

INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION BULLETIN

February, 1965 -- I

Contents

DOCUMENTS ON THE DISPUTE IN THE WORLD MOVEMENT

PART II

(Published as a fraternal
courtesy to the United
Secretariat.)

\$1.00

Published by the

SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

116 University Place New York 3, N. Y.

1965

Introduction

A previous International Information Bulletin issued in May 1964, contained a series of documents relating to an internal conflict between the majority of the United Secretariat elected by the World Reunification Congress of the Trotskyist movement and the minority headed by Comrade Pablo.

This bulletin contains a further series of documents which have appeared since then. These include an article written by Comrade Germain on behalf of the majority of the United Secretariat in which he analyzes the methodological and political implications of the course followed by the minority.

February 8, 1965

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	2
Letter from Michel Pablo (February 17, 1964)	4
On Comrade Pablo's "Warning" of February 17 (Statement by Majority of United Secretariat)	7
The Minority Launches Its Own Internal Bulletin (Statement by Majority of United Secretariat)	10
Letter from Comrade Pablo to Comrade Nic of the Australian Section (March 1, 1964)	12
Yes, It Is Time to See Clearly! (Statement by Majority of United Secretariat)	16
Declaration of the African Commission (Statement by Minority dated March 15)	19
In Reply to the Minority's "Fear No Split" Declaration (Statement by Majority of United Secretariat)	23
International Executive Committee Minutes (First Plenum After the Reunification Congress, May 1964)	30
Resolution of the African Commission (Statement by Minority Sent to Ceylonese Comrades)	43
Communiqué (Sent Out by Minority)	44
Resolution (Passed by United Secretariat)	45
Letter from Comrade Pablo (October 15, 1964)	47
Statement by Majority Members of the African Commission	51
Appeal to the Leaderships and Members of the Sections of the International (Minority Document)	52
We Will Continue to Protect the Interests of the Movement (Statement by United Secretariat of the Fourth International)	53
A Right-Wing Tendency -- by E. Germain	55

TO THE LEADERSHIP AND MEMBERS OF THE SECTIONS

Dear Comrades,

It is my duty to warn you in all responsibility that the unity of the International is in immediate danger through the decisions that the United Secretariat Majority took during two meetings of the United Secretariat, that of 26-27th January and that of 14th February, 1964.

Those decisions concern "Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme," organ of the African Commission.

Under the pretext that it acts as a fraction organ the United Secretariat Majority has decided to forbid its publication and to disavow it publicly, even before the IEC pronounces on this subject.

These measures mean to perpetrate a factual situation of split even before the convocation of the IEC.

"Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme" is an instrument absolutely indispensable for the political work of the African Commission, the appearance of which should normally have been greeted by the whole International as one of its greatest successes.

The even slightly objective reading of this organ will demonstrate on the other hand that the accusations of the United Secretariat Majority concerning its supposedly fractional character are denuded of all foundation.

"Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme" reflects the high degree of integration of the African Commission in the realities of the Algerian and African Revolution in general and its dominant preoccupation with a real mass work in this crucial sector of the Colonial Revolution.

To disavow publicly such an organ and to even forbid it signifies carrying a blow of extreme irresponsibility and gravity not only to the work of the African Commission, not only to the work of elements integrated in the Algerian Revolution, but to the work, to the prestige, to the interests of the International as a whole.

It is necessary to ask in these conditions who really has an interest in carrying such a blow with all the consequences that will not fail to have for the unity of the International?

Independent of all subjective activation of such measures, it is obvious that objectively the disavowal and the banning of the organ of the African Commission, as well as the extreme aggravation of the internal situation of the International, and the expulsions and ruptures that will accompany it, shall only benefit the enemies of the International.

In 1953 the International, placed by its correct policy in the best conditions to exploit Destalinisation which had commenced, received a grave blow by the split perpetrated at that precise moment under the sign of the "antipablist" fight.

In 1961 in no less favourable conditions for the exploitation of the beginning of the real integration of the International in the Colonial Revolution, in Africa and in Latin America in particular, Posadas carried out a new split and that on a political basis which sought to discredit the ideological prestige of the International.

In 1964 at the moment when Destalinisation is again making enormous progress in the USSR and several other Workers States and Communist Parties, when the consequences of the Sino-Soviet Conflict contribute to the clarification and regroupment ideologically of the international communist vanguard and when the Fourth International consolidates some extremely important positions never before achieved inside the Algerian African and Colonial Revolution in general, there is coldly prepared a rupture with the ideologically most advanced sector of the International; and politically the best integrated in the living Revolution.

If you allow this crime, this treason, to be perpetrated, if you allow this objective of the enemies of the International to be realized, you will thus assume the historical responsibility and you will sign with your own hands a statement of the degeneration of the International.

I came to assist at the United Secretariat meeting of the 14th February, 1964, despite the distance, the expenses and the multiple and other inconveniences for my tasks elsewhere to make finally an ultimate effort and to persuade the United Secretariat Majority to prevent the worst.

As you may see by the enclosed declaration, all our proposals (of ods. Lenoir and myself) to collaborate with the Majority in the political elaboration of the organ of the African Commission, and with the work of the latter, as well as all our clear declarations concerning our conception of democratic-centralism, the respect of the rights of the Majority, etc. met with the stubborn refusal of the Majority.

They had only one aim around which they marshalled all their "arguments": to stop at all costs "Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme" and sterilise the African Commission's work.

Discounting on the other hand our legitimate refusal to accede to such a demand, to thus provoke and justify our exclusion from the International.

It is true that at the moment when the developing events justify

the political positions defended by the Revolutionary Marxist tendency, and that Deutscher and other specialists of "Destalinisation" raise their voice in turn to signal the fundamentally "Stalinist" character of the Chinese tendency of the bureaucracy, our Majority encouraged by the habitual criminals of 1953 is strongly determined to disencumber themselves of their critics leaving them to operate afterwards a turn in the general direction of their line.

It must be hoped that your energetic and prompt reactions will check such calculations.

The word and the action is now yours.

Prevent the Majority applying its fractional, irresponsible and criminal sanctions, against "Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme," instrument of the work of the key-sector of our International.

Prevent the split that they prepare. The lot of the unity of the International is in your hands.

With my communist-internationalist greetings,

MICHEL PABLO

17th February, 1964

ON COMRADE PABLO'S "WARNING" OF FEBRUARY 17

A Statement by the Majority of the United Secretariat

(1) At the United Secretariat meeting of March 14-15, we placed on the agenda, so that it could be included in the minutes and thus be brought to the attention of the leadership of the Fourth International as a whole, a letter addressed by Comrade Pablo February 17 "To the Leadership and Members of the Sections." A copy of this letter, which discusses the decisions taken at the February 14 meeting at which Comrade Pablo was present, was not received by the United Secretariat, nor by any of the majority members in it.

Thus Comrade Pablo, without the least regard for the normal procedure of the bodies of which he is a member, directly addressed the whole movement, even going over the head of the International Executive Committee which is scheduled in the very near future to take up and decide on the very political and organizational questions on which Comrade Pablo and his tendency are opposed to the line adopted by the World Congress and which has guided the majority leadership elected by that congress.

At the same meeting, the United Secretariat learned indirectly of the publication of the third issue of Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme. As in the two previous issues the factional character of this publication was all too transparent. Among other things, none of the declarations of the United Secretariat with regard to African events (Zanzibar, Tanganyika, Uganda, Kenya, Gabon) were published in this organ.

(2) In his letter of February 17, Comrade Pablo presents his remarks at the meeting of the United Secretariat as an "ultimate effort" on his part in face of a majority deaf to his desire to respect such things as "the rights of the majority."

The truth is that having brought out a public factional organ under the label of the "African Commission," and then realizing that it was an "error" to print only articles by members of his own tendency, Comrade Pablo sought to rectify the mistake by inviting the members of the majority to associate themselves with his magazine after it was all over. We will not permit the United Secretariat to become a bargaining counter; we do not think that the normal rules of democratic centralism should be replaced by combinations between tendencies. To do so would signify installing a degrading and dangerous regime. Comrade Pablo's course for some time has left the majority of the United Secretariat no alternative but to condemn the repeated violations of the elementary rules of our movement, leaving it to the International Executive Committee to settle the differences in the United Secretariat.

As for Comrade Pablo's indignation over the fact that the

United Secretariat decided to publicly dissociate itself from the positions which he has taken in Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme, it is incomprehensible why he feels the need to put the real situation upside down. How can Comrade Pablo at one and the same time demand that the debate on the Sino-Soviet conflict should not be kept within our movement, that the tendency struggle should take place publicly, while he makes a great display of indignation over the majority issuing a statement that the positions defended publicly by him are minority positions in the Fourth International? Does he think that a public debate could take place without saying this?

Or is it that he objects to the public knowing that Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme is not an authorized publication of the Fourth International, that it was launched by a small minority without consultation and in defiance of the majority? These happen to be the facts. They involve a breach of one of the main principles of our movement -- democratic centralism -- as Comrade Pablo well knows. The public that follows our movement, including the one in Africa, would be disoriented if they did not know our movement's line. Moreover, the United Secretariat is against the establishment of a dangerous precedent. Tomorrow, any minority, big or little, would believe it had the right to follow the example of Comrade Pablo. It is up to the leadership, more exactly the majority of the leadership, to decide to what degree our internal discussions should be made public.

(3) The object of Comrade Pablo's letter is in reality to cast on the majority the responsibility for the split which he denounces, but toward which he seems to be orienting in a truly disturbing way. Proof of this is provided by two points in this letter.

(a) He attacks the reunification carried out last year, by resorting to an absolutely scandalous epithet against members of our movement, calling them "the habitual criminals of 1953." The reunification took place on a programmatic base which Comrade Pablo accepted together with the World Congress as a whole. Recourse to such a provocative expression shows that he did not accept the reunification, since no one could dream of a viable unity with "habitual criminals."

(b) If you don't condemn the United Secretariat, he says again, "you will sign with your own hands a statement of the degeneration of the International." Comrade Pablo's phrase could not be more revealing. If he doesn't hold a majority in the movement, this proves to him that the International has degenerated. And, under such conditions, what conclusions will he draw?

In the last documents which the majority of the United Secretariat submitted to our movement, we indicated the danger which the positions held by Comrade Pablo implied for the Fourth International. It is no use for Comrade Pablo to seek to attribute to the majority of the United Secretariat a responsibility which is his. The majority of the United Secretariat, the majority of our movement, is

ready to accord his tendency all the legitimate rights of a tendency within the Fourth International within the framework of its regular procedures. The Fourth International does not harbor "habitual criminals," it has not degenerated, it is not "factional, irresponsible and criminal." We admonish Comrade Pablo once more to draw back from his present course. Even if he finds himself in a minority on very important questions, is that any reason for losing confidence in the movement as a whole?

March 15, 1964

THE MINORITY LAUNCHES ITS OWN INTERNAL BULLETIN

A Statement by the Majority of the United Secretariat

The minority faction headed by Comrade Pablo has taken another grave step. It has now launched its own Internal Bulletin. This fresh violation of the most elementary rules of democratic centralism logically follows the previous act of issuing a public faction organ.

As in the previous case, the Internal Bulletin of the minority was launched without consultation with the majority; without notifying the majority; and -- most important of all -- without even placing the question on the agenda of the United Secretariat, where the minority has democratic representation.

When a minority faction, in the face of the fullest internal democracy, displays an uncontrollable urge to have its own public organ, this is always a sign that it has turned away from the comrades in the movement to an alien audience. We pointed to this classic symptom when we accidentally learned what the minority leader was up to behind the back of the United Secretariat and when we tried -- unsuccessfully -- to get him not to violate democratic centralism but to at least hold up the project of a public minority faction organ until the International Executive Committee could meet and consider it.

The same motives are evident in Comrade Pablo's decision to launch his own Internal Bulletin. No matter how fast the authorized Internal Bulletin of the International is published, it is not fast enough! No matter how many pages it contains, they are too few! Worst of all, the minority is denied the last word!

Impatience of this kind has been seen before in the history of our movement. It is a very bad sign.

This latest action confirms our worst apprehensions about the course of the minority under Comrade Pablo's leadership. Its objective meaning is quite clear. By publishing their own Internal Bulletin, the minority break off collaboration with the majority in editing and publishing the discussion documents. Instead of presenting their documents through the channels provided by the International, permitting the discussion to be regulated democratically and such incidental but important things as security measures to be handled in an objective way, the minority smashes the democratic controls.

By this decision, the minority reveals that it is incapable of participating with the majority in even producing a common Internal Bulletin.

What is the image now presented by the minority? It stands as a tight faction, with its own political line, its own aims, its own public organ, its own internal bulletin, its own finances, and its own discipline. It scorns the democratic procedures of the movement, has repeatedly violated the rules of democratic centralism, and follows a policy of answering the appeals to observe majority rule by recourse to violent and uncomradely language and provocative accusations, while its attitude toward certain currents outside the movement could not be more friendly.

Does it take much experience or political acumen to see how close this grouping has come to the split that may have been deliberately decided on some time ago?

And yet the leader of this minority continues to say that it is the majority that is pushing the movement toward a split -- and so soon after reunification!

This propaganda is highly revealing. What is considered to be a clever tactic -- to blame the majority for a crime the minority is committing -- in reality speaks volumes about the nature of the social forces to which this faction is responsive.

Comrades of the minority! Your actions speak even louder than your political line. Make no mistake about it; your actions are being correctly read by the overwhelming majority of the Fourth International. It is high time to call a halt to the disastrous course on which you have embarked!

(The following letter, which appeared in the "Bulletin Intérieur de la Tendance Marxiste Révolutionnaire de la Quatrième Internationale, Volume No. 3" was translated and placed in the record by the majority of the United Secretariat.)

March 1, 1964

Letter from Comrade Pablo to Comrade Nic
of the Australian Section

Dear Comrade Nic,

The Khrushchevist faction of the Soviet bureaucracy while being of Stalinist origin and education, and while necessarily suffering from these "original sins" has had to go very far down the road of concessions to the masses and of reconsideration and revision of the policies of Stalin in all fields.

It represents the transition between Stalinism and the socialist democracy of tomorrow.

The dynamic of the new Soviet society as a whole in the 1960's, which is bathed in an eminently revolutionary international context, pushes it in an irresistible way down the road of "de-Stalinization."

This dynamic is that of the interaction between the masses, the new productive forces in the USSR and the revolutionary international context.

The masses in the USSR are characterized by their renovation, their new composition and their new cultural quality.

In the USSR new generations are now rising, of a very powerful working class, having a highly qualified professional level and general culture.

The USSR has in addition become the second industrial country of the world, possessing an economy whose dynamism is considerably greater than that of capitalism.

And finally there is the international context characterized by the definitive rupture of the capitalist encirclement, the creation of the "socialist world," and of the "socialist market," as also the irresistible progression of the Colonial Revolution.

The interaction of these factors creates a dynamic which influences the politics and the evolution of the Khrushchevist tendency of the Soviet bureaucracy, in the general sense (and on the average) of an adaptation to this dynamic.

Doing this the Khrushchevist tendency has to struggle always against a Stalinist right in the USSR itself, and which has allies

in the different Communist parties, and now above all in China.

It is correct to say that the Khrushchevist leadership no longer has the possibility of making the different Workers States and even the different Communist parties automatically apply its politics.

That likewise in face of the struggle being continually conducted in the USSR, against the Stalinist right allied with the Chinese, Khrushchev temporizes and compromises with a number of his present "allies."

There is a discordance, evident and accentuated in the recent period, between his own declarations and his acts swinging to the left, and the conduct of a number of Communist parties.

How to explain this?

Division of labor or relative independence in relation to each other, while awaiting adjustment at a later stage and after certain necessary purges of the "Old Stalinists" (like Thorez and Co., for example)?

I incline to the second hypothesis.

I believe in the strengthening of the left policy of the USSR, including that of elements more advanced than Khrushchev, exercising pressure on him.

The reinforcement of the left policy of the USSR is inevitable and expresses the continuous reinforcement of the latter as a Workers State on the road to renovation (from the point of view of socialist democracy) in an international revolutionary context.

On what grounds under these conditions to criticize Khrushchev?

Naturally we never forget that he is the representative of a bureaucratic wing with all the limitations that this implies, nor that it is a question of tendencies in the politics of the USSR requiring a certain time to manifest themselves in a clear manner.

