

SPARTACIST



NUMBER 7

SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER 1966

10 CENTS

1966 ELECTIONS

The widespread internal opposition to the United States government's war in Vietnam has proven a happy surprise to more than a few anti-war activists. Not only have demonstrations against the war brought out thousands, but tens of thousands have recently cast their votes for primary candidates who were critical of the Johnson administration, with several such candidates getting 45 per cent and more of the Democratic primary vote in Congressional elections in California and New York. What has impressed anti-war militants has not remained unnoticed by the left-Establishment political pros. Thus in the last few months the public has been treated to the truly obscene spectacle of Robert Kennedy, former counsel for the McCarthy committee, evolving with indecent haste into the very model of a modern labor liberal, complete with anti-war stance, trips to South Africa, and a visit to the Delano grape strikers.

Mouldy Politics

Although he is the most prominent of all the liberal Democrats who would like to capitalize on the anti-war sentiment, Kennedy is not the only one. Various individuals and groups whose political aim is to strengthen their position within the Democratic Party have formed an organization called the National Conference for New Politics. Far from being *new*, the politics are the same old mouldy politics of coalitionism, "realignment," etc. which have suffered a partial eclipse within the civil-rights and anti-war movements, and which are now being revived. The National Conference for New Politics, in its own words, hopes to "bring together the liberals and the movement activists." Remember when "liberal" Governor Pat Brown was "brought together" with the "movement activists" of the Berkeley Free Speech Movement last year, through the medium of "liberal" Brown's police?

"New" Politics — Old Trap

But the Democratic Party looks so bad at present that some political tendencies which would normally be a part of the Democratic Party, and which will in the future be a faction within this party, are now going to run "independently." The effect of such "independent" campaigns will be to try to head off the growing discontent with Johnson's party and to channel it into those courses where it will eventually support the political ambitions of certain liberal Democrats. The now defunct campaign of Ronnie Dugger in Texas and

the projected campaign of Sy Cassady in California fall into this category. These "New Politics" are an old trap set for the anti-war movement.

Not all of the independent campaigns have the pernicious character of the preceding group. In several areas anti-war groups have decided to run independent candidates as part of an *explicit attack* on the Democratic Party, recognizing that this party is the favored tool of those forces which are committed to maintaining American capitalist hegemony throughout the world.

Oppose Ruling Class

But independence from the two war-parties, desirable and elementary though it is, does not guarantee that a "peace campaign" will cease to spread the harmful illusions about this society that have allowed the Lyndon Johnsons to monopolize its political processes. An inadequate analysis of the nature of this social system and the causes of its wars may lead to an "independent" campaign with a program that has fundamental flaws in its intended anti-war platform. In order to formulate an effective program we must first have a clear conception of the structure of American society and a

(Continued on Page 4)



JAPANESE TROTSKYISTS were among thousands of demonstrators protesting Vietnam war 4 July 1966. The demonstration was sparked by Dean Rusk's arrival in Kyoto for discussions.

SPARTACIST

A Bimonthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

EDITOR: James Robertson
 Managing EDITOR: Helen Janáček
 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 7



Sept.-Oct. 1966

LONDON CONFERENCE AFTERMATH

All interested parties have now offered their versions and taken their stands on the April International Conference called by the International Committee of the Fourth International. The Conference was marked by the driving away of the Voix Ouvriere comrades on the unique grounds that they would not have been invited had Healy known their positions, which had all been published months before the Conference, and by the nakedly trumped-up expulsion of the Spartacist group.

Healy's *Newsletter* reported the Conference immediately upon its conclusion, but said *not a word* about Spartacist and its expulsion, although the projected American unification between Spartacist and the American Committee for the Fourth International had been one of the main aims set for the Conference. Although as a result of the Conference we were supposed to be forthwith "removed . . . from the path of the working class," Healy was apparently too embarrassed to take the initiative.

Dirty Job

Thus he took an oblique approach, leaving the dirty work to his hacks on ACFI's *Bulletin*, who finally produced a series of political misrepresentations, a hint about a conference "cleavage" and no mention of the destruction of the projected American unification. When in reply SPARTACIST printed a full report of the Conference (see SPARTACIST, June-July 1966 issue), including our full political positions, as well as making public the organizational pretext for the expulsion—the refusal of a Spartacist delegate to state that his coming late to a Conference session constituted an admission of the petty-bourgeois nature of his organization—the SLL leadership and its ACFI satellite were finally forced to deal with the actual events of the Conference.

Three months after the Conference, two full pages were devoted to us in successive July issues of the *Newsletter*. C. Slaughter, a genuinely able Marxist, was given a dirty job which he tried valiently to carry out. But because Comrade Slaughter felt it necessary occasionally to quote from our remarks made to the Conference, as reprinted in our last issue, certain objective limits were placed on what are otherwise straw men masquerading as our positions.

Any independent comparison of our positions with Slaughter's intentional misrepresentation of them makes it unnecessary for us to detail the many discrepancies. For example: our emphasis on the importance of black working-class youth in the U.S. is not a denial of the working class as a whole; no more is our recognition of the generally propagandistic level of our work a denial of the agitational and class-struggle elements which are necessarily present but not dominant. For Slaughter to insist that the recognition of a certain primacy eliminates other aspects of a question is to be mechanistic, simplistic and anti-dialectical. Through such distortion Slaughter tries to obscure the collision between our actual views and the underlying sectarian and mechanical positions of the SLL.

The SLL contends that the Fourth International has been rebuilt (or never needed rebuilding—they haven't yet worked out which) and that Pabloism has been smashed internationally, but in any case that the IC is the FI. The IC under Healy avoids the necessary step of seeking to promote splits and fusions among other self-styled Trotskyist groups, resorting instead to attempting to destroy the revolutionary integrity of any group which does not display an abject submissiveness to the SLL leadership, by forcing it to profess indefensible positions and thus discredit itself, or, failing that, to the tactic of outright misrepresentation and lies.

Slaughter pretends to see some sort of unprincipled politics in our statement that the Cuban comrades of the Posadas tendency "were in the main excellent comrades struggling with valor under difficult conditions." He replies that the jailed Posadists were released last year, having given the Cuban authorities a declaration that their opposition to the Castro regime would cease. "Even Posadas himself denounced this declaration, but Robertson cannot mention it." In fact, Comrade Slaughter very likely first read in SPARTACIST *itself* (Nov.-Dec. 1965 issue) of the capitulation of some half-dozen of the 50-100 Cuban Posadists and of Posadas' repudiation.

Leninist Politics?

But wretched and false though Slaughter's polemic is, at least it attacks some ideas and defends others. However, Healy's American altar boy, Wohlforth of ACFI, in rushing to get into the act, felt no such compunction: no quoting of one's opponent, no ideas to attack or defend, only calculated loyalty to Healy and simple hatred for Spartacist appear in the *Bulletin*.

In "Spartacist and Leninist Politics, Part I, the International Movement," Wohlforth sidesteps the discussion of Conference events with the question: "We demand that Spartacist explain how 'bureaucratic centralists' could build the healthiest revolutionary proletarian party in the world." Since the revolutionary capacity of the SLL is still to be proven and its recent actions

cast serious doubts that it will be; since among British socialist groups its proletarian composition is hardly notable (the allegiance of radical unionists is still largely to the CP); since it is still far too small to proclaim itself a mass party—Wohlforth could be said to have overloaded the question just a bit! His supplemental conclusion is that “having no politics himself, the Abernite [i.e., Robertson] is forced to adapt to alien political currents.” Such “analysis” flows from the psychological realm of pure projection; Wohlforth has always followed persons rather than ideas, from right-wing conciliator Weiss all the way over to Healy, with lesser flirtations (e.g., Swaback, Mage, Phillips, Marcus) in between.

In “Part II, The Flight of the Middle Class Intellectual,” we find that Shane Mage plays the James Burnham to Robertson’s Shachtman (what happened to Robertson the Abernite is not clear). Wohlforth completes this preoccupation in personality by predicating his case on the assumption of Leon Trotsky’s basic infallibility. However, Trotsky was not infallible (indeed, why should he be?); until the bloc with Zinoviev his course in the struggle against Stalinism was disoriented and unclear, but afterwards unswerving to the end. Trotsky himself recognized this when he wrote in 1935 that he had misjudged the whole point of the “Thermidorian” reaction.

Wohlforth’s own working relationship with Marcus illustrates his preoccupation with personality. For nine months he used Marcus as his chief theoretician and even stated on record that he was in 99 per cent agreement with Marcus (to which we replied that Wohlforth would find the remaining 1 per cent awfully big). Marcus spent seven weeks with us, and ultimately found the atmosphere of Marxism far less congenial than that of ACFI. However, we still defend the most patient efforts to integrate talented intellectuals into our own ranks. Wohlforth, who opportunistically accepted Mage and Marcus *en bloc*, not critically, as did Spartacist, will not force us with his gibes into a sectarian mold.

Pabloists Protected

The Conference had a recognized importance beyond the ranks of the groups present. In particular, the “United Secretariat” tendency associated with the American Socialist Workers Party had cause to fear a successful outcome to the Conference. Strong opponent sections in the U.S. and France and a functioning international center for the IC would have threatened them severely at a time in which events in Algeria, Indonesia and Cuba have been dealing hard blows to their revisionist illusions. Consequently the United Secretariat was delighted with the actual Conference outcome; the SWP has now brought out a pamphlet, “Healy ‘Re-

constructs’ the Fourth International: Documents and Comments by Participants in a Fiasco, with a Preface by Joseph Hansen.” By showing up Healy as a prime example of “sectarianism and tinpot despotism” the United Secretariat protected its left flank just at the time that the Pabloists are politically most vulnerable.

