

masses, young workers, unemployed and, ultimately, the trade union movement. These forces cannot be attracted by a "pure and simple" peace program. The relationship between these forces and issues must be clearly shown in a comprehensive peace program that will confront the power structure with a set of political alternatives.

The program being forged by SDS and other student and Negro militants is clearly moving in the direction of such a synthesis. In spite of the efforts of Dr. Spock and his SWP brokers to attract Republicans, the peace movement is developing political content. If this development is to mature it is imperative that individual confrontations not take the place of social confrontation.

While remaining inflexibly opposed to the draft and the political system that rests upon it, activists in the peace movement should also take their opinions into the Army with them as they are entitled to do, and continue their work there insofar as possible. The notion that once a young man walks out of the induction center he has been miraculously transformed into something unreachable and unchangeably hostile must be dealt with in no uncertain terms. The soldier is the student - the Negro - the worker. The struggle to end conscription is his struggle. The basis for a new united front against the war, poverty and racism is now within our grasp. But only if we oppose and defeat those who seek to ignore or suppress the inevitable political and social concomitants of the peace movement, can this potential be realized.

PROGRESSIVE LABOR ON CRITICISM AND DEFENSE

Does a Critical Attitude Towards the NLF and the Soviet Bloc Aid or Sabotage the Struggle Against American Imperialism?

Progressive Labor Party is very upset. At the Fifth Avenue March in New York City the Spartacist group issued a leaflet which, while defending the Vietnamese Revolution against imperialism, was critical of the policies of Ho Chi Minh, the National Liberation Front and China. PLP has launched an attack on Spartacist in a statement published in the November 2nd issue of Challenge entitled "LEJ Attacks--With a Right and 'Left'".

Clearly, PLP is stating that those like Spartacist (and we, too, are happy to be counted in this camp) who couple their support to the National Liberation Front with a dose of criticism of its leadership are no more than the "left" agents of Johnson!

This attack is obviously a part of a concerted campaign on the part of PLP and its international allies. The November issue of Progressive Worker, a Canadian publication of a group very close in policy to the PLP, carries a similar attack on the

League for Socialist Action (LSA). The LSA is a group closely aligned with the SWP in the United States. Its line for many years has been one of abject and uncritical support to Fidel Castro and the whole leadership of the Cuban Revolution. However, recently the LSA has been forced to adopt a critical attitude towards at least a section of the Cuban Government which they accuse, according to Progressive Worker, of being "stalinized". Progressive Worker states: "The LSA is guilty of unwarranted interference in Cuba's internal affairs when they undertake to criticise the Cuban people and lecture them on how they should develop their revolution."

There is something terribly paradoxical about these attacks from PLP and its Canadian friends. Both groups were born in reaction to the Sino-Soviet dispute. Both groups were expelled from the Communist Parties of their respective countries for daring to support China in her critique of the USSR. Clearly both groups have therefore been guilty of "unwarranted interference" in the USSR's "internal affairs". If we are to follow PLP's logic one step further we can only conclude that since they criticize the USSR they can not really be for its defense. Thus they, too, must be the "left" allies of Johnson.

Monthly Review's Position

Truly the allies of the Johnson gang are omnipresent. No sooner did we finish reading the Nov. 2nd Challenge and the November Progressive Worker than we started to read the November issue of Monthly Review. We were shaken to find there as the lead editorial of the publication -- a critique of Lin Piao, Vice Premier of China!

Of course the MR editors felt quite embarrassed in their new critical role, but criticize they did. Essentially they stated that China's call for a bloc of the workers and peasants with a section of the national bourgeoisie is not applicable to Latin America, at any rate. There the revolution must be led by the workers and the peasants standing alone and against the national bourgeoisie. MR sums up its position as follows:

What this means is not that carrying through the national democratic revolution as a preliminary to the construction of socialism has lost any of its importance, but rather that in Latin American conditions the national democratic and socialist revolutions are apparently going to be carried out under a single unified program and in this sense are being telescoped into one.

Anyone even superficially acquainted with the past history of the Communist movement is well aware that this view did not originate with Huberman or Sweezy. This was the view Trotsky championed against Stalin. He called it the theory of the permanent revolution.

