

TROTSKYISM VERSUS
REVISIONISM

A DOCUMENTARY HISTORY

VOLUME FIVE

*The fight for the continuity
of the
Fourth International*

NEW PARK PUBLICATIONS

\$5.95

**TROTSKYISM VERSUS
REVISIONISM**

TROTSKYISM VERSUS REVISIONISM

A DOCUMENTARY HISTORY

edited by C. Slaughter

VOLUME FIVE

*The fight for the continuity
of the
Fourth International*

NEW PARK PUBLICATIONS

**Published by New Park Publications Ltd.,
186a Clapham High Street, London SW4 7UG**

1975

**Set up, Printed and Bound
by Trade Union Labour**

**Distributed in the United States by:
Labor Publications Inc.,
135 West 14 Street, New York,
New York 10011**

ISBN 0 902030 72 8

**Printed in Great Britain by
Plough Press Ltd.(TU)
r/o 180 Clapham High Street, London SW4 7UG**

Contents

FOREWORD	xi
----------	----

CHAPTER ONE: THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL LIVES

Document 1	Resolution of the seventh annual conference of the Socialist Labour League, June 7, 1965	2
Document 2	Preliminary record of the Third World Conference of the International Committee, April 4-8, 1966	5
Document 3	Resolution of the Third World Conference, April 8, 1966	8

CHAPTER TWO: THE THIRD CONFERENCE OF THE IC IN STRUGGLE AGAINST REVISIONISM

Document 4	Report of the commission on rebuilding the Fourth International and the tasks of the IC, April 8, 1966	30
Document 5	Resolution of the American Commission, April 8, 1966	34
Document 6	Statement of the IC on the Robertson group (USA), April 9, 1966	36
Document 7	Manifesto of the International Committee, April 1966	40
Document 8	Submissions to the Third Conference from <i>Voix Ouvrière</i> , March 8 and 22, 1966	64
Document 9	Declaration of the Union Communiste Internationaliste to an OCI meeting, March 20, 1966	75

CHAPTER THREE: THE LIQUIDATIONIST THEORIES OF THE OCI

Document 10	Record of work of the IC since the Third Conference, May 1967	80
Document 11	Statement by the OCI, May 1967	84
Document 12	Reply to the OCI by the Central Committee of the SLL, June 19, 1967	107

CHAPTER FOUR: THE STRUGGLE IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE

Document 13	Notes by Cliff Slaughter of the IC meeting of June 17-18, 1967	134
Document 14	Notes for proposed speech by Dany Sylvaire to Revoltes National Youth Assembly, June 24, 1967	140
Document 15	Letter from the SLL to the OCI, June 27, 1967	142
Document 16	The OCI announces more differences with the SLL, August 1967	144
Document 17	Minutes of the International Committee meeting, September 30-October 1, 1967	152
Document 18a	SLL statement in defence of the OCI, June 22, 1968	155
18b	Declaration by the International Committee, June 25, 1968	157
18c	Statement on the OCI by the <i>Newsletter</i> Editorial Board, June 25, 1968	160

CHAPTER FIVE: THE OCI BLOCS WITH THE CENTRISTS

Document 19	<i>The Rebuilding of the Fourth International in Latin America is underway</i> , by Marc-Etienne Laurent, May 1971	166
Document 20	Resolution before the Essen Youth Rally, July 1971	184
Document 21	Young Socialists amendment to the Essen Resolution, July 1971	194
Document 22	Letter from the Essen Liaison Committee to the Young Socialists National Committee, November 1971	195
Document 23	Extracts from the discussion of the Essen Liaison Committee, November 5-6, 1971	198

GLOSSARY OF NAMES AND ORGANIZATIONS	201
-------------------------------------	-----

INDEX	204
-------	-----

Note on sources

The documents published in these volumes have been collected from the journals, internal bulletins and correspondence of the Trotskyist movement over the period since 1951. The series is designed to provide the basic documentation of the fight within the Fourth International during that time. Editing of the text has been kept to a minimum: footnotes and bracketed explanatory notes have been added only for essential reference. In all other respects the documents have been reproduced as they appear in the sources indicated below.

Each volume has a foreword introducing the reader to the main developments covered in it, with a glossary of names and an index provided as additional guides to the documents.

The sources for the documents used in this volume are as follows:

1. Original document before the 7th Annual Conference of the Socialist Labour League
2. Official Record of the Third World Conference of the International Committee
- 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. *Fourth International*, Vol.3, No. 3, August 1966
8. Translated from *Voix Ouvrière*, March 8 and 22, 1966
9. Translated from a verbatim account taken at the OCI meeting of March 20, 1966
10. Original document before the 9th Annual Conference of the Socialist Labour League

- 11, 12. Pre-Conference discussion Bulletins for the 9th Annual Conference of the Socialist Labour League
- 13, 14, 15. Internal Bulletin of the Socialist Labour League
16. Translated from *Studies and Documents*, Vol. 2, No. 8(b), August 1967
17. Minutes of the International Committee
- 18a. *The Newsletter*, June 22, 1968
- 18b. *The Newsletter*, June 25, 1968
- 18c. *The Newsletter*, June 25, 1968
19. Translated for this volume from *La Correspondance Internationale* ('Bulletin du Comité International pour la reconstruction de la IV Internationale'), No. 1
20. Translated from the original draft of the Resolution before the Essen Rally
21. As quoted in the statement of the International Committee, October 24, 1971
- 22, 23. Translated for this volume from correspondence received by the Young Socialists, November 1971

Foreword

After 18 years membership of the International Committee of the Fourth International, the French Organization Communiste Internationaliste (OCI) in 1971 split with the majority of this Committee. At that time, the OCI leaders claimed to be the true representatives of the continuity of the struggle against revisionism and the building of the Fourth International carried forward since 1953 by the International Committee (see the companion volumes I-IV of this series).

By 1974, however, the OCI was publicly on record as having commenced formal discussions at the level of leadership, with the so-called 'United Secretariat', i.e. the revisionist political organization carried on by Pablo after the split of 1953. Present at the negotiations were Pierre Frank and Livio Maitan, among the most prominent and right-wing liquidationist leaders of the Pabloite revisionists ever since 1953. The talks were arranged and attended, by leaders of the Socialist Workers' Party of the United States, who had been working with the OCI to this end for over a year. (*Intercontinental Press*, January 1975: see appendix to Volume VI of this series).

At first sight, these events represent a remarkable about-face from the position of the OCI in the 1950s and 1960s. When it suited them, the OCI leaders would draw attention to the fact that they were the first to clash, politically and organizationally, with Pablo, Frank and Mandel (Germain). When the SWP, founder-member of the IC, participated at the Pabloite 'reunification' of 1963 (See Volume IV), the OCI supported (though making little or not independent contribution to the struggle) every step in the struggle against liquidationism. Indeed, the OCI affected a very intransigent stance. For example when the SLL (predecessor of the Workers Revolutionary Party) proposed a 'parity committee' to engage the SWP and the

Pabloites in open political discussion, they first opposed this and then accepted it very reluctantly. Yet now it is the same leadership of the OCI who appears in talks with the Pabloite revisionists, and who are commended by the latter for their 'sincerity' and 'seriousness'.

For its part, the IC majority was in no doubt that the questions on which the OCI split from the IC in 1971 were just as fundamental as those which had been at the centre of the struggle in 1953 and 1963. There could be no compromise once the OCI had persisted in a basic revision of Marxism (the rejection of dialectical materialism as the theory of knowledge of Marxism) to the point of publicly voting with enemies of Trotskyism against the IC, at the Essen Youth Rally of July 1971. (See Chapter Five below, and statement of the IC of the FI (Majority) October 24, 1971). The act of splitting in 1971, and the political basis on which it was carried out, were in all essentials a capitulation to the same Pabloite revisionism to which the OCI formally returned in 1974.

It is now time to make available in one place not only all the already public documents of the 1971 split and the work of the IC in the years leading up to it, but also certain internal reports and communications which make absolutely clear the principled struggle of the IC to answer and clarify the growing revisionist tendencies in the OCI between 1967 and 1971. Whilst the IC took up in detail the distortions of the OCI leadership and the questions of Bolshevik leadership and internationalism and then, in 1970, more and more openly on the basic philosophical issues, it also fought in complete solidarity with the OCI when De Gaulle's government declared it illegal following the May-June General Strike in 1968. The Socialist Labour League, for example, led a broad public campaign in the British labour movement against the repression, and considerable funds were raised to help the OCI (See Document 18 below). When the SWP took the road back to Pabloism in 1957-63, they attempted to justify this capitulation on the grounds that the Pabloites were returning to the principled positions on the main political questions. This manoeuvre failed when it was attempted on the basis of the Pabloites' reaction to the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, was eventually carried through on the bandwagon of the Cuban Revolution and the supposedly new, independent, and 'naturally Marxist' leadership of Castro and Castroism. On this entirely spurious basis, the 'reunification' was carried through with an agreement not to discuss at all the fundamental issues which had necessitated the split of 1953. The reasons were very clear: capitula-

tion to petty-bourgeois agencies like Castroism and its middle-class 'protest' support in the US and Europe was only an extension of the capitulation of Pablo to Stalinism in the 1951-53 period. Both these manifestations of liquidationism had the theoretical basis of idealism and impressionism, the rejection of dialectical materialism. Once the OCI took the road of openly rejecting dialectical materialism, it could not avoid the same political conclusions as the SWP and the OCI. What actually happened in 1963 was that the SWP had come to the position of the Pabloites, not vice-versa. And in 1974, it is not the SWP and its supporters in the 'United Secretariat' who have come closer to Trotskyism, but on the contrary, the OCI which has inevitably reached the liquidationist political consequences of its revision of Marxist theory.

In February 1975, the OCI showed what it had really meant by all the long disquisitions about a 'united front' as the basic policy of Marxism. Just as their famous 'reconstruction of the Fourth International' was shown at Essen as a formula for allying with centrists and anti-Trotskyist *against* the Fourth International, so now the 'United Front' is seen to be nothing more than a formula for liquidating the political and organizational independence of the revolutionary party into support for the unity between Stalinism and Social-Democracy. The OCI's main campaign from February 1975 was for 80,000 signatures calling upon the French Socialist Party and Communist Party to drop their differences and show unity! It would be difficult to recall a more extreme example of the liquidation of the independent role of the revolutionary party. The workers and youth of the OCI, instead of coming before the working class with independent policies based around the constitution of the alternative revolutionary leadership, are called upon, instead, to bring the reformists and Stalinists closer together with the working class! This is nothing more or less than collusion in betrayal. The more the workers are tied to these leaders, the greater the danger of defeat of revolutionary struggles in the maturing crisis.

It is because these are their politics that the OCI now enters relations with the SWP, choosing to forget the betrayals of the SWP, just as the SWP chose in 1963 to ignore the Pabloites' capitulation to Stalinism. In Latin America, for example, the OCI already in 1971 demonstrated the treacherous consequences of its 'United Front' and 'reconstruction' theories, when it supported the policies of Guillermo Lora and his Partido Obrero Revolucionario. Lora first capitulated to

the Bolivian Stalinists, abandoning the strategy of Permanent Revolution for the Stalinists' 'socialism in one country' and subordination to the 'national bourgeoisie'. The OCI administered a wild rebuke, but drew no conclusions, continuing falsely to present Lora as a Trotskyist right up to and even beyond the counter-revolutionary coup of Banzer. In the events of 1971 Lora's theories and policies surrendered the political independence of the Bolivian working class to the bourgeois nationalist party of General Torres. The inevitable consequence was defeat.

To this very day, the OCI and their Latin American collaborators (e.g. *Política Obrera* of Argentina) continue to support and publicise Lora. Because they cannot draw the lessons of 1971, but instead will repeat the treachery of 1971 wherever they are politically active, they do not see any inconsistency in discussing unity with the SWP and the Pabloites, who were responsible for the most craven liquidationism in 1963. This liquidation played its own part in the Bolivian and the Chilean defeats. In Chile, for example, the group led by Vitale left the IC for the Pabloites along with the SWP. They argued at that time that Trotskyism had no role independent of Castroism. Again we saw the essence of this position — the rejection of the political independence of the working class and of the revolutionary Marxist leadership — when Vitale found it completely impossible to oppose the Popular Front government of Allende, thereby contributing decisively to the defeat of September 1973. It is worth recalling the claims for Castroism made by the SWP and its supporters like Vitale in 1962-63:

It (Castroism) provides an immediate rallying centre for all revolutionary currents in the Americas . . . Despite any errors or inadequacies, the record shows the July 26 forces headed by Fidel Castro to be a revolutionary tendency that has increasingly taken Marxist positions on domestic and foreign policies, while clarifying its own thinking in the process. Under these circumstances, we believe the Trotskyists of Cuba should seek to enter and take their place in the soon-to-be-formed unified revolutionary party where they can work loyally, patiently and confidently for the implementation of the fully revolutionary-socialist programme which they represent. (Draft Resolution of SWP, May 1, 1962, reprinted in Volume III of this series, pp. 108-9)

In the same document, Hansen and the SWP declare:

. . . the Cubans are proving to be better revolutionists than such theoreticians, for they are proceeding to organize a Marxist-Leninist party. (*Ibid* p. 213)

In answer to this shameless liquidation, Castro proceeded only a few months later to denounce Trotskyism in crude 1930s Stalinist terms as an instrument of imperialism. When the SWP turned to a 'critique' of the guerrilla-ist orientation of the United Secretariat in Latin America, it did not of course pay the slightest attention to its own direct and primary responsibility for the disorientation of the Trotskyist forces in the wake of the Cuban Revolution.

The purpose of these historical examples is twofold. In the first place, it is necessary to establish the complete continuity between the struggles against Pabloism and the SWP (Volumes I-IV) and against the OCI and its supporters (Volumes V-VI). Secondly, it becomes clear from these examples that the work covered by this documentary history was not at all just an exchange of written documents, but the essential theoretical groundwork of the building of revolutionary parties of the Fourth International against the most fundamental attacks, in preparation for the revolutionary struggles of the 1970s.

Chapter One

The Fourth International lives

In this chapter is contained the principal background material to the 1966 World Conference of the International Committee of the Fourth International. This Third Conference became a fierce battle against a new version of the liquidationism which had already been expressed in the Pabloite tendency since 1953. It was the French group *Voix Ouvrière* (later *Lutte Ouvrière*) and the United States group of Robertson, Spartacist, both attending as observers, which formulated this tendency. They favoured some pragmatic 'unification' with the IC, but only on a completely anti-internationalist basis. This was the meaning of their demand that the IC write off the past, declaring that Pablo had actually destroyed the Fourth International.

It was absolutely essential to affirm the necessity and the success of the struggle for Marxist theory and the building of revolutionary parties against Pabloite revisionism. This is the content of the amendment carried on 'reconstruction' of the Fourth International in Document 2, on which the *Voix Ouvrière* and Spartacist delegations left the Conference.

In later years, as shown in subsequent chapters of this volume, the words 'reconstruction of the Fourth International', which the IC and its sections used in the preparation for this Conference, was misused by the OCI to deny the fundamental character of the fight for Marxist theory, and so adapt to the reformist bureaucracy. Undoubtedly, the Third Conference marked a transition from the successful fight against Pabloite liquidationism and its spurious 'unification' to the conscious building of new parties on the basis of dialectical materialism in preparation for the emerging capitalist crisis.

DOCUMENT 1

Resolution of the seventh annual conference of the Socialist Labour League, June 7, 1965

Revolutionary Greetings to the World Trotskyist Movement

This Seventh Annual Conference of the Socialist Labour League sends its revolutionary greetings to all the forces of the international working class who are in struggle for the overthrow of capitalism and the defeat of the treacherous reformist and Stalinist leaderships of the working class.

Our Conference declares its solidarity with the struggles of the workers in the United States, Western Europe and Japan against their capitalist exploiters, with the workers and peasants of the colonial and oppressed nations, particularly in Vietnam, against imperialism and its agents, and with the workers of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe against the parasitic bureaucracy which collaborates with imperialism.

Only the reconstruction of the Fourth International, with Trotskyist Leninist parties in every country, can ensure the unity of these struggles and their victory.

We therefore send fraternal greetings to all sections of the International Committee of the Fourth International, and will give every support to its conference for the rebuilding of the Fourth International, planned for early 1966.

Our greetings go particularly to those who have fought revisionism under especially difficult circumstances in the USA, the American Committee for the Fourth International. They will receive every possible support from the SLL.

The Conference called by the International Committee will mark a qualitative stage in the development of the Fourth International. Revisionism in the Trotskyist movement has run its course from theoretical distortions to open class betrayal in the recent period. The entry of the LSSP of Ceylon into the capitalist coalition government of

Mrs. Bandaranaike in 1964 was the most crushing proof of this degeneration. It followed hard on the heels of the unprincipled 'reunification' between the Pabloite 'International Secretariat' and the SWP of the United States. This re-unification was completed without political discussion, deliberately to avoid the political questions confronting the international movement.

The struggle against revisionism carried out by the IC has hastened the process of degeneration of the Pabloite forces. Ever since 1951, these revisionists have in effect subordinated the working class and the building of the revolutionary party to the Stalinist bureaucracy, the reformist leaders and the bourgeois nationalists in the colonial countries. The forces of the International Committee have correctly fought for the political independence of the working class through the building of the revolutionary party and the application of the Transitional Programme of the Fourth International.

Pablo himself now separates publicly from the 'reunified' Secretariat in Paris, and openly advocates the complete liquidation of Trotskyism into the Stalinist bureaucracy and the bourgeois-nationalist movements.

This open break from Marxism by Pablo, supported by a number of old Trotskyists such as Santen in Holland and Vereecken in Belgium, together with half the French section, the majority of the Australian section and certain groups in Algeria and other colonial countries, should be the warning light for those Trotskyists remaining in the sections of the United Secretariat who want to fight revisionism and defend the Transitional Programme. They should support the SLL and the FI in fighting for a discussion of all principled questions and the serious preparation of a future conference of all those who accept the Transitional Programme. This was proposed by the IC Conference of September 1963, and rejected by the United Secretariat.

The evolution of Pablo, and the events in Ceylon, Belgium and the USA, have proved the correctness of our proposals. Germain, Frank and Hansen have proved themselves utterly incapable of defending the programme of the Fourth International. Their theory and their 'politics' are in essence the same as those of Pablo. In America, the SWP's prostration before petty-bourgeois nationalism in the Negro movement is only one reflection of their acceptance of the liquidationist revisionism of Pabloism.

In Western Europe, the sections of the 'Unified Secretariat' have become mere appendages of the 'Left' Social Democracy. Belgium

provides the proof. 'Entry' was used to opportunistically abandon the construction of the revolutionary party, only to end in the adventure of proclaiming a new centrist party in alliance with the worst nationalist and petty-bourgeois elements, whose split from the new party itself is only a matter of time. The next United Secretariat Congress will expel Pablo and his supporters, expel over 500 members of the LSSP, as well as having to give an accounting of all these events.

The present stage is therefore a crucial one. It is the last opportunity to engage in a serious discussion and reconstruction of the International before the forces around the United Secretariat are completely liquidated by Frank, Germain and Hansen, who are rapidly following Pablo to the complete abandonment of revolutionary Marxism. All those who struggle against these revisionists will receive the support of the SLL.

The successful fight of the IC against revisionism and the work of its sections in constructing a leadership of the working class provide the basis for the reconstruction of the Fourth International. Such a reconstruction is the fear of Stalinists and Social Democrats everywhere, just as it is feared by the capitalist class. The responsibility for the split in the International rests squarely upon the Pabloite revisionists.

1963 showed that in the USA the Socialist Workers Party had succumbed to the same revisions. When the National Committee of the SWP sent condolences to the widow of Kennedy, and called upon the US government to defend the Negroes with Federal troops, the consequences of revisionism were shown no less starkly than they were in Ceylon.

The 're-unification' of the revisionists in 1963 without discussion of past differences was a part of the whole method of liquidationism. The proposals for international discussion put forward by the International Committee conference in September 1963 were rejected by the Pabloite United Secretariat. Since then, the disintegration of the Pabloite forces, a reflection of the crisis of the reformist and Stalinist bureaucracies faced with the intensification of the international class struggle, has confirmed the political necessity of a thorough discussion in the world movement to prepare a real rebuilding of the Fourth International and a defeat of revisionism.

We call upon all Trotskyists throughout the world to support our efforts to re-organise the Fourth International on the programmatic basis of its 1938 Founding Conference.

DOCUMENT 2

Preliminary record of the Third World Conference of the International Committee, April 4-8, 1966

The third Conference of the IC was held in London on April 4-8, 1966. Delegates and observers from ten countries attended. Delegates from two African countries were prevented from attending by passport difficulties.

After three days of discussion on the main political report, the Conference voted on the report and on the resolution 'Rebuilding the Fourth International', which had been circulated internationally as the basis for the proceedings of the Conference.

In the course of discussion, it became very clear that one of the delegations invited as observers (the group publishing the paper *Voix Ouvrière* in France) opposed completely the political line and theoretical basis of the International Committee. This group broke from the Fourth International in 1940 on the grounds of the petty-bourgeois social composition, organizational methods and political line of the existing French sections. It considers that the struggles conducted against revisionism inside the Fourth International since that time have been nothing more than a waste of time within a petty-bourgeois milieu. For this reason, the VO group accepted participation in the Conference on the basis of their own interpretation of the references in the resolution 'Rebuilding the FI' to the 'death' and 'destruction' of the Fourth International. The Conference rejected this as an anti-theoretical tendency, a tendency which struck at the very root of the principled basis of the struggle for the Trotskyist programme and the building of revolutionary parties.

The Conference accepted an amendment to the draft resolution, submitted by M. Banda of the British delegation, worded as follows:

Amendment 1

Delete the sentence referring to the destruction of the Fourth International by the Pabloite revisionists, and substitute the following: 'The Fourth International has successfully resisted and defeated the attempts of

petty-bourgeois opportunism, in the shape of a hardened revisionist tendency which penetrated all sections of the Trotskyist movement, to destroy it politically and organizationally. The struggle against this tendency was and remains the necessary preparation for the rebuilding of the International as a centralized proletarian leadership.'

The rest of the resolution to be amended to correspond to this change.

A counter-amendment submitted by M. Varga (Hungarian delegation) read as follows:

Amendment II

Re-write the first sentence of MB's amendment as follows: 'In the framework of the Fourth International, and on the basis of its programme, Marxists have undertaken a successful struggle against, and have defeated, the attempts of petty-bourgeois opportunism, etc.'

Voting on the main political report and reply to discussion, on Amendment I, on Amendment II, and on the amended resolution as a whole, were as follows:

<i>Sections of IC</i>	Report etc.	Amendment I	Amendment II	Amended Resolution
SLL (Britain)	For	For	Against	For
OCI (France)	For	For	Against	For
Hungary	For	Against	For	For
Greece	For	For	Against	For
ACFI (USA)	For	For	Against	For
Spartacist (USA)	Against	Against	For	For
<i>Observers</i>				
<i>Voix Ouvrière</i>	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain
Denmark	For	For	Against	For
Ceylon	For	For	Against	For
Germany	For	For	Against	For
Africa (French-Speaking)	For	For	Against	For
Japan	Against	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain
Young Socialists (Britain)	For	For	Against	For
Revoltes (France)	For	For	Against	For

After the vote on the Resolution, the *Voix Ouvrière* and Spartacist delegations left the Conference. The spokesman of the *Voix Ouvrière* group announced that they had come under a misunderstanding: they were for the reconstruction of the Fourth International and therefore

did not vote against the Resolution, but they were convinced that the IC forces remained in the grip of the revisionism they talked about fighting, because they did not go to the roots of this revisionism in the question of Communist organization. The *Voix Ouvrière* group thereby separated itself from the struggle to reconstruct the Fourth International on the basis of the Transitional Programme. Their hostility to the battle to develop theory in a centralized international, preferring instead a 'centrist' international which puts aside theoretical differences, will bring them into sharp conflict with the International Committee.

The Spartacist delegation, and particularly its spokesman J. Robertson, displayed a similar anti-internationalist and anti-Marxist outlook. The International Committee proceeds in solidarity with the American Committee for the Fourth International, and declares that the Spartacist group in no way represents the positions of the IC. On the contrary, a section of the Fourth International in the USA, the most pressing need of the world proletariat, will only be built in struggle against the pragmatic, petty-bourgeois, narrow 'American' politics of 'Spartacist'. The Report of the American Commission at the Conference, together with the statement on Robertson and the Spartacist delegation, are appended to this record.

Three Commissions worked to formulate and complete the work of the Conference: the first was concerned with 'The Reconstruction of the Fourth International and the tasks of the International Committee', the second with 'The Fourth International and the building of a section in the USA', and the third with the drafting of a Manifesto on the political conclusions of the Conference.

The following documents represent the work of the Conference:

1. Amended Resolution, 'Rebuilding the Fourth International';
2. Report of the Commission on Rebuilding the Fourth International and the Tasks of the International Committee.
3. Report of the Conference American Commission.
4. Statement of the IC on Robertson and the Spartacist delegation to the Conference.
5. Manifesto of the International Conference.

Other documents submitted to the Conference are referred to the International Discussion Bulletin.

DOCUMENT 3

Resolution of the Third World Conference, April 8, 1966

Rebuilding the Fourth International

1. The class struggle is international. World capitalism has long since played out its historical role of laying down the objective bases for socialism; the struggles of the workers of all countries have meaning only in terms of the world socialist revolution which began in October 1917 in Russia, as part of the world proletarian revolution. The Third (Communist) International was set up to answer the needs of the working class in this epoch of wars and revolutions. Following the betrayals of Social Democracy after 1918, the degeneration of the CPSU and the Comintern led eventually to the defeats in Britain and China in 1926-27 and the victory of fascism in Italy, Germany and Spain. Between 1933 and 1938 Trotsky and the Bolshevik opposition prepared to establish a Fourth International in response to the needs of the working class in a period of defeats, when Stalinism passed definitively to the side of counter-revolution.

The history of the class struggle since 1938 has proved correct the basic starting-point of Trotsky and the founders of the Fourth International: the working class remains oppressed by capitalism because of the betrayals of the working-class leadership, particularly by the Stalinist bureaucracy in the USSR; *our epoch is the epoch of crisis of working-class leadership*. All the economic and political developments since then have shown the correctness of insisting that the development of imperialism constantly deepens the contradiction between the productive forces and capitalist social relations. But at every critical stage in the development of this contradiction, the traitorous social-democratic and Stalinist leaderships and the Soviet bureaucracy have misled the workers; these petty-bourgeois formations have divided the workers along national and sectional lines and held back

the development of a revolutionary consciousness. The post-war economic and political crisis in the advanced countries, the breakdown of capitalist rule in Eastern Europe, the victorious revolution in China, the mass struggles in the colonial countries — all of these international capitalism has survived because of the treachery of these misleaders who disarmed the working class.

Only an international revolutionary Marxist leadership could have enabled these class struggles to be used for the overthrow of capitalism in the main centres, the advanced countries. Only the Fourth International and its parties, intervening in the class struggle in these countries, giving them international significance, could have given leadership to the independent organs of working-class power, and could have led the peasant masses beyond the leadership of the petty-bourgeois nationalists in the colonial countries.

Imperialism was able to overcome its post-Second World War crisis through the collaboration of international Stalinism and of other petty-bourgeois tendencies. Such collaboration, fully developed in the bureaucracy's strategy of peaceful co-existence and peaceful competition between the two world systems since the death of Stalin and particularly since 1956, now takes on an added significance for the rebuilding of the Fourth International. This new and more advanced phase of the counter-revolutionary role of Stalinism is the response of the bureaucracy not only to the increased pressure of imperialism but also to the upsurge of the political revolution in Eastern Europe after 1953. At the same time, movements like the General Strike of August 1953 in France showed that the policies of the Stalinist and Social Democratic bureaucracies in the advanced capitalist countries were coming into contradiction with the mass movement. The containment of the working class in those capitalist countries where the Stalinists had mass influence became more difficult and fraught with danger. Every partial mobilization of the strength of the class threatened to rapidly develop into a general class confrontation, putting in question the whole capitalist system. The Stalinist bureaucratic leaderships of the working-class movement found themselves faced with the necessity of making themselves open agents of the maintenance of bourgeois order like the Social Democrats before them. In a different form, the historic defeat of French imperialism at Dien-Bien-Phu forced the international Stalinist apparatus into direct collaboration with imperialism for the purpose of preventing the extension of the revolution in the colonial countries.

The Hungarian Revolution represents the principal manifestation up to the present of the insoluble contradiction between Stalinism and the extension of the socialist revolution. At the same time as it was the first political revolution against the Stalinist bureaucracy, and was for a time victorious, it was also an expression of the international class struggle, taking its specific form in the countries of Eastern Europe. It posed the problem of workers' power through workers' councils not only in Hungary but throughout the USSR and Eastern Europe. Its actual development raised the question of the social revolution in the countries of Western Europe. Thus the increasingly international character of the proletarian revolution threatens the existence of both the Kremlin bureaucracy and imperialism. The Sino-Soviet conflict is another major external manifestation of the insoluble contradiction between Stalinism and the international revolutionary struggle. This struggle must be led by a Marxist leadership if capitalist counter-revolution is to be prevented in China, the USSR and Eastern Europe, and if imperialism is to be defeated throughout the rest of the world.

Another major principle of the founders of the Fourth International is thus more than confirmed. Stalinism is not a new social system but a regime of crisis in a degenerated workers' state, a regime which will fall to the political revolution of the working class; the political revolution can succeed only under the leadership of parties of the Fourth International. This is the lesson of the recurrent crises in the USSR since 1953, the East German and Polish uprisings, the Hungarian revolution and the Sino-Soviet split; the establishment of degenerated or deformed workers' states in Eastern Europe and China, far from ending the isolation of the USSR and softening its contradictions, has accelerated and deepened them. The more the planned economy develops under the control of the Soviet bureaucracy, the sharper become the social contradictions, thus giving more and more concreteness to the alternative posed in the founding programme of the Fourth International:

The political prognosis has an alternative character: either the bureaucracy, becoming ever more the organ of the world bourgeoisie in the workers' state, will overthrow the new forms of property and plunge the country back to capitalism; or the working class will crush the bureaucracy and open the way to socialism.

In neither event can there be any peaceful conclusion. The actual outcome will be the product of the world class struggle, primarily in the developed capitalist countries and in the USSR, Eastern Europe

and China. The unity of the workers' struggle in Eastern Europe with the workers' movement in Western Europe now urgently requires conscious and concrete expression. This can only be done by the rebuilding of the Fourth International of Marxist parties in every one of these countries. The Socialist United States of Europe is a living slogan: in Eastern Europe the bureaucracy clumsily attempts economic co-operation between the different workers' states (Com-econ); in Western Europe, the capitalists try to discipline the working class and resolve their contradictions in the framework of the European Common Market, itself a reflection of sharpening inter-imperialist contradictions; between the imperialists and the bureaucracy an uneasy series of compromises is negotiated, and the economy of Eastern Europe and Russia is penetrated more and more by the prevailing relationships and prices in the imperialist world market. Thus, along with its political rapprochement with imperialism since 1953, the bureaucracy is made more sensitive and responsive to the contradictory economic development of international capitalism. It is the task of the Fourth International to create working-class parties which consciously respond in struggle to these objective contradictions and potentialities. The historic division between the workers of Russia and Eastern Europe on the one hand, and those of Western Europe and America on the other, the result of Stalinism, can only be overcome through the conscious experience of the unity of their struggles; this conscious experience takes concrete form in the rebuilding of the Fourth International, rooted in the working class of the advanced countries as well as of the planned economies. There will be no spontaneous formation of such parties. In Hungary in 1956, despite a high level of political development and the formation of workers' councils, such a party was not built, and any conscious intervention by the Fourth International was sabotaged by the Pabloite revisionists. The workers' struggle continues in these countries since 1956, and it is the responsibility of the Fourth International to provide conscious leadership which can build on the lessons of 1956.

In the same way, the International and its parties are the key to the problems of the class struggle in the colonial countries. The petty-bourgeois nationalist leaders and their Stalinist collaborators restrict the struggle to the level of national liberation, or, at best, to a version of 'socialism in one country', sustained by subordination to the co-existence policies of the Soviet bureaucracy. In this way, all the gains of the struggle of the workers and peasants, not only in the Arab

world, India, South East Asia, etc., but also in China and Cuba, are confined within the limits of imperialist domination, or exposed to counter-revolution and imperialist intervention (the line-up against China, the Cuban missiles crisis, the Vietnam war, etc.). In each country, the organic link between the colonial workers and the struggle of the workers in the advanced countries and in the workers' states can be understood and given concrete expression only under the leadership of parties of the Fourth International.

The period 1953-56 marks a turning point in the world situation. At the end of the Second World War, the changed relation of class forces on a world scale broke the old capitalist equilibrium. However, to the extent that the Stalinist and reformist bureaucracies were able to contain or manipulate the strength of the working class in the advanced countries, the most decisive consequences of this changed situation were not immediately apparent in all their significance.

There was a growing together of the social and economic contradictions of the advanced capitalist countries and of the planned economies. In the long term, imperialism cannot survive except by bringing the workers' states back into the orbit of capitalist exploitation. At the same time, the harmonious development of the planned economies of Russia and Eastern Europe demands that the most advanced productive forces in the world be included in socialist planning. But the economy cannot be considered in and of itself. Its contradictions must be translated into class terms.

The Kremlin bureaucracy and all its satellite bureaucracies, precisely because they have the character of parasitic social groups, are no less attached to a purely national framework, to national states, than the bourgeoisie of the various capitalist nations. These national states constitute the basis of their exploitation of the working class in their own country. The idea that it is possible to achieve 'socialism in one country' is not only a false theory; it is at the same time the ideological expression of the conditions of growth and survival of the parasitic bureaucracy and its material interests.

A mechanical idea of working-class internationalism leads to a misunderstanding of the national factor in the struggle for emancipation of the working classes subjected to imperialism and the Kremlin bureaucracy. But it is no less dangerous to ignore the internationalist content of the workers' struggles in these countries. The workers must liberate themselves from the oppression and exploitation both of imperialism and of the Kremlin bureaucracy, a task which goes

beyond a struggle within national frameworks. Except in this context, national independence is meaningless.

The struggle of the working class in Eastern Europe can only be understood as a struggle against regimes produced by a revolutionary movement which has been doubly distorted:

1. It is part of a revolutionary upsurge which threatened the very existence of capitalism in the whole of Europe, a threat which was dispelled by the complementary actions of American imperialism, the Soviet bureaucracy and its agencies, and European Social-Democracy;
2. The Kremlin bureaucracy used its power to decapitate the revolutionary action of the workers of these countries, using for this purpose the old apparatus of the capitalist state.

The movements of August 1953 and of the summer of 1955 in France, together with the rising revolutionary wave in Eastern Europe, must be considered in their historical continuity, at the same time as marking a turning point in the world class struggle. From one point of view, they carried forward the revolutionary struggles in Europe of the years 1943-45; from another, they inaugurated a new period in the international struggle of the working class.

Independently of their level of consciousness of the question, the working classes of Eastern Europe and of France in particular fought struggles which tended towards the dictatorship of the proletariat; only through this dictatorship is it possible to achieve the planned use of the productive forces of the world, based on common property in the means of production and the breaking down of national boundaries. In this sense the struggles of this period were the response of the working class to the contradictions both of the capitalist system and of the planned economies. In these struggles, they came into direct conflict with the Soviet bureaucracy, with its international Stalinist agents, and with the reformist bureaucracies, as well as with the bourgeois state machines.

The linked crisis of imperialism and of the Soviet bureaucracy does not arise solely from the contradiction between capitalist economy as a whole and the planned economies. It consists also of contradictions between the imperialist powers themselves, which constantly nourish the class struggle and give it sharper forms in the advanced countries, and of the inability of imperialism to arrest the development of the revolution in the backward countries; the crisis is also fed by the fact that the Kremlin and satellite bureaucracies cannot resolve the prob-

lems posed by the development of the planned economy, whose harmonious development demands not only the extension of social ownership and planning to the means of production in the advanced countries, but also the participation of the working class in the management and control of industry; this is only possible if they exercise political power, which is impossible without the overthrow of the bureaucracy. This linked crisis creates the conditions for intensification of the world class struggle, and it is in that struggle that the crisis will find its solution. For this reason, the struggles engaged in by the workers of the advanced countries during the years between 1953 and 1956, and the changed relationship which these struggles expressed between the workers and the bureaucratic apparatus of the labour movement, were decisive factors. This fact was partially obscured by the defeat of the Hungarian Revolution, which was basically a victory for imperialism, encouraging pro-capitalist tendencies in the USSR and Eastern Europe and reformist trends in the Communist Parties. Nonetheless, this defeat was temporary and not fundamental, since in not a single advanced country has the working class been subjected to a defeat like those of the 1920s.

It is the perspective of combined revolutionary struggles, threatening at the same time the existence of imperialism and of the Kremlin bureaucracy, bringing the proletariat into conflict with the bureaucratic apparatuses which control the workers' movement, which demands and makes possible the rebuilding of the Fourth International.

2. No starting point for revolutionary practice in the present international political situation can be found simply from contemplation of the 'objective forces' at work. The lessons of the struggles within the revolutionary Marxist movement are decisive to the grasping of these opportunities in the objective situation. The Fourth International has successfully resisted and defeated the attempts of petty-bourgeois opportunism, in the shape of a hardened revisionist tendency which penetrated all sections of the Trotskyist movement, to destroy it politically and organizationally. The struggle against this tendency was and remains the necessary preparation for the rebuilding of the Fourth International as a centralized proletarian leadership. This revisionist tendency developed into a centre for liquidation of the revolutionary party and the International, now gathered together in the self-styled 'Unified Secretariat', which is the product of fusion

between the International Secretariat of Pablo and the revisionist groups previously associated with the International Committee and the SWP of the USA. Revisionism became liquidationism when the French Section was expelled from the International because of its defence of Trotskyism, of the Transitional Programme, and of its own very existence. The onslaught of the revisionists reached its peak in the split of 1952-1953. The liquidationist centre has become a major obstacle to the rebuilding of the Fourth International.

Revisionism and liquidationism in the Fourth International, with its primary political expression subordination to the bureaucratic instruments of imperialist penetration of the workers' and national liberation movements, must be seen not only as a result but also as an objective contributory factor to the success of these bureaucracies in containing the struggles of the international working class. The Fourth International cannot be rebuilt without a struggle against these 'Trotskyist' revisionists. In this period, when the counter-revolutionary actions of the Stalinist bureaucracy are an indispensable support to imperialism, revisionism and liquidationism take particular forms of capitulation to this bureaucracy. Centrist tendencies within the Stalinist movement, in Eastern Europe, USSR and China, as well as in the various Communist Parties, base themselves on the perspective of a reform of the Stalinist bureaucracy. Pabloite revisionism and liquidationism is the expression of this revisionism of our epoch within the revolutionary movement itself. The first steps of a fight against Stalinism in the countries ruled by the bureaucracy go through forms which tend to accept this revisionist framework. In this way, the dominance of Pabloite revisionism in the Fourth International objectively hindered the development of the political revolution in 1953-56. Thus Pabloite revisionism and liquidationism has not been a purely 'internal' or 'subjective' experience of the Fourth International.

The split in the International of 1951-53 was linked with the development of revisionism into liquidationism. The abandonment of the programme of the Fourth International which had been contained in the earlier theses of Pablo developed into actual support for the Stalinist bureaucracy against the revolutionary workers of East Germany. This constituted proof that the revolutionary organization founded by Trotsky no longer existed. In 1953, the revisionism contained in Pablo's earlier theses was most sharply expressed in his retreat from the programme of political revolution in Eastern Europe

at the time of the East German workers' uprising. The theories of 'centuries of degenerated workers' states', 'mass pressure on the bureaucracy', and the resultant tactic of 'entry *sui generis*', were the revisionist background of this betrayal and later of the Pabloites' similar attitude towards the Hungarian revolution of 1956, and to the whole phenomenon of 'de-Stalinisation'. The fundamental perspective of the founding programme of the Fourth International, the construction of revolutionary parties to fight for the political independence of the working class in the struggle for power, was abandoned. The Pabloite conception of an international centre whose role consists of influencing through abstract 'theoretical and political support' the leftward-moving sections of the bureaucracy, as the latter supposedly respond to the pressure of the masses and of 'irreversible' objective trends, is the negation of the basic task defined by the Transitional Programme: '... the crisis of the proletarian leadership, having become the crisis in mankind's culture, can be resolved only by the Fourth International'. The fundamental perspective of the founding programme of the Fourth International rests on the following appreciation: 'The orientation of the masses is determined first by the objective conditions of decaying capitalism, and second, by the treacherous politics of the old workers' organizations. Of these factors, the first, of course, is the decisive one: the laws of history are stronger than the bureaucratic apparatus.' The question is to fight in the course of the class struggle itself for the destruction of the bureaucratic apparatus and the building of the International and its parties.

Instead of the struggle to build the International, to construct in the course of this struggle an international leadership selected in and through the struggle, the Pabloites substituted their false idea of an international centre, and this resulted in the negation of the construction of revolutionary parties to fight for the political independence of the proletariat in the struggle for power. The active construction of revolutionary parties in Eastern Europe and the USSR was abandoned and this assisted in the isolation of the workers in these countries from the working class of the capitalist world. (This liquidationism is the essence of Pabloism in all sectors of the international class struggle.) In the capitalist countries themselves, the counter-revolutionary role of the Stalinist parties and of the policies of the Soviet bureaucracy is covered up by the Pabloite revisionists, who speculate on the 'irreversible' progressive tendencies within the

bureaucracies. Pablo's theory that the Stalinist party would be forced to the left and even to take power disarmed the vanguard of the French working class at the time of the 1953 General Strike, just as surely as it disarmed the Fourth International in relation to the political revolution in Eastern Europe. Clearly then, every national section of the Fourth International must carry out a determined struggle against Pabloite revisionism if it is to build a revolutionary party with a real perspective of international working class unity.

The bankruptcy of this revisionism became particularly clear in the Pabloite evaluations of the split between the Russian and Chinese Communist Parties. Instead of an objective analysis of the causes and consequences of this division as a way of strengthening the Fourth International in its struggle to defeat the bureaucracy, the Pabloites discussed at length the false problem of which line, the Chinese or the Russian, best expressed the needs of international socialism. The fact is that although the Chinese make formally correct criticisms of the revisionist formulations of the CPSU, these are only a theoretical dressing for an empirical rejection of the consequences of the Soviet bureaucracy's attempted agreement with the American imperialists at the expense of China. Correct formal criticisms of the role of the national bourgeoisie and of the Soviet attitude towards them in the colonial countries has not prevented the Chinese leaders from sabotaging the struggle of the workers, for example in Indonesia and in North Africa, in accordance with the needs of Chinese diplomacy. Chinese criticism of the theory of peaceful co-existence is again narrow and purely empirical because it does not go to the point of posing an alternative strategy of international mobilization of the working class against imperialism. This emerges clearly from the oft-repeated distinction between the colonial 'storm centre' and the advanced countries. The problem of unifying these struggles through the construction of revolutionary parties and above all of uniting these with the linked struggles in the workers' states against the bureaucracies, cannot be solved by the Chinese bureaucrats. Their attitude to Stalin and towards Trotskyism is entirely consistent with this limitation. It is objectively impossible for them to state clearly that proletarian revolution is the only escape from barbarism; they can present no overall strategy based on the nature of the epoch, because such a strategy puts in question their own existence.

In the advanced countries, the revisionists who usurp the name of the Fourth International are prostrate before the Social Democracy as

well as before Stalinism. Here, too, the building of independent working class parties is abandoned. Everything is concentrated on 'deep entry' and the encouragement of 'mass centrist' tendencies in the social democratic parties. In this way, the cadres of these sections are trained in opportunist adaptation to professional centrists and play their part in bolstering up the social democratic bureaucracy. In Belgium the General Strike of 1960-61 found the revisionists around Germain, because of their failure to prepare the way for the establishment of an alternative leadership, tailing behind centrist demagogues who opposed turning the movement into a struggle for power. They put forward the demand for 'structural reforms' derived from the minimum programme of the Belgium Socialist Party. Empirically they adapted themselves to the separatist moods produced by the lack of leadership during the strike and gave wholehearted support to the petty-bourgeois movement for Walloon federalism. From this time they were on the defensive, moving from one opportunist position to another until they found themselves helpless in the face of the bureaucracy's attacks on their freedom of expression in the Belgian Socialist Party in 1964. After years of 'deep entry' they now indulged in the sectarian adventure of proclaiming a new workers' party along with a handful of non-Marxists and demagogic elements. Their policy of 'structural reforms' is no different from that of the left social democrats and Stalinists of Italy and other parts of Western Europe. Germain and his collaborators provide the ideological cover for social democracy in those countries where social democracy is the main reflection of capitalism in the working class movement, just as they play the same role on behalf of the Stalinists in Eastern Europe or in those capitalist countries where the Stalinists are strong. In Britain a tiny group of supporters of the Pabloites has concentrated its efforts on attacking the more and more successful construction of a Marxist alternative to the Social Democrats and the Stalinists, particularly in the Labour youth movement. To this end, they have collaborated with renegades and anti-communists in service to the social-democratic bureaucracy.

The general swing to the right of all the social-democratic and Stalinist parties since 1956 is their response to the renewed upsurge of the international workers' struggle. The increasing subordination of the revisionists to the bureaucracies even during this right turn indicates clearly the international class nature of this tendency in international Trotskyism. Their theory that mass pressure forces opportunist

bureaucracies to the left is a treacherous and reactionary theory. These bureaucracies serve imperialism, and any adaptations they make to mass struggles are for the purpose of betraying these struggles to the imperialists. Only a struggle against the Pabloite 'objectivist' revisions of dialectical materialism can prepare for the building of real revolutionary parties based on Marxist theory. Without this fight, there can be no working out of the detailed strategy and tactics necessary in the international class struggle in response to every development in the linked crises of capitalism and the Stalinist bureaucracy.

As we have seen, this dialectical connection between imperialism, bureaucracy, revisionism and the fight to reconstruct the International holds just as true for the colonial and semi-colonial countries. The Algerian national liberation struggle against French imperialism culminated in the establishment of the Ben Bella Government and the Evian Agreement with de Gaulle, leaving French imperialism's North African interests protected. Instead of working for an independent working class party in Algeria, and for a revolutionary working class party in France which would forge the real international link between the French and Algerian workers against their common enemy, the Pabloites subordinated their sections in Western Europe to the FLN apparatus and collaborated in the new regime's repressions against the working class, at the same time excusing Ben Bella's deal with the imperialists at Evian. Even the building of independent working-class parties against bourgeois regimes in countries like Egypt and Syria is condemned as sectarian, and some spokesmen of the Pabloites characterize not only Algeria but these countries too as workers' states.

Castro's regime in Cuba has been uncritically praised as a 'healthy workers' state' and all independent working class struggle, including the building of a party, renounced. Even Castro's repressions of the Trotskyist party there (part of the Posadas group which split from the Pabloites in 1962) has been justified by the revisionists. The building of an independent workers' party and the establishment of workers' councils in Cuba as part of a proletarian internationalist orientation, with the extension of the revolution to Latin America and a revolutionary alliance with the workers of the USA and the rest of the world, is completely abandoned. The 'aid' of the Soviet bureaucracy is not seen in the context of the international class struggle, with the bureaucracy striving to trade the Cuban revolution for its own purposes, but as a 'progressive' assistance to Cuba. The theories about petty-bourgeois

revolutionists being 'unconscious Marxists', about 'Jacobin leaderships *sui generis*', about 'revolutionary parties being built in the course of the revolution itself', about 'special conditions' in the backward countries which outdate the theory of crisis of leadership, all of these have served in practice to assist the petty-bourgeois and the bourgeois nationalist leaders who, assisted by Stalinism, have managed to contain the mass revolutionary struggles in the colonial countries within the framework of continued world domination of imperialism.