As indicated, the pamphlet consists of a batch of documents, introduced by Hansen’s lengthy, amusing and sometimes accurate narrative of the Conference. Hansen describes the documents as having been “received” by the SWP “by chance.” (What a delicate way to describe the appropriation of the documents by an alternate member of the SWP National Committee!) Hansen attempts to use the documents as the basis for an attack on all par-

WHO LIES?

The following are several paragraphs from the article by Cliff Slaughter, secretary of the International Committee.

“*Spartacist*, in order to cloud over this political basis of the split, lies about the departure of Robertson and his delegation.”

And:

“Robertson was, of course, not asked to denounce himself as a petty-bourgeois, or anything of the sort. Such is not the politics of Bolshevik organizations.”

And finally:

“His very rejection of this, his insistence on personal prestige *against* this discipline, confirms our characterization of this group as petty-bourgeois, dominated by the ideology of middle-class radical groups in American politics, their ideology subordinated to the US monopolists and American exceptionalism.”

—from *The Newsletter*, 2 July 1966

participants. However, all he is able to dig up about Spartacist is the old and discredited lie that our predecessor tendency was expelled from the SWP for “indiscipline.” As for the *Voix Ouvriere* group, he can do no more than characterize them as “wily politicians.” Although we have substantial political differences with VO, we believe that our groups could exist within the framework of a genuine democratic-centralist International. This conclusion is strengthened by the exemplary honesty and responsibility that VO has shown in its dealings with the IC and with us, and the seriousness of its treatment of the main Conference documents as well as its participation in the Conference itself.

Monstrous Statement

We waited with interest to see how Healy would react to the Hansen pamphlet; in the *Newsletter* of 20 August, the reaction came. The statement by the SLL Political Committee is mon-

strous, showing that the SLL leadership, when trapped in a tight corner, will (1) slanderously accuse opponents and critics of being agents of the class enemy, “finger men for the State Department,” (2) and themselves threaten to use the capitalist police and courts to fight their political battles for them; “. . . [the] pamphlet . . . is legally libellous, we shall not hesitate to deal appropriately . . .”

The alleged basis for the SLL’s treatment is that the pamphlet opens up “the Robertson group and the Wohlforth group” for legal prosecution under the U.S. Voorhis Act. We for our part reject the SLL’s solicitousness on our behalf. The Voorhis Act is a *paper tiger*—never used against anyone and patently unconstitutional. For the Justice Department to start proceedings against a small group like ours or the smaller and much less threatening ACFI would make the government a laughing stock, and Healy knows this. He is aware that for years the SWP has hidden behind this very act to defend its own federalist idea of an International. He wrote contemptuously of the United Secretariat (*Newsletter*, 19 June 1965) when it refused on the basis of the Voorhis Act to hear an appeal from us against our expulsion from the SWP.

The truth is that the SLL is left gasping in the face of the documents. It can only bluster, threaten, conceal and tragically itself cross the class line by threatening to call the cops. Nowhere in the SLL-PC statement is any inkling given of the pamphlet’s contents—i.e., documents of Conference participants themselves. Instead the pamphlet is made to appear entirely the product of the SWP. The reason is that the documents, and especially the key letter written by Healy himself, expose Healy’s tactics for what they are.

In conclusion, there are two points. In the light of the best efforts by all the interested parties to interpret and justify their roles or attitudes toward the London Conference, we must state that for the historic short run at least we have been vindicated in the course that we steered at the Conference and subsequently, and have emerged with our capacity to pursue revolutionary work unimpaired. Healy and his New York centrist publicist cannot say the same.

It is absurd to describe Healy’s break with Spartacist as being our breaking from the Fourth International; rather, our understanding of authentic internationalism and of our role as a detachment of the world movement has been deepened. And if Healy’s wrecking sectarianism and bureaucratism have made the work of Trotskyists (including ourselves) internationally more difficult, we will go ahead; the world party of socialist revolution will be reborn, but toward that task Healy has been shown to be not a midwife, but an abortionist. ■

... ELECTIONS

(Continued from Page 1)

prescription for action to change that structure.

Most anti-war militants will agree that the high school civics text thesis of the nature of political power in America is false. There is obviously an enormous difference between the power wielded by the working people on the one hand, and such servants of the bourgeoisie as corporation hierarchies, military circles and government bureaucracies, on the other. It is apparent that we must attack and remove from power the ruling class and its agencies in order to end the causes of war for good. Where many anti-war fighters reveal doubt is over the question of how to attack the present system. The working people, including those organized into trade unions, look apathetic or worse, certainly not very likely candidates to overthrow the system. Thus many anti-war fighters end up directing their appeals to the middle class, especially its "intellectual" layer. They couple these efforts with an attempt to reach the one section of the working class they see as uncorrupted, the black workers jammed into the big city ghettos.

As an *immediate description of reality*, the image of an apathetic white working class is not entirely incorrect, and even those sections of the class which are beginning to fight again on economic issues do not appear particularly receptive to anti-war propaganda. But an examination of the reason for this will reveal the key to building an anti-war movement which can begin to make genuine inroads into the foundations of American imperialism. For in examining the state of the working class today, we will discover *how* the ruling class rules, and thus how we can fight it.

It is obvious that when substantial sections of the population have rejected, or are about to reject, the rule of their capitalist overlords, then the ruling class simply rules by open violence. That is what happened in the Dominican Republic and that is what is happening in Vietnam today. But the preferred method of control by the ruling class is *ideological*—that is to say, they would prefer that their slaves be willing. Thus, through a variety of social mechanisms, the masses of people are politically socialized to believe in, if not the justice, at least the permanence of capitalist rule. A false consciousness is implanted—not necessarily through a conscious "plot"—into the minds of the working people. Thus it is that millions of working people in the U.S. vote regularly for the Democratic Party, feeling that, whatever its inadequacies, it is "their" party.

Smash Illusions

This analysis points in the direction that the independent anti-war campaigns must take. They should not seek to reinforce the illusion of non-class politics with radical verbiage, but rather should openly declare their recognition that the U.S. is a class society where the working class has no political instrument to express its will. Their attack on the Democratic Party should be in these terms, pointing out that the war in Viet-

nam is only one of many examples of the betrayal of the interests of the working people by the Democrats. As an alternative to the Democratic Party, they should call for the formation of a party of the working people, based on trade unions, ghetto groups and other organizations of working-class struggle. Since such a party will be formed only in struggle against much of the present leadership of the trade union and civil rights movements, they should encourage the formation of militant rank-and-file caucuses within these movements, and seek to work with such caucuses where they do exist. In sum, independent campaigns must not only break with the Democratic Party, but *must break with the system of bourgeois rule*, and aim toward arousing the working class from its present passive allegiance to that system.

Socialist Candidates

There are a number of campaigns which have a clear socialist or working-class character, which openly identify the class basis of politics, and which will therefore help advance the anti-war movement. Although all of these campaigns may be criticized, they are deserving of serious support by opponents of the war. We refer to the campaign of Wendy Nakashima, Progressive Labor Party candidate for state assemblywoman in New York City's 69th A.D.; to the ticket headed by Judy White for governor being run by the N.Y. State Socialist Workers Party; and to the campaigns for Congress waged by Leslie Silberman in the Queens 7th Congressional District of New York and by James Weinstein in the 19th C.D. of Manhattan's West Side. The Nakashima campaign takes an explicit position for socialism and the working class. Silberman's less clearly defined platform includes the demand for a labor party, thus recognizing that one must choose to identify with the interest of one *class* over the other—that there can be no such thing as a "people's" candidate. Weinstein's newly announced candidacy as an independent socialist centers on two points: immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam and from all other overseas bases; the demand for a socialist alternative to corporation control. Thus Weinstein's campaign makes a definitive break from the terrain of capitalist party politics.

Levin Falters

An independent peace campaign which seems to come close to the class borderline but does not is being made by Hal Levin for Congress. Running in Brooklyn, Levin is opposing Herbert Aptheker, a Communist Party leader who is hypocritically running as an independent, for purely tactical reasons. Although he is for "ending the war in Vietnam," Aptheker refuses to call for immediate withdrawal. In the face of the politically dishonest Aptheker campaign, it is unfortunate that Levin does not come out forthrightly for class politics. Without such a position his campaign is an unsupportable waste. Although his platform includes a number of excellent demands, it falters when it reaches the question of politics. Instead of clearly calling for a political party based on the working people, Levin speaks of "building a broad-based movement independent of the Democratic and Republican parties . . . a movement, for the vast majority of the American people, not for

(Continued on Page 14)

1948-STYLE INDEPENDENT

Henry Wallace and Gideon's Army

In late 1947, Henry A. Wallace announced his intention to run for the presidency of the U.S. as an anti-war, pro-labor candidate. Wallace had been secretary of agriculture, vice president and secretary of commerce, all under Franklin D. Roosevelt, capitalism's phony champion of the working man. But for the 1948 campaign Wallace ran at the head of the new Progressive Party, a third party challenge to the two established capitalist "front groups."

During 1946 and early 1947, old-line New Dealers and some Democratic politicians; CIO President Philip Murray, left-dominated unions in the CIO and organizations based on the CIO; and the Communist Party had all shown an interest in such a third party. However by December 1947, the first two groupings, partially under the pressures of a growing red scare, had almost all retreated to the Democratic Party. Only the CP and groupings closely allied to it gave any substantial support after the end of 1947. The nature of that support can be seen by the continuing withdrawals throughout the campaign by Stalinist-led unions confronted by CIO pressure, and by the composition of the Progressive Citizens of America, a largely petty-bourgeois CP front group, a good section of which later formed the Americans for Democratic Action. Wallace, with his announcement, initiated not a wide-based movement but a petty-bourgeois "Gideon's Army," captained by Stalinists.