We must not hold back from publicly approving every declaration and above all every positive act of Khrushchev and show the utmost friendly comprehension of the positive aspects of the policy of the USSR, in regard to war, in regard to disarmament (even partial), in regard to the Colonial Revolution.

But we can and must likewise demand that the USSR persuade (and certainly not order) the different Communist parties, on a completely opportunist course, to change their politics in conformity with that of the acts of the USSR.

In the USSR itself we must elaborate a minimum program of demo-

cratic, economic, social, political demands that correspond to the present needs of Soviet society, capable of being understood by the masses (thus taking into account their level of consciousness likewise) and asking the Khrushchevist leadership to apply them.

This program must above all be centered on the necessity of letting the masses participate in the democratic management of the economy and the State.

The program must be a kind of completion of the tendencies and of the reforms, marking the present policy of the bureaucracy.

It must be formulated in a way to show the critical support which we accord to certain tendencies and reforms of the Khrushchevist leadership, to push the latter to struggle with more determination against the Stalinist right and to demonstrate in their acts and action the limits of the Khrushchevist leadership.

It is by such a process that we can help the masses to exercise the maximum possible pressure on this leadership, without running counter to it, without provoking it frontally, and proving in practice the limitations of this leadership.

These are some of the reflections which your letter to Bill (of 2/1/64) suggested to me.

I hope that these can prove to be of a certain usefulness for the Australian comrades of our tendency.

In pursuing our discussion on the Sino-Soviet conflict with the majority we will develop in detail all these questions.

However the majority are now visibly pressing: (a) to stop at any cost our publication "Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme": (2) to make a pretext of "grave" violations of "democratic centralism" and expel at least some of us.

We must be conscious of this determination on their part and act in accordance.

I think that it would be possible for the Australian Section to rise up unanimously against the measures hitting "Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme" and against our possible expulsion.

It is necessary to try to adopt some resolutions in this sense before the I.E.C. which will be convoked at the end of April, beginning of May.

My fraternal greetings to you and all the Australian comrades.

M.P.

1 March 1964

P.S. Certainly the withdrawal of the Soviet technicians from China, and the economic "reprisals," under no matter what form, are absolutely to be condemned.

However it is necessary to take into account also: (a) the fact that the Soviets deny having wanted to take or to provoke these "reprisals" and declare themselves ready to aid China economically; (b) the affirmation emanating from highly placed Yugoslavs -- whom I have met personally -- that the Chinese "made life impossible" for the Soviet experts and technicians beginning with the spring of 1960; (c) that the Chinese did not hesitate to apply such "reprisals" against Yugoslavia since 1957, which the Yugoslavs complain about at present.

YES, IT IS TIME TO SEE CLEARLY!

A Statement by the Majority of the United Secretariat

The international discussion in our ranks flared up over the question of the Sino-Soviet conflict. But if it has taken on extreme sharpness, this is because behind the dispute over a tactical question, profound differences exist in reality on fundamental questions. The members of the majority of the international leadership have pointed out that Comrade Pablo was moving toward a very deep revision of the concepts we have always held on the Soviet bureaucracy and on the political revolution in the USSR.

Far from disavowing this charge, Comrade Pablo has provided striking proof for it in the letter he addressed March 1 to Comrade Nic of the Australian Section. This letter, with the exception of a few lines in the postscript, does not deal with the Sino-Soviet dispute, but exclusively with the situation in the USSR, the politics of Khrushchev, the attitude to adopt with regard to the faction holding office in the USSR. The content itself of this letter appears to be a response to comrades of his own tendency wishing to have more precise explanations on the line Comrade Pablo stands for in relation to the Khrushchevist leadership. It deals with the public attitude of our movement, and not the one which, for tactical reasons, comrades have to observe in carrying out entryism in certain organizations.

Here, then, is what Comrade Pablo proposes:

"The reinforcement of the left policy of the USSR is inevitable and expresses the continuous reinforcement of the latter as a Workers State on the road to renovation (from the point of view of socialist democracy) in an international revolutionary context.

"On what grounds under these conditions to criticize Khrushchev?

"Naturally we never forget that he is the representative of a bureaucratic wing with all the limitations that this implies, nor that it is a question of tendencies in the politics of the USSR requiring a certain time to manifest themselves in a clear manner.

"We must not hold back from publicly approving every declaration and above all every positive act of Khrushchev and show the utmost friendly comprehension of the positive aspects of the policy of the USSR, in regard to war, in regard to disarmament (even partial), in regard to the Colonial Revolution.

"But we can and must likewise demand that the USSR persuade (and certainly not order) the different Communist parties, on a completely opportunist course, to change their politics in conformity with that of the acts of the USSR.

"In the USSR itself we must elaborate a minimum program of democratic, economic, social, political demands that correspond to the present needs of Soviet society, capable of being understood by the masses (thus taking into account their level of consciousness likewise) and asking the Khrushchevist leadership to apply them.

"This program must above all be centered on the necessity of letting the masses participate in the democratic management of the economy and the State.

"The program must be a kind of completion of the tendencies and of the reforms, marking the present policy of the bureaucracy.

"It must be formulated in a way to show the critical support which we accord to certain tendencies and reforms of the Khrushchevist leadership, to push the latter to struggle with more determination against the Stalinist right and to demonstrate in their acts and action the limits of the Khrushchevist leadership.

"It is by such a process that we can help the masses to exercise the maximum possible pressure on the leadership, without running counter to it, without provoking it frontally, and proving in practice the limitations of this leadership."

It couldn't be clearer. The Soviet government, he says, is conducting and will continue to conduct an international policy going more and more to the left (!). The Communist parties which at present are carrying out an opportunist policy are not in line with the policy of the USSR (!). We must put pressure on Khrushchev to convince -- without resorting to the material means of the Soviet Union -- his friends, the Togliattis, the Thorezes, the Gollans, etc., to turn to the left. In the USSR we must put pressure on Khrushchev without running counter to him, without provoking him frontally, in order to push the current reforms to completion.

In other words, Khrushchev grants reforms not because, as our movement has affirmed since the beginning of de-Stalinization, Khrushchev -- as head of the bureaucracy -- is conducting a defensive battle, a strategic retreat, in order to preserve the political rule of this bureaucracy, but because he is being carried by the dynamic of our epoch. But Khrushchev, a bureaucrat, does not have enough steam to go clear to the end, and, under these conditions, we must reform him a little, without any brutality whatsoever!

This program does not go as far as that of certain moderate left elements in the leaderships of the Communist parties, such as are to be seen, for example, in the Italian Communist party. Such a program is the result of abandoning -- without any justification -- our movement's concept of the Soviet bureaucracy. The reform of a reformist has nothing to do with political revolution. To carry out such a policy, the Fourth International is not only not justified, it even constitutes an obstacle.

Why doesn't Comrade Pablo openly say that he is revising? His struggle would become clear. He revises without saying that he is revising. His tactic is to proceed a step at a time. Each text he produces goes a little farther along this road. But we cannot help asking -- and the movement is entitled to know -- how long has Comrade Pablo hold the views he expresses in his letter to Comrade Nic? He doesn't say. He doesn't tell us when he changed his mind about the Fourth International's concept of the bureaucracy. He doesn't say what events caused him to switch. Nor does he tell us if this is all of his new position. He doesn't say whether the position he outlined to Comrade Nic is a definitive stopping point or if more is to come. In place of proceeding in the traditional way of a Trotskyist leader, he tries to camouflage his course by launching all kinds of declarations and accusations against the majority which lack the slightest foundation. He represents himself as the spokesman of revolutionary Marxism whom a sectarian majority wants to expel, a majority indifferent to the colonial revolution, completely anti-Soviet, etc., etc.

At the very moment when the crisis of the official Communist movement is reaching a paroxysm, when the leadership of the Soviet bureaucracy -- its hegemony threatened as it has not been since the epoch when it crushed the Left Opposition -- sounds the call for a fight to the death, Comrade Pablo proposes to the Fourth International "the utmost friendly comprehension," "critical support," reformative pressure on Khrushchev, the reformer.

This is the political root of the debate between the majority of the International and Comrade Pablo. "It Is Time to See Clearly," was the title used by Comrade Pablo for one of his articles. Yes, it is time to see clearly.

April 12, 1964

15 March 1964.

D E C L A R A T I O N
OF THE AFRICAN COMMISSION

The African Commission draws the attention of all the Sections of the International to the extreme gravity of the splitting act that has just been perpetrated by the U.S. Majority in publishing in the March 1964 number of "Quatrième Internationale" a public disavowal of the Commission and of its organ, "Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme."

This provocative act comes some weeks before the requested convocation of the I.E.C. and despite the positions taken by a very great number of Sections(1) against sanctions striking at the African Commission and its organ "Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme," signifies the putting into accelerated practice of the plan of those who have coldly organised for a long time the rupture with the sector the most ideologically advanced and the best integrated in the Colonial Revolution.

Their next action will be now to "exclude" from the International its Revolutionary Marxist tendency, using as pretext that it has put itself outside of "democratic centralism" as these elements interpret it in an outrageously bureaucratic, fractional and irresponsible manner.

These elements who pretend to work for the "reunification of world Trotskyism" and erect this task even into the principal task for the International at the present stage, are ready to carry out the gravest rupture which has ever occurred in the whole history of the Fourth International.

These elements who have decided to accord the most liberal regime to the heterogeneous organisations of the ex-International Committee, including to Lambert, to Healy, to Moreno, up to the next World Congress(2) do not hesitate today to usurp not only the powers

(1) Among which are the Australian, Dutch, Peruvian, Austrian, Danish, Greek, Chilian, and English Sections, the Majority of the French leadership, etc.

(2) See the "Declaration on the Reunification of the World Trotskyist Movement" adopted at the 23rd Plenum of the IEC (23-24 June 1962).

"Point 7" - In order to heal rapidly the wounds left by the 1953 split, it will be necessary to suspend till the World Congress following the Reunification Congress the disciplinary powers towards Sections retained by the I.E.C., i.e. to transfer them to that World

that they declared they wished to reserve for the World Congress alone, but including those of the I.E.C., so to strike at the tendency of the International with which is tied the most valid political and practical undertaking of the International of the last twenty years.

As for their manner of holding themselves to the "principles of democratic centralism" -- independently of the bureaucratic interpretation they give to it -- taking it as an organisational question in itself, without relation to the precise political context at each moment, it is sufficient to say this: that they take no account of a number of Sections bypassing by far the famous 15% of the opinion of the International that the Revolutionary Marxist tendency supposedly represents; that where they lose the Majority, as recently in Austria, they do not hesitate to immediately split the Section; that they maintain in A. direct relations with three elements organised for a certain time already into a fraction outside of and against the African Commission, and among whom the so-called "Cabral" whose extremely grave case is in the domain of the Control Commission of the International, according to the unanimous conclusion of the U.S. in its meeting of 14 February 1964 which comrades Pablo and Lenoir attended; that despite this unanimous agreement they continue to publish defamatory and provocative articles of Cabral attacking the MPLA and the Unified Portuguese Opposition engaged in armed struggle against the fascist Salazarist regime, and in revolutionary defeatism in regards to the war that this regime undertakes against the colonial peoples under its domination; that the attacks of Cabral, a more than adventurist element, are now openly supported by the U.S. Majority without the very important political questions which these attacks raise ever being discussed beforehand in the U.S. and in the International; that with the same irresponsibility are treated political cases as important as the crisis of the Angolan Revolution, the attitude towards the present direction of the Venezuelan Revolution and Self-Management in Algeria and in general.

The most profound reasons which irresistibly push the elements of the U.S. Majority to the rupture with the Revolutionary Marxist tendency of the Fourth International have been several times taken up explicitly in the documents of our tendency.

These reasons will become clearer and clearer for those who wish to understand in the months and years to come as has been the case with the 1953 split and the political bankruptcy of the frenzied "anti-Pabloites" of the period which followed it.

Those who still do not understand the decisive importance of the ideological struggle put up for several years already against the

Congress. Such a transitory measure is normal and inevitable after a reunification, and was indeed already proposed by the I.E.C. during the 1957 negotiations."

sectarian and opportunist currents which continue to impede the real integration of the International in the living sectors of the World Revolution in the present historical stage that is the Colonial Revolution and the "Destalinisation," will not fail to perceive at some point that they have been badly orientated by formalist, fallacious arguments on the so-called "indiscipline" of our tendency and the other calumnies which the present U.S. leadership diverts with.

This leadership is an alliance of the traditional "anti-Pabloites" and relatively recent "Pabloite" renegades.

This is the wonderful result of the "unification of international Trotskyism" developed under the sign of the sectarian, confusionist, unprincipled fight against the Revolutionary Marxist tendency of the Fourth International.

But to believe that this struggle could stop the affirmation and progress of this tendency would be to understand nothing of the real ideological and practical evolution, for several years already in the Fourth International.

The ideological and practical advance made by the Revolutionary Marxist tendency is irreversible and can only be accelerated by delimiting itself from the sectarian and opportunist "traditionalist" Trotskyist current having its bastions in some advanced capitalist countries, and affected by the persistent recule of the revolutionary workers movement in these countries.

This current which has stubbornly fought under diverse forms, and fights still today against the real integration of the International in the Algerian, African, Latin-American and Colonial Revolution in general, which is practically completely cut off from this Revolution, as well as from the new revolutionary forces disengaging themselves in the "Destalinisation" in the U.S.S.R., the Workers States, and the Communist Parties, represent the dead past of the International, without absolutely any future.

This current again turns inward, absorbed with "consolidating unification" with groups and small groupings which distinguish themselves in the fight against the forms taken by the Permanent Revolution in Yugoslavia, China, Cuba, Algeria, Venezuela, Congo, Angola, etc., against "Destalinisation" and against the primacy in general that it is necessary to accord at the present stage to the Colonial Revolution and "Destalinisation."

The "consolidation of unification" erected as task number one of the International, in absence of all real participation in the fields where the World Revolution lives and advances presently is conceived by this current as being synonymous with the internal and external fractional fight against the Revolutionary Marxist tendency of the International, a fight knowingly pushed at this moment to the point of rupture with this tendency.

What would be grave in these conditions would be that the base of the International, through inertia, routine, solicitude for "tranquility," "fear of a split," and conditioned by the unilateral tenacious formation of the apparatus, let things go, and only rouse itself when it will be too late.

The African Commission, body elected nominally during the 7th World Congress, composed itself and surrounded by militants who have acquired inside the African and Algerian Revolution a prestige, which reflects on the whole of the International, and which is such that only irresponsible fractionalists a thousand leagues from the realities of this Revolution could neglect it or attempt to combat it, the African Commission declares in all responsibility that it shall never accept to destroy its present work of which the regular publication of "Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme" is one of the principal instruments.

"Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme" has already become a determinant factor in the ideological formation of the genuine Left of the African and Algerian Revolution.

"Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme" has in no way been up till now the organ of a tendency having as its aim to polemicise indirectly with the fractional Majority of the U.S., as is the practice with the press which they control.

"Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme" for any objective militant, reflects the high degree of real integration in the problems and tasks of the Algerian and African Revolution.

That the elements of the U.S. Majority are able to think of allowing themselves to throw doubt and discredit on the African Commission and on its organ instead of deciding to give at last a real, practical aid to this decisive sector for the whole of the work of the International, is the certain sign of an ideological degeneration.

It is for the base of the International to judge the provocateur splitting act and prevent in extremis the worst.

As for us, we shall reply as is suitable to those who are blinded by their fractionalism, condemned by events, and have manifestly lost all sense of responsibility.

15 March, 1964.

IN REPLY TO THE MINORITY'S "FEAR NO SPLIT" DECLARATION

A Statement by the Majority of the United Secretariat

Once again it has fallen to the majority of the United Secretariat to place on the agenda of the executive body of the Fourth International a document produced by the minority headed by Comrade Pablo. The document in question is entitled "Declaration of the African Commission" and is dated March 15, 1964. It was mimeographed and apparently circulated on an international scale. But, as in the case of the previous faction document of the minority which we placed on the agenda of the United Secretariat meeting of March 14-15, no copy was made available to the United Secretariat itself. Again, it was only by accident that the majority learned of its existence.

Before considering this procedure followed by the minority, which clearly falls into a definite pattern with a meaning of its own, we will endeavor to answer the arguments advanced by the "African Commission" in its circular. This will not be difficult. Perhaps that is one reason why the authors did not choose to place it on the agenda of the United Secretariat.

