

VOTE

NO!

# TO JOHNSON'S WAR IN VIETNAM

Vote for the independent and socialist candidates who have firmly repudiated Johnson's war and who stand for a party of the working people to oppose both the Democratic and Republican parties of the bosses. Vote for: Statewide: Judy White for Governor and the rest of the Socialist Workers Party ticket; 12 CD, Brooklyn: Hal Levin; 19th CD, Manhattan: James Weinstein; 7th CD, Queens: Leslie Silberman; 69th AD, Manhattan: Wendy Nakashima.

PROVER  
APR 3 1967  
INSTITUTION

# TO REPEAL OF REVIEW BOARD

The racist, anti-labor and reactionary forces in New York City have launched a multi-million dollar program to repeal the Civilian Review Board. If they win no worker in this city will be safe from the vengeance of a Birchite-ridden and brutal police. Stop the racists! Start the struggle for a real board elected by the working people to watch every move, every step of the police and to report back directly to the people themselves.

A Look  
at NYC's  
Independent  
Campaigns  
page 3

# Bulletin

European  
Youth March  
Against War

page 4

OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

Vol. 3, No. 5 - 47

Nov. 7, 1966

Ten Cents

## Peace in Vietnam Through Defeat of U.S. Imperialism

by Tim Wohlforth

President Johnson's Manila Conference with his Asian stooges marked an important step in his plan to escalate the war in Vietnam even further. Shortly before the conference General Westmoreland presented McNamara with a request for a rise in troops over the 320,000 already involved. As soon as the elections are over Johnson can be expected to fulfill this request.

The most blatant imperialist act of all was the "Manila Declaration" itself. It seems the United States and lackeys plan to withdraw foreign troops from South Vietnam six months after the other side surrenders! It sounds like something Hitler thought up for the invasion of Poland.

Now that Johnson has defined his goals for peace in Vietnam it is about time American peace advocates were clear as to their goals. Our position has been clear from the beginning of the struggle: **PEACE IN VIETNAM THROUGH THE DEFEAT OF IMPERIALISM!** There is no other road to peace. Compromise as was tried in the Geneva Accords of 1954 leads only to renewed war. There can be no peace on the Vietnamese peninsula until the foreign invaders are driven from the land.

### worker's word

This so far has been the main thrust of Hanoi and the National Liberation Front, despite the inconsistency of continuing to support the Geneva sellout. This has not been the position of the major radical parties in the United States -- the Communist Party

and the Socialist Workers Party.

The Worker seeks to spread the opinion that the capitalist politicians in this country and abroad want peace in Vietnam but only Johnson and a few around him carry out a war policy. They fail to expose Johnson's policy as the policy of a class, the capitalists, who rule this country and most of the world.

In particular Senators Morse, Gruening, Mansfield and Fulbright are lauded in this country while DeGaulle, U Thant and Pope Paul are lauded internationally. In all this the position of the Worker is clear. It seeks to come to terms with imperialism at the very time imperialism is involved in a bloody war against the Vietnamese people. Hanoi and the NLF are forced to take a different stand. They recognize that negotiations with the imperialists are out of the question as long as the imperialist military offensive is continued. Under such conditions one could only negotiate surrender.

Fulbright and Mansfield precisely want the U.S. to pursue more aggressively a policy of negotiating surrender while they prosecute the war. This is why these Senators lauded Goldberg's phony UN peace plea. The Worker would have followed suit except for the quick rejection by Hanoi. But it did nothing to criticize its beloved capitalist "doves" and continues to spread illusions which make Goldberg's demagogic effective.

### chants

Let us look at what the Worker says and what

Hanoi says. "The worldwide desire for peace in Vietnam," the Worker informs us in its October 2 issue, "was expressed last Tuesday in the decision of Pope Paul VI to send a delegation of three top Catholic clerics to South Vietnam..." Eisenhower and LeMay are attacked in the October 9 issue for being "contemptuous of the anguished plea of Pope Paul VI..."

Nhan Dan, the organ of the North Vietnamese Communist Party, however, dismisses the plea of Pope Paul VI as "nothing but an appeal to the (Continued on page 4)



NLF TROOPS IN VIETNAM: WHICH SIDE ARE WE ON?