The Messiah Movement

The nature of the third party campaign waged by Wallace is accurately indicated in that term. Wallace himself relished the designation and seemed eager to portray himself as a latter-day Gideon. His appearances were accompanied by gospel singers, trumpets and a revivalist camp atmosphere. He campaigned on the basis of peace among nations, brotherhood among men and justice for all. Rather than use the first campaign of a new nation-wide party as a means for raising the consciousness of the working class, Wallace accepted the role of a messiah, come to save the American people.

Just before the election, Wallace proclaimed that the Progressive Party could count many victories: a third party had been put on the ballot in 45 states; moreover, his campaign had slowed the "cold war," given pause to the assault on civil rights and eliminated the possibility of a witch hunt.

The rejoinders to Wallace's claims are today obvious, but they need to be made because the type of victories which Wallace claimed are the same type that many peace and independent candidates seek today. Where is that third party today? What use, other than electoral, was made of the moye than a million voters who supported Wallace? If the "cold war" has slowed, it has slowed only to be replaced by a series of U.S. maneuvered hot wars and CIA-run counter revolutions, most aided by the treacherous role of Stalinist parties. As for the last two claims, one need point only to the continuing police assaults on Harlem, Watts, Chicago, Cleveland and East New York and to

the McCarthy period, followed by the HUAC period, followed by the Epton "trial."

Role of the Guardian

The totally capitalist nature of Wallace's third party can be seen by reading the early issues of the *National Guardian* and by comparing the specific items of Wallace's platform to those in any Democratic Party platform.

The *National Guardian* began publication in October, 1948, primarily as the propaganda organ for the Wallace campaign. Its very first issue (18 October 1948) proclaimed:

"This editorial point of view will be a continuation and development of the progressive tradition set in our time by Franklin D. Roosevelt...

"We conceive the progressive tradition to be represented today by Henry A. Wallace...

"We believe, with FDR and Henry Wallace, in expanding freedoms and living standards for all peoples as the essential foundation of a world at peace.

"We believe, with FDR and Henry Wallace, that peace can be secured only by seeking areas of agreement among nations, rather than seeking areas of disagreement."

The high-blown rhetoric cannot conceal three basic fallacies in those few sentences: that FDR, capitalism's front man *par excellence*, was in reality the advocate for the working man; that capitalism, which can do nothing to stem famine in India or prevent an approaching famine in Latin America, is able to improve the living standards of the whole world's population; and that there is no significant difference between the capitalist U.S. and socialist Russia.

A campaign based on such fallacies can do nothing but dull the consciousness of the working class. Why should the labor movement back a minor party candidate who pleads, "Capitalism would be just fine if slightly reformed, so vote for me"? The Democratic Party asserts the same line and its candidates can be immediately elected. Such a campaign can have no outcome other than the strengthening of the Democratic Party's hold over the working class.

When just that did happen in the '48 election, the CP and others backing Wallace took credit for such a strengthening of the party which the bourgeoisie have increasingly realized is their protector. The *Guardian* exulted in its post-election issue (8 November

(Continued Next Page)



SPARTACIST group in NYC 6 August march protesting Vietnam war.

... WALLACE

1948):

"The people of a whole world can look toward America today with renewed confidence. The American people have reaffirmed their progressive tradition. They have repelled the bold maneuvering of monopoly and reaction to take over America through Thomas E. Dewey and the Republican Party. They have handed Harry S. Truman an unmistakable mandate to return to the principles of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

"The mandate would not have been possible if the Progressive Party had not introduced the Roosevelt program into the 1948 campaign."

Wallace's Program

The laughable absurdity of such a statement is apparent as soon as one analyzes the class nature of the Roosevelt program which Wallace introduced. Its demands have already been fulfilled or have been repeated as truisms in the Great Society of another messiah.

Wallace's program broke down into two general areas, isolated from each other: the achievement of international peace and the progressive reform of U.S. capitalism at home. According to Wallace, the U.S. could achieve worldwide peace by establishing faith in the UN, by negotiating with Soviet Russia, by recognizing new small countries such as Israel and by abolishing military conscription at home.

The domestic reforms required slightly more complex solutions. On the social side, Wallace advocated abolition of Jim Crow laws and the establishment of legal guarantees for civil rights; federal aid to housing, health and education; and governmental promotion of science and culture. On the economic front, he called for a council of economic planning to assure high production, full employment and a rising standard of living; public ownership of key areas of the economy in TVA type developments; repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and a one dollar an hour minimum wage; anti-trust action against monopolies; and rollback of prices covered out of exorbitant profits.

A Bourgeois Program

Capitalism has been able to fulfill most of these demands or hold out the promise of their fulfillment without seriously damaging its own position. Thus the program posed no questions which capitalism itself could not appear to solve. It did not serve to link up the economic pressures at home with the already mounting imperialism of the "cold war." Thus Wallace's general evaluations of Progressive Party successes were all proved incorrect be-

cause his platform, accepted gladly by Truman, dealt with specific ills in a capitalist society and not with the capitalist mode of production which produces those ills.

There was no ideological content to the Wallace campaign—only the slogans of a messiah-reformer—and the one million votes formed no base for the development of a third party opposed to capitalist control.

Labor Control Needed

James Cannon in a 1948 internal SWP discussion on the Wallace candidacy offered several criteria which can be used as measures today of these new third parties. He stated that Wallace's policies showed only tactical differences in the camp of the bourgeoisie and that to support Wallace would mean an entrance into "lesser-evil" politics. He differentiated between the pseudo-radical party of a petty-bourgeois reformist like Wallace and the revolutionary labor party, which would proceed from the aim to assist the development of in-

dependent political action by workers and turn that action towards its revolutionary culmination. Finally he insisted that the class character of a party is determined not primarily by the class which supports it but by the class it supports, in its program, daily policy and practice.

The SWP Political Committee resolution on the Wallace candidacy developed on the basis of these criteria its minimum requirement for critical support to a third party: that the party be based on a significant section of labor and be subject to its control and pressure.

The incipient third parties could easily use these criteria in order to distinguish the class nature of their own demands, and therefore the possibility of those demands leading to a revolutionary culmination. More importantly, parties claiming to be Marxist need to establish such criteria as the basis for their own support to third party movements. (The SWP might well take note of its own past history.) ■

SANTO DOMINGO COMMUNE

REFORMIST BETRAYAL

To explain the 1 June victory of Joaquin Balaguer in the Dominican presidential elections, the apologists for the Dominican left leadership have produced the bogeyman of a U.S. rigged election. (See Juan Antonio Corretjer in PL's *Challenge-Desafio*, 5 July 1966.) Yet the defeat of Juan Bosch in a country recently torn by an insurrection apparently aimed at returning him to office cannot be explained by buck-passing fantasies. (Just as those same apologists were incorrect in viewing the betrayal in Indonesia as the work of the CIA bogeyman.) We do not deny the criminal role of the international bourgeoisie, but we do say that this role cannot be used as a blind to cover the rotten politics of revisionists. Successful counterrevolution usually follows class bargaining perpetrated by petty-bourgeois "leftists" at the expense of the masses.

The insurrection was originally bourgeois-democratic in nature, concerned with restoring the constitution of 1963. When "progressive" army officers demanded in April 1965 the return of the constitution, the working class and students, especially in proletarian sectors of Santo Domingo, joined the rebellion and supported their demands. However, the masses of Santo Domingo also created a potentially revolutionary situation. By 28 April, Santo Domingo was in the hands of the masses, organized into neighborhood

committees and similar military-political bodies. These were potential forms of workers' power.

U.S. Invasion

Then U.S. marines and paratroopers invaded. Soon they fortified the Junta's weak resistance, cut Santo Domingo in two, pushed the rebels into Ciudad Nueva, a proletarian sector, and allowed the troops of Elias Wessin y Wessin to "clean up" the northern rebel sector, isolated from Ciudad Nueva by the imperialist troops.

For all Latin American revolutionaries, the lesson of this invasion is clear: imperialism can never mediate; it can only react brutally in an attempt to smash revolutions, even those which start out with bourgeois-democratic aims. The only excuse imperialism will need will be a call from any semblance of a legal "property" government which imperialism itself has created.

While this is clear to the advocates of the bogeyman theory of counterrevolution, they seem unaware that a corrupt leadership can also defeat a potentially viable revolutionary situation. The very fact that they attach so much importance to the electoral defeat of Bosch indicates that they see no need for a leadership which is revolutionary. Bosch's whole political history is that of the governmental reformer: his simultaneously anti-Trujillo, anti-communist attacks before

1961; his program, while in office, to establish a national bourgeoisie, reform feudal land relations and democratize Dominican society; his position during the '63 coup, dumping himself in the name of order; and his disavowal of leftist groups during the recent election campaign.

Popular Front

Yet, the most significant lesson of the uprising and its developments is contained in the treacherous role of the left leadership, whose actions revealed their petty-bourgeois outlook. Leaders of the *Partido Socialista Popular* (pro-Moscow communist), the *Movimiento Popular Dominicano* (pro-Peking communist), and the 14th of June Movement (nationalist) all sought during the insurrection to emasculate real revolutionary action in the armed masses. This leadership took up a popular front tactic and maintained at first that the struggle was one of constitutional legality and then, when U.S. marines entered, one of national liberation. It is curious that these "leftists" at first tried to label this tactic a united front, as if the *Partido Revolucionario Dominicano* did not have a long history of traditional bourgeois politics and of anti-communist campaigns. Quite satisfied to be allowed to work under Bosch's PRD, they never challenged its mandate. If they had any perspective of class struggle left, it dissolved at the bargaining table of Caamaño, the Papal Nuncio and the OAS "Peace Force."

In this merger with the constitutionalists, they were unable to push the uprising towards a socialist revolution. They did not connect other Dominican cities or the countryside with Santo Domingo; nor did they call upon Latin American workers to support their struggle.

