

SWP

discussion bulletin

Published by the
SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE
NEW YORK 3, NEW YORK

Vol. 23, No. 6

November 1962

Contents

Page

PLENUM DISCUSSION OF WORLD MOVEMENT

Part 3

1.	T. Edwards	1
2.	R. Garza	4
3.	R. Kirk	7
4.	D. Stevens	12
5.	S. Mage	15
6.	M. Alvin	22
7.	C. DeBruce	25
8.	J. Boulton	26
9.	A. Philips	29
10.	T. Kerry	39
11.	F. Mazelis	46
12.	I. Warwak	47
13.	Myra Weiss	50
14.	B. Winnick	53
15.	F. Dobbs	55

60¢

Editor's Note

This is the third of a series of bulletins containing the resolutions, reports, discussion and summaries dealing with the world movement at the June 1962 plenum of the National Committee.

It contains discussion of the subject from the floor which has been transcribed from a tape recording of the proceedings.

#

PLENUM DISCUSSION OF WORLD MOVEMENT

T. EDWARDS: Since the Wohlforth tendency and the Socialist Labour League have neglected to provide their theory of revolution with a name I would like to propose that it be called the theory of the immaculate conception of revolution. In Catholic mythology, the theory of the immaculate conception turns a neat trick. It purports to explain how Mary, who appears to have been a virgin, even while being the wife of Joseph, gave birth to a baby son without either legitimate or illegitimate sexual intercourse of any kind.

The theory of revolution propounded by Wohlforth and the S.L.L. seems to run along similar lines. It states that any revolution contaminated by a non-Trotskyist leadership (as defined by the Popes Tim and Jerry) is simply designated as a bastard revolution because Tim and Jerry refuse to recognize or baptize the party or leadership in question as a legitimate Marxist party as they conceive it. Unfortunately, immaculate revolutions have been as rare as immaculate births.

What is more, this concept runs counter to the real Trotskyist conception of the proletarian revolution, a concept that we know as the permanent revolution. And since we are talking about the dialectical application of the Marxist method in this discussion, let me very briefly review the concept of the permanent revolution.

The theory of the permanent revolution states that the tasks of the bourgeois revolution cannot be solved by the bourgeoisie in this epoch in the backward countries. Secondly, that the proletariat once it is brought to power by the momentum of the colonial revolutions cannot stop at merely bourgeois tasks but must go over to the tasks of socialist construction. Thirdly, that these national revolutions will tend to grow over into the international socialist revolution.

This concept delineated by Trotsky in the early part of this century was gleaned from Marx and Engels who formulated the initial tracings of this theory of permanent revolution from their studies of the French Revolution of 1789 and the German peasant wars of the 15th century. Marx and Engels perceived that even in these early bourgeois revolutions, the dynamic of revolutionary struggles

was such that at their high point they tended to pass beyond the framework of bourgeois society. Far from utilizing some mechanical yardstick of whether or not "Marxist" parties were in the leadership (how could there be 400 years before Marx?), Marx and Engels nevertheless perceived elements of proletarian, i.e., of permanent revolution as early as the struggles of the 15th century and later.

What about the first workers state? Was it not the French Commune of 1871? And was not Marx right there on the historical scene as an observer? Marx did not refuse to recognize the Commune of 1871 because a Marxist party was not at its head. On the contrary, he supported it with all his might.

The theory of the permanent revolution points up how the objective dynamism of bourgeois revolution, even in the heyday of the rise of capitalism, led to the establishment of elements of proletarian power and tendencies toward a transition to a classless society. This was the kernel of the concept of the permanent revolution that Trotsky took up and elaborated into the full-blown theory of the permanent revolution as applied to our epoch.

In Russia, of course, this theory was carried out in full in its first two aspects during and after the October revolution, while it failed in its third aspect; not theoretically, but practically. i.e., the revolution remained isolated and failed to spread due to lack of leadership elsewhere. This in turn led to the degeneration of the Soviet regime. But in spite of that, from 1924 to 1933, Trotsky still saw the Stalinized Communist parties as possible instruments of the proletarian revolution. Only after 1933 and the default in Hitler Germany did Trotsky call for the construction of new parties. And yet as late as 1938, in the Transitional Program, Trotsky still put in the view that stated that under exceptional circumstances, the Communist and Social-Democratic parties may take power.

After the end of World War II, was the concept of the permanent revolution confirmed or not? It was realized in life as all theoretical and generalized concepts are confirmed in reality: in a peculiar, particular and concrete way. It was confirmed in a manner that the SWP and the IS, in a collective manner at first and then after the split in separate ways, analyzed absolutely correctly. It

was shown that even in their bureaucratized form, the "permanent" property relations established by the workers revolution in the Soviet Union were still alive and could not co-exist with bourgeois property forms in Eastern Europe but had to transform them also, albeit in a bureaucratic manner, based upon the power of the Russian Army.

Secondly, it was demonstrated in the mass upsurges taking place in Yugoslavia and later in China that the dynamism of the permanent revolution still exists, that mass revolutionary struggles can transform essentially petty-bourgeois formations into adequate enough instruments of proletarian revolution to establish deformed workers states. Perhaps this mechanism was masked and led to illusions about Stalinism because the petty-bourgeois formations involved were Stalinist parties. But then came Cuba.

The Cuban revolution demonstrated that the momentum of the permanent revolution is such that non-Stalinist, petty-bourgeois leaderships, fighting their way to power, also have to follow in textbook fashion the three aspects of the theory of the permanent revolution: After the tasks of the bourgeois revolution, the Castro regime has to go over to socialist tasks and has to acknowledge itself, moreover, as Marxist and Leninist. What more could one ask for?

The subject of methodology has been brought up. I would call the methodology of this theory of the immaculate conception of the proletarian revolution, as advanced by Wohlforth and the SLL, as sophistry, pure and simple sophistry. Nowhere in the theory of the permanent revolution is it implied that the primary importance that we attach to the leadership of revolutions, to the subjective factor of revolution, negates or weakens in any way the overriding law of history that is embodied in the concept of the Permanent Revolution. As always the relation is dialectical, inter-related, a two-way street.

All the particular cases of permanent revolution since World War II, resulting in the establishment of deformed workers states, as in Eastern Europe, Yugoslavia, China, or unformed workers states, as in Cuba, refer to backward countries, where the bourgeois tasks were unfinished and where the revolutionary dynamic of doing away with semi-feudal remnants brought leaderships into power that had to go beyond capitalism towards socialist tasks. This is an extremely favorable development, not one to be deplored or

approached negatively.

Where the tasks of the bourgeois revolution are essentially finished, namely in the advanced countries, the original concept of the absolute necessity of the construction of revolutionary, i.e., Trotskyist, parties continues to exist in full force. Only such parties can furnish the proletariat of the advanced countries with adequate instruments for gaining power in the metropolitan centers.

The world resolution passed by the SWP convention last year fully reaffirmed this prognosis and brought up to date what has been happening in the backward countries since World War II. We are oriented correctly and meaningfully because we have understood correctly and applied meaningfully the theory of the permanent revolution, while the Wohlforth tendency and the SLL are flirting with some kind of mythical immaculate conception as applied to revolutions.

R. GARZA: I take the floor not because I feel that what I say is going to have such a tremendous effect on the comrades that hold the minority position or on Tim, but because I feel certain things have to be put straight. I want to remind Comrade Tim that at the last plenum we held, when we discussed this whole question of Cuba, the entire plenum including myself bent over backward to give him the benefit of the doubt and to let events influence and teach him. But I get the impression from his presentation here today that he is playing around with ideas and playing around with the first proletarian revolution in this hemisphere. Let's set the record straight about what we said about Stalinism.

We all know that Stalinism is a product of a revolution in retreat. After the Second World War the expansion of Soviet property forms spelled the end of Stalinism. It could no longer exist. And now in the last couple of years we have seen not a revolution in retreat but a revolution that has been deepening and growing. In a revolution in ascendancy there is no groundwork, no fertile ground for the rise of Stalinism; not as we know it. Now this revolution has spelled out its socialist character. It was spelled out in the Second Declaration of Havana, the Communist Manifesto of the Americas. It spelled out to the entire peoples of the world that this was a socialist revolution and it was accepted by the masses of the Cubans.

Now I'd like you to listen to Fidel. I don't know, if he can't explain it I don't know who can. I think you should listen to what he says about the consciousness of the Cuban people. "Revolutionary ideas did not become the consciousness of a minority, of a group. They became the consciousness of the great masses of our people. Whoever doubts it, let him recall the Declaration of Havana, the Second Declaration of Havana, the presence there of a million Cubans; the enthusiasm with which those one million Cubans supported the revolutionary ideas, radical ideas. What did this show? That the masses have become revolutionary; that the masses had embraced Marxist ideology; that the masses had embraced Marxism-Leninism. That was an unquestionable fact. The camps had been defined; the enemies had declared themselves as such, the laboring masses, campesinos, the student masses, the masses of the poor, the underprivileged masses of our nation, a significant portion of the middle-class, a section of the petty-bourgeoisie, intellectual workers, made Marxist-Leninist ideas their own, made their own the struggle against imperialism, made their own the struggle for the socialist revolution."

At the last plenum you told us there was no socialist consciousness. But here it is, and you want to ignore it, you want to just brush it aside. That's not treating the party correctly, comrade, because this is a very serious question and for you to just ignore it is to say, in a playful fashion, "Well, alright it's a workers state, so it's a workers state. So what." You know it's like you're talking to kids on the street. You expect more from comrades.

You now raise the question that membership to the party (ORI) is not elected, and it's true. And the Escalante speech by Fidel points out why they're not elected at this stage. He said, about petty politics, "Our party isn't going to be a party of privilege." They're in a process. This is what he says about the party and I'm skipping over the best parts because I couldn't find a copy here of his speech, where he defines himself as a Marxist-Leninist and points out how history made it necessary for them to go about organizing: "Our party has to be organized using Marxist methods, not by the methods of Louis XIV: Presto, I begin to name the members of the party. No, that is not democratic centralism or anything like it. Democratic centralism is a very different thing. It is a leadership which organizes a party using Marxist-Leninist

methods of selection, of work. What does it look for? It tries to gather within that party the best of the people, the best of the working class. The best workers in the country should be members of that party. Who are they? They are the model workers, the model laborers, who are in abundant supply. In other words, the first requirement for belonging to the nucleus is to be a model worker. One cannot be a builder of socialism, nor a builder of communism, if one is not an outstanding worker. No vagrant, no idler, has any right to be a member of a revolutionary nucleus."

There are problems that he points to -- actual experiences that they have gone through. He points out that at a certain meeting the workers were choosing the model workers, "because the masses are perceptive, they have a sense of justice which in every meeting at which we have been present, and in all other meetings, manifests itself in the choosing of some old militant from among the masses, because he stands out as a great communist, as an excellent worker. The masses have a great sense of justice. Sometimes someone who has a bad record is chosen and the masses immediately bring this out. There have been cases where people who have had bad records have been proclaimed as model workers. In some cases they have unfortunate records. Unfortunately such things happen. But in the meeting to which I am referring it so happens that the masses named an individual as a model worker. A worker got up from the multitude and said, "This man was a Mujalista." (Mujal was the head of the CTC under Batista.) "Then the man defended himself by saying that he had not been a Mujalista and he confessed to having been a follower of Batista. And in spite of this the masses said that he should belong to the nucleus. Such a mass of workers is confused and should be oriented. This means that it should be explained to them that such a man cannot belong to the nucleus for whoever says that he was a follower of Batista is saying that he agreed with all the crimes, with all the murders, all the tortures which Ventura, Carratala and all those criminals committed. This has to be argued with the masses. That is the duty of the party organizers and they must say No!"

Our whole movement knows this background. It was Trotsky who was against letting untrained workers into the party when Stalin proposed it to water down the party. Every revolution has its own problems. Somebody from another country has to try to understand those problems if

they want to help that revolution. I'd say about elections, we've heard that word elections too often. The Stalinists would have been for elections, for their kind, their type, and they've been pushed back by the revolutionary leadership at this stage. I believe that if the comrades of the minority choose to ignore the Cuban revolution and choose to try and brush it aside and not discuss it, they are committing as serious an error as anyone in the radical movement could have committed in 1917 trying to brush away the Russian Revolution. That's how important it is for the revolution of the Americas.

For the comrades of the minority to get up and say, "Well, Castro doesn't know what he's doing;" "it's a petty-bourgeois leadership;" "maybe it doesn't even matter how you characterize the nature of the Cuban state." That's taking a petty-bourgeois phony attitude. Revolution is a serious thing. Millions of people are looking on this. And if we want to influence millions of people in this country we have to know what's going on in Cuba.

R. KIRK: It is our responsibility at this session of the plenum to uphold the Political Committee in its efforts to reunify the international movement and it is our responsibility thereafter to transmit to the party the significance of the move and the magnitude of the possibilities which it opens up for us.

