

SPARTACIST

NO. 5

NOV.-DEC. 1965

10c

INDONESIA:

LESSON IN BETRAYAL

The reign of terror being carried out by the Indonesian army against the working class of that country follows logically from a process of treachery tragically familiar in the annals of working class struggle. The working people of Indonesia are now paying with their blood for the betrayal by the leadership of the 3,000,000-member, pro-Chinese Communist Party of Indonesia (PKI), which must share guilt for the present violence. Workers and militants of all countries, particularly those who look to the CP of China for "revolutionary" example and direction, cannot afford to ignore the warning of this classic lesson.

Mao's Peaceful Coexistence

Guided by the Mao government's "bloc of four classes" doctrine and need for "Peaceful Coexistence" with "progressive, non-aligned" capitalist "friends," such as Indonesian President Sukarno (a former collaborator with colonialism), the PKI—largest Communist party in the capitalist world—has been helping administer Indonesian capitalism while suppressing the struggles of the Indonesian workers and keeping them wedded to Sukarno's police-state. Meanwhile the Chinese press has heaped continuous praise upon Sukarno, mentioning nothing of Indonesia's poverty-stricken economy, the abysmally poor conditions of Indonesian workers, Sukarno's military aid to Laotian right-wingers, etc. (This position has been echoed by Maoists in the U.S.; the October 1965 issue of *Progressive Labor* magazine reprints a "revolutionary" speech of Sukarno, apparently as a contribution to "Marxism-Leninism"!)

Nowhere is the Maoist opportunism of the PKI better reflected than in their adherence to "Bung (Brother) Karno's" cynical strategy of "Nasakom"—a Popular Front of nationalists, religious groups, and Stalinists under the roof of class collaboration. Following this policy, the PKI concerned itself with the "national interests" of the Indonesian bourgeoisie, pressured for reforms, and endeavored to woo various ministers and sections of the military leadership over to its "struggle against U.S. imperialism." Accepting Sukarno's promise to arm the workers and peasants "if necessary," the PKI called for "co-operation between the people and the Armed Forces," and to offset unrest over Indonesia's economic deterioration raised as a major slogan "*For the Maintenance of Civil Order, Help the Police!*" This counter-revolutionary policy led directly to the present violence and the Army's work is undoubtedly facilitated by it.

In return for its aid, "Bung Karno" bestowed cabinet posts and other favors upon the PKI, including outlawing left-wing political opposition (indiscriminately labeled "Trotskyist" by the Maoists). This symbiotic relationship was further illustrated last March, when

Arming the Negro Struggle . . . page 5

Trotsky and Revolution . . . page 8

Algerian Coup and Revisionism . . . page 12



TO THE POINT. Signs carried at Soviet UN Mission picket line called by NLF Aid Committee demanding USSR and China give real aid to Vietnam. Photo taken next day at anti-Johnson protest.

Communist petroleum workers took control of Standard Vacuum's refineries at Sungei Gerong and Pendopo. Instead of consolidating these gains and pursuing a program directed toward workers' power, the PKI allowed the Sukarno government to give back these plants to their imperialist owners. Foreign Minister Subandrio, another "friend" of the PKI, issued apologies to the firms and assured them that "there would be no further embarrassment of Americans" (*N.Y. Times*, 19 March 1965). Two months later, at the celebration of the 45th anniversary of the PKI, the party chairman D. N. Aidit eulogized His Excellency: "*Among us . . . is Bung Karno. The clear sky above us is witness to it. Thousands of eyes see him. Millions of people are listening to him over the radio and watching him on their TV screens. . . . Sukarno's portrait hangs beside those of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin.*"

Proletarian Leadership

Modern history has amply demonstrated that the outstanding problem facing the international working class is the question of leadership—i.e., the necessity for an international revolutionary party which, on the basis of its program, can lead the working people to the conquest of state power in every country. A further illustration of the counter-revolutionary nature of Maoism and its own version of "Peaceful Coexistence" is China's cynical support to the recent "palace coup" in Algeria (where, unlike Indonesia, Peking does not control the mass party of the poor)—idiotically parroted in the U.S. by the Progressive Labor Party's judgment that (in spite of Boumedienne's recent oil give-away to France) the coup was a "revolutionary advance" be-

(Continued on Page 4)

SPARTACIST

—published bimonthly by supporters of the Revolutionary Tendency expelled from the Socialist Workers Party.

EDITOR: James Robertson

West Coast EDITOR: Geoffrey White

Subscription: 50¢ yearly. Bundle rates for 10 or more copies. Main address: Box 1377, G.P.O., New York, N. Y. 10001. Telephone: UN 6-3093. Western address: P.O. Box 852, Berkeley, Calif. 94701. Telephone: TH 8-7369.

Opinions expressed in signed articles do not necessarily represent an editorial viewpoint.

Number 5

x-523

Nov.-Dec. 1965

TROTSKYIST UNITY

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE STATEMENT

To the American Committee for the Fourth International and to 'Spartacist':

The I.C. regards as the most urgent requirement of the working class the building of a section of the Fourth International in the United States, as part of the reconstruction of the Fourth International.

Crisis of U.S. Capitalism

As the world economic and political crisis of capitalism deepens, so the U.S. in particular falls victim to the sharpest conflicts and contradictions, the necessary consequences of its very dominance, economic, political and military, in world capitalism. The Vietnam war, the Negro movement expressed in Los Angeles and Chicago, the growing pressure on the whole of the American working class of the mounting economic difficulties of the U.S. economy, are the most violent expression of an international crisis.

At the same time, the intensification of U.S. capitalism's crisis has been accompanied by the most pronounced revisionism and liquidationism in the Trotskyist movement. Farrell Dobbs' letter to Mrs. Kennedy and the subsequent abandonment of all class positions by the Socialist Workers Party have demonstrated the victory of revisionism in the S.W.P. placing great responsibility upon those who accept the positions of the International Committee.

Toward A United IC Section

We call upon those in the U.S. who accept the Transitional Programme and the policy and programme of the I.C. to collaborate with us in preparing with us the International Conference of 1966.

Trotsky, before he died, insisted upon the necessity of a struggle for dialectical materialism and against the dominant pragmatism of American philosophy and politics. Dialectical materialism can be defended only by *developing* Marxist theory in living connection with the activity of the working class revolutionary party.

Such a party cannot carry out its work without concrete perspectives for the class struggle in the United States. Such a perspective is an urgent necessity for the American working class.

Not only the I.C.'s collaborators in the A.C.F.I. but also the 'Spartacist' group, have expressed agreement with our international resolution; thus there is a clear basis for agreement on American perspectives. Without this there will be no development of Marxism in the United States.

We call upon comrades in the A.C.F.I. and 'Spartacist' to accept their responsibility along these lines, and to work first and foremost to build a united section of the International Committee of the Fourth International in the United States.

3 October 1965

NY PEACE PARADE

Press Release:

SPARTACIST BREAKS WITH NEW YORK PARADE COMMITTEE

At the third meeting of the Committee for Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade, held on September 29, 1965, Albert Nelson speaking for Spartacist announced Spartacist's withdrawal from the Committee on the basis that it was politically dominated by right-wing pacifists and liberals and had established a policy of exclusion of all but the most moderate viewpoints in the scheduled activities of October 16.

Background

The Committee is coordinating activities in New York City in preparation for the National Vietnam Day demonstrations on October 16. While formally composed only of individuals, the Committee includes representatives from the Progressive Labor Party, Socialist Workers Party, Workers World, Young Socialist Alliance, Youth Against War and Fascism, May 2 Movement, American Committee for the Fourth International, Communist Party, N.Y. SANE, War Resisters League, Socialist Party, "Liberation" magazine, Committee for Non-Violent Action, and a number of other organizations. Previous meetings on September 15 and 22 had decided in favor of *one* slogan for the Parade, "Stop the War in Vietnam Now," and a speakers list for the Rally that features Dr. Spock, A. J. Muste, Russ Nixon, Dave Gilbert, Dagmar Wilson, Norman Thomas, and others.

Meeting of 29 September

Chairman Dave Dellinger had opened the meeting with a statement that apparently the difficulties of the previous meeting concerning political representation had been resolved to the satisfaction of everyone. In the Organization Report that followed, Dellinger indicated that four additions had been made to the Administrative Committee, the four representing in effect the Communist Party, Workers World, Welfare Workers Vietnam Committee, and Movimiento Pro Independencia.

Statement by Albert Nelson

At the conclusion of the Organization Report, Albert

Nelson from Spartacist made the following remarks:

"At the last meeting on September 22, we raised serious objections to the 'one slogan' policy and the political composition of the Rally speakers list.

"Had we been invited to the first meeting on September 15 where the substantial issue of non-exclusion was discussed and decided, we would have made our views known then. We objected to the concept that this is a committee of 'individuals' rather than organizations. But of course votes are taken on the basis of organization and not individuals since that is the reality. In an attempt to obscure the exclusion taking place, speakers for the rally were chosen on the basis of artificial 'representative' categories: Women, Art, Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Students, Marxist-anti-Imperialists, etc., with one speaker from each category. But our objections are not simply petty organizational grievances—they are political ones.

"Since the last meeting we have carefully considered these issues as well as the line of the Call that has been issued and have decided that we can no longer participate in this committee on a principled political basis. Therefore we announce our withdrawal and request that our name be removed from the list of sponsors of the demonstration.

