PART THREE: Internationalism and the Socialist Workers’ Party

ON JANUARY 2, 1961, the Socialist Labour League directed a letter to the National Committee of the Socialist Workers’ Party in the United States (SWP). Referring to the Open Letter issued by the SWP in 1953, which led to the formation of the International Committee (IC), and assessing the political evolution of the Pabloites since that date, it proposed a discussion within the IC on the question of Pabloism. There was no ambiguity on where the SLL stood on this question: ‘It is time to draw to a close the period in which Pabloite revisionism was regarded as a trend within Trotskyism’.

But the SWP leadership had already made a decision to proceed forthwith with re-unification with what was then called the International Secretariat. This was to be carried through politically on the basis of the common position the SWP and the Pabloites were taking on the class nature of the Cuban state and a number of related developments particularly in the colonial world.

In fact, central to the SWP’s conception of re-unification was that Pabloism and the 1953 split were under no condition to be discussed either among the International Committee supporters or with the Pabloites.

For instance Hansen notes in his ‘Report on the World Congress’, ‘that at the Re-unification Congress we reached an agreement to leave the assessment of the differences of 1953 to a time in the future when we could discuss them in an educational way without any heat.’

For a period of two and a half years, from January 1961 to re-unification in the summer of 1963, the Socialist Labour League and ourselves sought to hold a discussion on the question of Pabloism, the political meaning of the 1953 split, and the evolution of the political formations since that date. We did not object to discussions with the Pabloites, and in fact it was the SLL which proposed a parity committee precisely to discuss questions in dispute.

We were not even opposed to a re-unification of forces in principle as long as it was a principled re-unification.

We made absolutely clear our own assessment that re-unification must take place on the basis of the Tran...
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The unmentioned question which lies behind the whole struggle of the SWP at this conference is: 'Are we headed for another Trotskyist split?' It is necessary to issue another Open Letter to protect the SWP from a new form of Cochrane-ism within its ranks? Will we be forced back into a discussion on 1953 in the congress?

Hansen states near the end of his report on the congress: 'But it could turn out that the discussion on China and on the question of guerrilla warfare as it develops, the question of party building as it is associated with the problem of entrism, that all of this could turn out to be one of the richest and most educational discussions that the Fourth International and the World Trotskyist movement has had to this point. That remains to be seen. My feelings is rather optimistic'

He is optimistic but not totally convinced this is the way things will work out. It could turn out that way but that remains to be seen.

The question of 1953 haunts the SWP leadership today. It cannot be erased from their minds. There is the grave danger of history repeating itself, but in a far more disastrous way, for history now takes a different course. For the first time in history a Trotskyist daily paper is about to be launched in England. This cannot be ignored. It is an empirical fact—a fact brought into existence precisely through a principled struggle against Pabloism and pragmatism. The question of 1953 cannot be raised without raising at the same time the question of the International Committee based on the programme and method of the Transnational Committee.

The SWP have been warned that the origins of the 1953 split must be ascertained. There are certain central lessons of the 1953 split which must be ascertained. The question of the SWP as a political party—a political party within the Chinese Communist Party—simply 'Chinese Communist Party'. In the interim the terminological difference of 1963 was cleared up, for, as Hansen notes, Mao had come out for a political revolution in China. But the difference in line which so obviously underlay the terminology of 1963 erupted in this form of 'editing'.

At this point the Europeans introduce the edited SWP resolution as the majority resolution and the SWP supporters counterpose the unedited edition as the minority report. But the question was not so simple as that. Peng Shu-tsue enters the dispute with another minority report proposing that the United Secretariat intervene on the side of restorationist Liu Shao-chi. Then in talks 'Comrade Capa' of Argentina, who was also for an active policy of intervention in China, but he tended to be for intervention on the side of Mao. As if things weren't confused enough Ernest Germann proposes to muddy the waters even further by stating: 'that the agreement of agreement between the two documents was almost the same so far as the points of agreement were concerned'.

No wonder one delegate described the discussion as a 'marital dispute between the Europeans and the Americans'. In fact the whole congress was marked by such marital disputes which reflected unclarity as to the causes of the original divorce proceedings.

At the very centre of this dispute was the impact upon the United Secretariat of the bureaucratic forces within the Stalinist camp. One side tended to move towards Mao and another side towards the Kremlin variety of Stalinism. This in itself is another manifestation of the inability of the United Secretariat to start from the independent perspective of the working class in its struggle against both capitalism and Stalinism and develop a strategy on this basis. But this, in turn, demands a return to understanding of the original 1953 split.

