democrats, parallels the WL cry of imminent fascism from Wallace to build up the credit of the labor bureaucrats. Both objectively strengthen the two-party system. Just as the CP's call for an "anti-monopoly peoples party" is subordinated in practice to the Democrats, the WL's call for a labor party is subordinated in practice to embellishing the role of the union bureaucrats.

CP Aids Liberals

The Communist Party, by portraying the Democrats and particularly McGovern as candidates of peace, is an important prop of the bourgeois two-party system. A front-page story in *Peoples World* (15 April 1972) described McGovern and Chisholm as "clear cut" on the war and CP vice-presidential candidate Jarvis Tyner as the "most clear cut"—placing the candidates on the same continuum. The CP's basic electoral policy has not changed since Stalin's popular front strategy gave rise in 1935 to the "broad anti-monopoly coalition." By running its own ticket while whitewashing the Democrats the CP hopes to deflect criticism from militants in its own ranks, especially those recently recruited around the Angela Davis defense. The party gives "top priority" to its own campaign on the grounds that the liberals must be pressured to expose Nixon fully, that "at the present level of the campaign they cannot defeat Nixon." (*Political Affairs*, March 1972)

In the same issue of *Political Affairs* Gus Hall renders liberalism more profound:

"To expose Nixon is to expose the present policies of state monopoly capitalism. To defeat Nixon is to expose the reactionary fascist danger."

By identifying Nixon with the "reactionary fascist danger," by making his defeat the real aim of pressuring the liberal imperialists to advance from "clear cut" to "most clear cut," the CP prepares a whole new generation of cadre for betrayal. At a time when it must recognize unprecedented opportunities for mass work, it builds confidence in the Democratic Party. In his revolting social-chauvinist statement from a Hanoi bomb shelter to the American people, Gus Hall said not a word of criticism or warning about the role of the Democrats. He hopes that the shelter will protect him from revolutionary criticism as much as from imperialism's bombs.

The Socialist Workers Party (SWP), employing sophisticated arguments perhaps unprecedented in its history, has condemned the CP-led PCPJ "anti-war" campaign as a "multi-issue reformist campaign" which will lead to a class collaborationist, reformist electoral expression. The SWP argues that this approach will "exclude" revolutionists and some black nationalists who disagree with the full reformist program whereas the SWP's "single issue" approach will draw them in. The SWP approach is to the right of the CP (if only slightly) since it permits sections of the liberal bourgeoisie to participate in and dominate the "anti-war" movement based only on verbal agreement with NPAC's single issue—thereby giving the Hartkees even greater room to maintain their reactionary labor stand. The essential difference comes down to the CP's multi-issue reformism vs. the SWP's single-issue reformism.

Meany's Grandstand Play

George Meany's break from the Pay Board in no way represents a break from class collabora-

continued on next page

Workers Vanguard Subscription Drive

WORKERS VANGUARD

Marxist working-class monthly
published by the Spartacist League,
is for truthful and merciless
revolutionary criticism
and exposure of
lies, hypocrisy,
oppression and betrayal.



In order to build the circulation of its press, the Spartacist League National Office is calling for a drive to obtain 800 additional subscriptions to *Workers Vanguard* and to increase the circulation of the *RCY Newsletter*. An increase in our circulation, especially of *Workers Vanguard*, is essential if the projected expansion of the SL press is to continue.

The SL wants to maintain a press which actually reflects, and is linked with our intervention in the labor and radical movements. We want a press that is no mere showpiece, but is itself an intervention with real people to shift the axis of real struggles, transforming the consciousness of the militants involved. Thus not only the financing of our press expansion, but also the quality of the coverage itself, depends heavily upon our ability to get it into the hands of more readers, especially activists in the labor and radical arenas of our work.