This will be and is perhaps the most important, the most ambitious, the most historically significant organizational achievement that we have ever attempted: the international reorganization of the revolutionary movement. Among the elements of importance is the fact that the objective conditions of the world today are infinitely more favorable for the acceptance of this international organization than ever before and cry out for the reconstitution of a unified movement. Not so much in the U.S., but in countries where you have a politically advanced, aware and sophisticated proletariat, the division in the movement is a source of confusion and demoralization. We are able to begin the process of dispelling that demoralization by reunification.

We do it on the basis, as stated in 1957, that in spite of bitter factional warfare between us, and in spite of tendencies toward conciliation to Stalinism which were present in the early days of this fight, and in spite of

this fight, and in spite of mutual suspicions and recriminations on both sides -- operating over a period of years, we come out of the whole thing and we look at the basic principles that are at stake and we remain identical as Trotskyists.

In this regroupment Cuba plays a central role because this is the great new international phenomenon. And it will play a role similar to that played by the Russian Revolution in past decades as the phenomenon around which the international movement has got to divide. It is not simply a matter of for or against. Sections of the anarchists and social democrats were for the revolution, supporters of the Russian Revolution, but they did not grasp its great historical significance and could take no advantage from it, learned nothing from it and finally dispersed into nothing as a result of being unable to grasp the significance of the Russian Revolution. That is like it is with Cuba.

My experience in evaluating the problem of our international movement I want to relate to you very briefly. I held the view, which I believe is fairly common or has been fairly common until recent times in the party, that we support the idea that because on a few central questions there appears to be agreement between us and the IS, therefore it is objectively indicated that something could be done about it; but without great enthusiasm or confidence that this would come about. All of the old sores were still there, all of the organizational recrimination still in the background; an essentially factional atmosphere still pervaded the international movement.

About a year ago I was assigned to make a speech on the question of what's doing in the USSR and I accepted the assignment before I thought it over and realized that I did not know a great deal about what was going on in the USSR, about the internal conflicts in the bureaucracy, what stage the political revolution was at and what the relationship with China was. And a week or so before I was to give the speech, I didn't have the speech and I didn't have the foggiest idea of what to say. I looked through our literature and I got a few clues, but not very much, and in absolute desperation I went to the big stack of Pabloite material which we keep around without ever reading, thinking well, maybe they've got something to say. I pulled out those issues with Germain's article about the crisis in agriculture and the resolutions about this,

that and so on and I began to realize that they had something to say on the question of the USSR. This was a basically disputed point; we believed that they were heading toward conciliation to Stalinism; yet I was so fascinated by what I read that I read the whole stack of magazines and came to the conclusion that theirs was basically a Trotskyist movement. That's the truth of it. A Trotskyist movement. And by and large the leaders of their movement are our historic collaborators over a long period of time and there is not only no reason why we shouldn't get together but it is very imperative that we do, not only for the advantage that it will give the international movement but what we will regain from collaboration with them.

Now, Comrade Wohlforth puts forth two propositions which characterize what he calls Pabloism. First (on page 4): "the existence of a new world reality which in the balance of forces has shifted definitively in favor of socialism and in which accordingly resolution of the crisis of proletarian leadership is no longer sine qua non the world socialist revolution." That's one proposition. Then: "Soon thereafter Pablo in his war-revolution thesis made this theoretical abandonment the basis for a new political line. These consequences never subsequently repudiated by Pablo, etc., etc." Not true. They were repudiated. I read it. The war-revolution thesis they repudiated. They said, "We did not estimate correctly the relationship of forces and the tempo of the war development." That's what they said in resolutions.

About the new world reality, shifting the balance in favor of socialism: Germain only a few years ago, at the time of the 20th Congress, had some very interesting things to say about the world relationship of forces. This is what I gather from him as to their attitude towards the relationship of forces: that if the political revolution should happen in the USSR this would shift the world balance of forces in favor of socialism just as decisively as would the socialist revolution in the U.S.

I don't say that I thoroughly agree with that, but that is an idea which you have to cope with and a possibility you have to cope with and it is not the same thing as saying that because of what they said in 1953, they may still believe things which they have actually repudiated today.

We are talking about what they stand for now. And they stand with us and with ideas that are interesting and thought-provoking and quite in consistency with our concept of the world movement.

Comrade Wohlforth and the British, in their evaluation of Cuba, go through a series of stages: "The revolution is okay but it's not very good because they don't expropriate the foreign holdings." The next day the Cubans expropriate the foreign holdings. Then: "They've got no nationalized economy and they've got no planned economy." And the next day the Cubans start their planned economy. "But you can't have a socialist revolution unless you have a socialist consciousness." And the next day the Cubans produce great declarations of a socialist consciousness which are absolutely irrefutable. The next day: "You can't have a revolution without a party." And the following day you've got a party. "But the party ain't the right kind of a party. It's not exclusive enough, not sectarian enough. And the crowning thing is that there are bureaucratic functions in the state." What is the proof of this? The most important and the most tangible proof is that Castro struggles against them and exposes them!

I have a little sympathy for Castro in this circumstance. It reminds me of a story we used to tell about the CP in the '30's; about a landlord that I always had a slight sympathy with. I'll tell it for the youth who may not have heard it. A bunch of CP'ers lived in a tenement and they decided to picket it and after a couple of days picketing, the landlord got together with them and said, "All right, the rent is reduced \$5 and you get new wallpaper all around, a new light on the second floor, we repair the plumbing in the bathroom, but by Holy Suffering Jesus I cannot save the Scottsboro boys."

Castro cannot eliminate bureaucratic functions of a state in a backward country. He can't do it. He can prevent their getting control of the state which is the great lesson of the Russian Revolution, which he has learned, which Trotsky taught originally and which Castro is learning. But he cannot eliminate them.

The Trotskyist International must be able to take full advantage not only of the facts of the Cuban revolution but of the full impact of it. We've got to recognize a great debt of gratitude to a magnificent revolution.

Why? Because it was carried out without our consent and without a Trotskyist party? No. Because it was one revolution without the Stalinists and it was a revolution in Latin America under the nose and guns of the U.S. government and U.S. power. These two things have shattered all the pretensions of the Stalinist variety of popular frontism. This was the rationalization for the betrayal of all of the Latin American countries since the '30's -- that you can't have a revolution so close to the U.S.

The Cubans have made one important contribution to Marxism which has been through some tough sledding. In the Russian Revolution, out of necessity, Marxism became the ideology of austerity because of the poverty and isolation of the workers revolution in a backward state. Then Stalinism built on this austerity a dehumanized edifice which has repulsed new generations and prevented them from even considering Marxism seriously. Trotsky was forced during this period into a life of political polemics and even today his great humanistic works are virtually unknown even to the SWP.

But the works of Castro and the Cuban Revolution and its leadership have humanized Marxism in a way which we can take an infinite advantage of.

One of the reasons why they don't feel such a great pressing need for institutions of government is the interpretation of the leadership and the rank and file (which is a factor of their humanism). This doesn't mean that this proves a party is unnecessary. It demonstrates what can be done even in the absence of a revolutionary party and institutions which may be built up over a period of years.

We are dealing with a scientific appreciation of a phenomenon and I am reminded of what Einstein said about science. Somebody asked him what is science? He said: "It's classifying phenomena according to norms, discarding and reclassifying those which do not adhere to these norms." No, no, I'm just kidding. What he really said was: "To be a scientist is to observe minute change and act upon it." Science is not concerned with making things conform to norms but in observing the variation from norms and acting upon them, because this is the direction of progress and knowledge and is what must permeate our thinking. And there is not one tiny little iota of this in the British conception of the world revolution or in Tim's.

A couple of practical questions posed as obstacles to reunification: Tim says, "What has entrism got to do with it?" I say when you abstract the question of Stalinism (which I believe we have done -- they have discarded their former tendency to Stalinist adaptation) entrism becomes a question to be worked out in accordance with the traditional tactical formula which we have produced over the years and which finds expression in the resolution. Second, the British on the Belgium general strike. I have read both sides of the question and am not impressed by the British criticism of it; my opinion is that it is irresponsible and slanderous gossiping, similar to the kind of gossip that characterized the attempts to build a truck drivers union in Minneapolis as "company unionism." And at least I want us to be in a position to evaluate these things on the basis of their merits and on the basis of the facts.

I want to make three proposals to the plenum. I think there should be some reference in the resolution to the political revolution in the USSR and our prospects there. Our resolution is about the problems of the Fourth International and the problems of the Fourth International in the USSR, I believe, should be dealt with in some form, however brief. Second, we should publish in the magazine and in the internal bulletins selected articles from the Pabloite publications, particularly the articles by Germain on the political economy of the USSR. And third, that we circulate or authorize circulation of the FI in a similar manner to our handling of the Labour Review.

D. STEVENS: The question of the unification of the world Trotskyist movement, the main point and the first point on the agenda of this plenum has been placed there, I think, in the urgent and more immediate way in which it now exists, has been made so imperative for us primarily by the Cuban Revolution. It is impermissible in the light of the Cuban revolution and the agreement that now exists among Trotskyists to remain divided. The need for taking fullest advantage of the events which have occurred, of the possibilities which have opened up, requires that unification be carried out with the greatest speed possible. Concerning a preparatory period of international discussion, sounding out, etc., much of this, although not in a strict formal sense, has actually been going on for a long time. We are not in the beginning of such a

process. I think we are near the end of such a process. I don't think it is impetuosity or impatience to press for the speediest consummation of this unification.

Comrade Wohlforth does not address himself to this need. If anything, he dispenses with the need for unifying the movement with some lightly phrased words such as "should we unite with these guys" (after describing Pabloism of the past in its most horrendous form) "and break with the SLL"? Posing the question this way, that one requires the other, when we are in the process of discussion together with the SLL of world unification, strikes an ominous note at this plenum. One requires the other!

As far as the Cuban Revolution is concerned, Comrade Wohlforth has stood stock still in the development of his position. Since the last convention he's added nothing, absolutely nothing. Have events confirmed him? Have they confirmed the minority? Have they disproved the majority?

Our party -- which Wohlforth claims does not intervene, does not take part in the struggle, which he says exists on a cloud -- has published a wealth of material on what has transpired in the Cuban Revolution as well as its own participation in defense of the Cuban Revolution. The events of the revolution are completely ignored by Comrade Wohlforth. His position can find no support in the actual revolution. That's why the revolution is ignored. Instead he deals with formulas and quotes, and omits the inspiring and instructing facts of the revolution. Facts, that's the stuff of empiricism, isn't it? Empiricism has something to do with the facts. Therefore, and here another ominous note, Tim declares that the party is guilty of empiricism and the fundamental basic difference between us is method. He says, "Touch any question," and he enumerated a string of them, "and we will have differences on it." Any question? Then, why, Tim, did you vote for our political resolution? That's one little question, isn't it? The resolution deals with the entire role of our party in our own country. Touch any question and we'll have differences on it? That's saying a mouthful, Tim. That's serious.

You call Pablo an empiricist because he said at one time that Yugoslavia was on the way to a healthy workers state, and since that did not happen, Yugoslavia did not become a healthy workers state, therefore, Pablo is guilty of empiricism. Haven't you got things reversed

here? Isn't it just the contrary? Isn't empiricism consistent with accepting what is, what has already happened, and decrying the prognosis of something that fails to happen as an impossibility? The established, accepted success, that's good; what fails, that was a mistake. Isn't that Deutscher's approach to the failure of the European revolution, which Lenin predicted and looked forward to? When Tito broke with Stalin, that was a great step, wasn't it? Things were in flux. Was it wrong to think that this could develop further, to have hoped for it, to say it can become a healthy workers state, to participate in every way possible to help it? That's not empiricism. That's precisely what you're talking about: intervention and not to cut off the possibilities.

Lenin and Trotsky fought for, prepared for, and even expected many things that didn't happen and life shows many things that did happen that were never expected. Who expected the Yugoslav Revolution, or the Chinese, or the Cuban? If we had predicted it (even though the transitional program holds forth such a possibility), had we predicted it, what would you have called us then? Tito, Mao, and in a special sense, Castro, all broke with Stalinism in one way or another. Why in advance say that they cannot develop as revolutionary leaders? Or let me put it this way, Comrade Wohlforth or Shane. You draw the line, you tell us the actual limits of the development of these cadres, of the development of these revolutions. How far they can go and where they cannot go any longer. What is the limit of change?

But you are dealing only with the top, you will say, how about the masses? You nod your head, Shane, good. In April 1917 the small Bolshevik party in a dangerous social patriotic and class collaborationist phase held the balance of the revolution in its hands. Lenin and Trotsky coalesced on the revolutionary line and that little change up there on top made a great difference for the whole revolution. But in 1914 a party that was long prepared, built magnificently, mighty in its numbers, revolutionary in all of its programmatic declarations, the German party, collapsed. It couldn't lead the revolution that it spent decades preparing for.