The spectre of 1953 haunted the proceedings of the congress in an even more fundamental way. The theoretical positions formulated by Pablo in 1950 took organizational forms by 1953 leading to the expulsion of the majority of the French section of the Fourth International, the emergence of the Lawrench faction within the British section with the tendency to disintegrate into the Communist Party, and the Cochrane-Clarke faction within the SWP which utilized the new world reality theses and the enthrone 'sui generis' as a cover for a split from the SWP and liquidationism. New new liquidationist tendencies have grown up around Gueruism in Europe and Latin America but he has found an expression within the SWP through liquidationist tendencies among the youth of the Young Socialist Alliance (YSA)—most particularly in the form of black members leaving the YSA for the Black Panther'

Differences

The SWP succeeded in holding off any serious discussion of the question of 1953 and everything else was focused on this at the 1963 Re-unification Congress and the 1965 congress.

'Now the present congress,' Hansen notes, was different. We had some differences.' In fact all the questions submerged for the opportunist purpose of unification have reasserted themselves in a number of forms in its own way pushing the forces of the United Secretariat towards the very discussion proposed in 1961-1963.

We have already noted the theoretical and methodological continuity of the cover resolution, which everyone at the recent Pabloite congress supposed the New Line of the World Revolution' with the essential revisions of the 1950-1953 of Pablo by Pablo. But this continuity has reasserted itself in other ways.

The editing of the Secretariat's Resolution On Our Tactics In Europe'. This resolution proposed a turn from the deep extreme practices of the European Pabloites in the whole period from 1950, when Pablo proposed it to the last year or so. But it also contained a positive evaluation of this extreme. This, of course, raised a question which played a critical role in the 1953 split—Pablo's whole liquidationist proposal to dissolve our movement into the Stalinists which was taken up by the Cochrane-Clarke opposition inside the SWP and used to justify their own desertion of the party. The document has been held over for further discussion but discussion will have to take place.

Then there is the question of China. Hansen explains how this question was handled in 1963.

'The other thing that was that in 1963, certain differences on the question of China had to be considered. We had reached agreement on all other major questions in the world as we saw them at that time, with the exception of China...They did not believe in the necessity of a political revolution. That was the key point, so we had some discussion on that question, and we reached agreement that what we would do was use a formula that included the substance of calling for a political revolution in China, but without naming it as such. That was the agreement that we reached in 1963.

Faced with a fundamental difference on the key question of reform or revolution in China—the very question that was at the centre of the dispute in 1953, if it affected Stalinism as a whole— the whole matter was swept under the rug as a 'terminological' affair. All agreed not to use the term 'political revolution', but somehow its content would get through.

Then we come to the current conference and what was under the rug comes out flying all over the room. The SWP agrees to draft a resolution for the conference on the Cultural Revolution. This is sent to Europe where the European leadership 'edit' it. The editing consisted of such matters, as Hansen reports, of changing 'Stalinized Chinese Communist Party' to simply 'Chinese Communist Party'. In the interim the terminological difference of 1963 was cleared up, for, as Hansen notes, Mao had come out for a political revolution in China. But the difference in line which so obviously underlay the terminology of 1963 erupted in this form of 'editing'.

At this point the Europeans introduce the edited SWP resolution as the majority resolution and the SWP supporters counterpose the unedited edition as the minority report. But the question was not so simple as that. Peng Shu-tsue enters the dispute with another minority report proposing...
precisely this responsibility which the SWP has refused to accept.

Hansen expressed this very clearly in his short quoted ‘Report on World Congress’: ‘One of the things we have always held to—very consciously—was not to assume leadership of the International. We viewed our position, our role, and our function, even though we were the most powerful sector of the movement for many years, as that of offering support—helping and supporting the key leaders but not substituting for them and not trying to assume leadership.’

With this conception, as soon as the war was over, the SWP gratefully foisted the responsibility of leadership of the world movement to a group of Europeans—most notably Pablo, Germain and Frank. This is how Cannon describes the situation in his ‘Internationalism and the SWP’, a report to the majority caucus during the Cochran fight: ‘Our relations with the leadership in Europe at that time were relations of closest collaboration and support. There was general agreement between us. Those were unknown men in our party. Nobody ever heard of them. We helped to publicize the individual leaders, we commended them to our party members, and helped build up their prestige.’ And so the SWP turned over responsibility for international leadership to these “unknown men” in Europe, and happily proceeded to concern itself primarily with American affairs. Of course, the support the SWP offered was material, real, highly important. Its collaboration was of critical importance in the development in many of the sections—particular the British. But this was not the same thing as leadership.