The most striking confirmation of the definitively opportunist role of Pabloite revisionism has been provided by the political evolution of the LSSP in Ceylon. Adhering to the Pabloite centre, the leaders of the majority of this party responded to the call of Mrs. Banderanaiké and her bourgeois SLFP party to enter a coalition government. Here we had expressed concretely the fact that the theory about middle class leaders being pushed to the left, a substitute for the building of independent working class parties, is the cover for capitalist politics. Imperialism's survival in Ceylon depended upon the workers' resistance being divided and broken above all upon their leadership being beheaded. The 'unification' of the revisionists in 1963, explicitly carried through without discussion of such questions as the opportunism of N. M. Perera and company, was an essential part of the preparation of the betrayal of the LSSP in Ceylon in 1964. In this way, the spurious internationalism of the Pabloite revisionists ends by actively assisting imperialism. Under the cover of international 'unification' the politics of the national sections are left to adapt themselves to serving the direct agents of imperialism in their own countries.

3. The revisionism and liquidationism which has attacked the Fourth International is an international class phenomenon, responding to the needs of imperialism in its latest phase of extreme contradictions and dependence upon the Stalinist bureaucracy, social democracy, and the nationalist leaders. The abandonment of Marxist theory within the Fourth International, not only the abandonment of the programme but even of the fundamentals of dialectical materialism, was the mechanism by which the cadres were prepared for this capitulation. The objective situation — physical liquidation of many sections in the late 1930s and the Second World War, the apparent strength of Stalinism in the workers' movement from 1942 to 1953, the divisions and pressure of the cold war period, the McCarthy repressions in the USA — all provided the circumstances for

the decline, particularly by physically separating the class struggle in Eastern Europe and Russia from that of the capitalist world. But the emphasis placed on revolutionary consciousness by the Transitional Programme must be our guide. The death of Trotsky weakened the Fourth International immeasurably. There had not yet been time to train a cadre which had absorbed the living theoretical heritage of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky, particularly the lesson learned by Trotsky in the October Revolution of the need for a centralized Bolshevik party, founded solidly on Marxist theory, responding to every need of leadership by the working class in accordance with an internationalist perspective. This theoretical and political weakness, reflected in a dogmatic attitude towards theory and programme, not developing Marxist theory against hostile ideologies but attempting to 'preserve' it, was the reason for the inability of the Fourth International to develop the programme and build parties in the post-war period.

Instead the cadres of the International adapted easily to the petty-bourgeois trends dominant at that stage of political development, particularly to the Stalinists. A false and artificial 'international centre' was set up, relying on a propagandist contemplation and commentary upon 'objective' developments in the class struggle. Such a centre did not discuss the living experiences of the sections in the course of developing Marxist theory and programme but instead either left the sections without guidance or intervened bureaucratically (upon the basis of the most 'Bolshevik' of organizational statutes) to impose an abstract international line against the sections. Such an international centre, isolated from real struggle, adapting programmatic formulae to the surface atmosphere of politics and certain circles of the 'left' intelligentsia, dominated as it was by the petty-bourgeois elements who inhabit the Labour bureaucracies, was inevitably exposed to the pressures of the cold war, of international Stalinism and imperialism. Its theory and programme developed not in active connection with the living struggle but in the rarefied atmosphere of 'international secretariats'.

The theoretical backwardness of the SWP leaders, who paid no heed to Trotsky's warnings of the need to do battle against pragmatism, the dominant American philosophy, made it easy for them to adapt to the Pabloite revisions and to end in the position of pragmatists themselves. Such adaptation amounted in fact to a narrow nationalism in party matters, an abdication of internationalism and of

responsibility to the International. This explains why the rejection of Pablo's revisionism by the SWP stopped short of a real theoretical analysis. Cannon and the SWP leaders reacted empirically to Pablo's gross capitulation to Stalinism and to his organizational abuses in organizing factions within the national sections, especially in the USA, but they did not probe to the theoretical roots of the revisions and therefore themselves fell victim to revisionism; their abandonment of the programme of political revolution and the building of revolutionary parties in Eastern Europe, their increasing support for petty-bourgeois leaders in Algeria and Cuba, as well as in the Negro struggles in the USA itself, have all prepared a situation where the SWP is now in immediate danger of liquidation.

4. The assassination of President Kennedy provoked from the SWP leaders a reaction which revealed the depths of their capitulation. They addressed their 'condolences' to the widow, and published a statement denouncing the methods of terrorism. This action was only part of their liquidationism under the direct pressure, not of any Stalinist or Social-Democratic bureaucracy, but of US imperialism itself. Cannon's break with Pablo in 1953 only concealed this process of degeneration. It was perfectly possible, in the USA, to reject a tendency which took the *form* of a capitulation to the Stalinist bureaucracy, and at the same time to fall victim to the pressure of imperialism itself. That this was, in fact, the nature of the process was confirmed by the SWP's turn to the Pabloites after the crisis of Stalinism reached its peak in 1956.

The 're-unification' of the Pabloite revisionists in 1963 was preceded by the defection of Posadas and a number of Latin American Pabloite sections. The unification was followed almost immediately by Pablo's own break with the Unified Secretariat and by the debacle in Ceylon. This decomposition is not accidental. The revisionist theories of the Pabloites adapted them to the Labour and Stalinist bureaucracies and to the petty-bourgeois nationalists who in turn are the agents of imperialism. Consistent with the politics of this adaptation they revised out of existence the role of revolutionary consciousness and Marxist parties. Blinded by the apparent strength of the bureaucracy and the nationalists at the end of a period of working class defeats and world war, they were taken unawares by the revival of revolutionary working class struggles in Eastern Europe and later in the imperialist world. They had capitulated to the dominant bureauc-

racies. The betrayals of the bureaucracy and the opportunists strengthen imperialism, but only *temporarily*. In the very act of perpetuating a system racked by contradictions and conflicts, the counter-revolutionary social democrats and Stalinists in fact lay the basis for more violent and all-embracing class struggles, which demand ever more insistently an international proletarian leadership. Just at the point where the linked crisis of imperialism and the bureaucracy provokes the sharpest struggles, so do the revisionists support more faithfully the petty-bourgeois nationalists and the bureaucracy. This is clearly seen in Ceylon, in Belgium, in Britain and in relation to the Sino-Soviet dispute. The Socialist Workers Party plays a similar role in relation to the Negro movement and its leadership in the USA. There is nothing spontaneous about the growth of a successful revolutionary movement to end the rule of the imperialists. The reconstruction of the Fourth International is a real task which must be consciously carried forward in every country.

In every country the sections of the Fourth International will be built by insisting above all on training a political leadership which starts not from tendencies within the bureaucracies but from the movement of the working class which brings it into conflict with the bureaucracy, learning in struggle the treacherous nature of the official leadership and of their theoretical apologists, the revisionists. The policy of the working class United Front has nothing to do with the policy of capitulation before the apparatus. It is necessary because it opposes the working class as a whole to the capitalist class, to the capitalist state and to the capitalist government. Consequently it implies the exposure of the bureaucracies' politics of class-collaboration either with a section of the capitalist class or with the bourgeoisie as a whole. The United Front rests upon the correct aspiration of the working class, including those workers who are members of reformist and Stalinist organizations, for unity in action against the united forces of the capitalists, an aspiration which necessarily conflicts with the politics of the bureaucracy. It is not excluded that the bureaucrats in the traditional leaderships may be forced to take steps along the road of the United Front under pressure from the working class and their own members. In such cases, we support and participate in all actions which can be organized in that direction.

In any event, the policy of United Front must be taken in the context of the construction of independent revolutionary parties. Not even the semblance of a United Front can arise from spontaneous

developments. It demands political struggle by independent organizations carrying the Transitional Programme into practice. It must serve as the springboard for the development of these organizations. In sum, the policy of the United Front can only really exist through the building of the organizations of the Fourth International. At certain stages, entry into mass organizations will be the best way of effecting this tactic but in no case is such entry to be regarded as a permanent or semi-permanent feature. It is always a tactic, subordinated to the general strategy of the struggle for power, of which the construction of an independent revolutionary party is the general prerequisite.

The decomposition of Pabloism, with its politics emerging clearly as a necessary part of opportunism, is thus a consequence of the crisis of capitalism and its agencies, to which the Pabloites subordinated themselves through their abandonment of the Transitional Programme and of dialectical materialism.

5. It follows that the most serious theoretical preparation in struggle against revisionism is necessary for the rebuilding of the Fourth International. The deepening crisis of capitalist society and the connected crisis of the Stalinist bureaucracy are dissolving the old political relationships and creating favourable conditions for the construction of revolutionary parties. The changes in the internal relations of the international workers' movement at present taking place, and the need to exploit the linked crises of imperialism and the Stalinist bureaucracy, demand that our national tasks must be placed correctly in their international context as part of the construction of the Fourth International; only in this way will the international class struggle be resolved in favour of the working class. But these parties will nowhere develop spontaneously; they depend in every case on the intervention of Marxists who base their programme on the international perspective of Trotskyism. In particular, these national sections must grasp in theory and in practice the revolutionary role of working class youth in the USA, W. Europe, Russia and E. Europe, and in all the colonial and semi-colonial countries. It is these proletarian youth who are now drawn into struggle against the capitalists and the bureaucracy. In the building of parties of the Fourth International, youth play a special role as one of the most exploited sections of the proletariat. But the construction of sections of the International requires the mobilization behind the programme and organization of the Fourth International

of all the principal fighting forces of the proletariat. It is in this perspective, and not in isolation from it, or as a substitute for it, that work among the youth takes on its real importance. The Negro struggle in the USA, intensified especially by the impact of automation under capitalism, the heroic struggle of workers and students in Spain, the political opposition to the bureaucracy in the workers' states, the fight against the Social Democrats and Stalinists in Britain, France and all Western Europe, as the youth strive to join battle with capitalism, the workers' battles in Vietnam, Malaysia, Indonesia, Latin America and Africa, all of these bring a new generation of workers to the fore. As all the old working class political tendencies swing sharply to the right, a heavy responsibility falls upon the International Committee and the sections grouped around it. They have the responsibility, beginning from a scientific analysis, of providing the motive force for the rebuilding of the Fourth International on the foundations of this revolutionary potential. It is not a question of a 'youth movement' as such, but of a generation of the working class radicalized by new international revolutionary opportunities, resulting from the crisis of imperialism. The cadres of the Fourth International are on trial: in these struggles we must develop Marxism, defeat revisionism and demonstrate in practice in each national section the capacity for leadership of the Trotskyist parties as the only answer to the capitalist class and its bureaucratic servants.

In each country, therefore, the starting point must be the construction of revolutionary Trotskyist parties based on a Marxist analysis of the present international class struggle. The national tasks of the sections can only be carried out as part of the construction of the Fourth International. In this way they will contribute to the enrichment of Marxist theory and the strength of the International.

a) Imperialism is in a deepening crisis. The development of the productive forces during and since World War Two, particularly the production of nuclear weapons and the introduction of automation, strains to breaking point the conflict between the productive forces and capitalist property relations. The struggles produced by this contradiction radicalize the working class youth. The parties of the Fourth International will be built through these struggles.

b) The realization by the imperialists of the threat to their world position, and their determination to uphold their domination no matter what the cost in human life, have been shown time and time

again. The latest moves by the US government in Vietnam and Latin America, with the full support of the British Labour Government, underline still more the danger which imperialism represents for mankind: In Vietnam the US imperialists are developing a new strategy for dealing with the colonial revolution and with the USSR and China. It is no longer a question of 'peaceful co-existence', but of a Pax Americana maintained with destructive weapons which can blast out every living creature from large areas. These are not nuclear weapons — which are now only in the background. They are weapons for use, they are bound up with the military requirements of imperialism at the present stage, in which it can only maintain itself by violence and terror. 'War is the continuation of politics by other means' — the politics of imperialism have no appeal to the masses but have to be imposed, not on states so much as on peoples.

The US imperialists are not concerned about their unpopularity. They know that every bomb dropped in Vietnam makes it more difficult for the agents in the colonial countries to defend their policies, but they obviously do not care about this. They show contempt for the national bourgeoisie and intend to keep them in line by demonstrating that they possess overwhelming military force.

It is not a case in Vietnam of defending US investments, or even only of defending imperialism in South East Asia. It is rather the need for a testing ground and demonstration of US striking power to impress Africa and Latin America and the bureaucracies of Russia, Eastern Europe and China as well. The US is concerned principally with the strategy of counter-revolution adapted to the needs of the present stage. The Russian adherence to 'peaceful co-existence' has contributed to its success. The overthrow of imperialism cannot be the result of a number of struggles in the less developed countries: it is necessary to carry out the struggle internationally, with the task of building parties in the advanced countries and in the countries of planned economy as a prime necessity.

c) Imperialism is not only an epoch of wars and revolutions. More concretely, its life has been preserved through these wars and revolutions because the working class has not resolved its crisis of leadership. Since 1953, the Stalinist bureaucracy, severely shaken by the working class upsurge in its own camp, has entered into closer collaboration with imperialism. But this reflects above all the deepening of their own crisis. The construction of revolutionary parties of the Fourth International in Eastern Europe, Russia and China, with the

programme of political revolution as the basic requirement of the workers in these countries, is a primary task of the Fourth International. Whereas in the late 1930s defence of the Soviet Union implied primary emphasis on support for its military defence against imperialism, it is now necessary to stress the necessity of building revolutionary parties in these countries as the only answer to the capitulationist policies of the bureaucracy, which now directly endanger the basic conquests of October as well as holding back the struggle of the international working class, upon which the future of these conquests depends.

d) Revisionism, which separates into distinct sectors the revolution in the advanced countries, the 'colonial revolution', and the political revolution in the workers' states, is a most important cover for capitalist domination of the workers' movement and for obstructing the construction of revolutionary parties. This revisionism is expressed particularly in the theory and practice of the self-styled Unified Secretariat of the Fourth International, which was formed without discussion of theoretical and political questions. The next phase in the building of the Fourth International must on the contrary be accompanied by a most serious theoretical discussion in all sections of the policies and theory of the movement, past and present.

Many workers all over the world, particularly the youth, are in battle against the bureaucratic leaderships who want to confine them to narrow and sectional struggles. The Fourth International and its sections must be able to lead these struggles, explaining the class role of the bureaucratic leaderships and bringing forward the essence of these struggles — the perspective of world socialist revolution.

The intervention in the class struggle is not separate from the theoretical discussion upon which we have insisted. There is no development of Marxist theory except insofar as revolutionary parties fight in practice to penetrate living reality with that theory, enriching it in the course of the struggle, to negate the revisionism which has destroyed the International originally founded by Trotsky. It is not enough to make formal theoretical corrections on the one hand and to carry out intensive activity in the class struggle on the other. Such a procedure might give the appearance of limited success, but only when Marxists see themselves and their consciousness as part of the living class struggle, developing with it and transforming its quantitative ebbs and flows into an enriched theory from which to develop the

programme of the International, is the unity of theory and practice actually realized. Only in this way will the cadres of the sections of the International be trained. Their internationalism will be worthy of the struggles of the international working class, because it develops as a living part, the conscious and most vital component, of these struggles. The International Committee has been built in the course of the struggle against Pabloite revisionism, and as such has successfully fought for the continuity of the Fourth International. During the last 25 years its founding programme has expressed correctly the strategy of the international socialist revolution. It has no less importance for the struggle for the proletarian revolution than had the Communist Manifesto for the Marxist method and the fundamental aims of communists. In its appeal for the reconstruction of the Fourth International, the IC must show clearly the indissoluble link between this reconstruction and the building of revolutionary parties in every country, as the path to the victory of the socialist revolution.

Chapter Two

The Third Conference of the IC in struggle against revisionism

The actual work of the Third Conference is documented in the Conference resolutions reproduced below. In particular, the 'Report of the Commission on Rebuilding the Fourth International and the Tasks of the IC' anticipates the struggles that soon were to come within the committee. It stresses that the leadership of Pablo, Mandel and the SWP 'collapsed because of its distortion and abandonment of Marxism, i.e., of the method of dialectical materialism.' This is why the leadership was unable to root the movement in the struggle of the working class and particularly the youth. Before long the OCI declared that the opposite was the case, i.e. that the theoretical degeneration of Pabloism resulted from isolation from the working class. This was their justification for a descent into worship of spontaneity. By the time the Fourth Conference was in preparation, they declared against dialectical materialism as the theory of knowledge of Marxism.

DOCUMENT 4

Report of the commission on rebuilding the Fourth International and the tasks of the IC, April 8, 1966

1. The London Conference reaffirms that the programme and method for the building of the revolutionary parties and the Fourth International are to be found in the Transitional Programme. This programme remains the only one that is capable of providing a solution to the problems raised by the historical crisis of revolutionary leadership.

2. The Conference affirms that Pabloism (whether of Pablo, Frank-Germain, Hansen, or the Posadas tendencies) constitutes a revisionist current alien to the programme and methods of the Fourth International.

3. The Conference affirms that the Fourth International has not degenerated. The historical continuity of the Fourth International founded in 1938 by Leon Trotsky, re-formed in the years 1943-46, which Pabloism attempted to destroy in 1950-53, has been maintained since 1953 by the struggle waged by the Trotskyist organizations grouped within the International Committee.

As a result of this, the International Conference proclaims that the continuity of the Fourth International has been fought for and maintained by the International Committee's actions.

4. The conference recognises the inability of the leadership of the International, after Leon Trotsky's death, to succeed in the tasks required by the building of revolutionary parties and the International.

During the course of this hard battle for Trotskyism, some cadres have been exterminated, victims of imperialist and Stalinist repressions, others worn out, and the leadership of the Fourth International

became bankrupt. This leadership collapsed because of its distortion and abandonment of Marxism, i.e., of the method of dialectical materialism. This is why this leadership was unable to root the movement in the struggle of the working class, and particularly the youth. As a result, they were incapable of assimilating the methods and principles of communist organization. In no case can this failure be considered the failure of the Fourth International.

5. The essential unity of the international class struggle, flowing from the international character of the joint crisis of imperialism and the bureaucracy, implies the direct consequence of the necessity of building Trotskyist parties in every country. As against the liquidationist conclusions flowing from the revisionist 'division of the world into sectors', this perspective emphasises the urgency of building independent revolutionary proletarian parties in the countries of Eastern Europe, USSR, and China, and in the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

6. This central task of building independent revolutionary parties stresses yet again the essential struggle for the political independence of the working class, against the politics of the Stalinist bureaucracy and the reformist leaderships. This fight for the Party implies a determined struggle against syndicalism and all ideas that a revolutionary party can be spontaneously produced from the working class.

7. The International Conference stresses that the Trotskyist movement, in the course of the struggle to build the International, works towards the creation of a centralized leadership of the world revolutionary party, in a struggle organically linked to the fight in each country to rebuild revolutionary centralized parties leading the struggles of the masses. This building of parties and of the International must be carried out on the basis of the lessons of the struggle against revisionism and of the continuation of this struggle.

8. The proceedings of this Third Conference emphasise the necessity for the International Committee to politically prepare within eighteen months the Fourth International Conference, whose aim will be to rally all Trotskyist organizations fighting for the programme of the Fourth International. This will include a struggle by the International Committee to rally to the ranks of the Fourth International the

militants and groups who are misled by the revisionist leaders of the United Secretariat.

9. In order to achieve the tasks before such a Conference, the International Committee must organize an international discussion on the following subjects:

(a) The building of the revolutionary parties on the basis of the Programme in the context of the concrete struggle for the rebuilding of the International. Trotskyists, organized as sections of the Fourth International, must struggle for the construction of revolutionary proletarian parties based on the Transitional Programme of the Fourth International. They carry the fight for this programme and for the construction of the Party as the main basis of their work in the mass organizations and trade unions of the working class, and in particular towards the working class youth, as the principal source of new forces for the Fourth International. All such work is subordinated to the main task of constructing the Party. The building of the Party necessitates the production of a newspaper able to constantly fight for the overall programme of the Party, to raise the consciousness of the working class in all spheres of the class struggle. This fight for the independent party is the only basis for the defence of the positions won in the past by the working class, and all tactical considerations are subordinated to it. In conditions where the tactic of entry into existing working-class parties is necessary, this tactic is conducted in a manner which subordinates it to the main task of the construction of the independent party.

(b) The unity of the international class struggle.

(c) Defence by revolutionary methods of the conquests of the international working class, in the capitalist countries, in the USSR, China and all the countries which have been removed from the sphere of imperialism. This discussion will be carried out on the agreed framework of the unconditional defence of these states.

10. In the framework of the objectives agreed at this Conference, the International Committee must, so far as its resources permit, give assistance in:

(a) the building of Trotskyist organizations;

(b) the activity of Trotskyist organizations;

so that they can advance from the stage of propaganda groups to being

Communist organizations fighting in the class struggle for the leadership of the proletariat in the struggle for power.

11. The International Committee will publish an official internal bulletin in English to be translated into the various languages by each section.

12. The financing of the International Committee's tasks will be decided according to the possibilities of each section. The International Committee will work out for the next Conference the basis of financial contributions for the budget of the International Committee as such.

13. The International Committee will set up a youth commission working under its direction and consisting of representatives of the Young Socialists and Révoltes. The immediate tasks of this Commission to be:

- (a) Convening of an international conference of revolutionary youth organizations;
- (b) Organization of mass participation in the Liège demonstration against NATO and the Vietnam war in October 1966.

14. The International Committee must make a political and practical study of the tasks to be achieved in the building of sections in Eastern Europe, in the first place in strengthening the Hungarian section.

15. The International Committee is recommended by the Conference to organize visits to the United States and Latin America, and to Greece and Denmark. Also recommended are exchanges of cadres between sections as methods of strengthening sections.

16. The International Committee will appoint a Commission to begin work immediately on a history of the Fourth International.

DOCUMENT 5**Resolution of the American commission,
April 8, 1966**

1. The Commission believes that the main task before the American Committee for the Fourth International is to work politically along the line of the International Committee of the Fourth International. The Voorhis Act makes impossible any affiliation of a US section to the Fourth International.
2. The American Committee of the Fourth International must immediately begin work on the drafting of a perspective for the construction of a revolutionary party in the USA. This would include a concretization of the demand as elaborated by Trotsky for the formation of a Labour Party. It must concretize demands in relation to our work in the anti-war in Vietnam movements, the trade union and Negro movements. This perspectives document would include an economic analysis of US capitalism in relation to world imperialism. This draft must be ready not later than June 30.
3. A national conference of all the members of the American Committee for the Fourth International should be held towards the end of September or early October — a representative of the International Committee to be present.
4. The International Committee will undertake to produce a public statement concerning the attitude of the Robertson delegation towards the International Conference. This would become the basis for winning over members of the Robertson tendency towards the American Committee for the Fourth International.

5. As soon as possible a comrade must become a full-time official of the American Committee for the Fourth International prepared to make a national tour conveying the decisions of the International Conference. The pre-conference discussion should discuss a change of name for the American Committee for the Fourth International.

6. A serious effort must be made to study dialectical materialism against pragmatism and idealism. The International Committee will request from time to time as to how this work is progressing.

DOCUMENT 6

Statement of the IC on the Robertson group (USA), April 9, 1966

The Spartacist group (USA) was invited to participate in the Third International Conference called by the International Committee for April 4-9, 1966. A delegation of four attended the first sessions as observers. (The Voorhis Act in the USA prevents political tendencies from making international political affiliations.) During the course of the conference the political position of Spartacist was revealed as being fundamentally opposed to the programme and methods of the International, and the Spartacist delegation left the conference before its proceedings were completed.

Their presence at the conference resulted from an initiative from the International Committee, whose official representative, G. Healy, met delegates of the Spartacist group and of the American Committee for the Fourth International in October 1965. At this meeting on the basis of the acceptance by both groups of the International Committee's resolution 'Rebuilding the Fourth International' it was agreed to work towards a unified organization of the two groups in the USA, in political solidarity with the International Committee; the aim was to complete the preparation for this fusion for the International Conference.

Subsequently, discussion between the two groups and a certain amount of joint political activity were carried out and a delegation from both groups were sent as observers to the International Conference.

The Spartacist group led by J. Robertson originated in the opposition to the revisionist course of the leadership of the Socialist Workers Party in 1960-62. The Robertson group broke with comrade T. Wohlforth and those who now form the American Committee for the Fourth International on the basic question of the necessity to start from the building of the Fourth International. This took the specific

form of Robertson and others' refusal to accept the leadership of the International Committee in the fight against the Socialist Workers Party leadership. Robertson and the Spartacist group placed questions of procedure and questions of their estimate of American problems above internationalism.

In the intervening period Robertson and his group published some International Committee material and claimed to stand on the positions of the International Committee. In the course of preparations for its International Conference therefore the International Committee called upon all those in the USA who accepted the Transitional Programme, the decisions of the first four congresses of the Communist International and the resolution 'Rebuilding the Fourth International' to work towards the building of a Marxist party. This was the basis of the proposals accepted by Spartacist and the American Committee for the Fourth International in October 1965. It was absolutely essential to clarify at the international level the political problems involved in building a party in the United States.

In the conference after the secretary's report on International Perspectives based on the resolution 'Rebuilding the Fourth International', Robertson spoke at length on the third day of discussion (Wednesday, April 6). Despite Robertson's claim to agree with the resolution before the conference his contribution showed very clear disagreement with the main political line of the report and resolution. After making this contribution Robertson failed to appear for the subsequent session of discussion on the grounds that he was tired due to his having worked overnight on a draft document on American Perspectives for the conference.

The conference expressed the unanimous opinion that Robertson must immediately return to the proceedings. Not only were his reasons for his absence quite unacceptable, but he had made no approach to the chairman of the conference before leaving.

Robertson saying that he was 'not available' refused to return to the conference for the whole of the session in question in which a number of comrades made serious criticisms of points made in Robertson's contribution.

On Robertson's return for the Wednesday evening session, the Secretary began his reply to the discussion by saying that Robertson's absence from the exhaustive discussion on his own contribution was utterly irresponsible and that Robertson's request for permission to be absent had been rejected by the conference as inadmissible in a

communist organization. Here Robertson interjected on what he called 'a point of personal privilege'. In the first place, he explained, he had not requested permission to be absent and did not know of any rule requiring him to request such permission. He was present at the conference not as an individual but as part of his delegation; his delegation was fully empowered to note the discussion and participate in it during his absence. It was pointed out to Robertson that his responsibilities to the international movement through its highest body, the conference, were clearly involved, and he was asked to apologise to the conference. This he refused to do.

A motion was then put demanding an apology from Robertson and stating that if he refused then he must leave the conference. In the course of discussion on this motion Robertson again stated that he did not know the rules of the conference. The original motion was modified to say that its application would take place only at the end of the general discussion and the vote on the resolution and report of the Secretary of the International Committee, thus giving Robertson an additional opportunity to reconsider his position. This motion was carried, and Robertson stayed to the end of the discussion, reply and vote on the report and resolution of the International Committee. Robertson and the Spartacist delegation voted for the amended resolution but abstained on the report.

In accordance with its earlier resolution, the conference then asked for Robertson's statement on his absence the previous day. He again refused to apologise. Thus, the resolution applied only to Robertson's breaking communist discipline in refusing to accept the decisions of the International Conference and not to the rest of his delegation. The chairman asked Robertson to leave. He then left followed by his delegation.

By their behaviour the Spartacist delegation showed that they constitute a petty-bourgeois opposition to the programme and discipline of the Fourth International. This rejection of the primary importance of the building of the international is consistent with Robertson's position in 1962, and demonstrates decisively that Robertson and the Spartacist delegation have failed to break from the pragmatist and anti-internationalist politics, first of Shachtman and then of the revisionist Socialist Workers Party leadership. So-called agreement on programme has a history in the communist movement. Robertson's actions in the conference constituting a breach of democratic centralism, speak louder than any declaration on programme and

such behaviour is linked to a political method and programme, a petty-bourgeois method which rejects communist methods of building the revolutionary movement. Even if Robertson had thought the conference wrong on a procedural question or that he had been organizationally dealt with on the political questions his duty as an internationalist and a communist would have been to abide by the conference decision and fight to clarify the movement. His refusal to do so and his placing of personal prestige above considerations of his international responsibility condemn him.

Since the Spartacist group has in the past claimed to adhere to the positions of the International Committee it must be categorically stated that the International Committee not only dissociates itself from the activities and publications of the Spartacist group but insists that a Marxist party can be built only in opposition to it. Marxists in the USA must start from the building of the International as the only basis for constructing such a party. Only in this way can they begin from their responsibilities to the international working class. The comrades in the American Committee for the Fourth International represent this international tendency in the USA.

The International Committee reaffirms that the building of a revolutionary party in the United States of America is an indispensable requirement of the international proletariat. It calls upon all those who accept the programme of the Fourth International to devote all their efforts to this end through the activities of the American Committee for the Fourth International. In particular, we call upon members still in the Spartacist group to learn the lessons of the behaviour of their delegates and the Third Conference, to rally to the positions of the International Committee and to join the American Committee for the Fourth International.

DOCUMENT 7

Manifesto of the International Committee, April 1966

1. The crisis opened by the war continues

The Third Conference of the International Committee of the Fourth International declares that, as the founding programme of the Fourth International stresses, 'the crisis of humanity is the crisis of revolutionary leadership'.

Trotsky's prediction has been completely confirmed: the second imperialist world war opened an unparalleled revolutionary crisis, a crisis which still continues, despite the ebb and flow of the world class struggle. Only the absence of revolutionary leadership has allowed capitalism to survive with the collaboration of Stalinism and reformism. But imperialism has not been able to inflict an historic defeat on the working class.

It is on the basis of the revolutionary crisis opened by the Second World War that the present phase of the class struggle is developing. The deepening of the crisis of imperialism has destroyed beyond recall the equilibrium between the classes upon which the Kremlin bureaucracy rested. The apparent stability of the Kremlin bureaucracy on the morrow of the Second World War masked the deeper processes which revealed themselves in a series of crises as the Kremlin bureaucracy sought a new centre of gravity. The revolutionary movements of 1953-56 expressed in terms of the proletarian revolution the joint crisis of imperialism and of the Kremlin bureaucracy. This phase of the crisis of imperialism and of the Kremlin bureaucracy can only be provisionally surmounted by the class enemy if there is an absence of national and international revolutionary leadership. But here too, Trotsky's prediction is verified: the Kremlin bureaucracy cannot survive in the long run once the international equilibrium between fundamental class forces which gave rise to it is destroyed. The perspective henceforth is that of the social revolution in the

capitalist world and the political revolution in the degenerated and deformed workers' states, fused into a single process.

The basis of the class struggle is to be found in the contradiction between the development of the productive forces on the one hand, and private ownership of the means of production and national frontiers on the other. The two imperialist world wars were nothing else but the revolt of the productive forces against national frontiers. Automation gives a new scale to these contradictions. Automation combined with private ownership of the means of production is the exclusion of millions of workers from the cycle of production and from the minimal culture that they have conquered inside bourgeois society; it is the complete economic and social decomposition of the economically backward countries, famine alone condemning tens of millions of human beings to death, as in India; it means, for imperialism, the imperative need to bring back under its direct control those countries where the economy is planned on the basis of state ownership of the means of production, and to destroy this planning.

Atomic energy, one of the most powerful technical conquests of mankind, was revealed to the world through the bombs of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Automation in the framework of capitalism is developed primarily through its military uses. There could be no better example of capitalism's inability to develop technique except under the sign of parasitism, destruction and barbarism. If imperialism survives, these incredible technical means which, under socialism, would very rapidly free humanity from the humiliating constraints of satisfying daily material needs, which, under socialism, would be the basis of a new culture and a new civilization, can only lead to the destruction of humanity. It is the gains of thousands of years of civilization which are at stake.

From henceforth, imperialism can survive only by threatening all the conquests which the world working class has torn from it in class struggle over more than 100 years.

Every day, hundreds of Vietnamese workers and peasants are murdered by the mercenaries of US imperialism, burned to death by napalm. In Indonesia, members of the Communist Party have been murdered by the hundred thousand. In the whole of Africa and South America bloody repression by the civilian or military cliques in the service of imperialism spreads. The strategy of terror and annihilation which US imperialism tests out in Vietnam, after the collapse of all its plans for the stabilization of the national bourgeoisies, is the only

answer that it can give to the disintegration of economy and society in the economically backward countries under its impact, and to the will of the worker and peasant masses of these countries to free themselves from imperialist domination.

The working class is threatened no less in the economically developed countries. The attempt of the bourgeois state to incorporate the trade unions stems from the necessity for the bourgeoisie of these countries to destroy all forms of independent organization of the working class. As Trotsky put it, 'the bourgeoisie in crisis must destroy the positions of proletarian democracy inside bourgeois society'. Directly and immediately aimed against the capacity of the working class to organize and to fight, the attempt to incorporate the trade unions into the bourgeois state shows that the bourgeoisie of every country, even in the economically developed ones, can only survive by the unconditional crushing of the working class. The lot of the great mass of immigrant workers, their wages and living conditions, are a kind of anticipation of the future destiny of the workers of the advanced countries. And this would only be the first stage.

The workers of the capitalist countries risk being turned into a rootless urban mass with no place in the productive process, before being annihilated in a new imperialist war. The millions of starving people in India, the victims of the strategy of terror in Vietnam, are merely the first victims of the destiny reserved for the workers of the most technically advanced capitalist countries. Far from improving constantly, the standard of living of the workers of the dominant capitalist countries is at the mercy of the insoluble contradictions of imperialism. The working class of the advanced capitalist countries will not always be privileged in relation to other working classes. Inside capitalist 'prosperity' itself are contained the premises for their being thrown back to the economic and political conditions of the period of the primitive accumulation of capitalism. The attempt of the bourgeois state to incorporate the trade unions is nothing else but an expression of these deep tendencies.

These fundamental contradictions between capitalist productive relations and the development of the productive forces find their sharpest expression in the United States, the bastion of world imperialism. Its dominant position does not only mean a greater concentration of riches and productive power, it also carries the weight of responsibility of defending, politically and militarily, the whole of imperialism. What is more, automation threatens to reduce

to a state of poverty millions of workers inside a capitalist society which depends on a major extension of the internal market. The orientation of the political struggles of the Negro worker is beginning to proceed from the reality of this contradiction. The struggles arising from this will have all the violence and all the intensity resulting from the international conflicts which gave rise to them and which will find in them their most concentrated expression. The struggles of the Negroes must inevitably be linked to the struggle of the entire American working class and of the world working class. It is in its relationship with the international class struggle that the Negro question must be understood and the strategy and tactics of the American Marxists worked out.

The building of a section of the Fourth International in the United States, with its roots in the masses, is of immense importance for the entire world working class. It is in this context that the revisionist degeneration of the leadership of the Socialist Workers' Party takes on its full meaning. Precisely because the Socialist Workers' Party did not develop Marxist theory, together with organic ties with the class struggle in the United States, it was incapable of undertaking its responsibilities at the level of the leadership of the Fourth International, after Trotsky's death. This opened the way for serious mistakes in relation to the international perspectives which, in their turn, led to even more serious capitulations before the agents of imperialism in the United States itself. It is against this revisionism that a section of the Fourth International will be built in the United States.

The USSR, the European countries under its control and China are not oases in which the economy can develop harmoniously and independently until it peacefully reduces the social antagonisms, and arrives at socialism. Socialism can only be established on the basis of a mode of production which incorporates and overtakes the gains of the capitalist mode of production. One of the most important of these gains, a productive force in its own right, is the international division of labour. The economic growth of the USSR, of the countries under its control and of China demands their ever growing and ever more organic participation in the international division of labour. The 'theory' of the building of socialism in a single country expresses the inability of the bureaucracy of the Kremlin and of its satellites to go beyond the framework of national frontiers and to organize a rational international co-operation of labour. Incapable of overcoming the framework of bourgeois nationalism, it cannot appeal to the conscious

participation of the worker and peasant masses for the harmonious development of the planned economy, whose growth and diversification comes more and more into contradiction with its bureaucratic management. Its inability to overcome national frontiers by any other means than national oppression, its inability to have recourse to the control of the producers to develop planning, marks its socially parasitic and petty bourgeois character. The parasitism of the Kremlin bureaucracy multiplies the consequences of the economic, military and political pressure of imperialism (which has the main productive forces at its command), upon the USSR, Eastern Europe and China. The Kremlin bureaucracy must subordinate planning more and more to the fluctuations of the world market dominated by imperialism, and resort to the laws of the market as a regulator, to the detriment of conscious planning. The economic, military and political pressure of imperialism grows as its own contradictions deepen. But the pressure of imperialism only becomes effective through the growing social contradictions in the USSR, Eastern Europe and China.

The USSR, the countries of Eastern Europe and China do not constitute an independent sector of the world economy and class struggle any more than do the economically backward countries directly under the control of imperialism.

The further survival of imperialism demands the destruction of what remains of the conquests of the October Revolution, of their extensions in Eastern Europe and China, just as it means the destruction of the conquests of the working class inside capitalist regimes, just as it means the attempt to destroy any revolutionary movement in the economically backward countries.

Far from expressing some kind of stabilization of imperialism, the blows which it is dealing are episodes in a world class struggle which is part of the revolutionary period opened by the war. They mean a sharpening of the international class struggle in the coming years, and an alignment of social forces in relation to the fundamental classes, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, leaving less and less room for the balancing politics of the petty-bourgeois social strata — the Kremlin bureaucracy and its satellites, the national bourgeoisie of the economically backward countries, the petty-bourgeois apparatuses which have come out of the working class in the advanced capitalist countries. The confrontation which is being prepared on a world scale has as its basis the conflict between the development of productive forces and bourgeois social relations, of which national frontiers are part.

Either the proletarian revolution will hand over the decisive productive forces of humanity to the world proletariat, through the political and economic expropriation of the world bourgeoisie, through the revolutionary overthrow and liquidation of the parasitic bureaucracies; or imperialism will threaten the physical survival of hundreds of millions of proletarians, just as much in the countries dominated by imperialism, whether economically advanced or backward, as in the USSR, Eastern Europe and China.

Imperialist aggression in Vietnam is directed against the conquests of the Chinese revolution. Its destruction by imperialism, given the devotion of the Chinese workers and peasants to these gains, would demand the use of means of destruction, the vastness of which is underlined by the resistance of the Vietnamese workers and peasants. The proletarians of the USSR and Eastern Europe will defend the gain represented by state ownership of the means of production against imperialism and the bureaucracy with no less heroism than the Russian proletariat fought during the second imperialist war. The proletariat of the advanced capitalist countries will not allow itself peacefully to be stripped of its economic and political conquests. Imperialism is dealing its blows in an historical period in which the proletariat has reinforced its conquests and its positions and in which the world bourgeoisie is in retreat. Gigantic class struggles on a world scale are inevitable. They will place on the agenda the social revolution against imperialism, combined with the political revolution against the Kremlin bureaucracy and its satellites.

The outcome of these struggles, in the last analysis, depends on the building of revolutionary leaderships in every country and of an international revolutionary leadership, for the crisis of humanity more than ever boils down to the crisis of revolutionary leadership. This leadership can only be built on the programme of the Fourth International, in the tradition of the Fourth International expressed by the 1966 Conference of the International Committee.

We are in a period in which we must prepare the workers for revolutionary tasks on a world scale. In their struggle for the programme of the Fourth International and to build revolutionary parties fighting for workers' power, the sections of the International offer the only real strategy for the indispensable mobilization of the working class for the defence of the conquests of the international proletariat.

It is in the light of these considerations that the Third Conference of the International Committee takes on its full significance.

The International Committee of the Fourth International has fought since 1953 to defend, maintain and enrich the theoretical and political inheritance of the Fourth International. It has had to fight against all forms of revisionism disguised in the mantle of Trotskyism: from the liquidationist revisionism at the top of the Fourth International to the insidious revisionism of the groups fed 'from the crumbs fallen from the table of the Fourth International', which try to take advantage of the crisis opened inside it by Pabloism to question the Marxist method, the programme and the continuity of the Fourth International.

The Third Conference of the International Committee — which was held in London from April 4 to 8, 1966 — is part of the continuity of the Fourth International. The IC has become the axis and the motive force of the rebuilding of the Fourth International as the centralized proletarian leadership. The Pabloite organization is in full decomposition. After the open betrayal of the Lanka Sama Samaja Party of Ceylon, which entered a bourgeois government in June, 1964, after the capitulation of the Socialist Workers' Party, which lauded the Castroite leadership and sent their condolences to Kennedy's widow, Pablo, the ex-general secretary of the revisionist organization and its political and 'theoretical' head for more than 15 years, splits from the so-called Unified Secretariat. Revisionism contains the seeds of its own decay. It consists of, fundamentally, adaptation to bourgeois society, therefore inside it the contradictions of bourgeois society must necessarily express themselves.

The 'theory' of the division of the world into three sectors — 'the socialist states' — 'the advanced capitalist countries' — 'the countries of the third world or the storm-centre' — which complemented the 'theory' of 'objective forces' supposedly forcing Stalinism and the petty bourgeois leaderships to play the role of revolutionary leadership, implying the liquidation of the Fourth International and its organizations, introduced the seeds of decay into the revisionist international organization because it implied adaptations to the 'national necessities' of imperialism, of the bourgeoisie of the economically backward countries, and of the parasitic bureaucracies, starting with that of the Kremlin. The impact of the world-wide sharpening of the class struggle, together with the activity of the International Committee split the unity of the revisionists who, starting from a common trunk, have now spread out in different branches.

Revisionism dealt some very hard blows to the Fourth International, especially between 1953 and 1956. Whereas on a world scale 'the laws of history were stronger than the bureaucratic apparatus', as the programme of the Fourth International puts it, whereas the workers of Eastern Europe were marching, weapons in hand, to the assault on the Kremlin bureaucracy, whereas the French working class, stepping over the bureaucratic apparatus, carried out a general strike in August 1953, whereas this international movement of the working class culminated in November 1956 with the Hungarian revolution; the international Pabloite movement and its national branches intervened as the rearguard of the Kremlin bureaucracy and of the bourgeoisie. By destroying any possibility of a conscious expression of the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat under the direct control of imperialism and under the control of the Kremlin bureaucracy, the revisionist organization contributed to the defeat of the Hungarian revolution. It prevented the emergence and organization under the banner of the Fourth International of the vanguard of the international proletariat. It undermined the organizations of the Fourth International and jeopardised their existence.

But the establishment of the International Committee expressed the strength of the programme and the vitality of the Fourth International: from inside it came the organization and the force which would ensure its continuity in the class struggle. The Third Conference of the IC marks the victory won against the attempts of Pabloite revisionism to destroy the programme and the historical continuity of the Fourth International. It took up the fight against the groups which tried to use the crisis of the Fourth International to jeopardize its programme and its method. The struggle for the method and the programme of the Fourth International carried out by the IC, enables it to undertake the new tasks of rebuilding the Fourth International as the centralized proletarian leadership. This is the stage opened by the Third Conference of the International Committee.

2. The bureaucracies against the revolution in Vietnam

Imperialism has not miraculously recovered its health and strength. The blows which it is dealing to the international proletariat result from the counter-revolutionary policies of the Kremlin bureaucracy, of its agencies and of the reformist bureaucracy. Imperialist aggression in Vietnam is a consequence of the 1954 Geneva Agreements,

which robbed the workers and peasants of their victory over imperialism at Dien-Bien-Phu and divided Vietnam into two. It can only develop under the protection of the international policy of the Kremlin bureaucracy and of the reformist bureaucracy. The arms handed out so sparingly by the Kremlin bureaucracy are only an alibi. Insufficient to allow a military victory over imperialism to the Vietnamese workers and peasants, they can serve the Kremlin bureaucracy as a means of pressure on the government of North Vietnam.

The revolutionary war of the Vietnamese workers and peasants is an expression of and a factor in the world class struggle. The throwing-out of US imperialism from Vietnam would mean a resounding defeat for imperialism. It would be a major factor in the extension of the revolution in Asia. All the fragile equilibrium painfully preserved by imperialism in Asia would crumble. From India to Japan, the proletarian revolution would spread. Complementarily to its betrayal at Geneva in 1954, the Kremlin bureaucracy made itself the direct courtier of imperialism at Tashkent. Worried as much as imperialism by the consequences of war between the Indian bourgeoisie and the Pakistan bourgeoisie, knowing that the rotten economic and social structure of India and Pakistan would collapse under the strains imposed by the necessities of war, fearing the growth of revolutionary movements encompassing 400 million men and women reduced to the most fearful conditions, the Kremlin bureaucracy, to the plaudits of imperialism, undertook to negotiate a compromise which tramples underfoot the right of peoples to self-determination, and the most elementary rights of the exploited masses of India and Pakistan. Its sole preoccupation consists in preventing the extension of the revolution in Asia.

US imperialism, like world imperialism, congratulated itself on such an enterprise. Experiencing the greatest difficulties in forcing the Vietnamese masses to submit, despite the enormous use of its military power, US imperialism would be impotent before a revolutionary conflagration which, starting from India, would set the whole of Asia alight. The great struggles which are tending to develop amongst the workers and peasants of India to the powerful highly-concentrated Japanese proletariat, are ripening the forces which will destroy imperialism in Asia. The specific weight of the Japanese proletariat in the phase of the crisis of imperialism and of the world revolution which is beginning, is considerable. It is an urgent task for imperialism to arrest and discipline this class. This task is today

carried out for it by the Stalinists, with their reformist orientation of 'national independence' and of class-collaboration with Japanese imperialism.

Through its entire policy, but openly at Tashkent, the Kremlin bureaucracy tries to isolate the Vietnamese proletariat in a ghetto. It attempts to establish a situation enabling US imperialism to deploy its entire military strength against the workers and peasants of Vietnam.

There is no separation whatsoever between the policy of the Kremlin bureaucracy towards Vietnam and the policy that it has towards China. The accusation made by Moscow against the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party of wanting to unleash a thermo-nuclear war, the delivery of military equipment and political support given to the Indian bourgeoisie at war with China, are so many steps in a policy tending to justify a thermo-nuclear attack by US imperialism against China. At present, the Kremlin bureaucracy is trying to obtain, through all the means of pressure at its disposal, the capitulation of the Chinese bureaucracy before US imperialism, especially in Vietnam.

But social democracy and the trade union bureaucracy are no less responsible. They support with just as much ardour American genocide in Vietnam. The policy of the Labour Party, because it is in power in a country whose working class could play a considerable part against the intervention of US imperialism in Vietnam, as much by the direct influence that it could have on the American working class as by its position at the centre of the oldest and most powerful colonial empire, illustrates the policy of the social democratic and trade union apparatus. It consists in support without a murmur of protest for the worst crimes of US imperialism.

Since their capitulation to their own bourgeoisies in 1914, the social-democratic parties have always carried out a policy of class collaboration and flown to the aid of the bourgeoisie every time they were threatened. The Kremlin bureaucracy and the international Stalinist apparatus demonstrated by their capitulation without a fight in Germany at the time of Hitler's seizure of power in 1933, that they had definitely gone over to the side of the bourgeois order on the international scale. At the end of the war and immediately after it, imperialism only survived thanks to the political support of the Kremlin bureaucracy, its international apparatus and the social-democratic and trade union apparatus.