Local organizations will be responsible for organizing the drive in their areas, meeting the quota, and making sure that every SL and RCY member is participating. Following are the proposed quotas for the local areas:

Berkeley-Oakland	55
Boston	125
Chicago	40
Los Angeles	50
New Orleans	15
New York	180
San Francisco	25
San Diego	10
Stony Brook	20
Washington, D. C.	10
At-Large	90
Total	600

The comrade nationally who sells the most subscriptions during the two-month period of the drive will receive as a prize the choice of the new hardcover *Prison Notebooks* of Gramsci, the hardcover edition of Trotsky's *History of the Russian Revolution* or the new hardcover 1905 by Trotsky. There will be a booby prize, too—the National Office proposes to award the comrade selling the fewest subs a commemorative silver half dollar bearing the likenesses of Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver, minted in the 1950's expressly "to oppose the spread of communism among Negroes in the interest of national defense."

WORKERS VANGUARD

Marxist Working-Class Monthly
Published by the Spartacist League

Editorial Board: Liz Gordon, Marv Treiger,
Nick Benjamin (managing editor).

Production manager: Karen Allen,
Circulation manager: Janet Rogers.

West Coast editor: Mark Small,
New England editor: George Foster.

Subscription: \$1 yearly (11 issues). Bundle rates
for 10 or more copies. Address: Box 1377, G.P.O.,
New York, N.Y. 10001. Telephone: WA 5-8234.
Opinions expressed in signed articles or letters
do not necessarily express the editorial viewpoint.

tion. Meany recently stated that he favored either full controls or no controls, as if the bourgeois state could behave in a "neutral" fashion harnessing labor and capital alike. Meany's "rebellion" is not some latter-day discovery of incompatibility with Nixon's program, but an attempt to refurbish the long-standing illusion that the Democrats are the party of labor while the Republicans are the party of big business. Meany stands in Humphrey's camp and is an old supporter of the war. The Democrats consider the economic issue their "winning card" and Meany advances his position with them by his grandstand play.

The Workers League seeks to embellish Meany's role, thereby ultimately relying upon labor bureaucracy as the conduit of working-class pressure and as a counterweight to the "fascist threat" the WL sees posed by Wallace. Instead of recognizing Meany's move as a collaboration with Democratic capitalists, the WL states:

"Meany's walk off from the Pay Board signified the whole breakup of the traditional relation of class compromise between the labor bureaucracy and the capitalist class."

—Bulletin, 10 April 1972

The Bulletin goes on to describe Meany's walkout as a consequence of "the movement of the American workers which forced Meany off the Pay Board [which] does not merely coincide with the Vietnamese offensive that is part of the same struggle." If the WL maintains that Meany's walkout was prompted by the movement of the American workers and not primarily by Meany's desire to make himself more valuable to the Democrats and enhance their election chances, how will it explain the probable future development—Meany and his fellow bureaucrats walking back on a Pay Board of the Democrats when the American work-

ing class may be exerting even more pressure?

The WL needs a bogey from the right in order to justify its distorted evaluation of the present motion of the labor bureaucrats. Its Bulletin creates one in its description of Wallace's Florida victory as a fascist plot and a "tremendous threat" which is part of "Wallace's and the capitalists' plans for dictatorship. . . ."

Which Way for the Black Movement?

The eclipse of the Panthers following their split left the leadership of the black "movement" more firmly in the hands of the bourgeois forces. In class terms, the small rising black petty bourgeoisie ranging from extreme nationalist strike-breakers like Imam Baraka (Leroi Jones) to nationalist reformists like Jesse Jackson inherited the vague mantle of leadership of the black movement with determination to form a bloc with the black representatives of the liberal bourgeoisie like Mayor Hatcher of Gary and others.

This bloc with the bourgeoisie was consummated at the recent conference in Gary, Indiana. Jackson's crucial role at this conference (along with Jones) was to pass his "Economic Bill of Rights" and remain formally independent from the Democratic Party in order to maximize bargaining power at the Democratic Convention through politicians like Shirley Chisholm. Jackson voiced his conception of black liberation a few months ago when he stated that blacks should stop standing outside the office of the Welfare Department and start standing outside the office of the Treasury Department.