As popular frontists they didn't distinguish between classes. These "leftists" did not even notice that the rebellion was part of the international class struggle. The people were armed and willing to fight. That their consciousness and slogans were nationalistic and not proletarian was of no concern to the petty-bourgeois "left" leadership. They never attempted to advance a totally different concept, that of revolutionary class struggle, by which they could develop class consciousness of the proletariat in preparation for a continuing struggle against the bourgeoisie, both international and national.

Bourgeois Hegemony

Once under the hegemony of the bourgeois PRD and its policies, the M14J, the PSP and the MPD participated in their own liquidation as possible revolutionary parties. (In late 1961 and early 1962, the M14J was the

third largest Dominican party, with a broad mass following. Today it has returned to its earlier petty-bourgeois student base.) Their complete subservience to the propagandistically nationalist, bourgeois-democratic policies of the PRD was the logical end of their careers in opportunism, careers which included earlier accommodations to Bosch; and, in the case of the PSP, even to Trujillo; and, of the M14J, to the neo-Trujilloist *Union Civica Nacional*, who campaigned under the slogan "God is never wrong."

Although this leadership never disavowed collaboration with the class enemy, the bourgeoisie and its political representatives never lost an opportunity to attack them. For instance, Gaston Espinal, New York leader of the PRD, said at the beginning of the 1965 uprising: "They [the leftists] have no influence whatsoever and never will have any." He obviously felt that U.S. imperialism, however, ought to have influence, for, when he was asked about the landing of the marines, he replied, "How can you object to saving lives?" Yet, Manuel Tavares, a leader of the M14J, characterized the PRD as "the agent of a national, democratic, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution." This characterization was made approvingly as though a bourgeois-democratic revolution were the answer for all of Latin America's problems.

Nationalist Slogans

Given such a background of class collaboration, the final outcome of the election becomes more understandable. When the last rebel stronghold was "cleaned up" after the August truce, the left leadership continued to struggle under the same slogans of nationalism which had proven worthless in the insurrectionary struggles. Following this line, they continued to support Bosch for the elections, rather than pose a class alternative to the two candidates of bourgeois reaction. They preferred the immediate possibility of a Bosch victory to the continuing struggle to raise class consciousness to its proletarian revolutionary conclusion. However, Bosch rejected their support as he had in 1962. He made an official statement opposing a general strike called by MPD in November on the grounds that it was the "duty" of workers to ignore the strike call and to support the OAS-backed Garcia-Godoy regime. Apparently surprised by this move, the MPD, without naming Bosch, accused him of "sabotage" and of "playing along with the Provisional Government and Yankee imperialism."

A look at the strike call, however, makes it clear that it is the MPD which should be blamed for the failure of the strike. After a long series of accommodations to Bosch and no prepa-

ration for real revolutionary tactics, they adventuristically called for a "patriotic strike" against "Yankee imperialism . . . which wants to transform this country into a United States colony like Puerto Rico." Certainly we support national self-determination as one aspect of the proletarian revolution in the "colonial" world, but the MPD had not built a proletarian base for making such a call. Their adventurism allowed Bosch to divert the strike, also in the name of nationalism.

Balaguer's Victory

This adventuristic fling, on top of the whole long traitorous, expedient coalition, could do nothing but confuse the class basis of the struggle. The masses pushed the struggle as far as they could, only to be betrayed by the left leadership who called to Bosch for guidance. The subsequent feeling of betrayal must in part have contributed to Balaguer's victory.

He represented "order" after long months of meaningless bloodshed. Surely the masses didn't trust or respect Balaguer, but no class consciousness had been awakened by those purporting to lead the masses; the revolutionary situation had withered and died. Balaguer campaigned in the rural areas in the name of "order" and "unity," capitalism's electoral facade. There was no one with the force and authority to unmask him. And the rural areas, which had overwhelmingly supported Bosch in the 1962 elections, gave Balaguer the victory.

new MARXIST BULLETIN

Cuba and Marxist Theory
selected documents on
the Cuban Question
35¢ a copy

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

Role of Cuba

As the role of the leftist leadership was ultimately counterrevolutionary within the Dominican Republic, so the role of the Cuban bureaucracy was to give meaningless support. The Cuban leadership, and its main spokesman, Fidel Castro, failed to effectively aid the Dominican uprising. They did, however, deliver their predictable protests in the name of "people's sovereignty" through respectable channels of protest, such as the U.N. At the same time, Castro made it clear that the uprising was not communist and that Cuba had nothing to do with it. Though such a statement would not be an incorrect diplomatic tactic, the Cu-

(Continued on Page 11)

LABOR MURDER IN SAN FRANCISCO

by Geoffrey White

The sensational story of the shotgun killings of two California trade union militants in early April 1966 received heavy news coverage in West Coast newspapers. The assassination of Dow Wilson on 5 April and Lloyd Green on 7 May was a brutal affront only to the sensibilities of those with short memories who are misled by the facade of bourgeois democratic phraseology into forgetting that this country has one of the bloodiest labor histories of any country in the world. The American trade unions were built in bitter struggle, and the state of California itself has been the setting for some of the most pronounced conflicts. The San Francisco waterfront was the scene of violent, bloody clashes and hard-fought strikes from 1934 to 1936; in 1941 a famous strike at North American Aviation was crushed by the threat of force—more exactly, by the mobilization of 3500 National Guardsmen. In the immediate post-war period a series of shootings thwarted the attempt to organize farm labor in the San Joaquin Valley. Thus the Delano grape strike and the shooting of Wilson and Green are part of a series of struggles which in this last case have reached a particularly violent culmination.

Wilson, as a very young man, was active in the maritime unions in the immediate post-war period. Maritime in those days was a tough school, and Wilson apparently learned a great deal about militant unionism. After a couple of years of this experience, he left maritime and became a house painter by trade and in 1951 a member of one of the San Francisco locals of the Painters Union.

The Painters Union would appear to be a poor field of work for a militant unionist. Unionism in the building trades has been and still is notoriously conservative as well as corrupt. The building trades pay generally high wages, and to those who regard only the low-paid and unorganized workers as likely militants, the Painters Union appears an uninviting arena. In many respects, however, the painters are *not* privileged workers. Chronic unemployment, with sharp seasonal changes, is compounded by poor working conditions. The men suffer from an acute speed-up system and the con-

stant pressure of labor-saving—and labor-sweating—technological changes such as the air-gun and roller; in addition, painters' wages compare poorly with those of workers in the other building trades.

Central to all these problems have been the internal conditions of the union. The Painters International vies with management in its corruption and conservatism. Racketeering has been common and there have been numerous scandals. The prevalence of sweetheart contracts suggests unusually close relations between contractors and international officials. Union democracy has been a joke. In New York City's District 9 a group under the influence of the Communist Party has been battling the bureaucracy for decades, but with only partial and temporary successes. The routine of bureaucratic sell-outs has not been relieved by any major struggles for a long time.

/Struggle in Painters, Union

Into this arena the young maritime exile brought more than the skills he had learned on the waterfront. He brought a personality and ability to communicate that could win the trust and confidence of those who had been too often bilked and deceived not to be cynical. By the late fifties, the darkest of the McCarthy night was over, even in the union movement, where it lasted longer, perhaps, than in other social sectors. Wilson, in whom remarkable talents and experience combined with a no less remarkable integrity, emerged as a militant and powerful spokesman for an aggrieved rank and file. A period of intense struggles began. As Wilson and his supporters became increasingly powerful among San Francisco painters, resistance to speed-up was increased, job conditions were protected, and the rank and file began to achieve a new sense of its own power. In time, Wilson and the group around him were in a position to challenge the power of the international and its local representatives. Wilson and others in his group were elected to office, and the local went into opposition.

This was bad news for the contractors and their good friends in the international union. The newly militant

union conducted one of the most effective building trades strikes in recent history and won for the painters startling wage increases. The two San Francisco locals with overlapping jurisdiction—a source of delight for the employers and of opportunity for the international union officials—were amalgamated, over the bitter opposition of the higher bureaucracy. Contracts were not only improved, but enforced as well, against previously privileged employers. As the influence of the San Francisco militants spread into other locals in northern California, it became evident that Wilson and his friends might soon be in a position to challenge the leadership on a national level. The international tried to have Wilson and other union leaders removed from office on vague charges of disruption and disloyalty, but the militants' strength was already enough to prevent this maneuver.

Matters really came to a head over the question of the business agent assessment. It had been the practice in the international for each local to pay a certain per capita assessment, which was then used by the international to pay the salaries of business agents. Thus the full-time union employees in the field were employed by and hence controlled by the international organization. Wilson and his supporters opposed this and advocated instead that business agents be hired by and paid by the locals. This would obviously represent a shift in power, and involved basic control of not only the union but hundreds of thousands of dollars in union dues. The locals of San Francisco and neighboring East Bay finally threw down the ultimate challenge. They refused to pay their business agent assessments, and moved to hire their own functionaries instead.

Labor Assassination

On 5 April 1966 Dow Wilson was murdered, with a shotgun, gangland style. On 7 May, Lloyd Green, a collaborator of Wilson's in the Hayward local in the East Bay, was murdered in the same fashion. For the first time in thirty years, assassination appeared as a weapon on the northern California labor scene.

Considering the gravity of the crime,

the reaction was surprisingly mild. The murdered men's associates demanded prompt action by the police, and some of the unionists sought police protection. The local labor leaders deplored and condemned, as did the bourgeois press. The same reaction came even from the new-left radical movement, almost as if labor murders were deplorable but outside of and irrelevant to the student world. Some of Wilson's friends in the Painters Union suggested that all labor in the region be invited to attend the funeral; in short, they advocated a one-day general strike. Even in Wilson's own local, however, this proposal was rejected, and instead the union commended the diligence of the San Francisco police.

