

# SWP

# discussion bulletin

Published by the

**SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY**

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE  
NEW YORK 3, NEW YORK

Vol. 24, No. 15

May 1963

## Contents

	<u>Page</u>
1. The Rebuilding of the Fourth International -- Statement by the Reorganized Minority Tendency.	1
2. What Is An Unprincipled Amalgam?, by Albert Philips.	10
3. Unprincipled Combinationism -- Past and Present, by Tom Kerry.	13

30¢

## THE REBUILDING OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

--statement by the Reorganized Minority Tendency

1. The current deep crisis within the world movement can only be understood by first understanding the nature of the period we are presently going through. Despite the growth of the Soviet Bloc and the progressive development of the colonial revolution, the primary feature of the postwar period has been the temporary re-stabilization of capitalism. Thus while capitalism has weakened internationally by World War II, the traitorous role of Stalinism allowed it to stabilize itself for a short period in a shrinking section of the world and to go through a period of genuine economic boom. As a result of this objective situation, combined with the class collaborationist role of the Stalinist and social democratic leaderships of the working class, the class has been relatively quiescent in the advanced countries and to a lesser degree in the underdeveloped countries as well.
2. As a result of this situation the working class vanguard, the world Trotskyist cadres, have remained very small propagandistic groups, in many cases quite isolated from the mass of the working class itself. The split in the world movement in 1953, which found its expression in Cochranism within our own party, was caused by a section of the international cadre which deserted a proletarian outlook altogether, hoping that objective circumstances would compel the Stalinist bureaucracy to carry through the revolution. The International Committee was formed at that time to maintain the Trotskyist cadre during a period generally unfavorable to the serious growth of the International.
3. The current period is markedly different from this postwar period. The major importance of the SLL international resolution "World Prospects for Socialism" is precisely that it attempts to analyze this new situation and works out a tactical line for the rebuilding of the world movement on the basis of this analysis. The major characteristic of the present period is the growing internal crisis of the capitalist system as a whole. World capitalism is today going through a period of transition from the period of temporary stabilization which dominated the postwar world into a new period of revolutionary upsurge of the world proletariat. Thus, the "postwar period" as we have known it is coming to an end and the new period of revolutionary upsurge of the proletariat lies before us. This intermediary period is dominated by the growing crisis of stagnation which is deeply affecting both the advanced and underdeveloped capitalist countries and is itself creating the conditions for renewed class struggle activity on the part of the working class.

4. The effects of this growing capitalist crisis upon the advanced countries can be clearly seen in the recent events in France and England. The strike of the French coal and iron miners, supported by strike actions of other government workers, clearly indicated that the French working class is far from "quiescent". Only the rotten leadership of the Stalinists, social democrats and Catholics prevented the strike from expanding into a general strike and developing political as well as economic aims. The effects of prosperity on the French workers has been to encourage them to struggle when one section of the class lags behind another in gains and will in the future give the workers confidence to struggle when inflation eats away at the gains they have won so far. The recent demonstration of unemployed workers in England is also of extreme importance. The militancy of the demonstration and the fact that it immediately took on a political character, went over into a direct demonstration at the gates of Parliament and to demands for a Labour government, is a hint of what can be expected in the future especially when one realizes that unemployment in England today is nowhere near as extensive as in this country. These two events, taken together, give us an indication of the kind of class struggles we can expect in the advanced countries today during this extremely important transitional period.

5. We can also expect to see the proletariat in the colonial sector emerging as an independent factor of considerable significance in colonial politics as well as see the growing class struggle activity in the advanced countries. Certainly signs of this new activity on the part of the colonial proletariat can already be seen. In areas as far apart as Latin America, West Africa and India there have been strike actions brought about primarily by the eating away of the real wages of the working class through inflation, itself a reflection of this world wide crisis of stagnation. Thus the objective basis is being laid for the alliance of the proletariat with the peasantry which is essential for the carrying through of the democratic revolution and its going over into the socialist revolution.

6. The Stalinist countries cannot fail but be affected by this general process. Already the growing conflicts within the bureaucracies of the Soviet countries are a sign of the growing restiveness of the proletariat itself. We can expect as the class struggle deepens in the capitalist two thirds of the world that the proletariat in the Soviet countries will gain in self consciousness and the objective basis will be laid for the political revolution, that is the revolutionary uprising of the working class under Marxist leadership to restore true Soviet democracy.

7. The basic task of the Trotskyist cadre is to develop a strategic outlook based upon an understanding of this fundamental development. Every Trotskyist group or party has the responsibility not only to understand the general outline of this international development but to develop in the concrete a strategy for the building of the Trotskyist movement in the particular country upon the basis of understanding how this process is affecting the working class of the country. Our own document, "The Decline of American Imperialism and the Tasks of the SWP" is an attempt to develop such an approach for our party.

8. While the concrete analysis and tasks will differ widely from country to country, certain general tasks will be necessary everywhere. We must understand that this is a transitional period to a new period of upsurge rather than being either a period of the "organic expansion" of capitalism or of renewed revolutionary upsurge. Thus our tasks remain essentially preparatory in nature. Or to pose it in its classic form, our task now is not the conquest of state power but the conquest of the masses in preparation for the conquest of state power. Everywhere and in all countries our cadres must break away from the routine habits of propaganda group existence and reach out, no matter how meagre our forces may be, to establish contact with the masses themselves on whatever political level this can be done. This must be the main orientation of the whole international movement and the major task of each national section. Those sections which do not attempt such work will quickly find themselves bypassed by developments during the period of revolutionary upsurge.

9. Work among petty bourgeois strata, and fusions and maneuvers with such forces, must be a subordinate task of the sections. To the extent that we show ourselves to be serious about reaching the masses themselves we will attract to our banner those petty bourgeois forces capable of playing a serious revolutionary role. The forces which we must seek every opportunity to reach, to fuse with, are the leftward moving sections of the working class itself. Such formations can be expected to arise more frequently as the current crisis of stagnation has an ever deeper impact on the class.