With the sharpening of the class struggle during these last few years, the counter-revolutionary role of Stalinism, of the social demo-

cracy and of the trade union apparatus has become more open and direct. Not only do they cover up for the genocide of US imperialism in Vietnam, the preparation of a thermo-nuclear war against China, but they are also the agents of the destruction of the conquests of the labour movement in the advanced capitalist countries, in the USSR and in the countries controlled by the Kremlin bureaucracy.

The policy of the Labour Party leadership in power, with the co-operation of the trade union leadership, is to impose the Incomes Policy on the British working class, to carry out legislation against the independence of the trade unions, and to incorporate the trade union apparatus into the state machine. In other words, they are beginning the process of subordinating the labour movement to the bourgeois state machine, which can only lead to its destruction.

Although it is 'in opposition', the German social democracy plays no less a role in the policy of subordinating the West German labour movement to the bourgeois state. It has officially renounced Marxism and the class struggle and presents itself as a national German party since its Godesberg congress in 1959. It is ready to associate itself with anti-strike and anti-union legislation set up by the laws on the state of emergency. The German trade union apparatus has made itself the champion of co-management, the German form of subordinating the workers to the prosperity of the capitalist firm. It is ready to capitulate before the legislation on the state of emergency. These are so many steps towards the incorporation of the trade unions into the German bourgeois state, which the 'theoreticians' of this incorporation call the 'formed society'.

In France, the leaderships of the Socialist and Communist Parties place themselves, on this question, on the very same footing as Gaullism. They have made themselves the champions of 'democratic planning', a phrase invented by the 'theoreticians' of the participation of the trade unions in the plan, in 'concerted' management of the economy by capital, the bourgeois state and the trade unions. The trade union apparatuses take part in all the organizations for the incorporation of the trade unions into the state, like the Economic and Social Council, the planning commissions, and the commissions for regional economic development. They take part 'critically' in the organizations for the application of the Incomes Policy.

The social-democratic, Stalinist and trade union bureaucracies are taking one more step forward in their policy of supporting the bourgeoisie. What the Conservative Party was unable to carry out in

Britain, is carried out by the Labour leadership; what the CDU cannot accomplish alone in Western Germany, the social democracy helps it to accomplish; what de Gaulle demands in France, the socialist, Stalinist and trade unionist leaders hasten to carry out. In order to save bourgeois society in crisis, the petty-bourgeois apparatuses which have come out of the labour movement take part in the destruction of the labour movement with their own hands. They are sawing off the branch on which they are sitting.

The policy of the Kremlin bureaucracy in the USSR and in the countries under its control has similarly reached a new stage. The Kremlin bureaucracy becomes more and more the organ of the world bourgeoisie inside the workers' state, as the Founding Programme of the Fourth International foresaw. The putting down of the revolutionary movement in Eastern Germany in June 1953, the bloody liquidation of the Hungarian revolution in November 1956, are the hardest blows that have been aimed at the world proletariat since the second imperialist world war. Faced with the rise of the political revolution, obsessed by fear of the proletariat of Eastern Europe and the USSR, the Kremlin bureaucracy has only one solution: to lean on and to reinforce the pro-bourgeois tendencies in the USSR and in the countries which it controls. The blind alley that the bureaucracy finds itself in results from its parasitism. The development of bourgeois norms of profitability in the economy, as the solution to the crisis of bureaucratic planning, is closely linked to the need of the Kremlin bureaucracy and the bureaucracy of the satellites to fight against the proletariat of the USSR and of Eastern Europe. Thus, it makes itself the direct agent of imperialism. The only hope that imperialism can have of destroying what remains of the conquests of October in the USSR rests on the policies of the Kremlin bureaucracy in the USSR and in Eastern Europe, and, for that matter, in the rest of the world.

Whether it be in Vietnam and against the conquests of the Chinese revolution, in the economically advanced capitalist countries, or in the USSR and the countries under the control of the Kremlin bureaucracy, the social democracy, the trade union-bureaucracy, the Kremlin bureaucracy and its agents are more and more involved in attempts to destroy the conquests of the proletariat.

The powerful revolutionary movements of the last twenty years in the economically backward countries were and are expressions of the world crisis of imperialism. The national bourgeoisie in these countries has demonstrated the limitations of its independence from

imperialism. Protected on the left by the Kremlin bureaucracy, which subordinated to it all the mass workers' and peasant movements, it could, for a time, ride on the mass movement and play a Bonapartist role between the masses and imperialism. But it was unable to resolve the fundamental tasks of the bourgeois revolution. On February 14, 1964, Suslov, in his report to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, rattled the sabre of the Kremlin bureaucracy against the working-class and peasant masses of the economically backward countries dominated by imperialism:

It is absurd to say that the task of armed insurrection is posed to the workers of Algeria, Ghana, Mali and certain other countries. To say this would be, in fact, to call for support for the reactionaries who seek to overthrow these governments. And what could such a call bring in countries like, for example, Indonesia and Ceylon?

The recent series of military *coups d'état* in Algeria, Indonesia, Ghana, etc., is the consequence of this policy. The petty-bourgeois Bonapartist cliques are collapsing. Their political role, which gave them an apparent independence in relation to imperialism, consisted essentially in canalizing the mass movements. The most radical of them, however far they may have gone with their split from imperialism, have finally remained under its domination. The most extreme example — Cuba — is no exception to the rule. US imperialism forced the Cuban petty-bourgeoisie to go so far as to expropriate the American firms and to call on the Cuban worker and peasant masses to support its measures. But no matter how far Fidel Castro and the 26th July Movement may have gone, the social nature of the regime remained bourgeois. In its struggle against US imperialism, its main support could only be the Kremlin bureaucracy, and this made it its prisoner. Inevitably, the petty-bourgeois Castro leadership had to come into conflict with the Cuban workers and peasants, become more and more the prisoner of the Kremlin bureaucracy and be a bargaining counter between US imperialism and the Kremlin bureaucracy. It sought a compromise with imperialism itself. The offers to negotiate compensation for nationalized imperialist property, the struggle against the 'lefts', the trials of the original leaders of the Castro movement, the discovery of plots against Fidel Castro, the anti-Trotskyist attacks, are so many symptoms showing that the Cuban revolution is reaching a critical stage. Under the petty-bourgeois Castroite leadership the contradictions of the regime grow. In the absence of a revolutionary workers' party, they

will lead to the decay of the regime to the benefit of imperialism, whatever may be the personal destiny of Fidel Castro and his petty-bourgeois entourage.

The policies of imperialism feed on the counter-revolutionary activity of the Stalinist and reformist bureaucracies and of the petty-bourgeois cliques, who form a chain, the last link of which is the revisionism which has developed inside the Fourth International. This revisionism is the expression of social forces hostile to the proletariat — imperialism, the labour bureaucracies, the petty bourgeoisie — inside the Fourth International. It takes up the recurrent positions of revisionism inside the Marxist movement, whilst masking them in 'Trotskyist' language. The world class struggle is reduced to a series of isolated operations. It shatters at the level of consciousness, organization and action, the historical and organic unity of the struggle. It transforms dialectical materialism into a working of 'objective' forces, which are to force the Stalinist, reformist and petty-bourgeois leaderships to become revolutionary leaderships, each one in its own 'sector'. It abandons the struggle for revolutionary leadership, for parties, and for the International. What is more, it becomes an obstacle to their building. Revisionism, as it has developed inside the Fourth International, is not only liquidationist but, usurping the tradition which it represents, serves as a 'left' cover for the counter-revolutionary apparatuses.

The programme of the Fourth International is the most finished product of the historical development of the labour movement. It is the result of experience accumulated in more than a century of class struggle, and most especially since the beginning of the epoch of wars and revolutions, analysed through the method of dialectical materialism. But a programme is not an inert and lifeless thing. The programme was born with the Fourth International. It has remained alive in and through its action. The Pabloite crisis did not lead to the liquidation of the programme. For it is from the programme and action of the Fourth International that the forces have arisen who have fought against Pabloism and have organized in the International Committee of the Fourth International, ensuring its historical continuity.

Revisionism rejects the history of the labour movement, its theoretical and practical struggles. All the tendencies which reject the history of the labour movement, which want to stay on the fringe of its theoretical and practical struggle, reject along with this the whole of

historical materialism, Marxism and the fight for the building of the revolutionary leadership, for pragmatism, eclecticism and impressionism. By their method, they are petty-bourgeois tendencies. They have broken with proletarian internationalism.

The historical continuity of the Fourth International was ensured by the International Committee, for it alone was able to carry out the theoretical and practical fight against revisionism, indispensable for the building of the revolutionary leadership. Whosoever turns his back on the Fourth International, on its struggle for its historical continuity, on its organized expression — the International Committee — breaks with its programme, with proletarian internationalism, of which the IC is the concrete expression.

3. Build the revolutionary leadership!

'The task of the Fourth International is the abolition of capitalism's domination. Its aim — socialism. Its method — the proletarian revolution.' These definitions of the Transitional Programme are today more than ever living. The Fourth International fights on the ground of the world proletarian revolution, for the building of a world revolutionary leadership and of revolutionary parties in every country. Only in this way can the crisis of humanity, which is none other than the crisis of revolutionary leadership, be resolved.

The Fourth International pays particular attention to the young generation of the proletariat. . . . Only the fresh enthusiasm and aggressive spirit of the youth can guarantee the preliminary successes in the struggle; only these successes can return the best elements of the older generation to the road of revolution. Thus it was, thus it will be.

The entire struggle of these last few years confirms these lines of the Transitional Programme. In Britain, the Young Socialists are the vanguard of the struggles of the British proletariat, of the struggle to build a revolutionary Marxist workers' party. In France, working-class youth played a leading part during the 1963 miners' strike, the student youth was in the lead of the action against the counter-revolutionary war of French imperialism in Algeria. In Japan, the Zengakuren were the moving force of the mass action against the imperialist US-Japan pact. In June 1953 in Eastern Germany, in October 1956 in Poland, and during the Hungarian revolution of November 1956, working-class and student youth manned the revolutionary front line. In the USSR the ferment in the working-

class and student youth shows that revolutionary movements are beginning to develop. In Vietnam, working-class and peasant youth make up the vast mass of the revolutionary army, whilst in the USA it is in the student youth that the first actions are born against the counter-revolutionary war of US imperialism. It is also the youth who are the most determined element in the struggle of the American Negroes.

Mobilizing the youth, organizing it, ordering its struggles, demands that the broadest perspectives be opened to it, smashing the straitjacket of this society which oppresses and suffocates it. The mildewed and conservative bureaucracies fear the youth, its aspirations and its struggles. Only the programme of the Fourth International, because it is the programme of the world proletarian revolution for socialism, offers the youth a perspective measuring up to its demands, its aspirations and its legitimate ambitions. Only the Fourth International can organize it by uniting it to the mass of the working class in action for the proletarian revolution.

The International Committee of the Fourth International gives complete support to the internationalist initiatives taken by the youth organizations, the Young Socialists and Révoltes.

The fight to rebuild the Fourth International is inseparable from the most active participation in the class struggle everywhere and in all conditions.

The heroic fight of the Vietnamese workers and peasants is part of the world proletarian revolution. Vietnam is at present a point of convergence of the world class struggle. The Fourth International does not pronounce hypocritical homilies whilst in practice leaving imperialism a free hand. It does not praise the heroism of the Vietnamese workers and peasants only to betray their fight in the name of 'peace'. It does not rely on de Gaulle or any other bourgeois politician to re-establish 'peace in Vietnam'. It stresses and denounces, on the contrary, the deep solidarity of the imperialists, whatever their different interests may be, with US imperialism, the policeman of world imperialism in Vietnam, as it is everywhere else in the world. It brings out the real significance of the positions of the partisans 'of a negotiated and peaceful solution in Vietnam' perfectly illustrated by the words of de Gaulle: 'we must wait for things to ripen in Vietnam', or in other words for hundreds of thousands of workers and peasants to be assassinated and burnt by napalm. Then perhaps these pacifists hope, imperialism will be able to impose its 'peace'.

The Fourth International takes the Vietnamese revolution, the heroic struggle of the workers and peasants, as a strengthening of the call for the struggle against imperialism, for the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie in every country. At the same time as it initiates and supports on every occasion specific actions for the unconditional withdrawal of the troops of US imperialism in Vietnam, and the right of the Vietnamese people to self-determination, it links the struggle for the victory of Vietnamese revolution, for the defeat of imperialism, to the extension of the proletarian revolution throughout the world.

It supports the Vietnamese revolution by calling the workers to revolutionary action in New York, Moscow, Paris, London and Peking. Every blow against its own imperialism, every blow landed by the proletariat against the Kremlin bureaucracy, is effective help for the Vietnamese workers and peasants.

The defence of the conquests of the Chinese revolution is an integral part of the struggle for the world proletarian revolution. In the present circumstances it has the same importance as the defence of the USSR had on the eve of and during the second imperialist world war. The conquests of the Chinese revolution are threatened by the combined actions of imperialism and of the Kremlin bureaucracy. They are also threatened by the consequences of the policy of the Chinese bureaucracy and the Chinese Communist Party. By upholding the Indian bourgeoisie, and then the Pakistani bourgeoisie, by supporting the policy of the Indonesian Communist Party, which subordinated itself to the Indonesian bourgeoisie before becoming its victim, by giving complete support to the Algerian, Ghanaian etc., bourgeoisies, the Chinese bureaucracy and Communist Party paralyse the worker and peasant masses and the development of the proletarian revolution in those countries.

They prepare bloody defeats for the proletariat of those countries, like that of Indonesia. As in India, they reinforce the bourgeoisie of those countries, who inevitably will become the tools of imperialism against the conquests of the Chinese revolution. They isolate the Vietnamese worker and peasant masses from the world proletariat and reinforce in this way the aggression of US imperialism in Vietnam.

The 'theories' of the 'storm centre' and of America as 'the main imperialism' cover up a policy which is no less ill-omened for the conquests of the Chinese revolution. The revolution in the colonial countries develops as part of the world revolution; the counter-

revolutionary intervention of US imperialism is possible only in so far as imperialism can stabilise the class relations in the economically developed countries, including those where, as in France, the bourgeoisie has differences with US capital. The struggle of the American workers, their acquisition of political consciousness, is intimately linked to the struggles and consciousness of the proletariat of the economically developed countries. By supporting the Gaullist regime and its policies, on the pretext of differences and contradictions in imperialism, on the pretext that the main enemy is US imperialism, the Chinese Communist Party contributes to the strengthening of the bourgeoisie in Europe and by this facilitates the counter-revolutionary action of US imperialism, which is aimed against China.

In the same way, the Chinese Communist Party weakens the defence of the conquests of the Chinese revolution by condemning the revolutionary acts of the proletarians of Eastern Europe against the Kremlin bureaucracy and the satellite bureaucracies. The suppression of the revolutionary movements of Eastern Europe — June 1953 in East Germany, October 1956 in Poland, the Hungarian revolution of November 1956 — this suppression is part of the chain of counter-revolutionary acts carried out by the Kremlin bureaucracy, which, in the last analysis, are all to the advantage of imperialism. The counter-revolutionary agreement between imperialism and the Kremlin bureaucracy against the conquests of the Chinese revolution, basically, has the same origins as the bloody repression of the revolutionary movement of Eastern Europe and of the Hungarian revolution by the Kremlin bureaucracy. The conquests of the Chinese revolution can only be safeguarded in the long run by their extension, in Asia and in the world. The transformation of the economic and social structure of the countries of Eastern Europe demands their integration in an economy planned on the basis of collective ownership of the means of production on a European scale, which is incompatible with the existence of the Kremlin bureaucracy.

The Fourth International defends unconditionally the conquests of the Chinese revolution. That is, independent of the fact that they are under the control of the Chinese bureaucracy. It does not raise the overthrow of that bureaucracy as a condition of the defence of these conquests.

But the Fourth International defends the conquests of the Chinese revolution as a component part of the strategy of the world proletarian

revolution. The defence of the conquests of the Chinese revolution in no way implies alignment with the policies of the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party. It is indissolubly linked to the building of the Chinese Party of the Fourth International. The defence of the Chinese revolution implies a merciless struggle against the policies of the Chinese Communist Party, policies which jeopardise these conquests because that Party is opposed to proletarian internationalism.

The destruction of all the independent organizations of the proletariat is a vital necessity for the bourgeoisie in crisis. The working class does not live on abstractions. Through the daily struggle which brings it into opposition with capitalism, it has built trade union organizations. The incorporation of the trade unions into the bourgeois state means the destruction of the class nature of the trade unions. It is only possible to the extent that the trade union organizations have developed within themselves petty bourgeois apparatuses, the mouthpieces of capitalist policies inside the working class, whose constant feature is adaptation to the needs of bourgeois society. The struggle against the incorporation of the trade unions into the state is inseparable from the struggle for the proletarian revolution, for the building of revolutionary workers' parties. The founding programme of the Fourth International states:

The Bolshevik-Leninist stands in the front-line trenches of all kinds of struggles, even when they involve only the most modest material interests or democratic rights of the working class. He takes active part in mass trade unions for the purpose of strengthening them and raising their spirit of militancy. He fights uncompromisingly against any attempt to subordinate the unions to the bourgeois state and bind the proletariat to 'compulsory arbitration' and every other form of police guardianship — not only fascist but also 'democratic'. Only on the basis of such work within the trade unions is successful struggle possible against the reformists, including those of the Stalinist bureaucracy.

At present, the struggle against the incorporation of the trade unions into the state takes on overwhelming importance. Through the attempt to incorporate the trade unions into the state pass all the attempts, and this on an international scale, to destroy the working class's means of organization and struggle. The class struggle is expressed inside the trade unions. It is only possible to build the revolutionary party by fighting for the defence of the gains of the working class and in all fields of the class struggle.

The partisans of the Fourth International do not desert any battlefield of the class struggle. The defence of the trade union organizations and their independence from the state is a fight against the bureaucracies of all kinds. It demands that this fight be integrated into the programme of the proletarian revolution, and that the partisans of the Fourth International organize inside the unions as the most conscious section of the working class, that they associate with their struggle all those who have decided, inside the unions, to take steps to defend the class independence of the proletariat.

The attempts to incorporate the trade unions into the state are expressions of the sharpening of class contradictions. The capitulation of the bureaucratic apparatuses has no other source than the impossibility of defending the most elementary interests of the workers without blowing up the framework of capitalist society, without raising the question of power. It has the same origins as the capitulation of the reformist apparatuses and of the Kremlin bureaucracy before imperialism in the world class struggle. In this sphere, as in all others, the question is that of the proletarian revolution and of revolutionary leadership. The struggle against the incorporation of the trade unions into the state is linked to, and must be understood as a political task inseparable from, the rebuilding the Fourth International. It is an international task.

This is why the Fourth International re-affirms: 'Self-isolation of the capitulationist variety from mass trade unions, which is tantamount to a betrayal of the revolution, is incompatible with membership of the Fourth International.' And that: 'If it be criminal to turn one's back on mass organizations for the sake of fostering sectarian factions, it is no less so passively to tolerate subordination of the revolutionary mass movement to the control of openly reactionary or disguised conservative "progressive" bureaucratic cliques. Trade unions are not ends in themselves; they are but means along the road to proletarian revolution.'

The present phase of the class struggle places the struggle of class against class more than ever on the agenda. The proletariat must present a united front to the bourgeoisie, its state and its governments. This is the lesson of more than a century of class struggle. The more class antagonisms sharpen, the more the working class needs to fight as a whole. It is the bureaucratic apparatuses that divide and fragment the proletarian front. The tactic of the United Front, as it was defined at the Third and Fourth Congresses of the Comintern, is

more than ever valid. Confronted by the economic and political attacks of the bourgeoisie against the working class — the incomes policy, the attempts to incorporate the trade unions into the state — the working class must oppose the bourgeoisie as a class. The tactic of the United Front does not mean denying in practice that the vast majority of the militants of the working class are organized in the reformist and Stalinist parties. It means, starting at all times from the concrete situation in the class struggle and from the demands of the struggle, to propose policies which break from the bourgeoisie and draw up the working class and its organizations face to face with the bourgeoisie as a class. It implies the denunciation of policies of class collaboration either with a section of the capitalist class or with the bourgeoisie as a whole. The United Front necessarily comes into conflict with the policies of the bureaucracy. It cannot be ruled out that the bureaucrats of the traditional leaderships might be forced to take steps towards the United Front under pressure from the working class and their own members. In such cases, we support and take part in all activities that can be organized in this way.

The struggle for the United Front implies the building of revolutionary workers' parties. The accomplishment of the United Front cannot be left to spontaneity. It demands the political struggle of independent organizations translating into practice the Transitional Programme.

The revolutionary party cannot be built independently from participation and intervention in the real class struggle as it takes place under our eyes, or just through commentaries on the class struggle. The policy of the United Front can take on its real significance only in the building of revolutionary parties.

The Europe which came out of the second imperialist war is even less viable than the Europe resulting from the first imperialist war. The mosaic of European states has not disappeared. In Western and in Eastern Europe it is maintained both by the bourgeoisie and by the Kremlin bureaucracy and the satellite bureaucracies. To this has been added the division of Germany into two, cutting into the living flesh of the German working class.

This mosaic of states, and the division of Europe into two, is incompatible with the development of productive forces. The capitalist attempt to overcome the narrowness of the national frontiers by the setting up of the European Economic Community and by the establishment of the European Free Trade Association are only

agreements between groups of capitalists according to the relationship of forces. They are established at the expense of the working class. Each bourgeoisie puts more pressure on its working class to the extent that it 'collaborates' with other bourgeoisies on the European scale. At the slightest sign of economic tension, cracks and groans are heard from inside both the EEC and EFTA.

Under the guidance of the Kremlin bureaucracy, the bureaucracy of each national state of Eastern Europe, far from harmonizing the economy of its country has, on the contrary, reinforced the national divisions, thus multiplying the contradictions. The bureaucracy has no answer to this problem.

The division of Europe into two, and of Germany into two, can only be resolved on capitalism's side by the destruction of the economic and social structure of Eastern Europe and Eastern Germany and the reintroduction of capitalism. It would mean the liquidation of whole sections of the economy, the control of the remainder by American and European capital, millions of proletarians reduced to unemployment and poverty, and national oppressions of unheard-of brutality. The Kremlin bureaucracy has no solution. All that it can hope for is to prolong indefinitely a status quo which is impossible in the long run.

Revolution in a European country could not bring the working class to power without the whole of Europe being shaken. No working class in a single country could hold power in Europe without the extension of the revolution to the whole of Europe. The struggle for the proletarian revolution in Europe cannot ignore the question of national frontiers, of the division of Europe in two, of the unification of Europe. In Europe the social revolution in the capitalist countries and the political revolution in Eastern Europe and the USSR come together. The programme of the proletarian revolution in any European country demands the struggle for the United Socialist States of Europe, established by the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This slogan demands: the denunciation of the division of Europe in two brought about at Yalta and Potsdam; the struggle against all forms of national oppression whether it be by imperialism or by the Kremlin bureaucracy; the struggle for the unconditional reunification of Germany.

It demands the denunciation of the adulterated internationalism, consisting of participation of the trade union organizations in the organizations of the Common Market, which is only one facet of the incorporation of the trade unions into the state.

The slogan of the United Socialist States of Europe is a weapon in the building of revolutionary parties in each European country. It is the concrete answer to the national division of the European proletariat and unifies the social revolution and the political revolution in a single process. It demands that the working class take power in every country.

The joint crisis of imperialism and of the Kremlin bureaucracy is expressed in the search by thousands and thousands of militants for the programme of the proletarian revolution, by the search of millions of proletarians for the path of proletarian revolution. It confirms the total bankruptcy of the Stalinist, reformist and petty-bourgeois leaderships. The policy of capitulation before imperialism requires from these leaderships slander and repression against revolutionaries. To prevent the workers from finding the path of proletarian revolution necessitates for these leaderships that all means be used to prevent a vanguard from forming and establishing links with the programme of proletarian revolution and the organization which expresses it, the Fourth International.

To offset the bankruptcy of Castroism, Fidel Castro made a violent attack on the Fourth International and its programme. He thus acted not only on behalf of the petty-bourgeois Castroite leadership but also on behalf of the Stalinist apparatus. Against the revolutionary militants, the Fourth International and its programme, he uses the same methods and even the same words as the gravedigger of the revolution: Stalin. The Kremlin bureaucracy uses the revolutionary prestige which Castro has, and which it no longer can claim for itself.

Castro's attack on Trotskyism is part of an international wave of slanders and repressions by the Stalinist apparatus. In France, the revolutionary militants grouped around 'Révoltes' were the object of a campaign of slander during the presidential election campaign, emanating from the French Communist Party, because they denounced the treachery of the support for the bourgeois Mitterand by the Socialist and Communist Parties.

But the repressions also rage in the USSR, in Hungary and in Poland. The trial of Daniel and Sinyavsky was aimed to prevent any possibility of free expression. In Poland those arrested are militants known for their devotion to the proletariat, their roots in the labour movement of Eastern Europe and their sympathy for Trotskyism. In Hungary, more than 40 workers who took part in the revolution of November 1956 have again been convicted and thrown into gaol.

The aim is to destroy everything which can make up the elements of the building of an international revolutionary vanguard, on the only possible basis: that of the Fourth International. The struggle against this offensive of slander and repression has as much importance for the Fourth International as had the struggle against the Moscow trials in 1934-38.

The struggle for the rebuilding of the Fourth International is linked to all the problems that confront humanity. Thus is expressed concretely the fact that the crisis of humanity is the crisis of revolutionary leadership. Particularly important in this struggle is actively to build a revolutionary workers' party in the USA, the bastion of imperialism. The American Trotskyists have a particularly heavy task, complicated by the abandoning of the programme of the Fourth International by the Socialist Workers' Party. The Trotskyists of the entire world must give their fraternal support to the American Trotskyists who fight alongside the International Committee. No less important is the task of building revolutionary parties in the USSR and the countries that the Kremlin bureaucracy controls. The accomplishment of these tasks is essential for the rebuilding of the Fourth International and to open the perspective of the proletarian revolution and the world revolution.

The International Committee continues the struggle to rebuild the Fourth International against revisionism, under whatever mask it conceals itself. It carries out this struggle in all fields, theoretically, politically and organizationally.

*FORWARD TO THE VICTORY OF THE
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL!*

DOCUMENT 8

Submissions to the Third Conference from *Voix Ouvriere*, March 8 and 22, 1966

As an organization invited to participate in the Conference called by the IC, a Conference which sets itself the aim of 'defining the tasks of the rebuilding of the Fourth International', we undertook to distribute the preparatory resolution of the IC without thereby taking responsibility for its content.

On the contrary, the reading of this document leads us to formulate certain criticisms — and we shall leave aside all criticisms not directly concerned with the problem of the rebuilding of the Fourth International.

First of all, we have political disagreements, to be sure. We shall not expound them here. Not that we consider them secondary — on the contrary — but we think that these problems could be discussed within an International worthy of the name — one that is capable of handling theory seriously and capable of eventually correcting its errors.

However (to raise a problem on which we disagree) we regret that the document submitted by the IC to international discussion is of evident carelessness.

Indeed, we can read the following characterization of the Buffer States:

The struggle of the working class in Eastern Europe can only be understood as a struggle against regimes produced by a revolutionary movement which has been doubly distorted:

1. It is part of a revolutionary upsurge which threatened the very existence of capitalism in the whole of Europe, a threat which was dispelled by the complementary actions of American imperialism, the Soviet bureaucracy and its agencies, and European Social-Democracy;
2. The Kremlin bureaucracy used its power to decapitate the revolutionary action of the workers of these countries, using for this purpose the old apparatus of the capitalist state. *Thesis* 1 p. 55 (The quotations are taken from *Fourth International* - August 1965 - Volume 2 Number 2.)

Now in the same thesis, we find these countries characterized as 'deformed or degenerated workers' states'. Although we looked through the entire text, we didn't find where, when and how the transformation from 'the old capitalist state apparatus' into a 'workers' state' even deformed or degenerated occurred. We could refer to the 'Ten Theses' of Germain, but we don't think that now is the proper time to introduce this text into the discussion.

Once more, what disturbs us about this resolution is not so much the position taken as the lack of a clear position on this fundamental problem (Pabloism already existed in this overestimation of the 'progressive' role of the Russian bureaucracy in 1945). The paragraph which we quote and which is the only effort to handle the problem in the resolution is, to say the least, incomplete — whatever position one takes on this subject. And if it is true that the 'class struggle in Eastern Europe can only be understood' as the authors of the resolution understand it, then, one can hardly hope to see this problem clarified in the near future.

But this problem is only one of methodology and we have referred to it simply because we wish to see the international organization which cannot fail to arise from the conference this spring, approach seriously and methodically these problems, and not to content itself with repeating Pabloite analysis.

What disturbs us much more about the IC's text is the constant reference to the years 1953-56:

Such collaboration fully developed in the bureaucracy's strategy of peaceful co-existence and peaceful competition between the two world systems since the death of Stalin and particularly since 1956, now takes on an added significance for the rebuilding of the Fourth International. This new and more advanced phase of the counter-revolutionary role of Stalinism is the response of the bureaucracy not only to the increased pressure of imperialism but also to the upsurge of the political revolution in Eastern Europe after 1953. At the same time, movements like the General Strike of August 1953 in France showed that the policies of the Stalinist and Social-Democratic bureaucracies in the advanced capitalist countries were coming into contradiction with the mass movement. The containment of the working class in those capitalist countries where the Stalinists had mass influence became more difficult and fraught with danger. Every partial mobilization of the strength of the class threatened to rapidly develop into a general class confrontation, putting in question the whole capitalist system. The Stalinist bureaucratic leaderships of the working-class movement found themselves faced with the necessity of making them-

selves open agents of the maintenance of bourgeois order like the Social-Democrats before them. In a different form, the historic defeat of French imperialism at Dien-Bien Phu forced the international Stalinist apparatus into direct collaboration with imperialism for the purpose of preventing the extension of the revolution in the colonial countries. (p. 54)

Thus along with its political rapprochement with imperialism since 1953, the bureaucracy is made more sensitive and responsive to the contradictory economic development of international capitalism. (p. 55)

The period 1953-56 marks a turning point in the world situation. (p. 55)

The general swing to the right of all the Social-Democratic and Stalinist parties since 1956 is their response to a renewed upsurge of the international workers' struggle. (p. 58)

Since 1953, the Stalinist bureaucracy, severely shaken by the working-class upsurge in its own camp, has entered into closer collaboration with imperialism. (p. 62)

And we are surely omitting other similar examples!

Thus, according to the resolution of the International Committee, the years 1953-56 mark a turn to the right by the Russian bureaucracy, and that, then, the Stalinist bureaucracies of the workers' movement were transformed into open agents of the maintenance of bourgeois order, while during the same period the 'historic' defeat (what can an adjective such as 'historic' possibly add to the meaning of a word?) of French imperialism at Dien-Bien-Phu forced the international apparatus of Stalinism into direct collaboration with imperialism.

One has the impression of dreaming. And speaking of dreams, the authors of the resolution seem to have awakened ten years late and to have confused the period of 1953-56 with the period 1943-45 which, if we absolutely must find an epoch when the Stalinist bureaucracy evolved even further towards the right than before, is clearly the more characteristic.

Indeed, it was then that Stalin dissolved the Comintern; that the Potsdam and Yalta pacts divided up the world among the 'Greats', that Stalin promised support against eventual revolutionary movements in Europe and Asia (in exchange for the landing in the West) and he kept his word. Whether in Europe, where we immediately distinguish a change in comparison with the Finnish war in 1939, since according to the IC's text itself the Red Army did not contribute to the revolutionary upsurge in Eastern Europe, but, on the contrary, made use of the old capitalist state apparatus against the struggling

masses. As for open support of the interests of imperialism in colonial countries, we shall not go so far as to recall in detail Stalin's attitude in the Chinese Civil War, or the attitude of the French Communist Party — to cite only one example — in the face of the repression in Indochina (1945-46), in Algeria (Constantine 1945) or in Madagascar, not to mention the political support which it generously extended to the French government then confronted with the demands of the peoples of the French colonies in Africa.

No, no serious militant can be convinced of any right turn by the Russian bureaucracy in the period 1953-56. The turn — if there was one — was taken ten years earlier and what happened in 1953-56 with the end of the cold war, was a return to the period before 1948, a return moreover, which did not oblige the bureaucracy to go very far backwards.

And what worries us most of all about the IC's treatment of this question is not so much the error in analysis itself as what such an error can mean.

Indeed, it is clear — too clear — that the exaggerated importance given to this turn will enable the IC to place the 1953 split of the Fourth International in a 'historical' context. And thus, under the pressure of events, the unfortunate International will splinter in 1953. Certainly not! First of all, as we have seen, there was no *FUNDAMENTAL* change during this period in the politics of the bureaucracy, nor in that of imperialism, nor in the two of them together. Then, as we shall see again further on, this analysis does not provide a satisfactory explanation for the degeneration of the Fourth International. And what sort of International is this, that splinters at the first world crisis? It really should have splintered in 1939-40, then in 1945, and then in 1948! Unless we admit that it did in fact splinter which would be, everything considered, a more serious analysis than the one we are offered.

And the exaggerated importance ascribed to this period is very convenient to justify the politics of the organizations which belong to the IC and which participated in the Fourth International before 1953. If there was a change in the world situation in 1953, there is no need to re-examine the analysis and the politics of the period before. Thus, the IC's resolution is able to do what the miller in the fable couldn't: satisfy both everybody and his uncle!

In our opinion, this is not a correct way to proceed. Rebuilding the Fourth International is a difficult task. Considerable obstacles will

have to be overcome. Militants who fix themselves such an aim should try to be worthy of its founder. They ought to inspire confidence in the rising generations. For that, they must speak another language, use reason as an arm to understand and to prepare the future and not as a mean of retrospective justification. It will have to be shown that, at last, something has changed in the Trotskyist movement.

But this is not still the gravest thing about this preparatory resolution. The gravest thing is the insufficient analysis of the 'Pabloite' degeneration of the Fourth International and of its demise.

The resolution of the International Committee includes a long criticism of what we also designate, for the sake of simplicity, by the word 'Pabloism', a criticism of which we entirely approve, aside from some reservations which we shall return to later.

But how and why did the Fourth International not only give birth to 'Pabloism' which could be an accident, but why did 'Pabloism' become the dominant ideology of the Fourth International? Not only the leadership, the International Secretariat, but the majority of the organizations happened to defend either Pabloite positions or political lines hardly worth more, even if, according to the vicissitudes of the multiple splits, they found themselves cut off from the International Secretariat (the case of the SWP for example).

It is nonetheless indispensable to look for the causes of the collapse of the Fourth International if we really want to undertake to rebuild it. We agree with the comrades of the International Committee on the founding programme of the Fourth International, the Transitional Programme. If this political platform is correct and valid, it must be that the failure of the Fourth International was due to an organic defect. Of course its failure was due fundamentally to unfavourable social and historical circumstances, but it would be fatalism to leave the explanation at that. Was there nothing to be done, and were the degeneration and the failure inevitable?

Pabloism, correctly qualified by the resolution as a petty-bourgeois tendency did not appear in the Fourth International out of nothing. It was able to germinate and find a favourable environment for growth, in the Fourth International, and was the expression of its real nature, and this was seen in the later evolution of the different groups.

Now what do we find in the resolution as an explanation for the degeneration of the Fourth International? We quote:

The objective situation — physical liquidation of many sections in the late 1930s and the Second World War, the apparent strength of Stalinism in

the workers' movement from 1942 to 1953, the divisions and pressure of the cold war period, the McCarthy repressions in the USA, all provided the circumstances for the decline, particularly by physically separating the class struggle in Eastern Europe and Russia from that of the capitalist world. But the emphasis placed on revolutionary consciousness by the Transitional Programme must be our guide. The death of Trotsky weakened the Fourth International immeasurably. There had not yet been time to train a cadre which had absorbed the living theoretical heritage of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky, particularly the lesson learned by Trotsky in the October Revolution of the need of a centralized Bolshevik party founded solidly on Marxist theory, responding to every need of leadership by the working class in accordance with an internationalist perspective. This theoretical and political weakness, reflected in a dogmatic attitude towards theory and programme, not *developing* Marxist theory against hostile ideologies but attempting to 'preserve' it, was the reason for the inability of the Fourth International to develop the programme and build parties in the post-war period.

Instead the cadres of the International adapted easily to the petty-bourgeois trends dominant at that stage of political development, particularly to the Stalinists. A false and artificial 'international centre' was set up, relying on a propagandist contemplation and commentary upon 'objective' developments in the class struggle. Such a centre did not discuss the living experiences of the sections in the course of developing Marxist theory and programme but instead either left the sections without guidance or intervened bureaucratically (upon the basis of the most 'Bolshevik' of organizational statutes) to impose an abstract international line against the sections. Such an international centre, isolated from real struggle, adapting programmatic formulae to the surface atmosphere of politics and certain circles of the 'left' intelligentsia, dominated as it was by the petty-bourgeois elements who inhabit the Labour bureaucracies, was inevitably exposed to the pressures of the cold war, of international Stalinism and imperialism. Its theory and programme developed not in active connection with living struggle but in the rarefied atmosphere of 'international secretariats'. (p. 59-60)

This is the only attempt, as an explanation, which we were able to find in the text, unless we except the following sentence taken from a preceding paragraph:

Petty-bourgeois opportunism, in the shape of a hardened revisionist tendency penetrating all sections of the Trotskyist movement, has destroyed the Fourth International as an organization founded on the Transitional Programme. (p. 56)

Thus, the degeneration of the Fourth International was due

entirely to its leadership which isolated itself in the 'rarefied atmosphere of International Secretariats' (?), which was revealed incapable of helping the sections when it did not bureaucratically interfere with their activity; this international leadership allowed petty-bourgeois opportunism, flag unfurled, to penetrate all the sections.

In a word: it's Pablo's fault!

This explanation is more than insufficient. Political analysis cannot be replaced by manichean schemes.

The objective situation, Trotsky's death, and everything of the kind one might add — for many other factors played a role — indeed provided the conditions of the decline.

But why did the cadres of the Fourth International adapt so easily to petty-bourgeois currents? Why did the sections reveal themselves incapable of breaking with the so-called cadres and eliminate them from the International, why did they prove incapable of creating a new leadership out of their own ranks? What should have been done which was not? All these questions require answers to enable us to set about this rebuilding.

And how did the penetration of petty-bourgeois opportunism manifest itself? What had to be done to avoid it? To say that it was inevitable is not a militant answer.

In fact we do not find in this text a serious desire to seek the causes which engendered Pabloite revisionism within the Fourth International, nor — and these two phenomena are intimately related — what brought about the dwindling and virtual disappearance of nearly all the sections of the International including the French section which had not however a formally Pabloite majority.

In our opinion this is very serious, all the more serious since the failure of the Fourth International was due to the refusal of its militants and of its leaders, on the level of sections as on the level of the international leadership — for this was a global phenomenon — to admit that the social composition of the sections in majority petty-bourgeois, intellectuals, necessitated strict political and organizational measures to keep out corrupt elements, and, as far as possible, to escape from the influence of petty-bourgeois ideology by making a maximum effort to recruit within the working class, and by obliging elements of petty-bourgeois origin to tie themselves to work in the factories. Leon Trotsky himself gave this kind of warning to the American section just before the war. It was valid for all the sections of the International.

Pabloism, in the form of liquidationism, was but the finished expression of this petty-bourgeois opportunism of *all* the sections of the International. Certain sections — only one at the beginning — rejected the liquidationist conclusions of Pabloism while still accepting many of its premises and, above all, every one had given proof — some since 1939 or 1940 — that they were susceptible to other opportunist deformations according to the ideological vicissitudes of the petty-bourgeois environment to which they were tied. Pabloism was not the cause of the failure and the demise of the Fourth International; it was its product.

It is such an investigation that the organizations of the International Committee must carry out if they wish to undertake seriously — and with some chances of success — to rebuild the Fourth International. The task is very difficult, for, to know the causes is not enough; the remedies must be sought, and above all, applied.

These remedies are neither potions to be swallowed, nor formulae which need only be applied. Constant political research and constant organizational vigilance are necessary. Because of the conditions of this period, Trotskyist ideas win intellectuals more easily and more quickly than workers. It is therefore necessary to adapt the forms of activity and the forms of organization to this situation, in order to be able to struggle against the penetration of petty-bourgeois ideology.

This is very difficult, and we ourselves know the problem first hand. Our organization was born precisely of the necessity to separate physically from the petty-bourgeois environment with its Social-Democratic practices which made up the Trotskyist organizations, in France at the beginning of the war, to be able to recruit, educate and form cadres capable of putting into practice Leninist and Trotskyist organizational principles, and which were not content with 'Bolshevik' verbiage covering up opportunist practice. It is because we ran up against the sarcasm and incomprehension of the militants of the Fourth International with respect to these questions that we had to carry on an activity separate from the Fourth International, although we have always upheld its ideas and its programme. The fate of the Fourth International, moreover, did not give us cause for regret.

Today, still, it will certainly be difficult to convince the comrades of the organizations belonging to the IC. If we have any chance to do so, it is precisely because we have had a separate experience, that we have built up a political and organizational capital independent of the Fourth International.

But of course, our action alone will not be sufficient. It is necessary and indispensable that this consciousness and this preoccupation come from within these organizations themselves. The first task for all the militants who will participate in the rebuilding is unquestionably a re-examination of the past of the Fourth International and of the causes of its degeneration. The search for measures will come naturally afterwards. For that is needed but the firm will work toward the revolution by the most effective road even if it doesn't appear to be the shortest or the easiest.

This search is all the more necessary since the organizations of the International Committee come from the Fourth International. They shared in its existence throughout long years. They carry within the defects of the Fourth International. The fact that they have opened the struggle against Pabloism is not a guarantee, for that has nothing to do with the struggle against the causes of Pabloism. These organizations are imbued with Pabloite politics: there also they need an examination of themselves and a serious revision of all the analysis formulated by the Fourth International between 1949 and 1953, which the militants of the International Committee often rest upon.

For it is evident that the petty-bourgeois nature of a political organization reveals itself in the lack of seriousness of its political analysis. We have given an example at the beginning of this text (with regard to the People's Democracies). We should like to return to the criticism of 'Pabloism'.

We share with the authors of the resolution the opinion that it is necessary to carry on a resolute struggle against 'Pabloism' as an ideology.

Centrist tendencies within the Stalinist movement, in Eastern Europe, USSR and China, as well as in the various Communist Parties, base themselves on the perspective of a reform of the Stalinist bureaucracy. Pabloite revisionism and liquidationism is the expression of this revisionism of our epoch within the revolutionary movement itself. The first steps of a fight against Stalinism in the countries ruled by the bureaucracy go through forms which tend to accept this revisionist framework. (p. 57)

We believe that this phenomenon has an even more general character, and that Pabloism is in fact, the most 'finished' ideological expression of the numerous petty-bourgeois reformist tendencies as much in the underdeveloped countries, and even in the Western nations, as in the countries influenced by the USSR.

But there, it is only a question of Pabloite ideology, of political expression. Criticism of Pabloism contains the criticism of all of these tendencies, and it is necessary to criticize the most elaborate doctrine among them to be able to expose those which are unformed or just barely enunciated. But it is false to claim that Pabloism has an importance by itself, or as an organized movement.

And we find certain statements of the resolution perfectly ridiculous from this point of view:

In this way, the dominance of Pabloite revisionism in the Fourth International objectively hindered the development of the political revolution in 1953-1956. (p. 57)

The active construction of revolutionary parties in Eastern Europe and the USSR was abandoned and this assisted in the isolation of the workers in these countries from the working class of the capitalist world. (p. 57)

Pablo's theory that the Stalinist Party would be forced to the left and even to take power disarmed the vanguard of the French working class at the time of the 1953 General Strike, just as surely as it disarmed the Fourth International in relation to the political revolution in Eastern Europe. (p. 57)

These crucial examples demonstrate that the revisionist degeneration in the Fourth International is an international class phenomenon responding to the needs of imperialism in its latest phase of extreme contradictions and dependence upon the Stalinist bureaucracy, Social-Democracy, and the nationalist leaders.

This importance attributed to Pabloism is pure bluff and not serious analysis. Whom is it supposed to fool?

And this bluffing is serious, because it also concerns the organizations of the IC. If they are capable of deluding themselves in this way about the real influence of Pabloism, they are also capable of deluding themselves about their own. This sort of illusion is fatal. And when it takes the form of a bluff about oneself, it is one of the gravest symptoms of the unprincipled petty-bourgeois character of an organization.

In this regard we should have liked to see in the text, since a criticism appears therein — and a correct one — of the Pabloite organizations towards the FLN, some reference — be it only an allusion — to the policy of the French organization towards the MNA. This too is not a proof of seriousness.

We shall close by stating again, that we are not making these criticisms with a polemical aim. Nor are we censors. The organiza-

tions of the IC have taken a real step forward and have undertaken a considerable task. We wish to help them to the best of our ability. If we try to draw their attention to the main problem which we raise, it is because we honestly and sincerely wish the Fourth International to be recreated.

We know that our criticisms will not suffice unless the majority of the militants engaged in this rebuilding become conscious of these problems. We are convinced that such a consciousness will arise.

However, if this does not occur, that will only mean that the road is still longer than we had thought, and that we should have not to rebuild the Fourth International, but to build the Fifth, this would be the proof that a whole generation had failed.

In any case, and we are fully conscious of what we affirm, the next epoch will see the birth of a Revolutionary International.

DOCUMENT 9**Declaration of the Union Communiste
Internationaliste to an OCI meeting,
March 20, 1966**

We do not want to abuse this opportunity given us to speak at this meeting and we shall limit ourselves to a few points which we think to be essential. We refer those comrades who are interested to our publications for the rest.

First of all, we wish to say that we are happy to participate, in common with you, in the attempt to recreate an international revolutionary organization; we hope that we can soon find the means to unify our two organizations in the accomplishment of this task, a unification which, given our respective forces at the present time, would give a weight to the Trotskyist vanguard which would not be negligible in French political life.

We believe that the main positive thing in the IC declaration is the recognition of the fact that the Fourth International no longer exists and that it is necessary to *rebuild* it. In the last analysis it is this recognition which brings us to participate in the IC Conference.

In our opinion, to recognize this fact — this evident fact — presupposes a rigorous analysis of the political and organizational history of the Fourth International in order to determine the causes and the reasons for its failure. To rebuild is not all; it is necessary to know how, and to know how it is necessary to understand why the problem faces us again 28 years after the foundation of the Fourth International. If not, our undertaking will have the same result, at best, and most probably there will not even be any undertaking at all.

Now, we are led to state that not the least effort has been made to try to find the causes of the Pabloite degeneration of the Fourth International, either in the declaration of the IC, or in the course of this meeting, or in the texts which we have been able to read.

Pabloism is not, however, an epiphenomenon, an accident in the

history of the Fourth International. It is a whole trend, represented by the majority, at least in 1953. How and why was it able to break out within the organization to the point of being able to paralyse and destroy it? The leading position of Pabloism cannot be explained just by bureaucratic manoeuvres. Some sections did not cease being 'Pabloite' even when cut off from the International Secretariat.

Nor is it enough to invoke the unfavourable conditions or one or another of the 'linked crises of imperialism and the bureaucracy . . .' Between the God of unfavourable objective circumstances and the Pabloite Satan, there is nonetheless a small place for the free will of militants!