The excuse for this broadside was the publication in Quatrième Internationale of the notice by the United Secretariat that Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme is not an authorized publication of the Fourth International and that its line is not the one approved by the overwhelming majority at the last world congress. This public statement was the bare minimum that could be said under the circumstances. If criticism is to be made, it is that the statement was too brief and too mild, did not name names, point out the gravity of the violation of democratic centralism or warn of its dangerous threat to the unity of the movement. Yet the "African Commission" decided to picture this minimum statement as nothing less than a "provocative act," as a "splitting act." How then should the launching of a public minority organ be characterized if the blunt truth were to be put down? And what less could be said about such an act than was said in Quatrième Internationale?

Taking off from this highly factional interpretation of the statement in Quatrième Internationale, the circular charges that the majority is "coldly" organizing a split.

And why would the majority want to split the movement, coldly or otherwise? We are not told what the majority could possibly hope to gain from such an irrational act, flying in the face of its own needs and interests not to mention those of the movement as a whole. The truth is, as the record shows, that it was the minority who first raised the threat of split, who have continually repeated the threat of split, and who have raised their voices the loudest about split precisely with each new violation they have committed of the rules of democratic centralism. They are in the position of the

well-known hero who shouts "thief" in order to divert attention from his own handiwork. It is a time-honored trick of bitter-end factionalists which will hardly influence responsible and experienced leaders in any sector of the Trotskyist movement. Perhaps that is another reason why the "African Commission" preferred not to abide by normal procedures in passing out its publicity but decided to distribute the circular only where it would "do the most good."

The "African Commission" flatly predicts that the "next action" of the majority will be to expel the self-labelled "Revolutionary Marxist tendency."

Has the majority threatened the minority with expulsion? No. The majority has done no more than repeatedly ask the minority to abide by the rules of democratic centralism and has referred everything beyond that to the International Executive Committee which will make its own decisions as to what to do about the situation. What, then, is the basis for the prediction? Most likely it mirrors a calculation of the minority that no leadership could retain its authority or even dignity without taking protective measures commensurate to the brazen violations of democratic centralism committed by the minority. Consequently the minority leader, since the tendency has only one leader, feels sure that the majority will react with organizational measures; namely, expulsions. The prediction is a good indication of how far the minority has gone in breaking off all dialogue and even contact with the majority.

The "African Commission" charges that two standards are maintained by the majority in questions relating to discipline, a complacent, permissive attitude toward Lambert, Healy and Moreno; a rigid, "formalistic" one toward Comrade Pablo and his followers.

This is news to us. The Reunification Congress laid down as one of the basic conditions for membership the acceptance of democratic centralism. The initiative in this came from the side of the International Secretariat as Comrade Pablo is only too well aware, since he was one of those who pressed most strongly for it in the preceding period. Healy and Lambert rejected the condition out of hand. The situation with the Argentine group led by Comrade Moreno is not yet clarified. But in the case of Comrade Pablo, matters are very clear. He voted for the condition about reaffirming democratic centralism -- and then turned out to be the first one to violate it. And on what a scale! What do Healy, Lambert and Moreno have to do with Comrade Pablo's violations? Again we are reminded of the light-fingered artist when the crowd is on his heels. He stops, assumes an innocent, even injured, look, and points down the street: "The thief went thataway. Go chase Healy, Lambert and Moreno!"

We come now to a rich pot of stew. This includes (1) an accusation that the majority has deliberately split the Austrian sec-

tion; (2) an accusation that it is keeping in touch with "three" comrades in A. outside of the "African Commission"; (3) some charges levelled by Pablo about Cabral at the February 14 United Secretariat meeting; (4) some political differences maintained by Comrade Pablo on the Angolan and Portuguese opposition movements; (5) differences advanced by the minority over the revolutionary movement in Venezuela; (6) some discoveries yet to be revealed by Comrade Pablo about the attitude of the majority of the United Secretariat toward Self-Management in Algeria, and (7) "in general."

We plead guilty to keeping in touch with some comrades in A. outside of the "African Commission." These comrades have provided material of exceptional value in view of the notorious incapacity of the "African Commission" to prepare reports and articles for the movement. We utilize the occasion to express our appreciation to these comrades for their fine work and their devotion and loyalty to the Trotskyist movement.

We plead not guilty to the charge of splitting the Austrian section. This was one of the earliest areas to suffer the effects of unbridled minority factional activity. We did our utmost when a crisis occurred there to reach an understanding with the minority representatives in the United Secretariat on how to save the section from a split no matter on whose side the immediate responsibility might lie although things first came to a breaking point in Austria when a minority leader in that section launched a public organ of his own -- in evident anticipation, it turns out, of what Comrade Pablo was to do later. In agreement with the minority in the United Secretariat, a qualified representative of the United Secretariat was sent to Austria at the time and the situation was temporarily alleviated although it obviously could not be resolved on a local scale. Since then a new situation has developed, concerning which we have received contradictory reports. The best that can be said for the statement by the "African Commission" that the United Secretariat majority deliberately engineered a split is that it represents a one-sided report. The intended implication of this fraudulent charge is clear enough -- if the majority in the United Secretariat became a minority they would act like the minority headed by Comrade Pablo; i.e., prepare "to immediately split." Outside of this slanderous implication, the charge lacks any logic since it flies in the face of the course followed by the majority both in Austria, in the United Secretariat and in the Fourth International as a whole.

The differences over Angola and over Venezuela have already been indicated in resolutions or declarations in the minutes of the United Secretariat. The differences over the Portuguese opposition remain to be clarified. On the attitude of the majority of the United Secretariat about Self-Management in Algeria, while we wait for the results of Comrade Pablo's detective work we have nothing further to say. As for "in general," we likewise await further specifications. One point remains, the charges which Comrade Pablo levelled at Cabral at the February 14 United Secretariat meeting.

The unanimous agreement was to investigate his accusations. If they proved to have substance, a certain attitude would of course be called for toward the person against whom they were levelled. On the other hand, the most elementary justice demanded that this person be given full opportunity to answer the allegations.

Comrade Pablo, however, did not abide by this decision. As is proved by the paragraph in the mimeographed circular, Comrade Pablo took it upon himself to inform the "African Commission" of the decision of the United Secretariat. And the "African Commission" in turn broadcast it via mimeograph with its own insinuations about the case. In the meantime no investigation has been made, no opportunity has been provided for the defendant to be heard. Comrade Pablo constituted himself the prosecuting attorney, the judge, the jury, the executioner, and the public crier, and did all this without holding even a kangaroo court. It is a pure case of "La Justice, c'est moi." Thus Comrade Pablo repeats in a different field the kind of organizational procedures he has followed in the leadership of the Fourth International since the Reunification Congress.

Now in case you don't understand all this, the "African Commission" assures you that it "will become clearer and clearer" in "the months and years to come." Meanwhile you had better rise up against the majority.

To help in this laudable undertaking, the "African Commission" offers a characterization of the majority. It is "sectarian and opportunist"; it is an "alliance of the traditional 'anti-Pabloites' and relatively recent 'Pabloite' renegades." The alliance of recent and old renegades impedes the "real integration of the International in the living sectors of the World Revolution" in the "Colonial Revolution and the 'Destalinisation.'" It is conducting a "sectarian, confusionist, unprincipled fight against the Revolutionary Marxist tendency of the Fourth International." It represents "the dead past of the International, without absolutely any future."

You wouldn't want to remain united with such unattractive people, would you? But a question arises. Why did Comrade Pablo vote for reunification with these "elements," as the "African Commission" calls them? Why did he hail the reunification as a big step forward? Somebody, it is clear, has changed remarkably since last summer. Did the majority change into riffraff in that short time? Or did Comrade Pablo change his mind about the reunification and the revolutionary capacities of the Trotskyists it brought together after a long split? Some further questions arise. Did Comrade Pablo make a gross error last summer or is he making a gross error now? In either case, what guarantee is there he won't make gross errors and abrupt switches like that again in future relations with other revolutionists? What has happened to his capacity to make objective judgments?

If the labels placed on the majority by the "African Commission"

are accurate, it is difficult to understand why these character experts would place such confidence in the majority's performing the progressive act of helping the minority by expelling it. Wouldn't it be much more in character for these "sectarian, confusionist" renegades, suffering "ideological degeneration" and representing "the dead past," without "absolutely any future," to seek to keep the minority in their corpse-like grip? And consequently wouldn't it be highly progressive -- in fact, isn't it absolutely essential -- for the dynamic, irreversible Revolutionary Marxist tendency to seize the initiative and break loose? Wouldn't it be criminal not to break loose?

Let us now take up the gravest statements of all in this circular of the "African Commission":

"The ideological and practical advance made by the Revolutionary Marxist tendency is irreversible," we are assured, "and can only be accelerated by delimiting itself from the sectarian and oppositionist 'traditionalist' Trotskyist current having its bastions in some advanced capitalist countries, and affected by the persistent recule [recession] of the revolutionary workers movement in these countries."

Disregard the tired clichés and self-flattery and look at that again. ". . . advance. . . is irreversible and can only be accelerated by delimiting itself from. . ." In other words, the minority will not retreat from the course they have decided on. Moreover, they think they can only gain by separating from the majority. Is it possible to raise the banner of split in any clearer form while still trying to hold the majority responsible for it? A difficult question to decide! But here, just a few paragraphs farther on, is another "call" to compare it with. Perhaps this one is the clearest:

"What would be grave in these conditions would be that the base of the International, through inertia, routine, solicitude for 'tranquility,' 'fear of a split'. . . let things go, and only rouse itself when it will be too late."

In brief, the rank and file -- at least the rank and file of the minority -- are told by the "African Commission" that it would be wrong and evidence of unpardonable weakness and lack of revolutionary will power to be in "fear of a split." To put it positively -- something the "African Commission" still fears to do -- they should welcome a split.

It is evident that Comrade Pablo's headlong course toward a split has aroused doubts among some who have long been accustomed to look to him for leadership and he finds he must take this into account as he carries things toward the consummation he has projected. Hence the moral admonitions of the "African Commission" concerning the evils of "solicitude for 'tranquility.'"

Let us return now to Comrade Pablo's violation of democratic centralist procedure in not placing this publicity handout on the agenda of the United Secretariat, thus by-passing the normal channels of the Fourth International, for this in itself is very revealing. The minority, headed by Comrade Pablo, has presented the movement with a sequence of acts in this respect. It is sufficient to indicate the most important ones: (1) Launching a public faction organ without consulting the United Secretariat, without putting it on the agenda, without even notifying the United Secretariat although the minority enjoys full representation there. Then flouting a request to hold up on this ill-advised project after the highest body of the Fourth International accidentally learned what the minority was doing behind its back. (2) Launching an internal minority publication ("Bulletin Intérieur de la Tendance Marxiste Révolutionnaire de la Quatrième Internationale"), again without so much as consulting the United Secretariat, without putting it on the agenda, and without even notifying it, despite the fact that the minority sits in this body. (3) Beginning the circulation of individual handouts couched in the most violent and uncomradely language, shouting about split, raising all kinds of charges, accusing the majority of going so far as preparing to expel the minority, once more without placing these wild accusations before the United Secretariat for consideration and reply, despite the fact, we repeat, that the minority is represented in this body.

These facts alone -- and we could cite more like them -- prove conclusively that the minority has broken off practical collaboration with the majority in conducting the work of the International. They have set up their own organization which issues its own public organ, its own internal bulletin, and its own circular attacks against the majority -- all in complete disregard of even the formalities of consultation or so much as informing the majority. The minority representation in the United Secretariat does not even carry out the function of a messenger service. In short, to put it frankly, the minority has organized itself as an autonomous body, with its own public political line, and is conducting itself as if the majority constituted an enemy organization. So far as the substance is concerned, the minority has already almost completed its preparation of a split. This is the reality.

Is there any possibility at this point to prevent the minority from carrying this course through the few final steps now left? It must be recognized that the chances are quite slim in view of the slogan raised by the "African Commission" not to fear a split.

The slim possibility still remaining open is if Comrade Pablo's partisans and closest friends let him know that he is making the worst mistake of his life and that they will not follow him out of the Fourth International. That is all that can possibly restrain him from his "irreversible" decision to accelerate his tendency in "delimiting itself" from the Fourth International.

(S) (b) (7) - (C) (S) (b) (7) - (C)

The hour is very late but vigorous action may still prevent the minority from going beyond the point of no return.

(S) (b) (7) - (C) (S) (b) (7) - (C)

(S) (b) (7) - (C)

(S) (b) (7) - (C) (S) (b) (7) - (C)

(S) (b) (7) - (C) (S) (b) (7) - (C)

(S) (b) (7) - (C) (S) (b) (7) - (C)

(S) (b) (7) - (C) (S) (b) (7) - (C)

(S) (b) (7) - (C) (S) (b) (7) - (C)

(S) (b) (7) - (C) (S) (b) (7) - (C)

(S) (b) (7) - (C) (S) (b) (7) - (C)

(S) (b) (7) - (C)

(S) (b) (7) - (C) (S) (b) (7) - (C)

(S) (b) (7) - (C) (S) (b) (7) - (C)

(S) (b) (7) - (C)

(S) (b) (7) - (C) (S) (b) (7) - (C)

(S) (b) (7) - (C) (S) (b) (7) - (C)

INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

(First Plenum After the Reunification Congress -- May 1964)

First Day

First Session

Election of Presidium: Rienzi, Lenoir, Werner nominated.
Elected unanimously.

Agenda:

Three motions placed before plenum:

- (a) Motion by Pierre (in behalf of Bureau of United Secretariat):
"(1) Report on activities (one day); (2) Political report (day and a half); (3) Report on Latin America, plus various other questions (half day)."
- (b) Motion by Pablo: "To combine all the questions under a single point and devote all the time of the plenum to this point."
- (c) Motion by Pia: "To accept the Bureau's proposal, but to reverse the order; that is, to begin with the political report."

Pierre's motion -- 13 for. Adopted.
Pablo's motion -- 3 for. Lost.
Pia's motion -- 2 for. Lost.

Before proceeding to the first point on the agenda (report on activities), Comrade Pablo submitted various motions for a vote. Comrade Sirio proposed that these motions be submitted as resolutions at the end of the first point on the agenda. This was accepted unanimously.

Report on Activities. Report made by Comrade Pierre.

Second Session

Counterreport made by Comrade Pablo.

Discussion. (Participants: Walter, Livio, Pia, Rienzi, Lenoir, Renée.)

Third Session

Summary by Comrade Pablo as counterreporter.

Summary by Comrade Pierre as reporter.

Second Day

First Session

Motion by Pablo: "That the letters from sections on the situation in the International be read."

For -- 4.
Against -- 15.
Abstention -- 3 (Ilario, Pia, Marc).

Motion lost.

Statement by Pablo: "I protest against a decision without precedent in the International."

Statement by Livio: "We rejected this motion because most of these resolutions are known to those present; and the request to read them only aims at obstructing the procedure."

Motion by Pia: "Recognizing that it is impossible to read all the letters and resolutions, I propose that a member of the Secretariat give a short resumé of them."

For -- 10.
Against -- 11.
Abstention -- 2 (Livio, Marc).

Motion lost.

A discussion was raised over which had priority, the resolutions presented by the reporter or those presented by the counterreporter.

Statements for the record:

Livio: "We ask that priority be given the resolutions presented by Pierre so that it can be determined whether the minority is willing to accept the discipline of the organization."

Pablo: "We will accept only a certain discipline of the International, not a discipline that would be prejudicial to the work we are carrying out."

Vote on a motion by Pablo to give priority to the resolutions he was presenting:

For -- 5.
Against -- 16.
Abstention -- 1 (Pia).

Motion lost.

First resolution by Pierre: "The plenum of the IEC approves the report on activities presented by the United Secretariat.

On the request of the counterreporter, it was agreed to submit the report and counterreport for alternative votes.

For the report -- 15. Adopted.
For the counterreport -- 4. Lost.

Consultative votes -- 2 abstentions
(Pia, Rienzi).

Maurel and Marc stated that they were not voting because they were not present during the reports and the discussion.

Statement by Pia: "If the vote on the report and the counterreport had been taken separately, I would have abstained on the report and voted against the counterreport. The abstention on the report would not have signified a vote of no confidence in the majority of the U.S. in favor of the minority tendency. It would have signified rejecting certain declarations on the Sino-Soviet conflict and the Moscow Treaty which I consider to be gravely mistaken and prejudicial to our movement. These declarations go in the direction of very close identification with the Chinese positions, going beyond the critical support of the Chinese in the resolution of the World Congress which I already criticized at the Congress. The vote against the counterreport would have meant rejecting the false and subjective stuff which they presented and the method of systematically violating the most elementary discipline by which the minority tendency has, probably deliberately, forced the majority to place the tendency conflict on the organizational level."