This refusal to assume leadership flowed from the very conception of internationalism developed by Cannon and the SWP. This is the way Cannon states it in this same speech: ‘We don’t consider ourselves to be an American branch office of an international business firm that receives orders from the boss. That’s not for us. That’s what we got in the Comintern. That’s what we wouldn’t take. And that’s what we got out of. We conceive of internationalism as international collaboration, in the process of which we get the benefit of the opinions of international comrades, and they get the benefit of our opinions. This comradely discussion and collaboration we work out, if possible, a common line.

The same essential position was reiterated in the 1937 resolution ‘The Unity of the Fourth International——and the Next Steps’:

In our opinion internationalism is essentially a process of comradely discussion and collaboration in which the constituent sections of the world movements exchange views and jointly work out, if possible, common positions on the most worrisome problems of world politics.

With such a perspective the question of leadership of the world movement loses its vital importance. Each party carries on its own tasks as it sees fit, collaborates with other parties on its own terms, and if possible works out a joint line for the international movement. The national party emerges as the central thing, the international merely a clearing house for collaboration, a source for nice manifestos.

This conception of internationalism has as little in common with that of Lenin and Trotsky as do Stalin’s dictatorial policies of transforming the Communist International into a docile adjunct of the Soviet Union’s Foreign Office. For Cannon, as he does throughout this speech to the majority, to equate the Comintern of Lenin and Trotsky with that of Stalin under the heading ‘Cominternism’ is re-vealing in itself.

Lenin’s and Trotsky’s conception of internationalism flowed first of all from the working class as an international entity, which must develop an international programme and strategy in order to carry forward the revolution in any particular country. The international party is but the necessary organizational expression of this international programme and strategy. To see this international party as but a collection of individual national organizations which collaborate where possible and work out common positions where possible is a reflection of a view which sees the working class in national and not international terms.

The development of the national party with serious roots within the working class of a particular country is possible only if that party starts at all times from the international party, from its programme and strategy and takes as its major responsibility the development of that programme and strategy. Such a party must, of course, develop that strategy under the party’s own conditions prevalent in the particular country, but this is only possible if the party begins first of all with the international perspective and actually deepens itself into international activity through the process of concretizing it within the particular country.

Lenin addresses the Third Congress of the Third International: ‘Lenin like Trotsky conceived of the international movement as a world party based on: a common strategy, not collaboration where possible in the spirit of Cannon’

By 1952 Pablo was utilizing this prescription in a knock-down fight within the French section seeking to get it to liquidate ‘sui generis’ into the Stalinist movement seeing this movement being transformed under conditions of ‘war revolution’ into a revolutionary force. He finally carried out his political line with an organizational move and expelled the majority of the French section.

The French comrades sent an appeal to Cannon and this is how Cannon explained his reaction: ‘As the situation developed further, Benedict one of the French-German group appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sections that I appealed to me in a letter. I didn’t answer him for months. I didn’t see how I could write anything—sectio

Situation turns Cannon’s speech to the Majority Caucus on May 14, 1953, marked a turn in the situation.

‘We have heard,’ states the very first sentence, ‘the party is in no way claiming in the party that they have the support of what they call “the international movement.” And the speech concludes: “We hope to have the sympathy and support of the whole international movement. But if we don’t have the sympathy and support of one individual, or a section of one, or another, that doesn’t mean we will give up our opinions and quit the fight. Not at all. This means that the fight in the SWP becomes more and more the international struggle. Then we take the field, and look for allies to fight on our side against any- one foolish enough to side with the side of Cochran.”

But still Cannon did his best to hold off an international struggle.

‘We hope to avoid such a fight. We are not looking for it. We have no
tangible evidence to prove that there is no conspiracy against us, or any actions against us, on the international field. But if a fight should come, we will be prepared for it. That is the way we size this up." But this was a conspiracy, if one wishes to call it that. Pablo lined up with Castro and the British and French lined up with the United States and they were off to war. But leadership, as Hansen puts it, is something which the SWP considers to be important for the struggle. So, after a brief spate of articles in the 'Militant', the whole international question was filed away in a drawer of the 1961 Unity Place. The British and French left as much as possible to the official policies and the political and theoretical struggle with Pabloism avoided.