10. The major characteristic of Pabloism in all its manifestations is its failure to grasp the full significance of this change that is taking place and to seek to concretely orient its forces in the direction of the class itself. Nowhere has Pabloism emerged with a solid cadre, even of small size, with serious roots in the class itself. Everywhere it appears as an essentially petty-bourgeois grouping deeply enmeshed in maneuvers among centrist circles and never anywhere near the workers themselves. Not only has Pabloism

so far neglected this essential task, it has actually acted as a disorienting factor turning the attention of the cadres away from the class and towards petty bourgeois formations.

11. Lacking serious roots in the class, the effect of the new turn in the objective situation has been to throw the Pabloites into a deep internal crisis. Last year the entire Latin American cadre of the IS, that is that section of the IS which had experienced the most substantial growth in the past few years, split away under the leadership of Posados and set up a rival IS. Interestingly small groups in Italy, France and Belgium, made up primarily of young people, broke away and joined Posados. In addition Posados claims groups in Algeria and Japan. In part the Posados break-away represented a move to the left. This can be seen in the fact that the Posados organization is strongly critical of the European Pabolite's adaptationist line towards the social democratic and Stalinist parties in Europe and its adaptationist line towards petty bourgeois national currents in the colonial countries like Ben Bella. In part they remain confused on other questions such as their indefensible concepts on the war question.

12. The LSSP, the only substantial Trotskyist group formally adhering to the IS, has displayed over the past few years serious parliamentary weaknesses as well as a generally opportunist attitude towards the national bourgeoisie in Ceylon. Its relations with the IS are more formal than real and it is more realistic to view it as a relatively independent factor within the world Trotskyist movement as a whole.

13. The remaining European cadres of the Pabloite IS are now locked in a bitter internal battle with Pablo on one side and Germain-Livio-Frank on the other. Pablo accuses the Germain leadership of "right opportunism" in the carrying out of the "sui generis" entry line in Europe. In particular he accuses the Dutch, under Germain's tutelage, of completely adapting to the social democratic leadership in that country. This characterization is, of course, completely true. In the past we have shown how this outlook of Germain's paralyzed him during the Belgian General Strike during which the Pabloites were incapable of projecting any line independent of the centrist leadership of the strike. (See: "In Defense of a Revolutionary Perspective," Discussion Bulletin Vol 23, No. 4 and the SLL's "World Prospects for Socialism" Labour Review Vol. 6 No. 3).

14. Pablo, for his part, has gone as far or further than Germain in adapting to the petty bourgeois leaderships in the colonial countries. He now projects the creation of workers states "for a whole period" and "in a number of colonial and semi-colonial countries" by forces other than the proletariat. The proletariat, he

claims is a "privileged strata" in underdeveloped countries and plays a generally conservative role. As a substitute for the proletariat he looks to the petty bourgeoisie, what he calls "a Jacobin leadership sui generis" which will lead the peasantry. As far as the advanced countries are concerned, he sees no revolutionary possibilities at all because capitalism, he claims, is going through a "new organic expansion."

15. Thus it is not Pabloism which has changed in the period since the 1953 split. Even though objective conditions make its outlook more and more untenable, Pabloism today, as in 1953, represents a tendency to turn our cadres away from the working class; to look to other parties, other classes for revolutionary leadership. Should there be any doubt on this question the Pabloites have cleared it up in their "Declaration of Reunification of the World Trotskyist Movement" passed by the 23rd plenum of the IEC, June 23,24, 1962. They state: "The political basis of the 1953-54 split, as we saw it, was a lack of full understanding of the correctness of the International's turn in the estimate of the world situation, made in 1950-1951." However, the Pabloites comment, "starting from the XXth Congress of the CPSU, some organizations affiliated with the International Committee or in sympathy with its political views as in the case of the SWP, corrected their evaluation of the world situation and of the evolution within the Soviet Union, and arrived at an estimation of events very close to that of the IVth International. From that time on, reunification became not only desirable but also possible." Thus, the Pabloites correctly maintain that they have maintained in the period since 1953 their same central outlook, the outlook which the party clearly labelled at that time as Revisionism. It is the party which now has returned to the political positions it fought against in 1953. The party has a political responsibility to the world movement to explain this evolution. It cannot at one and the same time maintain it was correct in issuing the Open Letter in 1953 and maintain it is correct today in endorsing the same views it attacked in that letter in 1953. The party either was wrong in 1953 or it is wrong today.

16. The adoption of the method of Pabloism by the party majority has led to the erosion of the party's revolutionary working class outlook which has affected, to one degree or another, virtually all political questions. The traditional views of our movement on Stalinism have been among the hardest hit. It is precisely this very same process which played a central role in the 1953 split. The clearest expression of this process recently can be found in Milton Alvin's article "Critical Support of Political Revolution -- A Reply to Liang's Open Letter" (Discussion Bulletin Vo. 24 No. 5). This article, which seeks to defend the concept of

the political revolution against an open attack by Liang and Swabek, in reality revises its most central content. Comrade Alvin states: "We have never looked upon political revolution as an armed uprising, necessarily. It is impossible to predict in what form the revolution will take place, that is, by armed rebellion, as it was attempted in Hungary, or in some other way." (emphasis ours). This may be Alvin's view and it certainly is Deutscher's -- but it is not Trotsky's. As early as 1933 Trotsky saw the necessity of violent struggle against a section of the apparatus: "No normal 'constitutional' ways remain to remove the ruling clique. The bureaucracy can be compelled to yield power into the hands of the proletarian vanguard only by force." Note that this was a period when Trotsky still felt a political revolution would not be necessary. Later in the Revolution Betrayed (1936) Trotsky states: "There is no peaceful outcome for this crisis. No devil ever yet voluntarily cut off his own claws. The Soviet Bureaucracy will not give up its positions without a fight. The development leads obviously to the road of revolution." Still later in the Transitional Program (1938) Trotsky reiterates this point: "Only the victorious revolutionary uprising of the oppressed masses can revive the Soviet regime and guarantee its further development towards socialism. There is but one party capable of leading the Soviet masses to insurrection -- the party of the Fourth International!" (emphasis ours). All the above quotes can be found in "Trotsky or Deutscher?" by James P. Cannon (Winter, 1954, Fourth International). Does the majority still adhere to the concepts contained in that article? If so it must now repudiate Milton Alvin's views.