Second resolution by Pierre: "The Plenum of the IEC takes note that the minority tendency at the World Reunification Congress, refused, immediately after the Congress, to follow the line that was adopted there, notably on the Sino-Soviet conflict and the international crisis of Stalinism. Some sections and some members of this minority, ignoring the Congress, have published documents presenting positions rejected by the Congress. The comrades of this tendency have utilized the posts granted by the IEC on the African Commission (a commission nominated by the IEC, which under the statutes is strictly subordinated to the U.S., having different status from that of a section) to convert the latter into an international faction center, publishing a public tendency organ, factional circulars and internal bulletins, transferring members of the International in order to build a faction apparatus, and acting outside of all control by the regular bodies of the Fourth International.

"Consequently, the Plenum of the IEC decides to take the following measures in order to assure that the line adopted by the World Congress and by the IEC is observed in the future:

"(a) The organ Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme shall be published by an editorial committee composed of five members (three comrades from the majority, two from the minority).

"(b) The African Commission shall be reconstituted and be composed of five members (three comrades from the majority, two from the minority).

"(c) The minority tendency must cease bringing out its Internal Bulletin and must utilize only the Internal Bulletins regularly published in the International."

For -- 16.

Against -- 5.

Abstentions -- 2 consultative votes
(Pia, Rienzi).

Resolution adopted.

Statement by Pia: "My abstention on this resolution signifies regret that the resolution puts the accent only on the organizational side of the internal conflict, without attempting at the same time to propose political solutions, among other things by opening a free discussion on the burning political questions (Sino-Soviet conflict, struggle against atomic war, etc.). I am convinced that these could and should be discussed publicly to the advantage of our movement, under condition that the limits of the discussion be clearly fixed and that the difference between the official position of the International and discussion articles be made clear."

Statement by Rienzi: "Although I agree in principle with the decisions, I abstained because I do not think they will provide a solution."

Statement by Maurel: "The vote against is absolutely not a rejection of the discipline of the Fourth International, but a rejection of the lying, slanderous assertions, of accepting in advance of each difference rules of discipline issued for the occasion unilaterally by the majority, of accepting fantastic motions tending to separate the African Commission from an editorial board of its organ."

After the vote, Comrade Livio asked the comrades of the minority to state whether they would abide by the resolution.

Statement by Pablo: "The comrades of the minority will not reply before having consulted with their tendency as a whole."

Second Session

Motion by Walter: "That a statement by the majority be read."

For -- 17.

Against -- 6.

Abstention -- 1 (Pia).

Motion adopted.

Statement by the majority:

"The members of the majority tendency of the IEC state that it is impossible to take up any resolutions whatever until the members of the minority tendency of the IEC make clear their attitude in regard to their elementary duty of applying the resolution which the IEC just adopted on the question of the composition of the African Commission, Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme and the minority's Internal Bulletin.

"Since January 1964, the comrades of the African Commission elected by the IEC in May 1963 have violated the discipline of the International by publishing this public tendency organ and advancing in it a line different from the line of the International.

"In face of the indignation of the big majority of the sections and the ranks of the International, taxed with these flagrant violations of discipline, the minority tendency declared at the U.S. meeting of February 14 that it was prepared to undertake all measures to assure the collaboration of the majority of the International on the basis of the rights of the majority in editing Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme.

"At the same time, the minority tendency unleashed a new campaign of slanders against the leadership of the International, accusing it of wanting to expel Comrade Pablo, the African Commission and the whole minority.

"In fact, the flagrant violations of discipline committed by the African Commission would have justified energetic measures. But the leadership of the International, taking into account the existence of a struggle of political tendencies, which it did not wish to aggravate, taking into account, too, the fact that we had barely emerged from a Reunification Congress, abstained from any organizational measures against the comrades guilty of violating the discipline of the International, permitting in substance the publication of an organ decided on unilaterally by the minority without previously consulting the majority, and asking only that a working commission of the IEC be composed in such a way as to guarantee the application of the line of the majority.

"To have done anything less than this would have meant abdicating as the leadership of the International, liquidating democratic centralism in practice and transforming the International into a federation of tendencies.

"The minority, for its part, now demonstrates its real conception of democratic centralism:

"(1) By proposing an African Commission composed of four members of the minority and three members of the majority. This is the kind of 'guarantees' they are generously willing to offer, after their many violations of discipline.

"(2) By refusing to state clearly, yes or no, to the IEC whether they will apply the resolution that was passed, until they have consulted their tendency outside the leadership of the International. They thus show that they place their factional discipline above the discipline of the International.

"No revolutionary organization that respects itself, no responsible revolutionary leadership can accept such methods. With such methods no organization whatever will be built. It has been through these methods, and these alone, that a crisis has been precipitated in the leadership of the International.

"The majority of the IEC rejects all the diversionary maneuvers of the minority that mix in with the essential and simple issue that has been posed, the question of the location of the International's headquarters, the holding of a World Congress, the problems of the French and Austrian sections, a matter for the Control Commission, etc.

"The ranks of the International will not be fooled by these maneuvers.

"What has been posed is the question as to whether or not the IEC has the right to set up a working commission with a majority of comrades in agreement with the international majority, as to whether or not the minority has the right to refuse to apply a resolution passed by a big majority of the IEC.

"The majority of the IEC states that in the event the minority decides to loyally apply the resolution that was adopted, it is prepared to consider all measures for opening and widening the internal discussion in our movement, that the minority will continue to enjoy all the rights of a tendency, which it has never ceased to enjoy, including at this Plenum (where the counterreporter was granted more time than the reporter for the majority).

"But in the absence of such a clear decision, the majority feels that any further discussion on these organizational questions

has become purposeless.

"It is not possible to construct a revolutionary organization in which certain comrades are bound by discipline and others are not.

"It is not possible to apply discipline in an organization in which some members of the leadership refuse to act in a disciplined manner."

Statement by Pablo:

"This is an attempt at expulsion, a scandalous procedure. It is not possible for us to apply the line of the majority on the Sino-Soviet conflict. It is not possible for us to accept irresponsible comrades into the leadership of our Algerian and African work."

Statement by Livio: "It is up to the IEC, not a tendency, to judge whether the comrades are responsible or not. If the comrades of the minority do not undertake to respect the decisions of the IEC, we will submit a motion to suspend them from the IEC."

Statement by Pablo: "Our suspension will lead you to perpetrate a split in the International. We will not leave you with the banner of the Fourth International."

Motion by Pia: "The majority has the elementary right to name a majority commission. Twelve years ago on the initiative of Comrade Pablo, a leadership of the French section was named to accord with a majority of the International in opposition to the majority of the French section. But the minority has the right to know the composition of this commission. I move a preliminary discussion on the composition of the African Commission."

Statement by Pierre: "The minority comrades who do not accept the numerical composition of the African Commission are ready to vote in favor of giving Comrade Pia's motion priority only in order to exercise a veto on the nominations. That is why we will vote against giving it priority."

Vote on the priority of Comrade Pia's motion:

For -- 7.
Against -- 17.

Motion lost.

Resolution by Livio: "In view of the fact that the comrades of the minority of the World Congress have violated the dis-

cipline of the International and have indicated that they will continue to violate discipline by saying that they will accept only a certain discipline on certain questions, these comrades are suspended from their functions in the IEC. This measure will be automatically rescinded as soon as these comrades state that they are ready to accept the decisions of the IEC and the World Congress, or as soon as they show that they are ready to do so."

Vote on the priority of Livio's resolution:

For -- 17.
Against -- 5.
Abstention -- 2 consultative votes.

Vote on Livio's resolution:

For -- 17.
Against -- 5.
Abstention -- 2 consultative votes.

Resolution adopted.

Statement by Pablo: "We are voting against this resolution because of its motivation."

The suspended comrades were asked to leave the Plenum.

Third Session

The Plenum decided to go ahead at once with the political report, leaving the organizational resolutions to be taken up later.

Statement by Rienzi: "The members of the Control Commission have nothing to add in consequence of the vote that occurred at the end of the previous session."

The Presidium was completed by the nomination of Comrade Pia.

Political Report: Report made by Comrade Livio.

Fourth Session

End of political report.

Discussion. (Participants: Osmund, Walter.)

Third Day

First Session

Continuation of discussion. (Participants: Werner, Sirio, Marc, Ilario, Pia, Alan, Eduard, Pia, Peng.)

Second Session

Summary by reporter.

Resolution: "The IEC approves the general line of the report and empowers the U.S. to draw up the definitive text of the political resolution."

Adopted unanimously.

Resumption of consideration of the organizational resolutions:

(a) Resolution submitted by the minority: "The IEC decides to turn the Cabral case over to the Control Commission and asks that the U.S. not engage in any relations whatsoever with these elements before the verdict of the Commission."

After some discussion, the IEC unanimously rejected this resolution and adopted, with one abstention (Marc), the following resolution:

"The IEC approves the inquiry already undertaken by the U.S. in this case and transfers it to the Control Commission which will function in this case as a commission of inquiry. All the comrades who have any information are invited to submit it to the commission as soon as possible."

(b) Resolution submitted by the minority: "The IEC decides to set up a commission to examine the request of members of the French section to declare the recent Congress of the French section invalid."

After reading the request, Comrade Pierre read the statement made by the majority of the Congress of the PCI on the "mandates from Algeria."

The IEC unanimously rejected the resolution of the minority and adopted the following resolution:

"The IEC states that for the reasons given, and likewise by virtue of article 36 of the statutes, the delegates from Algeria had a right only to consultative voice and that their case could not be identified with that of the Vietnamese comrades of the French section. There is thus no reason whatsoever for putting in question the decisions of the Congress of the PCI. As for the complaints of the French comrades on the other questions, the IEC will transmit their letter to the French section for possible examination." (Article 36 of the statutes: ". . . Unless a special decision is made by the I.S., a member of a section living more than six months in another country where a section exists, must request transfer to this section. . . ")

(c) Resolution submitted by the minority: "The IEC decides, at the request of the minority, to set up a commission to examine the correspondence of the U.S. with the sections, as well as the finances of the U.S. The IEC decides in addition that all correspondence of the U.S. with the sections must be made available to all the members of the U.S. at each of its meetings."

In view of the fact that every member of the IEC has the right to check the correspondence and finances of the U.S., and each member of the U.S. has the right to see the correspondence of this body, the IEC considered the resolution out of order.

Statement by the majority: "It is necessary to underline that the minority does not hesitate to request that a commission be set up to examine the correspondence of the U.S. with the sections -- which the minority members of the U.S. have been able to read and have read at each meeting of the U.S. -- and to examine the finances of the U.S. on which regular reports are made to the U.S. and the IEC, whereas the African Commission, a working commission of the IEC, has not sent to the U.S. nor the IEC the least information on its correspondence and its finances, despite the presence of members of this Commission at meetings of the U.S. and the IEC."

(d) Resolution submitted by the minority: "The IEC decides to set up a commission to examine the situation created in the Austrian section following the overturn of the former majority."

The IEC unanimously rejected this resolution, which prejudged the situation, and adopted the following resolution:

"The IEC empowers the U.S. to look into the current situation in the Austrian section."

(e) Two resolutions submitted by the minority: "The IEC, in view of

"(a) The exceptional situation created in the international Communist movement following the new developments in the Sino-Soviet conflict,

"(b) The internal situation in the International,

"(c) The desire expressed by a great many sections and activists of the International,

"Decides to convoke the next World Congress within the statutory period of two years and to open 9 months before its convocation an international preparatory discussion for this Congress."

"In case this resolution is defeated, the following resolution is offered:

"The IEC, in view of,

"(a) The exceptional situation created in the international Communist movement following the new developments of the Sino-Soviet conflict,

"(b) The internal situation in the International,

"(c) The desire expressed by a great many sections and activists of the International,

"Decides to immediately open an international discussion on the new developments of the Sino-Soviet conflict and the position of the International with regard to it."

After discussing the resolution, the IEC decided there was no necessity to make a hasty decision and rejected these resolutions, adopting the following resolution:

"The Plenum of the IEC empowers the U.S., immediately following the present session, to establish a plan of work and discussion on the basis of the opinions expressed at this session and the points of view on these questions expressed by the leaderships of the sections."

(f) Resolution submitted by the minority: "The IEC decides to recognize the tendency rights demanded by the minority and to associate them in particular from now on in the publication of the Internal Bulletin to be regularly published by the International."

Statement by the majority: "Tendency rights have always been recognized, particularly those of the minority tendency and thus there is no need to vote on this resolution. For the future, in view of the new situation, the IEC asks the minority tendency to designate a comrade to stay in touch with the U.S. in anything dealing with the Internal Bulletin."

(g) Resolution submitted by the minority: "The IEC, in view of the exceptionally favorable situation which has been developing for the International through the progress of the Algerian and African revolution, and in order to better direct the colonial work of the International in general on the scene, decides to shift the center to A. for a period."

"In case of defeat, the following resolution:

"The IEC, in view of the exceptionally favorable situation which has been developing for the International through the

progress of the Algerian and African revolution, and in order to better direct the colonial work of the International in general on the scene, decides to reinforce the African Commission by three more members of the majority of the IEC, including at least one from the majority of the U.S. Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme, organ of the African Commission, thus strengthened, will continue to be published under the control of the African Commission as a whole, which will watch that its line does not come into open conflict with the positions of the International.

"From its side, the majority of the U.S. will avoid taking unilateral positions, without preliminary consultation with the African Commission, which could prove to be prejudicial for the work of the International in the Algerian, African and colonial revolution in general."

The IEC unanimously rejected these motions which, for one thing, were in contradiction with the decisions already taken, and made the following declaration:

"The motion to transfer the location of the U.S. to A. is demagogic. A. is not at all the most appropriate place to engage in the colonial revolution in Latin America and Asia. The International must establish its center in relation to the needs and possibilities of practical communication with the movement as a whole. These considerations speak, for the moment, in favor of maintaining the center at the place where it is now. In addition, the African Commission was itself obliged to publish its organ in Paris, which proves that the conditions are not very good in A. to carry out the work of the international leadership."

Resolutions and Various Decisions:

The IEC elected an African Commission and an editorial board of Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme in accordance with the resolution already passed. Comrade Livio was designated to be in charge of relations between these bodies and the U.S.

The IEC specified that the resolution suspending certain comrades from the IEC applied to comrades Pablo, Renée, Anderson, Lencir, who participated in acts of indiscipline, either as members of the African Commission, or by contributing to editing and publishing Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme. This measure of suspension does not apply to comrades Maurel and Santen, who did not violate discipline.

The IEC directed the U.S. to write a letter in its name to sections explaining the reasons for the decisions taken by the IEC.

Ceylon: The IEC approved the letter sent to the LSSP by the U.S. and decided to send a letter to the LSSP about this.

International Month. As in previous years, the sections are asked to set June or July as a "Month for the International." A circular will be sent out, indicating the special tasks which have been posed at present and which require a special contribution.

The IEC renders homage to the memory of A. Rosmer who recently died (see the note published in World Outlook).

The IEC sends best wishes to Comrade J. Hénin who is ill.

Third Session

Information Report on Latin America. Comrade Germain, reporter.

The U.S. is empowered to write a declaration addressed to the militants of Latin America drawing the main lesson of the events in Brazil in the light of the Second Declaration of Havana.

Information reported on a "World Congress" held by Posadas. A letter about this has been sent to the sections in Latin America.

United Secretariat and European Bureau:

After a discussion in which all those present participated, the IEC re-elected the comrades who are already members of the U.S. and adopted the following measures:

- (a) Elected two new full members,
- (b) Associated in the work of the U.S. some new comrades, selecting youth.

The new experiment will be reviewed at the next session of the IEC for which an approximate date is envisaged. Meanwhile, the European Bureau will not be reconstituted.

The U.S. is to study preparations for a conference of European sections, placing on the agenda the establishment of transition programs for the European sections.

Adjournment of the Plenum of the IEC.

RESOLUTION OF THE AFRICAN COMMISSION

The African Commission expresses its active solidarity with the revolutionary Marxist tendency of the Ceylonese section which has opposed, for a long time and with firmness, the opportunist course of the majority of the leadership of the section, a course which ended in the formation of a bourgeois coalition government headed by Bandaranaike and discredited before the masses.