Stop WHOSE War in Vietnam?

"The slogan 'Stop the War in Vietnam Now' can mean many things to many people. But given the composition of this Committee, the fact that it is dominated by right-wing pacifists and 'liberals,' i.e., pro-capitalist and pro-LBJ, it is clear that the slogan is deliberately ambiguous in order to avoid facing the duty to advance the only demand that has any meaning: 'For the Immediate, Unconditional Withdrawal of All U.S. Troops from Vietnam!' Instead of this, the Call demands that 'all foreign troops' be removed from Vietnam. This is only an endorsement of the position of the U.S. Government. Further, we are not simply for stopping the war, but rather for the victory of the social revolution that is taking place in Vietnam. It is absurd, and against the interest of the revolution, to call simply for disengagement of forces, and implies a confidence in the integrity of U.S. Imperialism to keep such a bargain. You have completely obscured what we think is the most important character of the Vietnam war—that this is a naked, ruthless intervention by U.S. Imperialism to interrupt and drive back a social revolution in Vietnam, a revolution that is the only road to freedom for the Vietnamese working masses. We are not neutral in this. What is involved is not simply a matter of self-determination or moral indignation or national security or the honor and reputation of the American people as the Call indicates. The best defense of the Vietnamese revolution in this country is to build a militant anti-war movement strong enough to compel the United States to get out of Vietnam!

For Real United Action!

"There are many people in this committee with whom we share a number of positions on a range of issues including Vietnam. As in the past, we stand ready to work fully and loyally with you on the basis of political agreement. But we cannot be a party to this committee as it is presently constituted, containing forces that in a class sense are simply not compatible.

"This split might have been avoided by a policy of

genuine non-exclusion, where all political viewpoints could be expressed. This would have meant, of course, that SANE and some others would have left the committee as they have threatened to do. Instead, in the name of 'unity,' you have combined with these right-wing elements and chosen to frustrate this alternative and suppress all but the most 'respectable' political views. The Socialist Workers Party has deliberately acted as a broker to cement this unprincipled alliance. Well, we for one value our political viewpoints more than we do such a fake 'unity.'

"All those who recognize the truth of what I have said should seriously reconsider their continued participation in this committee and act accordingly."

At the conclusion of these remarks, the Spartacist delegation left the meeting.

Correspondence:

New York, N.Y.

Re: 5th Avenue Peace Parade

Let me congratulate you and your organization for your insistence on your right to bear slogans in the projected "Peace" parade calling for the immediate withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam. Any position less than this is objective aid to the Johnson Doctrine of armed intervention against the social revolution where ever it may break.

Revolutionaries, above all, should be forthright and unequivocal in supporting a victory for the social revolution in Vietnam. This means the backing of the National Liberation Front and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

Sincerely,
Conrad J. Lynn

New York, N. Y.
22 October 1965

The National Guardian
New York, N. Y.

Dear Friends:

I would like to correct an error in your excellent reporting of the New York Anti-war parade. Spartacist, not the Committee to Aid the NLF, authored the signs bearing the demands: (1) "VIETNAM, WATTS: IT'S THE SAME STRUGGLE!"; (2) "VICTORY FOR THE VIETNAMESE REVOLUTION . . . NO NEGOTIATIONS!"; and also another not cited by you, (3) "UNCONDITIONAL WITHDRAWAL OF ALL AMERICAN TROOPS."

I offer this correction without any intention of disparaging the good people of the NLF Committee with whom we marched, but simply to take responsibility for our own slogans which were carried on placards signed by Spartacist.

This is a not unimportant matter inasmuch as we had earlier resigned from the Parade Committee so as to be free from its decision at SANE's insistence to carry only one (unacceptable) compromise slogan in the parade, instead of a democratic non-exclusionist policy.

Fraternally,
James Robertson,
editor of SPARTACIST

... BETRAYAL

(Continued from Page 1)

cause of Boumedienne's rejection of the "Trotskyites," Yugoslavs, etc., who "surrounded" Ben Bella (China's former "friend") and because of his "staunch support" of Peking's upcoming Afro-Asian Conference (*Challenge*, 27 July). Mao's former "ally," the Indian government, is now an imperialist pawn, as China's new "friend," Pakistan, was yesterday, and will be tomorrow. Similar pursuits have led the Mao government to *suspend struggle* in one country after another while seeking collaboration with capitalist or feudal rulers such as Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia or the "patriotic bourgeoisie" of Japan "against U.S. imperialism."

Counter-revolutionary Maoism

This line toward Japan, carried out by the big pro-Maoist Japanese Communist Party, has the gravest strategic consequences of all. Japan with its exceptional economic vulnerability and instability, its militant, or-

What Is The Permanent Revolution?

by LEON TROTSKY

15 pages—10c a copy

Order from: Spartacist

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

ganized working class and radical student movement, has been ripe for building a mass revolutionary party. At each point Chinese policy has deflected the proletariat from this course. A proletarian revolution in Japan, the industrial powerhouse of Asia, would profoundly alter the relationship of forces upon the whole planet. Such a revolution could *only* be carried out by a working class acting through soviets, armed and with a conscious party at its head—everything that China is not. Overnight U.S. imperialism's power in East Asia would vanish; *but the Maoist bureaucracy would be swept away in the same revolutionary wave.* This at the most fundamental level is the basis for Chinese policy.

Political Revolution

Meanwhile, China's rotten maneuvers have helped drive all the other deformed workers' states (e.g., Cuba, N. Vietnam, and now N. Korea), except Albania, at best toward neutrality in siding with the USSR—at China's expense; for Russia possesses overwhelmingly greater economic preponderance while China offers neither trustworthy military, nor economic, nor political aid. (The N.Y. *Times*, 13 October 1965, reports that even the feudal Cambodian government now draws back from China on the valid grounds that she has done next to nothing to stop the incessant bombing of her other "ally," N. Vietnam.) Thus China is now almost totally *isolated* as she faces U.S. imperialism—a fruit of the Mao bureaucracy's policies of coexistence with "friendly" capitalist governments and cowardly subordination of the interests of the working people to the special interests of the Maoist national ruling caste. It is no cause of joy to record that once again in the Indo-

nesian betrayals it is proved that Mao & Co. in China, as Stalin and his successors in Russia, systematically undermine the defense of the workers' states over which they rule. The defense of the Sino-Soviet bloc against imperialism urgently requires the *political revolution* by the workers in these countries against the ruling bureaucracy which strangles workers' democracy and economic growth at home and betrays revolutions abroad.

Revolutionary Party

In the United States groups such as Workers World and Progressive Labor, in their inexcusable support of the Sukarno regime and other capitalist governments, have shirked their responsibility to *tell the truth* to American workers, a necessary prerequisite to building the revolutionary movement in this, or any, country. The substitution of the illusion of automatic, inevitable revolutionary victory through guerrilla warfare (Algeria, Vietnam), or elections (Allende in Chile), or terrorism (Venezuela), or evolution of existing governments (Goulart in Brazil, Indonesia) is characteristic of the anti-working class revisionism of the PKI and the CP's of both Russia and China. Even the peasant-based guerrilla war fought to a victorious conclusion has *at best* led only to a *deformed* workers' state *barred* from the road to socialism by its bureaucratic leadership. Serious militants and revolutionists must decisively repudiate such methods and direct themselves to the outstanding task of constructing a revolutionary party which can lead the working class to the acquisition of state power.

DEMAND RELEASE OF THE JAILED COMMUNIST WORKERS OF INDONESIA!

REPLACE SUKARNO AND ALL CAPITALIST REGIMES WITH WORKERS' GOVERNMENTS!

POLITICAL REVOLUTION IN THE SOVIET BLOC!

NO CLASS COLLABORATION — TOWARD THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION!

CUBAN TROTSKYISTS

The release of the Cuban Trotskyists after 18 months in jail has been publicized by Joseph Hansen in the Pabloist *World Outlook* of 25 June. Hansen sarcastically criticized the report in SPARTACIST #3 of the Cuban jailings and dismissed the view that they were part of a right turn. On the contrary, he attributed the release to "the struggle . . . by the Fidelista leadership against bureaucratism," stating "a miscarriage of justice in relation to the Posadas group was rectified."

Hansen never protested about the jailings until *after* the Cuban government seemed to take the initiative by releasing the prisoners. But the circumstances of their release are grim. The prisoners had to sign capitulatory pledges to win their freedom—an old device from the arsenal of Stalinism. According to the published letter by Juan Posadas of 27 April the Cuban comrades "had signed to dissolve the party in Cuba and withdraw from the Fourth International." Posadas called upon his Cuban followers to repudiate their pledges and resume political activity. ■

Toward Arming the Negro Struggle

(The information on the Deacons for Defense and Justice contained in this report is based in part upon an interview between the writer and Charles Sims, head of the Bogalusa Deacons.)

Armed self-defense has at last taken root in the civil rights movement. On 21 February 1965, the *New York Times* reported the existence of the Deacons for Defense and Justice, "a mutual protection association, employing guns and shortwave radios," which was born the summer before in Jonesboro, Louisiana, to protect CORE workers there. The organization began to patrol the Negro neighborhood, and the impact of organized, armed self-defense became immediately obvious. Harassment from the Ku Klux Klan and allied groups had decreased markedly since the Deacons made themselves known.