17. Pabloism has also had a deep impact on the outlook of the party majority on the Colonial Revolution. The recent statement of the Political Committee "For Early Reunification of the World Trotskyist Movement" contains a whole section on the colonial revolution which does not even mention the working class. It would seem that the party majority is endorsing the views of Pablo on this question whereby the peasantry under petty bourgeois leadership replaces the proletariat. This is in direct contradiction to the theory of the permanent revolution which states unequivocally: "...the theory of the permanent revolution signified that the complete and genuine solution of their task of achieving democracy and national emancipation is conceivable only through the dictatorship of the proletariat as the leader of this subjugated nation, above all the peasant masses...Without an alliance of the proletariat with the peasantry the tasks of the democratic revolution cannot be solved, not even seriously posed..." (The Permanent Revolution and Results and Prospects by Leon Trotsky, pp. 152-153, emphasis ours). If the majority comrades feel that the theory of the permanent revolution is incorrect it is their responsibility to openly state this and revise this theory. If not they must revise the above mentioned PC statement.

18. The great Cuban Revolution has been incorrectly utilized to fortify revisionist concepts on the nature of Stalinism and the permanent revolution. By so doing comrades have done a great disservice to this most profound revolutionary development in the Western Hemisphere in the whole postwar period. Comrades see in the "Cuban Way" a new method of establishing workers states in all colonial countries without the proletariat playing a real role in the process. These comrades fail to see that to the extent that Cuba has broken away from the dominance of international capital while at the same time not taking a fully international proletarian position, it has become dependent for its very survival on counterrevolutionary Stalinism. But the Kremlin is not interested in promoting revolutionary developments which threaten its diplomatic efforts to seek peaceful coexistence with the imperialists. Thus, while the USSR has aided Cuba in order to put pressure on imperialism to force imperialism to come to terms with it, it is inconceivable that the Soviet countries would offer such assistance to our revolutionary countries as a pattern. Thus for the revolution to develop even as far as it has developed in Cuba in other underdeveloped countries the proletariat must be in the leadership of the peasantry and the revolutionary struggle must relate itself to the struggle of the working class in the advanced capitalist countries.

19. The Cuban missiles crisis clearly illustrates this point. It is now clear beyond a doubt that: (1) the missiles were placed in Cuba not for the defense of that country but as part of a pressure move by the USSR on the U.S.; (2) the method of their removal by the USSR through direct secret negotiations with Kennedy without consultation with Castro and including an acceptance by the Kremlin of UN inspection illustrated the extent to which the Stalinists are willing to sacrifice the Cuban Revolution to their own counterrevolutionary ends; (3) despite the fact that the Stalinists are the strongest political force among the world proletariat today, nowhere in the whole world did the Stalinists organize a single serious demonstration or action in defense of the Cuban Revolution during those critical hours. A section of our party reacted well in these events seeing in them a vindication of our traditional analysis of Stalinism. Another section, deeply infected by Pabloism, blunted in our press any direct criticism of the role of Stalinism in these events (even when the crisis was over) and thus hindered our efforts to defend the Cuban Revolution. The one lesson which our party must now absorb from this whole experience is the necessity for the very survival of the Cuban Revolution for this revolution to defend itself through reliance on the world proletariat and its independent power rather than upon counterrevolutionary Stalinism.

20. The PC majority claims to uphold the importance of the revolutionary struggle in the advanced countries and further to see a crisis developing within these countries. However,



so far it has done nothing to orient our own cadres towards the developing situation in the mass movement of our own country. Rather, the party has been concentrating its efforts working in the very same petty bourgeois radical milieu as do the Pabloites in Europe. Thus, at the very same time as it moves closer and closer to Pabloite views on the international scene, it neglects work in the mass movement in its own country. This illustrates the close connection between the drift of the party on the American scene and its international outlook.

21. The turn of the party once again in a Pabloite direction has led to a deep internal crisis within the International Committee. The British and French sections, which have been going through a period of substantial, healthy growth, have rejected the Pabloite views of the party majority while other IC sections have been deeply confused by these developments. It is extremely significant that it is the SLL which should assume the leadership in opposing the majority's turn to Pabloism. It is precisely the SLL which has emerged over the past several years as the largest Trotskyist group in all of Europe, almost entirely proletarian in composition with deep roots in the working class of Great Britain. A sectarian group is incapable of such growth and thus the majority's charges against the SLL do not stand up against the objective reality of the continued growth of the SLL.

22. We must realistically face up to the reality of the present state of the world movement and starting from there, seek how best to rebuild it into an effective international force. The Fourth International as we have always conceived of it, that is as a world party of revolution, does not really exist today. It is split into three major bodies: the IC, the IS, the Posados IS. The former two have deep political divisions within them. In addition the Indian section remains apart from any international affiliation and the LSSP operates as an independent entity. None of these groups is a real world party nor is any likely to emerge as such in the near future. Even if all these groups could be combined into one catch-all international, the resultant organization would be so paralyzed by the political differences within it, it would be incapable of functioning as a real world party. In fact it could do little more than regulate a discussion of these political differences, something which the Parity Commission, already in existence, can do just as well.

23. The rebuilding of the world party can only occur through a dual process of each section building its cadres through a revolutionary orientation towards the working class of its own country combined with an international political discussion process aimed at clarifying the political program around which a real cohesive

international can be rebuilt. Any step which facilitates this discussion process must be warmly supported. Any step which has the effect of disengaging a section of the cadres from this process must be strongly opposed.

24. Additional splits or quick reunifications which attempt to cut short this essential political discussion process hinder rather than help the genuine reunification of the world Trotskyist cadres. Any conceivable reunification that takes place in the next immediate period could succeed only in uniting but a fraction of the world Trotskyist forces and it could accomplish this only by precipitating additional splits. Such a step would not be a reunification at all but rather a political realignment. In our opinion the political discussion has not yet developed to a point where such a realignment will be properly prepared politically and thus properly understood by the world cadre.

25. It is our strong conviction that this international political discussion process will lead to the reorientation of the great bulk of the present world Trotskyist cadres, including the bulk of our own party, around a Trotskyist, that is a proletarian revolutionary outlook. Pabloism, which seems today to be such a dominant trend in the world movement, will show itself to be the ideology of only a small petty bourgeois section of the cadre, incapable of making the turn towards the masses which the objective conditions require of the world party.