What policies should the militants of the Fourth International have carried out *before 1953*, to avoid the degeneration? What are the political and organizational acts which they should have attempted in order to avoid this end? What did they do which they shouldn't have done?

If it was difficult to know at the time, it should now be possible to analyse the question. And such an analysis is of primary importance.

Unfortunately the declaration of the IC does not breathe a word about this. Nevertheless, it correctly interprets the Pabloite degeneration as an elaborated form of the ideology of certain strata of the petty bourgeoisie influenced by the apparatus of imperialism and of the bureaucracy. How is it that these influences were able to penetrate the Fourth International? These influences must have shown before 1953 both politically and *organizationally*. On the organizational level petty-bourgeois influence always manifests itself, and always in characteristic ways.

What should we avoid and how should we avoid it in this area to succeed in our attempt?

Nobody seems to care. In our opinion this is regrettable: it can condemn the best of undertakings since this is what undermined the Fourth International.

Our opinion in this matter is an old one and finally dates from our refusal to join the regroupment which gave birth to the PCI in 1944.

For us the French organizations of the Fourth International were petty-bourgeois organizations which, whatever the individual devotion of their members, had 'non Bolshevik' political and organizational practices. This was verified in 1940 by their nationalist deviations. This was verified at the unification of 1943-44 by the avoidance of criticisms, contrary to all principles, of the mistakes of 1940.

Whatever the later successes, this could lead only to disappointments worse than 1940, we wrote at the time. We should like to recall in passing that we have not an attitude of either fatalism or of easy hindsight. This we wrote at the time, and throughout the period 1940-1950 we considered our work to be *within the framework of the Fourth International*, in order to correct it, or rather to try to correct it. The fact that we did so from without rather than from within was not of our own choosing and we can hardly be reproached for it.

We do not recall this in order to be awarded a patent as 'anti-Pabloite from the very beginning'. Such patents, in our opinion, do not guarantee very much: Pabloism is one of the political expressions of petty-bourgeois tendencies. Others exist. The fact that one has fought this political line does not mean that one does not represent oneself a petty-bourgeois tendency, and does not exempt one from all other deviations of the same social base. Even the anti-Pabloites with the greyest hair and the longest beards cannot make do without a serious analysis of the roots and social origins of Pabloism in the Fourth International, why the Fourth International could be the soil where Pabloism sprouted.

It is not enough to have criticized Pabloite politics in 1953: the causes of Pabloism were visible in 1943. And so were the remedies! Not to have waited until 1952 to recommend them is not a fault, in our opinion.

In our opinion, the causes of Pabloism resided in the petty-bourgeois character of the organizations of the Fourth International. This character was due, of course, to *objective historical and social factors*, but it was due also to *subjective factors*: the absence or the abandon of any organizational methods designed to keep out of the ranks of the organization petty-bourgeois elements incapable of breaking with their class. An absence accompanied, moreover, by irony and disdain for those who used such methods.

It is this absence of organizational methodology in the organizations of the Fourth International which led us to a separate existence in order to demonstrate that this methodology was possible to put into practice. Our existence as a group *at least as powerful as yours in France*, despite infinitely weaker beginnings . . . and *the absence of the moral and material support of an International throughout our entire existence*, proves that these methods are fruitful. As for our political positions during those years, perhaps we shall have the leisure to discuss them, but let us note, at least, that we did not give birth to

Pabloism and . . . that, today, we find ourselves together in order to fight it.

In our opinion it is vital for the organizations of the IC to study these questions, for Pabloism did not arise out of nothing.

In our opinion a good many of your analyses come from Pabloite analyses; and in our opinion a good many of your organizational methods and methods of political analysis deserve to be reviewed in a new light: that of a methodical criticism coming from within your own organization.

Thus, to take a single example, precisely of a question which divides us, China and the Buffer States. The speaker at this meeting declared in substance that if he had a clear idea concerning the nature of the USSR, he had no clear idea concerning that of China and the buffer states. This is possible, but it is also regrettable. But what is still more regrettable is that this did not stop the comrade from claiming to make an analysis of what he believes to be the design of the bureaucracy to liquidate the Communist Parties. Aside from the fact that we do not share this opinion, we find it strange to claim to make an analysis of the policies of the Communist Parties and of the bureaucracy without a clear idea of a factor of evaluation, which is still important, however: the nature of the buffer states. (Not to speak of the method based on anything you like except the seriousness worthy of militants who aspire to carry on the tradition of Leon Trotsky.)

If we make these criticisms, it is because we think them essential. Nothing valid can be built on sand. For us, the rebuilding of the Fourth International is a serious matter. This rebuilding will not take place without an unsparing criticism of both the present and the past. But this criticism cannot come only from us. It is a question of completing this criticism and of acquiring a certain political and organizational methodology — which is not the easiest thing.

Finally, let us say in closing that we do not claim to act as censors. Whatever our efforts, we do not escape the hold of the environment and we also undergo its influence. We shall welcome all criticisms as a help to our undertaking. We consider this rebuilding as a common task and it is in this framework that we make our criticisms. They are fraternal. Yours will be taken in the same spirit.

But on the other hand, we are fully conscious of what we represent. If the organizations of the IC do not make the necessary review of their own past, the present undertaking is doomed to failure. This is not fatalism, but political analysis.

Chapter Three

The liquidationist theories of the OCI

Only months were needed after the 1966 Conference for the OCI to declare itself ready to abandon the principled positions adopted there against Spartacist and *Voix Ouvrière*. In their statement of 1967 (Document 11) they turn the 1966 decision on its head. They declare that the Fourth International was in fact destroyed by 'the pressure of hostile social forces'. Under this pressure, they claimed, the leadership of the Fourth International was unable to strike roots into the working class. What is rejected completely here is the conscious struggle to develop Marxist theory and method in the struggle to build and train the revolutionary party.

In point of fact, this re-writing of history was a rationalization of the practice of the OCI leaders, who thought they could adapt the Transitional Programme to the spontaneous development of the working class. This descent into pragmatism led them to denounce the Socialist Labour League as 'ultimatistic' because of its insistence on carrying out the tasks defined at the 1966 Conference: the building of Bolshevik parties on the basis of the theoretical conquest of the long struggle against revisionism. In this chapter, the basic outline of the positions of the OCI and the SLL are clearly presented in the documents of the two organizations. They are the political foundation for understanding the events covered in the following year (see Chapter Four).

DOCUMENT 10

Record of work of the IC since the Third Conference, May 1967

The following factual record of the work of the International Committee should be studied carefully in connection with the document of the Organization Communiste Internationaliste, in order to estimate the carrying out by the IC and its sections of the tasks set by the International Conference of April 1966. It is clear from this record that it is quite wrong to say that those decisions have remained a 'dead letter'. The setting up and carrying forward of the Youth Commission, working towards an International Conference of revolutionary youth, and the carrying of our slogans 'Victory to the Vietcong', 'Long Live the Hungarian Revolution' and 'Long Live the Fourth International' by the strongest delegations in the Liège demonstration, inflicting a major defeat on the revisionists, were very important steps carried out as a result of the Conference decisions. The work of our US section has been carried out entirely along the lines of the decisions of the American Commission at the Conference. The regular functioning of the IC and the carrying out of its work can be checked from the following account

1. Meetings of the International Committee.

Meetings of the IC were held in Paris on the following dates:

1966 — June 11-12, September 17-18

1967 — January 7-8, January 23 (Secretariat), February 25-26, April 1-3 (Extended meeting), May 2 (Secretariat)

Further meetings were held in London during the visit of the Nigerian comrade (May 1966), after the Liège demonstration (Oct. 28-29, 1966), and after the Extended IC (April 14-15), i.e. a total of 8 full IC meetings and two secretariat meetings.

2. International visits.

In accordance with Conference decisions, the IC and its sections had political and financial responsibility for the following visits.

A Nigerian comrade visited Britain after the International Conference of 1966, and travelled to Europe. He reported the work of the Nigerian group to a meeting of the IC. The British section undertook to provide regular financial assistance to the section at £50 monthly.

The Secretary of the EC visited the Greek section from September 19-26, 1966. On the journey there, an IC meeting was held in Paris, where the purpose of the visit was discussed. The results of the visit, including the agreement on internal party relations drawn up with the Greek section, was reported to and endorsed by the IC at its next meeting.

A leading Greek comrade has twice visited the British section and the IC of October 1966. The internal questions raised on the second visit were discussed and an agreed statement on behalf of the IC was communicated to the section from its meeting of April 15, 1967.

In November 1966 a British comrade attended, on behalf of the IC, the Conference of the US section.

For the Extended IC meeting of 1-3 April 1967, a US comrade was brought to Europe, with expenses met by the British and French sections.

British and French comrades attended the Youth Conference in Germany.

The French section has been responsible for contact work with regular visits in Italy and Germany.

Other individual visits have been made between Britain and France.

3. A separate report will be submitted to the Congress by the YS representatives on the Youth Commission set up by the 1966 Conference. This Commission has met regularly in Paris and London, and has carried through the successful campaign for Liège and the International Youth Assembly.

4. The French and British sections held meetings to commemorate the Hungarian Revolution of 1956; they published special material on this anniversary and carried the fight on it into the Liège demonstration.

5. The Discussion Bulletin of the IC was published once, on September 1st, 1966 (Resolution of the Hungarian section). A second number, consisting of documents of the 1966 Conference with editorial comments, is still in preparation.

6. International Correspondence.

Having discussed the new political situation signalled especially by the provocation of the 'Tate affair', the IC of Jan 7-9, 1967 decided on the publication in French and English of an international bulletin. The English edition would appear fortnightly and the French section would investigate the technical possibilities immediately.

Six issues have appeared in English (Feb. 6, March 1, March 14, March 29, April 12, May 3) and French publication has now begun (May 14). With reference to the statement in the OCI document, 'After four editions the bulletin of the IC has still not become the bulletin of the IC', here are the facts. After the first issue of International Correspondence, the French comrades objected to the heading in the name of the 'Executive Committee of the IC', and this was immediately changed to 'Secretariat of the IC'. The contents of No. 1 were agreed in detail by the Secretariat meeting of Jan. 23, 1967. Nos. 2, 3, and 4 had contents decided by the IC and the Secretariat.

During the Extended IC meeting of April 1-3, 1967, the French comrades again raised the question of the title of International Correspondence and it was agreed to continue publication as 'published by the IC'. The French comrades were informed on that occasion that No. 4 was in the press and the modification could only be made in the subsequent issue.

7. International cadre school.

The French document refers to 'international cadre schools'. One such school was originally planned to take place immediately after Christmas 1966. It was to be devoted to the history of Stalinism and to run for eight days. Difficulties about employment made it necessary for British comrades to travel one day later than the original schedule. On this basis flights were booked and preparations made in the British section. However the French comrades decided that the loss of one day made it impossible to continue with the school, and cancelled the arrangements. When the period between the Morecambe Conference and the Extended IC was suggested at the January Secretariat meeting, for the re-convening of this school, the British section informed

the French comrades during February that such an arrangement was not practicable.

All comrades must study the work of the IC since the Conference. The great gain made by that Conference was the clarification of political and theoretical questions through the fight with *Voix Ouvrière* and the Robertson group. It was necessary to clarify finally the question of the continuity of the Fourth International, established by the fight of the IC against revisionism. On this basis it is now possible to tackle the questions of party-building and the unity of theory and practice. It is to the extent that our work since the Conference has built on these foundations that it can be counted 'successful' or not. In fact the IC has carried out its work along this line, and the British section has discharged its international responsibilities. With this clearly established, the international discussion in preparation for the next International Conference, must now be urgently tackled, beginning with this Congress of the SLL. It is precisely on the questions of the continuity of Bolshevism and the central task of building parties on the Transitional Programme that the discussion has now begun, and this will be the biggest gain of the April 1966 Conference.

DOCUMENT 11

Statement by the OCI, May 1967

One year after the conference of the International Committee it is indispensable to draw up a balance sheet of the activity of the IC to measure what was gained by that conference, and what it left in abeyance, and consequently to allow the IC to progress in its struggle to rebuild the Fourth International, and to open discussions necessary to solve problems which the Third IC Conference was not able to discuss. Whilst in this analysis, we have to deal with points separately, we must stress that they make up a whole; the gains of the international conference, as well as the problems which it left in abeyance, are expressed in the activity of the IC and its weaknesses. The critique of the activity of the IC must be rigorous, precisely because it has the most grandiose, difficult and decisive tasks to undertake and to accomplish, and because it can accomplish them. This critique is not directed at any one section rather than another, because the weaknesses of any one section taken on its own are to a great extent attributable to the weaknesses of all the sections of the IC as a whole, and not only to that one itself. We want a discussion and not a settlement of accounts. We want this discussion because we believe it to be indispensable to the progress of the IC taken as a whole and of the sections which make it up, ours included. It can take place and develop in a fruitful manner, because in our opinion the IC has reached a point of maturity which allows it to undertake it. That means complete confidence on our part in the future of the IC and its sections.

Liège and the meetings in *Paris* and *London* commemorating the 10th Anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution are very important successes for the IC. *Liège* and the commemoration of the Hungarian Revolution demanded of the IC integrated activity. At *Liège*, for the first time in the history of the Trotskyist movement, an international

demonstration of this size took place, which linked the struggle against imperialism and the Soviet bureaucracy. This demonstration, bringing together more than a thousand young people from different countries of Europe, was dominated by the programme of the Fourth International. Originally planned by the Pabloite revisionist centre as a demonstration to re-assert its authority and particularly *Germain's* over the Belgian Jeunes Gardes Socialistes and to serve as a point of support for the development of its petty-bourgeois pacifist policy, it would have been an obstacle to the struggle to rebuild the Fourth International. But our intervention transformed it into a demonstration posing the problems of the revolutionary struggle of youth as the only perspective against imperialism. It was dominated by the slogans: 'The enemy is in our own country' and 'Long live the Hungarian Revolution', illustrating the indissoluble unity of the world class struggle. Pabloism suffered a very hard defeat on the ground it chose itself. Fools explain this as a matter of the relationship of forces. They forget to say why such a relationship of forces existed, why the Jeunes Gardes Socialistes had to approach the Young Socialists in order to put on an international youth demonstration of a certain size, and why they had to accept everybody's participating in this demonstration under their own slogans. Starting from the struggle to build a revolutionary youth movement in England and France, the integrated activity of the IC conditioned our participation at Liège giving it a political strength which was not the simple sum of the forces of the Young Socialists and of Revoltes, but which constituted there and then an international pole of attraction and an international force of intervention.

Although less spectacular and not appearing to be of such great immediate importance, the international meetings in London and Paris commemorating the Hungarian Revolution equally express the progress of the IC. Only the IC in effect commemorated the Hungarian Revolution internationally with the participation of a leader of the Hungarian Revolution, won over to Trotskyism by the policy of the IC, its struggle against Pabloism and the defence of the programme of the Fourth International. They were a further expression of the fact that only the IC can unite the world class struggle into one whole in its fight for the rebuilding of the Fourth International.

Although not resulting from the activity of the IC as a whole, the progress made by the American section is equally an integral part of the successes of the IC since the April 1966 Conference.

But it is indispensable to make a critique of the general working of the IC. A series of tasks and decisions taken by the April 1966 Conference and subsequently by the IC have not been carried out. They have remained dead letters. Enumeration of these could be very long-drawn-out. We confine ourselves to a few most important ones.

The internal bulletin has not been published. The non-publication of the internal bulletin is not attributable to any section taken individually. It must not be kept silent especially given the political importance which we attribute to it. Texts and documents were presented at the conference by the Japanese comrades, the Greek section and *Voix Ouvrière*. The publication of these texts, with the replies of the IC, was to continue the discussion of the Third Conference of the IC. It was very important in order to get the Japanese group to make progress. It was no less important for the Greek comrades. Finally, it made possible the preparation of the Fourth Conference the resolution about which from the Third Conference planned it should unite the organizations in agreement on the following bases.

The IC has not managed to have overall planned and co-ordinated activity, with a budget. Comrade Slaughter's journey to Greece has still not been followed up. The importance of these insolvencies is tragically manifest in Greece at the moment. One cannot state that if the IC had followed the development of the struggle between the factions of the Greek section and had intervened, the present crisis would have been avoided, but this was the only possibility of avoiding it. The very existence of the Greek section is in question, and it is superfluous to emphasise how important this section is from the point of view of rebuilding the Fourth International.

The SLL has had its own international activity, so has the OCI. Germany and Eastern Europe have remained the 'private hunting-grounds' of the OCI in co-operation with the Hungarian organization. The projected international cadre schools have not taken place. The secretariat of the IC set up in order to permit the accomplishment of the tasks decided upon in common has not functioned.

After four editions the bulletin of the IC has still not become the bulletin of the IC.

Enumeration of the decisions taken many times yet not carried out could be very long-drawn out, but that would not be of interest. It is not a question of recrimination. We have to see what political problems are covered by this method of functioning of the IC. Objectives

accomplished demonstrate the whole efficacy of integrated intervention by the IC, but this intervention is limited to short-term objectives and requirements which remain partialised and do not participate in an overall understanding of what the IC is and what its tasks are. It is in this way that the achievement and the limits of the April 1966 IC Conference are expressed.

What is continuity?

The April 1966 Conference dispelled any confusion with regard to groups such as those of Robertson and *Voix Ouvrière* as well as with regard to Pabloism. No such thing exists as a great Trotskyist family made up of different groups, differing violently over numerous points but nevertheless belonging to the great Trotskyist family. The Fourth International is first of all its programme, the basis of which is the unity of the world class struggle, the unity of the historical development of the working class movement. *Voix Ouvrière* develop conceptions typical of petty-bourgeois idealism. They do not understand the dialectical development of the working class movement. The *Voix Ouvrière* method consists in presenting on the one hand the working class imprisoned by the bureaucratic machines, and on the other hand the revolutionaries, whose essential quality is their moral purity, in possession of eternal truths. For *Voix Ouvrière* it is a matter of building a party and then when they have built this party they will rescue the beautiful damsel in distress, the working class, and confound the wicked baron, the bureaucratic machine.

For them the Eastern European states are bourgeois states, China is a bourgeois state. The test by which they come to this evaluation is quite simple. There does not exist in China a Party holding the positions of *Voix Ouvrière* and which led the Chinese revolution, therefore there was no Chinese revolution; the Kremlin bureaucracy has definitely passed over the side of the bourgeois order on the international scale, so, since it controls the Eastern European countries, the states of these countries are bourgeois. The way the concrete development of the international class struggle, its historical and organic unity, come about through contradiction does not interest them at all. They want pure workers' parties and pure workers' states; the programme is at best a catalogue of recipes, even of schemes, from which one might use one and reject another. It is not the conscious expression of the movement of the world class struggle in the histori-

cal era of wars and revolutions, with a working class which is not a raw working class, but which in the course of a struggle of the old classes has organized itself as a class, which has won hard-fought conquests, and which fights from positions gained through contradictions which express the limits of its conquests. They apply the same method to the class struggle in France. Intervention in the unions is not a fight to be carried out by the Trotskyists starting from the positions of the working class and their defence. If they are present in the unions, it is only with a view to spotting militants who might be likely subjects for enrolment to *Voix Ouvrière*. To intervene in the unions in any other way is impossible since they, i.e. the unions, are not revolutionary. It is impossible to participate in electoral campaigns, to intervene in the class struggle in general, because first of all you need a revolutionary party. The relationship between intervention in the class struggle and the building of the revolutionary party is foreign to them for the same reasons that they do not understand the unity between the historical development of the working class movement and the programme of the Fourth International. They are building a sect with its rites and dogmas.

It is this method again which has kept them outside the Fourth International. Such and such an isolated remark may be more or less correct but is of no interest. Neither the First International, nor the Second International (nor the Bolshevik Party), nor the Third International, were free from contradictions. All the (revolutionary) petty bourgeois of the world justified their absence from the Third International and condemn Bolshevism because they said the Bolshevik Party engendered Stalinism. It is true that the possibility of Stalinism was inscribed in the Bolshevik Party. But they do not answer certain questions.

1. Through what channel did the struggle for proletarian revolution pass at the given historical stage?
2. What are the relationships between the development of the international class struggle and the development and then the transformation of the Bolshevik Party and of the Third International, or to put it another way, the dialectic of the relationship between the classes, between party and class, and inside the party which resulted in the degeneration of the Third International?
3. The Bolshevik Party and the Third International did not only degenerate; they gave birth to the Left Opposition and to the Fourth International. Did other historical paths exist?

Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky, far from proceeding in this manner, sited their fight by basing themselves on the overall relationships of the working class movement inside the First, Second and Third Internationals. What more pointed critique of the newly-born social-democratic party could surpass the critique of the Gotha Programme? Reading it, one is perfectly aware of the contradictions which existed inside social democracy right from its beginnings. But Marx explained that one step forward for the movement of the masses was worth more than a hundred programmes. Not that he had no consideration for the programme. Quite the opposite. But he considered that the setting up of the social-democratic party — with its contradictions included — would enable the proletariat to make steps forward in the class struggle and that the aim of the programme and its application was precisely this. He applied an oft-neglected dimension of Marxism linked to the relationship between theory and practice, that of organization; ideas and programmes do not exist in themselves but are always the product of an organized struggle and must find their expression in terms of organization. And the constitution of German social democracy was the answer in terms of organization, of political practice, to the problems of the class struggle in Germany at that stage of development of the workers' movement, and consequently was the answer for theoretical development and struggle. The living struggle would resolve the contradictions in one way or another, but it was inside social democracy that this struggle had to be waged. Although in effect social democracy finally degenerated, it was the indispensable historical link in the development of the workers' movement without which there would have been no Bolshevik Party, no Russian revolution etc.

During and after the war did the Fourth International under the leadership of Pablo, Germain, and Frank, with all its weaknesses and contradictions, constitute this political and organizational framework indispensable to the programme; was any other possible? The *VO* do not reply to these questions for the simple reason that the method of the programme and consequently the programme itself are foreign to them. They understand nothing of the organic development of the working class movement; they are the alchemists of the working class movement in search of the philosopher's stone.

The battle during the April 1966 Conference to proclaim the continuity of the Fourth International was the struggle for the programme's method and for the programme. In questioning membership of

the Fourth International during and after the war, in not agreeing to take responsibility for the continuity of the Fourth International, the VO intended the IC to align itself with their petty-bourgeois idealism and to liquidate the reasons for its struggle against Pabloism — the defence of the programme. The VO-Robertson bloc is explained not by their political agreement on an overall conception, but by their mutual need to attack the programme and to destroy the IC and its organizations which today constitute the political and organizational framework indispensable to the programme. The VO-Robertson bloc was possible because both renounced active intervention in the class struggle. Starting from apparently opposing political positions they both ended up by capitulating to the bureaucratic machines and the bourgeoisie. The struggle against Robertson is fully identified with the struggle against Pabloism. His positions join those of the SWP and the US where they are not those of Pablo. The battle in the Third Conference of the IC was important because it showed that there was not the slightest basis for a conciliatory attitude towards any variety of Pabloism, and that it was necessary for the IC to assume responsibility for the rebuilding of the Fourth International. The illusion that the rebuilding of the Fourth International could result from the fusion of the IC and the Pabloite US, even after a deep-going discussion, was dealt with *coup de grace* at the conference. It will be necessary to destroy the revisionist centre and its excrescences as well as the petty-bourgeois organizations of the VO type in the course of the struggle to build the Fourth International.

The achievement of the April Conference was ensuring that the IC took responsibility for the Fourth International, just as the latter took responsibility for the First, Second and Third Internationals. It was this continuity that enabled the programme of the Fourth International to be worked out and later enabled the IC to undertake the struggle against Pabloism. But this continuity is not an academic statement; it is concretised in intervention in the class struggle with a view to the building of Fourth International parties. It is by fighting Pabloism on an international scale, by defending the Hungarian revolution, and by formulating at every moment, the concrete answers to the problems of the class struggle in their countries, understood to be a particular expression of the world class struggle, that the SLL and OCI gave life to the IC and began to build themselves up. These struggles, in assuming the continuity of the Fourth International, mean that in the joint crisis of imperialism and the Kremlin

bureaucracy, the IC can and must undertake the tasks of rebuilding the Fourth International.

The Liège demonstration, the meetings commemorating the Hungarian Revolution, and the progress of the American section transcribe the achievement of the Third IC Conference into action. They express what was clarified in the course of that conference, the rebuilding of the Fourth International can only result from international activity by the IC.

The weaknesses and method of functioning of the IC have their origin in the fact that the preliminaries which had to be settled, and which were settled in the course of that conference, did not allow discussion to begin on the tasks of rebuilding the Fourth International starting from a whole conception. We now have to open this discussion.

Proclamation and construction of the Fourth International

To say that we have assumed and that we do assume responsibility for the continuity of the Fourth International, that the class struggle is world-wide, that the working class movement develops organically, does not enable us to suppose that this development is not precarious. These processes develop through contradictions. Having declared the bankruptcy of the Pabloite leadership, we cannot simply state that the Fourth International continues purely and simply, with the IC taking the place of the Pabloite IS. It was no little event, no little incident, that all the old leadership of the Fourth International capitulated under the pressure of imperialism and Stalinism, without any reaction from the majority of the sections. It is no mere nothing that the SWP having temporarily broken from the IS, fused with it in 1963 breaking with the IC and is now the leading wing of revisionism. In fact, the Pabloite crisis dislocated the Fourth International organizationally, accumulated theoretical and political problems to be resolved, developed political confusion inside organizations which could have evolved differently, and prevented organizations of the Fourth International being built in the world, despite the joint crisis of imperialism and the bureaucracy giving rise to conditions never before present.

We cannot shout 'the King is dead, long live the King'. We must open a discussion on these questions which has not yet been thoroughly undertaken inside the IC. For us it is indeed a question of rebuilding the Fourth International by bringing the fundamental

reasons for the Pabloite crisis into the light of day and drawing the lessons from it.

The origin of the Pabloite crisis lay in the inability of the leadership of the International to pose, and obviously, to resolve the problem of the building of the Fourth International and its parties. It developed a formal Marxism. For Marxist analysis it substituted empiricism and ideology.

We find the echo of positions defined by Trotsky and historically correct, but mechanically projected and indeed becoming false.

This mechanical projection, transforming a historical perspective into a *fait accompli*, had its finished expression in the conception of a finished Fourth International, and parties, endowed with a pyramid style hierarchy, with world congresses, of ultra-centralist status, which had only to strengthen itself progressively. In this respect it is interesting to compare the statutes worked out at the Second World Congress with those worked out at the Founding Conference of the Fourth International. First of all, the foundation of the Fourth International was carried out by a conference; the statutes planned for the calling every two years of a *conference*. Those worked out at the Second World Congress transformed the conference into a congress. This is no mere nuance; on the one hand there is the conception of a completely structured organization, on the other the conception of an organization which has to construct itself and whose structures must be extremely supple.

In affirming that the Fourth International existed, Trotsky considered it neither as constructed, nor as possessing a definitive structure. In 1935 he wrote:

Bolshevik Leninists consider themselves to be a faction of the International which is being built. They are, however, ready to work hand in hand with other really revolutionary factions. But they categorically refuse to adapt their politics to the psychology of opportunist cliques and to renounce their own banner.

Trotsky was perfectly well aware that it was a question of winning the proletarian vanguard, without which there is no International, no really constituted parties. The proclamation of the Fourth International was possible by virtue of the programme. It provided a framework for militants fighting for its construction and nothing else. Above all, it was not the solution for 'the crisis of revolutionary leadership'. It signified precisely the opposite — such as it was the Fourth International had to push forward the struggle for its solution.

Historical continuity, assured at programme level, was broken at cadre level by the physical destruction of a whole generation of Marxist revolutionary militants by Stalinism and Nazism.

This situation acquired all the more importance because the way in which the Second World War developed made it difficult for the Fourth International and its parties to take root.

The isolation of the European proletariat from that of other parts of the world during the war, as also the isolation of the Fourth International, contributed to the development of a formal internationalism.

The isolation of the proletariat of the USSR and of the East European countries from the proletariats of the advanced capitalist countries at the end of the war strengthened the tendency towards a sectionalized view of the world class struggle.

The leaders of the Fourth International were not capable of overcoming the situation.

Indeed, the IS was not even the leadership of the International. It was the former European secretariat, and in practice, its powers extended no further than the European organizations. The SWP and the LSSP maintained their independence. They took sovereign actions in their own zones of influence and gave their support to the IS provided that the latter confined its pretensions to Europe. The 'apparatus' of the Fourth International concealed, beneath the appearance of rigorous centralism, of a facade of internationalism, strong tendencies towards national narrowness of the SWP and the LSSP. At that stage, only political and theoretical working out in common and determining the tasks to be accomplished for its construction, could have cemented the international political unity of the movement, outside of which centralism is an empty word.

Basically, the Fourth International was destroyed under the pressure of hostile social forces; its leaders capitulated to Stalinism and the bourgeoisie through not having been able to define its tasks in the class struggle.

It came to grief at the moment during the course of the Cold War when the pressure of imperialism and Stalinism reached its highest point, when imperialism had reached a certain degree of stabilization in Europe and when the Kremlin bureaucracy (despite the Yugoslav crisis) seemed definitely to be in control of the social processes in Eastern Europe and the USSR and of the Chinese Revolution through the Korean war.

The conditions present in the working class movement at that time

were at the basis of the crisis of the Fourth International. There was not, however, some kind of implacable mechanical process leading to the crisis.

The role of the leadership is of capital importance in the future of a revolutionary organization. The crisis of the Fourth International comes back in the final analysis to the absence of a leadership sorted out in the class struggle. It is true that there is a direct relationship between the organization's situation in the class and the selection of the leadership but it is all the same definitely the question of the leadership which is of capital importance. The Fourth International worked out its programme thanks to the leadership of Trotsky; it was not able to avoid the development of the elements of crisis which it carried in itself, as does any revolutionary organization, and their qualitative transformation through the weakness of its leadership. The process of the decomposition of the Fourth International is not identifiable with the process of integration into bourgeois society of the Second International and the social-democratic organizations, or of the bureaucratization of the Bolshevik Party and the Comintern. It is linked to the selection of leadership.

There will be no real leadership until the day when this leadership is selected in the course of the accomplishment of the tasks of rebuilding the Fourth International and its parties.

Rebuild the Fourth International

The IC finds itself henceforth at another stage of its struggle. The perspective laid out by the April Conference has been confirmed. The joint crisis of imperialism and the Kremlin bureaucracy is deepening. While it would be mistaken to identify the Chinese bureaucracy and the Kremlin bureaucracy, the break-up of the Chinese bureaucracy under the pressure of fundamental class forces, international as well as Chinese, foreshadows the fate of all the bureaucratic apparatuses. The Kremlin bureaucracy's big panic over Mao Tse Tung's policy springs from the fact that this policy questions on an international scale the relationships between the CPs and the Kremlin bureaucracy, the relationships between the class and the CPs, between the militants and the apparatus, the relationships between the class and the CP, and the relationships inside the apparatuses. The process which was revealed in the 1953-1956 period continues on a much more considerable scale. The building of parties of the Fourth International and the

reconstruction of the Fourth International find conditions in the proletariat which have never been so favourable. The construction of parties of the Fourth International and the reconstruction of the Fourth International are closely linked. The IC must undertake these tasks together and it does not have the choice. But it must not confuse tomorrow with today. It must have a precise view of what it is and what its role is, as well as a perspective, a strategy, for the reconstruction of the Fourth International. Nowhere do there exist parties or leading organizations of the Fourth International, unless it is a class sector. The IC is not the leadership of the Fourth International. The forces for the construction of parties exist in a certain number of countries. The IC is the motive force for the rebuilding of the Fourth International.

A correct appreciation of our position in the class struggle is indispensable, because it conditions our policy. Let us take two examples.

First example: between 1944 and 1951 it was customary for the PCI to send letters to the PB of the French CP to offer it a united front, organization to organization. What sector did the PCI lead which could provide a basis for a united front between it and the French CP? None.

Now our policy of a united front is different. We express the demands of the advanced workers to the leaderships recognized by the working class (SFIO, French CP, union leaderships); it is necessary to break with the bourgeoisie and bring about the united class front.

We strive at every moment to express this in concrete forms in relation to the development of the class struggle. We bring together and organize layers of youth, workers and militants to struggle for the united front. Through these battles for the united front we are building the OCI, demonstrating the necessity for a revolutionary party built on the programme of the Fourth International. In other words, it is through considering all the relations existing inside the working class that we determine our policy, including taking into account our own situation in the working class movement. In this way it is possible in certain circumstances even to prepare outflanking actions.

The principle of demonstrations at the Labour Party conference and the MP slogan seems to us to express the same orientation. It enables working-class militants and shop stewards to be grouped and organized round the SLL and YS keeping their own physiognomy.

Second example: at the time of the crisis between the Kremlin bureaucracy and the Yugoslav CP, the IS sent letters to the leadership

of the YCP asking it in practice to rally to the programme of the Fourth International. In return, it placed the Fourth International at the service of the YCP, notably by making a lot of the law setting up management committees.

Here already was the other side of the coin. After having considered in practice that the Fourth International was a finished organization requiring only to be strengthened progressively, the IS was on the look-out for miraculous methods of building the International — the transformation of the YCP into a Trotskyist party.

If it was correct to support Yugoslavia unconditionally against the Kremlin bureaucracy which wanted to strangle it, it was inadmissible to identify the policy of the Fourth International with that of the YCP and it was a renunciation of the tasks of building the Fourth International to expect the YCP, without crisis, without a split, that is to say, without exploding, to rally to the Fourth International.

On the question of China, a problem of the same nature is posed. We defend unconditionally the conquests of the Chinese Revolution; that is why we did not enter into the struggle between the wing of the bureaucracy supporting Mao and the wing which capitulates to the Kremlin and imperialism. We do not entrust them with building the Chinese section of the Fourth International, any more than we entrust the Red Guards as an organization to transform themselves into a party of the Fourth International.

The principles expounded by Trotsky in *In Defence of Marxism* enable us to orientate ourselves in the existing situation in China. 'In Defence of the USSR', p. 57 in *In Defence of Marxism* (American edition) . . .

The wing of the Chinese bureaucracy which is capitulating is the vanguard of imperialism. Mao and those who follow him are defending in their way the conquests of the Chinese Revolution. They are obliged to appeal to the masses in a certain way and at the same time they try and will try to strangle any class movement. The break-up of the Chinese bureaucracy opened up the voice of the masses and that is demonstrated inside the Red Guards. The masses tend to rush forward through the fissures in the apparatus and to act to their own plan and with their own method. We stand unconditionally with Mao against the wing of the Chinese bureaucracy capitulating to the Kremlin and imperialism; we stand with the masses against Mao. If it can come out of the Red Guard movement, out of the break-up of the Chinese CP, only a party based on the programme of the Fourth

International can bring the political revolution in China to a successful conclusion.

But how can the IC begin the construction of a section of the Fourth International in China? By waiting for some 'natural Marxists' to reveal themselves in China? There will be no more natural Marxists in China than there are in Cuba, Algeria, or elsewhere. To come on to the programme of the Fourth International, it is necessary for the historical continuity which the IC represents to enable the vanguard militants and workers to resume relations with the Bolshevism of Lenin and Trotsky. Declarations about China and the sending of a 'missionary' would resolve little by themselves. The IC cannot answer except by acting along the lines of the rebuilding of the Fourth International. Otherwise, to repeat unceasingly that a revolutionary party must be built in China, in Cuba, or in Algeria, risks being a gratuitous statement and eventually an alibi. The IC can do it only by starting from a whole conception of the rebuilding of the Fourth International, including a correct appreciation of the position it occupies in it.

It is correct to say that the success of the revolution in Cuba, China, Algeria, etc. is conditioned by the building and the struggle of parties of the Fourth International. But this is, after all, only a general statement and we have to go a bit deeper. The real question is: why were such parties not built in spite of the enormous revolutionary crises in these countries? We must go deeper still. How is it that the LSSP collapsed, that the Vietnamese section of the FI likewise collapsed and that in Latin America utter confusion exists inside organizations calling themselves Trotskyist and which belonged to the FI? The theory of the Permanent Revolution provides the key both to the revolutionary crises in these countries and to the fact that parties of the FI were either not built there or collapsed. Ultimately, it is as a part of the world proletariat that the working class in these countries is able to take the power and hang on to it. This is the essence of the Trotskyist movement. The Russian working class took the power in 1917 as a part of the international working class. It was because there was in existence a Bolshevik Party, *the product of the international working-class movement*, that the Russian working class was able to take advantage of the existing balance of class forces in Russia. Not only as a result of the objective conditions, but in relation to a given development in the international working-class movement. In the same way, the degeneration of the Russian Revolution, of the Bolshevik Party and of the Third International did not result only from

the objective conditions in the USSR, or in the world in general. It was also a product of a particular development in the international working-class movement: social democracy becoming the main obstacle to the victory of the revolution in Germany and Europe: so true is it that in the last analysis it is men who make their own history. There is no doubt that the impetus of the Russian Revolution had an enormous effect on the struggle of the working classes in the backward countries and on the national liberation struggles in these countries. The degeneration of the Third International led to the defeat of the Chinese Revolution. The crisis in which imperialism found itself at the end of the Second World War, in Europe, the cradle of imperialism, brought a fantastic new upsurge in these struggles. The Chinese revolution came out of this upsurge whilst through the Chinese CP it was linked to the Russian Revolution.

It is undeniable that Trotsky attached the greatest importance to the second Chinese Revolution. The Third International brought about the defeat of the Chinese Revolution. And yet he came to the conclusion that the Third International had definitely gone over to the camp of the bourgeoisie, after the German CP capitulated to Hitler without a struggle. It would be a mistake to think that any single factor determined Trotsky's position. Between 1927 and 1933 the bureaucracy in the Soviet Union had strengthened its position, and the Third International had been Stalinised. And yet, that was not the decisive factor. Proof of this is the fact that during the enormous crisis resulting from the application of the first two years of the 5-year plan, Stalin's position in the Politburo was threatened and the recall of Trotsky was even on the cards. But the capitulation of the German CP to Hitler was quite another matter because of the decisive weight of the German proletariat in the international class struggle and particularly in Europe. The fact that the other parties in the Comintern did not react at all was itself an indication of the consequences for the Comintern of the capitulation of the German CP and the defeat of the German working class without a struggle.

We now have to tie the two ends together. We must first analyse what were the particular national conditions which brought about a situation where, despite revolutionary upheavals, parties of the FI were not built in China, Cuba, Algeria and elsewhere, that the LSSP capitulated, the Vietnamese section of the FI was destroyed, and that such complete confusion exists in the South American parties which call themselves Trotskyist. But all of these particular conditions must

be situated within the framework of the history of the international working-class movement with the decisive weight of the working-class movement being placed in the advanced countries, in which the capitalist mode of production is the prevailing one, and the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries, and particularly Europe (including the Soviet Union).

The crisis of imperialism in Europe and the struggles of the working class were the decisive factors making possible revolutionary developments in the backward countries. Even now it is the relation of class forces in Europe in the main that prevents American imperialism from turning its full destructive might against China. The unpardonable crime of the Pabloites is their support for the 'pacifist' policies put forward by de Gaulle, which are part and parcel of the policies of American imperialism because they paralyse the European working class. The anger of the Pabloites at Liège and the importance of our demonstration stem from this — that in our slogans of 'The enemy is at home' and 'Long live the Hungarian revolution' we expressed the decisive importance in the class struggle of the European working class. Revolutionary struggles in the backward countries in turn deepen the crisis of imperialism. But the reason why, in spite of this, no parties of the FI have been built in these countries is this, that in the advanced countries, the workers' movement and the working class have stayed chained to the bureaucratic apparatus, thus obstructing the development of a world perspective from the working classes of the backward countries and their vanguard: since the FI was unable concretely to advance this perspective for building its own parties in Europe. Where parties claiming allegiance to the FI were built, it was through the relationship with the FI and its base in the workers movement in the advanced countries. Weak though this was, it was enough to allow the putting forward of a world perspective.

It is because the collapse of the Pabloites closed this perspective that these organizations collapsed or capitulated or foundered in the confusion introduced by petty-bourgeois tendencies. And the collapse of the Pabloites is itself related to their inability to pose correctly the problems of building the FI, particularly in the advanced countries. The reconstruction of the FI demands a very clear understanding of these phenomena. Far from leading us to neglect the work in the backward countries with China, Cuba, Africa, South America, etc. in view, a correct perspective for the reconstruction of the FI puts the

work of building parties of the FI in these countries in its right perspective and gives it meaning.

The FI will only be rebuilt insofar as the IC takes on, in a conscious and systematic way, the tasks of building parties based on the programme of the FI in Europe, in the Eastern European countries as well as in the West.

The nerve centre of the reconstruction of the FI is Europe. The whole development of the class struggle confirms the necessity for such a strategy to rebuild the FI. The combined crisis of imperialism and the Soviet bureaucracy is most acute in Europe. The old imperialist powers of Europe are being stifled within the boundaries in which they grew up, but they cannot escape without setting in motion a massive crisis. They are forced to radically alter their economic structure, with all the social upheavals that entails, involving every layer of society, whether it be the working class, the petty bourgeoisie, or even the big bourgeoisie. They have their own specific interests, which the bourgeois state in each country protects, interests which are mutually antagonistic, and at the same time they can only survive in an interdependent unit. The European imperialist powers could not remain in existence without US imperialism.

If US imperialism were to experience a sharp crisis forcing it to reconsider its own position, the crisis would rebound on the European imperialist powers with redoubled force. Again the particular needs of the European imperialist powers are not necessarily in accordance with the short term requirements of US imperialism and its policies. All of these contradictions are heightened by the division of Europe into two. The future of the European imperialists is bound up with the capitalist penetration of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, and each nation works towards this for its own individual benefit. But in all their sections, and this is the only way they can act, they lean heavily on the US imperialist giant trying to exploit to their own advantage the economic, military and political pressure that the US puts on the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and China. All these combined contradictions make themselves felt in France, in Britain, in Germany, throughout Europe in fact. They are intimately linked with the contradictions of Stalinism.

The development of the productive forces in the USSR and the Eastern European countries reaches a stage where it is entirely incompatible with their control by the bureaucracy. Harmonious development of the productive forces demands:

1. The participation of the masses in management. This can only be realized by a political revolution carried out by the working class (and *not* by management committees of the Yugoslav type).
2. Economic co-operation between the various countries. This co-operation is impossible as long as national oppression continues, and as long as the economy is managed by bureaucratic cliques, striving to maintain their own national base and dependent on the Soviet bureaucracy.
3. Integration into the international division of labour. But in the long run, this integration, especially from the standpoint of an economy managed by the bureaucracy is just as dangerous for the planned development of the means of production on the basis of state ownership as the autarchy of the 'Socialist states', as long as imperialism disposes of the most productive forces. Ultimately, it can only be realized in a progressive way by the European working class taking over the productive forces, i.e., by the victory of the proletarian revolution in Europe.

The effects of Yugoslavia's closer integration into the world market serve to illustrate the disintegration with which capitalist penetration threatens the planned economy. At the present time, Poland, Czechoslovakia and East Germany are encircled by German capital which has penetrated (in various forms) Hungary, Bulgaria and Rumania. The very existence of the working class in these countries is in question.

There is a bourgeois, imperialist solution to the crisis — a united Germany and the complete reconstruction of the European economy on the basis of the capitalist mode of production. It would necessitate tragic upheavals and radical changes, depending on the balance of forces between the rival imperialisms. It could not conceivably happen without the crushing of the working classes of both Western and Eastern Europe. The Soviet bureaucracy is unable to provide any solution to these problems. It can only try to gain time, to stick it out a bit longer. It is absolutely bankrupt.

There is a proletarian solution to this crisis: The United Socialist States of Europe. As always it will all be fought out in the class struggle.

We are, in Europe, on the brink of titanic class conflicts, which it is no exaggeration to say will be decisive for humanity. Of course, in each country these conflicts will have their own particular features, but there is a direct tie-up between these struggles of the British,

French, Italian, Spanish and German working classes, and indeed of the Eastern European working class as well. It wasn't just words when we said that the social and political revolution are jointly on the agenda in Europe.

It is in relation to Europe that the crisis of Stalinism assumes its real importance, and the raising of the question of the relationship between the masses and the bureaucracy by Mao and the wing of the Chinese bureaucracy he represents shows its real scope.

The new relationships between the masses and the apparatus, so brutally disclosed in 1953-6, have not ceased to operate. The defeat of the Hungarian revolution and the coming to power of de Gaulle have served to moderate and more particularly to mask the new relationships.

The absence of parties of the FI, and of an FI itself, shut off the European working class from the perspective of revolutionary unity which is the only way its struggles can go forward. The outcome of the joint crisis of imperialism and the Soviet bureaucracy depends on the revolutionary combination of the working classes of Western and Eastern Europe. Its conscious expression, i.e. in practice, can only be the IC. The IC must take on its shoulders the tasks of rebuilding the FI in terms of a deep understanding of the decisive importance of Europe.

Win new layers to the Fourth International

There can be no reconstruction of the FI without a constant battle against revisionism. In this respect the present political line of the revisionist leadership is a masterpiece of betrayal. Its political evolution during this year is notable mainly for the turn made on the Chinese question. Here is shown for all to see its role as the rearguard of the bureaucracy and of the bourgeoisie. Having drawn up a balance sheet of correct propositions on the Chinese question like good accountants, and lectured us on the 'rectification of the Communist movement', the Pabloites go on to abstractly condemn the cultural revolution. They take part in the campaign of the Soviet bureaucracy against Mao Tse Tung and the section he represents. They do not criticize him from the point of view of the working class, but from the standpoint of the Soviet bureaucracy: 'The Chinese are helping imperialism by refusing to carry out the united front against imperialism.'

The same orientation is expressed in their support for the Bertrand Russell Peace Committee and the movement for the 'Billion francs for Vietnam'. P. Frank's signature following the Gaullist MPs puts the Pabloite type of politics right where they belong. Frank participates in a campaign run jointly by imperialism and the Soviet bureaucracy against the conquests of the Chinese Revolution. And the position of the Pabloites at Liège who opposed the slogans of the IC, and, in particular, the banner 'Long Live the Hungarian Revolution' on the grounds that the united front for 'Peace in Vietnam and against NATO' should not be broken, is part and parcel of this sort of politics. To complete this orientation the SWP supports a Stalinist candidate in the New York state elections campaigning for a pacifist policy from the Democratic Party, and the Unified Secretariat proposes that the LSSP (Revolutionary) should turn towards a united front with the bourgeois MLF movement of Mrs. Bandaranaike.

Another concrete expression of this sort of politics is the justification of Castro's attack on Trotskyism.

J. Hansen tells us that Castro couldn't do anything else, in the best interests of the Cuban Revolution he could not break with Moscow.

From this political standpoint it is possible to understand the campaign unleashed by the SWP and the US against G. Healy, the SLL and the IC. What we have here is a campaign of slander, pure and simple. It began with the pamphlet 'Healy reconstructs the Fourth International' which attempted to spread the lie, with the help of Robertson, that the methods of G. Healy, the SLL, and the IC are plain, straightforward violence. It then continued with the campaign against the use of Stalinist methods by Revoltes and Liège. It really gets going when 'Gerry Healy' is accused of having a Pabloite militant beaten up in London and of having more or less been at the back of a violent attack on a JCR member at a meeting held by the OCI on the 4th November in Paris. This is nothing but a frenzied witchhunt with the object of discrediting the IC by any and every means. It is entirely in keeping with the political line being pursued by the Unified Secretariat. It has become a necessity to the Unified Secretariat, especially since Liège where it underwent a shattering political defeat on its own ground. It is a carefully prepared provocation.

