

TRUTH

ORGAN of the TROTSKYIST ORGANIZATION of the USA • SECTION (SYMPATHIZING) of the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL • NO. 164. MAY 6, 1983. 25¢

An Independent Labor Candidate for US President . . .

The Realistic Road in '84

By MARGARET GUTTSALL

The recent UAW-General Motors Assembly Division (GMAD) council meeting in New Orleans voted unanimously to strike in support of fellow workers from the Fremont plant in California whom GM and Toyota plan to keep on permanent layoff and replace with non-union workers.

This is another message to the UAW convention that the ranks of the UAW want to fight the corporations, not make more concessions to them.

This fighting spirit will be fueled, not dampened, by the recall of other auto workers and the current upturn. A new wave of strikes for higher wages, better working conditions and union rights is inevitable.

As Trotskyists, we will fully support, participate in, and do everything we can to carry forward such struggles. But such actions by themselves will not be sufficient to win the workers' demands. *Auto workers must enter into the political struggle taking place in the 1984 presidential elections.* They must put forward an independent labor candidate for US president to unify the struggles of the working class, reinforce its independence and prepare it for the massive confrontations ahead. This is the struggle that must take place at the UAW convention.

Economic struggle

No doubt there will be tendencies at the UAW convention that will insist that the union concentrate on the economic and union struggle and leave politics to the politicians. Already the agenda seems to be taking shape with this perspective in mind: GMAD, overtime, allocation of funds, direct election of the president, etc. All speeches by prospective Democratic presidential candidates have been cancelled since Fraser says he does not want a "cattle show."

But this orientation is wrong on two counts. First, an economic, union struggle — strikes, pickets, demonstrations, etc. — is inevitable. Auto workers and others *will have to* renew this struggle simply to survive. But will these strikes remain isolated, as were PATCO, the railroad workers, and the recent Caterpillar strike, and thus prey to attacks initiated by the bosses from unemployed and demoralized workers acting as scabs? Or will these strikes enter into and further generate a general movement against this anti-working class regime and thus have the possibility of making real gains for the workers?

With an independent labor candidate for president who puts forward a working class solution to the problems of unemployment, repression and war, the UAW can initiate just such a movement and insure that its struggles will not stand alone.

Second, the notion that the convention should concentrate on economic and union questions and leave politics to the politicians, *presupposes* that the union can carry out an economic struggle without running into conflict with the capitalists' state. Or that, if it does, the state will be forced to adapt itself to the workers, and thus need not be destroyed and replaced. But the workers' experiences — the suppression of the miners' strike under Carter and the PATCO and railroad workers' strikes under Reagan — prove the contrary. In the current situation, when the capitalists find themselves in crisis, incapable of maintaining production, much less developing it, even an economic struggle is a threat to their power and thus they meet it with violent repression. Workers must be prepared to do away with and replace this regime. An independent labor candidate is a means to begin to prepare this eventuality.

Wait and See

Other tendencies at the UAW convention will certainly agree that the working class must do everything in its power to insure a government that is favorable to it, but that it is too early to select a candidate.

In reality, this already is a position on what sort of candidate workers should endorse. Such tendencies say workers should play a passive role; wait and see what the various Democratic and Republican candidates are like. Obviously at that point it will be too late for the union to advance its *own* candidate and, on that basis, these same tendencies will press the union to select a "lesser evil" Democrat.

This is what Fraser is opting for. He does not want any Democrats at the convention because he is afraid that they will be *openly rejected* and that the question of an independent union candidate will then be posed. So he prefers to wait and hope that he will be able to *corner* the union into endorsing a Democrat.

Realism

Still other tendencies at the UAW convention, especially those that claim to be socialist or revolutionary, like the Communist Party or the Socialist Workers Party, will agree that an independent labor candidate is desirable, but not very realistic. It won't get enough support in the working class, the union bureaucracy is too strong and will prevent any such candidacy, they will say. And on this basis these tendencies will argue that workers should opt for running black or labor reform candidates *within* the Democratic Party (CP) or a "socialist candidate" that advocates the superiority of socialism (SWP).

But realism in this situation is entirely on our side, not on theirs.

The Harold Washington campaign in the recent Chicago elections shows that there is no basis for black or labor reform candidates within the Democratic Party. First, tendencies in and around the NAACP and the CP are advo-

The upturn that the Reagan regime has promised would solve all our problems is now upon us. And, lo and behold, it has had little effect upon the greatest problem that the working class faces: unemployment.

Even the most optimistic predict that in the next few years unemployment will not be less than 7% — that is 7 million workers and their families without jobs.

Reagan's most recent jobs bill consists of a limited extension of unemployment benefits and tax write-offs for bosses who hire young people. Now the Democrats are clamoring for public works projects and recalling the good old days with Roosevelt. For a party that has voted to lay off thousands of current public employees, the call for public works is sheer election-year hypocrisy.

In this situation, many tendencies in the working class have begun to focus on acquiring relief for unemployed workers and their families — food, shelter, health care, extended relief, moratoriums on utility shutoffs, mortgage foreclosures, etc.