April 20, 1963

WHAT IS AN UNPRINCIPLED AMALGAM?

by Albert Philips

Within the reorganized minority tendency in the SWP, and within the international tendency constituted primarily by our co-thinkers in Britain and France, there are differences on the exact sociological characterization of the Cuban State.

In a rather desperate attempt to make this question the central axis of the current discussion, spokesmen for the majority have, implicitly and explicitly, accused the minority of unprincipled politics, of "playing with the cadre."

The charge has a not unfamiliar ring. The Cochranites counterposed their political homogeneity with the I.S. to the common struggle waged against them by comrades with differing sociological evaluations of the USSR. This unity was forged in struggle to defend our Marxist heritage, our rich and potent revolutionary tradition against the attack of the revisionists: in defense of the concept of the working class as the decisive and only genuinely revolutionary force in society; in defense of the Trotskyist concept of the petty bourgeois and counter-revolutionary nature of Stalinism; in defense of the very existence of the revolutionary combat party of the working class.

It was a bloc, formally constituted or not, with deep precedents in the revolutionary movement. Trotsky, in the opening pages of In Defense of Marxism explains that while differing sociological evaluations lead, under certain adverse historical circumstance, to differing political programs and conclusions, in the long run, political agreement on the immediate and basic tasks is decisive for common action.

In Russia, for example, Trotsky and the Bolsheviks arrived for the most part at similar political conclusions despite important differences in the evaluation of the character of the coming revolution in Russia. They could arrive at such agreement basically because they concurred in the conclusion that whatever the nature of the revolution, it was the working class, and not the bourgeoisie or the peasantry which would play the leading role. And once Trotsky came to accept the necessity for the Leninist combat party, then Trotskyism and Bolshevism became one.

It is no accident that the questions involved dealt with party and class. In every major dispute or agreement in the history of the revolutionary movement, these two interrelated questions sooner or later came to the surface.

Our tendency has been formed in the face of attacks, some open, some concealed, against the concept of the revolutionary role of the working class and the necessity for a vanguard com-

bat party. Under such circumstances, it would be criminally irresponsible to permit sociological differences to stand in the way, so long as these differences are not concealed. In the case of Cuba, if these abstract differences were to lead to differences on the necessity for the defense of Cuba, then such a bloc would be impossible. But as a matter of fact, as militant revolutionary defenders of Cuba, our minority as a whole can justifiably claim the road towards the real defense of Cuba by calling for reliance on mass action of the working class and its allies, and not by giving fervent thanks to Khrushchev for saving the peace in the manner of some of the majority.

The majority, on the other hand, tries to conceal differences of a major character on all of the concrete problems and tasks of the revolutionary movement today beneath a facade of unity on the sociological nature of the Cuban State. In vain.

Pablo, who is a leading part of this "politically homogeneous and principled bloc", denies out of hand any revolutionary perspective for the working class in the advanced countries, or in the colonial countries. He denies any real historic role for the revolutionary party. Where do you stand on this, comrades of the majority? Or do you prefer to limit the discussion to only Cuba?

At the same time as the American majority boasts its principled unity, Pablo announces the formation of a tendency to combat Germain and Co. because he accuses them of being "right opportunists" in liquidating whatever Trotskyist cadre remains under their leadership after years of sui generis entries. Of such ethereal stuff is this bloc constituted on an international scale. But we would like to know if, within the big bloc we are to bloc with Pablo against Germain, or Germain against Pablo? Or would you prefer to limit the discussion to the nature of the Cuban State?

Within the U.S. Swabeck, a duly accredited member of the homogeneous majority by virtue of agreement on the "acid test" of the nature of the Cuban State, hurls the acid in the faces of his colleagues by quite properly demanding that the standards established by them for Cuba be applied to China, even if this should in passing complete the task of the destruction of the Fourth International begun by Pablo.

Milton Alvin defends the majority position on China against Swabeck by solemnly informing us that the political revolution against the bureaucracy does not entail violent overthrow, that this is a Stalinist canard. God defend the majority from its homogeneous friends. The Hungarian workers will not.

Comrade Bert Deck, who passed the acid test with flying colors by beating the rest of the majority by six months in

dating the establishment of a workers state in Cuba, is no longer in the party to defend his "special position."

Even on the most critical question of all, the defense of the Cuban Revolution (the real acid test of the Cuban events), the majority has no principled agreement within its constituents. One section of the majority has minimized the counterrevolutionary threat of Stalinism to the Cuban Revolution which was so clearly illustrated in the missiles crisis while another section of the majority reacted to these events in the same general spirit as the minority. How hollow is the majority's sociological definition of the Cuban State when it leads to absolutely contradictory methods of defending that state when its very existence was threatened.

No, good comrades of the majority! Your "acid test" reveals more about the examiners than the examined. Before the ink on the question is dry, the answers are rolling in, and they are all wrong in the most immediate and conclusive areas.

Our tendency, unified on its attitude towards the working class, towards Stalinism, and towards the party will be successful in growing not only within the movement, but in being its best defenders and builders nationally and internationally. Yet it is precisely here, in the most acid of all tests, that the majority falls into scattered parts, in theory and in practice, in politics and in organization. Who then is principled? Who then is playing with the cadre?

April 20, 1963

UNPRINCIPLED COMBINATIONISM - PAST AND PRESENT

by Tom Kerry

Verily, verily, it hath been said: A guilty conscience needs no accuser' I can find no other rational explanation for the fact that Philips chooses this particular juncture in the discussion to pose the question: "What is an Unprincipled Amalgam?"

By "amalgam" I presume he means an organizational combination which subordinates important theoretical and political differences to the exigencies of cementing a common bloc or faction dedicated to the aim of overthrowing the program, altering the policy and taking over the party leadership. To use simple terms, a heterogeneous power bloc devoid of consistent theoretical foundation and lacking a unified policy and program.

Philips begins with an apologia: "Within the reorganized minority tendency in the SWP, and within the international tendency constituted primarily by our co-thinkers in Britain and France, there are differences on the exact sociological characterization of the Cuban State." That is, if you'll excuse the expression, a fact: The extent and character of these differences and their political ramifications will be examined in the course of this discussion article.