By June the Deacons had achieved considerable success in several other southern towns. On Sunday, 6 June, the *Times* announced, "ARMED NEGRO UNIT SPREADS IN SOUTH." The article continued, "The Deacons for Defense and Justice . . . has crossed the Mississippi River to Mississippi and Alabama and plans to move into every Southern state. . . . Earnest Thomas of Jonesboro, La., the 32-year-old vice president and full-time organizer of the deacons, said yesterday that the organization had 50 to 55 chapters in various stages of organization in Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama."

"Protected Non-Violence"

The *Times* reporter could not hide the fact that the method of armed self-defense had proved highly successful in preventing violence. Local CORE workers, under the direction of Richard Haley, the Southern director of CORE, had begun to co-operate with the Deacons and to accept their services "when CORE discovered that its workers were safer with the Deacons around." Haley was forced to set down an official double-standard policy for CORE: CORE still believes in the basic principles of non-violence and so will not recruit, organize or plan for the Deacons; however, CORE appreciates the presence of the Deacons and is willing to co-operate with them and to accept their services—"protected non-violence" is better than unprotected!

Tremendous Step Forward

The Deacons organization is a tremendous step forward for the Negro struggle, not only because it saves lives, but also because it raises the level of consciousness of the civil rights movement by encouraging independent

by Mark Klein

action and discouraging reliance upon the institutions of the bourgeois state. Mr. Thomas explained that the organization was formed after the KKK paraded through a ghetto street under police escort, tossing out leaflets: "We decided that if the power structure would do that for the Klan, then we had better do something for ourselves." When the FBI tried to discourage Thomas' plans and suggested he join a bi-racial committee, he rejected their idea, because he distrusts such committees. "They are to slow things down," he commented.

Hence already the FBI has the Deacons under surveillance and has tried to discourage their growth. Recently, too, it was reported that HUAC, which is conducting an investigation of the KKK (under Chairman Willis, a La. Democrat), may also look into the Deacons!

Curious Duality

Although the Deacons have achieved a new level of militancy, they are still far from achieving the consciousness needed for ultimate success. In their Bogalusa, La., chapter, for example, they exhibit a curious duality: on the one hand, highly militant, paramilitary tactics are used to protect their struggle; on the other hand, comparatively mild, anti-discrimination politics relying heavily on the 1964 Civil Rights Act characterize their political perspectives. This duality is embodied in Charles Sims, the president of the Bogalusa chapter of the Deacons.

Bogalusa is a Klan stronghold, and so almost any struggle there is bound to produce violent reaction. This perhaps explains in part why the tactics there are so bold, while the politics are reticent. As Sims told a *Life* reporter recently, "I don't approve of the Deacons myself, but we have no choice."

Against Federal Troops

To a degree, Sims mistrusts the instruments of the power structure. Some of the members of the local FBI, he knows, believe in white supremacy. Accordingly, when the FBI tried to discourage his self-defense ideas, he replied that he would cease organizing if the FBI broke up the Klan; and thus Sims went ahead with his plans. In addition, Sims is against calling for help from U.S. troops, for he believes that troops cannot push the struggle forward—at best, they can only freeze the situation.

But Sims' mistrust is parochial. With his eyes on the local arms of oppression, he has not been able to see that those arms have their roots in an oppressive monster which, in one or another form, grips the whole country. Thus, he regards Martin Luther King as a "great man," though King is struggling to keep the Negro movement disarmed and dependent.

Politically Disarmed

Politically speaking, Sims' localized view tends to disarm the struggle. To Sims, the main problem in Bogalusa is unequal job opportunities. And to Sims, the Federal government, especially the Federal courts, is the answer to the problems of the Negro, North and South. This belief, of course, leaves no political role for the Deacons, and Sims will admit this—he believes the Deacons should be for defense only, and not get involved in politics. Building another party, he thinks, is completely out of the question because Bogalusa is a Democratic town, and another party would be merely another split. In short, Sims has put military power into the hands of the local Negro workers because he felt they could not get effective protection from the system; yet he still retains political faith in the system, and so does not seek to

YOU CAN HELP!

"Every Dime Buys a Bullet"

For information about the Friends of the Deacons, write:
c/o Henry Austin, 1210 Ann St.
Bogalusa, La.

put independent political power within their reach.

Revolutionary Program

The Bogalusa Negroes cannot long rely on the Federal government. For when the struggle attains a more distinct class character, when, for instance, Negroes demand more jobs as well as equal job opportunity, the Federal government will be out in earnest to destroy the Deacons. The presence of Federal troops in the South must very soon become a mortal danger to the Negro struggle. The contradiction in Sims' outlook—military armament, but political disarmament—will precipitate a crisis of leadership, revealing the urgent need for revolutionary theory and program to achieve the social liberation of the Negro people. ■

IMPERIALISTS AND STALINISTS IN VIETNAM

Spartacist says: *Victory for the Vietnamese Revolution! No Negotiations! No Deals! Build the American Revolution!*

Invincible?

It is now popular among American radicals to speak of the "invincible" revolution in Vietnam and elsewhere, and to regard the imperialist cause in South Vietnam as already defeated. Such an assumption, comforting though it may be, is not only wrong but dangerous. The cold fact is that the U.S. has the military power to physically smash the revolution in Vietnam, and that to do this in reality would not mean the total liquidation of the Vietnamese population. Only in the imaginings of revolutionary romantics do people fight on indefinitely against what they perceive to be hopeless odds. Rather, they seek out other forms of struggle, or seek personal or mystic solutions.

But will the U.S. be willing and able to use its military power fully? To prevent the genuine liberation of Vietnam, that is, to prevent the social revolution in that country, the U.S. will certainly try. U.S. policy in Vietnam is not fortuitous, mistaken, or insane. It is based on the economic and social needs of the capitalist ruling class in this country. First, U.S. imperialism needs a base for direct operations in Southeast Asia. Second, by forcing a showdown in Vietnam, and by its arrogant provocations of Hanoi and Peking, the U.S. seeks to administer to China the same type of defeat it gave to the Soviet Union in the Cuban missile crisis, since which time the U.S. has obtained the initiative and a much freer hand vis-a-vis the Russians.

However, the U.S. government may not have to go the entire military route, because it has a second line of weapons: after napalm, negotiations. Negotiations and diplomacy can also be imperialist weapons because of the nature of the world Stalinist movement, which controls state power in the non-capitalist world and dominates the revolutionary movement of Vietnam.

Stalinism

As a world movement, Stalinism has arisen from the victory of the revolution in economically and technically backward countries and its defeat in the great industrial nations. The October 1917 Revolution in Russia, the

greatest event in modern history, resulted in the creation of the world's first workers' state. But eventually difficulties multiplied and the Russian Revolution began to degenerate. It came to be dominated by an all-powerful bureaucracy led by Stalin and aided by police terror.

Stalinism thus represents the social and economic interests and political psychology of a privileged and dominating bureaucratic caste whose continuing material advantages and power prerogatives depend on an uneasy balance. On the one hand, they must maintain the nationalized property forms on which their power is based, against the restorationist drives of the world imperialist movements. On the other hand, they must struggle to maintain the political expropriation of the working-class, in whose name, but against whose interests, they maintain their rule. In this context their concern with their national-caste interests leads them constantly to seek a modus vivendi with world capitalism, agreement which would in essence safeguard their national bases from imperialist attack—at the expense of the revolution in other areas. This longstanding policy, currently expressed in the doctrine of peaceful coexistence, makes of stalinists treacherous enemies of the revolution within the anti-imperialist camp.

Reluctant Liberator

Ho Chi Minh ("liberator of his country") and the Vietnamese leadership are part of this Stalinist world and their record is far from admirable. The Stalinist popular front period of the 1930's had a peculiar effect on the colonial revolution. Instead of fighting Hitler by revolution, Stalin decided to form common fronts with liberal capitalist elements, who would then sign worthless non-aggression pacts with Stalin. Naturally, so as not to annoy these gentlemen, the colonial struggle was adjourned. Ho complied. Twice the Ho Chi Minh leadership has openly and consciously turned power in Vietnam over to the imperialists in the higher interests of Sino-Soviet diplomatic needs, without so much as consulting the Vietnamese people. First at the end of World War II for the sake of the Potsdam agreements and big-power amity they allowed the Chinese and British and later the French to reoccupy the country (all under the

aegis of the great Stalin, still a hero—in Peking at least).

Geneva Sell-Out

With the development of the cold war, they ceased to block the revolutionary drive of the Vietnamese people, and launched a successful war of national liberation. However, once again the diplomatic interests of the Stalinist giants came first, and at the Geneva conference in 1954 the southern half of the country was returned to imperialism and the revolution disarmed. The Geneva sell-out, remember, was also signed by the Maoists, who pretend to very revolutionary and Leninist. If it be suggested that they really believed that elections would be held to enable them to take power legally, it can only be answered that such criminal naivete is inconceivable from such experienced politicals. Ho Chi Minh has certainly been a somewhat reluctant liberator.

The Committee to Aid the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam asks YOU to aid the NLF. Send your contribution by International Money Order or Registered Mail to: the NLF of SV, Mission, Nekazanka 7, Prague, Czechoslovakia.