The danger is that under cover of such a campaign, Stalinist provocations and even all sorts of crimes could be perpetrated. Within the organizations of the US, this kind of politics and these methods open the door wide to the infiltration of agents of the Soviet bureaucracy.

Furthermore, the development of the campaign in Britain itself is asking for police intervention against the SLL. *Socialist Leader* and *Peace News* hastened to publish Tate's letter. At the same time as the SLL and the YS are campaigning to put the fake-lefts in the Labour Party on the spot, the Pabloites viciously help to defend them. For all these reasons the SLL was quite right to use all the legal means at its disposal to put *Socialist Leader* and *Peace News* on the spot.

The notable thing about this type of politics is that it separates the question of Vietnam, and the crisis of the Chinese bureaucracy from the struggle of the working class in the advanced countries, particularly Europe. Our victory over revisionism at Liège arose precisely from the fact that we expressed the need for uniting the two.

We should not reject all the forces that the US controls and consider them as being lost to Trotskyism.

The Pabloite crisis is only in the last analysis an expression of the joint crisis of imperialism and the Soviet bureaucracy. The work of the IC and its sections, on the theoretical level as well as in the construction, or reconstruction of sections like the British and French sections, deepens this crisis.

It would be a mistake, however, to think that the Pabloite international is going to disappear of its own accord. The crisis of imperialism and the Soviet bureaucracy will set in motion centrist tendencies, which will fall an easy prey to Pabloism, which is not above political adaptation. They could be a source of new recruits for the Pabloite international if this is not destroyed.

Our aim is to destroy it as an obstacle to the rebuilding of the FI. In no way is it intended to lead up to a reunification of opposites. From that standpoint tactical manoeuvres are not merely possible — they are absolutely necessary — with the political aim of destroying the Pabloite international. What makes this even more necessary is the fact that we consider that not all the organizations and all the militants inside the Pabloite international are lost to Trotskyism, and we think they can be broken from Pabloism.

But these operations will be more effective if they have behind them the IC carrying out the tasks of reconstructing the FI. Tactical manoeuvres with the purpose of destroying the Pabloite international are a component part of the reconstruction of the FI, although not, of course, the most important aspect.

In the fight to rebuild the FI the IC must as a duty make a more precise estimation of the organizations included in the Pabloite Inter-

national. For instance, in particular, our general principles are not sufficient to direct the activity of the groups connected with the IC in the USA and to provide a basis for their reunification. The IC must have an understanding based on a serious study of what exactly the SWP represents.

Given that the Pabloite International is a hostile organization, work as a faction within it is not only permissible, it is necessary.

However, the task of rebuilding the FI can only advance decisively by our winning over to the programme of the FI new layers of militants who had no previous connection with Trotskyism, layers of youth, won over in a struggle against Stalinism and social democracy.

The IC and the organizations adhering to it must defend in its entirety the programme of the FI and carry its banner, in the knowledge that the FI has still to be rebuilt; winning over new layers means they are not steeped in the programme of the FI. It is not enough to announce that our programme is the only valid programme, we have to prove it, not only by defending it in our literature, but proving its value by our ability to translate it into terms of intervention in the class struggle.

This is true in all sectors, but more particularly for the youth. The building of a revolutionary youth movement depends on our ability to open up to the youth a perspective of a struggle against disqualification. We do not hide from them the fact that it is only based on the programme of the FI that they are able to fight, to join with the working class, and make a reality of the unity in struggle of youth exploited by imperialism and oppressed by the Soviet bureaucracy. We do not make it a condition for young people who want to organize themselves to fight that they should belong to the FI. The condition we make for organizing with us in the same youth movement is that they take up the struggle in a class way. We don't ask for a formal *a priori* agreement with the programme of the FI. If we are to regroup all the youth who want to fight under the banner of the FI, the FI must also prove its ability to respond to the problems of the class struggle, and to bring about the unity in struggle of the international working class, i.e. it must be built. Of course, building revolutionary movements in the different countries and a youth international is one aspect of the reconstruction of the FI, but it is only one aspect.

The IC is faced with a very complex task. It represents the continuity of the FI, the driving-force for reconstruction. Through a strategy seen in terms of the development of the class struggle, it must

drive forward to build up groups and organizations which are in agreement with the programme of the FI and affiliated to the IC. This question is decisive. Without Trotskyist cells, groups and organization, no matter how weak, there must be dilution. That is why any development is conditional on Trotskyist expression and organization and on their consolidation, and the first task of the IC is to work and to intervene so that Trotskyist organizations are built in the different countries. Wide layers which will not accept an ultimatum to belong to the FI will nevertheless come into struggle. We must organize them. This is how we prove the validity of the programme. We cannot behave as if the present position and significance of the FI in the class struggle made it a pole of attraction similar to the Third International with the Russian Revolution and the Bolshevik Party behind it. That is not what the tradition of Bolshevism means: what it does mean is what Trotsky was defending when he wrote in 1935 what I quoted before.

Action and Discussion

This report only serves to open the discussion by raising a certain number of problems. It is absolutely necessary that this discussion should take place and that it should be on as high a level as possible. But since it cannot be an academic discussion it must go on simultaneously with the carrying out of the tasks confronting the IC. At its last meeting the IC confirmed or decided on:

1. The International Youth Assembly
2. The Commemoration of the 50th Anniversary of the Russian Revolution
3. The publication of the bulletin of the IC in English and French.

While still continuing the discussion in preparation for the Fourth Conference we must work out a plan of activity for the IC to integrate the international work of its sections. The regular functioning of the IC and a budget for the IC are the main points for integrating the work of the sections. Work in Germany, Italy, Belgium and Eastern Europe must become the job of the IC as such and not of one section or another. The same goes for the USA. Although it is obvious for practical reasons, this or that section may be given particular tasks. The IC must work towards its bulletin being both the expression of its work and an instrument in carrying out its work. Under these conditions it will be a weapon for the reconstruction of the FI, because it will direct the work and be an organizing factor for the IC.

DOCUMENT 12**Reply to the OCI by the Central Committee of the SLL, June 19, 1967***1. The crisis of imperialism and the building of the revolutionary leadership*

Internationally the working class is undergoing a radicalization because of the deepening and unresolved crisis of imperialism, linked with the crisis of the Stalinist bureaucracy. This linked crisis inevitably creates conditions where the problem of revolutionary leadership to prepare the struggle for power is the predominant and pressing one. In one country after another, the Stalinists, the reformists and the bourgeois nationalists are unable to discipline the masses sufficiently to permit the imperialists to impose their demands in the old way, and the ruling class seeks to impose more direct forms of state or military control on the working class and its allies. The powers demanded by Pompidou, and the military coup in Greece, are no less signs of the process than the fall of Soekarno and the massacre of the Communist Party of Indonesia, and the right-wing coups throughout Africa.

The future of the Fourth International is represented in the stored-up hatred and experience of millions of workers for the Stalinists and reformists who betray their struggles. The Fourth International must consciously fight for leadership to meet this need. Our Hungarian section was built on the basis of struggle against the revision of Bolshevism as the only way of learning the lessons of 1956 and arming those who went through that experience. Only this struggle against revisionism can prepare the cadres to take the leadership of the millions of workers drawn into the struggle against capitalism and against the bureaucracy. In the United States, too, it has only been those who built on the basis of the International Committee in its struggle against revisionism who have raised the banner of Marxism.

against the capitulation of the SWP. The revisionism of the leaders of the Socialist Workers Party (USA) has brought them to subordinate everything to the petty-bourgeois radicals in the anti-war movement, in the Negro movement and in electoral alliances. The revisionist forces internationally have similarly placed themselves directly in the service of bourgeois pacifism, a special weapon against the revolutionary forces of the IC. In France the 'Milliard for Vietnam',¹ jointly appealed for with Stalinists and Gaullists, in Britain the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation.² This brand of pacifism can no more than any other conceal for long its anti-working-class character. Agents of the Unified Secretariat³ in Belgium have now designated de Gaulle's military relationship with NATO as 'objectively progressive'! Through vilification and dirty provocations, such as the 'Tate' incident in Britain, these liquidationists carry out a special task for the ruling class against the Fourth International. This is why they concentrate on Britain and France. In Britain the Socialist Labour League and Young Socialists have struck a major blow in defeating the reformists and Stalinists in the youth movement, and preparing a force which emerges as the concrete political alternative to more and more workers. Such a breakthrough in the struggle of the independent revolutionary leadership against the reformists and Stalinists is the most dangerous development of all for the imperialists, for the bureaucratic apparatuses, and for the revisionists themselves. This successful battle against the Labour Party machine and the Stalinists was fought solidly on the basis of a struggle for Bolshevik principles and organization in the training of a cadre, starting from the struggle against revisionism.

The crisis of imperialism itself, its inevitable drive to impose new forms of state control and integration of the unions into the state, brings to the fore the question of preparation for workers' power. Only the International Committee fights to subordinate all tactical questions to this main strategic task and the building of the type of Party to accomplish this subordination and centralization. That is the meaning of Bolshevism. Any move away from centralism, any irres-

¹ A campaign for financing relief in Vietnam, North and South alike, with appeals signed by Pabloite revisionist leaders as well as Stalinists and Gaullists.

² A bourgeois pacifist organization, to which the British Pabloites have subordinated their activity.

³ The 'centre' for the Pabloite revisionists led by Frank, Germain (Mandel) and Hansen.

possible and half-thought-out questioning of the principles of Bolshevism, is in this context a concession to the class pressure spearheaded by the revisionists.

2. *The fight against Pabloite revisionism*

The revolutionary movement has always based its forward development on a struggle against revisionism. Pablo's revisionism was aimed at the heart of the Fourth International: the conscious struggle for alternative leadership based on revolutionary theory. The fight against Pablo began on issues of his imposition on the movement of a capitulation to the Stalinist bureaucracy. The IC could only build on the positive struggle against this capitulation to the extent that the issues were consciously deepened to understand the methodological sources of it. Pablo, Germain, etc. could only reject the basic programme after they had abandoned the dialectical materialist foundations of Marxism. These foundations had to be understood once more, in the process of a fight, in their living development and connection with the deepest objective forces of the present epoch. The discussion which began in 1952-3 had to be taken to the end. Pabloite revisionism reflected the pressure of imperialism inside the Trotskyist movement. This pressure is continuous. The purpose of the fight against revisionism is to expose the actual sources and forms of this pressure, for without the fight against revisionism the expressions of this pressure will recur in one form or another. It is only in this fight that Marxism, through the revolutionary party, penetrates to the fundamental objective forces at work in the class struggle. Around these theoretical conclusions the cadre is built.

It was therefore necessary to fight not just against the particular results of Pablo's revisionism — entry *sui generis*,⁴ acceptance of the progressive role of the Stalinist bureaucracy and its agents, etc. — but to understand that Pabloism was a fundamental break with Marxism, with Bolshevism. The struggle was taken up specifically at this level, after the experiences of 1956, with the leadership of the Socialist Workers' Party. Their response to the deepening of the crisis of imperialism and the bureaucracy was to seek a way back to the Pabloites. This reaction to the 1956 revolutions and later to the Cuban

⁴ Entry into the social-democratic and Stalinist parties, but entry 'of a special kind', meaning for an indefinite period, in the expectation that it was in these bureaucratic organizations that the 'objective development towards socialism' would take place.

revolution was justified by them only through a descent into the crudest pragmatism and empiricism. The failure of the SWP to heed Trotsky's warning — to do battle for dialectical materialism against pragmatism — was the essence of their failure to prepare theoretically for the struggle in the Fourth International and in the American class struggle. Inevitably they capitulated to the method of Pabloism and to the politics of the petty-bourgeois radicals in the US.

We first insisted that the whole Pablo split and what lay behind it must be discussed in the international movement. Thus we had to fight for a Marxist approach to our own history and against the unprincipled 'unity', blurring over differences, prepared by the SWP and the Pabloites. Involved here was the basic question of continuity of the Marxist movement, established in struggle against revisionism. The SWP leaders pressed ahead towards 'unity' on the grounds that the IC ignored the new 'facts' of the world situation: 'facts' about the supposed natural evolution of non-Marxist non-proletarian forces like Castro and Ben Bella to Trotskyism. The independent revolutionary party was no longer the central question: Marxism was distorted into a crude objectivism. The relation between revolutionary theory and the class struggle, through the revolutionary party, had to be fought for against this liquidationism and rejection of Marxism. Hansen was eventually forced to reveal his revisionism at its source, with his classic formula: 'Marxism is consistent empiricism.'

3. Trotskyism and the crisis of leadership

Trotsky and his collaborators founded the Fourth International as the necessary political and theoretical continuation of Marxism and Bolshevism, to conduct the struggle above all against those who had betrayed the working class. This betrayal and its consequences, the most serious of which was the threat to destroy the revolutionary tradition, theory and cadres of the working class, were recognized and estimated by Trotsky in order to prepare for the defeat of the traitors in a struggle against them. But the revisionists *accepted* the consequences of these betrayals, particularly in the situation after World War II, as objective and unalterable facts to which they must adapt. They abandoned the dialectical materialist analysis of the class basis of these betrayals and the forces which could overturn them. It was necessary for the IC to carry forward the analysis and programme of Trotsky, against the revisionists' capitulation to the betrayal of leadership.

That involved a long battle for dialectical materialism in philosophy and method, for a dialectical, class analysis of the world situation, of the crisis in the Stalinist bureaucracy, of the so-called 'colonial revolution', and of the central importance of revolutionary leadership. From this analysis we were able to direct our party work to the radicalization of the working class internationally, and particularly to the new working-class forces among the youth. Through this orientation we were able to make definite gains in independent struggle against the Social Democracy and the Stalinists. The sharpening crisis in the international class struggle brings out ever clearer the central role of this preparation by the IC.

Through the struggle with the SWP, and their unprincipled unity with the Pabloites, and then in analysing and intervening in the crisis in the LSSP⁵, the International Committee established in struggle the fact that Pabloite revisionism is outright liquidationism, carried through on the basis of a rejection of the basic essentials of Marxism. Further, in the fight against it, the concentration must be above all upon the unity of Marxist theory and practice in the building of the revolutionary party. Marxism is a whole, and the basic questions of dialectical materialism are approached directly through the problems of building revolutionary leadership in this epoch.

As the sections of the IC confront the problem of actual alternative leadership, in response to the radicalization caused by the linked crisis of imperialism and the bureaucracy, a new stage must begin in the struggle against this revisionism. The building of the International in these favourable objective circumstances, and the solution of tasks of working-class leadership in the national sections, demand advances on the basis of the conquests made against Pabloite revisionism. The first prerequisite is to grasp that the fight against Pabloism was a fight to develop Marxism and at the same time to defend *every* past conquest of Marxist theory. The 1966 Conference of the IC expressed this clearly in insisting that the IC, through its struggle inside the FI, represented the continuity of the movement. Against *Voix Ouvrière* and Robertson, we insisted that only in the fight against Pabloism had Marxists preserved and developed the theory of the revolutionary party, of Bolshevism. The sections of the IC will only develop as Trotskyist parties insofar as they base themselves on *all* these gains,

⁵ The Lanka Samasamaja Party (Ceylon), which in 1964, after many years of work as a party accepting the Trotskyist programme, and working with the Pabloite revisionist 'International', entered the capitalist coalition government of Mrs. Bandaranaike.

understanding that the continuity we fought for comprised every development in Marxism and Leninism.

What was theoretically implicit in the position of the revisionists — capitulation to the basic positions of the class enemy — is now expressed in their political line on every question, especially their going over to bourgeois pacifism. The dialectic of the discussion has overtaken them, despite the fact that they rejected the dialectic.

But the International Committee must also understand its own development dialectically. Our own activity and fight against the revisionists has forced them to their present position. But it was not a defensive fight. We were engaged in consciously going over, on the basis of our theoretical gains, to the actual struggle for leadership. The new developments in the crisis of imperialism and the Stalinist bureaucracy, and in the struggle against Pabloism, make it urgent that this task is the principal one to be resolved. The OCI gives answers different from ours. This is because the lessons of the fight against revisionism have not yet been learned. *The revolutionary party, Bolshevism, was the target of the revisionists.* The basis for our work is the carrying forward of this Bolshevik method of leadership.

4. *The Fourth International is not dead*

This was why at the 1966 IC Conference we rejected out of hand the formulation, 'The Fourth International is dead', 'Pabloite revisionism destroyed the Fourth International', etc. Behind this formula petty-bourgeois groups (*Voix Ouvrière*,⁶ Robertson⁷) wanted to scrap the history of the Fourth International and the fight for Bolshevism. Their avowed opposition to Pabloism had *this* content. How have these groups evolved in one short year? Under the pressure of the crisis of imperialism, they were brought to collaborate with the revisionists in a direct attack on the IC and particularly the SLL and G. Healy in the Tate provocation. Robertson continued propaganda denunciation of the Socialist Workers' Party's politics, but welcomed their 'objective struggle' and 'right' to use his factional

⁶ A group around the paper *Voix Ouvrière* ('Workers Voice') claiming to be Trotskyists, but rejecting the history of the Fourth International, and rejecting also the fight against revisionism as the basis of development of Marxist leadership.

⁷ Robertson, leader of the 'Spartacist' group (USA), which broke from the SWP, but rejects internationalism and the basic importance of the fight against revisionism.

material in their hysterical attempts to destroy the Socialist Labour League. The SWP and the Pabloites avoided above all a discussion of history in 1963 when they broke from the IC; Robertson and Co., *Voix Ouvrière*, etc. wanted to say, 'The Fourth International is dead—start again on the "concrete possibilities" of today, recognize "other" Trotskyists.' They end up by joining the revisionist attack. The fight for *theory* and for continuity, which was carried out and won by our two sections, has proved the touchstone. The French comrades must, therefore, halt and reverse their new course when they return in their document to the formula (p.9 of the English translation) 'The FI was destroyed under the pressure of hostile social forces'. The OCI delegates voted for the SLL's amendment that the FI was *not* destroyed. It is not possible to go forward and build revolutionary parties except on this basis. Those who left the Conference on this issue joined the attack on the SLL by those who have gone over to the camp of bourgeois pacifism *and they will never return*. We tell the OCI: You cannot separate the return to this formula, together with your attacks on centralized organization and the supposed 'ultimatism' of the Socialist Labour League, from the line-up of revisionist forces on exactly these questions. In the preparation for the Fourth Conference of the International Committee, as our SLL 9th Congress resolution makes clear, we will fight to reaffirm the decisions and gains of the April 1966 Conference. Having insisted there on the continuity of the Fourth International, rejecting the formula 'The Fourth International is dead' as a middle-class, pessimistic rejection of the revolutionary role of the working class and of revolutionary consciousness, we went on to formulate in the Commission on the tasks of the International Committee, the central principles of the type of Party we build, a Bolshevik party. We stressed that all trade union work, youth work, etc. was subordinated to this task. We specifically rejected all 'spontaneity' and syndicalist theories of the 'organic' or 'natural' emergence of revolutionary parties through struggle. Now the radicalization of the workers in Western Europe is proceeding rapidly, particularly in France. The election results there, the threat of a return to the political instability of the ruling class in the Fourth Republic, the mounting strike struggles, the taking of emergency powers — all these place a premium on revolutionary preparation. There is *always* a danger at such a stage of development that a revolutionary party responds to the situation in the working class not in a revolutionary way, but by adaptation to the level of struggle to which the workers

are restricted by their own experience under the old leaderships, i.e. to the inevitable initial confusion. Such revisions of the fight for the independent Party and the Transitional Programme are usually dressed up in the disguise of getting closer to the working class, unity with all those in struggle, not posing ultimatums, abandoning dogmatism, etc.

The statement by the French section must be analysed against this background. It attempts to justify a rejection of the main political gains of the 1966 Conference and the fight against revisionism in the Fourth International.

It is a big mistake to see the long battle against Pabloite revisionism as an unfortunate gap, fifteen or twenty lost years in the history of our movement, assuming that the attack of the Pabloites diverted the cadres of the British and French sections from the principal tasks of building the Parties.

This mistake is derived from the misunderstanding of revolutionary continuity and from the linked theory that the Fourth International has been *dead* since 1952. On the contrary, the living struggle against Pabloism, and the training of cadres and Parties on the basis of this struggle *was* the life of the Fourth International in these years. It contains the most important lessons of this whole period. If the French comrades do not consciously start from this theoretical struggle, they will pay a heavy price. At the 1963 Second Conference of the International Committee, we made it clear to the OCI comrades that we acknowledged fully the contribution they had made by forcing the first political and organizational break with Pablo in 1952. They, on the contrary, accepted, at least formally, that it had been an error, with considerable consequences, not to go forward and deepen our understanding in a theoretical discussion of the whole basis of Pabloism. In the French section this resulted in a mistaken line on the Algerian national movement under Messali Hadj. In essence this was a *Pabloite* line — acceptance of left-bourgeois nationalism and abandonment of the construction of the revolutionary alternative. That mistake was corrected and the OCI fought in the International Committee alongside us.

In the SWP, such correction did not take place — and the SWP returned to the Pablo camp in 1963. We warn the French comrades that unless *all* the lessons of the fight against Pabloism are learned, above all on the Party, then the revolutionary line of the IC cannot be

consistently defended. The issue is not decided by subjective will, but by the logic of class positions and the reflection of these in tendencies inside the movement.

5. *Marxism, German Social Democracy and Bolshevism*

Now the French comrades want to revise many of the positions which we had established in the fight against revisionism. The first point of attack is on questions of the history of the revolutionary movement. The OCI statement looks over the history of Social Democracy and Bolshevism in order to 'prove' that a more flexible, or 'supple', attitude towards the party is necessary and was recognized by Marx and Lenin. The history of the revolutionary Marxist movement is a history of struggle. Its continuity has been fought for by the proletarian, Marxist wing, always against middle-class opportunist pressure on the working class in the form of revisionism. Every phase of the international movement since the days of Marx, and every party in every country, has gone through this struggle.

The OCI document considerably distorts this history. This is not surprising, since the task set is an impossible one: to 'prove' that Pabloite revisionism comes from over-centralization, too much insistence on 'Bolshevik' statutes, instead of flexible, supple forms of organization adapted to the level of class struggle. Hence the old formula, repeated in the French section's document — 'One step forward for the mass movement is worth more than 100 programmes'. This stress in the document, taken alongside the criticism of the SLL for posing the Transitional Programme as an 'ultimatum', must be understood as an adaptation to the same forces which pushed the *Voix Ouvrière* to say, 'The Fourth International is dead', 'The past is meaningless', etc.

Marx was no worshipper of unity for its own sake. The OCI document says:

... the constitution of German social democracy was the answer in terms of organization, of political practice, to the problems of the class struggle in Germany at that stage of development of the workers' movement, and consequently was the answer for theoretical development and struggle. The living struggle would resolve the contradictions in one way or another, but it was inside social democracy that this struggle had to be waged. Although in effect social democracy finally degenerated, it was the indispensable historical link without which there would have been no Bolshevik

Party, no Russian Revolution, etc. (Quoted from the English translation of the OCI statement, p.5)

In an attempt to unravel this utter confusion, let us first see if Marx and Engels saw the 'stage' of Social Democracy in this way.

Engels wrote in 1873:

... Old Hegel has already said: a party proves itself a victorious party by the fact that it *splits* and can stand the split. The movement of the proletariat necessarily passes through different stages of development; at every stage one section of people lags behind and does not join in the further advance; and this alone explains why it is that actually the 'solidarity of the proletariat' is everywhere realized in different party groupings which carry on life and death feuds with one another, as the Christian sects in the Roman Empire did amidst the worst persecutions. (Letter to Bebel)

Marx and Engels took this objective approach to the problem of party unity, and Marx was definitely against the unification with the Lassalleans as it was concluded. This becomes clear if we quote the whole passage from which the OCI document extracts the famous phrase about 'every step in the real movement':

Every step of real movement is more important than a dozen programmes. If therefore it was not possible — and the conditions of the time did not permit of it — to go beyond the Eisenach programme, an agreement for action against the common enemy should simply have been concluded. But by drawing up a programme of principles (instead of postponing this until it has been prepared for by a considerable period of common activity) one sets up before the whole world a landmark by which the stature of the party movement is measured. The Lassallean leaders came because conditions forced them to come. If they had been told from the beginning that there would be no bargaining about principles they would have had to be content with a programme of action or a plan of organization for common action. (Letter to Bracke, May 5, 1875⁶)

Engels in a number of letters at the same time made it clear that he and Marx were quite seriously prepared to split from the German Social Democracy completely in this situation. There was no question of any fetishes about the Social Democracy forming a natural and adequate practical and theoretical expression of the working class.

Trotsky later characterized the German Social Democracy in a way

⁶ Lassalle had led a party separate from the German Social Democracy. The latter, led by Wilhelm Leibknecht and August Bebel, had been supported by Marx and Engels, who characterized Lassalle's doctrine as 'Royal Prussian State Socialism' because of Lassalle's open collaboration with the German Chancellor Bismarck.

which is the antithesis of the 'stages' theory of the development of the revolutionary tradition:

Let us take the 'classic' party of the Second International, the German Social-Democracy. Its half a century of 'traditional' policy was based upon an adaptation to parliamentarism and to the unbroken growth of the organization, the press and the treasury. This tradition, which is profoundly alien to us, bore a semi-automatic character: each day flowed 'naturally' from the day before and just as 'naturally' prepared the day to follow. The organization grew, the press developed, the cash box swelled. It is in this automatism that the whole generation following Bebel took shape: a generation of bureaucrats, of philistines, of dullards whose political physiognomy was completely revealed in the first hours of the imperialist war. Every congress of the social democracy spoke invariably of the old tactic of the party consecrated by tradition. And the tradition was indeed powerful. It was an automatic tradition, uncritical, conservative, and it ended by stifling the revolutionary wing of the party. (*The New Course*)

The OCI document does not attempt to show by example that Bolshevism and Lenin 'based themselves on the overall relationships of the working-class movement'. That would be a difficult task. Lenin was condemned all his life as a splitter because of his insistence on principles in matters of organization as well as on programme. Such condemnations of Lenin characterized the actual relations between the opportunist majority in the international labour movement and Lenin's battle for Marxist theory and politics and he was similarly attacked on occasion even by Luxemburg. It was Lenin's challenge to the movement as it existed 'at that stage' which assured the revolutionary continuity of Marxism. It would have been utterly foreign to Lenin to depend on phrases such as: 'The living struggle would resolve the contradictions in one way or another ...'

On the history of Bolshevism, the OCI document makes only the general point that the Bolshevik party was '*... the product of the international working-class movement*', though elsewhere (at the April 1967 IC meeting) they have made an issue of the assertion that the October Revolution was achieved without Lenin being General Secretary, or anyone else holding such a post, in the Bolshevik Party. Again, the concrete reality was a battle of revolutionary Marxism against opportunism which reflected the pressure of capitalism. The OCI dissolves the real struggles of opposites into an abstraction. Without a battle *against* the dominant opportunist forces both in

Russia in the 'international working-class movement' there would have been no Bolshevism. And it was the Russian Bolsheviks who then provided the basis for the new Communist International. Such was the real dialectical relation between the international movement and the national sections.

6. *Trotskyism and Bolshevism*

For Stalinism to be victorious in the Third International, it had to physically wipe out this Bolshevik tradition over a period of years. It is wrong to say that the possibility of Stalinism was inscribed in the Bolshevik Party. Stalinism was the product of the bureaucracy, reacting to the pressure of imperialism and imposing its line through the faction of Stalin. To succeed it had to *eliminate* the representatives of Bolshevism and above all Trotsky. The OCI document's formulation about the possibility of Stalinism being inscribed in Bolshevism is a major concession to the revisionists who want to explain Stalinism as the result of Bolshevik 'dogmatism', 'intransigence', and . . . centralism.

The OCI document tries to portray Trotsky's own attitude to the party and the Fourth International as 'supple', despite the fact that in *Permanent Revolution* and elsewhere Trotsky insists that in the differences he had with Lenin on this point, Lenin was in every case right. Again, in *In Defence of Marxism*, Trotsky writes that Bolshevism distinguished itself from all other tendencies by its 'granite hardness'.

What was the basis of the crisis which overtook the Fourth International?

It was the conflict between the proletarian Marxist trend and the petty-bourgeois idealist and empiricist trend, a conflict which reflects the class struggles going on outside the Fourth International and inside the working-class movement. The document of the French section, on the contrary, points to an imaginary contradiction between the paucity of cadres and parties on the one hand, and the centralized structure of the Fourth International on the other. This is false and anti-Marxist. What happened in organizational decisions at the second Congress in 1948 was not the *cause* of the crisis, but a *result* of the petty-bourgeois impressionist and administrative method of Pablo and Germain. We reject Germain and Pablo, but not Trotsky. The statutes of 1938 are just as valid and necessary today as they were then. Democratic centralism is an indispensable *pre-condition* for

carrying out Marxist programme and policy. It gives shape and stability to the party: without it the party would crumble before the pressure of the petty bourgeoisie. That is not to say that rules alone are a guarantee of viability, but that viability cannot be conceived of without them. The OCI document quotes Trotsky in 1935, but not after 1938. Naturally, in the formative period of the FI Trotsky tried to collaborate with all manner of people such as Brockway and Pivert, but after 1938 Trotsky declared war on all these centrist formations. It is doubly dangerous to attempt some sort of identification between the tasks of today and those of the formative years before 1938, when Trotsky did say that the best possibilities for winning cadres lay in elements moving in a revolutionary direction from the crises of the 2nd and 3rd Internationals. Today both the objective conditions of the class struggle and the state of the workers' movement and our own preparation are entirely different, and 30 years of experience lie behind us.

By 1938 Trotsky had come to the conclusion to draw the lessons of the 1935-38 period. Read the Transitional Programme:

The Fourth International, we answer, has no need of being 'proclaimed'. It exists and it fights. Is it weak? Yes, its ranks are not numerous because it is still young. They are as yet chiefly cadres. But these cadres are pledges for the future. *Outside these cadres there does not exist a single revolutionary current on this planet really meriting the name.* If our International is still weak in numbers, it is strong in doctrine, programme, tradition, in the incomparable tempering of its cadres. (p. 54, New Park Publications)

There is not the slightest question of Trotsky preferring to wait until 'leadership of a definite section of the class' has been established before the International 'exists'. The criteria are — doctrine, programme, tradition, and the incomparable tempering of the cadres.

The answer to the OCI's categorical statement that 'Trotsky considered it (the Fourth International) neither as constructed nor as possessing a definitive structure' is answered by the equally categorical statement of Trotsky in this last section of the programme: 'The inner structure of the Fourth International is based on the principles of democratic centralism; full freedom in discussion, complete unity in action.'

Statutes I and IV are crystal clear:

I. All the proletarian and revolutionary militants in the world who accept and apply the principles and the programme of the Fourth International

are joined in a single world-wide organization, under a centralized international leadership, and a single discipline. This organization has as its name THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL (WORLD PARTY OF THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION), and is governed by these present statutes.

IV. The *internal regime* of the International, on the local, national and world scales, is determined by the principles and practice of democratic centralism.

The sections are required to observe the decisions and resolutions of the International Conference, and, in its absence, of the International Executive Committee, represented during the intervals between its meetings by the International Secretariat — while nevertheless retaining the right of appeal before the next higher bodies until the next International Conference. (*The Statutes of the Fourth International; The Transitional Programme*)

Trotsky had built *this* type of organization from the beginning. He wrote in October 1933:

... The formation in several countries of strong revolutionary organizations, freed of responsibility for the crimes and mistakes of the reformist and centrist bureaucrats, armed with a Marxist programme and a clear revolutionary perspective, will open a new era in the development of the world proletariat. These organizations will attract to them all the real Communist elements, who today still do not dare to break with the Stalinist bureaucracy and, what is more important, they will gather under their banner the young generation of workers. ('It is necessary to build anew Communist Parties and an International', Oct. 1933 *Militant*)

7. *Programme and Party organization*

In counterposing 'programme' to 'structure' the OCI is plodding faithfully in the steps of Martov and Axelrod and in fact their arguments are an expression of organizational opportunism. Let us quote their document again: '... On the one hand there is the conception of a completely structured organization, on the other the conception (Trotsky's conception, presumably) of an organization which has to construct itself and whose structure must be extremely supple.' (English translation p. 8) The first conception, according to the document, is a 'mechanical projection' of Trotsky by his followers. The whole history of the Marxist movement from 1903 onwards, however, bears powerful testimony against these arbitrary assumptions. A revolutionary programme is not enough. To carry it through the working class requires a revolutionary organization — with firm rules, iron discipline and a stable leadership.

Far from being 'supple', such an organization must be granite-like in its hardness, and its shape must be clearly defined. Flabbiness (or 'suppleness') and Bolshevism are mutually exclusive qualities. In this sense it is the OCI document which is guilty of mechanical and metaphysical thinking. It takes a one-sided view of the relationship of programme to structure. It considers that the programme is all-important, decisive and determines the growth of the organization. This is not so. Under certain conditions, and generally speaking, the programme (content) is decisive but under certain conditions and at certain periods the structure (form) becomes decisive for the future of the organization. Let us not forget that the most decisive and irrevocable split in Russian social democracy arose as a result of differences over the formulation of rules. In order to clarify this question still further, we refer to Lenin, whose 'mechanical projections' at the 1903 conference of the RSDLP were bitterly attacked as 'Jacobinism' by Mensheviks.

Lenin states unequivocally:

Started by Comrade Axelrod there runs like a crimson thread through all the writing of the new *Iskra* the 'profound idea' that content is more important than form, that programme and tactics are more important than organization, that 'the vitality of an organization' is in direct proportion to the volume and value of the content it puts into the movement, that centralism is not an 'end in itself', not an all-saving talisman, etc. etc. Great and profound truths! The programme is indeed more important than tactics, and tactics more important than organization. The alphabet is more important than etymology, and etymology more important than syntax — but what would we say of people who, after failing in an examination in syntax, went about pluming and priding themselves on being left in a lower class for another year? (*One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*)

Lenin goes on insistently to explain this relationship from another angle:

The adoption of a programme contributes more to the centralization of the work than the adoption of rules. How this commonplace, palmed off as philosophy, reeks of the mentality of the radical intellectual who has much more in common with bourgeois decadence than with social democracy! Unity on questions of programme and tactics is an essential, but by no means a sufficient condition for party unity for the centralization of party work . . . the latter requires, in addition, unity of organization, which in a party that has grown to be anything more than a mere family circle, is

inconceivable without formal rules, without the subordination of the minority to the majority and of the part to the whole ... (*Ibid*)

Trotsky fought above all for these Bolshevik conceptions when he founded the Fourth International, and it is this which we preserve in the fight for continuity. In the course of this fight Trotsky was opposed by many who argued for a more 'natural' growth. They argued: 'Don't raise the problem prematurely; don't anticipate events.' Thus Brockway of the ILP argued:

It (the Revolutionary Socialist line) recognizes that revolutionary socialist thought and spirit is growing in all sections of the working class ...

The time must come when this common thought and spirit will leap over all organizational barriers and create the united revolutionary movement which alone will be equal to the task of winning workers' power and establishing socialism.

To join the Communist International or to form a Fourth International under these circumstances is to postpone the coming of revolutionary unity. (Reported in *The Militant*, June 15, 1935)

This was the period of the ILP's United Front with the Communist Party of Great Britain and the Arbeiter Sozialistike Gemeinschaft!⁹
Now listen to the OCI:

The building of parties of the Fourth International and the reconstruction of the Fourth International find conditions in the proletariat which have never been so favourable. The construction of parties of the Fourth International and the reconstruction of the Fourth International are closely linked. The IC must undertake these tasks together and it does not have the choice. But it must not confuse tomorrow with today. It must have a precise view of what it is, what its role is, as well as a perspective, a strategy, for the reconstruction of the Fourth International. Only where they lead a section of the class can we speak of parties or leading organizations of the Fourth International. The forces for the construction of parties exist in a number of countries. The IC is the objective force for the rebuilding of the Fourth International. (English Translation, p. 10)

We are being asked to take five steps backward in order to take a half-step forward. If we proclaim our party and our programme we postpone a 'genuine' maturing of revolutionary unity. Here we see why the discussion must be seen in the context of a historical battle for Marxism against theories of spontaneity and the 'organic' development of the class struggle.

⁹ An International Bureau of centrist organizations.

8. *What is the United Front?*

How then should parties be built, according to our French comrades?

The Resolutions of the 1966 International Conference lay down a clear line, in accordance with our conceptions. The Party must fight openly on its own policies to challenge the opportunist and centrist political leaderships in the working class. The revolutionary newspaper, the full-time professionals, the central leadership, are the core of this political fight. Any notion that cadres or forces for the Party will emerge ready-formed from the working class is fraught with disaster. The OCI statement places all the emphasis, on the contrary, on what it calls the *United Class Front*.

We take up this proposition in relation to earlier discussions between our two sections. In 1965 the French comrades published internal bulletins for a Special Conference of their organization in which the formation of a new 'Ligue' was proposed. At that time it was argued that some 1,500 class-conscious militants in France provided the basis for such an organization, constituting the 'vanguard' of the French proletariat. This would in fact have been to dissolve our French section into a centrist mass, the dissolution being made more rapid and certain by confused ideas of a spontaneously produced 'vanguard', as against the Leninist notion of a steeled and educated cadre, bound together by Bolshevik methods of work and organization, as the vanguard of the working class.

The proposal for a 'Ligue' was dropped, though there has never been any real explanation of how it arose or how it was dropped. But this conception of organization was closely linked with the idea of a 'united class front' which is now more fully presented in the OCI document.

The document explains that between 1944 and 1951 the PCI¹⁰ mistakenly offered united fronts to the leadership of the French Communist Party — mistakenly, it is said, because the PCI led no section of the working class. 'Now,' the document goes on, 'our policy of a united front is different. We express the demands of the advanced workers to the leaderships recognized by the working class (SFIO,¹¹ French CP, union leaderships): it is necessary to break with the

¹⁰ Parti Communiste Internationaliste, the name of the French section of the Fourth International at that time.

¹¹ Social-Democratic Party.

bourgeoisie and bring about the united class front.' (English translation, p.10)

In this period of radicalization of the working class, the tactic of the 'united front' inevitably goes through many distortions, adaptations to the confusion of the initial stage of the break from the bureaucracy, calculated to divert workers from the path of revolutionary leadership. The United Front is posed as an *alternative*, an easier way, in opposition to the fight for independent leadership, which is denounced as sectarian, adventuristic, ultimatic. Thus the Pabloites join the bourgeois pacifists, and at the same time produce a 100-page book against the 'ultra-left sectarianism of the SLL'.

These revisionists explain their behaviour through a gross distortion of the idea of 'united front'. When Lenin and Trotsky, after the ebb of the first post-war revolutionary wave, called upon the new Communist Parties to fight to 'win the masses', they devised the tactic of united front precisely to *win* these masses *from* the Social Democracy to the existing Communist Parties. The Pabloites use the phrase 'united front' in precisely the opposite sense — a bloc of petty-bourgeois propaganda groups who together serve the political needs of the bourgeoisie.

How does the French section propose to correct its earlier 'mistaken' conceptions of the united front and the building of the revolutionary party? First the document insists that we must not abrogate to ourselves the name of 'Party', because we cannot truthfully claim to have the leadership of a definite section of the class. We have seen, however, that this criterion has nothing in common with the Bolshevik conception of the basis of a revolutionary party. The OCI delegates to the International Committee in April 1967 warned against regarding Marxism 'as a bible', and against using the Transitional Programme as an 'ultimatum'. This means in effect to *abandon the claim of the Fourth International to leadership*. The Transitional Programme was precisely such a challenge *for leadership*, and in that sense an 'ultimatum' to the labour movement. At this stage of the world crisis, at this stage of the fight against revisionism, to take all the emphasis away from the building of the Bolshevik Party is to open the door immediately to the full pressure of the class enemy. The so-called united class front is an expression of this dangerous course, a disastrous course. Thus the document says 'we express the demands of the advanced workers to the leaderships recognized by the working class: break from the bourgeoisie and bring about the united class front.'

To fight on such a course, and without making *central* in our open work and in the training of cadres the building of the revolutionary party, is to lapse into opportunism. The French section's document explains, however, that 'Through these battles for the United Front we are building the OCI, demonstrating the necessity for a revolutionary party.' (English translation p. 10). In essence, this means: the United Front first, and through this, the party second. We reject this. A United Front is posed by a revolutionary party at certain stages of development to the reformist parties, in order to break the masses from them. It is a tactic carried out by a revolutionary party. In the form proposed by the OCI it is a preparation for liquidation, just as surely as was the Pabloite theory of 'entry *sui generis*'. The Pabloites arrived at liquidation by this alternative path — dissolving into the bureaucratic and reformist parties, on the grounds that 'the masses are to be found there' and moreover, that the bureaucracy, or a section of it, would be forced to the left. Given the present deepening of the crisis, and the growing difficulty of the bureaucracy in holding back the working class, it is not surprising that liquidationism can now take the form of dissolving the party into the class as such, or a 'section' of it, or an imaginary 'vanguard' abstracted from the existing mass organizations and the reformists and bureaucrats.

The Pabloites anticipated the possibility of emerging from the Social Democracy as part of 'mass centrist parties', and have ended up with 'United Fronts' of small propaganda sects. The OCI's prescription will fare no better. The essence in both cases is the abandonment of the *central* importance of the building of the revolutionary party. For all the talk about 'the class', the result of this turn, if not corrected, will be determined by the emphasis against centralism, for 'suppleness', against Bolshevik conceptions of the relation between party organization and programme. Without these Bolshevik conceptions it is impossible to train a cadre for work in the trade unions or the youth, and the forces at the disposal of the OCI would inevitably be lost.

9. *Different paths to liquidationism*

How can we characterize this turn to 'united class front' and this opposition to centralism? Why should the OCI seek a new formula, change its ideas on the history of the Fourth International and attack centralism and 'ultimatism' just at the point of a radicalization which

demands greater emphasis on building the Bolshevik alternative? The turn is no different in essence from the mistake made by the French section in relation to the Algerian national movement against French colonial rule. At that time it was even argued that the Algerian revolution was the path through which the Revolution in France would first pass. The development of the Algerian movement, *without* the building of an alternative revolutionary party, was the necessary next 'stage', and the work of the PCI was subordinated to that. These utterly false conceptions are well expressed in the following extract from a document of the PCI on its Algerian work:

The MNA¹² is a mainly working-class organization in composition (in the way in which its influence and its recruitment is based on an important group, who have been displaced by the process of production), of whom the cadres and the leaders are mainly from the working class and landless peasants, who have lived a long time in France, where they worked and organized amongst French workers. The programme of the MNA is undeniably a revolutionary programme with a socialist content. In the search for allies for its struggle in the international field the MNA turns essentially to the working class.

These four characteristics are sufficient for defining the MNA as a working-class party. But the development of the MNA in the concrete conditions of its struggle against imperialism, which is dominated by the politics of the traditional apparatuses, has taken on a profoundly original aspect.

In this aspect the MNA is ahead of all the experience acquired by the working class of the West. In other ways it has failed to integrate itself in a tradition which alone has allowed it to triumph over the many obstacles in its path.

To take one example, Religion. It is clear that in the conditions of a wholesale assimilation in every field, political, economic and cultural, there was only one small barrier for the Algerians to overcome to become complete Frenchmen. The Muslim religion constituted in this way more than a mythical refuge, a national defence apparatus, enabling Algerians to be distinguishable from Frenchmen and to keep their national quality, to resist assimilation. The MNA has to incorporate religion in its political activity.

¹² Algerian National Movement, led by Messali Hadj, originated in the split in 1954 of the MTLD, which had united the National-liberation movement after the Second World War. The MNA, as against the FLN, which eventually took political power in Algeria, originally contained the majority of Algerian proletarians in France, together with the most militant vanguard of the national struggle. However, Messali and the leadership went over to a policy of direct collaboration with the French bourgeoisie.

Indeed, when we analyse the MNA we must consider that we have before us a revolutionary movement, almost unique in its way, which we cannot define as a Marxist Party, but because of its policies and character which carried with it the revolutionary hopes of the Algerian people and the Algerian working class. But the realization of the objects of the MNA, its future, will be determined largely by the form the revolutionary crisis takes, in particular in France itself, and the assistance it receives from the French working class. (PCI Discussion Bulletin April 1958 — our translation.)

There is no qualitative difference between this mistaken strategy, on the question of Algeria and the revolutionary party, on the one hand, and the call to abandon the claim of being revolutionary parties and a revolutionary international today. It is a turning away from the building of Trotskyist parties, the only revolutionary proletarian parties in the world, to lead the working class, the only consistently revolutionary class in the struggle against imperialism. This is the meaning of the lack of confidence in the past struggles of our movement as the principal, *crucial* struggles in the building of the revolutionary leadership. This past is the key to the future. The attitude of cutting adrift from the continuity and results of these struggles is characteristic of the petty-bourgeois revolutionist and not of Bolshevism. It is an abandonment to impressionism and empiricism, adaptation to the prevailing forces in the working class.

The OCI document presents its notion of the united class front as comparable with the Socialist Labour League's campaign to 'Make the Left MPs Fight'. No one in the British Labour Movement, and least of all our own members and close sympathisers, is under any illusion: we make this call always together with, and on the basis of, the building up of *our own* forces and resources to intervene on every major issue confronting the class, with our own paper, our own discipline, fighting to destroy all other tendencies and educate our cadres. Similarly in the Young Socialists, it is not a question of 'ultimatistically' posing support of the Fourth International to everyone who joins the youth movement. The Young Socialists is built on a broad base, with a wide range of types of activity, but this is done openly on the basis of Trotskyist cadres, a Bolshevik fraction in the leadership of the youth movement. It is clear that only Bolshevik cadres *can* build such a broad movement of youth, which is anathema to all opportunists, centrists and revisionists. By bringing into every struggle and campaign our independent policies and the fight for a

new leadership we do not 'express the demands of the advanced workers to the leadership recognized by the working class'. We fight on our own line; we hit at every manifestation of opportunism and revisionism; we win adherents through this political struggle.

10. The dialectics of building the International

The poverty of the analysis presented by the OCI, manifested in its indiscriminate and careless casting around for quotations and historical 'analogies', none of which are appropriate, derives from its undialectical character. Instead of a painstaking and detailed presentation of the history of the problem of the relations between party and class struggle, and particularly of the Fourth International's own history, the French comrades present us with selected impressions of the history of the movement, selected according to the needs of 'explaining away' and justifying the OCI's own practice. A dialectical materialist analysis proceeds with categories which reflect the struggle of opposites in the phenomenon under analysis, in this case the history of the revolutionary movement. All questions of structure and of tactics must be presented, understood and acted upon from the standpoint of the basic struggle between the Marxist proletarian tendency and petty-bourgeois revisionism from whatever immediate source.

When the OCI document moves to the question of constructing the International in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, these errors of method are even more exposed. We have seen that only a few years ago, Algeria was placed at the centre of developments. But now the OCI document goes to great lengths to explain that nothing has been or can be built in the colonial countries because of the absence of revolutionary parties in the advanced countries. There is in fact no such priority. This conception jumps back over the Pabloite conception of a colonial epicentre¹³ to the mechanical conceptions of the Second International.