After stating the fact Philips registers a complaint. "In a rather desperate attempt to make this question the central axis of the current discussion," he charges, "spokesmen for the majority have, implicitly and explicitly, accused the minority of unprincipled politics, of 'playing with the cadre.'"

So far as I am aware, there has been no attempt, "desperate" or otherwise, by any recognized "spokesmen for the majority," to "make this question the central axis of the current discussion." If my memory serves me this is the first time it has been raised for discussion in the party since the June 1962 plenum of the National Committee. And thereon hangs a tale!

But before proceeding to an examination of the facts of the matter let me quote another two lines from the Philips "amalgam" document. "Our tendency," he insists, "has been formed in the face of attacks, some open, some concealed, against the concept of the revolutionary role of the working class and the necessity for a vanguard combat party. Under such circumstances, it would be criminally irresponsible to permit sociological differences to stand in the way, so long as these differences are not concealed." (My emphasis.)

Now let's see who is concealing what from whom? Under date of March 14, 1962, comrade Wohlforth submitted to the Political Committee a document entitled: "In Defense of a Revolutionary Perspective -- A Statement of Basic Position." Among others signing the document was Albert Philips. What distinguished Philips from the others was his statement appended to the document, which read: "Differences in sociological evaluation aside, I want to indicate support for the general thrust of this statement and of its political conclusions."

I was rather puzzled by this disclaimer as the document contained no "sociological evaluation" of Cuba or any other state. The only possible reason I could adduce for making a special point of emphasizing the "differences in sociological evaluation," was that Philips felt the need of affirming his adherence to the "state capitalist" position which he has held since he entered the party.

At any rate, the matter came up for discussion at the June plenum. As a reporter for the majority at the plenum, comrade Joe Hansen devoted a part of his report to an analysis of the divergent views held by the SWP minority and its "co-thinkers" abroad. In the course of his remarks comrade Hansen stated: "Lately I have heard a rumor that comrade Philips has given up the state capitalist position. I do not know if it is true but I report it so that comrade Philips can correct me if I am wrong." (Discussion Bulletin, Vol. 23, No. 5, July 1962).

When Philips took the floor he confirmed the truth of the "rumor," informed us that the "reevaluation" had been proceeding for some time, and would be codified in documentary form. He urgently requested that the discussion be postponed until his views were presented in written form. Here are his exact words:

"Now comrade Hansen asks about the rumor on the re-evaluation 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 re-evaluation is concerned, if the comrade would check with the source of his rumor, he might discover that this re-evaluation 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 re-evaluation 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". (Discussion Bulletin, Vol. 23, No. 6, November 1962).

That was almost one year ago! We are still waiting! The party is now engaged in a pre-convention discussion of all disputed questions. Doesn't Philips think this would be the appropriate time to make known to the party the results of his "re-evaluation" and "in written form" as he promised to do last June? Instead, we are confronted with an effort to divert the issue through the transparent device of a man, caught with the goods, trying to escape detection by yelling loudest of all: Stop Thief!

No, comrade Philips, there is nothing "implicit" in designating such conduct as "playing with the cadre." It now goes beyond the cadre and involves the entire party membership. If not political gamesmanship, what would you call it?

Comrade Philips has the uncanny knack of befogging every question he touches. At the same June plenum in which he promised to produce, "in written form," his re-evaluation of the state capitalist position, Philips sought to justify his current bloc with the minority by reminding us of his "bloc" with the majority during the "Pablo-Cochran dispute of 1953." Philips is fond of resorting to the method of historical analogy to explain his tortuous course. There is nothing wrong with using the method of historical analogy if the lesson is correctly understood and properly applied. But I am afraid that Philips will be hard put to find in our history and tradition any useful analogy to justify unprincipled combinationism. However, you can't rule a man out for trying so let's hear what he had to say on this score at the June plenum:

"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," Philips continues, "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, 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." (Discussion Bulletin, Vol. 23, No. 6, November, 1962).

In my reply to Philips at the plenum I said: "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 're-evaluation' 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."

Since the plenum the number of conflicting tendencies in the minority bloc on the crucial question of the class character of the Cuban state, has increased to at least four, possibly five, as we shall see in a moment.

In his "Unprincipled Amalgam" article, Philips essays a truly remarkable excursion into the realm of historical analogy. Still speaking of blocs, principled and unprincipled, Philips invokes the authority of Trotsky. "Trotsky," he says, "in the opening pages of In Defense of Marxism explains that while differing sociological evaluations lead, under certain adverse circumstances, to differing political programs and conclusions, in the long run, political agreement on the immediate and basic tasks is decisive for common action." This analogy is truly a monstrous distortion of Trotsky's views.

The article in question, in the form of a letter to James P. Cannon, was Trotsky's opening gun in the struggle against the Shachtmanite petty-bourgeois opposition, dated September 12, 1939. It had not even the remotest relation to the question of blocs. At the beginning of the fight Trotsky began probing for the basic political essence of the Shachtmanite attempt to find a new label to define the class character of the Soviet Union.

If, said Trotsky, the dispute is purely "terminological" then the petty bourgeois minority would have to state what different political conclusions, if any, flowed from their terminological experiments. Or as Trotsky put it:

"Who says that the USSR is no more a degenerate workers' state, but a new social formation, should clearly say what he adds to our political conclusions."

But then Trotsky added: "The USSR question cannot be isolated as unique from the whole historic process of our times. Either the Stalin state is a transitory formation, it is a deformation of a worker state in a backward and isolated country, or 'bureaucratic collectivism' (Bruno R., La Bureaucratization du Monde; Paris, 1939) is a new social formation which is replacing capitalism throughout the world (Stalinism, Fascism, New Deal, etc.). The terminological experiments (workers' state, not workers' state; class, not class; etc.) receive a sense only under this historic aspect. Who chooses the second alternative admits, openly or silently, that all the revolutionary potentialities of the world proletariat are exhausted, that the socialist movement is bankrupt, and that the old capitalism is transforming itself into 'bureaucratic collectivism' with a new exploiting class.

"The tremendous importance of such a conclusion is self-explanatory," Trotsky adds. "It concerns the whole fate of the world proletariat and mankind. Have we the slightest right to induce ourselves by purely terminological experiments in a new historic conception which occurs to be in an absolute contradiction with our program, strategy and tactics?"