For more information about the work of the Committee, inquire directly c/o W. Teague, 103 Macdougall St., N. Y., N. Y. 10012 (Tel: YU 2-7162)

Ho's group and their political trainees, to face a few facts, now control the FLN. A few years ago there was added to this group a shadow nationalist element to make things look broader and more "progressive." These bourgeois nationalist elements have no social base of any consequence, and serve only as an ersatz "bloc of four classes." The Vietnamese Stalinists have won the support of the vast majority of the peasantry, and that plus their foreign connections make them the bosses of the show. Given their record, the American hope for negotiating another sell-out is by no means utopian.

What Can We Do to Aid the Vietnamese Revolution?

The imperialist war drive is inherent in the capitalist economic system itself. Therefore, imperialism will end only when capitalism ends. Imperial-

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

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

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

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

Towards a Labor Party

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

PROGRESSIVE LABOR

Stalin Lives?

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

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

of union support is more remote, since most unions are caught in the stranglehold of a conservative bureaucracy. Rather than give up on the rank-and-file of such unions, however, we must help them to organize militant opposition within the unions themselves.

The dangers threatening the Vietnamese revolution are indeed overwhelming. Externally there is U.S. aggression and internally there is the treacherous Stalinist leadership. Actually the internal factor, Stalinist leadership, depends indirectly on the existence of imperialism. For if there were successful revolutions in the imperialist countries, the Stalinist bureaucracies in the backward countries would soon be replaced. Thus, a socialist revolution in the U.S. would liberate not only the U.S. but also end the role of both imperialists and Stalinists in Vietnam.

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

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

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

Three Little Dots

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

Why Us?

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

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

Sectarian Abstentionism

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

(Continued on Page 15)

TROTSKY AND THE FATE OF

Review Article

THE PROPHET ARMED, Trotsky: 1879-1921; THE PROPHET UNARMED, Trotsky: 1921-1929; THE PROPHET OUTCAST, Trotsky: 1929-1940. Oxford University Press, 1954, 1959, 1963. Also in a paperback edition—Vintage Books, New York, 1965, \$2.45 per volume.

Isaac Deutscher's three-volume biography of Leon Trotsky¹ commands enthusiasm. The biographer of Trotsky confronts a staggering task. Trotsky was not only one of the decisive political personalities of our time, a "world-historical individual" in the fullest sense. He was a complex and colorful human being whose whole life was bound up with great events; a writer of unequalled brilliance; a profound thinker whose vision, having impressed itself indelibly upon reality, continues to exert an indispensable formative influence upon any serious conception of our social universe; a revolutionary leader identified with a party and doctrine. Beyond all that, his career has, not least in his martyrdom and diabolification, the import of a deeply meaningful modern myth. To create a living picture of Trotsky in all these dimensions seems a superhuman achievement: yet exactly this is what Deutscher has attempted and, to a remarkable degree, accomplished.

Enduring Biography

In technique, Deutscher is superb. He has mastered a vast primary documentation, both personal and political, and used it to produce a scrupulously accurate account. His style, likewise, is out of the ordinary: vivid, incisive, fast-moving, often colorful, sometimes rising to heights of eloquence, and always clear. Even tedious ideological wrangles and petty organizational squabbles somehow acquire real interest through their skillful absorption into the narrative flow, since Deutscher never for a moment lets slip from view the historical panorama within which the entire action unfolds, the monumental stakes at issue. Time and again he comes up with the memorable line or sentence that epitomizes a whole complex chain of thought. To cite only one instance: after posing the question of *why* in 1940, after the extermination of all opposition within the Soviet Union and the decimation of the few Trotskyist cadres outside it, Stalin finally decided that he could no longer tolerate Trotsky's physical existence, Deutscher answers, "All the prospects that were so real to Trotsky in his hopes were equally real to Stalin in his fears; and Trotsky alive was

their supreme and never-resting agent."²

These merits would themselves be enough to make Deutscher's trilogy an enduring biographical classic. Its importance, however, transcends even this. Just as the Russian revolution remains in a real sense still unfinished, still a dynamic force in the world, so Trotsky's life and thought remain intensely problematic. To ask what is the balance of success and failure in that revolutionary life is also to ask the balance of validity and invalidity in the revolutionary philosophy given its definitive contemporary form in that thought. For the socialist, the spiritual child of the Russian revolution, this means to meditate on the very meaning of our epoch. These problems arise ineluctably from Trotsky's life itself, and the response to them necessarily shapes the biographer's whole work.

Classical Tragedy

Deutscher first presents his central thesis through a striking thematic analogy: Trotsky's life is to be viewed as a "truly classical tragedy . . . or rather a reproduction of classical tragedy in secular terms of modern politics."³

"Much as I have been concerned with the restoration of the various features and details of the historical drama, I have never been able to dismiss from my thoughts the tragic theme that runs through it from beginning to end and affects nearly all the characters involved. Here is modern tragedy in the sense in which Trotsky himself has defined it: 'As long as man is not yet master of his social organization, that organization towers above him like Fate itself. . . . The tragedy of restricted personal passion is too flat for our time—we live in an epoch of social passion. The stuff of contemporary tragedy is found in the clash between the individual and a collective, or between hostile collectives represented by individuals' . . . what modern Sophocles or Aeschylus could possibly produce tragedy as high as Trotsky's own life? Is it too much to hope that this is nevertheless an 'optimistic tragedy,' one in which not all the suffering and sacrifice have been in vain?"⁴

The archetypal tragic structure that Deutscher rightly sees in the life of Trotsky is the inexorable dialectic manifested in the classic figures of Oedipus and Orestes: a) *Exile* in preparation for return and b) *Liberating Heroic Achievement* which, however, both

through its own ambivalence and the limitedness (one-sidedness, deficient consciousness) of the hero himself leads to his "downfall" and c) *Renewed Exile* but transfigured by a heightened, enriched understanding with ultimately redemptive significance.

The crux of this sequence is the "downfall" phase. Here the skeins of blind necessity and individual responsibility appear as inextricably intertwined: *we* have to unravel them if we are to assimilate the full content of



Trotsky in 1940

the tragedy. "The question which is of absorbing interest," to us as well as to the biographer, is "To what extent did Trotsky contribute to his own defeat? To what extent was he himself compelled by critical circumstances and by his own character to pave the way for Stalin?"⁵

Deutscher's Thesis

Deutscher never gives a direct answer to these questions, but a general response does emerge from his pages: That given the failure of the European workers' revolutions of 1919-1923 the Soviet Republic, isolated, exhausted, and terribly backward, was inescapably destined to bureaucratic degeneration. Given this bureaucratic degeneration, the Revolution could survive only through the Stalinist industrialization drive, with all its wastes and horrors. This process had the force of historical inevitability. Because Trotsky as an individual had no power to pre-

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

Shane Mage

vent it he can be said to have contributed to it only insofar as, "compelled by critical circumstances," he shared responsibility for the initial stages of bureaucratization in the years 1919-1922. Trotsky's role as leader and symbol of the Communist opposition to Stalinism was supremely justified: on him depended the preservation of the Revolution's moral honor. But this was work destined for future generations. Trotsky was "the representative figure of pre-Stalinist communism and the precursor of post-Stalinist communism."⁶ As a contestant for power in the era of "Stalinist communism" he was foredoomed to failure and his efforts to build a Fourth International were a fiasco. Nevertheless, already today the "all too modest" tentative liquidation of "the Stalinist perversion of socialism . . . vindicates the revolution and his basic optimism about it, and lifts the dense fog of disillusionment and despair."⁷

The thesis summarized above is a complex one, and in no way implausible or inconsistent with the Marxian philosophy of history. It is even an "orthodox" one, inasmuch as it agrees in essentials with Trotsky's own retrospective explanation of his defeat. Nevertheless, in my view, its truth is at best one-sided and conceals as its falsehood that fatalistic outlook which must produce confusion in the writing of history and fatal error in the acting of it.

Historical Inevitability?

"Historical inevitability" is a much misused and misunderstood phrase. In our (and Deutscher's) context, however, its meaning is quite clear: the victory of Stalinism that actually took place can appear as inevitable if and only if we are convinced that no reasonable course of action present as a real possibility to Trotsky but rejected by him would have resulted in a *preferable* alternative.

Did such opportunities ever exist? It is important to note that on Deutscher's own showing there were, during an entire decade, repeated instances when it was, sometimes arguably, sometimes manifestly, within the power of Trotsky and the Left Opposition to bring about the downfall of Stalin.