We are fully in favor of any form of relief for unemployed workers. But the most important form of relief the unemployed worker needs *is a job*. The working class cannot postpone a confrontation with the bosses over this question. The longer it waits, the more difficult it will become, for the forces of the working class itself will be weakened — the workers' health, strength, families, resources.

Workers must take advantage of the current upturn to wage an all-out offensive for 30 for 40

ating this tactic as a means of *pressuring* mainstream Democrats. They are not even talking about winning the nomination. So this "new form" of independent political action will quickly give way to the *old form* of endorsing whomever the Democrats come up with. Second, even if one of these candidate should win the nomination (which is especially unlikely since reformists and Stalinists are talking about running a "black candidate" and a "labor candidate" in the Democratic primaries), it is unlikely that he would win the election because he will have no program for solving the workers' problems. Washington *barely* won in Chicago, a strongly working class city in which Republicans have not received more than 25% of the vote for nearly a century. And, third, even if this candidate did win the general election, he would not improve the situation of workers — black or white — one bit, because he would be bound by the pro-capitalist program and composition of the Democratic Party. Washington's opponents and supporters in Chicago are: only weeks after the election, saying he is going to have a hard time carrying out the few election promises he did make. The CP complains in a recent *Daily World* statement: "The war-hawks and reactionaries still control the governor's mansion"; "this reality complicates the mandate won by the new mayor"; "the new administration of Harold

Washington has inherited a city caught in the grip of the most serious economic crisis." Thus they are already making excuses for and preparing to defend Washington against the disappointed workers who elected him.

No. Running black or labor candidates in the Democratic primary will do nothing to improve the workers' situation. Only the independent mobilization and organization of the working class, *the constitution of the working class as an independent political force* can do that. Indeed, such a policy will exacerbate the problems of the working class because it will mean

that the working class will be identified with powerless regimes that have no solutions to problems (like Washington's). Petty bourgeois elements ruined by the economic crisis will begin to think that it is the working class, not the capitalist class, that is the problem and begin to attack it. The potential for such a negative development is already clear in Chicago where, *because Washington had no program to deal with the problems* of unemployment, ruination of small businesses, etc., capitalists were able to mobilize white petty bourgeois, lumpen, and even disoriented workers against him.

Nor is there any basis for a socialist candidate that simply advocates the superiority of socialism. *The fight for socialism begins with a break with the bourgeoisie.* In such a struggle it will be possible to forge socialist cadre, but to demand that American workers agree with socialism before beginning to try to constitute themselves as a political force independent of the bourgeoisie, to demand that they "vote socialist" *as a precondition for voting against the bourgeoisie*, is to leave them completely in the hands of the bourgeois liberals, economists, reformists, etc. Such a campaign will in fact worsen the situation of the working class because it will give the impression that socialists, *who are the only ones who have any immediate, real solutions*, are just like all the rest.

The fight for an independent labor candidate for US president is the only realistic road for the UAW as a whole — for all the auto workers within it who want to rout the corporations and for the revolutionaries for whom this will be a first step in a longer road that will end with the workers' conquest of power and the total transformation of the society into one in which the worker will be truly free.

On the UAW Convention Agenda —

An Independent Labor Candidate for US President!

30 for 40 Now!

now! — 30 hours work for 40 hours pay; cut the work week without cutting pay until full employment is reached.

This means an end to forced overtime while other workers remain laid off; a recall of all laid off workers; training programs for new hires necessary to do the work. With 30 hours work for 40 hours pay at least 25% or 25 million more workers will be employed. Unemployment will be virtually eliminated. This slogan must be inscribed on the banner of workers in every factory, office and union in the country. It must be a central demand in all contract conflicts, strikes, demonstrations, etc. Committees must be formed in the factories, neighborhoods, and schools to make this happen.

The bosses will complain that 30 for 40 will cut into their profits or that they are incapable of providing it. Some will concede, some will not. In any case the workers will be strengthened and will be in a better position to take over industry and run it for their own benefit on a local, regional and national level at the appropriate time.

Opportunists in the working class will claim that 30 for 40 is impossible because the bosses will not permit it. But this is a question of a relationship of forces. Now it is necessary to begin the fight.

30 for 40 now!

M.G.



Economic Crisis and the Workers

(Part II)

By KEVIN FITZPATRICK

The speculative character of this recovery is already indicated by the course of the stockmarket, with its astronomical rise to over 1200 on the Dow-Jones industrials index.

Nature of Recovery

At the same time, the basis on which this recovery is finally emerging — as well as what will sabotage it — can be seen in the unprecedented *decline* (of 1.4%) in first-year wage scales negotiated by union workers in the first quarter of 1983. This is a direct culmination of the policy of "concessions," in particular, of the sell-out of the steel workers.

After almost four years of this attack, supplemented by Reagan's cuts in social spending, the capitalists have succeeded in raising the rate of exploitation enough to increase their profit margins.

Thus, there is not so far any real growth, but only a shift in the distribution of wealth. The fight against concessions and Reagan's attacks, even on a battleground that favored — with unemployment, especially — the capitalists, has already limited our losses and restricted the capitalist recovery.