The Fourth International has just experienced a defeat in Ceylon which says much about the growth of the rightist-opportunist tendencies, fostered, stimulated, by the present leadership.

This leadership, far from conducting, with the help of all the healthy forces of the International, a systematic firm ideological struggle to redress the situation in Ceylon, supporting the Marxist-revolutionary wing of the section and orienting the latter toward a real struggle for workers power and the socialist revolution, preferred to temporize, maneuver and lull the International on the gravity and imminence of the danger. This was because of profound ideological affinities with the opportunist leadership of the section and out of fear of losing its alliance with it in the struggle which it is conducting against the Marxist-revolutionary tendency of the International. Even on the eve of this defeat, the gravest suffered by the International in its whole history, this leadership utilized the recent Plenum of the IEC to center its fire on the Marxist-revolutionary tendency and take measures against it which it would never dare envisage for the opportunists openly betraying Trotskyism.

The African Commission demands the convocation of the regular Congress of the International which must be held in the summer of 1965 and the immediate opening of the preparatory discussion for this Congress.

It appeals to all the sections to draw the conclusion that after the struggle and the measures taken against the Marxist-revolutionary tendency of the International, the Ceylonese case makes more imperious than ever the necessity of convoking the Congress and opening the discussion.

The African Commission

June 10, 1964

COMMUNIQUE

The group of the Fourth International in Africa held a preparatory meeting July 25-26 for an enlarged African conference which will be held toward the end of this year.

This Conference will deal with:

- (1) The situation in Africa.
- (2) The Algerian Revolution.

It will be prepared on the basis of documents elaborated by the African Commission.

The general line of these documents was fully discussed at the time of the preparatory meeting which was attended by all the members of the group now present in Africa.

The African Conference will be enlarged to include representatives of the leading bodies of the International and fraternal delegates from the sections.

July 26, 1964

RESOLUTION

(Passed by United Secretariat)

The attention of the United Secretariat has been called to a "communiqué" dated July 26, 1964, presumably sent out to the sections of the Fourth International, announcing that "the group of the Fourth International in Africa" held a "preparatory meeting" on July 25-26 at which it was decided, among other things, to call an "enlarged African conference towards the end of this year." The "group," according to the "communiqué," decided on an agenda that includes "the situation in Africa" and "the Algerian Revolution" and assigned the African Commission to "elaborate" documents for the projected conference. The "communiqué" states that the "general line" of these documents was "fully discussed" at the "preparatory meeting" and that the conference "will be enlarged" to include "representatives of the leading bodies of the International" as well as "fraternal delegates from the sections."

As in the case of the publication of Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme, none of this was taken up with the United Secretariat beforehand, even informally. In fact, "the group" has not yet placed it on the agenda for consideration by the United Secretariat. The entire move, from the time it was conceived until it became an accomplished fact, took place behind the back of the leadership of the Fourth International and was then sprung as a "surprise."

Thus what is actually projected is an international conference organized by the faction headed by Pablo. The conference was initiated and is being prepared by the dual center set up by this faction; i.e., completely outside the normal channels of the International. The name of the African Commission has been used in this operation without any authorization whatsoever. The purpose is to provide a convenient cover for the factional character of the move. It is the latest in a whole series of flagrant violations of the rules of democratic centralism committed by the leadership of this minority faction.

It is worth noting that the "preparatory meeting" of "the group" opened on July 25, exactly eleven days after an independent figure, on his own initiative, talked with Pablo to probe if an understanding could not be reached between the minority and majority. Pablo indicated that he favored initiation of a new effort. The majority, for its part, was willing to make the test if it involved no violation of the decisions taken by the last International Executive Committee meeting; that is, the situation within the International could be "normalized" and the suspensions of the members of the minority from the International Executive Committee and the United Secretariat could be lifted provided that the minority recognized the African Commission elected at the last plenum of the IEC and placed Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme under the control of this commission. The United Secretariat learned about the secret "pre-

paratory meeting" and its decisions a month after it was held.

Under these circumstances, the projected conference organized by the minority can have only one meaning -- it is another step in the application of a completely revisionist conception of the International, a conception of the International as a federation of factions, in which the minority headed by Pablo acts under its own public and internal discipline and substitutes its own decisions more and more openly in opposition to the majority of the International.

Motion:

To adopt the above resolution and to authorize the Bureau to prepare and to circulate the necessary materials which will make clear to the membership of the Fourth International the political reasons for Pablo's course. The Bureau is also authorized to take such other steps as may be necessary to protect the interests of the world Trotskyist movement.

(Adopted unanimously.)

[Faint, illegible text and markings, possibly bleed-through or a second page of a document.]

A LETTER FROM COMRADE PABLO

October 15, 1964

To the U.S.

Comrades,

I have just studied the minutes of your meeting of "September 12-13 and the attached documents.

It is clear that you have resumed the attack against the Marxist-revolutionary tendency of the International, unilaterally breaking the discussions that you entered into at the time of my trip to England and Italy last July in order to find an acceptable modus vivendi and normalize the internal situation in the International.

Your decisions, so little responsible, so factional, of the May 1964 Plenum, suspending the representation of our tendency in the IEC and the US and dissolving the African Commission, brought the crisis in the International to a paroxysm and threatened it with an immediate split.

It was this, moreover, that you wanted to provoke in order to "finish" with us. But the unity of the International was, despite all these provocations, maintained, thanks to our serene and political attitude.

To your great astonishment and exasperation, we did not leave, denouncing your policy and your organizational methods, openly declaring our separation from the forces that you still control, thus publicly consummating a split.

We continued our work as in the past, convinced that the majority of the ranks of the International will never ratify your positions and your methods.

Your decisions of May 1964 aroused the keenest uneasiness and protests in the International.

Up to today you have avoided publishing the letters and resolutions addressed by so many sections, minorities of sections, cadres and militants of the International who demand that your sanctions and irresponsible measures be lifted, the convocation of a regular Congress of the International, the immediate opening of the international discussion.

But it was under the pressure of these reactions of the International that you contacted me in London and then in Rome with the aim of re-examining the situation more responsibly and finding a modus vivendi. I was naturally ready. Because it was certainly a

question of seeking a modus vivendi between two currents separated by grave political differences within the same organization and not of the pure and simple subordination of a "minority" to a "majority" in the name of a formal and factional "democratic centralism."

Whoever does not now understand to what point the situation of the international Communist movement has developed and is developing always under the pressure of facts and new factors is already relegated to the "Museum of History." This evolution of the International Communist Movement provokes profound differentiations in its ranks and incessant ideological regroupments that demand greater organizational flexibility and richer and freer internal democracy than ever.

It is a caricature of Trotskyism, a disgrace to it, to seek now in the name of a narrow, factional, formal "democratic centralism," to deny the evidence, to suppress by organizational violence the currents forming in it, to prevent discussion and seek to preserve a "united front" without a fissure on questions whose number, and among the most important, have never even been dealt with by our movement!

At a time when "the de-Stalinization" necessarily raises in the Workers States and the Communist parties the primordial question of the democratic nature par excellence of the workers movement, does the Fourth International have no other ambition but to appear as a "monolithic bloc" ruled by strict "Bolshevik" discipline?

Either the regime of the International will prove capable of containing all the revolutionary currents to which the situation is giving birth at present, or these currents will be perpetuated in organizational frameworks separated from the existence of the International.

The capacity and maturity of the Leadership will greatly determine the reply that will be given to this question.

For our part, we are ready to maintain coexistence in the same organizational framework through elaboration of an acceptable modus vivendi.

That is the reply that I also gave as well at London and Rome to your representative.

What does an acceptable modus vivendi signify?

That you lift your sanctions against the representation of our tendency in the IEC and the US which, a unique fact in the annals of the International, deprives a series of sections, minorities of sections, militants and cadres of the International, of all participation in the Leadership of the International, already for some months;

That you withdraw your decision to dissolve the African Com-

mission and to replace it by an inoperative and irresponsible body;

That you open the international discussion for the preparation of the regular Congress of the International before holding it in the summer of 1965.

As for us, we undertake the engagement of bringing into participation in the African Commission the responsible cadres that you send to work on the scene and assure them political control. This on condition, naturally, that these cadres exercise this control with seriousness and responsibility on the questions where a line of the International genuinely exists and taking into account likewise the interests of the work of the International in Africa and in Algeria in particular.

In this spirit I even made a proposal -- in my personal name -- to your representative in Rome, which consisted of creating a body of three cadres, of whom one would be himself, to supervise the African work and its publication, with alternate meetings in Europe and Africa.

I will add that within this body, your representative would assume political control in the sense I have already explained.

Your representative appeared to find the proposal worth discussing, even acceptable, and promised to follow up the discussions with the US in the direction of such a modus vivendi. At no time was there any question on our part of "recognizing the African Commission elected at the last Plenum of the IEC and placing Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme under the control of this commission" as you now declare in your declaration of September 12-13, 1964.

It is in fact evident that if it was simply a matter of ratifying your decisions at the Plenum of May 1964, there was no area for undertaking any conferences for a modus vivendi.

As to the formal pretext which you have now seized on to break these conferences and resume the polemic against "the Pablo tendency" on the basis of its so-called organizational "indiscipline," it is truly characteristic of your organizational concepts and your intentions.

Because this pretext is absolutely frivolous and inconsistent.

The smallest organization of the International has the right to convoke the conferences, the congresses, the meetings necessary for its work without being obliged to ask for preliminary authorization from the US.

But that the very numerous militants integrated for years already in the African and Algerian Revolution should hold a work meeting and decide to prepare a Conference to which they themselves

invited the leadership of the International to participate, there's a major crime which unleashes a new factional campaign and irresponsibly knocks down all the painful effort undertaken to reach an acceptable modus vivendi! Is it not monstrous and characteristic of the degree of factional blindness in which you are sinking deeper every day, thus to treat a sector of work among the most important, if not at present the most important, of the International?

In reality, you not only evade granting the least aid to this work, but you try to sabotage it, to undermine and destroy it.

Instead of encouraging and hailing our initiatives, which are constantly deepening and widening this work, you ask us to commit self-sabotage.

Still worse: in A. you collaborate with elements deeply hostile to Trotskyism whose compromising and shady, I repeat shady, activities, you know about, and you visit them on the scene.

The International will some day be given the staggering details about your parallel work in A. outside and against the militants and cadres of the International on the scene.

After this you speak of "democratic centralism," of "discipline" and other "Bolshevik" values which we do not respect!

What is your game?

For how long will the International still accept seeing the African and Algerian work sabotaged in this manner?

For how long will the International still accept that a whole tendency is not represented any longer on the leading bodies of the International, which you are conducting as a closed faction?

For how long will the International still accept your sabotaging the international discussion and the convocation of its regular Congress?

It is up to it to reply to these questions which will determine its future.

With my international communist greetings,

M. PABLO

Statement by Majority Members of the African Commission

The majority members of the African Commission (Brates, Dumoulin and Maitan), having taken note that additional issues of Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme have been published since the plenum of the IEC on the unilateral initiative of the members of the minority without any consultation whatsoever with the majority, and that the minority has fraudulently used the name of the African Commission in sending out factional material, in some cases without any relation to the African work; denounce the continued publication of Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme under such conditions and in a way that was already condemned by the IEC. We ask the United Secretariat to publicly condemn the grave violation of discipline and the inadmissible abuse committed by the minority comrades of the African Commission and to take the necessary measures to assure the normal functioning of the African Commission in accordance with the statutes.

October 3, 1964.

APPEAL TO THE LEADERSHIPS AND MEMBERS
OF THE SECTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL

In the name of the sections, minorities of sections, militants and cadres of the International which we represent, we appeal to all the leaderships and members of the sections of the International to invite the majority leadership of the International to immediately undertake the following measures in order to safeguard the unity of the movement and normalize the internal situation:

(a) Lift the suspension of the representation of our tendency within the IEC and the US;

For some months our tendency has no longer been represented in the leadership of the International. Now, either the measures that have hit certain of our comrades individually must be extended to all those, sections, minorities of sections, militants and cadres, who are in solidarity with these comrades, or they must be replaced by other representatives of our tendency in order that it can participate equally in the actual leadership of the International.

To maintain the present situation signifies accepting a regime of leadership of the International by a single faction.

(b) Lift the dissolution of the African Commission, a body made up of militants and cadres integrated, thanks to their long struggle, in the African Revolution, and who enjoy the confidence of the crushing majority of the militants of the International in this now decisive sector of its work.

Accept the proposals made for the African work by Comrade Pablo.

(c) Immediately open the international discussion with the aim of holding the regular Congress of the International in the summer of 1965.

S I G N A T U R E S

- Nic (Australia)
- Lerze (Austria)
- Guillaume, George, Suzanne (Belgium)
- Paul (Cyprus)
- Lenoir, Maurel, Michard (France)
- Dennie (Greece)
- Maurice, Sal Santen (Holland)
- R. (Italy)
- Ota (Japan)
- Frias (Peru)
- Renée (African Commission)

- H. (Germany)
- Preben, Gunner, Antonius, Erik (all members of the Danish Polit-Bureau, thus putting the Danish Polit-Bureau on record unanimously [one comrade absent] for the appeal. -- Erik.)

WE WILL CONTINUE TO PROTECT THE INTERESTS OF THE MOVEMENT

A Statement by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International

The attention of the United Secretariat has been drawn to an appeal sent out by the Pablo tendency in which the international leadership of the Fourth International is accused of preparing a split. The pretext advanced for this appeal is that the tendency has allegedly been denied representation in the IEC and the United Secretariat and that a sentence in a resolution attached to the minutes of the United Secretariat for September 12-13 indicates preparation for such a split, the sentence being authorization of the Bureau to take whatever steps may be necessary to protect the interests of the world Trotskyist movement in face of the continued violations of discipline committed by the minority.

The United Secretariat calls attention to the fact that the last plenum of the IEC did not proscribe any tendency. It suspended from the leading bodies of the International comrades who violated the discipline of the movement and who refused at the IEC meeting to undertake an engagement to abide by discipline and the decisions of the IEC. The plenum stated in addition that the suspensions would be lifted as soon as the comrades showed in action that they were abiding by discipline. The following comrades of the Pablo tendency, who were not accused of breaches of discipline, were not suspended: Santen and Frias, full members; Mimmis, Maurel, Ota, alternates.

As for the composition of the United Secretariat, this was decided by the IEC, and it is not a rule that this body must necessarily include representatives of tendencies as is the case in the IEC.

The United Secretariat is informing the sections that at the next session of the IEC the proposed agenda includes preparations for the next world congress, and, consequently, the opening of a discussion period.

But the United Secretariat is compelled to make the following observations on the subject of the Pablo tendency's appeal:

(1) The Pablo tendency demands rights in the organization in the name of the statutes; but, since the last plenum, far from making the least gesture showing its awareness of its duties toward the International, the Pablo tendency has deliberately disregarded the decisions of the plenum and has continued to publish its factional organ fraudulently as an organ of the Fourth International, advancing a line contrary to that of an overwhelming majority of the International. It is this that has led the United Secretariat, in defending the interests of the Fourth International, to publicly dissociate the International from the public activities of this faction which is conducting itself without the least regard for its responsibility toward our movement.

(2) The Pablo tendency, which acts along lines completely independent from the International, shouts about split, yet it is guilty in A., without the least formality and under the falsest of pretexts, of barring from the group meetings the comrades who favor the majority of the International, and thus splitting the group.

(3) If it were necessary to look for any further proof that we have here a faction acting in the International as if it were in an alien organization, it is sufficient to note that among the signatures on the latest document are to be found "H. (Germany)" and "R. (Italy)." This means that the faction has decided to act in clandestine fashion in sections of the International.

(4) The conduct, so grossly indisciplined, of this faction is not at all the result of a too rigorous application of democratic centralism. In reality the IEC suspended certain members because it considered it impossible for comrades belonging to the leading bodies to choose for themselves which measures, binding on all, they would abide by. As for the United Secretariat, it has taken no measures beyond calling emphatic attention in our movement to the violations of discipline committed by this faction. The source of this lack of discipline is the political line of the faction, which as Comrade Germain will demonstrate, is diverging more and more widely not only from the line upheld by the International but also from the very principles of our movement.

November 15, 1964.