The conference also exemplified the capitulation of the bourgeois black leaders to white segregationist policies, covering their retreat with clouds of nationalist rhetoric. The easily passed anti-busing resolution was defended by Roy Innis of CORE as proceeding from the nationalist view that black people should control their own schools, whereas Wallace's fight against busing was based on white racism. The fact remains that Wallace would like nothing better than to see blacks remove themselves from the fight for white-controlled educational resources through "black community control" of schools.

The contradiction inherent in the slogan of all-black unity grows more apparent as a thin layer of blacks (the new "talented tenth") rise into the petty bourgeoisie and find their conditions of life improving absolutely and relatively while the great mass of working-class blacks and those forced out of the working class find their conditions of life deteriorating.

The economic crisis has brought more unemployment while many of the state governments have begun to crack down on the welfare rolls. Watts, for example, is in worse shape than on the

eve of the 1965 Watts uprising despite innumerable showcase poverty programs.

The illusion of improvement in the conditions of blacks derives from this growing class differentiation within the black community between the downtrodden masses and the petty government bureaucrats, new black businessmen, students entering colleges in larger numbers, and celebrities sprinkling the mass media, cultural and sports world. The hegemony in the black movement of the representatives of the aspiring strata is bound to come into increasing conflict with the mass, whose conditions have actually declined, and who can provide an important, dynamic and even leading sector of a labor party alternative to the capitalists.

The Newton wing of the Panthers continues to address itself to the conditions of the mass of blacks but as social workers, not revolutionists. Black businesses are boycotted until they deliver a kickback which is then distributed to the poor at mass rallies under the slogan "This will tide us over till liberation." This is just another variant of the semi-municipal fake "socialism" of consumption of the community control schemes. The programmatic bankruptcy of the Panther Party will not, however, tide it over to liberation. It is quite likely that virtually all the voters among the 16,000 people fed at the Giveaway will vote Democratic in the absence of a working-class alternative, and, if Wisconsin is any indication, for the Humphrey wing at that. The Panthers have themselves just announced their support of the Chisholm candidacy, a milestone in their degeneration into bourgeois reformism.

The recent spate of muckraker articles and exposures directed against the Nixon Administration is an excellent example of guided ruling-class propaganda. The exposure of the ITT-Republican alliance which brought to the Republicans a guarantee of \$400,000 to bring the 1972 Republican Convention to San Diego sought to discredit the Republicans through selective revelations of monopoly control of the party. What leading liberal Democrat John Tunney of California and others refused to bring to light was the complicity of ITT with the Democratic Party in ITT's acquisition of Hartford Insurance Co. and other aspects of ITT's expansion in 1965-68.

Bourgeois rule has been shaken by Nixon's policies which are themselves a continuation of the policies of the Democrats before him. The liberal bourgeois politicians are seeking to shore up illusions in the Democratic Party, attempting to rescue it from its past and create the illusion of a genuinely democratic process. The opportunist "vanguard" parties that can do no better than tail after the bourgeois and reformist trade union leaders contribute their share to the continued enslavement of the working class. ■

Continued from Page 3 IS Prepares to Desert ...

or do you not support the current North Vietnamese offensive?" the ISers evaded: "This is a forum on Cuba only" the chairman asserted; another stated "we are not interested in intramural debates with Spartacist." The question was never answered.