This recovery, which is already bringing a number of workers back to the plants, is preparing the conditions for new advances and struggles. One worker going back to GM's Oklahoma City plant announced that he was returning "with a chip on my shoulder." With even a small margin of security, confidence will reinforce anger, and the drive of the workers for wage increases will *collide* with the continued drive of the bosses for wage reductions.

This last point is important to understand. In order to head off discontent, the union bureaucrats and capitalists are trying to minimize the impact of past concessions — like telling a child: "See, that didn't hurt so much." But, in fact, because so far there has been no real increase in the overall wealth created, the capitalists are going to have to continue to demand more concessions.

Here, too, we see the usefulness of

Trotsky's report for our understanding today: "The more restricted becomes the material foundation under their feet, the more fiercely must classes and groups fight for their share of this national income."

Trotsky points out not only that recovery in no way guarantees a calming of the class struggle (in fact, on a background of overall decline, it only fuels it), but — even more — that it is not at all a simple pattern. In this period, neither recovery nor new "recession" spell retreat. **"Neither impoverishment or prosperity as such can lead to revolution. But the alternation of prosperity and impoverishment, the crises, the uncertainty, the absence of stability — these are the motor factors of revolution."**

This is *today* a graphic description of the situation we face.

International Picture

Up to now, we have been examining the situation as it exists in the borders of the United States. But American capitalism is the most important *imperialism* in the world, and the situation inside the United States in fact forms part of this overall situation — although, to be sure, the decisive part.

What is the international picture confronting American imperialism? Even if we leave aside the political question of the rising tide of revolution, even if we look strictly at the *economic* aspect of this situation, we see only an intensification of the economic crisis of imperialism.

Between the imperialist powers themselves we see growing tension, an increasing dispute over the overall wealth available to them, which, like the various national incomes, does not increase if it does not actually decline. This leads to the growing prospect of trade war and its "political" expression, military conflict. This is expressed in two evident ways.

First, by the failure of the GATT (General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs) talks late last year to reach agreement on any of the disputed issues — and this meeting was conducted on the ministerial level for only the third time in GATT's

history! One economic report sums it up mildly: "The lack of appreciable progress on the specific issues addressed during the conference underscores the precarious state of world trade."

Second, statistically, by the fact that GATT itself reports that world trade fell by 2% in 1982, following a year of stagnation in 1981 and only a slight increase in 1980. To return to our comparison with past periods: in 1963-73 the annual average rate of increase was 8.5% and in 1973-79 it was 4.25%. Here again, a clear break with past patterns of boom. And in dollar value, world trade declined by 6% in 1982 to the lowest level since 1979. In conjunction with this, let us recall the now chronic deficit in the US balance of payments and balance of trade.

Even more drastic than this general situation is the question of the debt owed to imperialist banks, especially American banks, by the semi-colonial countries (as well as by countries in Eastern Europe). This situation has now reached the critical point.

Mexico, for example, owes over *eighty billion dollars* to foreign banks, including over *thirty billion* to US banks, in 1982. This compares to a total of "only" 40 billion as recently as 1980. Some other countries' figures are: Brazil — 84 billion (over 22 billion to the US), Argentina — 38.5 billion (over 10 billion to the US). As of June of last year, over 95 billion dollars was owed to US banks alone by just the countries in Latin America and the Caribbean.

These countries have no prospect of paying these debts. In fact, the economic crisis means they must fall farther behind. One sharp example of this crisis is expressed in the fact that many — Mexico, Venezuela — are dependent on oil income, whose falling price is pointed to by US imperialism as a major factor in the recovery in the US.

Class Conflicts

This growing debt, which threatens to pull down the financial empires in the West, leads not only to financial restrictions in the imperialist countries — that is

why the interest rates have not declined at all in proportion to the lowering of inflation, and this in turn restricts growth — but also means an incredible sharpening of tensions on the international scale.

Since the banks cannot write off these loans, they have to "reschedule" them, have to make additional loans to prevent economic collapse. At the same time that this feeds inflation worldwide, it also means — to avoid "throwing good money after bad" — that the banks have to demand even harsher guarantees for repayment. Brazil is the latest country to have to accept "austerity" terms from the International Monetary Fund, leading to open wage cuts, a 23% currency devaluation, etc. Thus, a few weeks ago, we saw riots in Sao Paulo.

Riots are only the first sign. It was similar demands by finance capital on the Polish Stalinist regime, which owed a paltry 28 billion, that led to the outbreak of the Polish Revolution.

The banks' crisis not only reacts on the US economy, it spells disaster for it. And this means even more that this recovery will, quite rapidly, turn into an all-out attack on the living standards of the workers. The international crisis of US imperialism means an incredible intensification of the crisis, and of class conflict, in the US.

Thus, we see a period ahead that does not require a mechanical understanding that recovery means peace, or that "recession" means retreat.

The economic crisis and its development impels the working class into struggle to defend its gains and, in a real sense, almost its very existence.

Trotsky closed his report with these words: "Let me repeat, the world situation and the future perspectives remain profoundly revolutionary. This creates the necessary premises for our victory. But full guarantees can be given only by our expert tactics, by our strong organization."