12th Party Congress

The first of these critical occasions came at the 12th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in April 1923. The conflict between Trotsky and the "troika" (Stalin, Zinoviev, Kamenev) over bureaucratization of the Party appar-

atus, economic planning, and policy toward the non-Russian nationalities had been simmering for almost a year. At the close of 1922 Lenin from his sickbed told Trotsky of his solidarity on all these issues and proposed a "bloc against Stalin." Outraged by Stalin's "brutal" behavior in regard to the Georgian Communists, Lenin resolved, "to crush Stalin politically" by denouncing him openly before the Congress and demanding his removal as General-Secretary. When Lenin was prevented by illness from appearing at the Congress he sent his prepared text to Trotsky and requested him to present it. "Moreover, in a last moment of an exhausting tension of mind and will he urged Trotsky to show no weakness or vacillation, to trust no 'rotten compromise' Stalin might propose, and, last but not least, to give Stalin and his associates no warning of the attack."⁸ But Trotsky violated Lenin's request on every point. He made a "rotten compromise" with Stalin, agreed to the suppression of Lenin's "Notes on the Nationalities Question," and confined his intervention at the Congress to questions of economic policy. As Deutscher sums it up:

"He missed the opportunity of confounding the triumvirs and discrediting Stalin. He let down his allies. He failed to act as Lenin's mouthpiece with the resolution Lenin had expected of him. He failed to support before the entire party the Georgians and the Ukrainians for whom he had stood up in the Politbureau. He kept silent when the cry for inner-party democracy rose from the floor. He expounded economic ideas the historic portent of which escaped his audience but which his adversaries could easily twist so as to impress presently upon workers, peasants, and bureaucrats alike that Trotsky was not their well-wisher. . . . Finally, Trotsky directly strengthened the triumvirs when he declared his 'unshaken' solidarity with the Politbureau and the Central Committee and called the rank and file to exercise 'at this critical juncture' the strictest self-restraint and the utmost vigilance."⁹

The description is brilliant, but when it comes to the crucial question *why* Trotsky stumbled into this "incredibly foolish," "awkward and preposterous" behavior, Deutscher's explanation is totally unsatisfactory: "The truth [!] is that Trotsky refrained from attacking Stalin because he felt secure. . . . It seemed almost a bad joke that Stalin, the wilful and sly but shabby and in-

articulate man in the background, should be his rival."¹⁰ But this is literally no explanation, since for most of the previous year Stalin had acted as Trotsky's main antagonist within the Politbureau and it was already clear to the mortally ill Lenin that Stalin as General-Secretary had "*concentrated immeasurable power in his hands.*" If Trotsky, despite Lenin's pleas, remained blind to these facts, that itself would call for explanation.

Circumscribed Struggle

There is, however, a real *political* explanation for Trotsky's catastrophic error: he was desperately anxious to avoid an open clash within the leadership of the Communist party (and, *a fortiori*, totally unwilling to take any action which might risk organizational exclusion from the party). Trotsky's conduct in early 1923 was not an episodic blunder, a mere momentary lapse: on the contrary it expressed an orientation which was to dominate, and paralyze, Trotsky's political activity up to the formation of the "United Opposition" in 1926, and was not to be fully abandoned until the mid-1930's.

The record of the years 1923-1926 leaves no doubt how profoundly Trotsky was politically crippled by this orientation. In the fall of 1923 the open struggle of the Left Opposition was begun with a declaration by 46 Old Bolsheviks, not including Trotsky, demanding restoration of inner-party democracy and accelerated industrialization of the Soviet Union. Although the Opposition was immediately identified (and regarded itself) as "Trotskyist," Trotsky himself, the most gifted and effective orator of the party, played a very limited and merely literary role in the struggle preceding the crushing of the opposition at the 13th Party Conference in January 1924. Why? In his autobiography Trotsky ascribes his inaction to illness—on a duck-hunting expedition he had contracted influenza followed by a "cryptogenic temperature"¹¹ which his doctors could not explain but which kept him a semi-invalid for the better part of a year.

On this vital fact Deutscher's analysis goes not an inch beyond Trotsky's own:

"It is curious to note how such accidents—first Lenin's illness and then his own—contributed to the trend of events which was more solidly determined by the basic factors of the situation. 'One can foresee a revolution or a war,' Trotsky remarks in *My Life*, 'but it is impos-

(Continued Next Page)

... TROTSKY

sible to foresee the consequences of an autumn shooting trip for wild ducks.' It was certainly no mean disadvantage to Trotsky that at this crucial stage the use of his live voice and direct appeal to an audience was denied him."¹²

An "accident," though? One need not dwell on Trotsky's term "cryptogenic" (which Deutscher for some reason transmutes into "malaria"). The important thing to note is that the "shooting trip" took place in late October, very shortly after the statement of the "46." It was certainly a time when one might reasonably expect Trotsky's full time and energies to have been taken up by the factional struggle. Is it an "accident" that this was not the case?

Correct Tactics?

In any event there was nothing accidental about the Opposition's decision in 1924 to stop open party activity as an organized group (nor about the effects of this decision on the groups of the Opposition: in Deutscher's words, "they shrank and fell apart.") Add in Trotsky's "disciplined" willingness to repudiate Opposition supporters abroad (of which his notorious disavowal of Eastman's publication of Lenin's testament was only one instance) and the refusal of the Trotskyists to give the slightest help to the 1925 Zinovievist opposition (at a conjuncture where, as Deutscher makes clear, a strong intervention by Trotsky would at the very least have put Stalin in deep trouble): the picture adds up not to a series of errors but to a ruinous policy.

Deutscher discloses this picture fully enough, but on each occasion he repeats his failure to suggest a fully satisfactory explanation. The net effect is to present each fact in isolation and thus to minimize the scope and consequences of Trotsky's orientation. This is not because Deutscher is *unable* to explain Trotsky's conduct. On the contrary, it is because his own analysis, in the context of his basic thesis, suggests a conclusion which contradicts his own profound insight into the tragic nature of the historic drama: *were Trotsky's inner-party tactics from 1923 to 1926 essentially correct after all?*

Deutscher advances two main propositions tending toward this unwanted conclusion: (1) The inherently anti-democratic nature of a socialist regime in the Russia of the 1920's; (2) The presence of overwhelming historical forces leading to the specifically Stalinist outcome.

The first starts from the nature of post-Civil War Russian society. The

old aristocracy and bourgeoisie had been driven into exile; the revolutionary proletariat of 1917 had provided many of the cadres of the Bolshevik regime, but otherwise, no longer existed. The only viable social class was the peasantry, instinctively anti-socialist but in itself politically impotent, "a huge sack of potatoes." The Bolshevik party, compelled by history to "substitute itself for the proletariat," could not withstand open democratic political competition in the reactionary Russian milieu, and could survive only by outlawing all oppositional parties.

Deutscher's Fatalism

This analysis is incontestably accurate. Deutscher, however, goes on from it to deduce an equal logical necessity for the suppression of factions within the Bolshevik party itself—that fateful measure, proposed by Lenin and endorsed by Trotsky, which ultimately provided Stalin with the indispensable weapon to suppress all dissent from his totalitarian rule:

"Destroying the multiparty system the Bolsheviks had no inkling of the consequences to themselves. They imagined that outside that system they would still remain what they had always been: a disciplined but free association of militant Marxists. . . . The single-party system was a contradiction in terms: the single party itself could not remain a party in the accepted sense. Its inner life was bound to shrink and wither. Of

APPEAL FROM CEYLON

The YOUNG SOCIALIST, a revolutionary socialist quarterly, asks its friends to make a financial contribution to insure its continued publication in the face of rising costs. Subscriptions will also be much appreciated. Price per issue is now 25c.

All communications and remittances should be addressed to Sydney Wanasinghe, 51a Peterson Lane, Colombo 6, Ceylon.

'democratic centralism,' the master principle of Bolshevik organization, only centralism survived. . . . No body politic can be nine-tenths mute and one-tenth vocal. Having imposed silence on non-Bolshevik Russia, Lenin's party had in the end to impose silence on itself as well."¹³

This lengthy quotation is an excellent example of Deutscher's central error: the fatalistic view that runs like a thread through the whole fabric of his interpretation. He here substitutes a logical necessity, expressed in the formula "no body politic can be nine-tenths mute and one-tenth vocal," for the historic choice *freely* made by

Lenin and Trotsky. But he fails to see that this argument is internally contradictory. In defending the establishment of one-party rule, Deutscher bases his case precisely on the fact that Russia *had ceased to exist as a "body politic."* The Bolshevik party, despite its growing deficiencies, remained a coherent political force with a clearly socialist history, ideology, and membership. The pressure of the peasant milieu made itself felt within the Party, but in exactly the opposite way from that feared by Lenin in 1921. The weight of the peasantry was exerted, not through an openly petit-bourgeois restorationist faction, but through the very faction that crushed party democracy under the pretext "no factions." The Opposition was therefore logically as well as politically justified in demanding (though all too hesitantly and belatedly) elimination of the ban on factions. By their fears of disunity in the face of the hostile peasantry the Bolsheviks were led to fight the wrong danger with the wrong weapon.

"Primitive Socialist Accumulation"

The really crucial point in Deutscher's thesis, however, is his view of the positive historical forces leading to Stalinism. This is first and most clearly stated in his discussion of the Trotsky-Preobrazhensky "Law of Primitive Socialist Accumulation." The "Law" holds, in essence, that a workers' state in a relatively backward country can survive the economic pressures of the capitalist world market and of domestic capitalist-type and peasant economy only by achieving and maintaining a rate of economic growth substantially above the capitalist norm; that the resources for such industrialization must come principally from the peasantry but also from restraints on industrial wage increases, and in quantities objectively dictated by the required growth rate; and that in the specific circumstances of the Soviet post-war economy these quantities would have to be relatively very large.