In the past, the IS has attempted to justify its support to the NLF on the grounds of "self-determination for the Vietnamese." While this is a correct Leninist slogan, it is nevertheless also true that if a particular national liberation struggle becomes absorbed into a general imperialist conflict, the slogan of self-determination becomes only an excuse for taking sides in an imperialist war. For example, to raise the slogan "self-determination for Serbia" after 1914 could only mean support to the Tsarist government against the Hapsburgs. It is well known that the NLF has been a political captive of the North Vietnamese Communists since the early 1960's, and that the North Vietnamese, insufficiently aided by the Soviets and Chinese, were carrying the main burden of the military effort by the late 1960's. To the IS, North Vietnam, the Soviet Union and China are "imperialist" powers; thus support to the NLF was sheer opportunism which flew in the face of all IS' theories. For our part, as Trotskyists we consider North Vietnam a deformed workers state—the victory of its army over Saigon would mean a tremendous gain since it would mean the destruction of imperialism in South Vietnam. If the IS thinks "self-determination" is all-important, even above class questions, then logically it should now be defending Saigon against the North

Vietnamese invasion on the basis of "self-determination" for South Vietnam. Who knows—maybe this will turn out to be the new IS position! ■

Spartacist Local Directory

ATLANTA. Box 7886, Atlanta, Ga. 30309.
BERKELEY-OAKLAND. Box 852, Main P.O., Berkeley, Calif. 94701. phone: (415) 848-3028.
BOSTON. Box 188, M.I.T. Sta., Cambridge, Mass. 02139. phone: (617) 876-1787.
CHICAGO. Box 6471, Main P.O., Chicago, Ill. 80680. phone: (312) 843-4394.
DENVER. (contact New York)
EUREKA. Box 3081, Eureka, Calif. 85501.
ROUSTON. (contact New York)
LOS ANGELES. Box 38053, Wilcox Sta., Los Angeles, Calif. 80038. phone: (213) 487-8855.
NEW ORLEANS. phone: (504) 482-5181.
NEW YORK. Box 1377, G.P.O., New York, N.Y. 10001. phone: (212) WA 5-2426.
SAN DIEGO. Box 22052, Univ. City Sta., San Diego, Calif. 82122. phone: (714) 453-1436.
SAN FRANCISCO. Box 40574, San Francisco, Calif. 84140. phone: (415) 828-8259.
STONY BROOK. L.I. Box 654, Port Jefferson, N.Y. 11777. phone: (516) 246-8848.
WASHINGTON, D.C.-BALTIMORE. phone: (202) 223-1455.
(FRANCE) Paris. phone: 887. 67. 13.

subscribe NOW

Special
Subscription
Offer: **\$1**
11 ISSUES

INCLUDES SPARTACIST

Name _____
Address _____
City _____
State _____ Zip _____

WORKERS VANGUARD

Mail to: Box 1377, G.P.O./New York/N.Y. 10001

Continued from Page 5

RECORD OF BETRAYAL

the "progressives" are better on rhetoric only to be worse on economic issues: Bridges of the ILWU sold but more thoroughly on containerization than the reactionary ILA, which won earlier the guaranteed annual wage for some of its members. The real function of the "progressives" within the trade union bureaucracy, to the minimal extent that they differ from the rest, is to contain discontent with liberal rhetoric.

The purpose of the CP is to help create such a "left" trade union bureaucracy, using what is left of CP credibility to prop it up, on the basis of a mild reformist program and a few radical phrases and goals "in principle." This is the meaning of the Chicago Rank and File Conference. The Conference was ostensibly for "independent political action," rank and file democracy and "action" (whatever that means), but it was highlighted with a speech by newly elected Democratic Mayor Gibson of Newark, since a notorious strikebreaker, and it was dominated by union bureaucrats and functionaries, some "opponents," some not, from such unions as West Coast Puip and Paper, UMW, Steel, UAW, etc. A keynote speaker referred to criticism of the recently signed GE con-

action to agitate for a labor party and fight union endorsement of Democrats and Republicans, and demanded "democracy in this conference," including "majority rule and minority rights." Needless to say, the bureaucratic leadership had no more time at this conference to hear the opposition than it does in its local unions: the paper's supporters were suppressed at the microphones.) After passing over these groups that he has to deal with in the labor movement with a few quotes, Morris then tries to discredit them by linking them with Stanley Aronowitz, Monthly Review, the literary "New Left," various unnamed anarchists, etc., whom he takes to task at length for abandoning the struggle in the unions. The lesson from Lenin on this question is something Morris has managed to remember; so he proceeds to knock down his straw men with righteous orthodoxy.

