working class of course, are now in one way or another still going along with the U.S. war, although discontent is definitely rising, most rapidly in some of the layers of the population. The millions of workers who today may react with apathy or horror to the demand for immediate withdrawal will not therefore react any more warmly to the moderate demand for negotiations. The negotiations demand suits more the essentially conservative moods of a liberal section of the middle class as well as certain sections of the bourgeoisie, who want to preserve the status quo and do not want to risk war with the USSR and China if it is at all possible. The mass of the workers, if they can be shown that this is not their war, will naturally demand immediate withdrawal, and will not stop halfway at a negotiations demand which assumes that the imperialists have some valid rights in Vietnam to begin with.

The working class today does not oppose the war, but if they can be shown in the course of struggle that the wage freeze is connected with the war in Vietnam and that the workers and minorities here and the Vietnamese half way around the world have the same enemy, then they will oppose the war. Not only will they oppose this particular war, they will also be in a position to put an end to all such wars. A working class perspective does not represent an attachment to traditional formulas, but the only way we will put an end to the Vietnam war for good, and not be faced with the same war in a different location tomorrow or the day after.

The key to success for the anti-war movement is inits becoming more than an anti-war movement. We must see the necessity of going beyond the "demonstration stage." The anti-war movement must become a political movement and a working class movement.

WHY PL DISSOLVED M2M

Self-Destructive Move is Sign of Return to Stalinism

The dissolution of the May Second Movement marks a new stage in the crisis of Progressive Labor. Unable to withstand the intense government pressure, PL is retreating into a sect-like existence. The press has been cut back; the organization itself is beginning to fragment. Ominous signs of this process began last year with the campaign against "counterrevolutionary" Trotskyism and the failure of the national PLP Convention to engage in serious political discussion.

Both the decision to dissolve M2M and the manner in which this decision was carried out have further weakened PL. The youth movement plays an important role in the Leninist conception of revolutionary organization. A healthy youth movement develops a new generation of revolutionary leaders. It offers youth a forum in which to reexamine the Marxist program in the light of problems and questions of their own generation. It provides an arena for tactical and organizational experience. It provides an opportunity for not-yet-totally-committed socialists to participate in revolutionary politics.

By its intervention in May 2nd then, PL aborted a necessary revolutionary process, but even were this not the case, the arbitrary manner in which it was effected can only damage the movement. The revolutionary party has not only the right but the responsibility to intervene politically in the youth movement, but to substitute organizational control for thorough political discussion is to abandon principled politics.

M2M clubs were invited to send delegates to a meeting to discuss the future of the organization. Not until they got to the meeting were they presented with the proposal to dissolve May 2nd, by the PL caucus within the movement. While the caucus had secretly adopted its position in advance of the conference, delegates were completely unprepared. Under the circumstances they could hardly offer effective opposition. Particularly as they had no opportunity to discuss the proposition in their own clubs.

This undemocratic procedure has unfortunate parallels in the past. The Communist party was infamous for its caucus politics. CPers were known for out-organizing independents, out-talking them, out-staying them and out-voting them. This is not to say that it is impermissible for revolutionaries to form disciplined factions. The issue is that such factions must never act to supress democratic processes, which means the fullest possible clarification of all political questions. To substitute organizational maneuvers for honest debate is not Leninist politics but dirty politics.

Why PL Chooses Suicide

Several hypotheses have been raised to explain PL's action. The claim has been made that PL felt that May 2nd was becoming too independent and therefore uncontrollable. It has also been suggested that PL is becoming organizationally conservative in response to its pressing defense needs. If this is the case they will find such a policy to be self-defeating. PL explains its policy as one more step in a turn towards Students for a Democratic Society. Since SDS already exists as a student protest movement there is no place for M2M. We cannot subscribe to this thesis. PL gave up leadership of the anti-war movement to SDS. It is now prepared to abandon the entire youth movement.

SDS is going through a severe crisis, partly because of its amorphous character. As an ill-defined radical protest movement it contains non-socialist and vaguely socialist, as well as left wing socialist youth. It can in no sense compete with the function of a revolutionary socialist youth movement--or even a radical anti-imperialist youth movement as M2M proclaimed itself to be.

This is not to say that M2M should not have concerned itself with SDS. Obviously M2M should have sought the widest possible active collaboration with SDS, but without abandoning or diluting its own program.

Implicit in PL's evaluation of the situation is its conception of a youth movement. It becomes apparent that what PL sought from M2M was not the development of a revolutionary socialist

youth movement but an organization like SDS but under PL's control. When M2M failed to attract a sizable section of the uncommitted youth, PL gave it up and sought greener fields.

A Parallel from the Past

One is reminded again of the Communist Party and the Progressive Party. In 1948 the CP expected Henry Wallace, the "peoples" capitalist, to attract a sizable section of the liberal vote. Their hopes were smashed when Harry Truman outflanked Wallace to the left. After a lethargic campaign in 1952, the CP gave up even the semblance of independent politics for greener pastures--the Democratic Party. They withdrew from the Progressive Party and in NYC from the American Labor Party, leaving the independents without any political alternative to capitalist politics.

Progressive Labor was formed in opposition to the American Communist Party. Yet from its inception it was cursed with the taint of Stalinism, because Progressive Labor never seriously analyzed its own past. Rather than developing a serious analysis of the social-economic perspective in this period, rather than understanding that the real task of class-struggle politics lies in development of the united front, rather than honestly facing Trotskyism, the only political theory which explains the degeneration of the Soviet Union, Progressive labor substituted instead a combination of adventurism and opportunism. Young PLers on the one hand were deceived into believing that by their own actions they would be able to electrify the masses--in a period when only a vanguard can be won over by a process of serious theoretical confrontation. At the same time PL borrowed doubtful glory from the Chinese and such erstwhile friends as Sukarno. For real proletarian politics PL substituted hero worship--Malcolm, Fidel, Mao. PL was foredoomed to the crisis it now faces.

At this time, several May 2nd clubs have expressed their determination to continue to build the movement. In NYC a group, also connected with the Free University, has already formed the American Liberation League.

If the American Liberation League is to avoid the pitfalls of its parent organization it will have to decisevely reject the politics of Maoism as well as the organizational methods of Stalinism.

COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN GHANA

Lessons for American Radicals

A few years ago, a score-odd heads of state of "new nations" provided hero-symbols for the New Left in the United States. "See," the New Left's anti-ideologues proclaimed, "the success of these leaders proves that the Old Left, with its labels and doctrines, is hopesessly out of date." They argued that one need only a "guts-reaction" and a Castro-like turn to the "communities" of poor peasants or urban impoverished.