In Spain, without a revolutionary party, Trotsky said one could be built in the heat of the struggle. He

looked forward to our comrades entering into the social democracy to make something out of that creature as a weapon, a tool of the revolution. The Spanish Trotskyists failed to do it. A revolutionary party did not materialize in the heat of the battle. It did not happen. Was Trotsky, therefore, wrong? Not at all. Castro, from the top, huh?, from the mountains, that's top enough, descended down below with a handful of tops. There was only one difference. That the action of these tops was in full, complete accord with the sentiment, the feelings, the readiness, the motion of the masses at the bottom and when that happens, you've got a revolution.

That's the whole secret of the thing. [Aside from Tom K.: That's what we call a revolutionary party. Dave: That's right, those tops.] That's what took place, rather the ideal of parties prepared in advance to lead a revolution. That's pretty toppist, I think, you've got to have the tops all ready, in advance, or no dice.

One has to see the dialectical interrelationship between leadership and masses, between top and so-called below. Anything else is a schema, and schemas are useful only for one thing, and that is to reject life, to reject the living revolution, the one that's actually occurring. Schemas for turning your back upon the revolution. That's lifeless, that's against the revolution. That's stultifying. That's doom for any revolutionary organization, and that's all you present us with.

S. MAGE: To start, I will answer point blank the question that Dave asked point blank: Where do you draw the line? What is the limit to where these cadres, Mao, Tito and Khrushchev (he broke with Stalin too, didn't he) will go? The line is the point at which their violent insurrectionary overthrow by the workers of these countries becomes unnecessary. They will not, as devils -- and they all are in the sense that Trotsky used the word -- cut off their own claws. They will not restore workers democracy from above. If any of them becomes a revolutionary he will have to break with all the others. With all the others and his own caste as well. When Djilas made a slight move towards it, you saw what happened to him in Tito's Yugoslavia. That was a very slight move, as far as the direction of left social democracy, and no further.

This is where I draw the line. If I'm proven wrong, I'll admit that I was proven wrong and revise the theory on the basis of which I made that prediction. But you have the responsibility also, to make a similar prediction. Not anything can happen in the future. Can Stalinism be reformed into socialism? It can or it can't. You'll have to predict whether it will or it won't, and stand on that prediction. Pablo made a prediction and he was wrong. And this has certain implications as to the theory on which he based his prediction. Now Comrade Kirk made a very valuable contribution because he placed the issue squarely where it belongs. On the question of whether the split in the International was justified, who is right? Pablo or those who have been fighting Pablo? He says Pablo was right. Now this seems to be inherent in the line of the PC document. The only political reason it gives for the 1953 split with the Pabloite movement is: "an apparent tendency to conciliate with Stalinism and look upon the Soviet bureaucracy as capable of self-reformation." Soviet, Chinese, Yugoslav bureaucracy capable? Only an apparent tendency? If this "appearance" did not conform to reality, and the PC draft nowhere affirms that it did, this is nothing less than a striking admission of political irresponsibility. Whatever the facts about Pablo's regime organizationally in the International, a split could only be justified by profound political differences. You don't split because you think the guy has bureaucratic habits. You stay in and try to fight him inside.

We weren't so unsure about the reality of the political differences in 1953. In the Open Letter we characterized Pabloism as "revisionism," not a gentle characterization but a fundamental political one, and we said politically not organizationally, not just organizationally, "politically" we said, the lines of cleavage "are so deep that no compromise is possible." The question that has to be posed, that everyone has to answer and that Comrade Kirk has answered in his fashion is were we right or were we wrong in 1953?

He says wrong. I disagree. I say we were right. And that this characterization of Pabloism has been confirmed by everything that has happened since then including their attitude toward the Hungarian revolution which I don't have time to go into now. However, just to give one latest, or the most recent possible example of the concrete policy of the Pabloites.

In February 1962 -- this year -- our comrades, the French Trotskyists (there's only one Trotskyist group in France) with other revolutionaries (not Trotskyist, revolutionary syndicalists) were giving out leaflets, in front of several important factories when they were attacked physically by thugs from the French CP. The workers rose to their defense and they succeeded in distributing their leaflets and papers. At the same time, to prevent further attacks, they organized in cooperation with some of the best leftwing trade unionists and intellectuals in France, a committee for workers democracy, protesting the techniques of the CP and calling on all unionists to prevent anything of the sort in the future. Now Comrade Hansen said that the French Trotskyists are barred from friendly collaboration with the French "trotskyists-sic" who adhere to the IS, by their own bitter dead end factionalism, and therefore must invent profound differences. Now what happened in forming this defense committee? It was our comrades who approached the Pabloites to participate in it, to aid it on a very simple defense issue -- freedom of expression within the labor movement, the issue on which the IWW, despite substantial political differences, came to our aid in 1928 and 1929. What was the answer of the Pabloites? Not only did they refuse to participate in this defense committee, they attacked it, publicly in their press in "La Verite des Travailleurs." Why? Because it was embarrassing to the CP bureaucracy. That's why it violated their basic political line. Is this or is this not an expression of a serious and fundamental political difference?

I maintain that the Pabloites are completely justified when they assert that their politics have not fundamentally changed since 1953 in any real respect and we were correct when we termed this political position revisionism. And the essence of Pabloism as I see it is to convert Trotskyism into a left-wing satellite of the existing labor and colonial revolutionary leaderships. Under the formal label of Trotskyism what we see in Pabloism is not at all a "heterodox" variety of Trotskyism, but on the contrary a specific form of centrism, and if the PC draft finds that "on most of the vital issues of the day the positions of the SWP and the IS are so close that they are indistinguishable," as comrades have repeated, this would seem to be an indication that the SWP majority is abandoning its previously defended position and passing with arms and baggage into the camp of Pabloite revisionism.

One of the main issues on which the lines of division between the SLL and the SWP are drawn in this draft is on the question of Algeria. Now when the bourgeois leaders of the FLN signed a peace settlement with the leaders of French imperialism, guaranteeing the preservation of capitalist property relations in Algeria and the continued economic dependence of Algeria on French capital, the SLL took a clear and correct class position. They said this agreement is a sell-out of the basic aspirations of the Algerian people. For the SWP leadership however the agreement is "a major victory for the Algerian people." Why a victory? Because it "substantially realizes national independence"? Because "the key issue, Algeria's political independence appears to be unequivocally established"? And since when have alleged partisans of the theory of permanent revolution regarded political independence "the key issue" and not as merely one aspect of the bourgeois democratic revolution which could be substantially realized only through its uninterrupted transformation into the socialist revolution.

Because "the agreement wrested from DeGaulle... is a jolting setback to French and world imperialism"? But have not the Marxists consistently declared that the political independence of Algeria on a capitalist basis corresponded to the essential interests of French and world imperialism? This was, at any rate, stated very clearly in the Militant ... in 1957. It was also stated no less clearly at the same time by the then Junior Senator from Massachusetts, one J.F. Kennedy. The imperialists of Paris and Washington currently seem to regard the Evian agreement as the opposite of a "jolting setback."

If we want to find from a capitalist class standpoint an analysis in agreement with that of the PC we must turn to this: "In short granting independence to Algeria would signify for France and therefore for the entire West a defeat of the highest importance by the Communist world. It would signify that a probably decisive point in the path toward decadence had been passed." The author of these lines, so remarkably responsible and intelligent, is none other than Col. Antoine Argoud, fascist "theoretician" of the Secret Army.

"How has the SLL appraised DeGaulle's de facto recognition of Algeria's right to independence?" asks the PC draft. That's an embarrassing question -- for the asker. How did the Militant appraise the recognition of

Algeria's right to independence when DeGaulle openly and formally recognized that right on September 16, 1959? With what scorn did Comrades Hansen and Lavan denounce this "phony" offer! Well, and now that the offer turns out not to be "phony" but indeed to be DeGaulle's real policy? Very simple -- the recognition of Algerian self-determination is redated to March 1962.

The gravest sin of the SLL, however, is that it "concentrates its condemnation upon the FLN leadership," mere innocent bystanders at Evian, instead of placing "primary blame for the concessions" on "the CP and SP leaderships in France." Now I never noticed that the SLL was particularly gentle with Stalinists and social democrats. The SP and CP leaders who correctly claim that the Evian agreements correspond perfectly to their own program on Algeria have merited and received their full measure of blame in the pages of the Newsletter, but, after all, it was Ben Kedda and Ben Bella, not Thorez and Mollet, who signed and promised to carry out the Evian accord.

Of course the Algerian revolution remained essentially "without help from the French workers." But the leaders of the FLN themselves bear heavy responsibility for this. Even those among them who were not openly reformist to begin with were distinguished from the Messalist left-wing of the nationalist movement precisely by their refusal to base their political strategy on solidarity with the French proletariat, and their preference for political ties to Nasser and the Arab ruling classes. And the Pabloites incidentally, if you will recheck the Internal Bulletin in which I and the late Patrick O'Daniel had a lengthy exchange, completely supported the position of the FLN on this. In the course of the revolution the FLN by its use of blind terrorism against European civilians, by its de facto political bloc with the French CP to keep Algerian workers from forming their own unions, and above all by its assassinations of the best and most militant Algerian workers -- assassinations which the Pabloites in their own way apologize for -- played a major role in helping the Stalinists and social democrats stifle proletarian opposition to the Algerian war.

There is a difference between concessions and a cynical deal. The difference is that, in the former case the leadership is acting from an open proletarian standpoint, in the latter the leadership has a capitalist class objective and basis. The latter is the case in Algeria.

Unless it means concretely opposition to the bourgeois leadership of the FLN and struggle for the construction of a Marxist alternative leadership, a line which is that of the SLL and PCI, unless it means this, the phrase "strive to fight together with the worker plebians against the bourgeois elements of the nationalist camps," which the Pabloites as well as the PC agree on, is purely platonic and can only be an alibi for a policy of subservience in practice to the "leftist" section of the bourgeois leadership.

Now in discussing Cuba the draft says, "the institutions of workers democracy have yet to be worked out and stabilized." A correct statement would be that the institutions of proletarian democracy, which for a start could be listed as workers councils, internally democratic trade unions, several worker and peasant political parties, these institutions do not "yet" exist in Cuba. Nevertheless the draft says the Cuban "state" displays "profoundly democratic tendencies" and this is certified by Castro's denunciation of Escalante.

But if this episode showed anything at all it is the undemocratic functioning of the Castro regime. Escalante (for whom, of course, we should have no more sympathy than we do for Molotov) was simply gagged, abused and shipped out of the country and the charges against him were echoed by the Stalinist press from Hoy to Pravda. What Cuban worker or peasant, what rank and file member of Castro's new party (assuming there are some such members) had the right to hear Escalante's side of the matter on a nationwide radio hook-up for equal time? But if this right does not exist, neither does workers democracy.

Now you can speculate on the political significance of the denunciation of Escalante, but one thing it was not: a break with Stalinism in the name of workers democracy. Workers democracy cannot be defended by silencing opponents and that's what Castro did. Nor can Castro combat Stalinist bureaucratism by putting all the blame on an Escalante or a Stalin while maintaining silence on the essential nature of the Stalinist bureaucracies and expressing solidarity with their representative leaders, Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung.

Is it merely a minor error or is it a careless indication of the change in political attitude embodied in the whole course of which this draft is an example, that the Stalinist states are referred to as "states deformed

by Stalinism," and Cuban foreign policy is distinguished from Soviet as "more consistently revolutionary." Is Stalinism merely a deformation on the basically sound Soviet and Chinese states? Then what becomes of the Trotskyist program calling for the violent overthrow of all the existing Stalinist states, for the political revolution? Is Cuba's foreign policy "more consistently revolutionary than Soviet foreign policy"? Isn't this identical with saying that Soviet foreign policy is "less consistently revolutionary" than Cuban foreign policy? However, Trotskyism has always contended that Stalinism is essentially and consistently counter-revolutionary. Not inconsistently revolutionary, or less consistently revolutionary or something like that. We used to insist on the imprecise but politically justified phrase, "counter-revolutionary through and through and to the core." The proposition that the foreign policy of a Stalinist state is revolutionary, even though inconsistently, is absolutely alien to Trotskyism. It belongs with a centrist, not a Marxist tendency.

Now finally on the question of theory which I don't have time to go into. The draft states that "it is a fact that capitalism was eliminated in 1960." There is a real confusion here between theory and fact because what you're stating in this draft is a theoretical conclusion and not at all a fact. It is a fact, which no one denies, that in 1960 the decisive sectors of Cuban industry were nationalized. Under its peculiar and totally fallacious conception of the "Marxist standards for determining the character of a workers state" the PC majority may believe that this turned Cuba into a workers state. But they should at least recognize that there are comrades who hold that a workers state is defined by its historic origin in a proletarian revolution; that nationalized property in such a state is a non-capitalist and progressive property form because it was established by that revolution; and that the bureaucratic, anti-working class establishment of "deformed workers states" has taken place through the structural integration of formerly capitalist states into the economic and political system deriving from the proletarian revolution, a process in which nationalizations are a part, though not a decisive part. This is a theoretical position and no one should be taken in by the circular counter-argument that the existence of a workers state in Cuba is a "fact" and not itself a theoretical position that needs to be proven.