### restraining the right to shoot first

## NYC Police Terror Against Puerto Ricans Spreads In Wake of Rightist Drive to Defeat Review Board

by Vincent Rodriguez

As the campaign to preserve the Civilian Police Review Board despite all of its weaknesses and inadequacies enters the final stages, the New York City Police Department is stepping up a wave of violence and intimidation. Arrogant and defiant in its firm belief that it has victory over the Review Board in its hands, it can hardly restrain itself from showing its contempt of New York City minorities, especially the Puerto Rican minority. We can only tremble for our children in the post election period who will have to suffer the bulk of their retaliation if they succeed in removing this feeble restraint on their right to shoot first and ask questions later.

At this writing Trifilo Rubero, 44 years of age, was shot to death in front of a tavern in the Bronx Saturday

Oct. 22, by an off-duty policeman dressed in civilian clothes, Martin Farrell. According to the police report of Farrell, Rubero was threatening him with a knife. Trifilo was shot not once but three times in the chest and in the head outside an Irish-American tavern in the Bronx. His companion who was with him at the time, Rafael Bernazar, has been placed under arrest and members of Trifilo's family have not been able to talk to him, nor for that matter get a copy of the police report. Family and friends of Trifilo describe him as well liked and most unlikely to be carrying knives or any other weapon, although he was fond of going out drinking on a Saturday night which is when the tragic events occurred.

### harassment

Meanwhile, a commission

of Bronx citizens has been constrained to demand an investigation of police reprisals and acts of aggression against persons campaigning for the preservation of the Review Board. Peter Dario, a member of the National Maritime Union was arrested Saturday, Oct. 22, while driving a panel truck using a loud speaker on the corner of 149th Street and Third Avenue. The loud speaker was urging everyone to support the Civilian Review Board.

### phony

The National Maritime Union has sent a telegram of protest on the arrest charging "certain members of the Police Dept. are going beyond the bounds of the law in an attempt to intimidate those who are opposed to the referendum sponsored by the Patrolmen's Benevolent Assn."

(Continued on page 2)



# LABOR SCOPE

## SSEU & SUPERVISORS

The Department of Labor recently rejected an election petition submitted by the Social Service Employees Union for the title of Welfare Supervisor. The title is now held by Local 371 AFL-CIO. Although the SSEU leadership was well aware of the working required by the Labor Department they submitted a petition which called only for an election. They feared that many conservative frightened supervisors would not sign the stronger petition required by the Department of Labor. The entire petition campaign smacked of the same kind of opportunism. President Mage deliberately silenced all actions, particularly in regard to client organizations, which might have

must begin to prepare now for a long struggle and probable strike in January. That the union has absolutely no friends in the city administration is proved daily. Its only strength is the rank and file and the allies that can be won among client groups and other unions. So far, President Mage has shown little sign of recognizing this.

## ILA MEMBER WRITES

Dear Editor,  
The recent announcement by Teddy Gleason, president of the ILA, that he was in favor of amalgamating his union with the West Coast longshoremen, led by Harry Bridges, was a trial balloon that was soon punctured. After a storm of protest led by Tony Acotto, Brooklyn ILA head who aspires for Gleason's job, and the longshore post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Gleason retracted the statement.



SSEU MEMBERS PICKET DURING 1965 STRIKE.

alienated the supervisors who live in fear and tremble at the city's wrath. Mrs. Mage has long silenced her left wing with promises of militant action to come, while at the same time pandering to the most conservative elements with talk about "professional unionism". (Something in between a labor union and a professional society.)

When the petition was rejected the SSEU staged demonstrations and an eight day sit in at the Department of Labor. The one thing significantly lacking was any mass support from the supervisors or even the rank and file. The workers sitting in were finally arrested and will probably be fined. The entire action ended in failure. Lindsay's lick-spittle Costello practically told the SSEU leadership to go to hell in a later interview. None of this should come as a surprise.

The city struck down the petition and later arrested the SSEU workers as part of its deal with District Council 37 over the vicious Tri-Partite plan to muzzle city unions. The last thing Lindsay wants is one union in Welfare--unless it is a company union like 371. The present arrangement is fine. Local 371 will sell out its supervisors and the city will use this miserable settlement to try to hold down SSEU demands for the coming January contract.