A few weeks after the murder of Green, San Francisco police arrested five men for conspiracy to commit murder. The arrests were as much the result of the efforts of a single stool-pigeon and the local liberal newspaper as of the energy and skill of the police. The defendants themselves are an interesting, if depressing, lot. They include painting contractors from the Sacramento area, employer trustees of an employer-union health and welfare fund, and a San Francisco bar owner. As "representatives of the bourgeoisie" they are a scroungy bunch. In fact, with their picture-window houses, loud cars and brittle wives, they would almost arouse sympathy, were it not that more people are killed by insects than by rattlesnakes.

Trial by press began at once, and went so far that local authorities are reading the Sheppard decision by the Supreme Court with considerable misgivings. The case against the defendants appears to rest primarily on the testimony of an underworld informer. Another unsatisfactory aspect is the motive alleged by the *Wall Street Journal* and others for the killing—fear on the part of the welfare fund trustees that Wilson would expose their misappropriation of funds. This seems rather inadequate as all Wilson had said on the subject was, that the trustees had used poor judgment on some investments, and in fact the handling of the welfare fund was already under the scrutiny of the district attorney.

Public confidence in the prosecution's case was not further increased when Clyde Simmonds, 75-year-old secretary of the Sacramento Painting and Decorating Contractors' Association, was released on bail by Judge Elkington because the only testimony against him was the following recording on a taped telephone:

"I had to take a certain little action to stop a fire from growing into a big bonfire, and now you don't hear anything more about it."



DOW WILSON

What is known about the case to date creates little confidence in the minds of thoughtful people that the whole tale will be told. It would be altogether too convenient for the authorities that some already soiled, lumpen-bourgeois elements should take the rap in this embarrassing case. On the Green case, there has been total silence.

Underlying Conditions

The murder of a public figure for public reasons always throws into sharp relief the underlying social conditions. So it was with Malcolm X, with Kennedy, and so also with Wilson and Green. One aspect of the current labor movement, highlighted by the indictment of the allegedly crooked welfare fund trustees, is the extent to which American labor unions are victims of their own partial successes. The accumulation of vast sums in pension and welfare schemes, running into millions of dollars, is not only a source of ideological corruption—tying the unions more firmly to the system, by giving them bank accounts, buildings and investments to defend—but also attracts open gangsters and racketeers, on the side of both employer and union. Yet the abolition of these funds, in a "back to the thirties" movement, is no answer. Besides the economic power the unions derive from the money, the health and welfare provisions give union members a protection they would not otherwise have. The only prophylaxis against the inherent and inevitable corruptive influence of these funds on the union movement is the politicalization and ideological transformation of the labor movement.

This process, transcending pure and

simple unionism, alone can provide a countervailing influence. The alternative is increased corruption, leading to rising demands for government supervision and control. This would be a step toward statification of the unions and their complete destruction as independent organs of the working class, which would be fatal to the role of the unions as the economic arm of the working class on the road to power.

"New Leftism" Undermined

Despite superficial appearances to the contrary, the Wilson case undermines some of the pet notions of the new-left theoreticians, outstanding among which is an attack on an alleged labor mystique and a tendency to write off the organized sector of the working class as hopelessly corrupt, conservative and immune to radical ideas. Wilson, a man with a radical background and a radical style, was able to build a regional power in a building trades union, win it to a militant trade union line on economic questions, and force major concessions from the employers. Furthermore, at the time of his death, he was on the offensive against the international bureaucracy of the union. All this was accomplished by serious and sustained work inside the union—a far cry from the settlement-house-mission style favored by some new leftists and by Progressive Labor. Old-line Stalinists might also consider that Wilson quoted Shakespeare freely, grew a beard and frequently wore a beret—scarcely the "just one of the boys" style they teach their cadre.

These events also point up the right and the duty of radicals and labor militants to take what steps are feasible to defend themselves. Besides the southern bombings and murders, the recent period has seen two West Coast bombings, the assassination of Malcolm X, the politico-psychopathic shooting of Trotskyists in Detroit, and the assassination of the two trade union rebels in the Bay Area. However, in a society where a man's life can be ultimately purchased for a few thousand dollars, the only fundamental defense of dissident leaders is the creation of an organized, political and programmatic movement which can carry on the work of its leaders and which, furthermore, can react effectively to assassinations. A one-day general strike in the Bay Area would have done more to protect the lives of future Wilsons and Greens than the most zealous work of the bourgeois police.

Militancy Not Enough

Not only Wilson's successes, but also his ultimate failure should have meaning for all those who seek a radical

(Continued Next Page)

... MURDER

transformation of society. Here the analogy to Malcolm is painfully close. The school of maritime was the toughest school, but not necessarily the best, for young trade union militants. The milieu in which Wilson spent his early trade union days was ideologically dominated by the pragmatic opportunism of the Stalinist movement. Its aim was to control, to win—not to build a principled, long-range movement. The Stalinists of course did not invent this attitude, which was shared by the right and by other centrist forces. The Communist Party can be blamed, however, for not attempting to overcome the trend of the general union movement, particularly within its own ranks.

The activists of the New Left recognize the betrayals of the labor movement by Stalinist reformists but refuse to analyze them in order to de-

termine the correct tactics for winning labor struggles. They put down as sectarian, factional, Old-Left and futile any internal struggle within political organizations, and by analogy, the factional fight in a union; the latter escapes their specific condemnation only because of their ignorance of it. The history of Dow Wilson in the Painters Union serves to illustrate once again that the fight for rank-and-file control and militancy within the union is simply the manifestation internally of the external class struggle, just as is the struggle with revisionism, sectarianism and ultra-leftism within radical groupings. For the trade unions, as for political groups, the internal struggle is decisive. Only to the extent that Wilson and his associates were able to overcome the internal opposition were they able successfully to confront the bosses. The impatient young men of the New Left do their best to bypass or deny this process, as they resist any clarification of the political direction or efforts at polariza-

tion along class lines of the anti-war and civil rights movements.

Programmatic Position Needed

It is clear that what Wilson was attempting to build in his union was a militant democratic rank-and-file movement but, for all that, one built on no other basis than the most advanced form of pure trade unionism. The course of events since his murder, especially the act of his supporters in substituting commendation of the efforts of the police for the proposed one-day strike, indicates that Wilson did not win over a decisive grouping to a class-conscious ideological or programmatic position. This would meet with the approval of the new-left anti-theoreticians, but, as in the case of Malcolm X, it has had tragic consequences. The bourgeoisie has a political program and ideology; when its chief political spokesman was murdered, its political course was not substantially altered. With "left" leaders, whose leadership is based on charisma, like Malcolm, or on a certain style, like Wilson, assassination can deflect the course of an entire movement.

The history of Wilson and Green contains both a promise and a warning for those who would change this society at its base. The labor movement is not dead, nor is the working class irreversibly wedded to the bourgeois system. Skillful and persistent efforts by militant unionists can work significant transformations in the most corrupt unions and can reawaken the political consciousness of even the relatively prosperous workers. On the other hand, mere militancy has its limitations and is subject to external hazards and shocks, not the least of which is the hand of the assassin. Building an ideological and programmatic movement within the trade unions, linking up the struggles of the different sections of the working class, and carrying these struggles forward to the point where the question of political power is clearly posed is slow and difficult, but it ultimately remains the only road to fundamental and permanent transformation of society. ■

Red Squad Handbook

THE NEW LEFT by Philip Abbot Luce. David McKay Company, New York, 1966. \$4.50.

Prior to his expulsion from the Progressive Labor Party, Philip Abbot Luce spent nine years in and around the radical movement. This experience, coupled with a good literary style, makes *The New Left* likely to become a standard reference text for "liberals" seeking a rationale for their anti-communism. The author worked hard to give his new book an aura of credibility; *The New Left* is billed as an inside job, and it is.

Frame Up

Writing from the vantage point of an "older but wiser friend of alienated student youth," Luce avoids the blatant anti-communism of HUAC and the Birch Society. As he speaks in the same breath of the "democratic" war in Vietnam and the "democratic" right of "young Communists" to express their views, Luce also builds a case for putting his ex-comrades in jail. In addition to repeating the lie about Epton's "kill cops and judges" speech, *The New Left* concocts a tale of arms smuggling and plans for insurrection. The falsity of Luce's allegations becomes doubly clear in light of the State's evidence at Epton's frame-up trial for "criminal anarchy." The tape of Epton's speech was so garbled that the prosecution was forced to explain what was really said. The Grand Jury and Fritz O. Behr's Red Squad couldn't produce

another shred of "evidence" despite all the anti-communist hysteria that grew out of the Harlem "riots."

Clearly Luce condones the creation of a witch hunt atmosphere wherein political views alone are the measure of guilt. In the State's zeal to get rid of black revolutionaries, it overstepped the bounds of the bourgeois-democratic court, in a manner reminiscent of the McCarthy period; the "democratic anti-communist" Luce is silent on this point, however.

As "American" as apple pie and motherhood, Philip Abbot Luce is now committed to the "freedom-loving" imperialist establishment. From his initiation into journalistic anti-communism in the *National Review* and the *Saturday Evening Post*, Luce has graduated into the Philbrick-Budenz Club with his writing of *The New Left*.

Malice

In no way is *The New Left* an honest appraisal of current radical politics. Luce is both malicious and sloppy in his presentation, naming persons and inventing anecdotes to connect them with his distorted and largely dishonest accounts of various political organizations. His purpose in writing and the thrust of his book is the implementation of his prophecy: "No one, least of all the Progressive Labor people, should be surprised if the government steps in soon and takes viable and visible action against them and their advocacy of revolution." And we can be sure Luce will be cheering from the sidelines. ■

Contribute to the Gallashaw Defense Fund

P.O. Box 95
New Lots Station
Brooklyn NY 11208

**DEFEND VICTIM
OF RACIST FRAME-UP**

... COMMUNE

(Continued from Page 7)

ban bureaucracy meant what it said and was willing to prove it to the world. On the other hand, Castro had to simulate militancy, at least in words. Thus, he praised Frei, the reactionary Chilean president, for "demanding that the U.S. cease its armed intervention in the Dominican Republic."

