PL on Cuba
Ernest Haberkern

"notice first the fact that the struggle for socialism, far from being a mass struggle, is understood as a struggle for a leadership that can act only in order to win. From this conception the struggle naturally flows the conclusion that socialism is equivalent to structural changes - a state-controlled economy.

"If socialism is simply a matter of structural change, then we have no need of the concept of class struggle or class dictatorship. The structure is above the socialist people; the socialist people and the structure can serve it and is controlled by it in the extent the leader struggle for national economic independence."

The lines above could have been written by a Trotskyist in the thirties, criticizing the "socialism in one country" line of Joseph Stalin. The whole concept of a "national socialism" in which an economic growth of the state-planned economy was the equivalent of socialism, was the distinguishing feature of Stalin's being a leader.

It was around this line that Stalin organized these elements in the Soviet bureaucracy who wished to pull necessary solutions and rules of the European and world revolutions. For these people, the growth of Soviet industry (and the corresponding increase in the bureaucratic posts) was the measure of Socialism's victim's progress. What their place and role was in the context of a competitive world economy, required that the working class give up their naturally held ideas about the nature of the planned economy during the period of the October revolution.

It was Stalin's whole name, more than any other, which was connected with this concept of bureaucratic nascent national socialism, and its nationalistic ambitions. That is why it is so surprising that the quote above comes from a Trotskyist publication of the thirties, from "Progressive Labor: the battle for the realization of the October revolution has been most important in the attempt to resurrect Stalin as a political thinker."

"Progressive Labor is not referring, of course, to the Russia of Stalin's day, nor to present-day China. They are talking about Castro's Cuba - which has chosen the right side in the world struggle. The wages they make against Cuba, however, raise questions that go beyond this most recent split in the Stalinist bloc."

PL argues 1) that the Cuban regime is elite, and sees their methods and the names in general at simply raw material to be mobilized by the elite - so that it, the elite, can take power and introduce certain necessary reforms in that Castro-nationalized property in order to free Cuba from foreign domination, without preparing the workers to control and run the state-owned industry; and 2) the party's "program" for the workers is 'anti-hard and anti-coalition'.

It is hard to see how anyone can continue to call himself a Maoist and make such charges against Castro. What does this mean? And is this economic or political mean, if not "keep quiet, work hard, and produce?"

International Socialists have argued from the beginning that the revolution in Cuba is both a working class to the "Cultural Revolution" was not just a demand for better wages and working conditions (although we support such elementary demands) but rather the first attempt in forty years at political intervention on the part of the working class. The problem for Maoists is this.

You say that the Cuban working class and peasants are infected with communism, and have not yet reached the stage of political consciousness that will allow them to rule directly. If the Chinese masses are not yet ready directly, then why is it running China for the last twenty years?

The usual defense of the cultural revolution is that in twenty years they may have the conditions like Liu Shao Chi, who had been disciplined and trained for rule by the People's Liberation Army struggle, had become soft, but this is at best a very weak and not been involved in that struggle of the PLA against the Japanese, and played no role in the victorious fight of the PLA. Neither did the bulk of the peasants, who preserved themselves outside the control of the Red Army until quite late.

If, at least the people in PL argue, the returned to the national "socialists" of Eastern Europe. The Kardas, Grunhäuser, Dubeck and Tiso also did not hesitate when SKL moved against the working class, but were capable of all kinds of demagogic appeals to those same workers when it was a question of preserving their own local rule against Russian imperialism.

The international aspect of these matters is of great interest to revolutionary socialists for the same reason that the similar conflicts within the capitalist class engage the attention of others. The capitalist classes have an important tactical significance. They encourage the working class to cease the initiative. If Mao split with the Russians engenders the kind of question that international periods. But in this case, the strategic, the weight of concepts among Western radicals, it will have served some useful purpose.
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