This conclusion is fully valid today. More than anything else, the solution to the economic crisis is the building of the party of the revolution.

Barnes and Healy vs. Trotskyism

One thing that came through clearly in the infamous "Gelfand case" (see *Truth* #161 for our position) was the sinister role played by the Workers Revolutionary Party (WRP) of Britain and the Workers League, its US representative — a role of collaboration with and aid to government provocation against a working class organization.

Barnes

In a statement published in both *The Militant* and *Intercontinental Press*, the Barnes leadership of the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) states that once the WRP "was a Marxist organization." It then asks the obvious question: "How did it degenerate into its present state?" A valid question, but Barnes' answer is false not only in its factual basis, but even more in the conclusions that he draws.

Barnes' logic is simple: 1) it all starts with Cuba — "Since the Cuban revolutionary leadership was not Trotskyist, the Healyites (Gerry Healy is the central leader of the WRP — K.F.) concluded that no revolution had taken place"; 2) the Healyites developed this error widely, leading them "further and further from Marxism"; 3) the Healyites "covered up" this course by attacking the SWP, and gave it "a new twist in the mid-1970s" by charging the SWP with being controlled by government agents, the latest example being "Gelfand"; 4) since the question of Cuba is once again central to world events, all groups that disagreed with the SWP are

trying "to get out of the line of fire," leading them to increase their attacks on the SWP; 6) "As a consequence, the Healyites have tailored their case against the SWP to echo such charges coming from these quarters."

What a neat package! But, like a Chinese puzzle, once you open it, all you find is box within box — leading ultimately to nothing.

Now first of all, the discussion in 1960-61 on Cuba was hardly over the absurd question of whether or not a revolution had taken place! It was not even over the class nature of the state that emerged from this revolution. (The majority of the International Committee did have an *incorrect position* on this second point — Cuba is indisputably a country of the socialist conquests dominated by the Stalinist bureaucracy, headed by Fidel Castro in this case; that is, it is a *deformed workers state*.)

No, the real issue was *Trotskyism or Castroism*. The SWP attributed all the gains of the Cuban Revolution to this leadership, said that there was no need for the workers to exercise political power (Honest Fidel would take care of that), and put forward the "Cuban Road" as the model for revolution. In practice, this meant tossing Trotskyism out the window, including refusing to build a Trotskyist party in Cuba.

Barnes has to avoid this reality because he has himself pronounced the final verdict on this dispute. His leadership —

drawing the conclusions of its policy over the last twenty years — has officially renounced and abjured its claim to Trotskyism.

On this *fundamental* question, the struggle of the International Committee has been completely borne out!

Healy

On the basis of this struggle for Trotskyism, the International Committee by the early 1970s was on the verge of being able to rebuild the Fourth International. The struggle for sections in Eastern Europe and, above all, the fight for the Revolutionary Youth International posed this directly. At this juncture, all the accumulated weaknesses of the Socialist Labour League (the old name of the WRP) led it to retreat from this decisive task and to *break with the International Committee*.

It is this retreat from Trotskyism that has led the WRP onto its present course. The content of its slander is very particular: the Fourth International as a whole was never anything but a nest of spies, riddled from top to bottom with "cops" and "agents." This position, which parallels the line of the Kremlin (and imperialism), *complements* the position of Barnes — Trotskyism is a bitter joke.

The Fourth International has for a long time stated that slander is not some kind of continuation of bad politics — sort of an unfortunate excess — but a break with working class methods, period. The WRP does not have abstractly some false politic-

al positions; no, it is now a grouping whose whole purpose is to attack working class organizations. We ourselves have been attacked by the WL as a "violent group," "agents," etc. The question of the WL-WRP today is hardly to discuss its position on Cuba, but to expose it and drive it out of the workers movement.

Barnes, however, does not have a very distinguished record on this score. As we have seen, his statement itself tries to create an amalgam between the WRP and all groups opposed to the SWP's anti-Trotskyist course. Further, when the French OCI (which had in its turn broken with the IC) turned to slander in its fight against Michel Varga and those who continued the IC's fight, the SWP worked with the OCI, as well as its prosecuting attorney, "Spartacist," in attempting to legitimize these lies. Indeed, several figures in the SWP (like John Hawkins) spread the slanders, while the leadership — having to face the fact that they were false — put forward the shameful "verdict" of "not proved," but never made any of this public.

Barnes cannot be allowed to turn the defense of the SWP from Healyite slanders and provocation into a "political" justification of slander and an attack on the Trotskyists of the International Committee. We will never permit that.

K.F.

1963

By DAVID HEFFELFINGER

Nothing is more important or more decisive for the preparation of the American revolution today than the construction of the Trotskyist party. Central to this objective is the balance sheet of the years of crisis of the Fourth International and the struggle to rebuild it. This balance sheet demands an examination of the past political struggles that shaped the present situation in which numerous tendencies claim to represent Trotskyism and the banner of the Fourth International. The balance sheet of these struggles represents the accumulated lessons of the struggle of the proletariat over the course of more than a hundred years of Marxism and Bolshevism and thus is an indispensable guide to the future.