Deutscher quite rightly accepts the validity of the law, but by coupling it with the supposedly inevitable bureaucratization of the revolution and the (genuine) deep identification of the Bolshevik bureaucracy with the nationalized sector of the Soviet economy he comes up with a startling corollary:

"It was Trotsky's peculiar fate that even while he declared war on the political pretensions and the arrogance of the bureaucracy, he had to try and awaken it to its 'historic mission.' His advocacy of primitive socialist accumulation aimed at this. Yet such accumulation, in the circumstances under which it was to take place, could hardly be reconciled

with the workers' democracy. . . . The two aspects of the program which Trotsky expounded in 1923 were to prove incompatible in the near future; and therein lay the fundamental weakness of his position. The bureaucracy raged furiously against one part of his program, the one which claimed a workers' democracy; but after much resistance, hesitation and delay, it was to carry out the other part which spoke of primitive socialist accumulation."¹⁴

Economics of Workers' Democracy

This proposition is, I believe, gravely erroneous. The entire economic program of the Opposition was aimed at a demonstration, not that rapid industrialization was desirable (no Bolshevik leader could or would deny that truism) but that industrialization was economically feasible in the context of workers' democracy. Deutscher does not even attempt to refute the Opposition thesis by economic arguments. All he can do in the end is appeal to the mere facts against the potentialities: "The Stalinist bureaucracy was about to put into effect Trotsky's program of primitive socialist accumulation. Trotsky was the authentic inspirer and prompter of the second revolution of which Stalin was to be the practical manager in the coming decade. It would be futile to speculate how Trotsky might have directed that revolution, whether he would have succeeded in carrying out Russia's industrialization at a comparable pace and scale without condemning the mass of the Soviet people to the privation, misery, and oppression they suffered under Stalin, or whether he would have been able to bring the *muzhik* by persuasion to collective farming rather than to coerce him into it. These questions cannot be answered; and the historian has more than enough work in analysing events and situations as they were, without trying to ponder events and situations that might have been. As things were, the political evolution of the 1920's predetermined the manner in which Russia's social transformation was to be accomplished in the 1930's."¹⁵

It should be noted that the last sentence cited, if taken seriously, would reduce Deutscher's argument to impotent circularity, for how can the political evolution of the 1920's be explained by a subsequent fact which itself is "predetermined" by the evolution to be explained? Even without that sentence, however, this appeal is self-defeating, since it is precisely the potentialities of the "situation as it was" that are at issue in regard to the supposed incompatibility between indus-

trialization and workers' democracy.

This very citation, nevertheless, points up where Deutscher has gone wrong. By asking the wrong question, whether Trotsky would have been able to carry through industrialization at Stalin's "pace and scale" without totalitarianism, the validity of that "pace and scale" is implicitly asserted. But this is altogether indefensible. Deutscher does not contradict Trotsky's characterization of Stalin's 1929-1933 policies as catastrophic ultra-leftist adventurism, nor can he, since the historical facts speedily and conclusively vindicated Trotsky's position. The rapid growth of heavy industry achieved under Stalin's aegis was paid for by a vast destruction of productive forces in the agricultural sector, saddling the Soviet Union with a permanent agricultural crisis; a long stagnation in consumer-goods production; and imposition of a hopelessly wasteful and inefficient planning system over the whole economy (and all this without even mentioning such "non-economic" aspects of the Stalinist monstrosity as the Comintern policies which enabled Hitler to take power!) The conclusion in the field of economics is beyond dispute: if the growth of heavy industry had been restrained to a level that did not disrupt the other sectors the Soviet economy would have emerged in a far healthier condition.

But was such an expansion path politically feasible? By 1928 the Left Opposition had been defeated and exiled, and Stalin's "second revolution" seemed to leave it only the choice between capitulating to Stalin in order to help the Soviet Union survive the desperate crisis into which Stalin had plunged it, or opposing Stalin in the name of the principles and ideals of socialism, but without hope of immediate effect. With the exception of Trotsky, all the major leaders of the Opposition ultimately capitulated to Stalin.

Bloc With Bukharin?

In 1928 and even 1929 the Opposition had, however, a third alternative: a bloc with the "Right Opposition" led by Bukharin. This idea was first proposed by Bukharin in the summer of 1928, well before his break with Stalin came into the open. It was viewed favorably by Trotsky, provided that this was solely "for one purpose, namely, the restoration of inner-party democracy."¹⁶ But these overtures led nowhere, since both factions still saw each other as the main enemy.

Deutscher correctly, though inconsistently, sees in this a major, virtually fatal, error. He ascribes it partly to the preoccupation of all the Russian Communists with the misunderstood and misleading precedent of the "Ther-

midorian Reaction" in the Great French Revolution (his critique of this analogy is brilliant and decisive. Cf. particularly *The Prophet Outcast*, pp. 314-318) but also to the "Marxist tradition which approved alliances between left and center against the right, but considered any combination of left and right directed against the center as unprincipled and inadmissible."¹⁷

It is unfortunate that Deutscher does not also carry through the critique of this "tradition," beyond the statement that "subsequent events were to transcend" its logic. But the "logic" itself was faulty: the episodic, contingent political designations "left," "right," and "center," which should be neutral and have no emotional weighting at all (at least within the revolutionary spectrum) somehow became metaphysical essences showing the true nature of each faction. Thus the way in which the schema was transcended was misunderstood by the Trotskyists: they continued to regard the Stalin faction as the "center" even after it adopted adventurist policies that placed it at the extreme (or, if you wish, "ultra") left of the Soviet Communist Party and the Communist International, destroying the previous relationship of the mid-1920's, when Trotsky and Bukharin had symbolized opposite poles. Bukharin recognized this change when he told Kamenev, "Our disagreements with Stalin are far, far graver than those we have had with you."¹⁸ Trotsky, however, and still more the rest of the Trotskyist Opposition, continued to view the Bukharinist right as "the chief antagonist."

Trotsky's Error

From this discussion one major conclusion can be drawn: when Deutscher speaks in terms of the "historic mission" of the Stalinist bureaucracy he in essence transposes into historical language the major political error of the Trotskyist Opposition: the fatalistic sense of impotence against overwhelming social forces that caused its fatal inability to recognize that Stalin was the main enemy. This should not be taken to indicate even infinitesimal acceptance of the reactionary view that any alternative to Stalin would have been preferable: the point is that on real, though quite limited, programmatic issues there had developed a consensus between the "Left" and "Right" Bolshevik oppositions at that time. Deutscher's paradox is that he is too fine a historian not to recognize the Trotskyists' error (when, for instance, he speaks of the failure of efforts from within the Stalin faction itself to remove Stalin in 1932 as caused by fear of the consequences of overthrowing Stalin, "the fear that

(Concluded Bottom Next Page)

Algerian Coup-

A Crushing Blow to Revisionists' Theory

The recent military coup d'etat in Algiers contains most important lessons for Marxists. Colonel Boumedienne's army, which deposed President Ben Bella, is the instrument of "order" on behalf of the native capitalist class in Algeria.

A national-revolutionary struggle, involving years of large-scale conflict, was necessary before these native capitalists could take hold of state power. As in all national revolutions, the bourgeoisie had a double problem: to establish their own power by shaking off the foreign imperialist domination; and to push back the forces of the workers and peasants whom they had to mobilize for the first aim.

So great is their fear of the popular

[CLIFF SLAUGHTER examines reactions to the coup in "The Militant," organ of the Socialist Workers Party, and "World Outlook," of the 'United Secretariat' of revisionists in Paris.]

forces of the workers and peasants, and so impossible their development as an "independent" capitalism in the modern world of monopoly capitalism, that these bourgeois-nationalist governments do not even carry out the elementary tasks of the national struggle for the bourgeois-democratic revolution. Land reform, a complete break with imperialist power, and democracy—all of these become the subject of compromise with the imperialists, and repression of the people.

Classical

Marxists in our epoch, organized behind the program of Lenin and Trotsky in the Fourth International, have approached this problem always with the theory of Permanent Revolution. Only the *working class*, leading the poor peasantry, with its own Marxist party in a struggle for workers' state power, can complete the bourgeois-democratic revolution, and for this, a political struggle against the national bourgeoisie is necessary.

In Algeria, these problems were presented in almost classical form.

However, a whole group of so-called Trotskyists, the revisionists, Pablo, Germain, Frank and later the leaders of the American Socialist Workers Party, who came to their support in 1963 in the "United Secretariat," instead of *opposing* the national bourgeoisie and fighting for an independent proletarian revolutionary party, offered themselves as apologists for the bourgeois-nationalist leaders.

These revisionists encouraged the fatal illusion that colonial liberation movements would transform themselves into socialist revolution without the independent Marxist party, and without a struggle against the bourgeois nationalists.

They went further, and concluded that nationalist leaders, such as Ben Bella, would lead the nation to the establishment of a workers' state.

Pablo, who recently split from Germain, Frank and Hansen in Paris, went to the extreme of taking a post in the Ben Bella administration.

For something like a year, these Pabloites, particularly the Paris clique, have expressed shamefaced doubts about their "premature" conclusion that Algeria was a "workers' state."

They have written "worried" articles about the masses' resistance to bureaucracy and the concentration of power in the centralized state and Presidency.

Final Blow

The Boumedienne coup has delivered the final crushing blow to this revisionist school (see last week's *Newsletter*). A revolutionary situation with a divided ruling class today finds the Algerian working class and peasantry leaderless.