We are told, for example, that the lessons of the LSSP betrayal in Ceylon confirm the document's claim. But in fact the lessons to be learned from the 1964 Coalition and collapse of the LSSP are totally different. It is not the absence of a strong International in Europe,

¹³ The revisionists developed the theory that after World War II the world revolution only expressed itself directly in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, which were therefore called the 'epicentre' of the revolution.

taken as a thing in itself, which explains the degeneration of the LSSP. In point of fact, the revisionist leadership in the International strengthened the opportunist hostile class forces lodged inside the LSSP. A strong Fourth International would not have guaranteed a revolutionary development of the LSSP. It could only have supported a proletarian wing in the Party. The same contradictory forces work organically in the LSSP as throughout the International. It is not a question of a relation between two undifferentiated wholes, the LSSP and the International, with a one-way relationship between them. Instead we have a dialectical relation of struggle within the LSSP, within the International, and between the two, the whole complex representing the conscious reflection in the revolutionary movement of the unconscious development of the world crisis and the class struggle produced by it. It is because of its wrong analysis of this question that the document, proceeding through a one-sided and wrong presentation of the Russian and Chinese Revolutions, presents to the Ceylonese workers the prospect of taking power only 'as a part of the international working class' — a platitude reminiscent of Kautsky or his deformed descendent, Germain. We must, on the contrary, insist that our Ceylonese comrades study and assimilate the lessons of the LSSP's development to the 1964 betrayal, understand the international and historic significance of it, and relate it to the crisis in the Fourth International, beginning the building of a revolutionary party from the position of the International Committee. Next, the forces of the International Committee everywhere, from a study of the 1964 betrayal, sharpen their understanding of the changes in the class struggle, the role of revisionism, and the urgency of our own tasks. Thus, the youth cadres of the Socialist Labour League were trained for the final stage of their work in the Labour Party in 1964 on the basis of the lessons of the Ceylon betrayal.

This un-Marxist interpretation of the history and the tasks of the Fourth International entails a very thoroughgoing revision of basic Trotskyist ideas, ideas which were themselves forged in the history which is being now distorted. Trotsky and Lenin insisted that the backwardness of Russia was a *contradictory* phenomenon, an intersection or combination of Russia's backwardness with the latest developments in world capitalism, and that the world socialist revolution was likely to break out first in that country. Stalin distorted Lenin's writings to suggest that he had been in favour of the construction of socialism within a single country, whereas Trotsky had

insisted, according to Stalin, on the simultaneousness of the revolution. The French section opens the door to any and every distortion of the Trotskyist position, with the nonsensical assertion that not only the conquest of power, but even the building of revolutionary parties in the backward countries can only develop in the wake of successful party-building in Europe. The OCI says literally nothing about the process of degeneration of the Socialist Workers' Party in the most advanced capitalist country in the world. Thus the road is prepared for a complete, pessimistic rejection of the whole Marxist revolutionary perspective.

What is the theoretical mistake underlying this abandonment of perspective? It is a wrong understanding of the role of consciousness, of the unity of the theory and practice, and therefore of the dialectic. Comrades of the OCI have repeated many times that the essence of our epoch is the crisis of leadership. They have accepted analyses which show that the role of the traitorous bureaucracy has objectively affected the relationship of class forces, particularly in the aftermath of the 1939-45 war. But this 'recognition' of the betrayals of the traditional leadership has become the basis of a *prostration* before their betrayals, instead of an arming against it. Similarly, the 'Economists' of the Russian Social Democracy 'accepted' the Marxist thesis of the inevitable growth of capitalism in Russia, but turned this into the basis of a prostration before his development. Marxists base themselves on the *contradictory nature* of these betrayals. As the Transitional Programme puts it: 'the laws of history are stronger than the bureaucratic apparatus'!

The logic of the OCI's position on the revolutionary movement in the colonial and semi-colonial countries is to reject the standpoint of the Permanent Revolution. Proceeding from 'recognition' of the betrayals of the bureaucracy, we are led to the conclusion that the imperialists and the bureaucracy collaborate to effectively determine the limits and the outcome of every struggle everywhere in the world. By an opposite path, we have arrived at the same prostration before the bureaucracy as did Pablo. The revolutionary force of the working class and of the present masses who follow them in the colonial countries is rejected. This is why on the question of the conflict between Egypt and Israel the French section could take a position of supporting neither side in the war. Faced with the fight of the Arab masses they could see only the manipulations of the bourgeois nationalists and of the Stalinist bureaucracy. The characterization of

both the Israeli and Egyptian governments as 'bourgeois' and 'counter-revolutionary' within the world 'relationship of forces' sufficed for them, and wiped out entirely the role of the Arab masses. Here we see the real class meaning of the line that nothing can be done to build revolutionary parties in the backward countries until there are strong revolutionary parties in Europe.

The fight against revisionism by the International Committee had to be combined with the building of the sections as Bolshevik parties. When the French comrades talk about a Bolshevik 'organization' we reply that the only such organization is a *party*. This is the only way of unifying the different parts of the work of Communists into a single strategy of the preparation for power. We were of the opinion that the Conferences of 1963 and especially of 1966 had clarified this question. The discussion of some differences had to be postponed because of the priority of dealing with *Voix Ouvrière* and Robertson. But the latter struggle, clarifying as it did the nature of the continuity of the revolutionary movement, laid a firmer basis for overcoming the differences on party-building and the fight against revisionism.

The OCI document says that the 1966 Conference ended for all time any idea that the world movement could be built through a rapprochement between ourselves and the revisionists. However, the OCI in this same document raises for the first time the argument for entry into the Pabloite organizations. When the SLL proposed to engage the revisionists in an international discussion in 1962, the OCI leadership only very reluctantly agreed, yet they now write that we must not exclude the possibility of developments in a revolutionary direction inside the Pabloite ranks, and they raise the necessity of entry. Such entry would be entirely wrong in this situation. The French comrades are reacting empirically to the recent relative growth of the revisionists on the basis of a radicalization of youth and students in France. It is the independent struggle and growth of our parties on their programme which wins cadres, disintegrates and demoralises the revisionists. But to prescribe entry into these rotting organizations, centres of pessimism and middle-class scepticism, at the same time as you are training your cadres in an anti-centralist, 'organization-as-process' spirit, instead of as disciplined party members, is to surely lose them. It is only another variety of liquidationism.

The Liège demonstration, with our participation planned from the April 1966 Conference, placed us on the road to the next great step in

the building of the International — a world youth organization in which the cadres of the Fourth International will be formed. Without the collaboration of the French and British sections this perspective could not have been opened. But we must insist: the basis of our collaboration is Bolshevism. If *this* is revised, our work turns to nothing, and worse than nothing. The SLL Central Committee, in accordance with the line of our Ninth Congress, rejects *in toto* the approach and conclusions of the OCI statement, which revises the fundamental conceptions of Bolshevism and the Marxist understanding of the history of our movement.

Chapter Four

The struggle in the International Committee

In the revolutionary situation of 1968 in France, the International Committee actively organized defence of the OCI against the slanderous attacks on it by the Pabloite revisionists as well as against its illegalization by the Gaullist state after the end of the General Strike (see Document 18). This defence was undertaken despite the differences which had developed within the IC since early 1967. Every effort was made through these campaigns, and through prolonged discussion with the OCI, to resolve the differences. The SLL considered that the revolutionary developments in France and Czechoslovakia, marking a completely new stage in the European and the world revolution, provided conditions where it might be possible to correct the OCI's wrong orientation, but this proved not to be the case.

The first document in this chapter records not only the profound differences on the 1967 Middle East War, but also raises for the first time the question of the OCI's opportunist position in relation to the Bolivian revisionist, Guillermo Lora. Four years later, the defeat of the Bolivian revolution was to make this one of the central political questions of the split of the IC with the OCI (see Volume Six).

The remaining document records the unprecedented action of the OCI leadership in censoring the speech of the British comrade in France because of political differences on the Arab-Israeli war. In anticipation of the Essen Rally (Chapter Five) this showed that the OCI was by now finding its connection with the IC an embarrassment to its opportunist direction in France.

DOCUMENT 13

Notes by Cliff Slaughter on the IC meeting of June 17-18, 1967

The meeting began with discussion on the Middle East war. The British section delegates drew attention to the serious situation created by the 'neutralist' stand taken by the French section, and urged that the IC should work for a declaration of support for the Arabs in the war against the imperialist outpost of Israel, along the line stated by the Political Committee of the SLL. An immediate discussion was necessary on the situation brought about by the opposed positions.

F. de Massot (French section) attacked the position taken by the SLL Political Committee. There was no such thing as the Arab Revolution: this was only an ideological weapon of the bourgeois nationalists. The war was not a war of liberation against imperialism, but a conflict between agents of imperialism, used by imperialism, and within the limits set by imperialism. This was confirmed by the peace settlement which was being imposed. It was necessary to approach the conflict from the point of view of the linked crisis of imperialism and the bureaucracy. 'Arab unity is a myth, and is as bad as Zionism.' There was no Arab people, only different Arab nations formed by the framework of colonial domination and the struggle against it, such as Algeria.

M. Varga (Hungarian section) said that above all the Middle East war must be seen as part of a new stage in the complicity of the bureaucracy and imperialism, camouflaging collusion over Vietnam. 'What is the Arab Revolution? Do we believe there are different types of revolution in the present epoch, or do we believe there is only the proletarian revolution, to which national liberation struggles are

organically linked and must be linked politically?' The basic question was the character of the Arab states. Like all bourgeois states they are linked to imperialism. Only on this basic question can we interpret the conflict between some of the backward countries and imperialism.

In 1956 it was different, and our support for the Nasser regime then was determined by the nationalisation of the Suez Canal, an act against imperialism. We defended not Nasser but this blow against imperialism. The condemnation of Zionism applies equally to Arab nationalism. They are the same thing. Arab nationalism is the ideology of the Arab capitalists and landlords, puppets of imperialism. The SLL statement gave an independent role to the Arab bourgeoisie. But what is fundamental, as stated in the French section's declaration in *Informations Ouvrières*, is where Nasser lines up on the main conflict between imperialism and the working class, in Vietnam. Nasser allows US military materials through Suez for Vietnam.

M. Banda (British section): F. de M. and M.V. are abstracting the Egypt-Israel war from the real crisis of imperialism and the real struggle against it. In 1956 the most important aspect of the struggle determining our attitude, was not the single act of nationalising the Canal but the struggles of the working class unleashed throughout the Middle East and also in Europe. The immediate instrument unleashing this radicalisation was the dictatorial bourgeois-nationalist regime of Nasser! Since 1956 the masses have been drawn in millions into the anti-imperialist struggle behind Nasser, notwithstanding his class and political character. In the most recent phase of this process Nasser was forced to pay attention to the problem of the Palestinian Arabs and the Israeli threats to Syria.

During the Japanese imperialist invasion of China, Trotsky had insisted on the necessity of military support for the Chiang Kai Shek defence, while at the same time preparing a constant political struggle against political betrayals by the Kuomintang leadership, a struggle which would in the end lead to civil war. This was the correct position on Egypt.

Albert (Hungarian section): Astonished that the British section could side with one bourgeois government against another in the war. It was significant that the Stalinist bureaucracy had in no way supported the Israelis. The SLL position held the danger of capitulation to the Stalinist line of 'non-capitalist paths of development' by talking about the Arab revolution. If we take the Arab side on this question we cannot convince those who are breaking from Stalinism in Eastern

Europe, and who understand our opposition to regimes like Nasser's on a class basis. An IC declaration along the lines of the SLL would endorse the line of the Stalinist bureaucracy. Only the building of the Fourth International in these countries can open the right way for the masses.

S. Just (France): The differences revealed at the last IC meeting are now becoming more precise. The SLL statement omits the proletarian revolution, the unity of the world class struggle, and the reconstruction of the Fourth International. We get on the one hand lots of abstract general talk about the building of revolutionary parties and a tendency to regard ourselves as the Fourth International right now; but now we see the other side of the medal — when the question is really posed these are forgotten. What does the Political Committee mean in its declaration by 'the peace and security of the Arab people'?

Arab nationalism represents world capital just as surely as does Zionism. Ben Gurion expressed his great admiration for Nasser as a statesman in the handling of his difficult task; this shows it is not just a simple matter of a war between the Arabs and US imperialism.

We need a responsible discussion and not insistence on a declaration in conditions where there is an obvious division in the IC. We propose that a special discussion take place during July between the Central Committees and leading comrades of the sections.

M. Banda: We will report this proposal to our section, but in our opinion it would serve little purpose. The differences are related to those raised in the document submitted to the April extended IC meeting, and the discussion must take place between and within the sections in preparation for the next Conference of the IC.

C. Slaughter (British section): Every section of the revisionists has taken the line of neutrality, always excused with a declaration of the need for some 'pure' internationalist solution. The SLL had come out with a clear anti-imperialist line. The OCI (French section of the IC) had stated that it could support neither side in the war, since neither side represented the peoples of the Middle East. Here was the real tailing behind the bureaucracy with its line of 'peace and a cease-fire, since neither side can gain by war'. The reality is that the Arab masses are in battle against the imperialists and against the capitulation of the Stalinist bureaucracy. The French and Hungarian sections have isolated themselves from this real struggle. The argument that in our epoch there is only the socialist revolution is anti-Marxist. We stand on the theory of the Permanent Revolution: the national-democratic

tasks of the bourgeois revolution cannot be carried out under the leadership of the national bourgeoisie in the backward countries today, and the struggle for these demands passes under the leadership of the proletariat. This class then places its own demands into the struggle and this merges into the world proletarian revolution.

In this conflict it is not a question at all of two bourgeois governments, equally the agents of imperialism. In any case there were on the Arab side archaic kingdoms whose internal class character was pre-bourgeois, combined with the worst aspects of imperialist influence, but even in these cases Marxists would be for their defence against the imperialists. Comrades Varga and de M. had put forward views which gave imperialism the character of an international system of rigid control over all economic and political developments. The theory of joint crisis of imperialism and bureaucracy has become a formula for prostration before the apparent power of these forces.

What is the importance of the argument that no bureaucratic support has come forward for the state of Israel? To use this as a criterion in this way indicates that Comrade Albert has arrived at a theory of the Soviet bureaucracy which assimilates it to a class, entirely homogeneous with the imperialists. This is again a capitulation to the bureaucracy, and obliterates the role of the Soviet working class. It contains the potential of abandonment of the defence of the USSR by Marxists.

How can Arab nationalism be said to be the same as Zionism? The latter was always a bourgeois 'solution' within the framework of imperialism, whereas Arab nationalism, whatever the religious distortions accomplished by the bourgeoisie, is part of the upsurge of the Arab masses against imperialism. The French and Hungarian sections have adopted a position which is based not upon the theory of permanent revolution but upon the supposition that imperialism and the Stalinist bureaucracy are now able to impose a complete straitjacket upon the international class struggle, and that this is the 'framework' of all conflicts. This is why Varga can raise Nasser's attitude to the Vietnam conflict to the level of the 'decisive' criterion. The reality is that the Arab masses have been drawn directly into politics because of the intensified crisis of imperialism, and that this leads to a new stage in the crisis of both imperialism and the bureaucracy. It is urgent that the IC reject the neutralist line of the French section, supported by the Hungarians, and make a declaration in support of the Arab struggle.

S. Just: Is this an ultimatum? Even if the French section were mistaken — and I do not think so — we could only agree on a declaration after fresh discussion and not here. We will report this discussion to the French section. Slaughter misunderstands fundamentally the counter-revolutionary role of petty-bourgeois nationalism. It shows a wrong understanding of the IC's role to press for a declaration. Neither OCI nor SLL would have been correct to wait for a decision of the IC before taking a stand, but neither side can insist on the agreement of the other. We will only say in the course of discussion if we change our position. Even if we got agreement there would be further disagreements, and this would not be for the first time among Trotskyists.

M. Banda: We must consider very seriously the fact that the IC remains paralysed in the middle of a great world conflict. What is the line of our sections to be on the Arabs in the territories occupied by Israel? How is neutrality possible? We must take up a clear attitude to the struggle against the Israeli gains, and our attitude to the original war must be consistent with this.

S. Just: We are of course against the Israeli state and its conquests. But the *fundamental* question is the use of the Palestine issue to evade the real problems of the Arab masses. There is no solution by war, which is used to control the masses. There is no Arab nation, no ethnic unity, there are only different Arab countries.

C. Slaughter: It is nonsense to now say you are for the Arab struggle against the Israeli conquests and cling to your original line on the war. The developing struggle of the Arab people makes urgent a correct line, and there must be an immediate correction.

It was agreed that the discussion for the international conference, besides the documents already prepared, should include the statements of the OCI and SLL on the war in the Middle East.

At another point on the agenda, the French comrades informed us that they have a branch consisting entirely of Algerian students in France. In answer to our question about the attitude of these students to the OCI line on the war, the French delegates said they did not know.

Comrade Banda raised the question of the IC declaration on the imprisonment of Guillermo Lora in Bolivia, pointing out that this statement gave uncritical endorsement to Lora's leadership as that of a Trotskyist. Quite apart from the fact that Lora's party had recently unified with the representative of the Unified Secretariat in Bolivia,

Moscoso, Lora had in the past carried out an active opportunist line in relation to the MNR government. It was eventually agreed to publish a correction of this declaration.

★ ★ ★

The final part of the agenda was taken up with a report of the visit of French and British members of the International Youth Commission to Belgium, Germany and Italy, in preparation for the International Assembly of Youth. Detailed plans were made for the organization of transport, based on the direct and immediate responsibility of the French section for all those coming from Europe, without exception.

DOCUMENT 14

Notes for proposed speech by Dany Sylveire to Revoltes National Youth Assembly, June 24, 1967

On behalf of the National Committee of the Young Socialists I bring revolutionary greetings to this Assembly. This is an important occasion for the youth of Western Europe. Since the Liège demonstration of October 1966, both the Young Socialists and Revoltes have been increasing their numbers and influence in Britain and in France. Together they are proving a most attractive force for rallying young people in Belgium, Germany, Italy and other countries especially the United States. In that country over recent months, a revolutionary youth organisation, also under the name of Revolt, has been formed and already they have made arrangements to bring a good number to the International Youth Assembly.

Every delegate and visitor at this Assembly must be conscious that what plans you make will have immediate international repercussions.

We do not speak only for the youth movement in France and in Britain. We speak for the youth everywhere. It is our job to give them a decisive leadership. The keynote of this Assembly must be directed towards providing revolutionary leadership. This means that we must have a great devotion to Marxist theory which in our time is the only comprehensive theory to guide the youth to socialism.

Lenin long ago stressed that there can be no revolutionary movement without revolutionary theory. No solution to the problems of mankind either by the Stalinists, social democratic or middle-of-the-road centrist leaderships. It is in this sense that I address you today as a Marxist, a Trotskyist and a member of the Fourth International.

Our movement in particular represents the application of Marxism to the fundamental problems of the day since Lenin's death in January 1924. We are the only movement today that supports all and every activity of the working class in capitalist countries, of the workers and

poor peasants in colonial struggles against imperialism, their common enemy.

This is why all our thoughts over recent weeks have been concentrated on what has been happening in the Middle East. There can be no doubt in anyone's mind that the State of Israel represents the most reactionary interests, represents the oil interests, ranging themselves against the poor down-trodden Arab peoples. There is no doubt also that the Imperialists have been greatly assisted by the Soviet bureaucracy which played a major role in disorientating and disarming the Arab masses. In the background sat the American imperialists allowing the Soviet bureaucracy to do the dirty work on its behalf.

Youth in Britain and France have especially a major responsibility to fight the counter-revolutionary role of Wilson and de Gaulle. There is no doubt that militarily and in every other way they have supplemented the American Imperialists. We must demonstrate to all the youth of the Arab countries that there are two Frances, two Britains and two United States. We do not cease to criticize the reactionary nature of the nationalist capitalist regimes such as that of Nasser. But this is subordinate to the struggle against Imperialism and the role of the bureaucracy. We cannot and must not be neutral. We cannot and must not use left phrases in order to cover up such neutrality.

The Young Socialists stand four-square for the Arab revolution against the Zionist agents of Imperialism. We are for the complete military victory of the Arab peoples. We are for the unity of the Arab and Israeli working class, but this can only be achieved in the common struggle against imperialism, and in order that it is achieved we must take up a class position: the defence of the Arab revolution. There is no other road forward for the Jewish toilers.

Finally, comrades, I come to the importance of the International Youth Assembly. Comrades in Britain look forward to this event with enormous interest. It will indeed be an occasion of tremendous importance when hundreds of young people for the first time since the second world war (since 40 years) gathered in order to begin to work out revolutionary policies to guide their actions. We are firmly convinced that our Assembly will be a resounding success. We firmly believe in the international unity of Revoltes and the Young Socialists which will stand at the base of the Assembly.

Long live Revoltes, the organisation of the French Young Socialists!

Forward to the International Youth Assembly!

DOCUMENT 15**Letter from the SLL to the OCI, June 27, 1967**

Dear Comrades,

At its meeting on Monday, 26th June, the Political Committee discussed a report by Comrade D. Sylveire of a Revoltes National Youth Assembly in Paris which she attended on behalf of the Young Socialists.

It appears that before she was allowed to speak her notes were studied by members of your organization who decided that because they contained reference to the war in the Middle East different from yours, she could not speak unless she deleted that section of her notes. She then asked for facilities to telephone London, but due to unforeseen difficulties there was a certain delay in this arrangement. Upon arrival back at the hall she found that the Conference had already terminated and she was thus unable to bring the fraternal greetings of the Young Socialists. This was particularly ironical since Pabloites were allowed to speak as freely as they liked during the proceedings.

We would like to draw your attention to the following procedure governing relations between sections.

The International Committee is the appropriate body for officially dealing with all problems that may arise between sections. No section has the right to censor or prevent another section from making its political opinion known in its press or in the capacity of fraternal delegates to public or private functions of our organizations. If a situation should arise where a member in the capacity of fraternal delegate makes such a declaration that is resented by the section to which he or she makes it, then they naturally have the right to reply or comment on the statement when it is made, or refer the matter to the International Committee, or both.

It is the opinion of the Political Committee that representatives of the OCI grossly violated this procedure. The Socialist Labour League would not, under any circumstances, dare to censor or interfere with what a fraternal delegate was saying from any section, no matter what was involved. It is most regrettable that, on the occasion where there are already many fundamental differences between the French and English sections, that such an organizational incident should occur which could cut across the political clarification which is so necessary for the whole of the international movement.

For our part we have no intention of allowing an incident like this to prevent clarification. We hold our comrades in France and those of their youth section, Revoltes, in the highest political regard. All we ask for is that both sides responsible join hands to prevent arbitrary interference with the traditional democratic rights of the sections and work together to see that all documents in the discussions are publicised to the entire membership of our international movement. We want not only meetings of leading committees, but joint membership aggregates to discuss the differences.

We formally, therefore, make a request to the French section and the International Committee to give an undertaking that such an incident will not take place again. Furthermore, that the undertaking accepts that the speeches and notes of fraternal delegates to either public or private functions will not be censored.

We are enclosing a copy of the speech by Comrade Sylveire. A copy of this letter has been sent to the International Committee for circulation to the sections.

Yours fraternally,
G. Healy
National Secretary

DOCUMENT 16

The OCI announces more differences with the SLL, August 1967

The discussion which is beginning

The publication in this bulletin of the CC resolution of January 23, 1967, of the written report made by Ducros in the name of the OCI at the enlarged session of the IC in May 1967, and of the resolutions of that same session of the IC, opens up a discussion of decisive importance for the future of the IC and the rebuilding of the FI.

We are going into a phase in the life of the IC in the course of which, as necessities for its reconstruction, the profound reasons for the crisis of the FI must be brought into the light of day. The discussion does not arise artificially. It springs from the development of the sections of the IC and the tasks hereafter incumbent on them related to the joint crisis of imperialism and the Soviet bureaucracy. Liège and the commemoration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Russian Revolution are the most obvious demonstrations of the activity of the IC. They are completely linked up with the requirements of the building of the sections of the IC, and not only of the English and French sections. One can find no more evident demonstration of the interdependence between the construction of the sections of the IC and the struggle for the rebuilding of the FI.

However, it becomes vital to clarify what the rebuilding of the FI means, and what the IC, its role and its tasks, represent. So it is in a politically deliberate manner that the OCI has undertaken the discussion at this moment as opposed to any other. If undertaken before the IC was capable of carrying on international activity directly integrated in the class struggle, it ran the risk of being formal and somewhat academic. Not to undertake it now would be impossible, so com-

pletely is it part of the tasks which the IC must accomplish if it wishes to accomplish its mission.

Dissolution of the concrete in the abstract

We knew that profound differences existed between the SLL leadership and ourselves which the Third Conference of the IC left in abeyance. They concerned the very basis of the questions of the rebuilding of the FI. In our opinion the SLL leadership has not sorted out the why's and how's of the birth of Pabloism inside the FI. It has registered the fact that at a certain stage in the life of the FI Pabloism appeared, that it placed the construction of parties of the FI in question, and that it is the expression of the pressure of the bourgeoisie and of the bureaucratic machines on the FI. Which is exactly so, but which explains nothing. The only thing left to be analysed is the essential thing. When Lenin and Trotsky declared the bankruptcy of the Second International, they explained that this was the pressure of bourgeois society taking effect on the parties of the Second International, but they also brought out how and in what way: the role of the working-class aristocracy participating in the super-profits of imperialism exploiting the world market.

When Trotsky analysed the degeneration of the Third International, he too explained that it degenerated under the pressure of imperialism and the world bourgeoisie, but he did not stop there. Very concretely he analysed the why's and how's of the formation of the Soviet bureaucracy, of the degeneration of the Bolshevik Party and of the transformation of the Third International into an instrument of the Soviet bureaucracy. And since the SLL comrades are fond of having recourse to the language of the dialectic, we would say that to go no further than this correct but extremely general affirmation — that Pabloism is revisionism inside the FI expressing the pressure of the bourgeoisie — that to stop there is to dissolve the concrete in the abstract. If it is to be fruitful this generality must lead to a concrete analysis bringing out in what specific way the pressure of the bourgeoisie and its ideologies is expressed inside the FI, and why and how it developed to the point of turning into virulent Pabloism.

Feeling the weakness of their position the SLL comrades reply: they (Pablo, Frank, Germain, Cannon & Co.) capitulated through not having studied dialectical materialism. This takes us forward not an inch. It is possible that Cannon did not study either Marx, Engels,

Lenin or Trotsky, but this is not the case where Pablo, Frank, Germain and so many others are concerned. We would even wager that the majority of them have also read, if not studied Hegel. Here also we have the dissolution of the concrete in the abstract. One does not study dialectical materialism as a method in itself, but in relation to the development of the class struggle and the struggle for the building of revolutionary parties and of the FI. The method is inseparable from its content. A means employed by bourgeois ideologists to distort the dialectic is to transform it into a logical system developing on itself (absolute thought). It consists precisely in separating method and content.

Here we are back at the point of departure. Why and how did Pablo, Frank, Germain and Cannon renounce dialectical materialism in relation to the development of the class struggle and the struggle for the construction of the FI, and arrive at virulent revisionism in 1950-51?

This refusal to approach concretely the analysis of the causes of Pabloism in order merely to limit oneself to its manifestations when quantity is transformed into quality, runs the risk of having serious consequences; the repetition of the same mistakes which led to Pabloism, the inability to approach and resolve concretely the tasks of rebuilding the FI, and recourse to empiricism where the activity of the sections of the IC and of the IC itself is concerned.

Dangerous political confusion

Serious manifestations of this have come to light in the course of the last few months. When the decision was taken to publish a bulletin of the IC the English comrades, no doubt unconsciously, entitled the first English edition 'Bulletin of the Executive Committee of the International Committee'. What does that mean? Clearly, the IC is a centralised international organisation which functions in accordance with the principles of democratic centralism at the level of a constituted international leadership. The Pabloite crisis and its consequences on the FI are struck out by the appearance of the title 'Executive Committee of the International Committee'. The FI does not have to be rebuilt: the EC of the IC succeeds the dethroned Pabloite IS. In this way, not only the analysis of the Pabloite crisis, but also its consequences on the FI are struck out. In fact nothing is struck out, unless one declares a problem to be resolved in order not to have to resolve it: the

problem of rebuilding the FI which was destroyed as a centralised international organisation. The SLL comrades corrected this after discussion at the IC. But this is a worrying symptom which shows the importance of this discussion.

No less worrying are certain of the SLL's positions. The one called 'Critical support for Mao-Tse-Tung and the Red Guards', and the slogan 'Victory to the Viet Cong'. Two positions foreign to the programme of the FI and to its method. We do not give our critical support to Mao and the Red Guards. In the struggle against the wing of the Chinese bureaucracy which expresses the tendency to capitulate to imperialism and the Soviet bureaucracy, we support unconditionally the wing incarnate in Mao without serving sureties on him or posing conditions to him. Basically to impose conditions means either that one supports nothing at all, or that one entrusts him with accomplishing the tasks which should be those of a party of the FI in China. Trotsky emphasised the equivocality of a similar formulation with regard to the defence of the USSR. We are unconditionally for the defence of the conquests of the Chinese revolution, that is why we support Mao-Tse-Tung against the capitulationist wing when he struggles against it and calls for action, even if just controlled action, by the masses, but without imposing conditions on him, conditions which could only be those that lead to the realisation of the programme of the FI. To impose such conditions is to stand bail for him. The slogan 'Victory to the Viet Cong' proceeds from mistakes of the same type. In a war between the USSR and imperialism we are for the victory of the USSR, even if the war is carried out under the leadership of the bureaucracy. Because we defend unconditionally what holds good of the conquests of October, we do not demand a priori that, if we are to defend them, they should first of all be regenerated by the elimination of the bureaucracy. We are for the victory of the USSR but our slogan could not be 'Victory to the CPSU'.

On the contrary, we are for its defeat by the Russian party of the FI. We are for the victory of the working class and peasant masses of Vietnam even if they are led by the Viet Cong, without the slightest confusion.

We are not for the victory of the Viet Cong, any more than we were for the victory of the MNA or the FLN. The slogan 'Victory to the Viet Cong' introduces the same confusion as conditional support for Mao. Behind it, there can surreptitiously slide in renunciation of the task of building a Vietnamese party of the FI, this mission being

accomplished by the Viet Cong. In fact this slogan is appropriate to cover up rallying to the petty-bourgeois policy of the Viet Cong since the Viet Cong will not accomplish the tasks of a Vietnamese party of the FI. It is at any rate to stand bail for it politically and to cover up its policy, to place in question the necessity for the building of the FI and its parties, and to prepare oneself to adopt the Pabloite orientation which supports the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois leaderships which would assume the role of leadership of the proletarian revolution in the economically backward countries. Further confusion from this slogan: it leads one to believe that the working class and peasant masses of Vietnam can defeat imperialism militarily, while their victory is entirely subordinate to the course of the struggle between the classes internationally, military action being integrated in this course.

The confusion in similar slogans is clearly revealed when one understands that there are no definitive victories in the struggle against imperialism except when it is defeated as a whole by the victory of the world proletarian revolution, that is to say by the seizure of power by the proletariat in the economically developed countries.

Also, although under the leadership of the Soviet bureaucracy, of a wing of the Chinese bureaucracy or of petty-bourgeois groups, such and such an imperialist enterprise might suffer a defeat, however important this or these blows might be in taking part in the maintenance of the bourgeois order internationally, the bureaucratic and petty-bourgeois leaderships undermine the successes that are won. They are incapable of carrying through the revolutionary conquests to the end. Quite the opposite: in the final analysis, after having exploited them, they can only destroy them with their whole policies. In this sense the victory of the working class and peasant masses of Vietnam and the defence of the conquests of the Chinese or the Russian revolutions come through the defeat of the Viet Cong, of that wing of the Chinese bureaucracy represented by Mao, and of the Soviet bureaucracy, by the workers in the course of the struggle against bureaucracy, the bourgeoisie and imperialism. Our slogans cannot leave room for any confusion on this score.

The taint of Pabloism

The taint of Pabloism emanating from the positions adopted by the Political Committee of the SLL on the question of the war between

the state of Israel and the Arab states is extremely strong. Strictly speaking, it is possible to discuss whether the attack by Israel on the Arab countries is an attack by a state interposed by imperialism against the latter. Everything proves that it is not, and that it is a question of a war resulting from the impasse of the Israeli and Arab bourgeoisies, consequent on the domination of this part of the world by imperialism, but undertaken on their own account to the detriment of the basic interests of imperialism.

The model example of this type of war was provided by the war between India and Pakistan. Then already mechanically projecting the fact that the Indian bourgeoisie and the Pakistani bourgeoisie depend on American and British imperialism, the *Newsletter* explained that this was a case of a war unleashed by the American and British imperialists. This was clearly false. The error lies in believing that American imperialism in its way manipulates all the bourgeoisies and that these have no specific needs or interests of their own. Starting from this simplified view, very little is needed to adopt the conception of a super-imperialism. The immediate consequence was that the Political Committee of the SLL declared itself for the victory of the Arab bourgeoisies and feudal rulers and the defeat of the Israeli bourgeoisie; instead of showing that the Arab bourgeoisies and feudal rulers as well as the Israeli bourgeoisie, unable to free themselves from their dependence on imperialism, try to contain social antagonisms and to overcome their economic and political bankruptcy by having recourse to Zionist and Pan-Arab ideologies, by exacerbating nationalism, the war being the extension of this policy.

But this mistake, although serious, is not the most important one, because theoretically one could not exclude the possibility that imperialism, American or some other, might unleash a war through an interposed state in order to tie down some bourgeoisie more closely, or to overthrow a regime. In this case while participating in the military struggle against imperialism the proletariat nevertheless should not depart from its class independence and its struggle for the overthrow of the regime of the bourgeoisie and the feudal rulers.

The capital error was to subordinate the proletariat of the Arab countries to Nasser's regime and to Pan-Arab ideology. According to the Political Committee of the SLL the third phase of the Arab revolution was beginning, the proletarian revolution being subordinate to the struggle for the national unity of the 'Arab nation'. There is no Arab nation, but all the same, even if there were one, the

opposite would be true: the democratic tasks, including national unity, could not be brought about except by the dictatorship of the proletariat, that is to say by proletarian revolution. The class independence of the proletariat is the ABC of Marxist politics. Nasserism enslaves and subordinates the working class to the interests of the Egyptian bourgeoisie. The official ideology, expressed by the title of United Arab Republic, is the aspiration to domination by the Egyptian bourgeoisie of the peoples, Arab or non-Arab, of this region of the world.

There is no third phase of the Arab revolution, all the more so since there has not been any first or second phase. Nasser in power was a regime à la Chiang-Kai-Shek instituting itself in Egypt, whose most pressing task was the destruction of all autonomous expressions of the proletariat. In contrast, the democratic demands must be raised against Nasser's counter-revolutionary regime: freedom of the press and of organization, the rights and independence of trade unions, etc. The 'national' slogan in the Middle East is: for a Federation of Socialist Republics of the Middle East. There is far less an Arab revolution than there is a colonial revolution. Such an expression signifies a bloc of the 'progressive' classes of the Arab countries in the struggle against imperialist domination. The revolution in the Arab countries is an integral part of the world proletarian revolution. The building of parties of the FI in the Middle East is as vital as elsewhere.

The orientation defined by the statement of the Political Committee of the SLL on the war between the state of Israel and the Arab countries is exactly the same as that defined by *The Militant*, organ of the SWP.

The mistakes made by the leadership of the SLL all proceed from a failure to assimilate the origins of Pabloism. Not having correctly posed the problems of the reconstruction of the FI, the leadership of the SLL, affirming that the IC is purely and simply the Fourth International, is caught by events.

They are obliged to look for substitutes for the reconstruction of the FI and to entrust to Mao, the Viet Cong, and Nasser the accomplishment of tasks which can only be accomplished by the FI.

What kind of discussion

This is very serious. The wound (the scratches) can turn into gangrene. But not every wound turns into gangrene. The SLL has

contradictory positions. In England, it struggles effectively for the building of a party of the FI starting from the programme. It participates to the full in international activities such as Liège, the Commemoration of the Hungarian Revolution and the International Assembly of Youth in England. It has fought against Pablistism on a whole series of questions, particularly at the moment when the SWP rejoined the International Secretariat. After having thought it was possible to unify the Robertson group and the ACFI in the USA, and to unify *Voix Ouvrière* and the OCI in France at the Third International Conference, it fought with us against these groups which are the enemies of the FI's programme and of the FI.

The SLL is a Trotskyist organization committing serious and dangerous mistakes. The discussion beginning inside the IC must be understood as being a discussion between Trotskyist organizations conducted with the greatest sense of responsibilities on both sides. The IC constitutes the motive force for the reconstruction of the FI and its sections. We shall try to convince the SLL and not defeat it, being all the more persuaded that we shall both progress in the course of the discussion. It must go on alongside the common activity of the sections of the IC.

This bulletin will be followed by other bulletins: one will contain the translation of the articles and statement of the Political Committee of the SLL on the Middle East crisis, and another the reply of the SLL to the report of the French delegation to the IC with the answer which the OCI will make to this reply. Other bulletins will be brought out. The next Congress of the OCI will have an item on the agenda devoted to a discussion of the problems of rebuilding the FI.

This discussion cannot be put off; it must be carried out without political conciliationism, but without losing sight of the fact that the reconstruction of the FI is the question involved.

DOCUMENT 17

Minutes of the International Committee meeting, September 30-October 1, 1967

*Agenda: Ceylon
Work of Youth Sections
International Discussion
Greece
USA
Russian Revolution Anniversary*

1. Ceylon

A report was read from the group in Ceylon. The following resolution was carried unanimously:

The International Committee welcomes the approach of a group of Ceylon comrades around the papers *Virodhaya* and *Edhirripu* for closer relations with the International Committee. We propose the following steps in preparation for the building of a Ceylon section of the International Committee.

It is necessary to make a basic estimation of the development of the LSSP and LSSP(R) and their degeneration under the pressure of bourgeois parliamentarism, paralleled and supported by the Pabloite revisionists internationally.

This must be done as part of an analysis of the economic and political situation in Ceylon and the perspective of the revolutionary movement in that country.

After discussion of a draft in the sections of the International Committee, the IC will publish in English, Sinhalese and Tamil, before the next Conference of the Ceylon comrades a declaration on the lessons of the experiences of the LSSP and the LSSP(R) in relation to the Fourth International and its principles and programme. It will call for a discussion

on this declaration as the basis for regroupment of all those who came forward to build a section of the IC in Ceylon.

The Ceylon comrades will prepare in time for their next Conference a document examining in detail the experiences of the Trotskyist movement and of the class struggle in Ceylon with the perspective and the platform for the building of the revolutionary party. This is the necessary first step both for the Ceylon comrades and for the international movement.

On this basis we work with the perspective of establishing a section of the IC in Ceylon before our next International Conference in 1968.

2. Work of Youth Sections

Reports were made from the British, French and Hungarian sections of work since the International Assembly of Youth. The next meeting of the committee for organization of the World Youth Conference is to meet in Paris on November 19th.

3. International Discussion

The SLL reply is now translated and will generally be circulated in the French section by October 15th. A lengthy document is being prepared by the French section and will be ready (in French) by the end of October.

Joint meetings of the delegations of the leaderships of the two sections will take place on November 18th/19th in Paris. After the Congress of the French section (December 30th-January 1st) membership meetings will be organized in the various regions in both sections, with speakers from both sections.

Cde. Just drew attention to T.W.'s minutes of a July meeting in which he mentions 'three' international discussion bulletins, the third being C.S.'s notes of the IC discussion on the Middle East war. This had not been received in France, and this was a breach of the form a discussion must take. The document was produced and is an internal SLL document 'for members' only and not 'international discussion' material. T.W. was to be informed of this, and copies supplied to the French comrades. In future, minutes of IC meetings to be circulated.

4. Greece

A written and spoken report was taken from the Greek section. The Committee members expressed the firm opinion that the essential first task was a political centre, and for the moment this must be built in emigration. The general discussion centred on the necessity for a

political line completely independent of the 'democrats' and based on complete awareness of the fact that there was no return to 'democracy' in Greece.

A letter from the expelled minority in Greece was read. It was agreed to write for clarification of its contents and invite the writer to the November 18/19th meeting. Preparatory steps to be worked out for an IC visit (French) to Greece.

5. USA

It was agreed that a French comrade represent the IC at the Congress of US group (end of November).

6. *Russian Revolution Commemoration*

Reports were made of the work in France and Britain and exchange speakers arranged for the principal meetings.

The Hungarian section is organizing a special meeting of Hungarian workers in Paris, and circulating a special bulletin in Eastern Europe. The section had been contacted by ex-Social Democrat and Populist groups now in exile, for a joint declaration on the anniversary of the Revolution. These groups have contacts inside Hungary, and the reaction of these contacts to the rightward course of the bureaucracy must be behind their making this first approach to us. However, discussion had revealed deep differences, with these groups remaining dependent on the bureaucracy in a centrist manner.

It would be suggested that special issues of *Arbeiterkorrespondenz* and *The Bulletin* be devoted to the Russian Revolution. The IC agreed on a common declaration on the anniversary of the Revolution.

DOCUMENT 18a**SLL statement in defence of the OCI,
June 22, 1968***A Pabloite slander is exposed*

The Socialist Labour League has declared unequivocally that it will fight with all the strength at its command against the illegalization of those socialist organizations which have been banned in France.

Everyone who reads our paper knows that we have the most serious fundamental disagreements with the Unified Secretariat of the Fourth International (Pabloite). We will, however, stand foursquare with them in opposing those who have taken their freedom away.

Here we want to correct a slander which people in their ranks have circulated about our comrades of the Organisation Communiste Internationaliste (OCI), 'Révoltes' and the Fédération des Etudiants Revolutionnaire (FER), who are also affected. It is to the effect that on the night of May 10 our comrades refused to fight behind the barricades.

In *The Newsletter* of May 21 Tom Kemp, who was present in Paris on that evening, outlined the position as follows:

While the barricades were going up, which left the students open to police attack with no possibility of re-inforcement, the members of the FER were holding a meeting in the Palais de la Mutualité attended by some 1,200 students. This meeting stressed the need to carry the student struggle into the working class and to give it a revolutionary political character. It therefore adopted as its principle slogan the bringing into the Latin Quarter of 500,000 workers from the suburbs as an answer to the governmental repression. When this meeting ended at about 11.45 pm on Friday night those who had attended it formed up with linked arms in a solid phalanx which marched through to one of the main barricades on the Boulevard St-Michel in the Latin Quarter. This march took place through streets the entrances of which were barred by hundreds of armed police and which were still full of people in the proximity of the Latin Quarter.

Responsible and disciplined, with student stewards marching with joined hands on all sides, at times passing within only a few yards of the lines of police, it chanted the slogan: '500,000 workers to the Latin Quarter on Monday', alternated with singing the Internationale. At the barricade the followers of Cohn-Bendit and other groups refused to accept the proposition of a link up with the working class. The red banners of the FER were therefore taken back through the marchers, whose numbers, joined by many bystanders, had increased to some 3,000. On arrival at the Mutualité, at about 1.15 am a short speech was made by a leader of the French Trotskyists and the order was given to disperse and to carry the slogan into the working-class districts during the weekend.

Now we have information about what happened after that. At 2 am information reached those on the barricades that the French Communist Party had been forced to change its policy and call a general strike for Monday, May 13. This ultimately meant that over one million workers thronged the Left Bank in the most powerful demonstration France had ever seen.

The demands of our comrades were absolutely right. Students by themselves could not have changed the situation. It required this massive intervention from the working class.

At 2 o'clock in the morning of Saturday, May 11, when this about-face was forced on the French Communist Party, then the students had actually won that part of the battle. There was absolutely no need whatsoever to have stayed at the barricades in order to give the police an opportunity to viciously beat up and injure hundreds of young people. Our comrades refused to participate in this adventure. It is not the anarchists such as Cohn-Bendit, no matter what publicity he receives in the press and on television, who tells us what to do. They justified it by saying they wanted to dislocate the traffic in Paris the next day.

Our comrades were guided by what was right politically, and acted accordingly. To suggest that our people in France are cowards is the language of the provocateur. As everyone knows, they were in the forefront of the battles from beginning to end, whilst at the same time opposing needless adventures.

DOCUMENT 18b**Declaration by the International Committee,
June 25, 1968**

The International Committee of the Fourth International calls upon workers' organizations in every country to act and to protest against the political repressions of the de Gaulle regime in France.

The Organisation Communiste Internationaliste, the youth organization 'Révoltes' and the Federation of Revolutionary Students, together with the Parti Communiste Internationaliste, Jeunesse Communiste Revolutionnaire, Voix Ouvrière, the May 22nd student movement, pro-Chinese Communist organizations and others, have been pronounced dissolved. Any militant found guilty of re-building these organizations can be imprisoned for two years.

All this is done in the name of ensuring peaceful and democratically conducted elections. At the same time Bidault returns to France unhindered, Salan is set free, and the ex-torturers of Algeria are turned out of the jails on to the streets of Paris.

This is the reaction of the French bourgeoisie to the great revolutionary strikes of May-June 1968, the first mighty blow struck by the working class in the new stage of the socialist revolution in Europe.

The same French working class, despite the despicable betrayals of the Stalinists, will, supported by the international proletariat, fight back against the political repressions of de Gaulle and his government.

The promised General Election is an excuse to strike at the revolutionaries. To the long list in French history of the seekers of 'order' after every revolutionary struggle by the working class is now added — the Communist Party.

While de Gaulle prepared his decrees against the revolutionaries, and to ban demonstrations, the Stalinists prepared the way: they

warned union members against solidarity with the Renault workers, for fear of 'provoking' de Gaulle and endangering the General Election.

While Bidault and Salan went free, Waldeck-Rochet laid claim to the Tricolore and the Marseillaise and promised to share government with all 'progressives' and 'democrats' under de Gaulle and the Fifth Republic.

It was these same Stalinists, in the month of May, who condemned the heroic students of Paris as 'ultra-lefts', 'adventurers' and 'playthings of the Gaullist regime'.

It was they who sought to confine the greatest general strike in history to wage demands. And it was they who handed the initiative back to de Gaulle when he was effectively paralyzed by the workers' actions.

It was the Stalinists who drove the workers back to work and who have prepared the ground for the present repressions.

This was no 'mistake' but an inevitable consequence of the policies of the privileged Kremlin bureaucracy.

'Peaceful, parliamentary roads to socialism' means ruthless opposition to any other path to socialism, just as 'socialism in one country' implied '. . . and in no other country'.

The Stalinist bureaucracy understand full well that a workers' victory is their death-knell as well as that of the capitalists. And so they join hands with the class enemy.

Let the workers of all countries be warned yet again that the Stalinists will collaborate with the bourgeois state, indeed provide its only real support, for the suppression of the proletarian revolution and of the revolutionary leadership.

This is also the key to the solidarity struggle. Everywhere Stalinism must be fought as the principal barrier to proletarian internationalism.

Campaigns must be waged in every country for financial support for our French comrades. They have suffered casualties and victimization. Their members face arrests and imprisonments. Their work in illegality is difficult and expensive.

The International Committee's sections will organize the maximum financial support.

The fight against de Gaulle's repressions is an urgent question in every country. He has done what every bourgeois government will try to do, just as they did in Greece.

The economic and political effects of the French events will spur on the crisis throughout the entire world, and new revolutionary convulsions are inevitable in the very near future.

Preparation of the revolutionary leadership in readiness for these events is the first necessity. The campaign of political and financial solidarity with our French comrades can be one of the vital steps in preparing that leadership and sinking its roots deeper into the working class.

France lights up the future brilliantly.