At the present moment many Trotskyists would agree that the party that once represented the Fourth International in the United States, the Socialist Workers Party, has been set on a course that heads toward the complete liquidation of the last remnants of the traditions and program of Trotskyism by the Barnes leadership of the SWP.

Nevertheless, there remain still two conceptions, two separate roads for the construction of the Trotskyist party in America, as there have been from the beginning of the struggle to overcome the crisis of the Fourth International. One is getting together all those who claim to be Trotskyists. The other is rebuilding the Fourth International through a delineation of Trotskyism from centrism. The first road, on which the SWP has gone the furthest, necessitated at each stage that a portion of the past be buried.

Having taken the second road to fight for a Trotskyist Congress rebuilding the US section of the Fourth International, the Trotskyist Organization of the USA dedicates this series to the clarification of the pivotal political struggles in '53, '63, and '72 that led to the foundation of the TO in 1975 and the rebuilding of the Fourth International in 1976.

Let us be clear, once again, on the fundamental meaning of the split with Pablo and Mandel in 1953, a split which necessitated the formation of the International Committee of the Fourth International, in order to prevent the political and physical annihilation of Trotskyism.

The "Letter to Trotskyists Throughout the World," states:

This faction centered around Pablo, is now working consciously and deliberately to disrupt, split, and break up the historically-created cadres of Trotskyism in the various countries and to liquidate the Fourth International.

To sum up: The lines of cleavage between Pablo's revisionism and orthodox Trotskyism are so deep that no compromise is possible either politically or organizationally.

How then could Cannon write in 1957, only four years later, that "a sweeping organizational compromise, which would permit the formal unification of the international movement before the dispute is settled," was needed?

What began in 1957 as a search for the possibility of an "organizational compromise," would become on the part of the SWP in 1963, a complete political prostration before Pabloism — the formation of the United Secretariat. *The present course of the SWP was set by its political capitulation to Pabloism in 1963.*

Aside from the position of the SWP itself, which had to rewrite the entire history of the 1953 split with Pabloism in order to justify its capitulation, there are two other positions of importance.

One is that of Healy who developed the theory that the roots of the SWP's betrayal lay in its failure to appreciate dialectical

materialism and Marxist methodology.

The second is that of Nahuel Moreno, who split with the United Secretariat in 1980, saying that the present liquidationist course of the SWP began in 1973 with the consolidation of the Barnes leadership of the SWP. It is a view that is shared, at least implicitly, by some of the oppositions in the SWP.

But in fact both of these positions represent a distortion of the struggle against Pabloite revisionism, introduced as an element of one or another stage in the crisis of the Fourth International. Healy's, as a basis for his abandonment of the rebuilding of the Fourth International in 1971, and Moreno's, as a product of rejoining the Pabloite revisionists with the SWP in 1963.

Reunification

In 1968, with the French General Strike and the Prague Spring in Czechoslovakia, a pre-revolutionary period on a world scale was opened up. Fifteen years separated the split with the revisionists in 1953 and a complete turn of the international situation. It was a period that prepared the International Committee to meet the great events of '68. The theoretical and practical struggle of the IC against Pabloism was the vehicle of this preparation, concentrated in the fight against the unprincipled reunification of the SWP and the International Secretariat.

The Hungarian Revolution of '56, an armed uprising against the Stalinist bureaucracy, and Khrushchev's speech to the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, underscored both the nature of the crisis of the Stalinist bureaucracy, and the burning necessity of the construction of the party of political revolution. Khrushchev's speech was the signal for "peaceful co-existence" with imperialism, meaning the brutal suppression of the revolution in Eastern Europe and collaboration with imperialism in the betrayal of the revolutions in Southeast Asia, the Middle East and Latin America.

Pabloism took the former, the "crisis," and threw out the essential part — the party and the proletariat. The crisis would automatically lead, under the pressure of the masses, to the evolution of workers democracy and a convergence of sectors of the bureaucracy with the revolution.

Thus, even while the Stalinists were intervening with tanks in Hungary, the Pabloites could shamelessly say: "... this new situation restricts more and more the capacity of counterrevolutionary measures of the bureaucracy."(!)

Blind revisionism of the Pablo school also saw the Chinese and Cuban revolutions as confirmation of a new epi-center of the world revolution. They proved, so the revisionists said, that socialism would develop in the advanced imperialist nations only after the socialist transformation of the Third World. This was their deformed version of the permanent revolution.

Early on, one of the central weaknesses of the IC, its character as a federation of national sections, was to reveal itself. The SWP in 1957 opened up negotiations for unity — through the intermediary of the Ceylonese (Pabloite) section — with the International Secretariat of Pablo, without any prior consultation with its IC comrades. Though the SWP pulled back when it was rebuked by the IC, it would soon become clear that there were two different conceptions of Pabloism already existing in the International Committee.

By 1961, the differences were growing very deep. Whereas the French and British sections had come to the conclusion that, "it is time to draw to a close the period in which Pabloite revisionism was regarded as a trend within Trotskyism," the SWP responded, "... the main obstacles to



unification come from (1) our conflicting conceptions of the internal life of the world movement and (2) the purpose and practice of entrism."