Morris Turns Lenin into His Opposite

At the end of this exercise, Morris quotes a couple of passages from Lenin against "revolutionary phrase-making" unidentified as to context and Lenin's purpose. The quotes were from articles written against those who wished to suck out of their thumbs a revolutionary war against Germany in 1918, instead of temporarily accepting Germany's terms dictated at gunpoint in order to preserve revolutionary Russia. Morris, of course, completely misapplies them: the 1918 Bolsheviks had a revolutionary perspective hampered in application by backward objective conditions; the American working class today faces a world objectively ripe for revolution and speedy

construction of socialism, but lacks the subjective awareness of this imperative. It is precisely the task of communists to aggressively apply a revolutionary program, not by seeking to bypass the unions or by individual terrorism, but by raising consciousness in the labor movement through persistent exemplary struggle around transitional demands.

The CP program is a pabulum of meaningless abstractions; it is the mush remaining after forty years of cooking up new dishes out of the same old unprincipled twists and turns, blunders and betrayal. Every step of the way, Morris changes his line, covers his tracks, tones down his verbiage from the past—but at every step he prepares again both the betrayals of the CP and the rise of new Lovestones, Beirnes and Meanys. While the CP attempts to bring together into a so-called "left" the future bureaucratic henchmen of capital, serious union oppositionists must set about the task of building an alternative leadership. The Spartacist League seeks to build such a leadership by the only possible method: the organizing of caucuses and creation of a communist cadre in the unions on the basis of the Transitional Program. This program calls for breaking state wage controls, a sliding scale of wages and hours, opposition to the special oppression of blacks and women, strike action against the Vietnam war, defense of the deformed workers states against imperialism, opposition to renewed protectionist nationalism by the bureaucrats and the renewed threat of inter-imperialist war, and breaking the grip of the two capitalist parties through a workers party based on the labor movement. ■

"Progressive" Bureaucrat Reports on Vietnamese "Progressives"

The dangers to the Vietnamese revolution posed by its Stalinist leadership are well described by a friendly source who recently visited Vietnam. District 65 President David Livingston reported on his trip to Hanoi (with Teamster Vice President Gibbon and Amalgamated Meatcutters Vice President Caldwell) at a union meeting on April 27. In Hanoi, he had spoken to Le Duc Tho, a chief North Vietnamese negotiator, who had met with Kissinger in secret talks. Tho said North Vietnam was ready to resume peace talks in Paris, that he was not in favor of a Communist government in the South, but a "three-segment government" including (1) the present Saigon administration (minus Thieu); (2) the PRG (Provisional Revolutionary Government), only a "tiny minority" of whom are Communists; and (3) "unaffiliated independents." Tho said that they did not seek a Communist government, but one that is "independent and neutralist," that they did not seek to humiliate the U.S. after the war is ended, but that they wanted good relations with the U.S. government. Tho also said that they do not seek total military victory in the current offensive, but only seek to expose phony "Vietnamization" and pressure the U.S. back to the peace talks.

tract as irresponsible radicalism and "company propaganda." Action on some minimal reforms was discussed, but all discussion on a program of transitional demands to break the labor movement out of the reformist grip of the bureaucracy was considered out of order.

"Left" Bureaucrats Squash the Left

Attempts made at the Conference to interject a class-conscious program apparently spurred Morris to do some homework on "ultra-leftists" and to spend almost 30 pages attempting to discredit them, mostly through guilt by association. Interestingly, the evil Trotsky-"ites" of 1945 are now Trotsky-"ists." Morris has indeed forgotten much since then. Gone are the lurid tales of how Himmier was sponsoring a "Fourth International" to wreck the Allied war effort, etc. It appears that the Trotskyists keep popping up in the unions and having to be answered, despite having been swept out "as so much vermin" by Morris in 1945!