The SWP, because it refused to function even under these new conditions from an international perspective, had never really understood Pabloism. It fought Pablo's revisions with orthodoxy. Perhaps its biggest sin was that it missed Pablo's historical orthodoxy was its 1953 resolution against Nationalism.

Understanding Pablo's theory of a new world reality based on the concept that the movement was an accident, incapable of being changed in favour of socialism—a concept which we noted in the 1961 SWP's international resolution and in the current 1969 resolution—the document defines.

A rounded review and realistic résumé of the net result of the march of the international political forces from 1943 to 1953 leads to this conclusion.

Well, some people seem never to learn. The honeymoon is now over. The collapse of the deepening international crisis is forcing upon the ranks of the United Secretariat a serious discussion of the very fundamentals of the movement. Some within the United Secretariat have actually asked us to study the jokes about the SWP's functioning, and to treat the congress as saying, according to Hansen, "if that any conclusion was to be made it was that we were under the influence of the peace movement in the United States and that the international was continuing in the tradition of 'com-

martyr' politics: that we comment and do not engage in action'. The majority at the congress voted the SWP down on the Latin American question and the Chinese question, and evicted any opposition to its resolution on youth radicalization that a vote on it had to be postponed to a future meeting. The question is now posed with all its sharpness and urgency before the membership of the SWP and YSA. They can allow their movement to be captured by what it has in the past, seeking to duck any real struggle for clarity internationally and even within the SWP, and preparing to break all international political connections if it is impossible to do so.

The Cuban miracle is over. Fundamental problems still face workers there, but Castro (right) has no program for them or the workers and peasants of Latin America.

We must return to a thorough discussion of Cuba, which played such a central role in the 1963 reunification and to-day's tendency to seek an easy solution which divides the United Secretariat supporters. First we must be absolutely clear about the political guerrilla warfare which the Socialist Workers' Party (SWP) now opposes is a position of which the SWP was the main proponent for a whole number of years beginning with 1961.

It was only an empirical reaction to the defeat of Guerilla in Bolivia and the limited successes in the advanced countries which led the SWP to its present critical position on Guerilla. It neither predicted nor prepared for the outcome of the beginning of May—June France nor warned and fought against guerrilla warfare in the period which preceded the 'honeymoon'.

It was only the International Committee which upheld during this whole period the perspective of revolution in the advanced countries and exposed the dangerous character of rural guerrilla schism which was in the SWP.

For instance the resolution around which the SWP carried through reunification in 1963 ('For Early Reunification of the World Trotskyist Movement') had this paragraph of guerrilla warfare in it:

"Along the road of a revolution beginning to spread, and ending in the capture of capitalist property relations, guerrilla warfare conduces by landless peasants and semi-peasantry, under a leadership that becomes an instrument of carrying the revolution through to a conclusion, can play a decisive role in undermining and eventually destroying the downfall of a colonial or semi-colonial power. This is one of the main lessons to be drawn from the experience since the Second World War. It must be consciously incorporated into the strategy of building revolutionary Marxist parties in colonial countries." So read point 13 on the World Conference points around the SWP reunion took place.

Much the same can be said for the accords that the Latin American sections of the United Secretariat are today seeking to dissolve themselves into the Organization of Latin American States (OLAS) and the Carribean Treaty Organization which the SWP itself advocated in the article 'The Problem of the Fourth International—And the Next Steps':

"We believe the Trotskyists of Cuba should seek out and take their place in the soon-to-be-formed OLAS and the Carribean Treaty Organization. They can work patiently, patiently and confidently for the implementation of the fulfils of this programme which they represent. In addition to mobilizing support for the Cuban case, as they are doing, we think the struggle throughout Latin America should try to bring together all those forces, regardless of their specific origins, which are ready to take the Cuban experience as the point of departure for the revolutionary struggle in their own countries."

These liquidationist policies flowed quite logically from the characterization of the class nature of the Cuban state and of the Cuban government. If Cuba were part of the SWP's orthodox共青主义 or Trotskyism, then the question of 'workers' state' would be meaningless. The SWP maintained, 'a workers' state', although one lacking as yet of the forms of pre-capitalist property relations. It would therefore seem to follow that a political and military guerrilla warfare could create a workers' state. Thus an orientation towards and liquidation into such formations is perfectly logical. All this business about 'blunted instruments' and what it means in liquidating the conscious struggle for Marxist theory and the party then follows.