M. ALVIN: Comrades, one of the problems that confronts us in considering the reunification of Trotskyist forces on a world scale is the need to redefine our attitude toward all other parties of the working class, all other tendencies that exist in these parties. Ten years ago we didn't have this problem; the period was entirely different; the whole situation was different and the problem was a very simple one. We were opposed to all these other parties and they were opposed to us. But now we're in a different period, a period of a considerable amount of motion, of many changes that have taken place. We have actually been in the process of this redefining of our attitude towards all other organizations and tendencies.

Tim said, pretty much in passing during his presentation here this morning, that Lenin was a great fighter against the opportunists. He was, of course, but we should remind ourselves that he didn't spend all his time at this. He wasn't always fighting the opportunists. Why, as a matter of fact right in the middle of the Russian Revolution in 1917, Lenin and the Bolsheviks proposed to the Russian opportunists that they go ahead and form a government without any capitalist ministers. That was the meaning of the slogan raised at that time to expel the ten capitalist ministers from the government. This would have left a government of opportunists, if you will forgive me, and you need to look at that in looking at the perspectives of revolutionaries.

There is a lot to learn from the past history of building revolutionary movements, a lot to learn in how we define our attitude towards other tendencies. In the working class in 1903 and the years that followed until the Russian Revolution, Lenin dealt some of his hardest blows precisely to those tendencies that stood closest to him and the Bolsheviks -- to Plekhanov, Martov and Trotsky and many others. Trotsky himself repeated this process under other circumstances after 1928, criticizing very sharply tendencies that were not Stalinist but were not Trotskyist either; people who wanted to see if they could combine with him in the building of some kind of new movement.

What is the meaning of these attitudes in those periods? As I see it the problems faced in both instances, by Lenin in 1903 and by Trotsky in 1928, was that they were struggling to establish a new tendency, one with a new doctrine and different strategies and tactics and they first

had to gather the cadres together to do this. They couldn't unite with all people, even those who stood very close to them. They had first of all to establish themselves as a known tendency in the working class, in the revolutionary movement, and one that would be known to everyone as a different tendency.

Now is that our problem today? Do we have to save our hardest blows for those who stand closest to us? I don't think so. Trotskyism is a special tendency of the working class that has been established now for a long time. We don't have to repeat in 1962 what Trotsky did in 1928 or what Lenin did in 1903. That isn't our problem today. This differentiation between ourselves on a world scale and all others in the working class, that has been done for us.

But we do have a new task that altered circumstances dictate to us. And that is to identify ourselves and not differentiate ourselves from new tendencies that are moving toward us. The SLL tends to lump all centrists into one pot. You can't do that and get any place in politics, because the centrists move one way in one period and another way in another period. And we want to work with, do whatever we can, with those centrist elements who are moving toward us, not turn our backs on them as we would on those who are moving away from us.

If I understand the position of the British correctly they have raised a slogan of war to the end against all centrism. I read that in their document. They want to declare war against all centrism and in their view this includes the leaders of the Cuban Revolution, the elements in the British Labor Party that are around the Victory for Socialism group, and others, the IS people and anyone else who happens to come down the road that they can find to conduct a fight against.

If we're going to get anywhere in politics, we've got to understand how to differentiate between elements who are moving away from us and elements who are moving toward us. And it is obvious that if the leaders of the Cuban revolution have been moving in our direction and not away from us and that if some IS elements have also been moving in our direction and not away from us, it is a big mistake for Comrade Shane to get up here and dump into one pot Pablo, Germain and other people who are identified with the IS. They are not in the same faction any longer. They are moving in different directions. If we don't

take note of that and act accordingly, we can succeed very nicely in building a group for ourselves here in this country and a replica of it in every other country where we'll talk to each other but we're not going to build any revolutionary movements, not with sectarianism. Not in this period where for the first time in the 34 year history of Trotskyism our cadres have the opportunity to build mass parties and to lead them.

But we're faced with this peculiar circumstance. In every country except the United States, the workers are already organized in other parties, and in other groups and they have leaders and factions and tendencies and if we don't know how to act towards them we cannot build revolutionary movements that are going to win the power, not with sectarianism that just throws everybody who doesn't agree with us into one pot and says to hell with you. That's not revolutionary politics. That can't build anything and it won't build anything.

I would like to invite the comrades of the minority here to give some thought to what Lenin did in fighting "opportunists." I would hardly call Plekhanov, Martov and Trotsky of 1903 opportunists. Explain to us why he dealt them his hardest blows, give that a little thought, and give a little thought to why he dealt differently with people who were real opportunists some 14 years later.

While you're at it you might give some thought to what we did here only a few years ago when we literally strained every effort in the regroupment campaign here in New York and elsewhere in the country where we could, to unite with people whom we certainly weren't in agreement with; very limited objectives and so on. You'll have to condemn all of them, if you want to be such simon-pure revolutionaries. We don't have to give up our principles to work with other people in the working class movement and work with them we must. There is no other way. The U.S. is the only place where there is a clear field, you know, where the workers are not organized politically. You have to give that a little thought.

You have to give a little thought to all these movements that have arisen in Latin America, that just consider themselves pro-Castro, pro-Cuban, they don't have, many of them, a clear delineation in parties and so on. Do we want to turn our backs on them? I don't think so. I think we want to identify with them in every way that we can. Anybody that is moving in our direction can get a

hearing from us. People who thought that we were the toughest sectarians in the world learned a great lesson in 1957 and 1958 when they found out how reasonable we can be, if we can unite on the basis of a common program or a common effort to carry out even a limited objective.

We have to be very flexible in our tactics and our attitude toward groups that are moving towards us. I don't care whether it's here in New York or someplace in Africa or Latin America or somewhere else. That is the way we'll build revolutionary movements and we certainly ought to take that attitude toward the elements of the IS who are very anxious to identify with us and with whom we can find a common basis.

C. DE BRUCE: What Comrade Tim has consistently done has been to criticize. Never an indication of where we have an agreement, or general agreement, or an explanation of the difference between their starting point and ours, from the point of view of adding something or that "we feel that you've developed the point this far but it should go a little farther for all of these reasons outlined" and so on and so forth with the idea of presenting to some extent some concrete example as to where there are inadequacies or where there are errors. That is lacking.

In order to understand anything that is taking place it is necessary to look a little bit in the past. There have been references made to the Russian Revolution. I think the "History of the Russian Revolution" by Trotsky should be read and re-read carefully, not from the point of view of trying to justify a particular idea but to try to learn basically what is involved in the writing as presented by Comrade Trotsky. In particular we should study the section entitled "The Art of Insurrection," where Trotsky explains the tasks of the party, the role that it must play and why. Also, in the revolution itself, we can view two stages, February and October. With one stage there was enough organization to overthrow the existing social order but the Russian people were not prepared enough politically to maintain that power.

I believe that's analagous to the Cuban Revolution today. They are in the process of establishing the political consciousness to maintain the power and to expand the revolution. In the discussion presented prior to and at the convention last summer we projected certain ideas as to what the logic would be, what we could expect, what the

possibilities were. Life has verified this. It seems to me that any leaders who, as stated by Comrade Shane, are willing to accept the responsibility of leadership also have to put their own analysis to the test of life. They have to be big enough politically to recognize and admit whether or not they were wrong, where they were wrong and why, because unless they can learn a lesson from their mistakes, it's just a question of time before they will find themselves in opposition to the revolutionary movement, which they hope to be a part of.

The same method and approach appears in the discussion today around the question of reunification of the Trotskyist movement. The PC draft demonstrates point by point basically what's involved, our points of agreement and brings out many of the points as I outlined earlier. This is lacking in the document submitted by the minority. Marxists (I should say those of us who are striving to be Marxists) have to learn from the lessons of the past and strive to deal with processes in motion. We have to be very careful about taking a particular phenomenon out of reality to examine it and then forgetting to place it back in the world of reality.

This also is a part of the thinking and the method involved in the minority document. In the Cuban discussion in the past the idea put forth by the minority at one point was the characterization of the Cuban state. They gave it a new name, some sort of a transitional state that could move either way, forward to socialism or back to capitalism without a violent upheaval. Since that time a counter-revolution was attempted in April 1961 but not since the first discussion has there been any utterance of any indication by the minority that, well maybe they were a little wrong or maybe there is a possibility of something, some indication. Rather than admit this they ignore it. It reminds me of a certain method of approach where you prepare a formula and cook up a certain blueprint. Reality either fits into this blueprint or you just throw reality out. This is a very dangerous method. One thing it certainly is not; it is not the Marxist method of approach.

J. BOULTON: Comrades, I did not enter my name on the speaker's list primarily because I adhere to the point of view which holds that the divisions within the International, and the unsteadiness of component sections of the world Trotskyist movement, derive in great measure from failure to come to grips with the whole problem of the

Chinese revolution. And I will try to avoid speaking directly to that question.

The distinct merit of the Political Committee Resolution submitted to the Plenum, and to which Comrade Hansen has undoubtedly contributed a great deal, is that it takes us a long step away from the idea of revolutions that simply emerge out of the objective interplay of world social forces and political events -- and with the assistance of American gunboats. The Resolution seeks to relate the course of development in Cuba to an interaction between the movement of objective forces at work and the role of the subjective factor, i.e., the independent revolutionary party.

Moreover, the Resolution perceives contradictions within the Cuban regime and within the Castroist Party; and it records the dual nature of this regime. Our Resolution makes it possible for us to intervene as Trotskyists in the internal struggle within the Cuban party, through our participation on the world arena not only as socialists who accept the Cuban Revolution as an historical reality, but as partisans of that revolution. And it is along this road that we will be able to find new Marxist forces within the (Latin American) working class. There is no prospect for serious growth as a revolutionary leadership of the proletariat, either at home or abroad, through the ritualistic reiteration of an absolute prerequisite to revolutionary victories: the existence of a perfected party of Marxist revolutionary consciousness.

If we had rested content with merely recording the development in Cuba as signifying the coming into existence of a new workers state, rather than putting ourselves squarely on the class-side of the Cuban regime in its struggle against both American imperialism and the world Stalinist movement, as these struggles unfold and will continue to unfold, then our party would have taken a further step in the opposite direction -- along the road of sectarianism. Failure to have met this test in relation to the Cuban Revolution could only have urged death for the American party.

Now in connection with the problem of reunification in the Fourth International, I think it would be vain to turn back on history, and to say now that the split of 1953 was improperly motivated (unnecessary). The political content of Pabloism at that time was invested with liquida-

tionism and conciliation to Stalinism. And it was the determination of the American leadership, acting in a fraternal way, to resist that direction of the Pabloist sector in the Fourth International. If we are to suppose that parties, traditionally related to the whole history of the Fourth International, are not influenced by the work of our American Party and its contributions to their growth and theoretical development, at this point in the life of the Fourth International, then we are handicapped to understand what it is that has brought about a reorientation on the part of the Pabloist section of the Fourth International. And it was not events alone.

If we can understand that the October Revolution produced two diametrically opposed tendencies in the international working class, i.e., the Stalinist tendency and the Trotskyist tendency, then it should be possible to perceive the dual character in the further development of those parties which originated (grew, evolved) under Stalinism and those parties which originated in the course of development of the Fourth International. Within this area a wide variety of tendencies have developed, and some have been compelled to take the road of revolutionary struggle. The objective conditions in history are now maturing, as recorded in our Resolution, for a re-unification of all of these (revolutionary) forces that originated in the worldwide impact of the October Revolution, and that are still capable of learning the lesson of history.

As early as 1939, I think in "Imperialism, The Death Agony of Capitalism," Trotsky already perceived the possibility that certain petty-bourgeois tendencies within the working class would be compelled to go further than they wished, expressed programmatically, that they might be compelled to take the road of revolutionary struggle. He added that this was, however, at that time the least likely variant. Yet the further evolution of history has demonstrated that under certain conditions the dual character of those communist parties originating in Stalinism has compelled the further development of tendencies within these same communist parties along the road of fulfilling certain tasks of a revolutionary leadership. From this point of view we should bear in mind that the contradictions within the world Soviet camp, the contradictions between the Soviet bureaucracy and if you please -- if you wish to say so -- between the Chinese bureaucracy, are unquestionably part of the conditions for the further development of the Cuban revolutionary movement. Already

there is solid evidence that the Soviet bureaucracy determined to pursue its traditional policy of imposing counter-revolutionary restraints upon the working class in Cuba; but that it is in turn restrained by those pressures which bear upon the Chinese Communist Party and the line which the Chinese Communists have elaborated.