The bourgeoisie is forced by its crisis to attack every gain made by the working class. But this class is more confident and combative than ever before. It enters strike struggles with a growing political consciousness.

The bourgeoisie is forced to consider fascist and militaristic dictatorships as the only discipline. The Stalinists and social democrats are the willing executors of this bourgeois dictatorship. And so the historic task of resolving the crisis of leadership of the working class coincides immediately and in the political experience of the masses, with the unavoidable necessity of a clash with the capitalist state.

This is the problem of power, the problem of the bourgeoisie's preparation for civil war in every advanced capitalist country.

The working class will respond.

The International Committee calls for the maximum publicity against the repressions in France, for immediate financial assistance, and for campaigns of political solidarity with the French workers.

The International Committee of the Fourth International hails the French working class! We are confident of victory.

Never before has Stalinism in France been so cruelly exposed. The workers in the factories will rally to the banner of the Fourth International, the true banner of Communism.

With the help of the international working-class movement, the French workers will sweep away the repressive laws of de Gaulle, and go forward to the Soviet Republic of France!

- Long live the French Socialist Revolution!
- Long live the heroic workers and students of France!
- Long live the United Socialist States of Europe!
- End the ban on revolutionary organizations in France!
- Maximum financial support for the French Trotskyists!

DOCUMENT 18c

Statement on the OCI by the *Newsletter* Editorial Board, June 25, 1968

Various centrist and revisionist groups refer to the sister organization of the Socialist Labour League in France, the Organisation Communiste Internationaliste, as the 'Lambertist' group.

This is, of course, a deliberate falsification of the position of the OCI which, as everyone knows, is the French section of the International Committee of the Fourth International. The OCI emerged as a result of the expulsion of the majority of the French section of the Fourth International in 1952 by a minority led by Pablo. This man used his position as International Secretary to carry out what was in essence a Stalinist organizational frame-up.

The Socialist Workers' Party of the United States, which today refers also to the OCI as 'Lambertist', at that time issued an open letter to all Trotskyists which had the following to say about what happened in France:

This Stalinist organizational course began, as is now quite clear, with Pablo's brutal abuse of administrative control in his disruptive campaign against the majority of the French section of the Fourth International more than a year and a half ago.

By fiat of the International Secretariat, the elected majority of the French section was forbidden to exercise its rights to lead the political and propaganda work of the party. Instead, the political bureau and press were put under the control of a 'parity commission'.

At the time, we deeply disapproved this arbitrary action by which a minority was used to arbitrarily overturn a majority. As soon as we heard about it, we communicated our protest to Pablo. However, we must admit that we made an error in not taking more vigorous action. This error was due to insufficient appreciation on our part of the real issues involved. We thought the differences between Pablo and the French section were tactical and this led us to side with Pablo, despite our misgivings about his

organizational procedure, when, after months of disruptive factional struggle, the majority was expelled.

But at bottom the differences were programmatic in character. The fact is that the French comrades of the majority saw what was happening more clearly than we did. The Eighth Congress of their Party declared that 'a grave danger menaces the future and even the existence of the Fourth International . . . Revisionist conceptions, born of cowardice and petty-bourgeois impressionism have appeared within its leadership. The still great weakness of the International, cut off from the life of the sections, has momentarily facilitated the installation of a system of personal rule, basing itself and its anti-democratic methods on revisionism of the Trotskyist programme and abandonment of the Marxist method.' (*La Verité*, September 18, 1952.)

The whole French situation must be re-examined in the light of subsequent developments. The role the majority of the French section played in the recent general strike demonstrated in the most decisive way that they know how to uphold the fundamental principles of orthodox Trotskyism. The French section of the Fourth International was unjustly expelled. The French majority, grouped around the paper *La Verité*, are the real Trotskyists of France and are so openly recognized by the SWP.

The fact that they wrote this in 1953 does not prevent the SWP today from falsely describing the OCI as a sectarian split off from the Fourth International. It is simply a case of lies catching up with liars.

Pierre Lambert, the secretary of the OCI today, was a prominent leader of the majority expelled by Pablo in 1952.

The OCI not only represents the majority of the Trotskyists in France, it is, historically speaking, the only legitimate continuator of Trotskyism in that country.

Chapter Five

The OCI blocs with the centrists

Formally correct in its characterization of the counter-revolutionary role of Stalinism, and its proclamation that the youth must be in the vanguard of the impending great revolutionary struggles, nonetheless the draft resolution for the Essen international youth conference was an entirely inadequate basis for the founding of a revolutionary youth international.

The Alliance des Jeunesses pour le Socialisme (AJS) was given the responsibility of preparing the resolution which we reproduce here. The statement of the IC calling on its sections to campaign for the Essen rally was published well in advance of the rally itself, but the draft resolution was presented to the Young Socialists (youth section of the SLL) delegation only a few hours before the rally began, leaving no time for translation and proper discussion.

It was necessary to prepare an emergency amendment at the very last minute. This amendment was absolutely necessary because the essential foundation for revolutionary parties, for the Fourth International, and therefore for the international youth movement, was entirely omitted from the draft. All the lessons of the struggle against Stalinism and against revisionist attempts to liquidate the Fourth International are summed up in the fact that the IC and its sections had to defend and develop basic Marxist theory, starting at the level of method and philosophy.

It was in no way accidental that when the OCI opposed this Young Socialist amendment, the centrists who were present (not to mention

the right-wing US student group, NSA) threw their weight immediately behind the OCI. Their votes together outnumbered those of the majority of the International Committee delegations at the rally. The Spanish POUM, for example, understood very well that its opposition to the very foundation of the Fourth International in the 1930s was exactly equivalent to the OCI's denial of the fundamental nature of the theoretical struggle.

These questions are dealt with in the statement of the IC, October 24, 1971, Part I, section 2, 'The Split at Essen' (see Volume Six). As the IC statement indicates, the presence of an observer from the American 'Spartacist' group of Robertson was also highly significant. The OCI's nominated leader of the AJS, Charles Berg, had issued the invitation to Spartacist despite the fact that, at the 1966 World Conference of the IC, the OCI had voted, along with all the other sections for a resolution which stated: 'The IC not only dissociates itself from the activities and publications of the Spartacists (Robertson) group but insists that a Marxist party can be built only in opposition to it.'

This declaration had come after a bitter struggle against the attempt of Robertson (and the *Voix Ouvrière* group from France, also observers at the 1966 Conference) to deny completely the continuity of the struggle for Marxism established by the IC against Pabloism. The presence of one of Robertson's representatives at Essen signified the abandonment of this struggle for the continuity of the Fourth International. All this was in fact the ideological preparation for the OCI to take up its role as left apologist for Mitterand and his fake 'united front' with the Stalinists. The same OCI which wrote in 1971 about the 'imminence of revolution' was by 1975 conducting a signature-collecting campaign imploring the Social-Democrats and Stalinists to desist from quarrels for the sake of the 'United Front'.

The theoretical source of this political degeneration of the OCI was undoubtedly the growing determined resistance of the leadership to the philosophical basis of the struggle of the International Committee. As we have seen, this took the form of the OCI's renunciation of Lenin's assertion that dialectical materialism as the theory of knowledge of Marxism is 'the essence' of Marxism. It led them immediately to reject Lenin's *What is to be Done* because of its insistence on the fundamental character of the theoretical struggle and of the struggle against spontaneous (trade-union) consciousness.

Without this, when the OCI delegation voted against the Young Socialist amendment at Essen, they declared a fundamental split.

Document 19, at the head of this chapter, is included as the political declaration of the OCI which prepared inexorably its complicity in the soon-to-be-enacted betrayal of the Bolivian working class. Under the guise of 'rebuilding the Fourth International in Latin America', the OCI set out to rally a number of centrist groups, and in particular the POR (Revolutionary Workers Party) of Bolivia, led by Lora. They characterized the POR as a 'Trotskyist Party' despite the fact that they themselves, in other documents, were obliged to criticize Lora for having capitulated, in his major political statements, to the Stalinists and then complete subservience to the bourgeois nationalists. Lora had openly abandoned the Permanent Revolution for the theory of Socialism in a single country together with its consequences for strategy and tactics in the backward countries: the two-stage theory of a bourgeois revolution first under bourgeois leadership and proletarian revolution only later, the Menshevik perspective revived by Stalin.

The OCI, by providing an 'international' cover for Lora's opportunist course, then had their own responsibility for the subsequent defeat of the Bolivian workers in 1971. They had helped give credibility to Lora's POR, which bore the direct responsibility for leaving the working class unarmed, politically and physically, against the counter-revolution.

DOCUMENT 19

The Rebuilding of the Fourth International in Latin America is under way, by Marc-Etienne Laurent, May 1971

In February this year, on the initiative of the OCI, acting on behalf of the International Committee, a meeting was held in Europe for Latin American organizations and militants, with the aim of preparing the conditions for rebuilding the Fourth International in Latin America.

The meeting was attended by representatives of the Bolivian POR and the Mexican LOM, members of the IC, and of the Argentinian organization *Politica Obrera*, which has proclaimed its loyalty to the Transitional Programme from its foundation, but has until recently developed on the fringes of the internationally-organized Trotskyist movement, waiting to join in the struggle for the rebuilding of the Fourth International. Also present in an individual capacity were members from Peru, Brazil and Venezuela. The brutal repression in Brazil, which has dealt severe blows at the leadership of the 'Trotskyist Bolshevik Faction' (which came out of the Posadist POR), prevented this group from attending, although they had taken part in the preparations from November 1969.

The main decisions reached are to be found in the *Resolution for the Latin American Conference for the Rebuilding of the Fourth International* printed below.

This resolution defines the basic agreement reached by the participants, and lays out their decision to undertake the preparation and organization of a conference for the re-building of the Fourth International in Latin America.

It defines the main points around which discussion must be publicly carried out in order to prepare this conference politically. The meeting of February 1971, which for the first time brought round one table factions, organizations and militants with little or no acquaintantance with each other, was not able to go beyond a preliminary discussion on many important problems. It cleared the ground, and made it possible for the first time to put up positions against each other. It was indispensable to engage in the active phase of preparation of a conference in Latin America, which can now go ahead with everything clear.

The preparatory nature of the work done at the February meeting in no way diminishes its significance.

Following on the conference of members from Eastern European countries in late 1969, which led to the formation of the Organizing Committee of Communist (Trotskyist) Militants of Eastern Europe, this Latin American meeting — the basis of which was laid by the Bolivian POR joining the International Committee in 1969 and then the Mexican LOM in 1970 — is the preparation for another step on the road to rebuilding the Fourth International.

This step will be the more important because it involves a decisive sector of the proletariat in the backward countries under capitalist domination. However limited in scope it may appear, this meeting itself already represents a moment in the process, now an open one, of re-establishing at the level of *consciousness* — which for Marxists can only mean the level of *organization* — the organic unity between the proletariat of the imperialist-dominated backward countries, the struggles of the proletariat of the advanced capitalist countries and the working class of countries dominated by the bureaucracy.

* * *

In the document it submitted for the discussion to prepare the Fourth Conference of the International Committee, the OCI wrote: 'The retreats of the world proletariat have always found their reflection in the destruction of the International . . . Every step forward by the world proletariat, on the other hand, has gone hand in hand with a resurgence of the struggle to rebuild the International.' And indeed, this meeting, the discussion it has opened and the decisions it has reached, cannot be taken out of the context of the present-day class struggle in Latin America and throughout the world.

This context is defined in the first paragraph of the resolution the meeting voted for, on the situation in the class struggle in Latin America, where it says that :

1. The huge student demonstrations in Mexico from June to September 1968; the general strike and factory occupations and the street battles of the cold store workers in Montevideo in 1969; the street battles of the proletariat and the youth in Cordoba and Rosario and the general strike of 30 May 1969 in Argentina; the upsurge of the Chilean workers and peasants, leading to the electoral victory of Popular Unity in September 1970 — these are the manifestations in Latin America of the turn in the political situation, which has been brought about by the ceaseless struggles of the proletariat in every part of the world, beginning with the French General Strike of 1968 and the upsurge of the political revolution in Czechoslovakia — a very important part of which is the resistance of the Indochinese workers and peasants to the brutal attacks of American imperialism.

The Conditions Today

Among the factors which made it possible to hold this meeting, there are some which need to be directly related to the turn which took place in 1968-69. Thus the voyage of Comrade Guillermo Lora to Europe and the decision taken by the POR to put an end to the 15 years of isolation in which this party had maintained itself since its split with the International Secretariat, and to affiliate to the IC at the end of 1969, and moreover the clear position taken by *Politica Obrera* in July 1970 for the reconstruction of the IV International and the discussions that have opened up between it and organizations belonging to the International Committee — are the direct expression of the fact that not only the POR but also *Politica Obrera* have understood that it was impossible to face up to the responsibilities imposed on them by the revolutionary rise of the proletariat and the youth in their country outside of the framework of the struggle for the construction of the International.

One of the features which defines a revolutionary organization as Marxist, is the understanding that because of the international character of the productive forces and the resulting development of both the bourgeoisie and the proletariat as world classes, however national the form of the revolution, it is international in character, and its victory can only be achieved by development on the world arena. Marxist revolutionary organizations have therefore to be aware that their

development, their progress nationally and the carrying out of their task of leading the masses to destroy the bourgeois state, depend on the extent to which they decide to or are able to draw strength from the building of the International, at the same time working with all their strength to build it.

In Latin America as elsewhere, the rebuilding of the Fourth International will not somehow come about in advance of the great struggles now beginning, or of intervention in these struggles by revolutionary organizations fighting on the basis of the Transitional Programme. In the eyes of the organizations and the members who came to the February meeting, and those who have already joined them since, what is needed is an understanding that beyond the partial victories over imperialism and the comprador bourgeoisie that the proletariat and the youth can gain in the short term, the definitive outcome of these struggles depends entirely on building the International.

The framework now laid down by the decision of the February meeting to engage in the preparation of the Latin American conference for re-building the Fourth International, together with the links now being forged between the older member organizations of the IC and the Latin American groups and organizations which have joined or are close to us, for the first time makes it possible for the Latin Americans, even in a limited way at first, to draw on the political experience built up by the organizations which have fought in both Western and Eastern Europe to secure the political continuity of the Fourth International. For organizations like the POR and *Politica Obrera* which are immediately faced with very grave responsibilities, this is an important factor — even if this opportunity is spoilt by the counter-blows of the Pabloite crisis, which has had particularly disastrous consequences in Latin America, consequences it will take some time to overcome.

On the other hand, the links which are now beginning to be forged are extremely important for the 'European' organizations of the IC. They will in themselves make a considerable contribution to the political progress of these organizations, while all progress along this road must lead to a considerable strengthening of the IC, and, together with the work in Eastern Europe, in Spain, and for the building of the RYI*, will make it possible for the rebuilding of the Fourth International to make a qualitative leap forward.

* Revolutionary Youth International

For the OCI, it is of the highest importance that the International Committee, through the POR, member organization of the IC, and through *Politica Obrera* who are working ever more closely with us, was very much in evidence in the revolutionary process which has begun in Bolivia and is now beginning in Argentina. No one in the ranks of the IC should fail to grasp the significance of this.

Discussion begins

The Bolivian POR, the LOM of Mexico, *Politica Obrera*, the 'Trotskyist Bolshevik Faction' of Brazil, the Marxist faction which has just left the centrist organization *Vanguardia Revolucionaria* in Peru, and the Venezuelan groups now in contact with the IC, are those who have understood the need to struggle from now on for the re-building of the International, the world party of proletarian revolution.

By starting the preparation for the Latin American conference they are showing their desire to harness everything — with the support and the assistance of the organizations belonging to the IC — to working in such a way that other organizations, factions and militants can set foot without delay on the road that they have opened.

They are doing so at a vital moment, at a time when the demands of the class struggle and the necessity of making a political orientation that conforms with the interests of the working class in a revolutionary phase, on the one hand pushes forward a new generation of young militants who are starting on the search for the programme of the proletarian revolution, while on the other it leads militants who have been engaged in the class struggle for a long time to enter into conflict with the traditional nationalist petty-bourgeois or Stalinist or in some cases syndicalist or social-democratic leaderships whom they have followed up until now. The objective — and the responsibility — of those organizations and groups that have already accepted the framework of the conference is to turn resolutely towards these youth and these militants in crisis and to win them for the task of reconstructing the International.

It is within this perspective that we have to select the principal questions around which the discussion in preparation for the Latin American conference has started and must continue.

Certainly many features of the discussion still reflect the fact that it is only starting between organizations that have for years developed in

the most complete isolation and which are still in the first phase of their common work. But the character of the questions that have henceforth been tackled, as well as the profoundly responsible way the discussion has been taken up, not only in the public exchange of letters between the OCI and the Bolivian POR in July August 1970 but also at the January meeting, offers, we are sure, to the organizations or groups who pose the problem of how they are to insert their struggle against imperialism and its ally, the Stalinist bureaucracy, into an international framework, the most serious guarantees of finding what they have a right to look for.

To judge this it is sufficient to examine the principal features of the political situation that is developing today in Latin America and to see how the discussion that has been started is already beginning to answer the problems it poses to revolutionaries.

'The fundamental law of revolution', Lenin says, 'is as follows: for a revolution to take place it is not enough for the exploited and oppressed masses to realize the impossibility of living in the old way. It is only when the "lower classes" do not want to live in the old way that the revolution can triumph. Revolution is impossible without a nation-wide crisis (affecting both the exploited and the exploiters).'

The political situation in Latin America

Today an ever-growing number of Latin American states are in this situation or at least very close to it. The complete impasse in which the policies of economic and social development worked out by CEPAL and other international bodies, which were expected to work miracles, have ended up, and the accentuation, on the contrary, of the pressure of imperialism the more the manifestations of the crisis of the capitalist system have grown in the advanced countries, have eroded the foundations of the majority of political regimes in power and opened deep splits in the ranks of the comprador bourgeoisies.

This crisis situation which affects all the conditions of life of the proletariat and the youth, in the town and in the countryside, and in the face of which there is no even relatively privileged situation of any value, constitutes the objective basis for the mobilization of the proletariat and of the youth and their breaking into the political scene under conditions of mass struggles. The great struggles on the streets of Cordoba, Rosaria, Tucuman and Montevideo, the demonstrations of 300,000 and 500,000 students and young people that broke out in

Mexico and were only stopped by the massacre at Tlatelolco, the mass combats opened up following February 1971 by the workers and students of Colombia, etc., etc., cannot be understood outside of this context which provides the immediate terrain for the intervention of revolutionaries armed with the method of the Transitional Programme.

From its very outset the intervention of the proletariat and of the youth has the effect of deepening the splits in the heart of the bourgeoisie. Today, whether in Argentina, Bolivia, Peru, Mexico or Venezuela, the comprador bourgeoisies are shaken — and paralysed — by profound disagreements on what policies to follow, not only towards their own working class but also towards imperialism. These disagreements do not spare the army, but on the contrary open up the deepest cleavages in the ranks of the military.

The immediate consequence of the crisis of the comprador bourgeoisies is to give back to the petty-bourgeois nationalist organizations, as well as to the Stalinist apparatus from which these organizations draw a decisive part of their strength, a role and an importance of the first order. Even in periods when the bourgeoisie has a more or less firm hold on the reins the nationalist and Stalinist organizations, as well as the 'non-political' trades union bureaucracies, play a considerable role in guarding the flanks of the bourgeois order. In time of crisis this role grows even more and the ability of the bourgeoisie to regain its freedom of action depends on their ability to divert the action of the masses.

Whether they intervene directly, as in Chile, or whether they try to consolidate and support the action of the petty-bourgeois nationalist organizations (or the petty-bourgeois nationalist factions within the armed forces), the role accomplished by the Communist Parties in this work is *decisive*. Today, as in the 1930s or in the world political crisis that followed the Second World War in 1944-46, it is the international disposition of Stalinism in Latin America that comes to the aid of the threatened rule of imperialism and takes it upon itself to help the bourgeoisie, in the appropriate form for each country, to plug the gaps and to dam the rise of the masses.

It is undeniable that in many countries it is the petty-bourgeois nationalist political formations or government teams (more and more frequently military) that represent the immediate obstacle in the path of the development of the consciousness and the revolutionary activity of the masses, and the 'immediate' enemy that the revolutionaries

must confront politically. It is behind them that the Stalinist apparatus is invariably found, to give them support and to help them to maintain their influence among the masses.

This is notably true in Peru. But it is only neutralized in Bolivia by reason of the political importance of the POR, although the latter must furnish proof of the most careful attention. It will be the case tomorrow in Argentina, where the Communist Party is trying to prevent the future assault on power by the working class by setting up a 'popular front' formation in coalition with a wing of Peronism. That is, in fact, as the French Stalinist Furnival explains very well, the meaning 'of the holding, in broad daylight, on the 21 November in a big hall in Rosario, of a "national meeting of Argentinians"; 4,300 delegates from various organizations, including Peronists, Communists, socialists, Christian democrats, radicals etc., there constituted, with hundreds of support committees all over the country, not a new party but a permanent organism that constitutes a serious step towards the formation of a united front with a view to a new government with a popular programme.' (*Cahiers du Communisme*, January 1971)

For a revolutionary to arm himself politically to intervene in this situation at the present stage means that he must:

1. Understand the whole range of the method of transitional demands as well as the necessity of facing the tasks of the construction of the revolutionary party as tasks *inseparable from the intervention in the struggle of the masses* on the field of their daily living conditions, from the *fight to make possible the realization of the unity of the proletariat* and the imposition of its hegemony at the heart of the alliance of the workers and the peasants and of the anti-imperialist united front, and finally — the backbone of the whole of this struggle — from the fight constantly to put forward the slogan of *the workers' and peasants' government*, the central slogan which alone is able to direct the activity of constructing the party in its entirety.
2. Be able to assess exactly the international context of the class struggle within which is situated the class struggle and his [the revolutionary's — trans.] intervention on a national level, and equally to formulate slogans capable of tying together the revolutionary process and the fight in his own country with the whole struggle of the international proletariat for the world revolution.

The presence of the POR at the February meeting as well as the central role it has to play in the preparation of the Latin American conference means that the discussion around the preliminary themes has started, not in the abstract, but from the very outset as part of a living experience, in a situation where the POR, a Trotskyist party, is preparing itself to assume the most onerous responsibilities in the struggle for power.

The framework provided by the International Committee, already expressed by the initiative taken by the OCI in convening and running the February meeting, furnishes the guarantee that the discussion will develop within the context of the world revolutionary process as a whole and as a part of the central objective of the reconstruction of the International, of the World Party of Socialist Revolution.

The tasks of the POR

In February the discussion around the slogan of the workers' and peasants' government and the way of expressing the method of the transitional programme took place above all in relation to Bolivia, where, as the resolution said, 'the highest point of the revolution in Latin America' was situated, and in relation to Chile, where a revolutionary process is taking place in the face of which the Trotskyists owe it to themselves to fix principled positions while waiting to be able to intervene there directly. Albeit incompletely and imperfectly, the general resolution expresses the general sense of these discussions.

On the subject of Bolivia the resolution first of all characterizes the situation as it was in January, and shows how:

On 7 October 1970, responding massively to the slogan of the general strike called by the COB and the political organizations of the working class, and invading the streets, the proletariat broke the *coup d'état* organized by the right wing of the army grouped around Miranda and opened a new phase in the process of its own mobilization. The new attempt at a *coup d'état* that followed on 10 January enabled the proletariat to make a new demonstration of its strength, cohesion and determination, to mobilize on its own ground and with its own methods with a view to the realization of its own class objectives, in the first place the establishment of its own power, its own government.

And the resolution continues, briefly analysing the central place of the slogan of a workers' and peasants' government and the responsi-

bility of the Bolivian POR in the political struggle to concretize these slogans.

The continued mobilization of the masses and their growing impatience in the face of the manoeuvres of the representatives of a bankrupt bourgeoisie create a situation where the slogan of a workers and peasants' Government led by the proletariat provide the only solution which could permit the crisis to be solved and the country to be put on the path that corresponds to the demands of the proletariat and the oppressed masses of the countryside and the towns.

The organizations and the militants gathered here salute the fight of the Bolivian POR, a Trotskyist party, whose political struggle in this context is of decisive importance not only for Bolivia but for the development of the whole class struggle in Latin America and for the reconstruction of the IV International in this part of the world.

Within the framework thus set up the meeting then discussed the perspective opened up by the creation, on the eve of Miranda's failed *coup d'état*, at the behest of the POR, of the Popular Assembly, that is to say of an organ that is not only legislative but also executive, whose consolidation would lead to a situation of dual power.

The discussion dealt with the necessity of finding the political means that would enable the masses to intervene directly in the process thus opened up. It was thus suggested that this objective could without doubt be best achieved through 'the preparation of a congress of the rank and file organizations of the Popular Assembly, the realization of which should enable the whole of the working class, the peasantry, the students and the popular masses to seize hold of the organ set up at La Paz as *their* own organ, and not as some organ that is distant, although set up by the representatives of their own organizations'.

The importance of this discussion and the range that it was destined to have is measured by the fact that it was this orientation that was adopted by the organizations belonging to the Popular Assembly, who decided, as the text of the summons to the session of the Assembly details: 'As soon as it is set in motion the Popular National Assembly will prepare a congress of its rank and file organizations from all over the country in order to take to its highest level the process of organization and of determining the tactics imposed by the struggle.'

The absence of any Chilean revolutionary militants or organizations at the February meeting prevented it from taking the discussion

forward to the same point it had reached on Bolivia and from doing more than defining the main lines of orientation on principle, although the meeting engaged itself 'to do everything in its power to help a revolutionary nucleus to form, starting from the conviction that there exist in the organizations of the Chilean labour movement workers who are trying to engage in their own movement on the path of a conscious orientation based on Marxism.'

The text defines however without ambiguity the role of the Allende government, the inevitable collision between the latter and the masses and the necessity of the formation of a vanguard within this process by selecting the concrete paths of struggle for the establishment of a government that will break with the framework of bourgeois institutions, a *workers' and peasants' government* opening the path directly to the dictatorship of the proletariat and a regime of workers' councils. Thus the resolution affirms that:

The continued rise of the masses, the occupations of land and of bankrupt businesses which the workers of the countryside and the towns have carried out since November, indicate the strength of the movement and the will of the proletariat and the masses to see their pressing demands satisfied. This movement is already coming into contradiction with the Allende government and will collide more profoundly with it in the months to come. Although in the eyes of the masses the Allende government is the incarnation of their government, we are dealing here with a bourgeois government authorized by the bourgeoisie to accede to power only to the extent that it has promised to accept the institutional framework and the rules of play of bourgeois parliamentary democracy and not to touch the repressive apparatus of the state (the army, the police). The mission with which it has been entrusted by the bourgeoisie is to dam up and to wear out the combativity of the masses and to prepare the conditions for the counter-offensive of the bourgeoisie and of imperialism against the working class and its organizations.

The strength of the impetus of the working class shows that nothing has yet been decided. But the situation imperiously demands the detachment of a revolutionary nucleus possessing the political ability to formulate in terms of slogans and forms of organization the aspirations and needs of the masses, to make them become conscious of the contradiction that exists between their aspirations and the policies of Allende, to explain to them the role and the nature of the present government and to show them the means to put an end to it by the establishment of a true workers' and peasants' government which breaks with the framework of bourgeois institutions and rests on the mobilization of the workers and peasants to

apply the programme of demands on whose satisfaction the latter are insisting.

The place of Latin America

The initiative taken by the OCI in convening and holding the February meeting and the responsibilities it intends to continue to shoulder in the preparation of the Latin American conference supply the guarantee that these vital discussions will never be divorced from the international context of the class struggle nor from the reconstruction of the International as a politically centralized organization on a world scale. Conversely, for the European organizations of the IC the question is to understand that the fight that is taking place for the reconstruction of the IV International is *their* struggle and not that of the Latin American sections of the IC, and the fundamental discussions on the revolutionary strategy of these organizations is a discussion which concerns them above all, as directly as it does the others.

It was in view of this assessment that the OCI asked Comrade Balazs Nagy to present the introductory report on the situation of the international class struggle and the reconstruction of the Fourth International, that it proposed to the meeting an agenda in which half the time available was to be dedicated to the discussion of these problems, and that it fought politically to impose a fundamental discussion on Stalinism and the necessity of understanding the reconstruction of the Fourth International as a centralized fight against imperialism, but also decisively opposed to the Stalinist bureaucracy and for its destruction.

This discussion finished with a vote of a strictly indicative character on a text presented by the OCI. After two deletions had been proposed and rejected the participants voted unanimously, with the exception of one militant present in a personal capacity, for the whole of the following text (the two passages whose deletion was demanded by the POR and *Politica Obrera* are shown in brackets):

A new period of the international class struggle opened with the French general strike of 1968 and the process of the political revolution in Czechoslovakia. It is situated within the framework defined by Lenin as the period of wars and revolutions. It is inseparable from the development of the international class struggle which, since the revolution of October 1917, has opened the way to the world proletarian revolution. But it has the following particular characteristics:

(a) The rottenness of the international capitalist system has spread to the very heart of imperialism — US imperialism — which has added to its own contradictions all those of the decadent imperialisms particularly of Europe, and vice versa.

(b) The crisis of the world imperialist system is linked with that of the Kremlin bureaucracy, the satellite bureaucracies and its international apparatus.

(c) The social revolution in the metropolitan imperialist countries of Europe and the political revolution against the Kremlin bureaucracy and against the satellite bureaucracies are simultaneously on the order of the day and tend in Europe to fuse into the same differentiated process.

(d) The political relations between imperialism and the Kremlin bureaucracy on the one hand and the international working class and the Kremlin bureaucracy on the other are undergoing a profound change (which does not change the nature of the Kremlin bureaucracy, which on the contrary is confirmed in the heat of the class struggle).

(e) The fundamental antagonism between the proletariat of the USSR, the Eastern European proletariat, the world proletariat and the Kremlin bureaucracy and its international apparatus is bursting into the light of day: this is the significance acquired by the struggles of the proletariat of East Germany in 1953, of Poland in 1956, the revolution of the workers' councils in Hungary in November 1956, the process of the political revolution in Czechoslovakia in 1968 followed by the revolutionary movement of the Polish proletariat in December 1970 which everywhere formed its councils. (This antagonism is reaching a new breadth and a new depth. The Kremlin bureaucracy and its international apparatus and the satellites are obliged, in order to defend their privileges against the proletariat, to rest on imperialism, the forces in support of the bourgeoisie against their own proletariat in their country, in the same way that they support imperialism against the international working class as a whole. In this struggle they put at risk the gains of the revolution of October 1917, which were extended at the end of the second world war to Eastern Europe, and those of the Chinese revolution. This is the profound significance of the planning reforms. But the working class is standing up to defend its conquests, to re-enter into possession of them, to regenerate and extend them, challenging the political power of the bureaucracy and entering into the fight that leads them to constitute, on the basis of its councils, its own political power, and to raise it up against the bureaucracy.)

(f) Resting on its previous conquests the international proletariat replies to the offensive of imperialism and the bureaucracy. The resistance of the

workers and peasants of Vietnam to imperialist aggression, the resistance of the Palestinian masses, the fights that are taking place in Latin America (in Mexico, Argentina, Uruguay, Venezuela, etc.) which at the moment are culminating in the Bolivian revolution, prepare and are part of the new period of international working class struggle.

(g) The slogan of the Socialist United States of Europe is indispensable as the expression of the joint struggle against the Kremlin bureaucracy, against imperialism and against the satellite bureaucracies that the European working class is carrying out, to unify its struggle in the East and in the West of Europe. This slogan concretizes proletarian internationalism and is indispensable for the reconstruction of the Fourth International. (But it goes beyond the framework of the class struggle in Europe because it surmounts the division of the world proletariat into two which imperialism and the Kremlin bureaucracy brought into being at the end of the Second World War, in order to save and to reconstruct the international imperialist system and to safeguard the interests of the parasitical caste threatened by the revolutionary wave at the end of the war.)

(h) The revolutionary wave that is developing in Latin America is no less important from the point of view of the international proletarian revolution. It destroys one of the principal seats particularly of US imperialism. It will have profound repercussions, just like the class struggle in Europe, on the development of the class struggle of the American proletariat. The slogan of the United Socialist States of Latin America has become from this point of view a slogan that not only unifies the proletariat of Latin America but is also the only political answer to imperialism and the only road against its plans, which neither the petty bourgeois nationalist tendencies nor the Stalinist parties can open up and which only organizations based on the programme of the Fourth International can open up. Similarly, its repercussion on the North American working class is a decisive factor in the latter's political development.

(i) The joint crisis of imperialism and the Kremlin bureaucracy and its international apparatus forces them to confront the working class, but it is the latter that has the initiative in the class struggle. In these conditions it tends to dislocate them. But no revolutionary crisis, not even the dislocation of imperialism and of the Kremlin bureaucracy immediately means the victory of the proletariat. 'The crisis of humanity is the crisis of revolutionary leadership.' The joint crisis of imperialism and the bureaucracy and their eventual dislocation only open new and as yet unheard of possibilities for the reconstruction of revolutionary parties based on the Transitional Programme and for the reconstruction of the Fourth International.

For the Socialist United States

As is indicated by a reading of point 'h', which places the bearing of the revolutionary process opened up in Latin America in relation to the whole of the international class struggle, a discussion opened up and then developed within the framework of the discussion on Latin America itself on the topicality and the meaning of the slogan of the *Socialist United States of Latin America*.

The political struggle around this slogan is a task that Trotsky entrusted to the Latin American Trotskyists in 1934 on the occasion of the first conference for the Fourth International held at Geneva, whose resolution declared: 'The grandiose historical task represented by the unification of the states of Latin America into a powerful confederation is destined to be resolved, not by the laggard Latin American bourgeoisie, a completely prostituted agency of foreign imperialism, but by the young proletariat, chosen leader of the oppressed masses.'

Today, faced with the revolutionary process that is extending beyond the unequal rhythms of development to some of the Latin American countries that are most important for the class struggle in that part of the world — above all Bolivia, Chile, and Argentina — the necessity of the struggle around this slogan makes itself felt as never before, and has never been so important.

The struggle around the slogan of the Socialist United States of Latin America permits the binding together of the struggle undertaken in each country with that of the others, their centralization and their unification around a single perspective, whose realization would constitute a decisive stage in the road to the world revolution. As the text affirms, to make a start on realizing the slogan would necessarily have a rapid and profound repercussion on the North American proletariat and would accelerate its political development. Thus the slogan of the United States of Latin America appears before the proletariat of the Latin American countries as the concretization of the unity not only of their common struggle but with the proletariat of the rest of the world. As the representatives of the OCI stated at the meeting, it was a question of 'one of the strategic objectives that Trotskyist organizations ought to set for themselves and which condition the struggle for the reconstruction of the Fourth International'.

Such are the directions in which the presence at the February meeting of the Bolivian POR on the one hand and of the OCI and the Hungarian League of Socialist Revolutionaries on the other have permitted us to orientate from the very outset the work of the reconstruction of the Fourth International in Latin America.

There are certain problems that could not yet be tackled. This is true in particular of the characterization of the Cuban state and the drawing of the balance of the Cuban revolution and of Castroism. Although the increasingly right-wing course, more and more openly at variance with the interests of the Cuban and international working class, that Castro has followed since 1967, and also the ever more open support he has given to the Kremlin bureaucracy and beyond it to imperialism, have put an end to the illusions that many militants had in him, this balance sheet is still indispensable and must be drawn up without delay.

The development of the other organizations and groups represented at the February meeting and their growing intervention in the class struggles of their countries can now take place in the framework of and according to the perspectives traced out by the discussion that opened up, and resting on the political capital represented by the experience of the organizations in question.

It is evident, in this respect, that the development of the political crisis in Argentina places increasingly heavy responsibilities on the organization *Politica Obrera* and thus on the organizations of the Fourth International that have played an important role in the running of the February meeting. If Bolivia is the highest point of the revolution in Latin America, it is nevertheless the intervention of the heavy battalions of the Argentinian working class in this process which alone is able to determine a really decisive turn in the relations between the classes in the southern part of the continent.

The reconstruction today of the Fourth International in Latin America is a direct function of the ability of Trotskyists, and not only the Trotskyists in Bolivia and Argentina, to carry out the revolutionary process to the point of the destruction of the bourgeois state in Bolivia and to build the revolutionary party able to clear a path for this decisive turn in Argentina.

The reconstruction of the Fourth International does not take place outside of the class struggle. Nor does it take place, as has been said, outside of the crisis and of the reconstruction of the labour and revolutionary movement in its different components. Thus, to take

but one example, the crisis of the Venezuelan CP, the first stage of which has been expressed in the formation of the MAS (Movement for Socialism), liberates militants who now have to be won for the reconstruction of the Fourth International.

Regrouping the forces of the revolution

But in addition to the number of militants whom the organizations and militants represented at the February meeting wish to take with them in this task of reconstructing the Fourth International in Latin America there are also, and in some cases above all, those who believed it possible to defend positions that conform to the *Transitional Programme* and to remain faithful to the lessons of Bolshevism in the ranks of the 'Unified Secretariat'.

Although he only enjoys the status of 'sympathiser' of the 'Unified Secretariat', Hugo Blanco is in the first (but by no means the only) rank of these militants. Defending as he does certain fundamental principles of Trotskyism, that is to say, Marxism, in particular the necessity of the revolutionary party, as well as the fact that the emancipation of the workers can only be the work of the workers themselves, and not that of someone or other claiming to be their substitute, Hugo Blanco places himself on the same ground as the organizations and militants who engage in the reconstruction of the Fourth International in Latin America. He defends the same heritage as they in the face of the liquidators of Marxism in the bosom of the 'Unified Secretariat'.

It is today indispensable that Hugo Blanco takes a further step, that he searches for the roots of the recurring tendency of the 'Unified Secretariat' to develop the most varied forms of positions liquidating the *Transitional Programme*, that he draws some conclusions from the liquidationist policies followed by the 'Unified Secretariat' in relation to Castroism and guerrillaism. The development of Hugo Blanco has taken place outside of the framework of a politically centralized international organization, and H. Blanco shows a considerable lack of understanding of the functions of, and as a consequence of that the necessity to construct, such an organization. Today, what Hugo Blanco wants above all from the 'Unified Secretariat' is to be left in peace in Peru, and not to have imposed on him a guerrillaist orientation which he has, with an entire generation of militants, already tried, and which has proved to be an absolute blind alley.

We say to Hugo Blanco: the error that you think you made at the Convention, in particular the under-estimation of the role of the party, express *as much the absence of the international* as a politically centralized organization, as they do any weaknesses of your own that you may have. The International whose reconstruction we are undertaking in Latin America is destined to be something very different from the body, such as it was conceived at first by Pablo and Posadas and today by Maitan, Mandel and the ambitious and ageing young men of the Ligue Communiste, that is to say a body combining bureaucratic tyranny with the greatest laxity, depending on the changing moods of the people in Paris, and propagating opportunism and capitulation under the most varied forms.

Today the way is opened for the construction in Peru of a Trotskyist organization with serious roots in the masses by the formation, from the disintegrating centrist organization that *Vanguardia Revolucionaria* had become, of an internationalist nucleus around Comrade Ricardo Napuri which declares that it bases itself on the position of the *Transitional Programme* and that it has decided to engage in the struggle for the reconstruction of the Fourth International. We think, Hugo Blanco, that it is your responsibility as a Marxist, that is to say as an internationalist, to take with them — and with us — the path of the reconstruction of the Fourth International as a Marxist, centralized organization, the nucleus of the future world party of socialist revolution.

DOCUMENT 20**Resolution before the Essen Youth Rally,
July 1971**

We, 4,000 young workers, students and school youth from () countries, meeting in Essen to launch the struggle to build the revolutionary International Youth Movement, the fight for the United Socialist States of Europe and for the international Socialist revolution, address ourselves to our Comrades, to youth all over the world.

In the success of this Rally, which is the result of militant activity organized in several countries, we see the confirmation of the call of the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels:

'Workers of the world unite!'

Demonstrating its will to unite the international working class in the world revolution, the fighting younger generation of the working class has organized this demonstration in Essen, in the heart of industrial Germany, a Germany whose division concretizes the impasse into which imperialism and bureaucracy has plunged a divided Europe.

Our aim, our task, is to be in the front line of the international struggle of the working class to transform the world and to bring about the socialist revolution. To carry this out, we must organize and build revolutionary youth movements in each country, we must build on a world scale the International Revolutionary Youth Movement. We see this task from the standpoint of detachments in the struggle of the working class, of participants in the building of revolutionary parties and of the International which are necessary for working class victory.

As the call for the Essen Rally says:

The bourgeoisie and the bureaucracy attempt to pit the youth against workers and to divide workers among themselves. Youth reject these

divisions, these splits. Youth affirm their unity with the working class, for proletarian internationalism, for socialism.

Youth do not accept frontiers, zones and blocs. They proclaim: Workers of the world unite!

This struggle of the world proletariat, of which revolutionary youth will be the flame, expresses itself with great intensity in Europe. In December 1970, workers and youth everywhere responded when the heroic Spanish proletariat, challenging repression, forced the hangman Franco to retreat, saving the Burgos six from death. Everyone understood that this struggle, which made the Franco dictatorship tremble in its shoes, threatened the very foundations of stability necessary for the preservation of bourgeois order in Europe.

In December 1970 and in January 1971, in the Polish towns of Gdansk, Stettin and Gdynia, the workers came out on general strike. In this way they replied, by mobilizing the whole class, to the provocative price rises of the most necessary goods decided by the Gomulka government, measures which expressed the bankruptcy of a parasitic bureaucracy and the consequences of its adaptation to the preservation of the domination of imperialism on a world scale.

Gomulka, who had sent coal to Franco during the Asturian miners' strike, ordered the troops to fire on the Polish workers on strike. But the working class did not give in, the movement spread throughout the whole of Poland. The workers' councils extended their network from one end of the country to the other.

The bureaucracy had to retreat, had to sacrifice Gomulka, cancel the price increases and accept negotiations with the workers' councils.

Workers and youth everywhere felt this battle as their battle, as their struggle against the forces that are obstacles to the achievement of Socialism, as the fight for the Republic of Workers' Councils, the aim which is the same as that of the workers fighting in the capitalist countries against the bourgeoisie and its state.

Thus, throughout the whole of Europe, in 1971, the struggle of the proletariat opens the perspective of the defeat of the capitalist system through the elimination of the obstacle of the bureaucracy, of the unity of Europe under the banner of the proletarian revolution.

From Prague to Paris, from London to Warsaw, from Berlin to Madrid, from Rome to Brussels, the force comes together that can end this ailing system — the working class. And in each of the struggles that represent stages in the mobilization of this class for the final attack, the working class youth and students educated in the condi-

tions of the crisis of imperialism, conscious that there is no future for them in the 'lunatic asylum' which Europe is under capitalist rule, are in the front line of the struggle. Imperialism is in crisis and has no means of surviving other than by preparing to confront the working class to destroy its rights, its conditions and its organizations.

The bourgeoisie must everywhere, including those countries where its rule has for decades been through the parliamentary form of the state, threaten all the rights which were won out of the past struggles of the working class. The revolutionary youth must consciously place the defence of these rights at the centre of their struggle. The crisis of imperialism throws into crisis also all those layers whose privileges and positions rest on the maintenance of the capitalist system on a world scale. The Kremlin bureaucracy, which is mortally threatened even inside the USSR itself not only by the consequences of the movement of the working class internationally but directly by the struggle of the working class in the USSR and in Eastern Europe, rests more and more on imperialism which in turn demands more and more, thus sharpening the conflict between the bureaucracy and the working masses.

But it will not be the plans of imperialism nor the collaboration of the bureaucracy which decide history. The period opened by the French General Strike of May-June 1968 and by the upsurge of the political revolution against the bureaucracy in Czechoslovakia, which led to the armed intervention of the Warsaw Pact countries on 21 August 1968, shows that everywhere the working class is fighting back. In the oldest capitalist country in the world, the birthplace of the workers' movement and its organizations, England, the government of capitalist reaction wants to destroy the most fundamental rights of the working class by taking away the right to strike, but the powerful resistance of the workers, their strikes and demonstrations, place on the agenda today the bringing down of the Tory government and open the road to the socialist revolution in Britain.

In France, the decrepit regime which hangs on to the scattered remains of Gaullism, which wants to make the workers pay the cost of its bankruptcy, which continuously resorts to repression and provocation, has to face the continuously reinforced mobilization of the working class, which poses more and more openly the question of another government, of a government of workers' organizations, of a government which will take on the state and private property, a workers' government.

In Germany, the refusal of the workers to see their interests sacrificed for the needs of the employers disrupts the basis of the coalition which links the Social Democratic Party to the bourgeoisie.

In Italy, no mere manoeuvre could have produced the combativity shown by the working class, and the crisis which deepens there can have no other positive outcome except the bringing down of the bourgeois government, which seeks to solve the crisis by force against the workers' movement.

Everywhere, from the oldest of dictatorships in Portugal, where since 1968 strikes and movements have multiplied, to Sweden, that so-called paradise of 'successful reformism', the working class rises up to defend its interests.

Everywhere are posed the alternatives which are at the heart of the historical period we live in: Socialism or barbarism.

Throughout Europe the struggles of workers force the bourgeoisie, despite its fears and divisions, to prepare the civil war which Edward Heath at the United Nations Assembly said was inevitable.

The bourgeoisie want to preserve their 'order'.

Pompidou and Heath meet to talk about a 'United Europe' at the point where the law of the jungle which guides the relations between the capitalist powers rules with increasing brutality, with monetary chaos and trade war mercilessly exposing the fight of each capitalist for survival. But their 'European harmony' is only a joke: the reality is that all the bourgeoisie are ready to join together in 'harmony' against the workers and youth of Europe, against their rights, against their future.

And at the very point where the representatives of the old reactionary bourgeoisies of Europe seek such agreement, the Kremlin bureaucracy take up their place in the Grand Alliance against the workers of Europe.

At the pseudo Congress of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, Brezhnev, applauded by his lackey Husak, threatens Czech militants and workers; at the Congress of the SED of East Germany, Brezhnev gets the division of Germany consecrated and ratified, because of his fear of the German proletariat, which Stalinist policies delivered over to Hitler in 1933, and which set in motion the political revolution in 1953. At the same time the successor of Stalin addresses himself to the bourgeoisies of Europe to ensure 'European Security'. We, the youth assembled here at Essen, fighting against imperialism and bureaucracy, know the meaning of this security.

This security is the order of Franco in Madrid, of Marcellin in Paris, of the Greek colonels in Athens, and of Heath in London — the condition for maintaining Brezhnev-Husak's order in Prague. This order is one of oppression and exploitation, of misery, of illiteracy, of unemployment and of forced emigration of hundreds of thousands of workers such as those from Spain, Portugal, Italy, North Africa, Greece and Yugoslavia, who are delivered over to the great capitalist powers for super-exploitation. It is an order in which there are, in each country, too many workers in the factories, too many peasants working on the land, too many students in the Universities, too many teachers and never enough policemen.

It is an order which, conscious of the infinite possibilities for development held out by the accumulated results of Man's history, the youth reject. It implies the preservation of exploitation, of inequality and oppression; it leads to the destruction of entire generations, and can be preserved only by liquidating all the conquests of the working class at every level. The achievement of this order would mean a return to barbarism as shown by the nuclear holocausts of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the colonial wars, the Indo-Chinese war and the massacre of the Bengali people. This order we, revolutionary youth meeting at Essen, pledge to fight to destroy totally.