Trotsky viewed the terminological experiments of the Shachtmanites as the starting point of petty bourgeois revisionism -- of the genuine variety. So far as blocs were concerned, Trotsky considered the Burnham-Shachtman-Abern bloc an abomination. If there is any lesson to be drawn from that experience it is opposite to the one Philips tries to teach.

The cement that held the bloc together was the "organization question." On the central theoretical-political question in dispute Abern held a workers' state position, Shachtman ducked with his formula of the "living reality of concrete events," and Burnham, in deference to maintaining the bloc, tucked his "bureaucratic collectivist" position into his briefcase, where it remained until after the split. In fact, it was not until the first convention of the Shachtmanites in 1941 that they officially adopted the Burnham "bureaucratic collectivist" position. But the practice of unprincipled combinationism indulged in by the petty bourgeois revisionists exacted its toll.

In the split Burnham took his departure from the socialist movement while the Shachtmanite combination was cursed from its inception with the most frenetic factionalism which assumed the character of a permanent feature of their internal existence. Your analogy speaks against you, comrade Philips. Do you intend to keep your "state capitalist" position tucked away in your briefcase in deference to maintaining your bloc with the present minority? If you do, it would be best for you to leave Trotsky alone. You will find no sanction in Trotsky for unprincipled combinationism.

It is easy to understand why comrade Philips would have second thoughts about his "re-evaluation" of state capitalism -- which is in no way superior theoretically to bureaucratic collectivism. His "bloc" partners have already conceded, not just a finger, but a whole hand to the "state caps" -- as the British dub them.

The British, for example, applying the very latest revelations of the Slaughter-Healy school of dialectics, contend that: "On all decisive and fundamental questions which impinge upon the power and wealth of the national bourgeoisie as a whole, however, the (Castro) regime comes down on the side of capitalism." This was a bit too thick, even for the dialecticians of the Philips-Wohlforth-Robertson-Mage minority, so in their plenum document: "In Defense of a Revolutionary Perspective," they enter a demurrer. "We fully support the general line," they say, of the Slaughter-Healy international resolution, "though we disagree with major aspects of its evaluation of the Cuban Revolution." What "major" aspects? Or what minor ones, for that matter? They do not say! After all they do owe allegiance to the bloc with their "co-thinkers" abroad.

Their French "co-thinkers" characterize the Cuban regime as a "workers' and peasants government," and add: "It is still true however that the Cuban revolution is going on and that history has not yet decided whether the Fidel Castro workers and peasants government will open the way for the dictatorship of the proletariat or on the contrary for the restoration of the bourgeois state and of capitalism in Cuba." They therefore find merit in the position of the American minority because: "The formula of a 'transition state' defended by the SWP minority has the great advantage of leaving the door open for another definition."

But, they add, the open door policy also has its dangers. For, they say, "at the same time, it is a refusal to give a definition and thereby leaves the door open for the most dangerous contradictions." Their fears were well grounded. For Tim Wohlforth has now marched through the open door with a "new" definition, which he presents in his own name, while casually mentioning that "some" comrades of the minority hold the mistaken view that Cuba is a "deformed" workers state.

In a document recently submitted for publication in the discussion bulletin, Wohlforth holds that, "we must characterize this (Cuban) state as a decomposed, partially eroded capitalist state susceptible to the pressure of the working class as well as other social forces but not under the control directly or indirectly of the working class. (Or as the French have characterized it "un état bourgeois, délabré, décomposé, fantomatique.") (Wohlforth's emphasis.)

So we have a phantom or spectral "capitalist state" which has expropriated the property of the national and imperialist bourgeoisie, nationalized the basic sectors of the economy, instituted a planned economy and monopoly of foreign trade, plus a regime which proclaims itself part of the world socialist sector, designates itself as Marxist-Leninist, and calls for an extension of its social revolution to Latin America and the world. Some phantom!

Shouldn't we now amend the Communist Manifesto to read: Let the ruling classes tremble at the specter of the phantom revolution? Wohlforth is a little mixed up. The French warning to the SWP majority that: "It is a serious error in method to confound the nature of the state and the nature of the government," is directed to the wrong address. We pass it on to Wohlforth to whom it rightly belongs.

The theoretical flights of fancy on the character of the Cuban state and its regime indulged in by the SWP minority and its "co-thinkers," are no happier than the terminological experiments of the 1939-40 petty bourgeois opposition. This has led, as it inevitably must, to a "re-evaluation" of the basic criteria employed by our movement in determining the class character of Yugoslavia, China, the East European states, etc.

In their document (Position of the French Section of the International Committee on the Cuban Question) the French have announced: "We will no doubt have to revise the analysis (made in 1948) of the new workers' states in Eastern Europe..." "We are happy," they say, "that the discussion on Cuba inevitably calls for a re-examination of past discussions and the working-out of a new analysis of the nature of the 'iron curtain' countries, and especially of Yugoslavia and China. On these points," they proudly proclaim, "we are 'revisionists' to the extent that -- and the Cuban discussion demonstrates this -- some comrades question the very principles on which the construction of our international movement was based, by basing themselves on characterizations adopted in 1948."

If the French comrades think it can stop there they are laboring under a delusion. The path they have chosen leads directly back to the dispute in the movement over the class character of the Soviet Union. We await the retrospective revelations of our new revisionists. We trust they are on a somewhat higher theoretical level than the rather novel views on the question recently submitted by Tim Wohlforth -- about which we shall comment at a later date. However, all of this "new" thinking has obviously impelled Philips to keep his briefcase tightly sealed for the nonce. Who can tell what may come of it. Perhaps under one label or another, the discredited theory of "state capitalism" may yet get another lease on life?

In discussing the matter of "blocs," "amalgams," and unprincipled combinations, we must touch on a subject which has a

direct bearing on the question. The comrades will note the opening sentence of the Philips "amalgam" piece which reads: "Within the reorganized minority tendency in the SWP," etc. This is the first public announcement to the party of a split -- pardon me! -- a "reorganization" of the minority.

The fact had been previously made known to members of the National Committee in a statement entitled: Call for the Reorganization of the Minority Tendency. It was submitted for the information of N.C. members last November. A cursory examination of the signatures on the "Call," disclosed that, among others, Robertson and Mage had been "reorganized" out of the Philips-Wohlforth faction. Now we have two minorities competing for the Slaughter-Healy franchise. Both insist that they stand on the platform they submitted to the June plenum.