Now I only point this out to indicate to Comrade Wohlforth, and it is to be noted that he too has perceived the contradiction in an objectivist view of historical development that reduces the subjective (party) factor to a mere auxiliary role, that he too has failed to come to grips with it (the role of the party) in anything but a ritualistic way -- if the resolution they (the Minority) have drawn up means anything. To point out that the dialectic method begins by seeking to describe internal contradiction within a phenomenon rather than through the metaphysical route of describing contradictions from the outside, setting them up, as it were, and attempting to impose them upon phenomena in such a way as to fulfill your preconceived, ultimatic, and idealistic view of the forces of historical development, and of the conditions for the development of a revolutionary leadership. Summing up the Minority Resolution, I have concluded that the view of the Wohlforth tendency is shot through with metaphysical ritualism.

A. PHILIPS: Let me say first comrades that I think the image drawn by Comrade Kirk about immaculate conception is inaccurate. [Interruption: It was not Kirk but Edwards who coined this label.] That is the trouble with these things. You don't know where they come from. In any case, whatever the source, one of the problems of the immaculate conception is its one-sidedness. The picture of the immaculate conception is that while you have a mother, you don't have a father. The essence of the position which the SLL and the comrades of the minority tendency are trying to project into this discussion is that in order for the proletarian revolution to be born you have to have both a mother and a father. That is to say, you must have a working class and a party and a certain relationship between the two. And if the concept of an immaculate conception with regard to a proletarian revolution, a workers state, could be applied, I think it would be applicable much closer to home.

Now it is precisely because these two major questions are involved -- the role of the working class and the role of the party -- that in my opinion this discussion is a continuation in a modified and less acute form of the Pablo-Cochran dispute of 1953. And here, of course, is a historical precedent for a bloc between a state capitalist tendency and a tendency which holds to the position that Russia is a workers state. As a matter of fact the last time we heard this complaint, especially in Detroit, was from the Cochranites who were complaining about the Cannon bloc with the state capitalists, as unprincipled amalgam. But at the same time there was no objection to the bloc among the comrades of the majority, and for a very simple reason. They recognized, as they had to, that within the framework of a common position (Comrade Hansen has gone out of his way to insist upon the fact that the Pabloites before the split, during the split, and after the split, maintained a common analysis with the majority on the nature of these states) a split could take place. Which means only that within this so-called common framework differences important enough to warrant splits, (and this was also true of the Marcy group) can develop. And upon what issues? Upon the role of the working class and its relation to the revolutionary party.

Now Comrade Hansen asks about the rumor on the reevaluation of our state capitalist position. It is unfortunate that this should arise in such a manner. We are obviously not prepared to present this to the party in a written form. This will be done. And that is when the discussion should take place. As far as the timing of this reevaluation is concerned, if the comrade would check with the source of his rumor, he might discover that this reevaluation has been going on for a considerable length of time. The comrades could note in addition that I took very little part in the previous discussion on the Cuban question. So Comrade Hansen's attempt to make a certain coincidence of the timing is a little bit off the mark. I don't propose at this time to indicate in any detail the outlines of the reevaluation which we have been undergoing. Let me just sketch it. I hope the comrades don't inject this into the discussion now, but wait until the material is presented in written form.

The whole phenomenon of peasant revolutions led by petty-bourgeois groupings, with the Castroites at one end and the Stalinists at another, is obviously wide spread, although temporary and transitional in character. In Cuba

for example at one end, there is a certain parallel with the role played by the first American Revolution in the transition from feudalism to capitalism: and at the other end with the role played by the struggles leading to the erection of absolute monarchies and to the destruction of feudalism in its major characteristics as a social, economic and political system. The absolute monarchy in alliance with elements of the progressive classes in the towns, and developing a system of mercantile capitalism, broke the back of the feudal order. These were progressive, although historically transitional states which preceded the classic revolutions of the historically progressive class, the bourgeoisie. Of course, there is a compression in time, given the difference in the character of the two transitional periods, which will have to be allowed for. And as always, analogies have their limits. But this is the general direction of our reevaluation. As I say, this is going to be spelled out in detail in written form.

But what we have in agreement, comrades, among the SLL, the Wohlforth tendency and ourselves is basically what we had in agreement in 1953 with the majority: we are fighting to defend the role of the working class and the role of the revolutionary party in the proletarian revolution, and that, as we said then, is its own justification for this bloc.

Now let's get into the discussion proper. The two major indications of the continuing nature of this discussion, i.e., its development out of the Pablo-Cochran dispute is as follows:

(1) The resolution which was introduced at the last YSA convention which called upon comrades of the YSA who were not actively involved on campus to orient towards industry, and which was defeated. This represented to me and to other comrades as well, a danger sign of the extent to which the erosion of our proletarian orientation has taken place. I place this first deliberately, and in a moment I'll indicate why.

(2) The second indication -- and the two are connected -- was the 1961 resolution of the Party on international affairs, which introduced symmetrical revisions of our traditional position on the role of the peasantry and the role of the working class; the role of the Stalinists and other petty-bourgeois groupings vs. the role of the Fourth International; the revision of our traditional position on

the nature of the Stalinist bureaucracy in the Soviet Union. The basic conception which is advanced by the majority, not just in backward countries but world-wide, is a conception of the real possibility of a shortcut to building of mass revolutionary parties. The mechanism of the shortcut is through the movement of established bureaucracies in countries which are characterized as deformed or degenerated workers states, and through existing Stalinist parties.

At this point let me say that in my opinion the overwhelming majority of the American party, if it existed under British conditions, would adopt a position far closer to the British than to the one which they presently hold, which is far closer to that of the Pabloites. This is the relationship between the erosion of our proletarian orientation caused by the extremely difficult objective conditions under which we've been living in this country, and the search for a substitute both for the party and for the class on a world-wide scale. I have spoken deliberately of the overwhelming majority because -- and this is not a new opinion of mind or of comrades associated with me -- there has remained in the party a certain small, but not unimportant core of comrades, who while they in 1953 rejected Cochranism, never in essence repudiated the theoretical source of Cochranism, Pabloism.

How is it possible for us to say that a certain section of the party leadership could reject Cochranism without rejecting Pabloism? Very simply. The Cochranites in this country had to vanish into thin air. There was no Labor Party or mass Stalinist Party for them to move into. In my opinion, a certain section of the comrades if they were in British circumstances where there is a positive party growth among the working class and working class youth, would nevertheless not be in the SLL, but be lost inside the British Labor Party.

A brief word of warning, comrades. I think the IC proposal for a discussion and joint activity is good and necessary, but we have to be extremely careful. I will say this now, and it will be repeated, I am sure at a later time. We are fostering on a national and international scale those forces and those illusions which will fight a genuinely revolutionary orientation towards the masses, especially in the advanced countries as those opportunities are developing and as they will shortly develop in this country.

I do not think the majority is homogeneous. I say that, among other reasons, from watching the discussion as it has unravelled itself here. Comrades like Comrade Kirk demand the inclusion of a statement on the political revolution. Comrade Weiss on the other hand says we don't know where to draw the line on how far these bureaucracies can evolve in our direction. These are not minor questions. They go to the heart of our political relationship with Pabloism.

When we talk about a discussion and unity with the Pabloites, it is necessary to refresh ourselves on exactly what Pabloism represents. Contrary to what has been stated here, the Pabloites have never repudiated any of their basic ideas. What are they? There are three stages, the first of which was their thesis of centuries of degenerated workers states. This represented more than just conciliation with Stalinism as a certain current within the working class movement. In our theory, once a question mark is placed over the ability of the working class to reconstruct society, once you have a conception of an epoch of so-called degenerated workers states, they become something entirely different. They become a new exploitative society. They are no longer a current within the working class. They are a new ruling class. The Pabloites thus crossed over beyond mere conciliation with a petty-bourgeois trend within the working class, and theoretically adjusted themselves as a part of a new exploiting class. This is a part of their tradition, not ours. A comrade stated that he had discovered where they had repudiated their war and revolution thesis. We'll come to that in a moment. But they have never repudiated this position, the theory of centuries of degenerated or deformed workers states. Once the sickness of doubt of the working class seeps into any revolutionary political organization, then major surgery is necessary to cut it out. Has the major operation taken place? Unfortunately no. The only thing which can destroy such a disease is clear reaffirmation in practice that the working class in its own name and through its own revolutionary party can establish a workers state. Until that happens we have to be more than a little concerned about whether that disease has really disappeared, especially when we know that instead of repudiating it, they have just deposited it in their theoretical bank.

Their second stage is the war-revolution thesis. In going back over this material, I noticed something I wasn't aware of before but it is extremely logical. Once war is equated with revolution, it is logical for Pablo

(and typically in a footnote) to criticize the Stalinist bureaucracy for not waging war, and marching into Europe and so on, in the period when they had the balance of forces. This is pseudo militancy. This position is derived from the Stalinist concept of world revolution on the bayonets of the Red Army. Equating war with revolution not only wipes out the role of the working class in the advanced industrial countries. It also serves to drive the working class straight into the arms of the imperialist bourgeoisie. Now the comrade says that this thesis has been repudiated. Not at all. They admitted to error on the question of tempo, on when the war would break out. The political equation of war and revolution was never repudiated. This was dropped in the bank along with the rest of the theories for future use under certain circumstances.

Of course, if we agree with the Pabloites that the advance of socialism, of the revolution on a world scale is irreversible, perhaps it's not such a problem, that is, if we also agree on the very concept of what socialism represents. But if we think that the decisive battles are yet to come, then we have to acknowledge the possibility that under the impact of possible reversals, the Pabloites will withdraw from their theoretical bank the ideas which they had on deposit and never repudiated -- ideas which are deadly for the revolutionary socialist movement. Let us enter the discussion, but let's understand the ideological forces we're dealing with.

The third stage, the "comeback" stage in the evolution of Pabloism upon which there has apparently emerged a common ground, is the attitude towards revolutions in the colonial countries. In words the Pabloites never formally repudiated the revolutionary Trotskyist concept of the role of the working class and its party at any time. On the contrary, great care was always taken to pronounce adherence to the concepts of the permanent revolution, as well as the central importance of the workers in the advanced industrial countries. In practice, their return to revolutionary Trotskyism has been severely limited. They have worked their way back only as far as colonial revolutions are concerned. But these are revolutions based upon the peasantry, and without a revolutionary party. We, however, have been moving towards them. Not all the way, of course, but the common ground of the colonial revolutions is not solid ground, comrades. It is swamp.

The resolution on international affairs which was passed in 1961 by our party was manufactured in a Pabloite manner. It's a Pabloite cook book. If you turn to the right page, you can get a recipe for any kind of dish you want to cook. It has nevertheless an underlying character; a deep-going revision of every basic analysis of the movement.

I wish there was time to list the changes and additions in the 1961 resolution up to the final version, because they are a political education in themselves. But in the final version you will search in vain for any class characterization of Stalinism. It has been removed. It is given a functional description. To make it symmetrical, the class designation of the social democracy has also been removed. It too is given a functional rather than a class description. This is part of a method, conscious or otherwise, and I will demonstrate that it leads inevitably to one conclusion.

Let's begin on the description of the type of leadership which will solve the crisis of humanity. The resolution says that the central feature of such a leadership "is understanding" ... listen to these characteristics ... "is understanding of the profundity of the issues at stake and the most resolute determination to bring them to a favorable outcome. An additional requisite which at certain points can prove decisive is accurate judgment in the field of tactics and strategy."

Comrades, to us these characteristics have always flowed from a class analysis. They are not floating in mid-air. It is the class and the program of the class which in the last analysis determines whether these so-called central features of the proletarian leadership will be forthcoming. But there is no class analysis. In its place are characteristics which may have been derived from Castro as an individual as he developed: profound understanding, determination of will.

However, the resolution does not stop here. It goes on to apply its newly discovered method of judgement. I want you to ponder these words carefully comrades. It goes on to say that "The Cuban Revolution ..." (when there was a crisis in the Communist parties, we used to address our comments to the rank and file), "The Cuban Revolution gave every Communist party in the world and above all the "Cuban Communist Party, something to ponder." Ponder! Is

this suggestion derived from a class analysis of Stalinism? Obviously not. They are called upon to think, and, hopefully, perhaps arrive at a profound understanding. And from that perhaps will come determination, and so on. This is not limited to CP's in the backward countries, but is addressed to Stalinist parties all over the world, who have been lifted from any class base and are floating in midair awaiting the power of thought to determine their class character.

What was the situation in Cuba as far as the relations between Castro and the Cuban CP are concerned? At first we didn't see any positive relationship at all. Then Castro in his call for the creation of a party, equated the Cuban Stalinists with the working class. They were to represent the working class in the new party structure.