A RIGHT-WING TENDENCY

By Ernest Germain

Since the plenum of the International Executive Committee in May 1964, Comrade Pablo has continued his course of ignoring the decisions of the leading bodies of the Fourth International in sovereign style. Openly violating the resolutions of the plenum of the IEC, he has continued to maintain a parallel center, to publish internal bulletins under the auspices of his tendency, to bring out Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme in accordance with his own line and not that of the International, to fraudulently present this public faction organ as the "Monthly Review of the African Commission of the Fourth International," hiding from its readers the fact that the ideas he presents are those of a small minority, not those of the majority and hence the leadership of the Fourth International.

This course of increasing divergence from the Fourth International, its organization, tradition, program and line, cannot be explained fundamentally except by the deepening political differences which Comrade Pablo, with his characteristic lack of self-discipline, feels compelled to impart to the entire world. Consequently it is the nature of these differences that must be analyzed in order to understand their dynamics and to alert the movement to the causes that have brought Comrade Pablo to call in question the political and organizational acquisitions of the Fourth International.

Questions of Method

In the issue of the faction's Internal Bulletin devoted to the May 1964 plenum of the IEC, Comrade Pablo waxes ironic over Germain, a "specialist in dialectics." He would have done better to hold his tongue -- you do not speak of the rope in the house of the hanged. In fact, the very numerous political errors which he has committed in recent years are all due to his giving up the dialectic method more and more systematically in favor of the common, ordinary evolutionist method. He sees "irreversible" tendencies everywhere, pays less and less attention to the contradictory nature of reality, made up of opposing tendencies coexisting with each other, marked by abrupt leaps and changes in the direction of processes.

Thus Comrade Pablo thought that the victory of Gaullism gave birth to a bonapartist regime "evolving toward fascism." He attached insufficient importance to the manifest contrary tendencies, linked to objective conditions, which were unpropitious for fascism, as well as the capacity of the French working class, even after a severe defeat, to react to an attempt to destroy their trade unions.

Comrade Pablo was mistaken on the relation of military forces between the USSR and the USA, since he thought that the temporary advance registered by the USSR toward the end of the fifties in the field of long-range rocketry had become irreversible. He forgot the

logic of uneven development, operative in the military field as well as in economics, above all in the case of a power of such economic potentiality as American imperialism.

Comrade Pablo was mistaken on the possibility of the Soviet economy catching up with American production on a per capita basis by 1970-72, because he mechanically projected into the future the enormous momentary gap between the Soviet and American rates of growth toward the end of the fifties. He did not understand -- despite our efforts to convince him otherwise -- that it was inconceivable that the American bourgeoisie would not seek to increase the American rate of growth (this has already been largely confirmed). He did not understand likewise that the rate of growth of the Soviet economy could drop again, beginning with the time when the first series of Khrushchevist reforms had exhausted their stimulating effect.

Comrade Pablo was mistaken on the dynamics of the colonial revolution -- unfortunately inspiring errors here a thousand times worse than his own; those of Posadas. Believing in an irreversibly victorious dynamics, he gravely underestimated the decisive role of the subjective factor (the leadership of the revolution) and underestimated the possibility of imperialism blocking the revolution for a time at a neocolonialist level, a possibility already witnessed in Latin America and Africa after being seen earlier in Asia.

Comrade Pablo was mistaken in believing in the long postponement of revolutionary possibilities in Western Europe after the victory of de Gaulle. He mechanically put the "reformist atmosphere created by the high economic conjuncture" in opposition to the "revolutionary atmosphere," without understanding that in accordance with the internal logic of the contradictions arising in neocapitalism itself, abrupt leaps are possible, and prerevolutionary situations like the one in Belgium in 1960-61 can appear in a whole series of countries where the working class has retained its potential for struggle, without mentioning the revolutionary dynamics in the Spanish and Portuguese situations.

All these errors, in the final analysis, can be traced to a single error in method, to thinking that is increasingly mechanical, less and less dialectical. In the same issue of the Internal Bulletin put out by the faction, Comrade Pablo seeks to reply to a criticism made by me concerning his conception of de-Stalinization:

"For them there are concessions and resistance on the part of the bureaucracy, for us there are only concessions. I replied to him that for a specialist in 'dialectics,' what counts is the average result in time of the two terms (concessions, resistance) and not their undifferentiated juxtaposition on the same plane.

"We do not neglect the aspect of the bureaucracy's resistance (since we repeat that it cedes to the pressure of the masses. . . and finds itself obliged to cede) but we place the accent on the fact that

the average result in time, gives an ascending line of concessions. Otherwise there is no conclusion, there is no perspective, but simply indetermination between two alternatives, equally possible, and of the same dynamics. This, among other things, has not been the case with the evolution in the USSR for the past ten years." (P. 23, emphasis in original.)

Without noticing it, Comrade Pablo provided us with a typical example of common, ordinary evolutionary thought in opposition to the dialectical thinking of Marxism.

"What is properly dialectical movement, is precisely the juxtaposed coexistence [Nebeneinanderbestehen] of the two opposed sides, their conflict and their disappearance in a new category" [our emphasis], Marx writes in the Poverty of Philosophy (p. 94, German edition of Dietz. Stuttgart). The characteristic proper to the category of "de-Stalinization" is precisely that the two tendencies, concessions of the bureaucracy to the masses, and self-defense of its privileges and power, exist side by side, that there is a conflict, a growing contradiction, between these two tendencies, and that this conflict can be resolved only by de-Stalinization being replaced by a new category -- the political revolution. It is then that the process really becomes irreversible. Naturally, this dialectical view of things becomes difficult when you put an equals sign between "de-Stalinization" and "political revolution."

Let's turn to experience. Comrade Pablo states that the "undifferentiated juxtaposition," on the same plane, of the tendency to grant concessions and the tendency of resistance "has not been the case with the evolution in the USSR for the past ten years." Really? There have been some important concessions to the masses (without overlooking those of primary interest to the bulk of the bureaucracy itself) on the juridical plane and on the plane of consumption. There have been concessions to the intellectuals on the plane of freedom of research and expression. There have been important concessions to the peasants concerning the administration of agriculture and exchange relations with the state and the city. But parallel to this list of concessions let us now draw up a list where "resistance" has manifestly prevailed; that is, where there have been practically no concessions. There is no genuine participation of the workers in the management of industry; no form, even embryonic, of workers self-management in the factories; no form, even embryonic, of participation by the workers in elaborating the big economic and political decisions of the state; no form, even embryonic, of a return to the regime of genuine soviets; no form, even embryonic, of freedom of tendencies or of parties that respect the Soviet constitution; no form, even embryonic, of freedom of tendencies within the CPSU; no form, even embryonic, of freedom of political discussion within the CPSU prior to decisions by the Central Committee.

Does Comrade Pablo dare affirm that in the past eleven years, the fierce and still victorious resistance displayed by the Soviet

bureaucracy in these fields -- that is, still victorious defense of its power and privileges -- is definitively "less important," "secondary," "minor," in relation to the scope of the concessions made in the other fields?

To do so would in reality mean affirming that the structural problems are less important than the conjunctural, that the content is less important than the form. In fact, this is the difference underlying most of the debates between common ordinary evolutionists and Marxist revolutionists.

Does Comrade Pablo dare affirm that at a certain moment, conjunctural, formal concessions imperceptibly slip into structural changes, that workers control over the economy and over the state will be re-established step by step, that freedom of tendencies and political parties will be reborn little by little through successive concessions made by the bureaucracy? If so, he would offer us once again a typical instance of the difference between a common ordinary evolutionist concept and the Marxist concept.

Or will Comrade Pablo affirm that these structural changes in fact require a leap, a violent rupture, a transformation of quantity into quality? In this case we will reply that he has contradicted himself and that this leap, this violent rupture shows precisely the necessity for the birth of a new category (the political revolution), different from the old one (de-Stalinization), so that the "juxtaposition" of the tendency of the bureaucracy to make "concessions" and to display "resistance" can be broken. . .

Does this signify that in our conception this juxtaposition is "undifferentiated"? Not at all. We stand for making it clear that for the past eleven years and up to the very day the masses enter into revolutionary action, resistance will remain predominant in structural problems (defense of the political power and economic privileges of the bureaucracy). Does this signify that there is no perspective but simply "indetermination between two alternatives"? Not at all. The perspective on which we stand, the variant that appears to us to be the most likely, is that in the struggle between the "concessions" and the "resistance," at a certain point in the process, the "resistance" will give way under the action of the masses. What we stress is that the situation in which this occurs will be qualitatively different from the present situation; it will mark the passage of "de-Stalinization" into political revolution.

But doesn't "de-Stalinization" prepare the political revolution? Without any doubt. Evolution always prepares revolution; without the former, the latter could not occur, because it cannot fall from the sky. Despite this, for revolutionary Marxists, evolution does not at all equate to revolution; and they even understand that the slight nuance separating the one from the other fundamentally distinguishes revolutionary Marxists from reformists.

This is the heart of the matter. An analogy will permit us to see it more vividly. What is the essential argument that common ordinary evolutionists (from the liberal bourgeoisie to the right and even left Social Democrats) offer against the revolutionary Marxists in the imperialist countries of Europe and North America? "Compare the situation of the working class in 1960 with what it was in 1860. Hasn't a tremendous revolution occurred? Hasn't wretched poverty been succeeded by well-being, the 72-hour week by the 40-hour week? Total insecurity by social security, illiteracy and the degradation of alcoholism by paid vacations and the right to culture? All this, together with growing political rights, hasn't this been conquered step by step, by pressure (which implies many 'actions, strikes and slow downs' to use Comrade Pablo's words)? Hasn't the 'resistance' of the bourgeoisie been reduced, historically, in the long run, in the face of this pressure of the masses? What use is it then to chatter or to dream about revolution in face of this 'irreversible' evolution that has already been going on for a century? Let's join, instead, in increasing the pressure; let's struggle for more and more radical reforms, and little by little the social revolution will be achieved under our noses. . . ."

In the USSR, the question is not of social revolution but of political revolution. It is a matter not of the bourgeoisie but of the Soviet bureaucracy. But in the passage cited above, replace "social revolution" by "political revolution," and "bourgeoisie" by "bureaucracy," and you will find Pablo following the classic reasoning which the evolutionists, reformists or liberals, have offered us for decades in the West!

How do we reply to this reasoning? We prefer not to follow Thorez and other extinguished luminaries who deny the striking progress which the mass of the workers have actually realized in their standard of living "along the road of reform" in the past century. We add, however, that these reforms, involving the standard of living or even political rights, do not transform the capitalist nature of the economy or the bourgeois nature of the state; that these reforms have even been accepted historically by the ruling class in order to defend and preserve (in a situation of "weakness" before the masses, to again cite Comrade Pablo) their power as a class; that these reforms can prepare the revolution, on condition that the subjective factor reaches the necessary level, but that this revolution will not come about either automatically, irreversibly, or without a "qualitative leap." Insofar as the Soviet bureaucracy is a caste; that is, a more or less structured social formation that defends its power and its privileges, this line of reasoning applies to the political revolution in the way it applies to the social revolution.

What Is De-Stalinization?

To this question, which he himself places at the center of the international discussion, and to which he accords central importance in understanding the Sino-Soviet conflict and the entire evolution in

recent years of the international situation ("de-Stalinization has again become, as in 1953, the touchstone. . . demarcating two currents in the traditional Trotskyist movement" -- issue of the Internal Bulletin of Comrade Pablo's tendency devoted to the IEC plenum of May 1964, p. 14), Comrade Pablo now gives the full reply: de-Stalinization is the political revolution. It was the Australian comrades of the minority tendency who were the first to frankly express this formula (see their article, "De-Stalinization is the Nascent Political Revolution," reproduced in the faction's Internal Bulletin No. 4, April 1964), but Comrade Pablo later expressed agreement with it.

To this we replied by defending the classical definition of "de-Stalinization" which the Fourth International has not ceased to maintain since 1953; namely, "de-Stalinization" is the "liberal" course of the Soviet bureaucracy, through which the bureaucracy seeks to defend and maintain its essential power and privileges in face of the mounting pressure of the masses in the USSR itself and in the "people's democracies." (1)

That this was most certainly the line of the Fourth and Fifth World Congresses and particularly the line of the theses of the "Rise and Decline" and "Decline and Fall of Stalinism" there is not the slightest doubt. The minority tendency claims, it is true, that in these theses it is affirmed that "de-Stalinization" is the "rising political revolution" (p. 12 of the minority tendency's Internal Bulletin No. 4). But it is sufficient to cite the following passage from the theses "Decline and Fall of Stalinism" adopted by the Fifth World Congress of the International to determine the facts:

"We thus considered the 'new course' of the Kremlin not as a movement of self-reform by the bureaucracy, but as a movement of self-defense by it. While promoting and even hastening the awakening of the movement of the masses by its objective consequences, especially by the divisions that it created from the top to the bottom of the bureaucratic ladder, the 'new course' was not, we considered, a substitute for, but rather a preparatory phase of, the political revolution of the masses against the bureaucracy." (Fourth International, Winter 1958, p. 56.)

In other words, the theses "Decline and Fall of Stalinism"

(1) Besides this it is necessary to add a series of Khrushchev's reforms which were not only (or not so much) concessions to the masses as measures of indispensable rationalization to bring the economic system out of the blind alley in which Stalin had plunged it. This is especially the case with many economic reforms such as the installation of Sovnarkhozes, the extension of the work and jurisdiction of the COMECON, the utilization of electronic calculating machines, the employment of techniques of operational research. These measures are no more "concessions to the masses" than the similar reforms introduced by neocapitalism.

said: de-Stalinization is not the self-reform of the bureaucracy but its self-defense in face of the pressure of the masses. De-Stalinization is not the political revolution but only a preparatory phase. Today, the minority affirms the opposite: de-Stalinization is not a movement of self-defense of the bureaucracy, nor the preparation of a future political revolution; it is the beginning of this revolution, hence the beginning of the re-establishment of Soviet democracy, hence (whether one wishes it or not) the beginning of the self-reform of the bureaucracy (under pressure from the masses). Comrade Pablo has the cheek to declare that he said the same thing in 1954 and in 1957, whereas the documents adopted at the time said just the opposite!

The 1957 theses are still clearer, dotting the i's even more carefully. They state that "continuance of the 'new course' is inexorably preparing the big show-down between the proletariat and the more privileged layers of the bureaucracy, a show-down which will have as its main stake the administration of the plants and which will inevitably raise all the questions of the structure and control of the economy and of the workers' state." (p. 58.) They specify (p. 59) that "Both [the neo-Stalinist tendency and the "liberal" tendency of the bureaucracy favorable to de-Stalinization], however, are trying only to preserve and defend the privileges of the bureaucracy as a whole." They stress that a "growing tension between the masses and the bureaucracy. . . are drawing near a violent explosion" (p. 60); that an "open collision" is being prepared "between the forces that want to keep the basic institutions of the dictatorship" (and the text specifies that this applies to both the neo-Stalinists and the Khrushchevists) and "the masses who want to undertake a democratic administration of the state and the economy. . ." (p. 60). And they conclude: "The transformation of the pressure of the masses into direct action of the masses will in this way signalize the beginning of the political revolution in the USSR." (p. 60.)

Beating a retreat and seeking to cover up the traces of his change in political position on this question, Comrade Pablo now states that "de-Stalinization is synonymous with a continuous revolutionary upsurge in the USSR." (p. 14 of the faction's Internal Bulletin devoted to the plenum of the May 1964 IEC.) This is already different from saying that de-Stalinization is synonymous with political revolution; to confound a revolutionary upsurge with revolution is a grave error for a revolutionist who wants to lead the process. We have spoken of a revolutionary upsurge in Brazil in recent years, which unfortunately has not culminated up to now in the beginning of the revolution but rather in a temporary victory of the counterrevolution. A revolutionary upsurge among the masses prepares a revolution; it is not identical with it.

This remark having been made, is it correct to identify "de-Stalinization" with a "revolutionary upsurge," if not a "political revolution"? "De-Stalinization" is a calculated policy of the ruling caste in the USSR, the Soviet bureaucracy, or at least its ruling fac-

tion (and its overwhelming majority). The revolutionary upsurge is the deep wave among the toiling masses opposed to this bureaucracy. That the bureaucracy was obliged to undertake the turn of "de-Stalinization" under the pressure of the masses; that the consequences of this turn in the long run favor the outbreak of revolution -- this provides no justification whatsoever for disregarding the social distinction between the rulers and the ruled, between those who are maneuvering in order to maintain their dictatorship and those who are pressing to overthrow it. In mixing up all these factors; in wiping out these distinctions; in speaking of a "combined effect of the progress of the productive and cultural forces, and the multiple and multiform pressure that likewise never ceases to increase in an international revolutionary context"; in stating that "de-Stalinization is the result of an interaction between the concessions of the bureaucracy and the mounting pressure of the masses, the bureaucracy differentiating itself constantly in the process," Comrade Pablo is beginning in fact to suppress the fundamental distinction between self-defense and self-reform of the bureaucracy which was one of the pillars of the theses "Decline and Fall of Stalinism." This is clearly to be seen when he writes:

"Far from being a handicap, the fact that the Soviet bureaucracy is at present at the head of an economically and culturally advanced state, constitutes in reality the essential condition for the political decline and fall of the bureaucracy, engaged in a process of both more and more important concessions to the masses, and its own differentiation.