The SSEU membership

son's job, and the longshore post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Gleason retracted the statement.

Gleason, who was put into office with the support of the Syndicate, did not tell the ILA membership that while attending a "Port Authority" conference in Detroit, he had met with Harry Bridges and had his picture taken with Harry Bridges for the "Worker." Gleason also appeared in Detroit TV and defended Bridges against the charge of "communism." But the ILA members do not know about this. The rumor on the docks is that Harry Bridges, now 66, may retire soon. Morris Watson, editor of the union paper, the "Dispatcher" retired when he reached 65. With Bridges out of the picture, it might be possible to unite the two longshore unions, providing Gleason could overcome the factionalism and red baiting that would take place in the ILA. Some longshoremen claim that the crafty Gleason is only bluffing Bridges because of the debt the ILA Syndicate owes Bridges who works closely with Hoffa also. If it was not for the money and advice tendered the ILA by Harry Bridges in the 1950's, The ILA would never have defeated the rival AFL longshore union. Bridges' price was the combining of the two longshore unions but the ILA leadership double crossed him and used him as a threat to get back into the AFL-CIO in 1958. Bridges has been under steady attack in his own union in recent years from what's

left both of the "Left" and the "Right." His recent five year contract was only passed by a 60% to 40% vote. Portland and Seattle voted against it. By stepping down from the royal throne he has occupied for over thirty years now, Harry Bridges could exit with a grandstand play if he could announce the joining of the two unions. If Gleason cannot pay off his debt, then Bridges can always retaliate by financing a rank and file group in the ILA. Perhaps this possibility explains the silence of the "Militant" on the new Bridges contract which included the overrated Mechanization Plan. When Bridges first proposed this plan at the last ILWU contract, The "Militant" was bitterly against it. A well documented article exposed the weakness of the plan. As it is well known in the Labor movement that the SWP and the CP are working together now in mass organizations and in the trade unions, it may be that the "Militant's" silence is due to the fear of losing some "pie-card jobs. Bridges may have promised them in his maneuvering with the ILA. It will be the rank and file longshoremen on both coasts who will make the final decisions on both the organizations and on Bridges and Gleason as trade union leaders

## ILA member SAN FRANCISCO SSEU

In San Francisco social workers three months ago formed a new union: the Social Service Employees Union. The S.S.E.U. is not out for more pay for social workers who are already well paid. It is fighting for more pay for the typists and clerks who often know as much as the social workers but are underpaid because they don't have B.A.s. The S.S.E.U. intends to fight for more benefits for clients (a mother with one child only receives \$144 a month from welfare) and fight against paper work and contradictory rules which serve no purpose other than to make it impossible for the client to understand what is happening to him. The S.S.E.U. has joined the welfare rights organizations in picketing and has already won one victory in the abolishment of a proposed Incompatible Activities Commission. But there are still thousands of clients whose children need clothing for school or wish to continue their own education but are given no child care allowance and many more who pay \$100-\$110 a month in rent but are only allowed \$50-\$60 by welfare. Instead of the clients' needs, the worker must obey the Manual, which is the source of all welfare truth.

BULLETIN OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM



editor - Tim Wohlforth

art director - Marty Jonas

circulation - Fred Mueller

Published bi-weekly by the American Committee for the Fourth International. The American Committee is in political solidarity with the International Committee of the Fourth International. Editorial offices: Rm. 305, 339 Lafayette St., N.Y. 10012. Midwest Office: Box 14002, University Sta., Minneapolis, Minn. 55414. Western Office: Box 1663, S.F., Calif., 94101.

VOL. 3, NO. 5 (47)

NOV. 7, 1966

printed entirely by union labor

## OCTOBER --49 YEARS LATER

The Russian Revolution! The greatest hope, the greatest potential of humanity lies in the Russian revolution. 1917 in Russia, 49 years ago, the revolutionary workers and peasants tore power from the hands of the Tsarist autocracy.

There has never been power like this in the history of the world! The potential, the power of the Russian revolution; sleepless, hungry, angry power: invaded, at war, with no shoes, backward and underdeveloped. That power against the most terrible odds, the most terrible cowardice and brutality of Stalin, the murder by Stalin of its revolutionary leaders, the stranglehold of the bureaucracy continuing after Stalin; even deprived of its revolutionary leadership, strangled, deformed, distorted and crippled, the Russian workers state is one of the most powerful forces in the world today. From the wooden plow to space satellites, all in 49 years! Who can say the Russian revolution is dead? Who can say the Russian revolution is only in books?