Why the split? What were the issues which made it incompatible for individuals with a common political platform to co-exist in one faction? Why is the party kept in ignorance of the reasons for the split? Isn't that the unmistakable hallmark of unprincipled combinationism? That goes for both groups. Neither has found it necessary to offer any explanation to the party. Both remain part of the anti-SWP majority bloc together with their "co-thinkers" abroad. If not "playing with the cadre," how would you characterize such conduct, comrade Philips?

I said it was the hallmark of unprincipled combinationism. Permit me an analogy. We characterized the Cochran-Clarke block in the SWP as an unprincipled combination held together by their common hostility to the line of the majority. We predicted that freed from restraint exercised by the majority they would fly apart into their respective components. It was not too long after they split from the SWP that our prediction was confirmed.

The Cochranites split along the lines indicated in our appraisal of the divergent tendencies in their bloc. We were curious about the reasons for the split. When we met up with some of them during the regroupment period we tried to elicit from them an explanation of the political issues motivating the split. To no avail. All we could get from them was the heated asseveration that Cochran was a son-of-a-bitch. Not just an ordinary, common, garden variety, s.o.b., but an arrogant, rude, insufferable s.o.b. and a bureaucrat to boot. But all of this was a matter of common knowledge before they split. Some of them were experts on Cochran's idiosyncrasies long before they joined with him in their common bloc. The S.O.B. theory explains nothing. What, comrades of the minorities, is the explanation for your split?

Oh yes! During the faction struggle with the Cochranites they kept insisting that they, and only they, represented the

position of the international movement. They had the franchise. But oddly enough, one of their first acts following their departure from the SWP was to junk the franchise along with the "old" Trotskyism against which they had fulminated during the faction struggle. I note that our current minorities now speak in the name of the I.C. (International Committee). It is, if anything, a more flagrant fraud than that perpetrated by the Cochran-Clarke faction.

The Slaughter-Healy faction has "captured" the IC through the simple device of weighting the vote of the British and French over that of the other sections. What they think they will gain by such tactics eludes me. At the October meeting of the IC, the Slaughter-Healy faction, with the support of the French, adopted a voting procedure giving the British two votes, the French two votes and one each for the other sections. A simple way to achieve a majority, don't you think?

The Canadian representative lodged an official protest. I quote from his statement: "Referring to the ruling adopted by the International Congress of June 1958 titled 'Function of the International Committee,' the Chinese delegate proposed that we recognize one vote for each section. He read Clause 9 of the resolution which states that 'The International Committee shall be composed of one representative from each participating section.'

"To an enquiry as to why this practice had been violated, comrade P (France) said -- to give representation on the basis of rough estimation of numerical strength. I questioned the proposal. If strength was to be a factor then Canada should have at least the same as France. I expressed the opinion that we should follow the rule as provided in the Resolution of 1958. This was based on recognition that we were not the FI, governed strictly and formally by the principles of democratic centralism, but an International Committee of the FI, a faction in the world Trotskyist movement seeking to reconstitute the world movement on the basis of orthodox Trotskyism. That as a faction we were not bound by formal votes so much as a common understanding of our role as a tendency in the Trotskyist movement. I moved that we revert to our original procedure of one vote for one section."

But Slaughter-Healy would have none of that petty bourgeois democracy. "I called upon the chair to take the vote on my motion of one vote for one section," writes the Canadian delegate. "This vote was not counted on the basis of the procedures laid down in 1958 but on the basis now being proposed by the British and French. The motion was defeated: For -- 2 (China, Canada), Abstain -- 1 (Austria), Against -- 4 (2 French, 2 British)."

This gives the Slaughter-Healy-Lambert faction the

dubious factional advantage of speaking in the name of the IC. The Philips-Wohlforth and Robertson-Mage factions in the SWP are extremely sensitive about the democratic rights of minorities. What do they think of the Slaughter-Healy school of workers democracy? Once having established a majority through the device of a weighted vote there is no problem about warding off any challenge to their control of the "apparatus." If the two-to-one ratio doesn't do it what is to prevent the raising of the ante to three or four to one, if necessary? All it requires is a proper understanding of the dialectic!

Philips has some fun with Joe Hansen's designation of Cuba as the acid test of all political tendencies. He is a very funny man, a regular comedian. His "subtle" irony is calculated to lay the comrades in the aisle. But somehow I remain impervious to his wit. Maybe it's because my sense of humor has been dulled by having to plough through page after page of minority documents, saturated in the pretentious piffle of stale and outworn ideas and swathed in the most pompous rhetoric it has ever been my misfortune to read.

Let us apply the acid test of the Cuban revolution to Philips' alter ego in the minority bloc and see what we come up with. In a rather lengthy letter addressed to a leading party comrade, dated May 4, 1958, Tim Wohlforth unburdened himself on a number of problems concerning the world movement. It is worth quoting at length:

May 4, 1958

Dear M:

"As we both are so busy these days I am taking this form to communicate to you some of the thoughts I have on some matters of concern to the SWP and the World Trotskyist movement. I have been so tied up in youth work that I hardly ever have a chance to communicate to other SWP'ers on any other topics. Please show this letter to the PC members or whoever is responsible for the questions under discussion. Also enclosed is a letter I have received from O'Daniels. I would like this back soon as I want to take him up on his suggestion to establish contact with the Belgian youth.

"I have been thinking considerably since I last talked to you briefly on the subject about the state of the international movement. It is my opinion that unity of the World Trotskyist movement should be put forward as our primary international task. And as internationalists we should not subordinate this task too greatly to the

many important domestic tasks such as the United Socialist Ticket.

"I have studied thoroughly in detail the documents of the 5th congress and find them to be in all basic features identical with our positions. They are in fact -- Germain's speech especially -- very fine formulations of the world Trotskyist outlook. There is no difference discernible on the Russian question and therefore no fundamental political barrier remaining to unity.