So far the SWP has not probed this root question, reacting as empirically to the failures of guerrilla warfare as it did originally to what it interpreted as its success. But the discussion must go beyond this level; it must return to an objective analysis of the origins and nature of the Castro regime and the Cuban state from the point of view of the Marxist method. Again and again we say every question must be probed to its roots.

The position the SWP took on Cuba is expressed in summary in their 1962 resolution.

'Facts, however, are stubborn things. It is a fact that capitalism was eliminated from Cuba, and that the basis of Cuban social and economic life—and this overturn was directly or indirectly by a leadership which did not explicitly call itself Marxian, although a very large and quite a number of the SWP did not overturn the overthrow of capitalism and does not show Trotskyism to this day. As the proponents of the Soviet Union and in the USSR, the Eastern, Europe, Yugoslavia and China demonstrate, Cuba could not logically be defined as anything but a workers' state, even if its political structure was not democratic and its leadership non-Marxist.

'But the SWP comrades, the resolution continues, 'do not want to admit even this much. They correctly view the deformed states in Eastern Europe dominated by the Kremlin as non-capitalists, but they refuse to grant that status to the unincorporated workers' regime in Cuba. They set aside the traditional Marxist standards for determining the character of workers' state and advances instead purely political criteria. They so exaggerate the importance of the subjective factor that they lose sight of any other factors and changes in the basic property relations.'

Facts, as we have noted earlier, stubborn things. It is one thing to 'recognise' them and it is quite another to understand them. To do so requires a methodological and methodical basis, and for the latter dialectics is essential to get at the underlying processes of change which produce the momentary appearances. The SWP's theoretical approach to Cuba consists essentially of two methods of combination and in this it reflects the methodological approach of bourgeois social science. First is empiricism. The facts are noted, collected. As Hansen put it in his speech to the 1961 SWP Plenum on Cuba: 'What we have reached are not speculations; they're not projections, are not based on any political confidence in what the regime down there is going to do. Our charac- terization simply reflect the facts, just the facts. The fact is that the capitalists have been expropriated in Cuba. The facts that a planned economy has been started there. The fact that a qualifi- cation to the facts is that the facts are there. No matter what you call these facts, they are the facts that everyone has to start with.'

But the SWP does not stop with these 'facts' alone—and obviously much of the above of the Helsinki group is a fact is actually a conclusion he draws from certain empirical data. These facts are then interpreted on the basis.
the international proletariat revolution. The former road leads the movement into the arms of the American bourgeoisie. That is the logic of pragmatism, of nationalism. The International Committee will assist this process of clarification in every way it can, for much depends on it.

There is no longer room in the middle ground. The international crisis is in our disposal. And we have a ready-made test: it is tested daily, hourly. The tasks before us are tremendous, the potential fantastic. We have entered the era of the European Revolution and the American revolution is fast at Europe's heels.

What Trotsky fought so hard for under such difficult conditions is now coming into life, in the very fabric of the mass movement of workers in all lands. There is no greater task nor more rewarding one than to take up NOW the struggle for the Transitional Program with its central task of building the Fourth International into the leadership of the workers of all countries.
The Cuban ‘miracle’ is over.
Fundamental problems still face workers there, but Castro (right) has no program for them or the workers and peasants of Latin America.

mentary’ policies: that we comment and do not engage in action. The majority at the congress voted the SWP down on the Latin American question and the Chinese question, and evicted such opposition to its resolution on youth radicalization that a vote on it had to be postponed to the future.

The question is now posed with all its sharpness and urgency before the membership of the SWP and YSA. They can allow their movement to continue as it has in the past, seeking to duck any difficulties, or for clarity in this crisis, or within the SWP, and preparing to break off all international political connections if it is impossible to so duck the issue. But interesting this time completely into American national affairs without any cover at all.

Or the SWP ranks can insist on a serious discussion which should cover the depth of all questions from the point of view of the class struggle and their historical roots in the 1953 split and what preceded it.

The latter road leads in the direction which the International Committee has pioneered since 1963, the direction of the international proletarian revolution. The former road leads the movement into the arms of the American bourgeoisie. That is the logic of pragmatism of nationalism. The International Committee will assist this process of clariﬁcation every way it can, for much depends on it.

There is no longer room in the movement for us. The time this is upon us. Each political organization is tested daily, hourly. The tasks before us are tremendous, the potential tastic. We have entered the era of the European Revolution and the American revolution is fast at Europe’s heels.

What Trotsky fought so hard for under conditions which are vastly different is now coming into life, into the reality of the mass movement of workers in all lands. The workers and peasants will no longer stand by and watch while the stalinists make the next move.