Power and potential is the most real thing in the world. Potential can be touched, heard, felt and tasted. It fed the Russian workers and peasants during the famine, it was with them in the streets, the trenches, the factories, the revolutionary workers councils, it was with the Hungarian revolutionaries in 1957. Today in 1966, 49 years later, the potential of revolutionary workers is being felt in every country in the world. In 1966 the struggle is beginning again. Soon there will be a roar of revolutionary power like the world has never seen. Government after cruel rotten, decaying capitalist government will topple before the workers. The Russian bureaucracy, a poor twig in a hurricane, will go with the rest. But the struggle for the revolutionary party is vital! Without revolutionary leadership, the workers will be defeated, the revolutionary party holds the precious history of the working class in its hands, its internationalism. It is the most conscious expression of the workers struggle to take power. Only through the leadership of the revolutionary party can the revolution be insured success.

We will hear from our comrades, the Russian workers. The mighty voice of October, of the workers and peasants and the Bolshevik party will be heard again. Long live the Russian Revolution! Long live the world revolution!

## REVIEW BOARD

(Continued from page 1)

Chief Inspector Garelik of the New York Police Dept. who is in favor of the Review Board and is trying to argue some sense of moderation and fairness into the PBA, has called the Review Board an "efficient addition to law enforcement which will benefit both the public and the police." He points out that the Board is a filter which eliminates 90 per cent of the complaints received and discards them as lacking in justification. Only 3 out of 113 cases have been considered worthy of administrative

trials for the men involved.

The course of action for the Puerto Rican community and for all progressives is very clear. A maximum effort to mobilize the black community as well as the Puerto Rican community to defeat the racist attacks on the Review Board to be followed by a real struggle in conjunction with the communities and the workers black and white, unemployed and employed, to build a real Review Board representing themselves which will fight in their own interests against the police.

## The Theory of Structural Assimilation

A Marxist Analysis of the Social Overturns in Eastern Europe, Yugoslavia and China by Tim Wohlforth. This detailed study of the creation of deformed workers states in the postwar period deals with thorny theoretical questions which have plagued Marxists for more than two decades. Second edition. 91 pages.

75 cents

Send to: BULLETIN PUBLICATIONS, rm. 305, 339 Lafayette St., NYC 10012. Checks to: "Bulletin".

swp, cp, plp, cipa, etc.

# A Critical Look at New York's Independent Campaigns

by Fred Mueller

This year's elections are important because the development of the anti-war movement has led to numerous anti-war election campaigns across the country and because this political action comes at a time when the workers face the tremendous issues of the Vietnam war and the accompanying inflation and tax increases which are already cutting into their standard of living. Now is the time, not to wait or hope for some sudden awakening of the American workingclass, but to turn the anti-war movement and its electoral expression toward the workingclass.

Around the country there are many campaigns which have a connection of one sort or another to the anti-war movement. There are those forces, in the right wing of the movement, which have sought to channel all opposition to the war into safe Democratic Party channels. The Communist Party, which is running Herbert Aptheker in one district in NY, has lined up with this right wing and has not changed its basic policy of supporting liberal Democrats.

## cp's position

The New York State Communist Party has just issued its election analysis. This statement is must reading for all those young people who have been working so hard for Aptheker thinking they were aiding independent political action.

The CP's position is clear enough. "We urged the running of peace candidates in party primaries," they state. As an added thought: "and where possible on independent tickets." If possible run within the capitalist parties. If this is impossible then perhaps an independent ticket. That is the CP's position.

The Weiss primary fight is extolled and Weinstein is indirectly scolded for abstaining from that fight: "Nor did certain sections of the Left work actively and energetically for Weiss's nomination falsely placing the need for a radical alternative against that of helping this Reform peace candidate win."

This should be clear enough--The Communist Party's central orientation is working within the capitalist parties while subordinate to that "radical alternatives" to the Democrats are tolerable as long as such radical alternatives are not posed to the liberal wing of the Democratic Party.