Not a word of warning or protest from the Militant. Or the ISR. Or in a pamphlet by Comrade Hansen. Castro had to go through the experience without benefit of our advice. Well, Castro went through a certain experience. He came across a guy by the name of Escalante, and he drew certain conclusions. In his talks he warned not Escalante as an individual, but the Cuban Stalinists as a whole against a return to what he called dogmatism and sectarianism. What was our position? We deliberately and consciously separated Escalante from the CP as a whole. We called him: "An unreconstructed Communist Party bureaucrat educated in the Stalinist school." It would appear then that more typically we should find reconstructed Communist Party bureaucrats not educated in the Stalinist school. And we did. We found Blas Roca. This isn't going to last very long, but for the time being we've gotten him.

But what did we get? We spread Blas Roca's diplomatic sneer at us all over the limited pages of the Militant. He said: "Look, I know all about Trotskyism in general, I know about the Cuban Trotskyists in particular, they're enemies of the revolution. About the American Trotskyists I know very little, but if anybody wants to join in support of the Cuban Revolution, they are welcome." This is what we spread over the pages of the Militant.

Apparently as a sort of return gesture, Comrade Hansen indicated that while he knew what the American Trotskyists were doing, he wasn't too sure of the Cuban Trotskyists, "but don't be too hard of them, boys, they really mean well." A real diplomatic exchange.

The revision hasn't been limited to just the Stalinist parties. It has gone, as it had to, to the nature of the Stalinist bureaucracy. When you say A you must say B. This is what we used to say of the role of the Stalinist bureaucracy. This is Comrade Cannon, a thoroughly authoritative voice, and we will ignore the objections to our quoting him. Speaking from the point of view of the American working class, we would still rather be cannonized than castrated.

This is our old position: "Churchill and those for whom he speaks sensed that the overthrow of Stalinism by a workers political revolution, reinforcing the Soviet economic system by the creative powers of workers democracy would only make matters worse for them, for world capitalism as a whole. And they are not in favor of it. There is scarcely less doubt that in the final extremity the main section of the Soviet bureaucracy, concerned above all with their privileges, would ally themselves with the imperialists against the workers revolution."

This isn't what we say today. The 1961 resolution says: "The capitalist class as a whole, especially its American sector, views planned economy, especially its strengthening and extension, as a mortal peril." And here's the payoff: "The capitalists make little distinction between planned economy and those in charge of it," and then we are thrown in with the bureaucracy, "whether they live off it in a parasitic way or defend it with revolutionary socialist means."

In 1954 the political revolution was a reality for us. A more or less immediate conflict, an explosion between the bureaucracy and the working class was a strategic possibility in which the bureaucracy would play a reactionary role, and the world bourgeoisie would look to the bureaucracy against the workers revolution. The drastic change in formulation is the concretization of the fact that the concept of the political revolution is in grave danger of disappearing from our party, as a real and important strategic possibility. There is no other explanation for this change.

And when a comrade asks that another recipe be added to the Pabloite cookbook, that the question of political revolution be added, he at least is conscious that it is lacking. But there are other comrades who do not recognize this lack. They say: After all, who knows where the

Stalinists are going to end up. Let us not be empirical. Let's proceed from our theory and wait and see whether the Stalinists can regenerate themselves.

We come now to a related question. In the answer of the Majority to the Minority two things are done. The British are attacked for putting too much emphasis on the subjective factor, the party. They do not put sufficient emphasis on the class struggle. When the Majority comrades get at the Minority, it is accused of placing too much emphasis on the working class. Insufficient emphasis is placed, among other forces, on the revolutionary potentialities of the peasantry. We've heard this around our movement before; only then it was part of a direct attack on the theory of the permanent revolution and the revolutionary role of the working class through the classic accusation of the "underestimation of the peasantry."

But we don't stop there. We now go to the question of how to build mass revolutionary parties. Listen to that title, comrades, How To Build Mass Revolutionary Parties. I don't have the time to go into the fantastic distortion of the history of the German Social-Democracy and of the Russian Bolshevik party that Comrade Weiss felt impelled to inject into this discussion. It is a fantasy on which a book could be written, a fantasy which is a complete reversal of the entire history of the parties involved.

But look again through this section. You'll find that the majority comrades discuss how to build mass revolutionary parties with only one ingredient missing -- the masses. It comes to that point because it lacks a real perspective for the formation of a mass revolutionary party in terms we have always understood it. When the history of Lenin's party is mentioned, we are told that the Bolshevik Party became a mass revolutionary party through splitting with the Mensheviks, but also through reunification with them and also with Trotsky's group. Only one thing is lacking. That is the fact that Lenin went to and won the masses, and that this is what made it in the last analysis a mass revolutionary party, the only one of its kind in our history.

It is not just regroupment with Pabloites which this kind of approach is intended to foster. Also involved is opening the door to the possibility that whole Stalinist parties may "ponder" their way to a revolutionary line, and even ruling bureaucracies. Through such an opened door

many moods and ideas alien to revolutionary Trotskyism may well slip.

I would like to conclude at this point. On a world scale, comrades, we are continuing the struggle for the revolutionary perspective which was begun in an immediate sense in 1953. It is a sign of hope that the struggle has been undertaken this time, unlike 1953, not in the manner of a last-stand, desperate defense -- but from confidence and hope which is concretized in the growth of the British section, among other IC groups, through the youth and the working class.

The discussion has this time been initiated in the United States by comrades recently associated with the youth. This is also an indication of a shift in the objective situation in our country, and is thus an augury of even more positive times ahead.

TOM KERRY: I want to try in these few brief minutes to touch upon three points raised in the discussion: One -- on party history; two -- on the Belgian general strike; three -- on our appreciation of the Socialist Labour League.

I would like to begin by coming to the defense of Comrade Kirk. Acting as defense attorney for Dick is a role to which I am decidedly unaccustomed. But I am constrained to do so because of the bowdlerized version of his remarks made by Comrade Shane.

Putting it charitably, I would say that it was a gross distortion to place upon his remarks the interpretation that he admitted we were wrong in 1953 and that Pablo was right. That's not what he said. What he did say was that being confronted with the problem of delivering a lecture on Stalinism in Eastern Europe he consulted the Pabloite press in his search for material. He hadn't been following the IS press and he took a look. When he took his look he found that a pronounced change had taken place. I thought he was very specific in his assertion that what he found led him to the conclusion that they had changed. They had changed -- not we. And, he added, he found it useful material. He appreciated the change and on closer examination he saw that neither in what they said -- or in what they did which is even more decisive -- any political reason for continued division in the world movement.

"Am I correct in my interpretation of your remarks, Dick?" (Answer: "Yes!")

Our method is not to judge groups, tendencies and parties, primarily by what they say but by what they do. That's the test we applied to the Pabloites -- using that term for the sake of convenience to include all those adhering to the IS.

We first noted a change as early as 1954, when Cochran broke with the IS or vice versa. Cochranism, we said, was a liquidationist tendency. The Stalinist conciliationist wing, represented by Lawrence, Michel Mestre and Clarke, also broke. We took note of the fact. That split marked a difference between the Cochranite liquidationist-Stalinist conciliationist bloc and the IS.

Then in 1956, when the IS came out in support of the Hungarian ~~revolution~~ and the uprising of the Polish workers, it had to be recorded as a decisive change from the position they took in Germany and France in 1953. As a matter of historical fact we were compelled to conclude that the "Pabloism" of the period following 1953 and the "Pabloism" of 1953 -- using the term "Pabloism" to characterize the political line of the IS -- had undergone a significant change.

Without going into the question of the existing divisions within the present IS -- I'm lumping them all together for the sake of simplicity in the discussion -- to say that there was no change or to charge that it was the SWP that had changed for the worse is to fly in the face, not only of history, but of irrefutable fact. It is to abandon historical fact and embrace, for the sake of political expediency, historical fiction. And that's what the Wohlforth-Philips minority constantly do.

On the basis of the changes noted, in deed as well as in word, and around such decisive events as revolution if you please -- the latest being Cuba -- we detected not a widening of the political gap, as the British insist, but a narrowing of the political differences. It was on the basis of such established facts that we projected in 1957 our parity proposal to initiate a reunification.

What has changed since 1957? The Belgian general strike? I'll go into that event in a moment. The one big decisive event in world politics since 1957 has been the

the Cuban revolution. And on Cuba we stand with the IS and against the SLL.

We are accused of capitulating to Pabloism, if you please. We are charged with abandoning our programmatic position on the political revolution, the necessity of the party, etc., etc., etc. That's so much hogwash!

What is more, we are informed that our programmatic deviation dates back some 12 years. According to the Wohlforth-Philips school of historiography this plenum is informed that when Pablo first presented his theory of centuries of deformed workers states, we subscribed to that position! No, that's not party history. That's not fact -- that's fiction!

We supported Pablo in 1948, you say! Against whom? Against the state capitalist, Johnson, yes! I know because I was there. I was at the convention when Johnson tried to play the neat little game of counterposing "Cannonism" to "Pabloism" because of the obvious conflict between the line of the American Theses and that of the centuries of deformed workers states position.

We saw in Pablo's theory of the centuries-long rule of degenerated workers states a direct contradiction with the line of the American Theses. We stood then, and do now, foursquare on the main line of the Theses. We saw in Pablo's theory a position that ruled out the American revolution as a factor in world development. We wanted no part of it. As a matter of fact the Pablo theory was never adopted either by the SWP, the IS or the FI.

But we weren't about to make a bloc with Johnson against Pablo despite our differences with the latter. Not at all! We viewed the difference as one within a common tendency and acted accordingly. It would have been unprincipled to do otherwise.

Philips tries to draw an analogy between our "bloc" with him, a state capitalist, against the Cochranites, and his bloc with the current minority. His analogy limps on both legs. Our "bloc" in the fight against Cochranism is not the same as the current minority bloc. Even with the rumored Philips "reevaluation" of his state capitalist position which he promises to present at some future date.

There was no question about our making any concession to the Philips position on the class character of the state

in our "bloc" against the Cochranites. That question was not involved. If it had been there could have been no "bloc" with you. That's not our political school.

One of the main issues in dispute today is over the class character of the Cuban state. Your bloc contains at least three conflicting positions on what we consider a question of political principle. The attempt to justify your "bloc" with the current minority by reference to your association with us in the fight against the Cochranites just doesn't hold water.

The Belgian General strike -- I happen to know a little about that event as I was working on the Militant staff at the time, assigned to write the articles on the Belgian strike. I have learned through long experience the difficulty of culling out facts, not only about such a massive movement as the Belgian strike, but any significant strike struggle -- especially one taking place 3,000 miles away with no direct source of information. We examined every source available, checking our facts through the reports in the New York Times, La Gauche, the Christian Science Monitor, etc., etc. Under such circumstances it is wise to exercise extreme caution especially in matters involving tactical line.

Then we heard that the SLL was assigning Tom Kemp to Belgium for first-hand reportage of the strike. I said to Joe, who was then on the desk: "That's fine. Now we should get some on-the-spot information to clarify some of the obscure problems involved in the strike."

Unfortunately such was not the case. After seeing Kemp's articles, the first two I believe, I said to Joe: "I suspect that Kemp went to Belgium, not so much to gather authentic facts and information, but to seek ammunition to blast Germain." We did not run the Kemp articles in the paper as I considered his factionally motivated "analysis" the most infantile leftism.

You know, I have puzzled about this position of the British on the Belgian strike -- which you have now adopted and champion as your own. You flatly state as your basic premise that without the revolutionary party there can be no revolution. You insist that there was no revolutionary current in the Belgian labor movement. Yet you assert that the task of the moment in Belgium was to raise the slogan: "Workers to Power."

Who was to raise this slogan? Germain? But, you contend, Germain was and is a "Pabloite revisionist" of the first rank! If you are serious you certainly did not expect him to do so. Yet you stigmatize him as a betrayer for not doing so!

The next question -- Was there an insurrectionary situation in Belgium at the time of the strike? You haven't said so in so many words. But you imply as much by your insistence on the workers to power slogan.

When Germain presented his analysis of the strike recently his contention -- which I believe was correct -- was that the central tactical task was not the immediate conquest of power but the conquest of the masses. That is, to advance those immediate and transitional demands which would be calculated to unite the workers in action against the state. That in the process of such action the question of state power would inevitably be pushed to the fore as the central task.

Remember, the working class was split down the middle. Half of the working class were not even participating in the strike. The strike, from the beginning, was of a defensive character, directed against the austerity program of the government. The tactical problem then was how to unite the workers around such demands as would solidify them in action and permit the class to pass over to the offensive.

And under the conditions that prevailed during the course of the strike you insist that the central slogan should have been the conquest of state power through the slogan: Workers to Power! Nonsense! Sectarian, infantile nonsense! I am convinced that the Belgian strike has been dragged into the discussion in order to try and prove that there has really been no change in "perfidious Pabloism," and that the nature of the "betrayal" in Belgium was of a piece with the position of the IS in East Germany in 1953.

You see you are hard put to find or concoct historical examples to bolster your contention that "Pabloism" of 1961 is the same as in 1953 and if you have to twist, distort and pervert the facts to do so -- then so much the worse for the facts. And that is what your whole Belgium indictment amounts to.