Formula

With these precedents utilized to remove from consideration all questions of leadership, consciousness and even what class carries through the revolutionary overturn, we are left with a very simple distilled formula: a workers' state equals a country where the basic means of production have been expropriated by the state, some form of overall state planning exists and the state also maintains a monopoly over foreign trade.

Suddenly theoretical work becomes simplified. We have, by our disposal and we have a ready-made label with a simple, clear deﬁnition. The fact of Cuba ﬁts the deﬁnition and therefore Cuba is a workers' state.

It is the syllogism of formal logic in all its beauty. The law of identity: A = A. The deﬁnition matches the facts. It is all so simple and clear that Hansen cannot understand how anybody could possibly object to it.

What we actually have here is an empirical gathering of facts which are then matched to a metaphysical notion—the definition of a workers' state—abstracted out of the concrete development of history. Methodologically the SWP combines the worst features of empiricism with the worst features of metaphysics, which the empiricists sought to fight. To give pragmatism its credit, its one virtue was its war against superimposing on factual reality preconceived schematics—the old method of world revolution against an empirically developed political movement. And against the SWP we have a precedent, the formula that 'bruted instruments' can bring the workers to power under certain circumstances.
Farrell Dobbs (second from right) tours Cuba during period when the SWP unconditionally supported the Castro leadership and urged the same liquidationist policies it now opposes

his government—as illustrated by the two Escalante affairs—and maintains complete control in the hands of the petty-bourgeois nationalist forces who came to power with him. In Cuba, and only in Cuba, the nationalizations were not accompanied by the emergence of a government controlled by the Stalinists. Instead we have to this day, as we had in 1961, a pragmatic bloc between a petty-bourgeois national formation at home and the Soviet Union abroad.

Secondly what remains a mystery to the Pabloites now becomes crystal clear. Why is it that for ten years following the Cuban Revolution ‘no new workers’ state has been established’? It is clear that the extremely radical ‘statist’ direction of Cuba was only possible because of the support of the Soviet Union gave to Cuba. If the Kremlin bureaucracy decides not to give such support, then this kind of development under this kind of leadership is impossible. But the Stalinist bureaucracy in the Soviet Union is a counter-revolutionary force. Thus the ‘Cuban road to revolution’ is actually dependent on the goodwill of counter-revolutionaries.

As it thus so surprising that the Soviet Union today does not consider it in her interests to involve herself in any more highly expensive Cuban ‘experiment’? The Soviet Union leadership has also learned some lessons from Cuba. While undoubtedly it first viewed Cuba as just one more leftist-nationalist regime which could be bought off, perhaps to play a certain neutralist role, it has ended up having to assume a tremendous financial burden at a time when all its resources are stretched to the limit and now has a sore point which must be regulated for its strategy of working with the American imperialists.

The task of the socialist revolution in a backward country is to carry through the tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution by proletarian methods, going over to socialist measures. This requires first of all industrialization and the raising of the productivity of labour together with an international revolutionary strategy. While the deformed workers’ states have not as yet been able to raise the level of their economies to that of the advanced capitalist nations, and will not be able to do so as long as they remain under bureaucratic rule, it is a tribute to the class nature of those states that they have made definite economic development. Trotskyists have been progress as a tribute to the power of socialist property relations and not to any ability of the bureaucracy.

The central economic task in Cuba is to free that country from its dependence on the one export crop of sugar and developing a more balanced economy through an industrialization programs. Such economic plans require the political power of the working class in Cuba, oriented towards an international revolutionary struggle against imperialism. Castro has openly abandoned even an attempt at this, placing even greater emphasis on the sugar crop than did Batista. The result is that the living standards of the Cuban people, to the extent they are not subordinated by the Soviet Union, are completely dependent upon the world price of sugar. This also explains the independence of Cuba on world capitalism, a problem qualitatively different from those facing the deformed workers’ states, and illustrating once again that the petty-bourgeois nationalists, Stalinist or no, Soviet aid or no, are unable to carry forward the bourgeois democratic revolution. To call Cuba a workers’ state is to make a travesty of what we are fighting for—socialism itself.

Extreme crisis

When we understand Cuba in this scientific way, then we see Castro’s policies in his failures as a reflection of the class nature of his regime and his political stasis in the class nature of this state and regime.