"This enables us to foresee the possibility of a diminished, weakened resistance by the core of the bureaucracy that might possibly resist the total and actual liberalization of the regime." (p. 15 of the faction's Internal Bulletin on the May 1964 plenum of the IEC. Our emphasis.)

It is sufficient to compare this passage with the extracts cited above from the "Decline and Fall of Stalinism" to see how far the position of Comrade Pablo has departed from the line which the International has not ceased to follow in this regard for ten years! If he states that today he has always been of the same opinion, he should at least undertake a severe self-criticism for having voted at the Fifth World Congress for the opposite of what he says now. He voted then for the position that a collision is inevitable between the masses and the leaders (both the "neo-Stalinists" as well as the "de-Stalinizers") of the bureaucracy; that these leaders neither can nor want to "totally and actually liberalize" the regime, because "de-Stalinization" for them is a means of defending their power and their privileges, not to "progressively" re-establish Soviet democracy.

Comrade Pablo's schema signifies at bottom that in the USSR and the "people's democracies" there is only one political battle: the one between the "enlightened," "liberal," "de-Stalinizing," in

short, Khrushchevist wing of the bureaucracy, fusing more and more with the masses, and the neo-Stalinist "core" of the bureaucracy, supported by the Chinese. This schema has no relation whatsoever with reality.

This reality, which we know, not only through studying the facts a posteriori but fortunately also through increasing contact with revolutionary Marxist elements fighting for a return to Lenin in the workers states themselves, shows that the fundamental conflict remains the one between the masses and the bureaucracy taken as a whole, which the masses hate and despise more than ever, as was the case June 16-17, 1953, in East Berlin, as was the case in Poznan, as was the case in the initial phase of the Hungarian revolution.

Of course, with a very sure instinct, the masses know how to take advantage of the divisions in the bureaucracy; they "prefer" Khrushchev to Stalin or to Molotov, and Kadar to Rakosi. But more than Kadar-Rakosi and Company they prefer the workers councils, not forgetting for one moment that Kadar bears just as much responsibility for their being crushed as Rakosi. This was clearest in Poland when the brief period of illusions in Gomulka as a genuine Leninist initiator of Soviet democracy completely vanished among the workers, students and intellectuals, the masses grasping that the difference between Gomulka and the Natolinists was infinitely less than the difference between Gomulka and the regime of socialist democracy to which the revolutionary vanguard aspired. The mass support which the "de-Stalinizer" Gomulka enjoys today is above all that of the private peasants who owe to him the restoration of private property, and even this social layer supports him more and more the way a rope supports the hanged.

Moreover, it is this phenomenon of the progressive isolation of the summits of the bureaucracy, who played the cards of terror and "liberalization" successively without gaining genuine support among the masses, which the theses on the "Decline and Fall of Stalinism" correctly forecast, even if they were mistaken as to the rate of the process.

Just as Comrade Pablo does not understand the real nature of the conflict between the masses and the bureaucrats in the workers states today, so he completely distorts the nature of the struggle within the bureaucracy and among the intellectuals, the only layers up to now that have been able to express themselves under the regime of "de-Stalinization." According to his schema, the struggle there is essentially between the de-Stalinizing "Khrushchevists" and the more or less pro-Chinese neo-Stalinists. In reality the struggle involves at least four "tendencies": the neo-Stalinists (who are becoming increasingly isolated and insignificant); the direct representatives of the "economic" bureaucracy who demand the strengthening of the rights of the directors and who are not at all opposed to "de-Stalinization"; the bonapartist summits of the bureaucracy, who play the role of balancing the forces; and the "left" wing of the bureaucracy (above

all the ranks linked to the workers) and the intellectuals, who demand a much more radical de-Stalinization than that introduced by Khrushchev. The illegal, sometimes even semilegal, spokesmen of this "bureaucratic left" use a language infinitely more critical, more aggressive and more direct with regard to Khrushchev and Khrushchevism than does Comrade Pablo. (See in connection with this especially the notable article that appeared in Les Lettres Nouvelles, March-April 1964, directly from the USSR.)

To embarrass us, Comrade Pablo raises the question: but the comrades of the majority, do they call today for the "immediate violent overthrow of Khrushchev, Tito, Gomulka, Kadar, etc." (p. 18); do they seek to mobilize the masses "who are taking into account the process of de-Stalinization which has begun and who think of pushing it as far as possible"? In reality, it is with his own schema of the situation in the USSR that the reply fitting this question fails to correspond. We were the first to declare that today, above all after the experience of the Hungarian revolution and in the climate of increasing improvement in the standard of living of the masses, that the atmosphere is rather "reformist" in the USSR and in several of the "people's democracies." In such an atmosphere, it is clearly necessary to work out a program of immediate demands to start the mass movement going. Is it necessary to remind Comrade Pablo that we have never called for the "immediate overthrow" (not to speak of the violent overthrow) of de Gaulle in France or President Johnson in the United States, because the relation of forces is clearly not propitious for an immediate revolution?

But how can Comrade Pablo square his analysis of a situation marked by a colossal "continued revolutionary upsurge," by the beginning of a genuine revolution. . . with the elaboration of a modest program of action around immediate demands? Strange "revolution," to tell the truth, and strange "revolutionists," who, confronted with this "revolution," do not speak of either the conquest of power, or the overthrow of the government, or even of dual power, do not think of advancing revolutionary slogans or even transitional slogans, but content themselves with modest immediate demands!

Comrade Pablo and the Sino-Soviet Conflict

It is in the Sino-Soviet conflict that the almost organically right-wing orientation which Comrade Pablo has now adopted is displayed in the most striking and dangerous way.

At first it could have been believed that the differences in this field were not serious, that Comrade Pablo was even rendering a service to the International in certain respects, facilitating an adjustment of any excessive, uncritical support of the Chinese which some comrades might have been tempted to accord. It is clear that the Sino-Soviet conflict subjected the entire international revolutionary movement to enormous pressure, which our own movement could not escape. It was more or less inevitable that within the

Fourth International pro-Khrushchevist and pro-Maoist tendencies would develop. The essential at present is to make sure that they do not gain undue amplitude, that they do not undermine the autonomy and objectivity with which we work out our policies, and that they do not prevent us from taking advantage of the opportunities to construct revolutionary parties in the ever more favorable conditions opening up on a big part of the globe.

It is necessary to take a look at the evidence, above all since the appearance of Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme. While the majority, without modifying its fundamental course, which has been confirmed by the passage of events, has criticized and attacked the Chinese each time they adopt a position contrary to the interests of the world revolution, (2) Comrade Pablo has practically abstained from all public criticism of Khrushchev and Khrushchevism, masking this position of adaptation to a wing of the bureaucracy with an aberrant theory of which he is the only advocate in the entire world, since it is not shared by the bourgeoisie, by the proletariat, by the Social Democracy, or by the cadres of the international Communist movement themselves (including or even especially those who support Khrushchev with enthusiasm); namely, that the Khrushchevist course in questions of international politics is a "left" course, and that Khrushchev is increasingly becoming a "defender of the world revolution"!

To "demonstrate" this concept, which is in contradiction to the reality, Comrade Pablo finds himself obliged to distort and even systematically falsify the facts, cutting out of Chou En-lai's speeches the passages where he speaks about Algeria moving toward socialism; in Khrushchev's messages the parts where he states that an "immediate" move toward socialism is not possible in Africa; in an article devoted to the temporary victory of the Brazilian counter-revolution, maintaining shameful silence on the overwhelming responsibility falling on the one hundred per cent Khrushchevist Brazilian Communist party for what happened (Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme, No. 6); polemicizing (in No. 7-8) against the Chinese on their theory of the role of the national bourgeoisie while passing by in complete silence Khrushchev's much more rightist theory on this (contained in the program of the CPSU adopted at the Twenty-second Congress); going so far as to publish (in the same No. 7-8) an article on Chile which

(2) On the accusation of Comrade Pablo that I displayed the "height of cowardice" in "beating a retreat" on our position on the Sino-Soviet conflict, I simply cite the May 1964 issue of Quatrième Internationale. I declared at the plenum, and I still maintain, that the majority always distinguished the Chinese bureaucracy from the Chinese revolution and the Chinese tendency in the international Communist movement. One only need re-read the political resolution of the Reunification Congress to see this. Comrade Pablo, who denies this, and who claims that we uncritically supported the "Stalinist line of the Chinese bureaucracy," is simply displaying bad faith.

begins with this highly prophetic sentence:

"Latin America has not ended her surprises for us. After having established her first socialist regime in Cuba by the most unexpected and heterodox of roads -- guerrilla warfare -- she now seems ready to establish the second in Chile by another road which, although unusual, is not less surprising: elections."

The same article contains in addition this gem of the purest Khrushchevist water:

"But if Allende gains a majority, will he be permitted to assume the office of president? The FRAP has already exposed the existence of a conspiracy aiming at a military coup d'état. However, it is very difficult for the high command of the army to risk such an adventure, given the legalistic tradition (unique in Latin America) of the Chilean officer corps and the defeatist tendency of a part of the young officers." [Emphasis added.]

To disseminate such illusions after the Brazilian defeat -- which was caused in great part by similar illusions sown by the Khrushchevist CP -- some years after the Second Declaration of Havana proclaimed that in all the countries of Latin America the greater part of the army is and will continue to be the scaffolding of the counterrevolution, is genuinely criminal. Trotskyism is thereby discredited in the eyes of the numerous revolutionary militants in Latin America of the Fidelista tendency, with whom we have to build the revolutionary party, who have nothing but contempt and indignation for these Khrushchevist illusions.

A new and revolting example of this systematic adaptation to Khrushchevism, of this abandonment of a minimum of objectivity in analyzing the Sino-Soviet conflict, is offered in the article which Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme (No. 9) devoted to the Chinese document "The Phony Communism of Khrushchev and Its Lessons for the World." The Chinese document contains two fundamentally contradictory aspects: it points to the phenomenon of social inequality as at the bottom of the degeneration of the USSR; and it affirms that the degeneration takes the form of the re-establishment of capitalism. For a Trotskyist, the first statement constitutes an important step forward -- because it is true that the privileges of the bureaucracy lie at the basis of its power, and the struggle against social inequality was considered by Trotsky to be the most important struggle conducted by the Left Opposition; the one that would unleash the political revolution in the USSR; the second constitutes a dangerous error to be fought, the origin of which evidently lies in the difficulty of grasping the real nature of the bureaucracy, a difficulty which was witnessed among the Yugoslavs (who talked for years about state capitalism in the USSR) and which has appeared in the history of our movement on various occasions.

But when Comrade Pablo deals with this Chinese article in

Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme, he does not devote a single word to the whole part that criticizes social inequality (a criticism that applies even to Stalin, since it is not the smallest contradiction in the article that it recognizes that high salaries existed in the time of Stalin while it denies that the "degenerated elements" were in power in the USSR at the time); Comrade Pablo speaks only of the erroneous theses concerning the re-establishment of capitalism in the USSR.

This whole partial, subjective, truncated manner of conceiving the Sino-Soviet conflict, denying the evidence; namely, that in all the countries where the "Chinese" and "Khrushchevists" oppose each other, the former occupy positions to the left of the latter, ends up in an untenable thesis which Comrade Pablo has the habit of repeating without the least proof. He claims that the Chinese do not defend Stalin personally, but Stalinism, that is, Stalin's domestic and foreign policy ("the six-sevenths of Stalinism," it is claimed in the latest internal bulletin of the Pablo tendency).

The struggle against the theory of socialism in one country (even when this theory is absurdly attributed to Trotsky), is this a "defense of Stalinist domestic policy"?

Defense of the theory of "uninterrupted revolution," not only within the frame of the colonial revolution, but even after the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, is this a "defense of Stalinist domestic policy"?

The struggle against excessive inequality in wages and for greater equality, is this a "defense of Stalinist domestic policy"?

Opposition to the theory of peaceful (and parliamentary) roads to socialism, first defended by Stalin in his famous letter to the British Communist party, is this "defense of Stalinist foreign policy"?

The Chinese thesis, according to which the countries where the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established must serve as "bases for the world revolution," is this "defense of Stalinist foreign policy"?

The Chinese thesis, according to which the colonial and semi-colonial peoples cannot free themselves from the imperialist yoke except through armed struggle under the leadership of the proletariat, is this "defense of Stalinism"?

We could continue the list; but to what purpose? We have never denied that the Chinese retain Stalinist positions in a number of areas. But, despite all the progress of "de-Stalinization," the Soviet bureaucracy headed by Khrushchev also retains Stalinist positions in some fundamental areas: maintenance and justification of bureaucratic privileges in the USSR; a "world strategy of Communism" centered on economic construction in the USSR ("communism in one

country"); subordination of the interests of the international proletariat and of the international revolution to the interests of the Soviet bureaucracy. To speak of "de-Stalinization" while deliberately ignoring the rightist, opportunist course adopted by most of the faithful followers of Khrushchev or presenting it as "secondary," means in fact abandoning the interests of the world revolution as the fundamental criterion in judging the Sino-Soviet conflict.

The position adopted by Comrade Pablo with regard to this conflict necessarily goes counter to his claims about having fused with the vanguard forces of the colonial revolution. Because there is not the shadow of a doubt that from South Vietnam to Guatemala, from India to Colombia, from Zanzibar to Venezuela, the forces already battling, or who are ready to struggle in the front ranks of the colonial revolution, feel infinitely more sympathy for the Chinese positions than for the Khrushchevist. Contrary to Comrade Pablo's repeated declarations, in Algeria itself, outside of the narrow circles of the apparatus, his positions, dogmatically, unjustly and systematically anti-Chinese, together with his systematic apologies for Khrushchevism bar the road to many revolutionary militants, Algerians as well as those from other African countries. The fact that we foresaw this special consequence of the Sino-Soviet conflict among the forces engaged in the colonial revolution, was one of the main reasons why we adopted the position we did in reference to the Sino-Soviet conflict: without making the least concession in principle, without hiding a single one of our criticisms with respect to the Chinese or the pro-Chinese, we sought above all to link ourselves with the left Communist forces, who in the great majority throughout the world sympathize with the Chinese theses, rather than try to play the role of carrying water for the Khrushchevist bureaucracy among the Communist parties.

Comrade Pablo's Positions on Problems of the Revolution in the Imperialist Countries

The deeply rightist tendency of Comrade Pablo's position is likewise shown in an increasingly clear way in the problems posed by the revolutionary workers movement in the imperialist countries.

The first manifestation of his turn to the right on these problems was provided by a sudden and astonishing position taken by Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme on the Spanish and Portuguese revolutions. Without consulting the International, without taking into consideration the fact that an "African Commission of the Fourth International" is not at all entitled to determine strategy in two imperialist European countries, Comrade Pablo came out publicly against the correct, Trotskyist political criticisms made of the popular-front type program of the Portuguese "Patriotic Front of National Liberation" (FPLN) and publicly expressed solidarity with the ridiculous "Movement for the Third Spanish Republic," which represents nothing in Spain, an action that could only discredit Trotskyism, making it appear to be a movement that is ignorant of the

facts in the Spanish revolutionary movement. The Portuguese "Front," centered around the Portuguese CP, is an enterprise that seeks to substitute bourgeois democracy for the Salazar dictatorship; that is, in a sense ardently desired by a part of the Portuguese bourgeoisie -- to liquidate Salazarism without losing economic power. What must be said of a former secretary of the Fourth International who publishes news and communiqués of this "Front," without a single word of criticism of its ultra-opportunist program?

Exposed by the criticism which we made of the opportunist position which he had adopted on the Iberian revolution, Comrade Pablo defended himself at the last IEC plenum by declaring that there were clearly not a few things to criticize in the program of the FPLN, but it would be "sectarian" to begin with this criticism; first comes the support, then the criticism. This position, which could be justified in the attitude of a section of our movement in an imperialist country in relation to an insurrectional movement in a colonial country oppressed by "its" imperialism, is absolutely unjustifiable on the part of the Fourth International in relation to an oppositionist movement against a fascist dictatorship in an imperialist country.