I waited for Philips to say something about the minority position on the Belgian strike but he neglected to do so. He, at least, has had some experience in the mass movement. He knows what it means to raise the slogan of the struggle for state power without the existence of a revolutionary party let alone with one. I can sum up your whole Belgian position in two words -- infantile leftism.

My concluding point -- the SLL. You don't have to lecture us, Tim, about the sterling qualities of the comrades of the SLL. What you do neglect to mention, however, is the not unimportant contributions of the SWP -- and Canadians, if you please -- in the building of the British movement. From the beginning there has been a close political collaboration between the SWP leadership and the Healy tendency. We've gone through some difficult periods together and I can truthfully say that the SWP never refused its wholehearted support. The same can be said for our Canadian comrades.

We've been able, up to now, to work out a common line and much of the success of the British can be attributed to the fact that their line was always worked out in close consultation with the SWP and the League. We now have an experiment in "independent" politics which I fear will not turn out too well.

Suddenly we have a concealed public polemic against the SWP in which we are not designated by name but appear anonymously under such epithets as "humbugs" or "dunderheads" for presumably fumbling and stumbling into the "untenable" position that Cuba is a workers state. You, the minority, are doing a great disservice to the SLL by painting them up as something special in an effort to prove that they are politically right as against us because they have achieved a few modest successes. Nobody is going to fall for that line.

They are no better nor any worse -- they are cast in no more heroic mold than our cadre. What they are today they owe in large measure to the SWP and its leadership which has consistently represented the orthodox Trotskyist tendency in the world movement and has been the main support of that tendency. Never forget that. And lest there be any misunderstanding, I speak here of political support, guidance and leadership.

I listened to Philips and perked up my ears when he went into his dissertation on how to build the mass revolutionary party. It's a subject about which all of us have

been vitally concerned. In fact it is the reason for our existence. So I listened, and listened and listened. But I must confess I know no more now than I did before.

I anticipated some new and startling revelation. But I guess I expected too much. What does Philips propose be done different from what we have been doing? We have faults -- granted! But taking us with or without our faults, how does he propose that the job be done? It still remains a mystery!

But I can tell you one thing. It will never be done by turning our backs on the living movement. It will never be done by trying to press into some preconceived mold of perfection the imperfect movement as it exists before deigning to grant it our recognition. We will either accept the living movement as it develops with all its imperfections and try to influence its development in a revolutionary direction by participating in it, or -- we can stand on the sideline and bemoan the fact that it doesn't meet all the norms and shout betrayal at every "deviation." That's the posture of sectarian impotence. And there's been too much of that in the history of world Trotskyism.

I have also been disturbed, as have been others, that in recent years the SLL has been exercising a virtual veto power over our policy on reunification of the world movement. That's what has been happening. Since 1957 we have tried every which way to convince, to argue, to persuade, to go ahead in common with the SLL on a common line. We thought we had agreement but it appears it was only in words. In deed the SLL has proceeded to place one barrier after another in the carrying out of what we thought was a common line and in effect vetoed the policy agreed upon.

No more! That's finished! From now on the SWP, by plenum and convention decision, has decided that the most important political task on the agenda is reunification of the world Trotskyist movement around a principled programmatic line. We will move forward toward that goal with whatever allies can be gathered around the political line of orthodox Trotskyism. We are convinced that such reunification can and will give a great impetus to the developing world struggle for socialism. The discussion is opened and it will be an open discussion. We are opposed to the policy of exclusion. The discussion will decide who stands where.

FRED MAZELIS: Comrades, I would like to say a few words about China and Yugoslavia. Many of the comrades have had a lot to say about Cuba. I don't think the minority comrades are afraid of talking about Cuba. I think that Tim explained how he felt about the British position on Cuba. I am sure he is going to discuss Escalante if he has time in his summary. I think that we've discussed this so many times also on the specific nature of the Cuban state that there is very little need to repeat once again our position. For instance, the fact that I believe that it is the majority that has developed a new concept, the concept basically of a developing workers state, and the fact that I believe that this is an unnecessary revision of our theory.

I've only been able to find one comrade, Dave, who has discussed some of the questions presented by Tim in his presentation. Particularly the question of Yugoslavia. Now, I think that Dave raised the question of Trotsky making wrong predictions also so it was really not that important. Well, I think that Trotsky making wrong predictions about revolutions in Western Europe is not the same as Pablo's problems. Pablo, as Murry and Bert in their recent article in the ISR, puts forward the possibility of the transformation of a bureaucracy, a Stalinist bureaucracy in a specific country, Yugoslavia in one case and China in the other. Or the transformation of a decisive section of that bureaucracy. He puts this forward as a distinct possibility. This is something we polemicised against in 1953 and the fact that the Pabloites put forward the same approach in an Open Letter to Mao as well as Castro in a recent issue of the "F.I." indicates that they haven't changed their basic approach to Stalinism and to the colonial revolution. Murry and Bert say much the same thing as Pablo says in his Open Letter, only they say it in a much more sophisticated manner.

Where do the comrades of the majority stand on this problem right now of how to regard the Chinese Revolution. It is certainly as important a problem as the Cuban Revolution. And I am not evading the question of the Cuban Revolution, I am just asking the comrades not to evade the question of the Chinese Revolution. Assuming that the comrades do not agree with the position of Swabeck, do they agree with the position that has been put forward in the ISR.

Do the comrades agree with Tim's characterization of the position of Stein and Germain during the discussion on Eastern Europe? Do the comrades think that these comrades

were theoretically incorrect, but had the right methodology as Tim explained he thought? If you are not sure I suggest you reacquaint yourselves -- because so many of the comrades took part in that discussion -- reacquaint yourselves with that discussion. I think that Tim is completely correct in the analogy that he constructed between the disagreement of Pablo and Germain at that period, and the present disagreement between the SLL and the SWP majority. Both Germain and the SLL made theoretical errors, which are perhaps easy to ridicule but it is Pablo and the majority that I feel made the rather serious methodological error.

One more point on this question of political revolution. The comrade that had most to do with recruiting me to the SWP, Comrade Bert, at a forum in New York recently discussed the problem because he was giving a forum on the Moscow-Peking dispute. A real Stalinist hack in the audience, they don't come too often to our forums, but this guy looked like a real representative of the CP, got up and said: "Well, do you counter-revolutionary Trotskyists (that was his general tone, more or less) do you still hold to your position of violent political revolution in the Soviet Union." And Bert equivocated, and I was extremely upset about this, comrades. Because he said that this depends upon what you mean by political revolution. And he went on to explain how he did not mean by political revolution exactly what has been presented by Tim today, the violent overthrow of the bureaucracy, the insurrection of the masses in the Soviet bloc, but that it was a gradual process. I fail to see the great difference between the point of view that was put forward there and the point of view that was polemicised against ten years ago -- or eight years ago, nine years ago. In other words, the point of view of Deutscher.

I. WARWAK: After listening to the comrades of the minority, I begin to wonder and get confused. And wonder if the Party that they are talking about, what they are describing as the Socialist Workers Party is really the party I know, or whether it's all something else.

What the minority says about the permanent revolution and the way I've been taught to understand it are contradictory. Because the way I've been taught to understand the permanent revolution, it seems to me that Cuba is a perfect example of the permanent revolution, and that the Cuban

revolution fits into the theory of the permanent revolution.

Now everybody knows that it doesn't have to follow a certain form. It didn't have to follow October exactly, and it certainly didn't. But that does not mean that October will not be repeated in some Latin American country where there are conditions which will lead to an October. For instance, lack of a party in Cuba; they are moving to form a United Party of the Cuban Socialist Revolution, a Marxist combat party. And with such a party based on the working class in some country in Latin America, it is very possible, since there are no exceptions in history, that October will be reflected more directly. On the other hand you may find that the change may be as the one emphasized in the Second Declaration of Havana, beginning as guerilla warfare on the countryside. But it is not one or the other, because they both occurred in history.

But at any rate I feel there is a lack of understanding on the part of the minority of what Stalinism really is. Stalinism was the negation of Bolshevism, whereas the Cuban revolution tends to restore Bolshevism on an international scale. Not a definitive solution, not all the way. It's just a beginning. It is possible that in Cuba certain events might happen and the Cuban leadership may be entrapped and ensnared by world Stalinism -- but we have an elementary duty to help the Cuban revolution and leadership along its path. Certainly I don't believe that we are so almighty that we have everything to give them and they nothing to give to us; because the real fact of the matter is that the goal of our movement is the realization of world socialism. The Cuban revolution has put a powerful block into the building of world socialism, and we would defend it as such even if it produced a Stalin.

If Anibal Escalante and the Stalinist apparatus of the bureaucratic apparatus, the privileged apparatus, the ones that would falsify history, discredit the revolutionary leadership, and then move to take out the revolutionary content of the Cuban program, which is being elaborated on through Latin America, through the colonial countries and which is reaching into the more advanced sections of the proletariat, world wide -- if they would begin to do that, then they would be capable of fostering a Stalinist bureaucratic type apparatus in Cuba.

But what would it require? It would require diminishing the authority of the leadership, knocking over Fidel

Castro and Che Guevarra and Raul Castro. It would mean taking the Second Declaration of Havana and throwing it in the waste basket.

What is Stalinism? Well, it was terror, using the terror that had been developed against the counter-revolutionaries against the revolutionaries. Certainly that doesn't exist in Cuba. Stalinism is a privileged caste. Castro has analyzed the material roots of privilege in an underdeveloped country in his March 17th speech. He asked, how can a young man become a Communist if he gets certain privileges above and beyond what the masses get? We don't want that in Cuba.

What is Stalinism besides privilege, besides terror? Stalinism is reformism. The reintroduction of Menshevism into the Bolshevik movement. And what was Menshevism? Looking to the national bourgeoisie as leadership. Subordinating the Communist Parties, the Third International to the national bourgeoisie of the underdeveloped countries and seeking alliance with them in the developed countries.

Now certainly anybody who's read the Second Declaration of Havana knows that this is not the course of the Cuban Revolution on the international scene. Because they have generalized the experience of Cuba, they have generalized it for the rest of Latin America, and the underdeveloped world. That the revolution on the agenda for the countries dominated by imperialism shall be a socialist revolution. And furthermore that it will require a working class leadership. Because they say themselves in the Second Declaration of Havana on the question of the peasantry: Sure we started as agents of the peasantry and the agrarian reform, etc., but the peasantry can go so far. It requires the working class to take the revolution further. They have through their experience come to understand the permanent revolution which Trotsky elaborated in 1904 and Marx and Engels and others pointed out before them.

So Cuba is a brilliant confirmation of this and what does it mean? It means essentially that we who best interpret and understand the Cuban revolution do everything in our power to take it forward. First of all that means defense right here at home, we all know that the main enemy of the Cuban revolution resides here.

Now are there going to be further conflicts between the Cuban revolution and Stalinism? Khrushchev is still a reformist. His program is still one of blocing with the

national bourgeoisie of the underdeveloped countries. His program may have eliminated the terror against his fellow bureaucrats, and liberalized certain things in relation to the masses and to the working class. But Khrushchev is still the most firm representative of the bureaucratic caste, and he is not going to liquidate the privileges of the bureaucratic caste which have been built up over decades.

One of the most fundamental contributions Trotsky made to the development of the world socialist revolution, on the question of norms of proletarian democracy is certainly a contribution we have to offer to the Cuban revolution. Will they make it? There are no guarantees, but we have to help them. Will there be conflicts with Stalinism? There have to be.

The Cuban revolution both in its search for norms of proletarian democracy and in its international revolutionary implications must of necessity come into conflict with Stalinism. We've already seen it.

Now the question of the international movement is compounded for us in terms of the urgency and necessity of having an international movement. Because bringing our international movement into some form of unity will make it easier to speed the revolutionary process and to be a pole of attraction.

Does that mean we liquidate ourselves? That we concede to Pabloism? Certainly not. I'm sure that we have lots of differences with the Pabloites, but that really isn't the point. The point is that we can live as Comrade Tom said in a unified movement.

I can't understand the position of the SLL on Cuba. It flies in the face of reality. As for the point that they've built a movement. Well a lot of people have built a movement. The YPSL's have built a larger movement than the YSA and I certainly wouldn't blame Comrade Tim for that, I certainly wouldn't say this makes their program correct, but this is the demagogic argument he's using about the SLL.

MYRA WEISS: History evolved in a quite different fashion than was anticipated by the founders of the science of Marxism, the founders of scientific socialism and all their disciples. And because man can only predict in the science of society

the general course of development it is bound to be so. And that is why the subjective factor that Tim raised in his report is so vital because it takes a Lenin and a Trotsky, the students of Marx, to see the changed reality and act on the basis of it -- learning what they must from the masters applying all the experiences of the past and applying it to the fresh new reality in such a way as they can affect that reality.