Adolfo Gilly, in a *Monthly Review* article of April 1966, suggests an approach to revolutionary support significantly different than the one of the Cuban bureaucracy: "Active support signifies the mobilization of the masses in Cuba by all possible means for the purpose of showing their support for the Dominicans, and not the mere broadcasting of declarations. It signifies calling on the Latin American masses to mobilize, it signifies giving guidance in the struggle for the defense of the Dominican Republic, providing a center in Cuba for all the spontaneous mobilizations that were taking place in Latin America. The Cuban leadership did none of these things."

But the Cuban bureaucracy could do none of these things for it follows the policy of Moscow. Cuba's economic weaknesses force it to depend politically on the Russian bureaucracy, and Moscow's policy is peaceful co-existence. All this accentuates the crisis of leadership in Cuba. Under such a state of affairs, the way the Cuban bureaucracy reacted to the Dominican uprising is a logical one, traceable to the social composition of such a bureaucracy. This nationalist, petty-bourgeois and conservative bureaucratic caste is composed mainly of Batista's one-time friends, the Cuban CP.

Castro's unprincipled attack on the 13th of November Movement, a Guatemalan guerilla group that so far has struggled for a workers' and peasants' revolution, instead of a "popular front" with the bourgeoisie, confirms the inability of the Cuban bureaucracy to provide leadership to any part of the Latin American struggle.

"Leftist" Apologies

The leftist leadership which took part in the Dominican uprisings have already produced apologies for their actions. A spokesman for the M14J, Dr. Emilio Cordero Michel, in the December 1965 *PL* magazine, shows that he is grateful, as is Castro, to the governments of Mexico and Chile for "their unwavering defense of the principle of non-intervention." He ignores the real purpose of these reactionary governments: to declare themselves partisans of this or that *bourgeois* legality. The reactionary governments of

Mexico and Chile are only defending their own national bourgeois interests against possible U.S. intervention. But the imperialist and the colonial bourgeoisies are two of the same kind: their interests are the same in the final analysis. The revolutionary doctor forgets to mention that this "unwavering" Mexican government tortures revolutionaries and machine-guns peasant leaders with no guise of legality, or that the "non-intervening" Chilean government murders miners in revolt against U.S. copper mines. Although Mexico and Chile may utter unwavering demands to imperialism they permit it to plunder their working class and peasantry through semi-colonial exploitation.

Cordero Michel shows a deep distrust for the working class by portraying it as having a "weak conception of its objectives." Also, he characterizes them as having been politically stunted by the Trujillo tyranny. All of these characterizations fall short—they are based on petty-bourgeois sophistry. If the masses had a "weak conception," they had it because the M14J and other movements did not raise the mass level of consciousness. Instead, their bargaining with the bourgeoisie disarmed the working class and "politically stunted" them. The leftists never built a party able to lead the oppressed Dominican classes to power. Instead, they came to them *through* the PRD, never as the class vanguard. Moreover, they shared the same fear of the masses that is proper in bourgeois politics.

Need for Vanguard Party

The Dominican uprising shows how sharp is the need of the vanguard proletarian party today. No event in the past forty years has disproved this historic and fundamental revolutionary principle. The need has not disappeared for "a revolution which makes no compromise with any single form of class rule, which does not stop at the democratic stage, which goes over to socialist measures and to war against reaction from without; that is, a revolution whose every successive stage is rooted in the preceding one and which can end only in complete liquidation of class society." (From the introduction to Leon Trotsky's *Permanent Revolution*.) This is the only road to communism.

It is because the same criminal mistakes and betrayals of forty years of revisionism continue to repeat themselves that we can say that there is no such thing as "new realities" in the class struggle. It is because the same circumstances (i.e. sharp class confrontations) keep presenting themselves that we demand the approach followed by the party that took power in Russia in October 1917. It is because Stalinism,

and other petty-bourgeois ideologies haven't learned those lessons that the circumstances keep re-occurring and the working class continues to be betrayed by the revisionists.

The words of political shysters like Juan Antonio Corretjer and Dr. Emilio Cordero Michel bring to our minds similar apologies made by some of the betrayers of the Spanish working class during their civil war. Though that struggle was a more decisive international class event, the parallel with the Santo Domingo Commune of 1965 is not altogether irrelevant.

Trotsky's Reply to POUM

The following paragraphs from Trotsky's "The Class, the Party and the Leadership" can very well refer to the role of the leftist leadership in the Santo Domingo uprising of 1965 as to the POUM leadership in the Spanish Civil War:

"But it was precisely this party [the POUM] that played a fatal role in the development of the Spanish revolution. It could not become a mass party because in order to do so it was first necessary to overthrow the old parties and it was possible to overthrow them only by an irreconcilable struggle, by a merciless exposure of their bourgeois character. Yet the POUM while criticizing the old parties subordinated itself to them on all fundamental questions. It participated in the 'People's' election bloc; entered the government which liquidated workers' committees; engaged in a struggle to reconstitute this governmental coalition. . . .

"... the Catalonian masses were far more revolutionary than the POUM, which in turn was more revolutionary than its leadership. In these conditions to unload the responsibility for false policies on the 'immaturity' of the masses is to engage in sheer charlatanism frequently resorted to by political bankrupts.

"The historical falsification consists in this, that the responsibility for the defeat of the Spanish masses is unloaded on the working masses and not on those parties which paralyzed or simply crushed the revolutionary movement of the masses. The attorneys of the POUM simply deny the responsibility of the leaders, in order thus to escape shouldering their own responsibility. This impotent philosophy, which seeks to reconcile defeats as a necessary link in the chain of cosmic developments, is completely incapable of posing and refuses to pose the question of such concrete factors as programmes, parties, personalities that were the organisers of defeat. This philosophy of fatalism and prostration is diametrically opposed to Marxism as the theory of revolutionary action." ■

Target City Program

CORE in Baltimore

With militant talk of "Black Power" and Negro self-defense, the Congress of Racial Equality convened its national convention in Baltimore over the 4th of July weekend. For those who had been looking to CORE to make significant changes in its perspectives and put forward a militant anti-Establishment program of struggle, however, the convention proved a disappointment.

"Target City" Program

To those who are unfamiliar with the civil rights movement in Baltimore, it should be pointed out that National CORE has declared Baltimore its "target city." This was first announced 14 April by Floyd B. McKissick, CORE's national director. He stated then that "all aspects of discrimination in this city [Baltimore] will be under scrutiny and will be attacked until significant changes take place."

CORE was quite correct in selecting Baltimore as one of the worst cities in the country from the point of view of the Negro. Most of the black population lives in inadequate slum housing. They are charged exorbitant rents by the slumlords who control Baltimore real estate. Unemployment among black youth is high; according to CORE the unemployment rate for all Negro males is 12 per cent. The Baltimore city government is cynically indifferent to the problems of the black people, who make up 40 per cent of the total population of the city. The City Council has three times voted down an open occupancy bill. Yet Baltimore is engaged in a vast program of urban renewal (read "Negro removal") which consists of the destruction of blocks of ghetto slums, to be replaced by office buildings and expensive high-rise apartments.

The Baltimore chapter of CORE has concentrated for some time on the housing problem; the forces moved into Baltimore from National CORE have continued the approach initiated by the local chapter. While CORE has correctly seen inadequate housing as one of the Negro's most pressing problems, CORE's approach to this problem is completely inadequate and its efforts have been misplaced. Instead of organizing the ghetto residents against the real source of the housing problem, the parasitic slumlord, CORE has

conducted a campaign for "open occupancy"—the right to live in any dwelling one can afford. Thus, CORE launched a campaign to desegregate Horizon House, an expensive apartment building located near a ghetto area. Such a campaign benefits only the upper-middle-class Negro.

"Black Power"

At the convention "Black Power" seemed to mean all things to all people. Most honest militants chose to give it a revolutionary meaning, as had Fannie Lou Hamer and Stokely Carmichael in their keynote addresses. On the other hand, McKissick in his address spoke of "Black Power" as including consumer boycotts of auto firms in order to force manufacturers to grant franchises to black auto dealers. It is difficult to see how this sort of "Black Power" will help the hundreds of thousands of unemployed Negro workers.

Spartacist Local Directory

- AUSTIN.** Box 8165, Univ. Sta., Austin, Texas 78712. phone: GR 2-3716.
- BALTIMORE.** Box 1345, Main P.O., Baltimore, Md. 21203. phone: LA 3-3703.
- BERKELEY.** Box 852, Main P.O., Berkeley, Calif. 94701. phone: TH 8-7369.
- CHICAGO.** Box 6044, Main P.O., Chicago, Ill. 60680. phone: 728-9311.
- COLUMBUS.** Box 3142, Univ. Sta., Columbus, Ohio 43210. phone: 291-8650.
- EUREKA.** Box 3061, Eureka, Calif. 95501. phone: 442-1423.
- HARTFORD.** Box 57, Blue Hill Sta., Hartford, Conn. 06112. phone: 525-1257.
- HOUSTON.** Box 18434, Eastwood Sta., Houston, Texas 77023. phone: 926-9946.
- ITHACA.** Box 442, Ithaca, N.Y. 14851.
- LOS ANGELES.** Box 4054, Term. Annex, Los Angeles, Calif. 90054. phone: 783-4793.
- MISSISSIPPI.** (contact New Orleans)
- NEW ORLEANS.** Box 8121, Gentilly Sta., New Orleans, La. 70122. phone: WH 4-1510.
- NEW YORK.** Box 1377, G.P.O., New York City, N.Y. 10001. phones: National Office—UN 6-3093; Uptown—UN 5-6670; Downtown—477-2907.
- PHILADELPHIA.** (contact New York)
- SAN FRANCISCO** (contact Berkeley)
- SEATTLE** (contact Berkeley)
- YOUNGSTOWN** (contact New York)

Self-Defense

Much attention has been paid to CORE's modifying its stand of absolute non-violence. The actual position which gave rise to all the fanfare, however, amounts to this: all of CORE's activities will be non-violent, but off the picket line one may exercise his right to self-defense. This amounts to no change at all in CORE's tactics, since their members were never committed to pacifism when not on a CORE demonstration. The real position of the CORE leaders became clear when CORE asked the police to remove Spartacist supporters who were outside the convention selling literature advocating self-defense.