The logic of this line goes far beyond even running peace candidates in primaries. In California the Communist Party was a major factor in the unsuccessful battle of the right wing of the Conference on Power and Politics to prevent the Conference from denouncing both Brown and Reagon. Brown, far from being a "peace candidate," is an open supporter of Johnson and his imperialist war in Vietnam.

LET US ALL NEVER FORGET WHERE THIS POLICY LED THE COMMUNIST PARTY IN 1964. SEEING THE MAIN ENEMY AS GOLDWATER IT GAVE BACKHANDED SUPPORT TO JOHNSON--THE VERY SAME JOHNSON WHO NOW CARRIES OUT GOLDWATER'S POLICIES. EVERY MEMBER OF THE DU BOIS CLUB MUST FACE UP TO THIS LESSON AND DEFINITELY BREAK FROM THE CP'S DEMOCRATIC PARTY POLITICS.

There are, however, many candidates who have broken more decisively with the capitalist parties. Independent Congressional candidates Hal Levin in Brooklyn and Leslie Silberman in Queens, both running on the Independent Party, and James Weinstein in New York, of the Committee for Independent Political Action, reflect this more genuine independent trend. These three candidates, as well as the Socialist Workers Party ticket and the Progressive Labor Party's candidate for State Assembly from Manhattan's West Side, all urge a break with the policy of working in the Democratic Party and all call for immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam. To one extent or another, and with some severe limitations and drawbacks, these candidates all meet the test of advancing independent workingclass political action and merit support.

A meeting at which most of these candidates spoke was held in New York on Oct. 22, sponsored by the Tompkins Square Neighbors for Peace Action. This meeting presented an opportunity to discuss the programs of the various campaigns and to clarify the extent to which they were meeting the test of the issues posed by the war and the developing crisis at home.

It is not surprising that a great deal of confusion exists within and between the various cam-



GE WORKERS TAKE ON SCAB. SOON THEY WILL TACKLE POLITICAL SCABS AS WELL.

paings. The SWP, for instance, refuses to support any of the campaigns for various reasons, some sound formally correct (the independents do not come out for socialism) and some absurd (they are not "significant" enough). But the SWP does support the only "independent" whose independence is completely phony--Herbert Aptheker!

## swp's sophistries

Cutting through all the sophistries the SWP position is logical enough. It dismisses all left wing candidates as competitors but when it comes to the CP (this is no competitor?) it utilizes a different, opportunist criterion. The SWP wants an opening to the right and in the radical movement today this is provided that the CP, a veritable school, a veritable university of opportunism. Thus this attitude of the SWP's is another reflection of the opportunist line it has followed within the peace movement.

The SWP has for almost two years sought within the anti-war movement to build a multi-class coalition, around the slogan of immediate withdrawal from Vietnam. It has urged the movement to concentrate on this "single issue" and to avoid all issues such as the labor party, independent political action, and even the fight for Negro equality, which could alienate some present supporters of the movement.

It is precisely this kind of approach which the SWP has carried into its election campaign. The Vietnam war has not been linked up to the issues facing the workingclass, and the demand for a labor party is added to the program as an afterthought and not as a living slogan.

The SWP is not interested in the workers', it is simply not talking to the workers. What is important to them is gaining the support of as many radical figures, primarily academic, cultural and literary figures, as possible. A recent issue of the Militant proudly informs us that "A.J. Muste, the dean of American pacifism", is supporting the campaign.

Thus, as the SWP continues to adapt to the right wing of the peace movement, it refuses to support candidates which represent the left wing. As it continues to avoid the class issues it refuses to support candidates who meet these issues clearer than it does itself, and it supports an "independent" who calls for support to Democrats and a "negotiated settlement" in Vietnam. There is a logic to these positions of the SWP.

## cipa: halfway house

The Levin and Silberman campaigns are by no means clear enough on the basic class issues, although they are superior to the SWP and to the Weinstein campaign in this respect. Weinstein and the CIPA have an orientation that is if anything more middle class than the SWP's. Its newspaper, "19" (named for the Congressional district in which Weinstein is running) is a somewhat more left wing version of the Village Voice, the wellknown liberal intellectual weekly of Greenwich Village. "19" devotes fully 20% if not more of its first 3 issues to films and other cultural events. There is not a single article on any important trade union struggle. There is not a single article oriented basically to anyone but a middle class radical or liberal living in the 19th C. D.