The SWP saw the new modifications of Pabloite revisionism on China, Cuba and Stalinism as a convergence of the positions of the IC and the IS. But, in reality, it was a convergence of the SWP toward Pabloism.

The Resolution of the SWP National Convention of that same year clearly marks the depth of the political retreat. Here we find as sub-heads, "The Struggle Between the Socialist and Capitalist Camps," and "Three Sectors of the World." Under the sub-heading "Main Determinants," we read: "The current world situation is determined by four major factors: the decline of the imperialist camp; the growing strength of the Soviet bloc; the irresistible spread of the colonial revolution; and ... the relative immobility of the labor movement in the centers of imperialism."

Not one word about the party or the proletariat, because to the SWP, they were no longer the "main determinants." Every tenet of Trotskyism was turned on its head.

No longer is the Permanent Revolution based on the taking of power by the proletariat, rather the reverse — the "backward" proletariat will be the rearguard of the petty bourgeois nationalists.

The SWP would use the question of the class nature of the Cuban state to hide the real issue in dispute with the IC. They would try to mask their political capitulation to the liquidators of the party by citing the incorrect position of the British section of the IC, which denied that Cuba was a workers state, as evidence of a betrayal of the Trotskyist understanding of Stalinism.

But the betrayal was from the SWP. The Resolution of the Reunification Congress in 1963 says that, "... Cuba became the first example in our epoch of a revolution in which the leadership through its own experiences in the very course of struggle came over to the concepts of Marxism-Leninism."

How nice. So who needs the Fourth International anyway? The question was not the class character of the Cuban state, but rather the class character of the party!

And as far as Cuba itself went, the entirety of the IC did not share the British section's position — but this fact, and the documents, were suppressed by the SWP. Furthermore, while the SWP was singing the glories of Castroism, Trotskyists were rotting in Castro's prisons.

Finally, as the logic of capitulation always demands, there must come a moment when the quantity of "bad positions," takes a qualitative turn. That moment must always find an expression in the leading cadres of the party, those who, in a Bolshevik party, are the most responsible for its course. Perhaps there were many such moments in 1963, but there is certainly one that stands out.

In a letter dated October 31, 1962, James P. Cannon, a personal collaborator of Leon Trotsky, central leader of the Socialist Workers Party, and the American Left Opposition from the beginning, wrote to Farrell Dobbs.

Cannon praises Khrushchev's role in

the Cuban missile crisis, for "saving the world from war and the Cuban Revolution from attack ... What else could he have done under the given circumstances?" Cannon asked.

What else was there for Cannon to do, we might reply. It was a pathetic capitulation.

The reunification was thus a complete abandonment of all the past traditions of the SWP. In every essential component it represented the present liquidationist course of Barnes and the very definition of centrism.

The acquisitions of the SWP in the construction of a proletarian party would become buried in the acceptance of a theory of "new radicalization" that counterposed the youth and its movement in the sixties to the proletariat — no longer the basis of the revolution because of its endemic backwardness.

An immediate fruit of the '63 betrayal was the liquidation of the Ceylonese section of the Fourth International which joined the capitalist government of Bandaranaike in 1964.

Which Road

At each stage in its development the crisis of the Fourth International has been a part of the historical crisis of leadership of the world proletariat. At every point the struggle against Pabloism was an attempt to prepare the Trotskyist cadres to assume the responsibility for resolving that crisis in the living struggle. The essence of Pabloism was and is today a denial of the central role of the proletariat, and the relegation of the historical vehicle of revolutionary consciousness — its party, assimilating the lessons of more than a century of Marxism — to the scrap heap. Impressionism, adaptation to the apparatuses, and glorification of the status quo, are the only course left to those who so carelessly cut their links to the traditions and history of the Fourth International.

If we insist on the necessity of a true balance sheet of the past struggles to maintain the Fourth International against centrism, it is only because this balance sheet is the accumulated revolutionary capital indispensable to the further development of the Fourth International.

Thus the balance sheet of Healy, developed after the fact, as we shall see, to justify his abandonment of the rebuilding of the Fourth International, substituted first an abstraction, "dialectical materialism," and later a "weapon in the hands of the enemy," cop slander, for the rich lessons of the IC in the period 1953-63.

In the same fashion, the balance sheet of Moreno represents an acceptance of the failures to overcome the crisis of the Fourth International rather than the acquisitions of the fight to rebuild it. If indeed the degeneration of the SWP began in 1973, then it is a question not of rejecting the essential features of centrism, and deepening the struggle against it in the course of rebuilding the American section of the Fourth International, but rather of rejecting only the most blatant formulations of Barnes and effecting a regroupment on the same political underpinnings of 1963. In other words, another "reunification" recapitulating all the failures of the past — guerrillaism, entrism, the theory of blocs, etc.

Thus in the period 1953-63, already two roads had been opened up for Trotskyism to travel. The road of reunification which has brought the SWP on its present course, to the abandonment of Trotskyism. And the road to the rebuilding that passed through a struggle against centrism and the renewal of the Trotskyist cadres among the new generation of the proletariat. All of the permanent acquisitions lie on the second road.

Central America: All Out June 18!