Now we live in a different world than existed in the 1930's when we had a Trotsky's guidance. We can't answer all the problems by reading the works of Trotsky. We can get the clue to the answers, we can get the methodology, we can get the guidance theoretically, but we can't get the answers. We have to become Trotsky's. We have to become Lenin's, or we will sit in a small circle talking with each other pedantically about formalistic dogmatic notions.

How has the world changed? Well it's very simple. It looked in the early part of this century as if the revolution would take place in an advanced capitalist country and it would spread out from there. It didn't happen that way. The German Social-Democracy was rotten through and through and Lenin had to see the new reality and bring the proletariat to power in an undeveloped country. Alright that was Lenin. That was his genius. That is what we must learn from. His genius.

Trotsky saw the degeneration of the Soviet Union, saw it develop its bourgeois abnormalities, saw the great proletarian democracy corroded and destroyed and a bureaucracy develop. He saw a whole revolutionary generation sidetracked and in fact a whole revolution brought to defeat in the advanced capitalist countries of Europe. Trotsky said it is necessary to make a political revolution and overthrow this bureaucracy and he counterposed his ideas of political revolution to Stalinism. That became an extension of the conception of the permanent revolution. Not just a combination of the bourgeois national revolution and the proletarian revolution but also the political revolution.

Then came the second World War and there was a new upsurge of revolution. Trotsky was absolutely right in prognosticating that this must be the course of the development of the world revolution. He was proven right to the hilt but who led it? Quarrell with history if you like but we didn't. It was made by the Communist Party. It was

made by the proletarians under the leadership of the partisans in Yugoslavia. It was made by Mao Tse-tung and his rotten bureaucratic Communist Party of China. They made a revolution and in making a revolution they began a struggle and a break with Stalin and the whole domination of radical revolutionary forces by the Kremlin. This was a great event. It broke the back of world capitalism, did it not, and it even brought the world revolution to the point where we had a revolution entirely free of Stalinist control. And so the world revolution moves on in its manifold form.

Now we have the advanced theoretical conception which is the highest expression of the objective needs of the world revolution. There is no higher expression of it than in our heads. But frankly if I had to choose I would rather learn it from life as Castro did, rather than to have learned it from the books because I'm an activist as all of the rest of you are here, except a few people who are yet to learn the struggle that they have been reading about.

We want to make a revolution. Castro is ours. The Cuban revolution is ours. The Chinese revolution is ours. The Hungarian revolution is ours. But in the victory of the revolution in the advanced countries and in its further growth and development in the undeveloped countries, there must be fusion of our consciousness with the Castro's, with the Chinese communists, with the Hungarian communists, who fought a revolution against the bureaucracy, with all those youth and all those proletarians who love freedom and who want socialism enough to fight for it and die for it. We have to fuse with them.

Now how do we do it? Not by sitting on our haunches and criticizing every step and predicting disaster the next day. It's by taking everything positive they do, every forward step they make, and saying yes we make it with you. Good, now go further.

A young comrade who happens to be a wanderer and was the first I think to wander to Cuba to bring us back a very enthusiastic report, also wandered to South Africa. The African continent as the American continent, is boiling, seething with revolutionary development. I was excited at his report. He met a whole bunch of young communists -- they said they were -- they considered themselves in the Soviet bloc, but they didn't like Khrushchev. They were Fidelistas. Already a new axis is developing in the whole youth and radical movement in Africa as in Latin America. A new axis that is moving on the basis of a new and more excit-

ing and more clear-cut revolutionary victory than has been up till now enjoyed since the October revolution and that's the Cuban revolution. And they are ardent Fidelistas.

Now these young kids are engaged in revolutionary actions in South Africa where it is certainly dangerous to undertake revolutionary propaganda. They read what Blas Roca had to say. He says alright, he admits that we were wrong on many questions, the Communists, and these young Africans said: But why doesn't he explain why they were wrong? How was it possible for a party that was supposed to be revolutionary to have made so many errors? These youth are deeply involved in theoretical discussions trying to find their road to us. And they are the revolutionary forces that we must unite with.

Now Philips declared war against us on the international level and on the course of reunifying the world movement. I'm not surprised and I'm not dismayed, not alarmed because I knew from the beginning that we would have to struggle with sectarianism in order to regroup the forces that will make a living reality of world Trotskyism, link it up with the masses, and enable us to lead a revolution. We are going to have to fight sectarianism and you do us a favor to act as a foil so we can clarify our own thinking in the course of the tasks that lie ahead. So I welcome the contribution you make and I can also promise on my part that we will engage patiently and hopefully in the polemic that is necessary to make the small cadres of Trotskyism sufficiently viable on an international scale so that we will lead the world revolution instead of sitting and arguing and discussing its further course. This is my hope for history and I think it will be done only if we succeed in booting out of our own habit of thought all vestiges of dogmatism, of intolerance for differences, and show ourselves sufficiently flexible to be able to gather together the forces that can build a new revolutionary movement, from whatever direction they have come, to lead the world revolution.

B. WINNICK: This is a rather difficult statement I have to make. As a point of departure, I would like to refer to Comrade Alvin's remarks. In a sense the idea he was talking about was: "How to win friends and influence people." He indicated that when you want to build parties, to influence people who are coming toward us, you have to go toward them, to "identify" with them. I think that is not the right approach. As long as I've been a Trotskyist I've always thought the way to win people over (contrists

who are moving toward us) is by collaborating with them, maintaining a friendly relationship, but in no way softening the sharpness and clarity of our program. In this way we serve as a solid center of attraction for these comrades.

Now, I support the majority point of view on Cuba. I have thought all along that the SLL position on Cuba is cockeyed. I also support the reunification of the International. That is why my statement is a difficult one to make, because I believe that the majority resolution -- the international resolution -- which was adopted at the convention, and which, of course, we are still discussing, is in fact a centrist document. On the other hand, I feel that the minority documents (both Tim's and the SLL position) are sectarian and anti-dialectic. I, therefore, feel that neither is consonant with the genuine Trotskyist tradition. Of course, when I mentioned this to comrades in the branch, they said: "If you feel that both positions are wrong, it's your duty to write your own document." I regret that I am unskilled in writing documents, but I do feel it necessary to make this statement.

At the national convention I asked: "Why was it necessary to repudiate basic Trotskyist positions?" which in my opinion the majority did. At that time I believed it was just a problem of weak formulations. But upon further study and reflection, I am convinced that it wasn't merely formulation. There was a basic purpose on the part of the framers of the resolution. It is now plain that the purpose of obscuring sharp positions that we have taken historically was to present a document which could serve as a basis for unity in the International.

In this sense you'll understand what I mean by saying that the discussion concerns the question of how to win people who are coming closer to you. I believe it is still necessary to sharply differentiate ourselves from centrists. We don't have to soften our language; we don't have to cut out the heart and guts of our most important positions. We were not afraid to present our full position in the face of the most frantic pressure during the Finland days, and during many other trying and crucial periods. Comrade Alvin said there were times when Lenin and Trotsky were extremely sharp and polemical only because they were "trying to establish their position." But they were trying to distinguish their position from comrades who were close to them, and there was no mercy on their part toward these centrists who were wavering. And I think this was correct. Yes, we should continue to differentiate ourselves. In

practical work, we're finding that to be necessary every day. We work with socialists, with people of the "News and Letters" group, and we must maintain the clarity of our differences, even though we're working in the same organization.

In summing up: the relinquishment of basic programs ought to be presented openly and I don't think that they have been. The abandonment of basic ideas, which express the essence of our political existence, should not be sneaked in through the back door of vague, nebulous and centrist formulations.

F. DOBBS: Comrades, I want to touch on just one central aspect of the discussion before us -- what's at the heart of and what follows from our discussion at this plenum.

The Political Committee believes that it has become objectively possible and necessary to work consciously to help promote reunification of the world Trotskyist movement. We put as the central axis of that endeavor an objective search to ascertain what premises exist for a sound reunification on the broadest possible basis commensurate with the principles of our movement. We believe it would be misleadership to proceed on any other basis.

We are confronted here by a counter-view which takes as its premise, so far as I am able to ascertain, opposition to any conception of the possibility of reunification. Instead of lending themselves to a probe for political clarity, the minority tries to abstract from political differences among those who stand in opposition to reunification. Just let me cite a couple of examples that I think will illustrate the point.

We have before us a document signed by Comrade Wohlforth and Comrade Philips and others. In that document you will find a clause saying that they don't agree with everything the SLL has to say on the Cuban question. There's that little disclaimer. (You're an insurance man, Bill, you'll know about things like that). We are not told where are the areas of agreement and where are the areas of disagreement. And one begins to wonder whether or not there is fidelity to political principle when a section of our party solidarizes itself with the SLL resolution on that premise.

Then you come to the end of the same document and down below the signatures you find a foot-note. Comrade Philips

adds another disclaimer. I forget the exact words but he says in effect that he doesn't agree with everything in the document he has signed. Well, that didn't come as a complete surprise to comrades but it naturally gave rise to some of the questions that have been asked in the discussion. What is the basis for agreement, where is there disagreement?

Comrade Philips is well-known to have held a state capitalist position and it was our impression that Comrade Wohlforth didn't subscribe to that position. Well, how then do you justify your common document? I failed to perceive in Comrade Wohlforth's presentation at the opening of the discussion any attempt at an answer, but I did note rather carefully the answer that Comrade Philips presented very briefly in his remarks. He said that he's in the process of rethinking some positions, needs a little more time to develop his new views, this isn't quite the place, the occasion -- words to that effect. Meantime, he indicated, there is a premise for solidarity with Wohlforth against the PC, if I heard him correctly, to preserve the role of the working class. As against what? As against alleged attempts on our part to substitute some other social strata for the working class.

With this presentation, or more accurately -- if I may make an understatement -- lack of presentation, of a basis upon which this bloc is cemented, we have been treated to quite a lambasting about the manner in which the leadership of the party is abandoning all good principles. You comrades of the minority are going to preserve the role of the working class? Part of what's necessary for the preservation of the role of the working class is a little clarity on fundamentals. That's where it begins. How are you going to preserve the role of the working class when you begin by fogging up, in the vanguard cadre of the class in this country, some very fundamental theoretical questions that have a history in our movement? Questions which you've both had -- down to and including this plenum -- an abundantly ample, democratic opportunity to explain. Nobody gagged you.

I begin to get the uneasy feeling, and I don't believe I'm alone in it, that you're maneuvering with the cadre. I make that as a political charge. You're maneuvering with the cadre. And that's against principle, that's against preserving the role of the working class, that's against educating comrades, that's against building a firm, responsible, principled cadre. That's against everything that we've been taught in our movement. That's against one of the most precious things in our movement. Integrity to the cadre.

And I mean political integrity. I'm not talking about anything personal. I'm talking about political conduct of members of the National Committee vis-a-vis the cadre of the Socialist Workers Party.

Now, the issue is fogged in numerous ways. We're told that either we have to say there is no possibility for reunification with anybody on the IS side today, or we are admitting that Pablo was right and we were wrong in 1953. We are told that when we don't demand equal time for Escalante on the Havana radio, we have abandoned the principle of workers democracy. Such gimmicks are presented by way of a theoretical evaluation of how the leadership of this party is going to hell in a handbasket.

But I'm running out of time, so just let me conclude by saying something on behalf of the Political Committee. I want to make crystal clear that despite all contrary insinuations, it's not just this slicker Hansen -- who got some heady ideas up in the rarified atmosphere of Utah and came down among us to write and speak real smooth -- who's presenting a position to the cadre. He's the official reporter for the Political Committee. He's reporting on a position supported by every member of the Political Committee, save one, Comrade Wohlforth, who's getting equal time as a minority reporter.

I gather from the discussion that the plenum will concur in the Political Committee report and I want to say this: It shall be the aim and intention of the PC, on the basis of the action of this plenum, to proceed as outlined in the document and the report to press for reunification within the world Trotskyist movement of all forces who can reach common political agreement along basic lines essential to principled collaboration.

We, as you know, are prevented by anti-democratic laws in this country from having organizational affiliation, but we will nevertheless, in a fraternal way, do our best to promote unity within the world movement. In doing so, we will take cognizance of the fact that an important section of the cadres on the IS side -- in the split of the last 9 years -- have indicated they are prepared to quit fooling around with factional maneuvers and get down to some serious discussion about measures to achieve reunification. It will be the policy of the Political Committee, as a mandate from this plenum, to promote reunification on the world arena among all cadres where this is the necessary basis of political agreement, and to oppose all -- from whatever quarter --

who in a blind, factional, sectarian way try to obstruct unity.

What's at stake is whether the world Trotskyist movement is going to take advantage of new objective opportunities to go forward, or whether it's going to be historically discredited, which it would deserve to be if it hadn't learned enough in all these years to be able to recognize a historic opportunity when one comes along and do something about it. And the cadre of this party is going to be watching very closely to see whether the comrades of the Wohlforth-Philips bloc conduct themselves responsibly on this question.

#