Castro has followed a consistent line of opposition to the working class. He jailed Escalante as an agent of the Soviet Union, a worker who was instrumental and because he advocated material incentives for the working class—and because even in a Stalinist way a reflection of the working class. But he was more than happy to support the Soviet Union when it meant imposing its will on the workers of Czechoslovakia and when the Cuban example itself was to intimidate any oppositional elements in Cuba which could become active for working-class struggle against his regime. Recently he has been cracking down on the Black Panthers. Even such a tendency as the Panthers displays an independence of the Cuban regime and thus is dangerous to Castro.

He ignored May-June in France, ignored the Mexican student strike and even complimented the ‘progres- sive’ role of the Mexican students movement following its bloody repression of the students. He utilizes guerrilla war—his own pressure upon the revolutionary movements of Latin America which refuse to recognize him—supporting it against those opposing it again its friends. He was more than happy to block with the Stalinists at the Tri-Continental Congress against Trotsky- ism, only to suppress Stalinists within Cuba if he fears they in any way reflect the working class. Today Castro faces his most extreme crisis. His sugar policy has collapsed around him with the smallest produc- tion in a number of years. As a result he has raised taxation rates and is under the greatest pressure to ship almost all his sugar to meet con- tract terms with the Soviet domination. He is applying the greatest pressure on the Cuban working class, seeking to raise productivity without giving the workers anything in return—not to mention his use of unpaid labour during weekends and holidays for the sugar harvest. Revolution now means no longer Cuban working class to Castro. His inter- national policies are completely bankrup- t, especially following the Guevara adventure.

We cannot predict exactly what will happen next in Cuba, but the situation is becoming remarkably similar to that which preceded the fall of Ben Bella. Whether or not Castro will fall to the military or to other forces in his government, or make a deal on his own with the Americans, or limp on for a little longer, cannot be predicted.

But the Cuban ‘miracle’ is over. The fundamental economic forces of workers in Cuba remain. And Castro has no programme at all for the workers in Latin America or the world.

This task now falls to the Fourth International. We can carry out this task only with the complete and total liquidation of any remaining illusions about Castro, his real policies, the class nature of his regime and state.

It is the accumulation of these material, class contradictions in Cuba and on a worldwide scale that is the foundations of the so-called ‘reunifica- tion’. The only way to wipe out their haste to run behind Castro in 1961-1963 completed their rejection of the Marxist line. What is needed is the liquidation of even the semblance of independent programme and organiza- tion.

The Socialist Workers Party refused in 1961-1963 to face up to the liquidi- dationist changes that were taking place in the Pablisto group. Now they face the choice of either being completely destroyed by this pragmatic alliance, or making one last effort to ‘return to the road of Trotskyism’.

It is the Stalinist group which provides the fuel for the crisis which makes possible the opportunity for the best elements in the SWP and sections of the United States Trotskyists to come to a discussion which was rejected in 1963 and to grasp the significance of the flag- ships set out by the International Com- mittee.

Dear Comrades,

On the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the Trotskyist movement in the United States, the National Committee of the Socialist Workers Party sends its revolutionary socialist greetings to orthodox Trotskyists throughout the world.

Although the Socialist Workers Party, because of its constitutional laws passed by its Democratic Socialists, is no longer affiliated to the Fourth International—the World Trotskyist Revolutionary Party—founded by Leon Trotsky to carry on and fulfill the revolution betrayed by the Second International—the Social Democrats and the Third International—the Spartacists—we take interest in the welfare of the world-wide organization created under the guidance of our martyred leader.

As is well known, the pioneer American Trotskyist 25 years ago brought the programme of Trotsky, supported by the Kremlin, to the United States. The Democratic Socialists, is no longer affiliated to the Fourth International—the World Trotskyist Revolutionary Party—founded by Leon Trotsky to carry on and fulfill the revolution betrayed by the Second International—the Social Democrats and the Third International—the Spartacists—we take interest in the welfare of the world-wide organization created under the guidance of our martyred leader.

As is well known, the pioneer American Trotskyist 25 years ago brought the programme of Trotsky, supported by the Kremlin, to the United States.

The SWP was founded in 1933. The Transitional Programme, which remains the keynote of today’s programme of the world Trotskyist movement, was written by Trotsky in collaboration with the leaders
of the SWP and at his request was submitted by them for
consideration.

The intimacy and thoroughness of the collaboration between Trotsky and the leadership of the SWP can be seen from the fact that the commander-in-chief of orthodox Trotskyist principled in 1939-40 against the Petrograd Soviet, Leon Trotsky, and David Schachtman. That record has had a profound influence in the Trotskyist movement through the years.