Those revisionists who lent the name of "Trotskyism" and "Marxism" to the stifling of independent working-class

... TROTSKY

had hamstrung all previous oppositions") but is prevented by the fatalism in his ideological preconceptions from seeing its full implications.

Trotsky's Greatness

If this essay has seemed to dwell on Trotsky's errors disproportionately to his immeasurably greater and better known achievements it is in order to emphasize through what travail the idea of the new revolutionary movement, unconditionally committed to workers' democracy and to struggle against Stalinist and Social-Democratic bureaucracies, had to pass to achieve birth. This is the ultimate significance of Trotsky's tragic destiny. His call for a *Fourth International* was far more than a mere recognition of the irremediable degeneracy of Stalinism: it above all demonstrated with unchallengeable moral authority and gave living symbolic form to the survival of revolutionary Marxism as a spiritual ideal and political force.

Deutscher, however, just as he earlier had understated the significance of Trotsky's errors is now led by a comparable fatalism to question his achievement. True, Deutscher cannot be gainsaid when he contends that the Fourth International, like even the Comintern before it, never succeeded in attaining actuality as a *world revolutionary party*, or that Trotsky's revolutionary expectations in both instances were over-optimistic. But this does not even touch Trotsky's real purpose—to define the construction of the revolutionary international as the critical task

confronting contemporary socialism.

Deutscher can cite the partial reforms in the Soviet Union since 1953, or the socialist direction taken, in distorted form, by the Chinese revolution thanks, he says, to "the gravitational pull of the Soviet Union"¹⁹; but he himself recognizes that these leave open the question of the ultimate validity of Trotsky's revolutionary perspective.

Fourth International

For our part we recognize these facts as fully as does Deutscher, but draw a firmer conclusion: the manifest limits of these "objective processes" can be transcended only through a political struggle mobilizing the working classes of "East" and "West" toward the practical realization of Trotsky's essential program. The concept of the *Fourth International* therefore emerges with even greater clarity as the conscious form, equally symbolic and rational, of mankind's present historical necessity. ■

NOTES

1. In his introduction the author states "The three volumes of the present work are, of course, interconnected. . . . But I have so planned them that each volume is as far as possible self contained and can be read as an independent work."
2. *Prophet Outcast*, p. 480
3. *Prophet Armed*, p. vii
4. *Prophet Armed*, p. xii
5. *Prophet Armed*, p. vii
6. *Prophet Unarmed*, p. ix
7. *Prophet Outcast*, p. 512
8. *Prophet Unarmed*, p. 90
9. *Ibid.*, p. 103-104
10. *Ibid.*, p. 93
11. Trotsky, *My Life*, p. 498
12. *Prophet Unarmed*, p. 118
13. *Ibid.*, p. 16
14. *Ibid.*, p. 131
15. *Ibid.*, p. 466
16. *Ibid.*, p. 448
17. *Ibid.*, p. 316
18. *Ibid.*, p. 442
19. *Prophet Outcast*, p. 520

politics bear a historic responsibility for this situation.

They condemned the International Committee, and its sections, such as the Socialist Labour League, for "sectarianism" when we denounced the arrests of oppositionists like Boudiaf, and when we drew attention to the capitalist character of the Algerian state and of the Evian agreement, to the suppression of independent trade unions and to the centralized state's restrictions on workers and peasants.

Above all, we were condemned for an insistence that the workers must have their own party, independent of the National Liberation Front (FLN), independent of the bourgeoisie, and opposed to the myth of national unity perpetrated by Ben Bella and the bourgeois leaders.

The supporters and sympathizers of this revisionist tendency are now of course in disarray.

The Militant, organ of the Socialist Workers Party, appeared last week-end with just over 100 words on the coup—"the facts are still unclear."

It would have been better to remain silent, we suggest, than to say in one sentence:

"The military coup that overthrew the Ben Bella regime is obviously a political move of the deepest significance for the Algerian people and the world socialist movement."

And then to say in the next:

"... it is not realistically possible to determine if General Boumedienne's seizure of power will mean a general continuation of the policies of the Ben Bella government or a significant shift away from them."

Fortunately, perhaps, *The Militant* now goes on to its summer schedule and will not appear again until 12 July.

If we turn to *World Outlook*, published by the United Secretariat in Paris, we find a more comprehensive treatment.

"Boumedienne's seizure of Power" is the main news article, which informs us that the Algiers' coup "has been judged by experts [?] in this field to be one of the most skillful in history. It caught virtually everyone by complete surprise, the most stunned of all being Ben Bella who was hauled out of his bedroom at 2:25 a.m. by the conspirators." No doubt!

Once the inspired journalism is done with, we get down to the political verdict. Says *World Outlook*:

"In the absence of a well-organized vanguard party, of unions with an independent leadership, the army stood as the only cohesive power in the country."

In the guise of a "Marxist" commentary, we here have a blanket drawn

over the decisive questions.

What is a "well-organized vanguard party"? There is deliberate confusion here.

World Outlook wants one set of readers (Ben Bella's entourage, the July 26 movement in Cuba and all sorts of "progressives") to understand by this phrase the official party of the Algerian state, the National Liberation Front. One wing of the Algerian national bourgeoisie and most, perhaps, of the Algerian petty-bourgeois politicians, would prefer control through this party to army control.

At the same time, *World Outlook* hopes that those who regard themselves as Trotskyists will understand by a "vanguard party," the revolutionary proletarian party of Marxism.

Above all, the relation between the two things must not be clarified.

But this clarification is precisely what has been necessary in the past period. In this way, the revisionists complete their betrayal, just as they did in Ceylon.

In the same issue of *World Outlook* is published a declaration by the "United Secretariat of the Fourth International" (i.e., Paris revisionists) on 23 June, "Defend the Algerian Revolution." Here, the position of the revisionists is stated more precisely.

In this declaration, all manner of radical phrases are thrown out, but the question of independent working-class

removed from power . . . shows the correctness of the criticisms which the revolutionary Marxists offered while supporting Ben Bella against the right-wing forces that sought to block, slow down and de-rail the Algerian revolution."

How "correct" can you get? *World Outlook* says all this has happened because:

"... the Algerian revolution had not been carried through to the end, to the institution of a workers' state based on committees of workers and poor peasants exercising the real power."

The main question is ignored: such a state could only have been created by building a Marxist revolutionary party, opposing the bourgeois nationalists in every one of the actions which they took to halt the revolution and consolidate their own power.

The revisionists, instead, speculated about whether Ben Bella was "another Castro," i.e., someone capable, in their opinion, of taking the revolution through to workers' power.

All the criticisms in the world of Ben Bella's compromises with the Right, his attacks on the unions, his concentration of personal power, are worse than useless without the struggle to build an alternative, the basis of which must be a revolutionary workers' party.

In so far as the revisionists only campaigned for greater "pressure," organized by the "left wing" to change the policy of the FLN, they helped the reactionary forces to prepare the present situation.

Their deception now will convince no one in Algeria, France or anywhere else. The sum total of their politics was to persuade militants that the FLN itself could become the "mass vanguard party" which they now talk about at every turn.

"Negative"

And so to the miserable conclusions of this declaration (of bankruptcy). The theory of the permanent revolution, it appears, has "been strikingly confirmed; this time, unfortunately [sic] not in a positive sense as in the case of Cuba, but in a negative way."

After advocating liquidation of the revolutionary party, placed by Trotsky at the center of the theory of the permanent revolution, you then pronounce the verdict that "unfortunately," the theory has been confirmed in a "negative" way.

The whole process is viewed as something separate from Marxist theory, not as a process in which this theory, given concrete form in the revolutionary party, plays a decisive objective role.

(Continued Next Page)

NOW AVAILABLE —

Marxist Bulletin #2

(mimeographed)

"The Nature of the Socialist Workers Party"—discussion material

70 pages — 50¢

SPECIAL ISSUE —

Fourth International

A JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL MARXISM

documents on: "The Fourth International and the Socialist Workers Party"

35¢ a copy

both from SPARTACIST

Box 1377, G.P.O.

New York, N.Y. 10001

politics and a Trotskyist party of the Fourth International in Algeria, is avoided.

"Strength"

This same *World Outlook* commented only a few weeks ago that Ben Bella's announcement withdrawing the death sentence on Ait Ahmed was a "sign of the strength of the Ben Bella regime."

Now they say:

"The ease with which Ben Bella was

... ALGERIA

Only after the negative confirmation, is it necessary to say, as does the declaration's next sentence, that:

"No conquests in a colonial revolution can be considered to have been consolidated until a workers' state has been created, until a revolutionary socialist party has been built, until the workers and poor peasants hold power through their own institutions of proletarian democracy."

Not a word about the criminal confusion between the working-class revolutionary party and the bourgeois-national movement. Not a word about the criminal responsibility of the authors of the same declaration, who have been in the forefront of the revisionist subordination to bourgeois-national leaders like Ben Bella.

Their vagueness about the "Algerian left wing" is matched by the statements earlier this year by Pablo, recently expelled from the leadership of the United Secretariat. He referred constantly to "the organized left, the marching wing" of the revolution, but he discussed always within the framework of Algeria as a country on the road to socialism.

When he criticised government tutelage of the unions he did this always in terms of the state becoming isolated from the masses.