It is hard to conceive of a narrower view of the

tasks of a "committee for independent political action". The parochialism of this tendency, shown even in its choice of a name for its newspaper, in addition to its fairly consistent petty bourgeois orientation, severely limits its work in fighting for independent political action. The Levin and Silberman campaigns are by no means as clear on this issue, however, as we think they should be.

The clearest example of all of Weinstein's orientation was his position on the Weiss-Farbstein primary fight within the Democratic Party of his beloved 19th C. D. On the one hand, Weinstein correctly sought to build a political force independent of the reform Democratic movement. But on the other hand, he conciliated with the opportunist prejudices of the "progressive" milieu he oriented towards.

Thus he arrived at the position that Democrats should work and vote for Weiss while independents like himself will remain separate from this. Thus "19" even went so far as to run a large ad in its September 23rd issue urging its readers to: "VOTE, VOTE, VOTE -- Weiss-Farbstein Primary"

Needless to say this compromising has done nothing to endear him to the Communist Party which at every opportunity none to subtly hints in the Worker that his "diversion" cost Weiss the primary. In a sense on this level the CP has a point. If we are to grant that it does not make a difference whether Weiss or Farbstein wins, then certainly it is one's duty to work wholeheartedly for Weiss's victory. To both urge a vote for Weiss and also abstain from the Weiss campaign effort is just a reflection of political unseriousness.

Levin in his own way seeks a similar compromise. Much of Levin's political confusion is caused by an opportunist attempt to have it both ways-- to run as an independent and receive liberal dissident reform democratic support.

## class and community

All these campaigns share a central weakness. They lack a clear class perspective. In this respect the Nakashima campaign of Progressive Labor Party is as weak or weaker than the others.

Each of these candidates seeks to orient towards the "community". This "community" is seen as an amorphous "poor" made up primarily of minority peoples which are urged into action around such issues as housing, high prices, discrimination etc.

None of these candidates thinks, talks or acts in class terms. Classes are determined by their relation to the means of production while the "poor" and "community" are determined by their relation to the means of consumption. The former is organized to fight the bossed, the owners of American industry (in fact the owners of America itself) while the latter, to the extent it does organize, fight the retailer, the landlord--that is the small businessmen who front for the real powers that be.

Not a single one of these candidates really had a thing to say about the class struggle in the United States. This was at a time when the struggle of the working class as a class was on the upswing as expressed through the airlines strike and the local strikes recently against GE.

# Revolutionary Youth on the March!



FRENCH YOUTH MARCH UNDER 4TH INTERNATIONAL BANNER.



500 BRITISH YOUNG SOCIALISTS JOIN LIEGE DEMONSTRATION.

Around 500 members of the British Young Socialists joined with 400 members of the French "Revoltes" group to demonstrate in Liege, Belgium for the program of the Fourth International. These revolutionary youth supporters of the International Committee of the Fourth International, made up half of a giant demonstration in that city on October 15th against the Vietnam War and against NATO.

The demonstration had been called by the Jeunes Gardes Socialistes of Belgium and supported by socialist youth from all over Europe.

Before the march began, supporters of the revisionist Pabloites (represented in this country by the SWP) sought to bar the revolutionary youth from the banner: "Long Live the 1956 Hungarian Revolution--Forward to World Socialism." Facing the firm determination of the British youth, the Pabloites were forced to back down and allow the banner.

At one point in the demonstration the chant "Vive la quatrieme internationale" (Long live the Fourth International) was taken up not only by the British and French youth but also by many of the working class onlookers who

crowded the pavements of the town applauding the demonstration.

The demonstration was a reflection of the growth of revolutionary ideas among working class youth and students throughout the world. The major contingents represented at the demonstration were formed in struggle against the old and discredited leaderships of the working class.

The British Young Socialists owe their origins to a long struggle within the British Labour Party against the traitorous policies of Wilson. The result was that the majority of



the Labour Party youth were won to a revolutionary program and the right wing leadership was forced to expell them.