Only a few weeks before, on 12 June, Baltimore CORE leaders acted to remove from a protest march several Spartacist supporters who were carrying a sign with the demand, "Organized armed self-defense against racist terror." Baltimore police prevented the demonstrators from returning to the march and later attempted unsuccessfully to prevent them from attending a public rally held by CORE. Robert Kaufman, one of those removed from the march and well-known in Baltimore as a veteran of civil rights and anti-war struggles, was detained by the cops until the march was over on the grounds that they didn't know who he was and were "checking out his identity."

These actions on the part of the Baltimore CORE leadership reveal their true position on Negro self-defense. It is precisely because of the real necessity in the Negro struggle for armed self-defense that the CORE leaders turned so promptly to the cops to have the Spartacist slogan removed from the line.

Non-Violence for Cops!

One of the problems facing the civil rights movement is that Negroes have been robbed of both Negro and working-class history. Hundreds of strikes in this country have been broken by the use of police and the armed forces in the service of the bourgeois state. Anyone who promises victory for the Negro struggle through non-violence is blind to the readiness with which the class enemy resorts to force. The cops are the armed tools of the capitalist state; their purpose is to keep workers, black and white, in line.

... CORE

Spartacist Excluded

Prior to the convention, CORE extended an invitation to all interested individuals and groups to address the convention body. Accepting this invitation were Baltimore's mayor and the Black Muslims. However, when a Spartacist spokesman asked to address the convention, CORE leaders replied that no time could be found to schedule even a 5-minute address, although the call for speakers had appeared in a local newspaper article only the day before. Clearly the CORE leadership felt more at ease with persons who represent the Establishment than with those who advocate a revolutionary alternative so that Negro equality on all fronts can be made a reality.

Spartacist Intervenes

Since Spartacist was denied an opportunity to address the convention, a Spartacist leaflet was distributed outside the convention site on the last day. The leaflet made the following points: 1. The slogan "Black Power" is a step forward insofar as it admits that the question at issue is the struggle for political power and not simply a "moral issue" but is both incomplete and misleading because black people will win power only when the *working class*, black and white, comes to power; 2. an independent political organization must be formed, based on the civil rights, labor, anti-war and student movements—a Freedom Labor Party; 3. the struggle for political power cannot be divided from the necessity of self-defense; 4. CORE must drop the anti-Communist restriction from its constitution. (A motion by two delegates from St. Louis to drop the anti-Communist restriction and to exclude from CORE membership trade union bureaucrats and members of the capitalist parties was defeated.)

CORE Convention Lessons

It is always to the advantage of the ruling class to keep sections of the working class divided so that they cannot unite against their common oppressors and struggle for common goals. It is the task of all serious militants to struggle to understand, explain and fight for a radical perspective and program which can unite black and white workers around its demands. The recent riots in Chicago, Cleveland and other urban ghettos show the need for the civil rights movement to adopt a class struggle perspective so that the militancy of the black people can be channelled into a struggle for working-class political power. ■

FREEDOM SOCIALIST PARTY REACTIVATED

At a conference held Saturday 9 July in Seattle, it was unanimously voted to reconstitute the Freedom Socialist Party of Washington State as a permanent membership organization. The party was first organized in 1964 to place socialist candidates on the ballot and conducted a strong campaign for Clifton DeBerry for U.S. president, Ed Shaw for vice president, and Waymon Ware for Congress. Following a vote to reconstitute the group, the general line of a program calling for world socialism, socialism in the U.S., defense of the colonial revolution, socialist democracy, independent political action, and women's emancipation was adopted.

Spartacist Greetings

A representative of Spartacist delivered greetings to the new group, in particular lauding their revolutionary positions on the Negro and anti-war struggles, and calling for further discussion and collaboration between Spartacist and the FSP. Later the Spartacist representative urged the group to make concrete its stated internationalism by recognizing the need to rebuild the Fourth International rather than relying on any section of the Chinese Maoist leadership. The group was also urged to treat all questions of working-class history and program with the utmost integrity so that the working class can be fully armed in its struggle against the American bourgeoisie. Following adoption of the program, a sizeable number of workers and young people registered for membership in the new group.

Many of the cadres of the FSP had previously been members of the Seattle

branch of the Socialist Workers Party. The entire branch resigned from the SWP in April of this year because of the SWP's increasing rightward motion and sectarianism, and in particular its betrayal of the anti-war struggle and its unquestioning acceptance of Black Nationalism. Further struggle inside the party was made impossible by the SWP's abandonment of internal democracy.

For our readers in Washington State:

Freedom Socialist Party of Washington State

Freeway Hall
3815 Fifth Ave. N.E.
Seattle, Washington
ME 2-7449

Others joining the new group were long-time independent socialists. Greetings were delivered to the conference by the Independent Socialist Union, an autonomous youth organization which considers itself in political solidarity with the new group.

Fraternal Relations

Formal fraternal relations were established between the FSP and Spartacist for the next period. Spartacist will as a courtesy assist the FSP in the production and distribution of selected material and is inviting the FSP to participate fraternally in the Spartacist National Conference over Labor Day and in its pre-conference discussion. ■ L.H.

The founding conference of the Spartacist League to be held over Labor Day will inaugurate a more tightly scheduled basis for publication of the SPARTACIST. Beginning with the first post-conference issue, SPARTACIST will be published as an eight-page tabloid. SPARTACIST will continue to analyze the economic and political struggles which confront the working class, putting them in their historical perspective, and to involve itself in those struggles.

SUBSCRIBE TO THE SPARTACIST

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

Name

Address

City

... ELECTIONS

(Continued from Page 4)

the big corporations that profit by the war." Even such firm supporters of capitalist politics and the Democrats as the Communist Party frequently use such phraseology, because it allows them to appear radical while at the same time remaining conveniently vague about the actual content of their political practice. What we need is not, as Levin puts it, "an independent movement, free from the corruption of the machine politics of the two major parties," but rather a *class party* of the working class. The difference may appear to be merely over terminology, but the conflicting choice of words reflects a basic divergence in political approach. The Levin campaign is unfortunately caught in the worst of all possible positions: while not making a fundamental political break with capitalist politics, it nevertheless takes a number of quite radical positions. Thus it can neither pile up a large "reform" vote in November, nor fundamentally raise the consciousness of those it does reach. It is to be hoped that the Levin campaign will embrace a principled class stance before November, and like the other independent campaigns mentioned, call for the building of a party of the working people.

Build a Labor Party

Will such a call be heeded? We frankly state that we do not expect to see a labor party formed this November. We do see the possibility, however, of the fulfillment of a far more realistic and necessary goal: the formation of a small but persistent circle of militants around the general program outlined above. For the working class is not homogeneous. It has its layer of reactionaries, its broad center, and its advanced layer of militant shop-stewards, tenants council chairmen, thoughtful youth, etc. It is to this strata that our campaigns must be aimed, for through them the entire class will be moved. And with the proper consciousness among its ranks, the coming social struggles will put an end once and for all to American capitalism. ■ D.H.

... GHETTO

(Continued from Page 16)

do some damage." Such official attempts to make SPONGE appear innocent are belied by the facts: roving bands of SPONGE racists attacked black residents; white sniper and police fire killed 11-year-old Eric Dean and wounded black men and women. Yet all the spokesmen of the ruling class deplored "Negro violence"; however, not one white person has been killed or seriously injured as a result of "Negro violence."

Brooklyn DA Aaron Koota, who earlier had darkly accused outside black radical agitators, now admits that the Gallo brothers, Cosa Nostra heads in Brooklyn, were the ones able to "cool" the riot area. Yet the conclusion which should flow from this one fact—that this was a white-caused race riot—is ignored by Koota and other officials. They are still trying to frame-up Ernest Gallashaw, a 17-year-old black youth for murdering Eric Dean. Although Gallashaw was with more

than 20 adults at the time of the shooting who testified to his innocence; although eye witnesses reported a car loaded with whites who shot at blacks, hitting Eric Dean; although Eric Dean's mother denies that Gallashaw could have shot her son; although no corroborating evidence such as bullet or gun has been produced, Gallashaw has been indicted for first degree murder without a preliminary hearing. The frame-up certainly has another meaning—Mrs. Gallashaw has been an outspoken critic of the 75th Precinct and of the living conditions which blacks are subjected to—this is retribution to prevent further action on the part of blacks.

Such attacks, whether by cops or by the increasingly evident fascists, show the absolute need for the ghettos to have organized programs of self-defense. The ghetto struggles must become consciously militant.

ANTI-WAR STRUGGLE

The need for such conscious militancy is shown by the protest against the war, the most significant struggle that has taken place in Harlem since the '64 police riots. It is clear that the majority of Harlem residents are opposed to the war, although on many different levels. Most black workers oppose the war on the basis that black soldiers should not be sent to be killed in Vietnam fighting for so-called freedom only to return to racial oppression in the U.S.

Some of the most militant and radical elements in Harlem are in Afro-Americans Against the War in Vietnam. The AAAWV over a period of several months has been holding street meetings and distributing anti-war literature. One of its most significant activities was a march through Harlem and a rally on 30 May. The march, comprised of about 50 people, was planned on short notice, but succeeded in gaining the support of the many people lining Eighth Avenue and the spectators at the official Memorial Day parade.