After months of passive support to Reagan's attack on Central America, Tom Turner, head of the Detroit Metropolitan AFL-CIO, has finally been forced to call a march and rally against Reagan's attack.

The fact that a leading member of the AFL-CIO an organization that has openly collaborated with a series of US administrations in Central America, has been forced to call this action — scheduled on Saturday, June 18, 12 noon, at Grand Circus Park in downtown Detroit — is a sign of the tremendous opposition of the American working class to Reagan's policies.

The AFL-CIO, the NAACP, the Communist Party and other forces involved in building this march and rally will certainly try to turn it into a platform for the Democratic Party and its program of negotiations between US imperialism, its fascist henchmen and the rebels. Revolutionaries, youth and class conscious workers must do everything in their power to turn this action into a massive demonstration to drive the US out of Central America and build support for all the practical measures necessary to make this happen — boycott US supplies to the dictators, expedite supplies to the rebels, etc.

Democratic Party politicians and opportu-

nists in the working class will claim that the most important thing to do is to stop the fighting in El Salvador, bring an end to the bloodshed, and thus bring about immediate negotiations between the parties to the conflict as a means to this end.

But this completely avoids the issue of who is responsible for the fighting, the bloodshed, and thus how it can be terminated.

The fact is it is the United States. The United States has ruled Central America for decades. The native ruling classes of Central America were educated in American schools, work for American corporations, take vacations in the US and were trained by the US in US military methods. Through them US imperialists have exploited the human and natural resources of these countries, reaped tremendous wealth and left these countries barren and dry, just as they have exploited US workers in cities like Detroit and are now attempting to leave them to rot and move on to better things.

Republicans and Democrats like to complain about the "human rights abuses" of their allies in Central America. But who trained these people? They also like to complain at the same time that Salvadoran army officers are only waging a "nine to five" war against the rebels and refuse

to utilize "counterinsurgency tactics." But what does this mean but the Salvadoran military is not sufficiently aggressive, brutal and ruthless in suppressing the peoples' uprising. And what are counterinsurgency tactics, for which the US is famous, except widespread terrorization of the civilian population, i.e., human rights abuses on a heretofore unknown scale.

In other words, in street parlance, *the US is the pusher*. The Salvadoran militarists are just the junkies. And the US is not trying to cure their habit. It is trying to spur them on to even more barbarous acts in order to line its pockets.

Thus the only way to bring peace to the peoples of Central America is to drive the US out!

This is what both Reagan and the Democratic Party representative tried to hide in their recent speeches to Congress. Reagan said Cuba and the Soviets are responsible. Christopher Dodd, former member of the imperialist Peace Corps, said "economic and social conditions" are responsible. Each is trying to deflect attention from the real enemy — US imperialism.

Centrists will agree that it is necessary to drive the US out of Central America, but they will say that demonstrations to "stop the fight-

ing," "end the bloodshed," for peace, negotiations, etc., are a step on that road, that to attack this policy is sectarian or even counterrevolutionary.

It is their policy that is sectarian and works against the revolution, however, for the working class is the only class that can drive the US out of Central America, with its own force and own methods. Mobilizing it around the Democratic Party's program to "stop the fighting," for negotiations, will only pacify it and foster illusions that some force other than the workers can drive the US out.

In order to make the June 18 demonstration into a real demonstration to drive the US out of Central America, in opposition to the Republicans and the Democrats, it is first necessary to insure that this demonstration will be a working class demonstration. All out June 18 must be our cry. Revolutionaries must fight for every union local to mobilize itself *en masse* for this demonstration. Every organization that claims to be revolutionary has a responsibility to work together to insure that this happens. A large working class turnout will create conditions most favorable to revolutionaries who want to make this a demonstration against US imperialism and all its parties.

May Day and the Polish Workers

At this writing, May Day has not yet come. Yet we can say that no matter what specific events take place in Poland, this day will mark a great advance in the struggle of the Polish workers and of the international working class.

These May Day demonstrations are being called by the leadership of Solidarnosc ("Solidarity") as a conscious affirmation of the *working class* character of the Polish movement. May Day is international workers day, the holiday and commemoration of the workers of the world and their struggle. The aim of the Polish workers is to recapture the full significance of this day — by wresting it from the control of Stalinism, the usurper of the socialist conquests, the abuser of the workers' traditions.

Last year, May Day was the first open sign that the "spring" of the Polish workers had indeed come. Masses of workers and youth surged through the streets, shouting: "Our holiday, our holiday!"

This year, that concept is already the motivation for the calls to action.

This advance, together with other

events we want to take up, speaks against both capitalist and Stalinist slanders of the Polish Revolution.

The first great lie — what we might justly call the *Big Lie* — is that the Polish Revolution is dead. Over and over again we have attacked this capitalist and Stalinist lie; every time, when the latest upsurge of the workers falls short of the revolutionary goal, these forces once again bury the struggle of the Polish workers. *Time to call a halt!* The Polish Revolution advances painfully because it lacks a revolutionary leadership. But it none the less advances. The May Day actions are only the latest proof of this.