We suspect soon Sweezy and Huberman will be taken to task for the "arrogance" of differing with the leadership of a successful revolution. What revolution have you led, Sweezy and Huberman? Where do you get the nerve to "meddle" in affairs outside the U.S.?

Arrested Development

The position PLP is presently taking is a sign of their arrested development and a warning to all who seek to become true revolutionaries and internationalists. Having come to a correct understanding of the revisionist character of the world policy of the USSR, they have correctly found it necessary to fight this international line of the Soviet bureaucracy. However, they have broken from decades of uncritical panegyrics of the USSR leadership only to begin the same process all over again in reaction to China. Recognizing that the defense of the Russian workers state demands of revolutionaries in other countries an open and critical attitude towards the present policies of the Russian leadership--policies which hinder the defense of this state--they at the same time slander all critics of China as agents of imperialism.

Thus PL continues to identify defense with non-criticism. Logically we are forced to conclude that their present stance towards the USSR means that they are no longer for its defense. The only other alternative is to conclude that one can only criticize what PL criticizes and still be considered by PL to be a legitimate part of the left. We must inform PL that this old game is done and finished. The new generation of revolutionaries intends to look at all programs and all leaderships critically. No one will dictate to them who and what can and cannot be criticized.

Two Cases in Point: Algeria and Indonesia

In past issues of the Bulletin we have shown over and over again how the international line of the Chinese leadership has actually undermined the defense of the Chinese workers state. Let us sum up here briefly two cases in point.

Algeria: The Chinese, like the USSR, has sought to bolster the bonapartist capitalist leadership of the Algerian Revolution despite the close ties of this leadership with French imperialism. In recent months the Ben Bella leadership moved closer and closer to the USSR internationally and thus undermined China's interests on the African continent.

Rather than seeking to support an independent working class leadership in Algeria, China actually came out in support of the right wing military opposition to Ben Bella led by Boumedienne. It distinguished itself by being the first country to support the Boumedienne seizure of power. Lisa Armand laboriously defended this line in Challenge explaining to PL's periphery that Boumedienne was truly the man of the left. We ask PLP to explain to us how Chinese policy in Algeria did anything other

than undermine China's international position, thus weakening its defense.

Indonesia: China has uncritically supported the PKI in Indonesia in its policy of a bloc with Sukarno as a substitute for an independent working class struggle for power in Indonesia. This policy has led to a paralysis of the PKI during the present crisis in which the military has turned on the PKI while Sukarno fronts for the military. The latest issue of Progressive Labor boasts an article by this same Sukarno and a recent issue of Challenge printed another article by Lisa Armand lauding the PKI as the very model of a modern Marxist Leninist party. We ask PLP to explain how Chinese policy in Indonesia did anything other than undermine China's international position, thus weakening its defense.

The Permanent Revolution

These two questions are not at all unrelated to the criticism MR gingerly makes of Lin Piao's statement on world revolution. Is not the line of support to Boumediene and to Sukarno the concrete expression of the false policy of a bloc with the national bourgeoisie? Is not the theory of permanent revolution, which Sweezy and Huberman apply to Latin America, just as relevant to other underdeveloped countries?

If this be the case, and we maintain it is, then the very future of socialist revolution depends on elaborating a revolutionary program which clearly breaks from the Chinese on these critical questions. It will be the growth of this revolutionary movement, not the praise of Milton Rosen and Co., which will really contribute to the defense of China. We maintain that criticism not only does not detract from defense, but is absolutely essential to defense. We challenge Challenge to seriously answer our position.

MAN VERSUS HIS OWN CREATION

THE GREAT EASTERN POWER FAILURE

The Great Eastern Power Failure of November 9th tore a piece out of US capitalism's slick "Madison Avenue" image, giving the world a glimpse of some pretty unwholesome flesh underneath. Heads of giant power utilities and massive government agencies stood before press and TV fumbling for meaningless phrases which explained nothing.

What had knocked out one after another of the great eastern U.S. and Canadian power systems--in the words of Governor Rockefeller--like a pack of dominoes? It hadn't taken a hydrogen bomb to do it; no ship had broken an underwater cable; no major trunk-line had gone down; there had been no great overload in any part of the system; not even a small transformer had blown up. The gigantic power network, covering 80,000 US and