The history of the European revolution is too charged with defeats and victims caused by "national fronts" and "popular fronts" in the countries where the bourgeoisie holds real economic, social and political power, and has solid traditions and a certain political shrewdness, for Marxist revolutionaries to let the least illusion about the possibility of such fronts achieving a socialist revolution go by without speaking up.

To refuse to participate in an armed struggle (which however has not yet broken out!) against Portuguese fascism would be sectarian. But to participate in the struggle by mixing our banner with the popular-front banner of the CP, by providing left cover for an operation that seeks to repeat in Portugal what happened in France and Italy in 1944, with the results we know about, is opportunism. It was not so long ago that Comrade Pablo would have been the first to point this out and to rise up against such a policy. That it is he who advocates it today clearly indicates what a distance he has traveled in recent months and in what direction he is headed.

In 1962 and 1963, Comrade Pablo criticized most of the European sections from the left, so to speak. We will not return to the debate. But today with regard to Western Europe, Comrade Pablo likewise is beginning to signal a turn to the right of a kind to take your breath away. In the issue of his faction's Internal Bulletin devoted to the last plenum of the IEC, he writes:

"For how much longer, for how many years longer will it be possible to get out of the new situation created in Europe for some years already with phrases as empty as 'the economic euphoria is tending to subside' and to avoid getting to the bottom of this euphoria, explaining it, taking it into account and working out a policy for our

movement that corresponds to this situation?

"By letting it be imagined for some years now that each time we have been coming to the end of this 'euphoria' and that a 'crisis' is close, by magnifying the movements for economic demands each time they break out here or there, or the victories of the social-democracy or other phenomena which despite everything occur in the frame of the relatively prolonged stabilization of capitalism in this part of the world, our forces are disoriented and prepared for ever more serious disillusionment.

"In addition, by proving incapable of working out a line for the European workers' movement and for our own forces that corresponds to the new situation, aiming at maintaining the class mobilization and education of the proletariat on the basis of the new economic possibilities and the new contradictions of capitalism, and the new social and political aspirations of the masses, the difficulties of the objective situation are aggravated and we are isolated from the masses." (p. 9, emphasis added.)

This text calls for comment, especially Comrade Pablo's audacity in reproaching us with "incapacity" to work out a line for the European workers' movement, whereas the fact is that whatever is worthwhile in the workers' movement of Western Europe has been inspired precisely by the line which we have promulgated for years. What is most striking is Comrade Pablo's extraordinary capacity to forget in sovereign style everything that does not conform to his latest turn. He forgets that for years we have fought the idea that there would be another "grave economic crisis" in Western Europe; we have simply forecast the inevitability of recessions. He forgets that to give up the perspective of recessions would signify admitting that capitalism has overcome for a whole historic epoch its main economic contradiction -- with all the revisionist consequences that flow from that. And he forgets above all what he himself wrote only a little more than a year ago:

"At the present time, the rate of economic expansion is everywhere slowed down in the advanced capitalist countries, although in an uneven way; recessions follow one another at an accelerated [sic] rate; the menace itself of a real economic crisis is more clearly revealed [sic again], beginning with the more industrialized countries, the United States and England. The economies of these two countries when they do not decline openly during the recessions maintain themselves on a level of quasi stagnation." (Fourth International, No. 17, on the Reunification Congress, p. 65.) (In the United States, the index of industrial output rose 23 per cent from January 1961 to August 1964, which is truly "quasi stagnation.")

Such a method of carrying out a 180-degree turn without a word of explanation or self-criticism is typical of Comrade Pablo's methods. With such methods, you cannot educate a revolutionary movement, you cannot form organizations or even tendencies.

But what kind of "new policy" should be worked out for our movement in Europe? Comrade Pablo gives us his revelation in Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme (No. 7-8) in connection with a dithyrambic criticism of André Gorz's book Néocapitalisme et Stratégie Ouvrière.

This book is not without positive aspects. It seeks to find a "new road" for the European trade-union movement imprisoned in the traditional reformist ways of the organizations led by the Socialist and Communist parties. In this sense it is largely inspired by the Belgian and Italian experiences, which have been partially inspired by the revolutionary Marxist forces of these countries. Everything that is worthwhile in this book, particularly on the necessity of formulating bold demands in the fields of leisure, culture, health, education, taking into account the new habits acquired by the proletariat during the period of full employment and the possibilities resulting from the expansion of the productive forces, has been said and re-said for years, not only in the Trotskyist press but in the official documents of our sections and the International.

But, contrary to Gorz, the revolutionary Marxists -- and even the centrists of the Belgian SP and the Italian CP -- know that the line of demarcation between "structural reforms," desired and sought by neocapitalism itself, and genuine transitional demands ("anticapitalist structural reforms," as they are called by the left of the mass movement in Italy, Belgium, Great Britain) is marked by workers' control and dual power on the factory and state level. To abstain from raising the question of dual power; to present things as if economic power could be torn piece by piece from big capital within the frame of the bourgeois state, is not working out a "new workers strategy"; it is simply working out a neoreformist line which is to neocapitalism what classical reformism is to traditional capitalism.

It is lamentable that Comrade Pablo, remaining below the level of consciousness already attained by these left currents in the mass movement, which includes thousands and thousands of workers, is satisfied with completing Gorz by the "perspective of forming a workers government beginning radical structural reforms," without raising the question of workers control, nationalizations, the character of the state, even dual power, thus bringing his modest stone to the neoreformist building which the Khrushchevists are trying to erect in the European workers movement, therein to lock up the proletariat once again!

Thus, we see that the rightist position of Comrade Pablo is not limited to the problems of the workers states and the Sino-Soviet conflict; it now extends to developments in the capitalist states. And, as we have pointed out, it stands in the way of working with the left currents in the colonial countries, since these currents are generally pro-Chinese.

The Question of the International

This rightist political line has its organizational extension, in fact signifying the liquidation of the Fourth International, as we shall see.

Thus, from the premise that Khrushchev is essentially following a line of supporting the world revolution, which only a few stupid leaders of poorly "de-Stalinized" PC's resist, he proposes that Khrushchev should put pressure on them. Here is what Comrade Pablo actually wrote to the Australian comrades:

"But we can and should likewise demand [!] that the USSR persuade (and not order, certainly) the different Communist parties that are on fully opportunist courses to change their politics to conform [sic] with that of the acts of the USSR." (The faction's Internal Bulletin No. 3, March 1964, p. 19. Emphasis added.)

In the final analysis, if in the USSR and in the "people's democracies" the "liberal" (Khrushchevist) wing goes along with the political revolution, if this wing can through pressure (and not through orders!) lead the Communist parties in the capitalist countries to align their politics with the "revolutionary" course of this wing, what becomes of the role of the Fourth International? What would be its historical justification if you add that in the sector of the colonial countries, which he claims to monopolize, Comrade Pablo's activities are characterized by the practical abandonment of any construction of an indigenous Trotskyist organization, beginning with Algeria? Merely reading Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme is enough to show that outside the fraudulent use of the label "African Commission of the Fourth International," the magazine never makes the least effort to spread even the idea of an organization.

Still more, the indications noted above have been developed in the discussion article, "It Is Time to See Clearly"; namely, the idea of a mass International, not on the basis of a program, but on the basis of grouping together all tendencies in quite a different way than on the organizational principles of democratic centralism. It is worth reproducing here some lengthy extracts so that Comrade Pablo's new ideas on the question of the International will stand out clearly:

"The rebuilding of ideological unity in the ranks of the international workers' movement will take place from now on through the reconstruction of a type of new democratic International, whose programme must correspond to the new realities of our extraordinary century, and within which the right of free discussion and the right to ideological tendencies will be acknowledged.

"Only a very high level of ideological education and of socialist democracy can achieve recovery of the organic unity of the international workers' movement, at present shattered under the harsh blows

of the revolutionary reality of our time.

"It may be that the present crisis will be revealed historically as the one which finally prepared the coexistence of all currents of the international communist movement inside a single Communist Party in each country, with a democratic regime, and recognising the rights of tendencies.

"For in fact, the progress of the world revolution characteristic of our time, in which must be included the new revolutionary development now prevailing in the USSR, which expresses itself globally in 'destalinisation', tends towards a reconciliation of viewpoints on some essential problems, while posing at the same time the need for a free discussion, conducted on a very high level, in order to find efficacious answers for some questions new to the whole international communist movement, which are posed by the new realities of the revolutionary world in which we live. ("It Is Time to See Clearly," September 27, 1963.)

"A communist movement in which this possibility existed of democratically working out the political line through discussion could regroup all the communist tendencies. Those who excluded themselves would demonstrate at the outset their sectarianism or their Stalinism. Given the events which the communist movement must face it could not avoid following this road. Togliatti's text will remain as the one that first openly expressed this. There remains the form of this new communist international. Togliatti came out against a centralized organization. At the stage where the communist movement is this is perhaps the only form. A centralized world party cannot really be Leninist unless its revolutionary politics, its profoundly democratic regime accompanies centralism. Otherwise it's a matter of bureaucratic, authoritarian Stalinist centralism. In addition, it will surely not be useless to re-think the structure of the communist movement. The presence in the same international of parties in power a long time, of parties in the capitalist countries, of parties in power in the underdeveloped countries, etc., must probably find new forms of organization." ("The Testament of Togliatti," Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme, No. 10, October 1964.)

"Comrade Pablo has left far behind the following conclusion in his article "In Praise of Trotskyism," an article which appears in the light of his backsliding to have been an expression of an internal conflict between his past and his present departure from Trotskyism.

"We have succeeded in working out a tactic which takes into account the double necessity: to openly defend the complete line of revolutionary Marxism, to struggle practically in the ranks where the class is essentially active. . . . Such a concept, flexible, bold, also difficult, of our practical action, implies an international organization of our tendency that is both highly political and disciplined. We know that our International is not that of the masses,

Nor can it be, as it now is, that of the masses of tomorrow. But it is absolutely indispensable for the cohesion, the survival, the future of the revolutionary Marxist tendency. It is thanks, in addition, to the firm voluntary discipline, resulting from a very high political education and consciousness, that the spearhead of the revolutionary Marxist tendency is felt in the combat and gives its militant physiognomy to our movement." ("Eloge du Trotskyisme," ["In Praise of Trotskyism"] Quatrième Internationale, Nov. 16, July 1962.)

Today Comrade Pablo is a long way from the Fourth International of "firm voluntary discipline." In his current documents there is no more talk about the program of the Fourth International which must be defended and enriched in order to serve the mass Fourth International of tomorrow.

The point of departure now is "the new realities of our extraordinary century," the new problems faced by the workers' movement. Without any doubt, the current situation presents gigantic problems; but it is not possible to solve them solely through . . . free discussion and the right of tendencies. Togliatti likewise talks about new problems in order to call for new forms in the Communist movement; but he does not limit himself to that, he also proposes, in a quiet but insidious way, a political reply to at least some of the new problems, a reply which is not even "rightist Communist," but revisionist. (It is impossible to imagine Bukharin or Brandler proposing to transform the bourgeois state from within into a workers state.) What Togliatti does is in accordance, moreover, with what can be called the classic pattern of the revisionists in introducing their merchandise -- new problems have arisen and it is necessary to re-think our policies.

We have seen above that Comrade Pablo, too, proceeds to revise the Trotskyist political positions on many problems, forgetting what our movement has defended and coming quite close on many points to the Khrushchevist or Titoist positions. In "It Is Time to See Clearly" he claims that "the progress of the world revolution . . . tends towards a reconciliation of viewpoints on some essential problems. . ." This is manifestly false. The rise of the revolution has on the contrary broken the monolithism and fostered a clash of diametrically opposed points of view. But the fact is that there was a reconciliation of the viewpoints of Comrade Pablo with those of Khrushchev, the Titoists, Togliatti, not only against the positions of the Chinese but above all against the majority of the Fourth International.

The Organizational Difference

Trotskyists have never conducted an organizational struggle separated from defense of their political program. They have always given priority to the political issues. That is why Trotskyists have never combined with rightists against the Stalinists.

But a struggle over organizational principles is also a poli-

tical struggle. And in this field, too, Comrade Pablo is revising (Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme prefers to say "re-thinking") the organizational concepts of Trotskyism. It has become a habit with him to characterize the discipline which we appeal for within the frame of democratic centralism as "formal." There is nothing "formal" about our organizational concepts. They are grounded in principles and theory just as much as the rest of our program. They are an integral part of our fundamental principles. They constitute the chapter entitled, "Leninist Theory of Organization." A difference over this theory is just as "fundamental," has as little to do with merely "formal" questions, as a difference over the Leninist theory of the state or the Marxist theory of value. That this difference shows up in a pattern of action rather than in verbal positions does not alter its gravity -- an entire tendency of the LSSP recently approved a coalition with a bourgeois government in practice while still voicing the Leninist theory of the state.

The school of Lenin and Trotsky does not play around with party loyalty, with the International; it recognizes that only betrayals of historic sweep with regard to principles justifies splitting from the party or the International. As long as such a betrayal has not occurred, any break, any split, is irresponsible and ineffectual, even if one's position is one hundred per cent correct. Because the objective is not only to be right but to incorporate this rightness in an organization capable of triumphing. And it is impossible to build an organization against a party to which the majority of the revolutionary cadres remain attached precisely because it has not betrayed the revolution (even if it may have committed some tactical errors).

In defending the integrity of the organization, we are acting not only in the interests of the Fourth International but also in the interests of the whole communist movement. One of the main struggles that most certainly must be conducted against the Stalinist concept of the party in this movement is the struggle for the right of tendencies. In this struggle the bureaucracy raises the well-known argument: freedom to form tendencies leads inevitably to splits. To grant freedom to form tendencies means installing a regime of permanent splits.

We must provide the practical proof that it is possible to combine complete free discussion within the movement, rights of the most ample kind for tendencies, with the necessary discipline in action. We must provide the practical proof that the right of tendencies has nothing to do with the systematic organization of disintegrating factions, because it presupposes in the final analysis that party discipline takes precedence over any "tendency discipline"; it presupposes a common effort in clarifying and building the party.

It is by our practical behavior that we must provide the demonstration of the correctness of our theses. The Fourth International, by demonstrating that it is possible to combine the right

of tendencies with discipline in external activities, will provide a thousand times more arguments in favor of freedom of tendencies within the world Communist movement than a hundred articles written in favor of de-Stalinization.

Here is our principle of organization: the minority, enjoying all the democratic rights of a tendency during the period of discussion and at Congresses adheres to the discipline of majority rule, even when it is convinced that it is one hundred per cent right, as long as it agrees that the International has not betrayed its principles, that the majority of the Trotskyist cadres are to be found within the International, without which it is impossible to forge the necessary instrument for the world revolution.

Comrade Pablo knows this principle as well as we do. He applied it for years, with much greater strictness than we have displayed today with regard to him. If he refuses to apply it from the moment he finds himself in a minority, there are only two possible explanations; either he is a cynical manipulator of people, believing in no principles, or he has in fact ceased to consider the cadres assembled in the Fourth International as essentially the forces necessary to assure the triumph of revolutionary Marxism in the world workers' movement, without which the triumph of the world revolution is more than doubtful.

It is evidently the second hypothesis that gives us the key to the mystery. Comrade Pablo has begun to seriously doubt not only the value but even the utility of the Fourth International (the way in which he repeatedly writes that "the Fourth International will not be able to survive" except under such and such conditions, is quite significant in this respect!). It is the logical and ultimate conclusion of his views on de-Stalinization and on Khrushchev. His whole course is on this road. The extreme importance which he attaches to being able to address the public outside the International, even at the price of violating all its organizational principles, even at the price of closing the possibility of speaking to the members within the International, is the objective expression of this course.

In "re-thinking" the forms of organization, Comrade Pablo offers a strange argument: In his hypothetical International there would be parties at different levels of development. But wasn't this the case in the past? Especially in the first years of the Third International? Is it possible to imagine the Marxist movement remaining at the same level of development in all countries for very long? Comrade Pablo's argument fuses with the arguments of the rightists of the Italian Communist party and with that of the London Bureau. This argument only rounds out the rightist direction of his political course.

It is true that among his arguments on this subject, he adds that on the one hand a flexible application of democratic centralism is required, and that on the other, at a time when we call for a