Despite the widespread dissatisfaction with the Vietnam war, the Harlem anti-war movement has not yet been able to engage the masses in *active* opposition to the war. The Black United Action Front consisting of Harlem Unemployment Center, the AAAWV, Harlem Organizing Committee, Progressive Labor, and Blacks Against Negative Dying, held another march and rally on 25 June. Even though many thousands of leaflets were distributed and sound trucks roving through the community announced the march, it was no bigger than the haphazardly prepared 30 May activity. Only the militants already in the movement participated in the 25 June March or in the BUAF organized feeder march from Harlem on 6 August.

The masses feel that all those rallies and marches won't change anything. Apathy to the anti-war struggle exists because the black masses do not see the link between imperialist wars and their position in society. To involve a significant section of black working people in the struggle against the war, the movement must provide a *revolutionary consciousness* by linking up the two struggles.

The principal slogan which has been used by the Harlem anti-war movement, "Bring our Black GIs Home," has not helped to build such a consciousness. The implication of this slogan is that black anti-war militants are not really against the war in-itself and

would not protest if this government used only white troops to kill the Vietnamese workers and peasants who are fighting American imperialism.

The U.S. will continue to draft from the black and white working class because there will continue to be imperialist wars. The U.S. government, as do all capitalist governments, wages wars for economic and political reasons—to defend the capitalists' freedom of exploitation and to prevent working-class victories. (Such victories would be encouraging lessons to workers and peasants in other countries, as well as to the black masses in this country, to throw off their chains.)

Therefore, in order to end imperialist wars, the anti-war movement must become an anti-capitalist movement. The only type of protest that can ultimately end this or any other imperialist war is a revolutionary struggle of the working class against capitalism.

As an alternative to "Bring Our Black GI's Home" we say: Fight racism in the army, End discrimination against blacks in the draft! End draft deferment for the white middle class! End the draft, Solidarity with the Viet Cong! Withdraw *all* American troops from Vietnam!

BLACK POWER

Even more dangerous to revolutionary consciousness than some of the tactics of the anti-war movement is the recent uproar about Black Power. When Stokely Carmichael first raised the slogan of "Black Power," it was a reflection of the practical efforts of the Student Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee in Alabama. SNCC was trying to elect black candidates to office through an organization independent of the Democratic and Republican parties, the Lowndes County Freedom Organization, better known as the Black Panther Party. Black Power meant the use of independent politics, in places with a black majority, to give blacks local political power.

In the North, however, the issue is being debated in a vacuum, with none of the major civil rights organizations and others who give lip service to the slogan struggling to make Black Power a reality. We have experienced, thus far, only a scramble for the lime-light among leaders of the various civil rights organizations and maneuvers by political hustlers to buy off blacks with radical words. They would force more illusions upon the masses of black people in the ghettos.

An example of this trickery is the statement of Roy Innis, New York CORE chairman, that "Black Power today means people like Adam Clayton Powell, Jesse Gray and J. Raymond Jones." Jones is a well-established Harlem Democrat. Gray sold out a rent strike movement and the people of Harlem during the 1964 police riots. His capitulation was emphasized when he tried to enter the Democratic primary in the summer of 1965, even though he had called for independent political action right after the '64 elections.

Congressman Adam C. Powell is a political hustler who has called for "audacious" Black Power—blacks will "move non-violently with whites into the mainstream of American life" and "whatever the percentage of Negroes in a community they must have at least the same percentage of jobs, appointments, judgeships and Commissionerships."

Power means nothing less than economic and political

control and an army and police force to defend that control. The cry for Black Power by militants in the civil rights and other movements is meaningless unless they struggle for the economic and independent political power of black working people. And the struggle to obtain that power needs a program of organized self-defense. Black Power means a social revolution. If honest militants don't recognize the real meaning of Black Power, the ruling class and its police forces do. That is why Vice-President Humphrey rushed to the NAACP convention to denounce Black Power as "black racism" and to align the government with the token reformist goals of that organization.

The first step toward obtaining Black Power is to break all ties with the ruling class. It requires a *black break-away from the Democratic Party*. The formation of the Black Panther Party in Alabama was a good step in this direction. But Stokely Carmichael, while shouting Black Power and independence from the Democrats in Alabama, is tying the movement to them nationally. SNCC gave active support to candidates running in the Democratic primaries in the state of Mississippi. And Carmichael is one of the sponsors of the National Conference for New Politics, which is "looking for a presidential candidate committed to peace in Vietnam" like "Robert Kennedy . . . whose interests parallel our own." This is the Kennedy who, as Attorney General, protected the racist killers in a whole series of murders and bombings in the South.

Black Democrats sitting in Congress or on some city council cannot change the conditions of the masses of people. These black Democrats enrich only themselves as agents of Johnson's party. As long as they can prolong the illusion that the masses can use the Democratic Party to change their conditions, they can deliver the vote from the ghettos. But such Democrats always desert the masses at critical points, as did the Negro councilman in Cleveland who called for the National Guard to suppress the people of Hough. The role of a political party is to gain and maintain state power for a particular class. This is what the Black Panther Party must do both North and South. The Democratic and Republican parties are instruments of bourgeois power—the oppressed cannot use the oppressor's instrument of oppression to free themselves.

In the struggle to obtain Black Power, the key question is not color but program. The question that should be raised is *which* blacks are to have power—the black working class or the Wingates and Powells struggling to become a black bourgeoisie. To achieve Black Power, a mass movement must be built in all the ghettos, North and South, with a militant program of struggle designed to take the power away from the slumlords, plantation owners and sweat shop bosses and their protectors, the brutal racist sheriffs and cops.

The conditions of black working people in this country are an intensified expression of the conditions of the working class as a whole. Thus, when a mass movement for black liberation comes into being with a concrete program to achieve black political and economic power—for a shorter work week to end unemployment, a higher minimum wage—it will also add inspiration to the struggle of white workers, both southern sharecroppers and northern factory workers. The working class struggles, black and white, can be linked together because both struggle against the same exploiters. ■

STORMS IN THE GHETTO

From 1960 to 1964, there had been a rise in civil rights struggle in the Northern ghettos, especially New York. But the 1964 Harlem police riots successfully smashed the existing mass organizations. Since 1964 the struggle has taken various ineffective forms and the difficulties have been intensified by direct assault on the ghetto.

ASSAULT ON THE GHETTO

Continuously for the past two years the rulers of this country have been conducting a psychological war against the black communities. The campaign has consisted of newspaper and magazine articles designed to whip up white racist hysteria against black, so-called extremists. Such articles were combined with police frame-ups and "official" violence.

It began in earnest in 1964 with the *NY Times* creation of a Black-Muslim-directed, dope-selling, karate-trained gang of 400 "Blood Brothers," whose main activity was supposedly the maiming and killing of whites. This fantasy led to the jailings, beatings and frame-ups of many Harlem youths, among them the Harlem Six. Then came the all-out reign of terror—the police riot provoked by the police murder of James Powell.

In the winter of '64, *Esquire* magazine carried an article entitled "The Red Chinese American Negro." This article, written by a former partisan of the struggle for black liberation, sell-out William Worthy, claimed the conspiratorial existence of a black revolutionary underground, plotting with Mao-tse Tung to unleash mass violence in this country. This "news" was verified by the bomb-plot frame-up of black militants, planned and instigated by a black cop. In February 1965, Malcolm was assassinated—the subsequent "investigation" and official cover-up made it clear that no matter who pulled the trigger, the government had been involved.

Then came HARYOU's cool summer of '65. HARYOU's boasted achievements were four vestpocket parks, 371 trees planted, day camps for children and summer jobs for youths who were sent back to starve during the winter. The government's chief troubleshooter in Harlem, Livingston Wingate, gets paid \$500 a week to keep Harlem cool. But when the HARYOU books were being investigated and Wingate thought he might lose his job, he started a scare campaign about the existence of a group of teen-agers in HARYOU, called the Five Percenters, who had beaten white teachers and would unleash massive violence if he were fired. Thus he contributed to the terror campaign at the same time that he planted trees to "beautify" Harlem.

The U.S. government and local officials were very successful not only in buying off all the reactionary nationalists who sided with the cops in '64 and now have high positions in HARYOU; not only in preventing the struggle of a section of the masses by giving them summer jobs selling "Organize for power and dignity through HARYOU-ACT" to their neighbors;



but also in confusing a section of the otherwise militant youth.

Even after Harlem was cooled for 1965, the terror campaign continued. In June 1966 *Life* magazine carried an article entitled "Plot to Get Whitey" about "Red hot young Negroes" in groups like RAM and UHURU, armed and planning to kill whites, receiving material aid from China and Cuba. In the meantime Police Commissioner Leary increased the Tactical Patrol Force (NYC's elite stormtroopers) to 690 men and announced that they were receiving special training in riot and crowd control.

1966 Fascist Riots

This is the background for the 1966 riots and racial clashes in ghetto areas, among them Cleveland, Chicago, East New York, Amityville, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Omaha, Boston, Jacksonville and Perth Amboy. This summer a new element has been added to the familiar police assaults—the cops have had the support of fascist-style elements, many proudly flaunting the swastika.

The riot in East New York typifies the 1966 brand of racial warfare. The Society for the Prevention of Negroes Getting Everything (SPONGE), a white racist organization based in an Italian neighborhood, started a race riot in the adjoining black and Puerto Rican slums. While the police didn't start this one, they sided with the racists who conducted anti-black picket lines and attempted to promote fights between blacks and Puerto Ricans. A cop queried by the *Times* said, "They are not anything organized like CORE. You might say SPONGE was their way of expressing their sentiments. I wouldn't call them big troublemakers or cop fighters, but in a tense situation, they could

(Continued on Page 14)