What was actually required was a struggle of the workers, leading the poor peasantry, to fight behind a Trotskyist party for their own power in opposition to the existing state.

Ben Bella has for years been consolidating the centralized state power against the workers and peasants. Boumedienne and the right have thrown him out because he did not go far enough and was too prone to give concessions to the masses.

As soon as Ben Bella had worked with Boumedienne for the 1962 overthrow of the old provisional government, he used Boumedienne's army to consolidate bourgeois state power.

This army was quite separate from the popular liberation force which fought the French. It was preserved in relatively privileged and comfortable conditions after the liberation, having previously been kept out of the fighting.

Collaboration

It was used to suppress and disarm all remaining forces of the Maquis in the different regions of Algeria. The resolution of the National Liberation Front Congress to create a people's militia remained just a scrap of paper.

This army consolidated its power while independence of the unions was eaten away and the land reform was halted. It was a classical example of

the bourgeoisie halting the democratic revolution, to collaborate with imperialism, and attack the workers and peasants.

Ben Bella, with his demagogic speeches and popular appeal, was necessary to the Algerian bourgeoisie and the imperialists only during the initial difficult period.

The reactionaries behind Boumedienne have now decided that his "left" talk about socialism can be dispensed with, and they will provide their own substitute.

This does not mean that the struggle is over or that the new regime is firmly established, but there can no longer be any doubt about the forces which have been established.

Certainly the Algerian events are of great consequence for Marxist theory and for the working-class movement. But the revisionists of the "United Secretariat" cannot calculate this significance because it involves above all an accounting of their own role.

As in Ceylon, revisionism has led to betrayal, and has prepared the way for defeats. But the struggle against that revisionism can be strengthened now that the lessons are being driven home.

Just as the workers and peasants of Ceylon and Algeria have not yet spoken their last word, so the Fourth International is no longer held back in its development by the revisionists.

On the contrary, they are being rapidly dissolved and defeated. This is a necessary part of the revived international struggle of the working class.

■ [from Newsletter, 3 July 1965]

... CHICAGO

(Continued from Page 16)

COPS! SEND THE TROOPS BACK HOME! ORGANIZE NEIGHBORHOOD PATROLS BY NEIGHBORHOOD PEOPLE! In conclusion, Spartacist called for the freeing of all those arrested and jailed during the riots.

Two supporters of Spartacist were arrested for "incitement to riot" and "mob action" while in possession of this leaflet. Held in jail for three days, they were subsequently released on \$1,000 bail each. They were later convicted of disorderly conduct and fined \$400. The more serious charges were dropped because the prosecution admitted it lacked adequate evidence.

Specter of Spartacist

The participation of Spartacist, alone among organized political movements, in the cause of the Negro people during the riots provoked widespread comment in the world press, from Mexico to Germany to China. *Time* magazine (20 August) reported: "The FBI was investigating the origin of another, anonymous leaflet distrib-

ed in the area. 'After years of frame-ups, brutality and intimidation,' it said, 'the black people are throwing off the control of the same rulers who are making war on working people throughout the world—in Viet Nam, the Dominican Republic and the Congo.'" James Robertson, editor of *Spartacist*, submitted the following reply (23 August) to the editors of *Time*.

"In your account of the Chicago black ghetto outburst (20 August), you falsely identify as 'anonymous' a leaflet produced by the Chicago supporters of Spartacist, a Trotskyist publication.

"This leaflet was signed by the local Spartacist Committee, together with its mailing address and phone number. The leaflet was in no sense anonymous; it was part and parcel of our desire to help transform these spontaneous, leaderless upheavals into

Spartacist Local Directory

AUSTIN. Box 8165, Univ. Sta., Austin, Texas 78712. GR 2-3716.
BALTIMORE. Box 1345, Main P.O., Baltimore, Md. 21203. LA 3-3703.
BERKELEY. Box 852, Main P.O., Berkeley, Cal. 94701. TH 8-7369.
CHICAGO. Box 9295, Old P.O. Sta., Chicago, Ill. 60690. Ph. 772-8817.
CINCINNATI. Box 46141, Glendale Sta., Cincinnati, Ohio 45246.
COLUMBUS. Box 3142, Univ. Sta., Columbus, Ohio 43210. Ph. 299-3982.
EUREKA. Box 3061, Eureka, Cal. 95501. Ph. 442-1423.
HARTFORD. Box 57, Blue Hill Sta., Hartford, Conn. 06112. Ph. 525-1257.
HOUSTON. Box 18431, Eastwood Sta., Houston, Texas 77023. Ph. 926-9946.
ITHACA. Box 442, Ithaca, N. Y. 14851. Ph. 273-4441.
LOS ANGELES. Box 4054, Term. Annex, Los Angeles, Cal. 90054. Ph. 667-2688.
MINNEAPOLIS. (contact New York)
NEW ORLEANS. Box 8121, Gentilly Sta., New Orleans, La. 70122. WH 4-1510.
NEW YORK. Box 1377, G.P.O., New York City, N.Y. 10001. UN 6-3093.
SAN FRANCISCO. (contact New York)
SEATTLE. (contact New York)

conscious political struggle for the social liberation of the Negro people."

Time responded, "Although we were unable for reasons of space to publish your letter, we thank you for setting the record straight and for your interest in *Time's* reporting."

Peking Review (20 August) reproduced the quotation from the Spartacist leaflet reported by *Time* as an expression of the sentiment of Chicago Negroes, and returned once more to the quotation the following week (27 August) in a reprint of an editorial in *Renmin Ribao* (19 August), the leading daily in China.

(Continued Top Next Page)

Los Angeles

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

ed:

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

II. The Struggle for Militant Leadership

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

Early Leadership Fails

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

Un-American Hearings

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

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

Willis—A Living Provocation

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

Toward New Leadership

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

. . . **PLP**

(Continued from Page 7)

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

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

An Amalgam

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

PL's Choice

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

—Resident Editorial Board

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

TWO REPORTS FROM CHICAGO

I. The Riots and Spartacist

"The tension exploded with a raw fury, spilling terror through the West Side community under cover of night," said the *Chicago Daily News*, Saturday, 14 August, following the Friday night riots on the west side of Chicago. Although the bourgeois press accounts attributed the "terror" to "Negroes run amuck" the residents of the ghetto in the West Garfield Park area had a somewhat clearer picture of who was being terrorized by whom. "I was sitting in a bar on Pulaski when they [the cops] came in, pulled guns, and lined everyone against the wall. Those who didn't know what was really happening and didn't jump fast enough were clubbed down. As I was being led to the wagon with a pistol at my head I heard the machine gun fire from down the street . . ." said a 22-year-old Negro youth arrested in the riot. Another youth said, "After we hit Goldblatt's [a department store] three of us headed down Madison where we ran into cops who had broken through the barri-

ades. We split and ran. I made it down an alley where as jumping a fence I heard the machine gun. I went to my belly and crawled away under fire with bullets pounding into the fence where I had been." Among the cops present—there were about 500—were reported open Nazi sympathizers, distinguished by swastikas on their belt buckles or by their open advocacy of Nazi methods: "Hitler did it to people like you."

No Middle Ground

Black workers in Chicago (as well as in Los Angeles), battling the police, were no longer submitting to the usual brutalities, intimidation and frame-ups. Those "leaders" who called for the people to go home, or called off demonstrations as Al Raby did, were participating on the side of the cops. The Chicago and Los Angeles riots scraped off the non-violent veneer from the actual policies of the kept civil rights leaders. On the one hand they called upon the people to go home,

while on the other hand they supported the occupation by police and troops. It was no accident that Martin Luther King, Dick Gregory and Al Raby did not call for non-violence on the part of the cops, for to do so would have meant opposing the police arm of the system which these men support and serve.

Riots and Revolution

Riots as such are not beneficial, for they are an unorganized and undirected outpouring of the grievances of the masses. Clearly the problem is not any lack of combativity on the part of the Negro population but rather their lack of leadership and program. The task of real leaders is to organize the struggle and to put forward demands which give the Negro movement political direction beyond its present scope.

Spartacist Intervenes

"GET THE COPS OUT," begins a Spartacist leaflet which was distributed in the West Side ghetto on 14 August. It continues, "The cops and the Daley Machine had this coming. The people are in the right, the cops in the wrong."

"The press informs us that Daley and his flunkies had to mobilize their National Guard today to enforce 'law and order' if necessary. 'Law and order' to these modern-day taskmasters means the same treatment black folks have received for the last 400 years. Their 'law and order' is the conduct of rioting cops in Chicago and Los Angeles as well as of U.S. troops in Vietnam. Their 'law and order' has nothing in common with the black working people. For when a people assume what is their civil rights to start with, the Daleys and Wilsons invoke 'law and order' to take it away."

Further on, the leaflet continues, "We must organize to defend the ghetto from cop terror! REMOVE THE (Continued Bottom Page 14)



Muhammed Speaks

KING ON WATTS: "It was necessary that as powerful a police force as possible be brought in to check them . . ." (NY Times, 16 Aug.)

**SUBSCRIBE TO THE
SPARTACIST**

Box 1377, G.P.O.
New York, N. Y. 10001
twelve issues — \$1
six issues — 50¢

Name _____
Address _____
City _____