In the murder of Trotsky by an agent of Stalin's secret police, the SWP took the lead in defending and advocating his teachings. We took the lead not from choice, but we had no choice. We had to expose, to denounce the capitalist and Stalinist forces that had forced the orthodox Trotskyists underground in many countries. From the beginning, the SWP, together with Trotskyists in Latin America, Canada, England, China, and ourselves, actively worked to show that we did what we could to uphold the banner of orthodox Trotskyism through the difficult war years.

When the war was over, we were gratified at the appearance in Europe of Trotskyists from the under-ground, which represented a decisive step toward the pro-

cession of the Fourth International. Since we were barred from political activity in the US by the Smith Act, we turned to non-political activities, we placed all the greater hope in the emergence of the Fourth International as the great tradition bequeathed to us by our movement world by world, we felt that the young, new leadership of the Fourth International was not to be tapped and prepared by capitalism, confidence and support. When self-corrections of serious errors were made on the initiative of the comrades themselves, we felt that our course was proving justified.

Therefore, we must now admit that the very freedom from the conditions which we foresaw set in the process which we had so prudently and intelligently supported. 

The Programme of Trotskyism
To show precisely what is involved, let us restate the programme of the world which the world Trotskyist movement is built upon:

1) The decline of the capitalist system threatens the world with periodic depressions, world wars and barbaric mechanisms like fascism and totalitarianism. This is, therefore, the gravest of all possible dangers, the gravest of which, the greater the world is to be.

2) The decay of the abyss can be avoided only by organizing a new society. This socialist society is the goal of the Fourth International.

3) This can be accomplished only under the leadership of the working class in society. But the working class alone is not sufficient, the world relationship of social forces was never any more favorable than this for the workers to take the road to power.

4) To organize itself for carrying out this world-historical task, the Fourth International must construct a revolutionary socialist party in the pattern described by Lenin, the party of the vanguard of a new socialist society on a world scale and thus redefine the sense of our leadership in the present era.

5) This main task of this is Stalinism, which attaches itself not to the vanguard but to the bureaucracy, is the October 1917 Revolution in Russia, only later, as it betrays the Russian Revolution, it separates itself from the armed forces of the Social Democracy, into quiescence, and into billions of illusions in capitalism.

6) The need for flexible tactics facing many sections of the working class, will thus be seen. The principles of our party, our IMF, must develop in sympathy to its programme, it makes all the more important. But the Fourth International is just what its own and all its petty-bourgeois agencies (such as nationalist forces) cannot be to themselves. They must form the vanguard to the proletariat to the Fourth International.

7) The principles established by Leon Trotsky retain full validity in the increasingly complex and unstable world presented to us today. In the revolutionary situations opening up on every hand as Trotsky has so ably shown, but rather in the determination of the course of practical action.

Pablo's Revisions

Trotsky's principles have been abandoned by Pablo. In place of them emerge the danger of a new barbarism; he sees the drive towards socialism as 'irreversible'; yet he is willing to use the present period of world depression or some generations to come. Instead, he has advanced the concept of 'spontaneous' or 'emergent' revolu-
tions, that give birth to nothing 'but deformed', that is, Stalinist workers' states which are locked for 'centuries'.

This reveals the utmost pessimism about the capa-
cities of the working class, which is only in keeping with the rigid orthodoxy of the struggle to build independent revolutionary socialist parties. In place of building the masses of workers and peasants, in a movement of building independent revolutionary socialist parties, he turns to a Stalinist movement and identifies his own as a mere agency to implement Stalinist policies.
The American Patriots

The world is now, in the words of a prominent figure, in the midst of a critical period against which we are not yet prepared. It is a period that, if not immediately dealt with, could lead to disastrous consequences for the future of the world. We must act now to ensure that our values and principles are upheld, and that the interests of the American people are protected.

For over a century, the American people have been fighting for freedom, liberty, and justice. We have stood up against darkness and evil, and we have triumphed. But now, there is a new danger lurking on the horizon. It is a danger that threatens the very foundation of our society, and it must be met with determination.

The crisis we face today is not just one of political or economic nature. It is a crisis of the spirit, a crisis of the soul. It is a crisis that requires us to redouble our efforts, to work together, and to stand firm in the face of adversity.

The stakes are high, and the consequences of failure are dire. But we are not alone. We have the support of the American people, and we have the strength to overcome this challenge. Let us work together, let us be strong, and let us protect our way of life.
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