Connected with this is the fact that the very cautious (too cautious) Lech Walesa has openly declared his meeting with the underground leadership (TKK) of Solidarnosc, as well as his general agreement with their call for May Day.

Likewise, the harassment of Walesa, his wife and associates, as well as a new wave of arrests, only demonstrates the insecurity of the regime.

The second slander is that Solidarnosc is

reactionary. The way in which the call for May Day actions has been put forward is a key refutation of that lie. But it is far from the only one.

One aspect of this slander is that Solidarnosc is controlled by the Catholic Church. The latest contradiction to this is the opposition to the May Day actions by Cardinal Glemp, a *continuation* of the opposition by the Polish hierarchy to the revolution, a *continuation* of its collaboration with the regime.

Another aspect is the charge — and this is among the vilest — that Solidarnosc is anti-Semitic. The Polish Stalinists have no shame. But the activity undertaken by Solidarnosc in regard to the fortieth anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Rebellion has helped to give the lie to this.

In opposition not only to the regime's attempts to take advantage of the memorial for its own benefit, but also in opposition to the slanders of anti-Semitism, the demonstrations by Solidarnosc took up the Ghetto Rebellion as part of the struggle of the Polish working class. Marek Edelman, one of the last survivors of the leadership of the Rebellion still living in Poland, turned out to be a firm supporter of Solidarnosc and was physically prevented by the regime from participation in the workers' commemoration of this event (as was, by the way, Lech Walesa).

All these facts show us not only that the Polish workers' struggle is — once again — on the offensive, but that there has even been a deepening of the political understanding necessary for victory.

The repressive measures of the regime — not only the arrests and harassment of militants, but also the patrolling of the streets with machine guns — shows that it is well aware that Solidarnosc is far from finished, is well aware that instead it represents the deepest aspirations of the Polish proletariat.

K.F.

Workers for Labor Party

We talked to workers outside the UAW Local 7 hall in Detroit during the UAW delegate elections. Almost everyone we talked to was for a labor party and an independent labor candidate for US president. Several were familiar with Fox Davis's campaign for a labor party in the elections. Here are some of the things they had to say.

- Give the workers a chance to have some say so about it. We have had no say so. We want some say so now. We want somebody who is going to represent us. We're going to tell the convention what we want. We're going to tell the man we want this party to speak for us. We want a man in there to say give the people what they want. Chrysler is making money. We know it. Every man who works out here knows it.

- I think it would be better if the convention would come out for a labor party. I think a labor party would be better because we done tried the Democrats. I don't see nothing wrong with trying the labor party now. A labor party to me would be like one big force joined in to protest the closing of the plants, the laying off of people. When they are laid off, you know they lose everything. That's what a labor party means to me. Everybody joins in and communicates on one subject. Instead of being like it is now where everybody has got their own opinion

about who's the best for this and who's the best for that. A labor party means everybody does.

- A labor party means the working people, whatever they want to do. The Democrats aren't out for the working man. They're out for the big money.

- We want the convention to do something about shorter hours, get some laid off people back to work. I want this overtime cut out. Stop the speed up. I'd like to see a six hour day. I think a labor party would make a difference, but they're not going to do it. Naturally they're not going to do it because this is a two-party country. But it's always time for a change. We're looking for a change. A labor party should be the laborer in the plant. The majority of the people. They are laborers.

- I'm for it (the labor party). The worker, the average citizen, I do not mean the citizen who is making 30 or 40,000 a year, but the laborer, the backbone of the country, the one who is making 15 or 20 if he is lucky, that is what is holding this country together. So something has to give. Something is going to give. The country cannot keep going the way it is going now. Nor can the UAW keep going the way it's going and survive. Something has to give. We'd like to see the UAW convention put forward its own candidate for president, we sure would.

- A labor party means the labor force will have a bigger say so in what happens.

A Polish Joke

There's a joke going around in Poland that, on one of his trips to Moscow, Jaruzelski visited Lenin's tomb. As it is logical to suppose, the counsels of Andropov did not console the Polish dictator in the least, and he went to see Lenin in a very grave and disturbed state of mind.

The Poles say that he was so anxious that he began to ruminate out loud, talking to the preserved remains of the leader of the October Revolution:

"What would you have done, Comrade Lenin, in my situation? The counterrevolution is threatening, is openly conspiring against socialism, the revolutionary conquests are menaced . . ."

The reader can imagine the effect of such words on Lenin. The Poles say that he leapt from his grave on hearing them and excitedly cried out to Jaruzelski:

"You say that counterrevolution is threatening? Quick, comrade, there's only one solution: **ARM THE WORKERS!**"

(translated from *La Aurora* #362)

TRUTH, Bi-Weekly Organ of the Trotskyist Organization/USA

Editorial Board: Kevin FitzPatrick; Margaret Guttschall, Editor; David Heffelfinger.

Subscription Rates. North America. \$1 for six issues (introductory); \$6 for one year. \$15 for one year supporting subscription. Inquire for other rates, including institutional rates.

TRUTH: Introductory Subscription, 6 Issues for \$1

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY/STATE/ZIP _____

Fill out this form and send it with \$1 to:
Truth, PO Box 32546, Detroit, MI 48232