"Secondly, the entry tactics of the Pabloites -- including entrance into the mass CP's -- seems to me to be perfectly in order. Certainly our own proposed electoral bloc with the quasi-Stalinists poses as many if not more dangers both theoretically and practically to our principled Trotskyist program than does the entry tactic. However, such tactic and regroupment efforts should be the primary task of every section of the Trotskyist movement except where we are mass parties. Therefore there should be no barrier to unity.

"Thirdly, the question of democratic centralism of the world party comes up. We in principle favor a democratic centralist world international. However, the question remains as to how to apply this concept flexibly to the present weakened state of the Trotskyist movement so as to make possible the regroupment of revolutionary socialist forces under its banner. I do not feel that this problem is essentially different on an international scale as on a national scale and therefore favor a good deal of flexibility in both cases. Certainly we must explore the possibility of working out an organizational solution with Pablo and conduct within our own ranks a discussion on this question.

"Fourthly, we come to the only major difference presently standing between the two Trotskyist factions -- contrary estimates of the Algerian question. Let me state at the outset that I feel it extremely sad that the present conflict over this question has begun in such a haphazard and unfraternal way. First, we printed Shane's articles on the Algerian situation without first discussing the question with the Fourth International and then discussing it within our own ranks. Thus we were forced publicly to take a stand on this hot issue without most of the Party having much of an awareness of the questions involved and began right off in a polemic against Pablo publicly instead of a friendly internal discussion among the Trotskyist groupings and factions.



"In addition I feel strongly that it was a mistake not to publish the O'Daniel letter in part since the Shane articles were not an adopted policy of any basic policy making body (NC, plenum, convention). The Militant would have done better to simply state Shane's views were his own and that it was discussing the question. I also feel bad about the tone of the discussion which was sharp on both sides. In addition the publishing of the O'Daniel letter in the FI will not help matters any. Finally Michael Banda's polemics in the current Labour Review (otherwise the finest so far published) are completely irresponsible and certainly do not flow from any conception of regrouping the Trotskyist forces. For instance I quote his phrase 'The spurious claims made by the authors (the Pabloites) to be 'Marxists' and 'Trotskyists.' This is far worse than the formulations in the FI on the SWP which I protested to Pierre Frank about.

"I therefore see the danger signs of utilizing this Algerian discussion as a method of widening the breach in the world Trotskyist ranks. This to me must be counteracted as soon as possible. If we can even conceive of regrouping with the National Guardian people we should certainly be instantaneously ready to regroup with fellow Trotskyists.

"Also I have the feeling that the Shane-Lambert-Banda position on the question is basically wrong and that Pablo's position -- while suffering from too much justifying the FLN leadership -- is basically right. Let's take a quick look at the situation:

"1) The Who's Shooting Who Controversy -- This is in my opinion largely an extraneous issue. It is our duty to unconditionally condemn the tactic of assassination as a political weapon and leave it at that trying neither to justify the FLN or MNA in this matter. That a national revolutionary tendency should use such techniques does not mean that we do not defend it as the case of China, Indo-China, etc. makes clear. Neither does it mean that we side with some grouping that is shot at more than it shoots back simply for that reason. All such methods prove is that the leadership of the tendency is not revolutionary socialist but petty-bourgeois of some sort -- something each side admits (I hope!).

"2.) Programmatic Differences -- The O'Daniel-Mage controversy proves one thing if nothing else -- each nationalist tendency has been inconsistent in its struggle and falls short of a socialist program. Both have opportunist tendencies and both likewise have working class

elements of a progressive nature in their ranks. However there seems to be no principled difference programmatically that would justify us siding with one or another faction on this basis.

"3.) Question of Strength -- It is clear -- and Shane seems to grant this -- that it is the FLN that is actually conducting the Algerian revolutionary struggle in Algeria. With the loss of Bellounis it is clear that the MNA have no military strength in Algeria and it is extremely doubtful if they have any real influence since the struggle has been carried on under FLN leadership for almost 4 years now. This is crucial and means that in effect the Algerian Revolution is under the leadership of the FLN and not the MNA.

"4.) On the Road to Independence -- This seems to be the crucial question of programmatic difference between the MNA and FLN. The best formulation of the differences is to be found in Banda's article on page 43. This contrasts a simple recognition of Algerian independence followed by all power to an FLN government to the MNA's more complicated demand which on the surface looks more democratic. It sees prior to negotiations with France the following steps: (1) A round-table conference with all Algerian tendencies (it is not clear whether this means Nationalist tendencies exclusively); (2) UN (this means the presence of imperialist forces -- or could mean it) supervised elections leading to the formation of a government which would (3) negotiate with the French. It seems to me that this latter formulation under the guise of 'pure democracy' opens the door for far more compromises with imperialism than the FLN proposal. As Marxists and not as petty-bourgeois democratic 'purists' like the Shachtmanites, let us face the reality. The FLN is the armed might of the Algerian people at present. Therefore it will be the government no matter what formulas one goes through. Its clear demand of recognition of independence first and then negotiations is far more militant than the MNA in my opinion.

"I hope there will be discussion on this question in the party and if there is to be more bulletins on it I would like to write along the above lines. Also I feel the question needs serious consideration in every branch looking toward a position adopted at a plenum. In the meantime we should inform the Pabloites and our comrades in France and England that we are in the process of discussing the question and would appreciate their comments and views.

"Let me again repeat my firm belief in the necessity of unity as soon as possible."

(There follows several paragraphs dealing with questions of no relevance to this current discussion)

(Signed): Tim Wohlforth

Now what has happened since May 4, 1958 to induce Wohlforth to execute a 180 degree somersault? What change occurred that led Tim Wohlforth to discover that the greatest menace confronting the world movement today is "Pabloism?" The major event in world politics since 1958 was the Cuban revolution. Confronted with this "acid test" the IS arrived at a position on the Cuban revolution -- its state form and revolutionary regime -- paralleling that of the SWP majority. Wohlforth thereupon executed a flip-flop and landed with his feet firmly planted in the sky.

Truly, the question of "sociological evaluation" which Philips pooh-poohs with such Olympian disdain exerts a most powerful influence on the political acrobats of the minority. Submitted to the acid test of the Cuban revolution the Slaughter-Healy-Lambert-Philips-Wohlforth-Robertson-Mage minority bear a striking resemblance to circus trapeze artists. It makes for an exciting display of virtuosity but no one knows where any one of them will land.

May 6, 1963