The Stalinist method of today, however, is essentially the same. Morris quotes a number of things from *Workers Action* (since incorporated in *Workers Vanguard*), *Spartacist-West* and a position paper entitled "Stop Manipulation—Power To The Ranks" (Morris failed to identify the authors of the paper: International Socialists, Spartacist and several union caucuses) as well as attacks by pseudo-Trotskyists and Maoists, to prove that these "ultra-lefts" attack only "progressives" and are therefore "encouraged" by "reactionaries." (The position paper linked "left"-sounding bureaucrats with the entire trade union bureaucracy, called for immediate independent labor political

CP Slander Exposed

In George Morris' "World of Labor" column in the 19 October 1971 *Daily World* of the Communist Party U.S.A. appeared a broadside directed against all critics of the liberal labor bureaucracy and the liberal bourgeoisie. Morris was not satisfied with accusing his opponents of "disruptive antics" and sabotaging the "unity" with people like Mayor Lindsay (who "came forward as a powerful voice for an end of the war") and his political allies in the unions. He went further:

"Who are the people engaged in this dirty business? There are among them some duped youths who may honestly think that the measure of 'revolutionism' is how violently you denounce union leaders. But in terms of what they accomplish, the ringleaders of these sects are clearly getting encouragement from very reactionary sources—as employer agencies, police, FBI, CIA or any of the other instruments for disruption and division in the progressive sectors of the working class movement.

"What else can you say of groups that make those who move forward their major target? What else can you say of a group like the 'Labor Committee' that seems to have ample funds to saturate every demonstration with printed leaflets?....

"This is not a 'revolutionary' group: it is a counterrevolutionary conspiracy and should be known as such."

Hard upon the *Daily World* charges came physical harassment of LC members by individual CPers. On October 21 the Labor Committee published

the demand that the CP publicly retract the charge. Silence was the CP's reply.

A Commission of Inquiry composed of notable left-libertarians (Rowland Watts, Eric Bentley, Fred Cook, Nat Hentoff, Conrad J. Lynn, Dwight Macdonald, Richard Ohmann) was constituted. On 20 January 1972 it wrote to the CP demanding that the party substantiate its charges against the LC or publish a retraction. The letter noted that such charges have often been used to justify violence against political opponents.

On February 9 the commission wrote the CP announcing a hearing to be held on February 23 and warning that continued failure by the CP to submit documentation justifying the charges would necessitate the commission's finding against the CP.

The CP did not respond, and the commission ruled that

"Therefore, the commission is left with no alternative but to publicize its judgment that the Communist Party is unwilling or unable to substantiate their charges made against the National Caucus of Labor Committees."

An organization with a history of betrayal as long as the CP's (see "Record of Betrayal" in this issue) must resort to slander, frame-ups, hooligan violence and assassinations to silence opposition and to harden up its own supporters with the bond of guilty consciences. ■

Farinas Jailed

On March 20 Workers League supporter Juan Farinas began serving a two-year sentence in the Federal Penitentiary at Danbury, Conn. Farinas was prosecuted for distributing an anti-war leaflet on his induction January 31, 1971. The Supreme Court has refused to review his conviction; on March 27 District Court Judge Milton Poilack rejected Farinas' motion for modification of sentence.

The Workers League, in addition to its hypocritical record on defense of the left against repression, has substituted for proletarian democracy a self-serving sometime lip service to this aim, alternating with the justification and practice of thuggery. Nevertheless Farinas' victimization is a blow from the state against the entire workers' and radical movement. His conviction and sentencing for the distribution of leaflets—a widespread practice and evidently no offense at all—stands in marked contrast to the more successful defense efforts on behalf of other militants, such as the Harrisburg defendants, many Black Panther militants, and the recent government offer to drop most of the charges faced by Puerto Rican activist Carlos Feliciano.

Immediate unconditional freedom for Juan Farinas!
We demand the expunging of his frame-up conviction and removing his status as a convicted felon, thus restoring his full civil rights.