The French Revoltes group has been built in a struggle with the reformist Stalinist party in France. The Belgian JGS were recently expelled by the Belgian Social Democratic Party,

There is a tremendous need in the United States today to build a genuine revolutionary youth movement like the Young Socialists and Revoltes. Such a youth movement should base itself on the teenage youth who face either the draft or unemployment, who have no future in capitalist America, and who have the energies to battle for a socialist America which will give them a future.

FRENCH AND BRITISH COMRADES (LEFT) ADDRESS EUROPEAN YOUTH RALLY (RIGHT)



## DEFEAT U.S. IMPERIALISM

(Continued from page 1)

Vietnamese people" to surrender that "will never be heed d." It rather accurately refers to Pope Paul's appeal as that of "certain religious powers" which "chant in unison with American imperialism." We need only add that the Worker seems to have taken up the chant.

On U Thant, the Worker quotes favorably the position of the National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam that

"the U.S. should support the three-point program advanced by U Thant, UN secretary general, for peace in Vietnam". Hanoi, however, while welcoming Thant's proposal that the NLF be represented at a future conference, attacked the heart of the proposal-- the call for "mutual de-escalation." Thant has not made the necessary distinction, namely that American imperialism is the aggressor and the Vietnamese people are the victims of aggression. He demands that this people should curb its struggle for independence and freedom." It is not only Thant, but also the American CP, which blurs over the distinction between invader and invaded, oppressor and oppressed.

We have no doubt that were the Worker published during the American Civil War they would have wanted to discuss "peace" with the South without reference to the question of slavery. We restate our position: **NO PEACE IN VIETNAM UNTIL IMPERIALIST SLAVERY IS ENDED!**

### swp's role

Now we must turn to the

Socialist Workers Party. The SWP is opposed to raising such slogans as "negotiations", "UN intervention", etc., within the peace movement. It has a more "radical" formula. The peace movement is to limit itself to the single demand: "Bring the Troops Home Now". This is a good slogan and a proper slogan; it must definitely be raised on every demonstration, at every anti-war rally.

However, to limit one's program on the war in Vietnam to this single issue operates in a slightly different fashion than the CP to obtain the same objective --confusion between invader and invaded, peace through victory or peace through defeat. It is not clear whether the boys are to be brought home in victory or in defeat. Thus advocates of a negotiated settlement who couldn't care less about the revolution in Vietnam stand together with advocates of victory for the NLF.

This is not a matter of a "united front" where we all march together but carry our own separate banners. The SWP never -- we repeat NEVER -- carries a

banner calling for the victory of the National Liberation Front.

### shopworn

Oh, we know the shopworn arguments by heart. We have heard the same rationale from the Communist Party's supporters as we hear from the SWP. The workers will not understand us if we call for the victory of "our" enemy. They will close their ears to our peace pleas and we will have no influence.

What hypocrisy! In the first place the SWP doesn't talk to workers. The Militant is not addressed to workers and it is neither sold nor distributed to them. The election campaigns likewise are conducted separate from and unrelated to the working class. It is not the workers the SWP is afraid of offending but its pacifist allies.

But even if the SWP did speak to workers, this would be no excuse. The present prejudices of the working class cannot be a guide as to what we seek to convince workers of. Otherwise we would have to drop our support to the

Negro struggle.

Let us remember the stand Lenin took during World War one. He urged workers of all countries to struggle for the defeat of their own "fatherland" in the war. Was this popular among workers in the early stages of the war? Of course not. It was the yellow traitors of the German social democrats who used the arguments then that the SWP uses today.

In any event the SWP might be surprised at the reaction it did get if followed a principled course and openly fought for the victory of the NLF. In the first place if there is one thing workers universally and correctly reject it is pacifism. They are aware that the central question of mankind can only be solved by arms. They are revolted by the pacifists who avoid risking their lives while the sons of workers are slaughtered.

The workers are well aware that somebody has got to win in Vietnam. It is our job to prove to them that their side is the other side, the NLF.

Johnson's program is clear. Let us now get busy and clear ours up.

## Subscribe Now!

enclosed 50¢ for ten issue introductory sub.  
enclosed \$2.00 for full year's sub.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

St. \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_

State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Send to: Bulletin of International Socialism, rm. 305, 339 Lafayette St., NYC 10012. Checks payable to: Bulletin of International Socialism.