This is the struggle which we wage under the banner of the United Socialist States of Europe, the expression in Europe of our struggle for the world socialist revolution.

This struggle is a world struggle, a struggle which gains strength from the fact that all over the world, in the bastions of imperialism, in the countries where the capitalists have been expropriated, the exploited and oppressed masses struggle, opening the way to the only solution for humanity, the World Republic of Workers Councils.

It is a world struggle because historical development has placed Europe in a decisive strategical position. It is on this old continent that all the contradictions of the world class struggles are concentrated. It is in Europe that, confronting imperialism in decline, the working classes with the richest tradition and experience are mobilized; it is in Europe that the 'status quo' established following the Second World War reveals its unviability in the most explosive way possible; it is here in Europe that the process of social revolution against the capitalist system and political revolution against the bureaucracy, its ally, are fused.

In this sense, the struggle for the United Socialist States of Europe

is not a European question but an international axis in the mobilization of the world proletarian revolution. It is a world struggle because it only has meaning in relation to the international struggle of the working class for the socialist revolution which on all the five continents is the predominant fact of our whole epoch.

For more than ten years the strongest imperialist power in the world, American imperialism, has been at war against the Indo-Chinese people. Despite the use of the most modern methods of destruction, despite the political isolation in which the Kremlin bureaucracy like the Chinese bureaucracy have kept the struggles of the workers and peasants of Indo-China, imperialism has not been able to achieve its aims.

But if they have not been able to use all their military forces it is because they have had to face a second front. The working masses of America feel that this war is not their war. And, now that Nixon's policy comes into conflict with the interests of the working masses, the youth who have spearheaded the anti-war struggle are being joined by more and more important sections of the organized working class, as the proletariat as a class resists the attacks on its rights and conditions of life, by strike action.

The demonstrations of May 1970, which cost the lives of four students from Kent State University; the struggle of the workers and negro youth against racialism; strikes like the postmen's strike, the railworkers' strike and the General Motors strike are the elements of a mobilization which threatens the very foundations of capitalism's rule in the United States.

In Latin America, the struggle of workers in the towns and of peasants without land join together against imperialism, against the national bourgeoisies and against their agents in the heart of the workers' movement. The working class of these countries, in which the youth as everywhere provide the most audacious and determined fighters, is a definite part of the international working class, and fights to impose its hegemony.

The most striking example is Bolivia where, coming in particular out of the action of the vanguard section which is made up of the miners of Bolivia organized in their trade union organization, the establishing of the Popular Assembly poses the setting up of a Workers' Government based on committees of workers and peasants.

Peaceful coexistence, this reactionary collaboration between imperialism and the Stalinist bureaucracy against the oppressed and

exploited masses, which was the framework of the counter-revolutionary plot carried out against the Palestinian workers and peasants under the cover of the Rogers plan, and to which the masses responded by building — in the face of vicious counter-revolution — their own organs of power, their soviets, as in Irbid — this collaboration showed its hideous face once again when the masses of East Pakistan rose up.

The rising of the starving Bengali workers against dictator Yahya Khan shook the whole domination of imperialism in Asia: the artificial division of India. The massacre could only be carried out because the Soviet and Chinese bureaucracies lent a strong hand to imperialism and its Indian and Pakistani agents: Brezhnev and Kosygin by preaching resignation, Mao Tse Tung by directly helping the monster of Dacca.

The same relationship of forces has been seen in Ceylon, where all the imperialist powers, the USSR, China, Pakistan and India assured Mrs. Bandaranaike, head of the Popular Front government, of their support when she went to war against the masses, destroying workers' rights and throwing revolutionary militants of the RCP into jail.

The youth, who want to fight imperialism and the bureaucracy, must play their part in this task, the central task of the epoch. This can be done only by giving all youth the organizational means for mobilizing against imperialism and its allies. The specific conditions of the struggle of the youth demand specific organizations which bring the youth together in struggle on the perspective of the socialist revolution.

This is the role, in each country, of the Revolutionary Organization of Youth; and on the international scale, of the Revolutionary Youth International.

The Essen rally does not constitute an end, but a point of departure.

Its success, its large international representation, and the enthusiasm which has marked it bear witness to the will to struggle, to the revolutionary consciousness of thousands and thousands of youth.

We must give our response to this.

Each organization, each delegation, each militant leaves this rally with increased determination to intensify the struggle for the socialist revolution through the organization of a fighting vanguard. Each one leaves with the conscious will to express in his daily and organized struggle, in the factory, the area, the college, school or technical college, that great historical aim which has united us here: the World

Republic of Workers Councils, expressed in Europe by the slogan, 'the United Socialist States of Europe'.

This is why the participants in the rally take up the proposal made by the revolutionary organizations of youth who initiated this gathering. It is now necessary to advance on the organizational plane, through co-ordinated action and discussion, along the road of setting up the Revolutionary Youth International.

The Essen Rally salutes the participation of the International Committee of the Fourth International whose support and political struggle made possible this rally and concretely opens up the road to the building of the Revolutionary Youth International.

Consequently, the organizations participating in the Essen Rally constitute as from now an International Liaison Committee to prepare an International Conference of Revolutionary Youth with the perspective of building the Revolutionary Youth International.

The Liaison Committee will appoint a permanent secretariat charged with co-ordination and correspondence between participating organizations and publishing an international bulletin preparatory to the Conference. This Liaison Committee will remain open and the participants in the Essen Rally invite all youth organizations who are fighting imperialism and bureaucracy to associate themselves with it and to take part in the discussion.

It is also in the militant action of each organization that the International Conference will be prepared, and this will be done, in so far as it is possible, through co-ordinating the Essen rally and the international activity of revolutionary youth.

In October 1971 it will be 54 years since the Russian workers and peasants took power under the leadership of the party of Lenin and Trotsky; it will be 15 years since the workers of Hungary, linking up again with the soviets of October 1917, began to establish their power.

On this occasion the revolutionary youth meeting at Essen appeal to all organizations of youth fighting imperialism and bureaucracy to lead an internationally co-ordinated campaign on the following themes:

- No to imperialist barbarism!
- No to the counter-revolutionary war against the peoples of Indo-China, for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of imperialist troops from Indo-China!
- For the right of the Indo-Chinese peoples to self-determination!

— For an international boycott, organized by the world trade union centres FSM and CISL, on moving material for the imperialist troops!

— Organize demonstrations against imperialism and its war!

— Long live the struggle of the workers and peasants of Indo-China!

— Long live the struggle of workers and youth in the USA against 'their' imperialism!

— For the release of American soldiers imprisoned for their struggle against the war, and militants imprisoned by Nixon, such as Angela Davis!

— Down with the division of Europe, a means of preserving capitalist domination!

— Down with the Common Market of poverty, exploitation and unemployment!

— Let us fight to weld all working class and youth organizations into a united front against the consequences of the imperialist pact, against unemployment, against attacks on the rights and organizations of the working class.

— Against the governments of the bourgeoisie, against collaboration with such governments! Open the road of struggle in every European country for the workers government!

— For an international campaign of solidarity with those militants and workers who are victims of repression in countries with fascist and military regimes.

— Long live the working class of Spain, Portugal and Greece!

— Long live the United Socialist States of Europe!

— The workers of the USSR, Poland, Czechoslovakia and all the East European countries, in struggling against the bureaucracy, are fighting for socialism, for the United Socialist States of Europe.

— In October 1971, the world unity of the proletarian struggle will assert itself through a vast campaign against the counter-revolutionary violence of Stalinism: stop the fake trials in Czechoslovakia, stop the 'normalization', stop the arrests of militants, workers and intellectuals in the USSR, in Poland, in Hungary and in all the East European countries.

— Withdraw the Warsaw Pact troops from Czechoslovakia!

— Long live the right of the peoples of Eastern Europe and the USSR to self-determination!

— Free immediately all those imprisoned because of their struggle for socialism.

— For an international workers commission of inquiry!

— Through the resolute action of the international working class, prevent the Kremlin bureaucracy from repeating in Poland what they did in Czechoslovakia.

— Down with the counter-revolutionary intervention by the bureaucracy!

— Long live the workers of Poland! Long live their workers councils!

— Long live the United Socialist States of Europe, uniting in the process of world revolution the struggle of the workers of East and West Europe!

DOCUMENT 21**Young Socialists amendment to the Essen Resolution, July 1971**

There can be no revolutionary party without revolutionary theory. Behind every opportunist development in the history of the workers' movement, and especially of Stalinism, has been the revision of Marxist theory.

The continuity of the struggle for revolutionary Marxist theory in the past, the struggle of the Fourth International and the International Committee, was the only basis for the initiatives which led to this rally and for the struggle to build the international revolutionary youth movement.

Revolutionary youth everywhere must devote themselves above all to the task of developing Marxist theory through the struggle against bourgeois ideology in all the forms it takes in the workers' movement. This is the only basis for combating the dangers of adventurism, activism and 'pure' militancy with which revisionists and Maoists mislead the youth, and which can only lead to historic defeats for the working class.

DOCUMENT 22**Letter from the Essen Liaison Committee to the
Young Socialists National Committee,
November 1971**

Dear Comrades,

On 5 and 6 November 1971, following the Second Congress of the *Alliance des Jeunes pour le Socialisme*, there was a meeting of the Liaison Committee set up at the time of the Essen International Rally. We thus began to apply decisions unanimously taken by the organizations participating in the Essen Rally — which included your organization, the Young Socialists of Britain.

Though you were properly notified, we regret to note that you were absent from this meeting without sending any communication, either written or verbal, to explain your absence.

We are enclosing a verbatim report of this meeting and minutes of the decisions taken.

You will observe that — as agreed at Essen — the discussion began on the amendment you proposed at Essen. Spokesmen for various delegations expressed their views on the basis of this amendment, but we decided not to take a decisive vote on the problems raised at this stage as you were absent. That is to say, the discussion will continue, and it is your duty to take part in it.

We would remind you that there was no vote on the basis of the amendment at Essen. During the delegate conference held on Saturday 3 July, the French delegation proposed to take this amendment into consideration and refer it to the Liaison Committee set up from the Rally, as they believed it raised problems which could not be dealt with in such a preliminary Conference. You were in favour of taking a vote straight away. The majority of delegates declared in favour of the

proposal of the French delegation, which simply meant that the question was held over and that the discussion would be held after Essen, at the same time as the common decisions for action were being put into effect.

Moreover, in explaining her position, comrade Dany Sylveire, speaking on behalf of the Young Socialists, made it clear that it was a question of principle. She thought the amendment so important that she could not accept it being referred back: hence her rejection of the French proposal. At the same time, she emphasised, the positive character of the intervention of the Young Socialists could be seen in the fact that their delegation was anyway calling for a vote for the resolution as a whole.

This is the attitude which made it possible for comrade Dany Sylveire to end her contribution by saying, 'The Young Socialists have always taken the building of the Revolutionary Youth International very seriously, and will do everything in their power to build this Revolutionary Youth International on the basis of Marxist theory.'

It is perfectly legitimate for the Young Socialists to see the discussion around their amendment as a part of the battle to build the RYI on correct foundations. This is still another reason for not avoiding the discussion.

But this discussion does not take place in a vacuum. It takes place within the framework of common decisions taken at Essen, unanimously ratified by the 5,000 youth who had rallied there from every country.

In front of thousands of youth, we have together taken on responsible commitments. Our ability to carry them through will be an important factor in the mass organization of the young fighting generations of the proletariat under the banner of the socialist revolution. The fact that this is what is at stake is what gives urgency to the discussions we must have and to the joint actions we must undertake in the framework of fighting to build the RYI.

Events since Essen have only sharpened these requirements. This was apparent to us in the Resolution you sent us. In this context, to evade discussion would be tantamount to an abandonment of international responsibilities to the 5,000 youth we brought together at Essen, and to the thousands and thousands of youth we must bring together and organize for the Socialist Revolution.

The Liaison Committee thinks it is therefore your duty to be present at the next meeting of the Liaison Committee which will be held in January 1972 (you will be informed of all details in good time).

The Liaison Committee mandates the Secretariat it has established to organize an interview with the NC of the Young Socialists so that there can be clarity about the relations within the Liaison Committee for the RYI.

Please accept, dear comrades, our revolutionary greetings.

For the Liaison Committee,
The Secretariat

DOCUMENT 23**Extracts from the discussion of the Essen
Liaison Committee, November 5-6, 1971**

Charles Berg (Alliance des Jeunes pour le Socialisme), Introductory Report: It is not a matter of proclaiming the RYI but of fighting to build it, as a moment in the building of the Revolutionary International, and for Trotskyists, in re-building the Fourth International.

On the amendment proposed by the Young Socialists at Essen: no revolutionary youth organization can be developed on the field of ideological struggle against the bourgeoisie, as such, but only by making the weapons of theory a part of the fight against the bourgeoisie and Stalinism.

The class struggle has just provided confirmation of the orientation of the Essen Rally. In particular, the process of revolution and counter-revolution in Bolivia, while almost the whole of the organizations of the Liaison Committee supported the POR and the POR Youth. The AJS has published the Essen documents and organized a mass demonstration on 31 October on the Essen line.

Concern for the building of the RYI was at the centre of the 2nd Congress of the AJS.

Our perspectives are to organize the force brought together at Essen, for despite the problems of distance and our own tasks nationally, only the dimension of the RYI can give a way forward for the development of the different organizations. So: we must prepare a real World Conference of revolutionary youth organizations.

(This was followed by the proposals adopted by the Liaison Committee and reported at the end of the Appeal.)

OCI representative: We are not out to build non-Trotskyist organizations, but to win the young generations to the programme of Trotskyism.

The differences between an organization such as the AJS and a youth organization of a Trotskyist party arise from their conditions of work, origins, and tactical considerations, not from questions of principle.

At Essen, we had to rally without exception all the organizations, groups and militants who posed the problem of the struggle against imperialism and the bureaucracy. To fight for the programme of the Fourth International does not mean making it a pre-condition.

The final resolution was adopted unanimously by the organizations which took part at Essen, while on the question of the Young Socialists' amendment, we wanted, in such a rally, to avoid a confused political clash; so we proposed referring back discussion on the amendment to this meeting of the Liaison Committee.

In view of the absence of the Young Socialists, I would make two proposals:

— discussion but no vote

— a letter from the Liaison Committee to the Young Socialists pointing out their absence and their obligation to attend, and asking for their position.

On the amendment itself:

The first sentence is correct, but inadequate, because we are talking about revolutionary youth organizations and not about the revolutionary party.

The problem raised about the relation between marxist organizations and the youth organizations is correct but serves no purpose.

Then to say: 'Behind every opportunist development in the history of the workers' movement, and especially of Stalinism, has been the revision of Marxist theory', is the opposite of reality, which is that revisionism is the product of the movement and relationships of social forces.

The second paragraph: nothing wrong in it, but it is confused, because what is needed is to convince people of the correctness of our politics through the common struggle, not the other way around: we don't want acts of faith as a pre-condition for work.

The third paragraph develops what is wrong in the first: idealism. There is no ideological battle in itself, no marxist theory in itself, but a programme, which is the experience of all the struggles of the pro-

letariat, concentrated by the marxist method, on which an organization fights.

For communists, the creative tasks of marxism are the tasks of the party and not of the youth organizations, or these would themselves become a party. We are not out to practice an inverted kind of paternalism with the youth organizations, which are the schools of communism.

This amendment, confusedly written, lying outside the framework of the discussion at Essen, is dangerously mistaken in its idealist base, and in relation to the positions on the Bolivian Revolution.

Representative of CLETRA (Liaison Committee of Revolutionary African Students and Workers): We are opposed to the Young Socialists' amendment, on the basis of the experience in which, from being just a delegation at Essen, we have become the CLETRA, making it possible for African militants who are raising many questions after the role played by the Stalinist apparatus in the Sudan, and Mao's support of Numeiry, to build the RYI for the victory of socialism.

Many African militants who at one time followed Maoism are realizing that the Peking bureaucracy has never explained the basis of what they call revisionism.

Representative of CLEPE (Liaison Committee of Students from Eastern Europe): CLEPE, like the Liaison Committee for the RYI, is not a constituted organization, but an impulse to the building of revolutionary youth organizations in the Eastern countries.

The Trotskyists have never hidden themselves in CLEPE, any more than they have in the Liaison Committee. And this broad framework makes it possible to carry out a struggle with organizations which do not recognize the need to rebuild the Fourth International.

It is this broad, non-exclusive framework which made it possible for the first time at Essen to bring together the youth of East and West.

Glossary of Names

ALLIANCE DES JEUNESSES POUR LE SOCIALISME (AJS) — Youth organization set up by the OCI in 1968.

AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL (ACFI) — Formed by supporters of the International Committee led by Tim Wohlforth, who were suspended from membership of the Socialist Workers Party (USA) in July 1964, and later expelled. They had opposed the complicity of the SWP in the Ceylon Pabloites' betrayal, and the spurious 'reunification' of 1963. In 1966 the ACFI was dissolved and the Workers' League founded.

ALBERT (pseudonym) — Member of the Hungarian Revolutionary Socialist League in exile. Attended meetings of the International Committee as one of the League's representatives.

BANDA, Michael — Member of the International Committee of the Fourth International and of the Central Committee of the Socialist Labour League and subsequently of the Workers Revolutionary Party during the period covered by these volumes.

BERG, Charles — National Secretary of the Alliance des Jeunes pour le Socialisme, youth organization set up by the OCI.

BLANCO, Hugo — Leader of the revolutionary peasant movement in Peru who became a supporter of the Pabloite 'United Secretariat'.

BROCKWAY, Fenner — In the 1930s a leading member of the centrist Independent Labour Party in Britain, and Secretary of the 'London Bureau', opponent of the formation of the Fourth International. Became Lord Brockway 1964.

CANNON, James P. — Founder of Trotskyist movement in the United States, expelled from the Communist Party in 1928. Leader of the SWP until he retired in 1960s. Supported Trotsky in the fight against the petty-bourgeois opposition of Schachtman and Burnham in 1939-40. Imprisoned during Second World War. Author of 'Theses on the American Revolution' in 1946 (see Introduction to Volume Two). Responsible for the 'Open Letter to the World Trotskyist Movement' of 1953, which denounced Pabloite revisionism and founded the International Committee. In the period 1961-63, together with Hansen, guided the SWP back into the revisionist camp.

DUCROS — See Just, Stephane.

FEDERATION DES ETUDIANTS REVOLUTIONNAIRES (FER) — Student organization of the OCI, replaced in 1968 by the AJS.

FRANK, Pierre — Collaborator of Molinier in pre-war French section of Fourth International. Leader of supporters of Pabloites in 1951 in French section. Today a leading spokesman of the 'United Secretariat'.

HANSEN, Joseph — One of leaders of SWP since late 1930s. Secretary and bodyguard to Trotsky in Mexico. Prominent in faction fight against Cochranites; after 1953 split took lead in opposing discussion of differences with Pabloites. Held principal responsibility for the international relations of SWP in the period covered by these volumes. In forefront of 'reunification' manoeuvres of 1961-63. Leads SWP since Cannon's retirement in 1960s. Author of *Too Many Babies*.

HEALY, Gerry — National Secretary of the Socialist Labour League (now Workers Revolutionary Party), and of the British section of the Fourth International before that. Member of the International Committee.

JEUNESSES COMMUNISTES REVOLUTIONNAIRES (JCR) — Youth organization of the Pabloites in France.

JEUNES GARDES SOCIALISTES (JGS) — Youth organization of the Belgian Social Democracy, under the influence of the revisionist Mandel.

JUST, Stephane — Member of the Political Bureau of the Organisation Communiste Internationaliste, and one of its representatives on the International Committee until the split of 1971.

KEMP, Tom — Member of the Central Committee of the Socialist Labour League.

LAMBERT, Pierre — Leading member of the PCI (French section) majority in opposition to Pablo, expelled by him prior to 1953 split. Joined in formation of International Committee. Secretary of revisionist Organisation Communiste Internationaliste. Helped betray 1968 General Strike and split from International Committee in 1971. Defender and apologist for Social Democracy and Stalinism in France.

LIGA OBRERA MEXICANA (LOM) — Small group claiming to be Trotskyist, supporting centrist positions of OCI.

LORA, Guillermo — Secretary of the Partido Obrero Revolucionario (Bolivia). Well-known revisionist who betrayed 1952 and 1971 Bolivian revolutions. Close political associate of the French revisionists Lambert and Just.

MAITAN, Livio — Leading member of Pabloite revisionists since 1953. Secretary of their Italian section, and a major spokesman of pro-guerrilla faction in the 'United Secretariat'.

MANDEL, Ernest (Ernest Germain) — Member of European Secretariat of Fourth International and of Belgian section during Second World War. Betrayed majority of French section in 1951 to join Pablo. Major supporter of Pablo in 1953 split. Author of many revisionist works on 'neo-capitalism'. Betrayed Belgian General Strike in 1961. Secretary of 'United Secretariat' since 'reunification'. Heads the faction of 'United Secretariat' which is again at loggerheads with SWP today and includes IMG in Britain, Ligue Communiste in France, various guerrilla groupings in Latin America and a faction expelled from SWP in the summer of 1974.

DE MASSOT, F. — Member of the Political Bureau of the OCI, and one of its representatives on the International Committee.

NAGY, Balazs — Secretary of the Hungarian Revolutionary Socialist League in exile, and its representative on the International Committee until the split in 1971. He and his organization subsequently broke with the OCI in 1972.

NAPURI, Ricardo — Leader of the Peruvian centrist group *Vanguardia Revolucionaria* in the 1960s.

PABLO, Michel (Gabriel Raptis) — Worked in International Secretariat of Fourth International during Second World War, becoming Secretary in post-war period. In the period of 1948-53 developed theory that mass pressure on Stalinist parties could transform them into revolutionary leaderships. His tendency broke from Trotskyism in 1953, calling itself the 'International Secretariat'. Shortly after 1963 'reunification' with SWP, was expelled from 'United Secretariat' with minority tendency standing openly for liquidation. Became a minister in the abortive bourgeois government of Ben Bella in Algeria.

PERERA, Dr. N. M. — Founder of LSSP. Leader of Ceylon Federation of Labour. Imprisoned during war and escaped to India. Right-wing parliamentarian; Minister of Finance in two coalition governments.

PIVERT, M. — Centrist leader of the 'revolutionary left' inside the French Socialist Party, founded in 1935 and dissolved with his agreement after he had participated in the Blum government in 1936.

POSADAS, Juan — Leader of Pabloite group in Argentina in 1950s. Expelled with his tendency from Pabloite movement in 1962. Notorious for advocacy of 'preventive nuclear war' by the Soviet Union.

ROBERTSON, J. — Expelled with Wohlforth from SWP. Formed revisionist Spartacist group (qv below). Expelled from International Committee at 1966 Conference.

SANTEN, Sal — Dutch Pabloite leader.

SHACHTMAN, Max. — Founder member of American Trotskyist movement with Cannon and Abern. Led opposition to Trotsky in SWP over Russo-Finnish war and occupation of Poland. An advocate of 'bureaucratic collectivism'. Split with SWP in 1940 to set up Workers' Party, which he dissolved to enter Socialist Party of USA and to join the Congress for Cultural Freedom — a CIA-subsidized organization. Author of *Behind the Moscow Trials*. Died 1972.

SLAUGHTER, Cliff — Member of the International Committee of the Fourth International and of Central Committee of the Socialist Labour League during the period covered by these volumes.

SYLVEIRE, Dany — Member of the National Committee of the Young Socialists, youth organization of the Socialist Labour League, and of the International Youth Commission. Member of the Central Committee of the SLL.

TATE, Ernest — Member of the Canadian section of the Pabloite 'United Secretariat'. In Britain at the time of the 'Vietnam Solidarity Campaign', he was at the centre of a provocation and witch-hunt against the Socialist Labour League and the International Committee.

VARGA — Pseudonym for Nagy, Balazs, above.

WOHLFORTH, Tim — Led opposition tendency in SWP at time of unprincipled 'reunification' of 1961-63. Expelled from SWP for demanding discussion on Ceylon coalition, and formed Workers' League, in sympathy with International Committee. In 1974, resigned from the Workers' League, after having been removed as Secretary, and proceeded to attack the International Committee.

Index

- Africa, 25, 26, 42, 99; North, 17, 188; right-wing coups in, 107
- Albert (Hungarian section), 135, 137
- Algeria, 3, 19, 22, 52, 54, 56, 97, 134, 137; failure to build IC section in, 98; FLN, 19, 73, 126, 147; MNA, 73, 114, 126, 127, 147; revolutionary party in, 127; struggle against French imperialism, 19, 126; students from in France, 138; working class of, 127
- Allende, S., 176
- Alliance des Jeunes pour le Socialisme (AJS), 195, 198, 199
- American Committee for the Fourth International, 2, 6, 34-39, 151
- Arab States, 135, 137; bourgeoisie of, 149; in Mid-East war, 134, 138; masses, 131, 137, 141; nationalism, 11, 135-7, 149; revolution in, 134-5, 141, 149-50
- Arbeitskorrespondenz*, 154
- Asia, 48, 66; building of revolutionary youth movements in, 200; domination of imperialism in, 190; revolution in, 48; S.E. Asia, 12, 26
- Banda, M., 5, 6, 135, 138
- Bandaranaike, Mrs. 3, 20, 103, 190
- Bebel, A., 116-117
- Belgium, 18, 139, 140
- Ben Bella Government (Algeria), 19, 110
- Bengali people, 188, 190
- Ben Gurion, 136
- Berg, Charles, 198
- Bidault, 157-158
- Blanco, Hugo, 179-180
- Bolivia, 138-9, 198. *See also* Latin America
- Bolsheviks, Bolshevism, 21, 69, 88-9, 106, 108, 111-3, 116-8, 121, 131-2, 186; continuity of, 83, 110; methods of, 123; Pabloism as break with, 190; Party, bureaucratization of, 94, 97, 145; Trotsky's fight for, 122
- Brezhnev, L., 187, 188, 190
- Britain, 54, 186; betrayals of Labour Government, 26, 50-51; fight against social democracy and Stalinism, 18, 25, 108; imperialism, 149
- Brockway, F. 119, 122
- Bulgaria, 101
- Cannon, J. P., 22, 145, 146
- Castro, 19, 52, 53, 62, 103, 110, 181; attack on Trotskyism, 103; support of Kremlin and imperialism, 179
- Centralism, democratic, 108, 118, 125, 146; of FI, 119
- Centrism, 123, 127, 140, 154
- Ceylon, 52; 1964 Coalition, 2-3, 20, 46, 128-9; section of IC, 152-3, 190
- Chiang Kai-Shek, 135
- Chile, 168, 171, 174-6
- China, 8-12, 15, 16-7, 31-2, 43-5, 49-50, 72, 78, 96-102, 190; bureaucracy, 17, 65, 94, 200; divisions in, 96, 102, 104, 147-8; revolution (1927) in, 67, 98; revolution, gains of, 45, 96, 103, 147-8, 178; struggle for FI in, 58, 97-8, 147; Trotsky on, 98
- COB, 171
- Cohn-Bendit, D., 156
- Colombia, 172
- Colonial countries, 3, 24, 51, 52; bourgeois revolution in, 52, 136; building of revolutionary party in, 130; 'epicentre', 128; revolutionary movement in, 130; struggle against imperialism, 9, 135; wars, 188
- Colonial Revolution, 27, 56, 66, 111, 141, 148; Arab revolution as, 150
- Communist Manifesto*, 28, 184
- Communist Parties, analysis of, 78; in Latin America, 172; Lenin and Trotsky on, 124; necessity to build new, 120; pro-Chinese, 157; relationships with working class and and Kremlin, 94
- Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB), 122
- Communist Party of Soviet Union (CPSU), 8, 17, 147; Central Committee of, 52
- Cuba, 98, 99; Missiles Crisis, 12; petty-bourgeois leadership, 22, 52; revolution, 19, 97, 103, 181
- Czechoslovakia, 101, 192-3; CP, 187; political revolution in, 168, 174, 178, 186
- Davis, A., 192
- De Gaulle, C., 19, 51, 99, 102, 159; and 1968 events, 157, 158; counter-revolutionary role of, 141; relationship with NATO, 108
- De Massot (French section), 134, 135, 137
- Dialectical materialism, 20, 24, 31, 53, 128, 146; analysis of class basis of revisionist betrayals, 110; battle for it against revisionism, 111; necessity for study of, 145; Pabloite revisions of, 19; struggle against pragmatism, 35, 110
- Dictatorship of the proletariat, 13, 61, 150, 176
- Dien-Bien-Phu, 9, 48, 66
- Ducros, J., 144

- Eastern Europe, 2, 9-18, 21-7, 31, 33, 43-7, 51, 61-9, 72-3, 93, 99-101, 106, 136, 154, 167, 169, 178; as 'bourgeois states', 87; activity of OCI in, 86; capitalist penetration of, 100; class struggle, 65; political revolution, 9, 65; revolutionary movement, 57; working class, 102, 178, 186, 192-4
- Eastern Germany, 15, 61, 101; Congress of SED, 187; 1963 uprisings in, 10, 16, 51, 54, 57, 178
- Eclecticism, 54
- Egypt, 19, 135, 150; bourgeoisie, 150; conflict with Israel, 130
- Eisenach Programme, 116
- Empiricism, 18, 92, 127, 146
- Engels, 21, 69, 89, 145; letter to Bebel, 116
- Essen Youth Rally, 184-200
- Europe, 13, 60, 61, 64, 66, 81, 98-102, 128, 135, 139, 163, 165, 183, 185; 'divided Europe', 181, 189; crisis of imperialism in, 99; old imperialist powers of, 100; participants in Liège demonstration, 85; social-political revolution on agenda, 102; socialist revolution, new stage in (France '68), 157; victory of proletarian revolution in, 101; working class, 99, 101, 102, 113, 179; civil war, preparation for, 184; economy, reconstruction on capitalist basis, 101; organizations of IC, 177
- FER, 155-7
- First International, 88-90
- First World War, 60, 117
- Fourth International, *passim*; crisis of, 94, 118, 144; continuity of, 89, 90, 91, 105; First Conference of (1934), 180; Founding Conference of (1938), 4, 75, 92; isolation of, 93; leadership of, 92, 94; 'Long Live the FI', 80; 1953 split, 67, 76, 110; organizations of, 181; revisionist leadership in, 129; Second World Congress, 92, 118; world perspective, 99; true banner of communism, 159
- France, 5, 19, 25, 50, 51, 57, 62, 71, 77, 100, 108, 123, 126, 127, 140, 151, 153, 154, 160; banning of socialist groups in, 155; branch of Algerian students in, 138; class struggle, 88; CP in, 50-1, 62, 67, 95, 123, 156-7; effects of 1968, 159; Fifth Republic, 158; Fourth Republic, 113; General Election (1968), 157, 158; General Strike of 1953, 9, 13, 17, 65, 73; Imperialism of, 9, 19, 54; Miners' Strike of 1963, 54; Renault, 158; revolutionary strikes of May/June '68, 156, 157, 161, 165, 174, 183; Socialist Party, 50, 51, 62; 'Soviet Republic of France!' 159; Trotskyism in, 156; unification of Trotskyist movement in, 75; workers' government, 186
- Franco, General, 185, 188
- Frank, P., 3, 4, 30, 89, 103, 108; method of, 145-6
- Furnival, L., 173
- Gaullism, 50, 57, 186
- Germain (Mandel), 3, 4, 18, 30, 85, 89, 108, 129; method of, 109, 118, 145, 146; *Ten Theses*, 65
- Germany (West), 50-1, 60, 81, 86, 98, 100, 105, 115, 139-40, 184, 187; capital, 101; CP, capitulation to Hitler, 98; class struggle, 89; reunification with E. Germany, 61, 101; Trade Union apparatus, 50; victory of fascism, 8, 44; working class, 60, 98, 102, 184; Youth Conferences in, 81
- German Social Democracy, 50, 89, 115, 116, 117; adaptation to parliamentarism, 117
- Ghana, 52, 56
- Greece, 33, 86, 153, 158, 188, 192; comrades from, 81; expelled minority, 154; IC visit (French) to, 154; military coup, 107; no return to democracy, 154; section of FI, 81, 86, 153; struggle of factions in, 86; working class, 192
- Hansen, J., 3, 4, 30, 103, 108, 110
- Healy, G., 36, 103, 112; letter of, 142-3
- Heath, E., 187-8
- Hegel, G. W. F., 116, 146
- Hiroshima, 41, 188
- Hungarian Revolution (1956), 10, 11, 14, 16, 47, 51, 54, 57, 62, 81, 90, 107, 109, 178; commemoration of tenth anniversary of, 84, 85, 91; defeat of, 102; 'Long live the Hungarian Revolution!', 80, 85, 99, 103
- Hungary, 10, 62, 154, 192; bureaucracy, 154; League of Socialist Revolutionaries, 181; penetration of German capital into, 101; proletariat, 191; section of IC, 33, 86, 107, 135-7, 154; youth section, 153
- Husak, 187, 188
- Imperialism, 12, 17, 19, 20, 17, 32, 40-9, 52-9, 62, 67, 69, 101, 102, 105, 135, 137, 147, 148, 149; crisis of, 25, 51, 90, 91, 94, 98-100, 102, 104, 107-112, 134-137, 144, 186; and crisis of Stalinist bureaucracy, 13, 24, 31; contradictions of, 42; ability to place strait jacket on class struggle, 137; aided by Soviet bureaucracy in Mid-East, 141; epoch of wars and revolutions, 26; Hungarian Revolution as victory for, 14; in Indo-China, 189; offensive of, 178; preparing to confront working class, 186; pressure of on FI, 76, 91, 93, 109; struggle against, 85, 127, 141, 148, 149, 177, 179, 189, 190, 191, 199; struggle of MNA against, 126; world, 34
- Impressionism, 54, 127, 161
- India, 12, 190; bourgeoisie, 48, 49, 56, 149; starvation in, 41, 42
- Indo-China, 67, 188, 191; workers and peasants of, 168, 189, 192
- International Secretariat, (Pabloite), 76, 91, 146, 168
- International Secretariat, (pre-Pabloite), 68, 93, 95, 96, 120, 160
- Internationalism, 21, 28, 39, 69, 112, 179, 183; proletarian, 12, 19, 54, 58, 158, 185; fake, 20, 37, 61, 93, 136
- In Defence of Marxism*, (Trotsky), 96, 118
- Indonesia, 17, 25, 41, 52; Communist Party, 56, 107; bourgeoisie, 56
- Idealism, 35

- International Committee of the FI, 3, 4, 7, 15, 25, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34, 47, 53, 54, 55, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 71, 72, 74, 95, 96, 100, 102-10, 141; attitude to Arab-Israeli conflict, 138, 153; factual record of work, 80; necessity for deep analysis of, 84; Fourth Conference of, 113, 136, 167; April, 1967 meeting, 117, 124; Third Conference of, 1966, 2, 5, 6, 31, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 47, 64, 75, 80, 81-87, 89-91, 94, 111-4, 122, 123, 129, 131, 134, 136, 138, 143-7, 150-4, 157-9, 166-8, 170, 174, 191, 194; British delegation to, 5; declaration of, 76; Hungarian delegation to, 6; Spartacist delegation to, 6
- International Youth Assembly, 81, 106, 139, 140, 141, 151, 153
- Israel, 137, 141; Arab territories occupied by, 138; bourgeoisie, 149; conflict with Egypt, 130, 149; Government, 131; imperialist outpost, 134; working class, 141
- Italy, 18, 81, 106, 139, 140, 184, 188; victory of fascism in, 8; working class, 102
- Jacobinism, RSDLP attacked as in 1903, 121; leaderships 'sui generis', 20
- Japan, 2, 48, 54; FI section, 86; imperialism, 49; invasion of China, 135; proletariat, 48
- Just, S., (France), 136, 138, 153
- JCR, 103, 157
- Kautsky, 129
- Kemp, Tom, 155
- Kennedy: assassination of, 22; his widow, 4, 46
- Kent State University, 189
- Korean War, 93
- Kosygin, 190
- Labour Party, 49, 108; demonstrations at LP Conference, principle of, 95; fake lefts, 104; SLL in, 129
- Lambert, Pierre, 161
- LSSP (Ceylon), 2, 4, 20, 46, 93, 111, 128, 129, 152; collapse of, 97; degeneration under parliamentarism, 152; LSSP (Revolutionary), 103, 152; 1964 betrayal, 98, 129, 111; relationship with FI, 129
- Lassalle, 116
- Latin America, 19, 25, 33, 41, 97, 99, 166-183; class struggle, 167, 168, 175, 189; Conference in, 32, 267, 169, 170, 174, 177; bourgeoisie, 117; organizations and militants, 166, 169; revolutionary activity in, 172; Stalinism in, 172; Trotskyists, 180; 'Trotskyist' parties, confusion of, 98
- La Verité*, 161
- Left Opposition, 8, 88
- Liebkecht, K., 116
- Lenin, 21, 69, 89, 97, 115, 117, 121, 124, 129, 140, 145, 146, 171, 191; battle for Marxist theory, 117; condemned as splitter, 117; death of, 140; differences with Trotsky, 118; General Secretary of Bolshevik Party, 117
- Liège Demonstration, 81, 84, 85, 91, 99, 103, 104, 131, 140, 144, 151
- Ligue Communiste, 183
- Liquidationism, 14, 20, 22, 46, 64, 71, 110, 125, 131; of Marxism, 181
- Lora, G., 138-9, 165; IC declaration on imprisonment of, 138
- Luxemburg, Rosa, 117
- Maitan, L., 183
- Mandel, E., 108, 183
- Mao Tse-Tung, 94, 102, 150, 190; campaign of Soviet bureaucracy against, 102; Maoists, 'pure' militancy of, 194; SLL 'critical support for Mao and Red Guards', 147; support of Numeiry, 200
- Marcellin, R., 188
- Martov, L., 120
- Marx, K., 21, 69, 89, 115-116, 145, 184
- Marxism, 19-21, 25, 27, 31, 50, 54, 69, 92, 110-112, 115, 124, 196; as unity of theory and practice, 89, 111; ABC of Marxist politics, 150; continuity of, 110, 117; conflict with idealism, 118, 199; dialectical materialist foundations of, 109; distorted into crude objectivism, 110; development through fight with Pabloism, 111; programme of, 119, 120, 132; revision of, 194, 197; revolutionary perspectives, 130, 140
- Messali Hadj (Algeria), 114, 126; and collaboration with French bourgeoisie, 126
- Mexico, 172, 179; LOM, member of IC, 166, 167, 170; student demonstrations in, 168, 172
- Middle East War, 135, 141, 142, 150; crisis, 151; discussion of, 134;
- Militant*, 120, 122, 150
- Mitterand, F., 62
- Moscoco, H., 139
- Nagy, Balazs, 177
- Napuri, R., (Peru), 183
- Nasser, 135, 150; attitude to Vietnam, 135, 137; bourgeois-nationalist regime of, 135, 136, 141, 149
- National bourgeois, 17, 26, 41, 44, 51
- National liberation struggles, 15, 134
- Nationalism, bourgeois, 3, 43, 107, 114, 130, 134, 138
- NATO, 33, 103; de Gaulle's military relationship with, 108
- New Course* (Trotsky), 117
- Newsletter*, 149, 155
- Nigeria, Trotskyism in, 80, 81
- Nixon, R., 189, 192
- Numeiry, 197
- Organisation Communiste Internationaliste (OCI), 6, 80, 86, 90, 95, 103, 112-144, 151-181 *passim*, 199; document of, 82, 115-123, 127-132; 8th Congress, 161; leadership, 131; line on Mid-East war, 138; 'united class front', 123
- October 1917 (Russian Revolution), 8, 21, 27, 44, 51, 69, 89, 97, 98, 106, 116, 117, 129, 177, 191; commemoration of 50th anniversary, 106, 144, 154; defence of conquests of, 147, 148; 54th anniversary of, 191

- One Step Forward, Two Steps Back* (Lenin), 121
- Opportunism, 18, 22, 69, 70, 117, 120, 125, 183, 194; petty-bourgeois, 6, 14; position of Belgian socialist party, 18; relation to youth movement, 127; struggle of Marxism against, 115, 123, 128
- Pablo, M., 3, 4, 15, 17, 22, 30, 46, 70, 73, 89, 109, 118, 145, 146, 183; break of 1952 with, 114; expulsion of majority of French Section, 160, 161; prostration before bureaucracy, 130; revisionism, 109
- Pabloism, -ites, 3, 4, 17-24, 30, 47, 65, 68, 70-78, 85, 87, 90, 103-115, 124, 142-5; bankruptcy of leadership of, 91; cause of, 146; 'colonial epicentre' theory, 128; crisis of, 92, 104, 146, 169; entry *sui generis*, 16, 109, 125; fundamental break with Marxism, 109
- Pacifism, -ists, 55; anti-working class nature of, 108; and Pabloites, 124; bourgeois, 112, 113
- Pakistan, 48, 190; struggle against India, 149; bourgeoisie, 48, 56, 149; East, rising of workers in, 190; imperialism in, 190
- Palestinians (Arab), 135; Palestine Issue, 138; struggle of, 179; workers, 190
- Parti Communiste Internationaliste (PCI), 95, 123, 126, 157; birth of in 1944, 76; document on Algerian work, April 1958, 126, 127
- Peaceful co-existence, 9, 11, 17, 26, 65, 189
- Perera, Dr. N.M., 20
- Permanent Revolution, theory of, 97, 130, 136, 137
- Permanent Revolution* (Trotsky), 118
- Peru, 170, 173, 182; members from at OCI-organized meeting, 166; construction of Trotskyist organization, 183; Vanguardia Revolucionaria, 183
- Poland, 192, 193; fight for Republic of Workers' Councils, 185; proletariat of, 192, 193; uprisings in 1956, 10, 54, 57, 62, 178; uprisings in 1970, 178, 185
- Pompidou, G., 107
- Partido Obrero Revolucionario (POR), 163-170, 173-177, 198
- Portugal, 188; dictatorship, 187; 1968 strikes, 187; working class, 192
- Posadas (faction of FI), 19, 22, 30, 183
- Pragmatism, 35, 54, 110; of Spartacists, 7
- Propagandism, 69
- Red Army, 66
- Red Guards (China), 96, 147
- Reformism, -sts, 58, 59, 60, 62, 72, 107; bureaucracy, 12, 48, 53; leadership of in working class, 2, 3, 53, 62; parties, 125
- Religion, in Algeria, 126; Muslim, 126
- Revisionism, 2, 7, 15, 40, 46, 115, 128, 146, 194, 200; acceptance of post-war betrayals as inevitable, 110; capitulation to betrayal of leadership, 110; capitulation to class enemy, 112; explanation of Stalinism, 118; fight against, 83, 102, 107, 109, 110, 112, 114, 115, 124, 128, 131; line of 'neutrality' on Mid-East, 136
- Révoltes, 6, 33, 55, 62, 85, 140, 141, 143, 155, 157; National Youth Assembly in Paris, 140
- Revolutionary party, 20, 32, 53, 54, 58, 60, 73, 95, 109, 111, 123, 125; absence of in advanced countries, 128, 182; building of, 3, 5, 16, 17, 19, 27, 30, 45, 88, 114, 125, 126, 130; 'natural emergence' of, 113, 122
- Revolutionary Youth International, 169, 190-1, 196-8, 200
- Robertson, J., 7, 34-9, 83, 87, 90, 103, 111-113, 131, 151
- Schachtman, M., 38
- Second International, 88-90, 94, 117, 119, 128; bankruptcy of, 145
- Second World War, 20, 22, 25, 56, 60, 68, 71, 93, 128, 130
- Section Française de l'Internationale Ouvrière (SFIO), 95, 123
- Sino-Soviet Conflict, 10, 23
- Slaughter, C., 136, 138, 153; journey to Greece of, 86
- Social democracy, 65, 66, 71, 73, 121, 125; betrayals of, 8, 98, 159; contradictions in, 89; bourgeoisification of, 94; counter-revolutionary role, 50; dependence of imperialism on, 20; Engels on, 116; European, 13, 64; history of (OCI document), 115; 'Left', in Europe, 3; necessity to win masses from, 124
- Socialist Labour League (SLL), 2, 3, 4, 6, 81-3, 86, 90, 95, 103, 104, 108, 112-115, 129, 136, 143-147, 150-155, 160; amendment at Conference that 4th International not destroyed, 113; Central Committee of, 132; Congress of, 83; 9th Congress of, 113, 132
- Socialist Workers' Party (SWP), 3, 4, 15, 21-23, 36-38, 43, 46, 63, 68, 70, 90-93, 103, 105, 108-114, 130, 150, 160, 161; leaders of, 108, 110; pragmatism and anti-internationalist policies, 38; pragmatism and empiricism of, 110; return to Pablo camp, 1963, 3, 20, 22, 91, 111, 114, 151
- Soekarno (Indonesia), 107
- Soviet Union, 2, 8, 10-16, 21, 24-7, 31-2, 43-5, 50-6, 61-3, 72-3, 98-100, 118, 186, 190; backwardness prior to the revolution, 129; capitalist penetration, 100; defence of by Marxists, 137, 147; party of FI, 147; political revolution, 101; proletariat of, 45, 93, 97, 178, 192
- Spain, 169, 188; Burgos Six, 185; Austurian miners strike, 185; victory of fascism in, 8; workers' and students' struggles, 25, 185
- Spartacists, 6, 7, 36-39, 112; anti-internationalism of, 7
- Spontaneity, 60, 113; struggle of Marxism against, 122
- Sri Lanka Freedom Party (SLFP), 20
- Stalin, 62, 66, 67, 98, 130; death of, 9, 65; distortion of Lenin, 129; faction of, 118
- Stalinism, 3, 9, 12, 15, 19, 22, 53, 65, 72, 120, 125, 130, 136, 158, 169-70, 174; betrayals of, 130, 159; centrist tendencies in, 72; capitulation to, 15, 93, 109; collaboration with imperialism, 189; conflict with masses, 186; contradictions of, 100; counter-revolutionary role, 16, 49, 193; crisis of, 102, 109, 111, 112, 134; danger of pro-

- letarian victory to, 158; destruction of generation of Marxists by, 93; entry into, 109; history of, 82; in Eastern Europe, 18; in France (1968), 158; New York candidature, 103; political revolution against, 188; 'progressive role' (Pabloite), 109; provocations by, 103, 192; repression by, 30
- Sudan, 197
- Suez Canal, nationalization of, 1956, 135
- Suslov, 52
- Sweden, 187
- Sylveire, D., 142, 143, 196
- Syndicalism, 113, 170
- Syria, 19, 135
- Tate Affair, 82, 104, 108, 112
- Third International (Comintern), 89, 90, 106, 118, 119, 122; degeneration, 88, 94, 97, 98, 145; dissolution of, 66; first four congresses of, 37; formation of, 8; 3rd and 4th Congresses, 59
- Trade Unions, 150; bureaucracy, counter revolutionary role of, 49-50, 182; role of revolutionaries in, 32, 58-9, 88, 125
- Transitional Programme (Founding Programme of the FI), 3, 5, 7, 16, 21, 23, 30, 32, 37, 40, 51, 54, 58, 60, 68-69, 83-88, 90, 92, 94-6, 105-115, 130, 147, 151, 152; as 'ultimatum', 124; statutes, 118, 120
- Trotsky, L., 8, 15, 21, 27, 30, 34, 40, 42, 43, 70, 78-89, 92-98, 106, 110, 118-124, 129, 135, 145-147, 177, 188; characterization of German Social Democracy in the *New Course*, 117; death of, 30, 69, 70
- Trotskyist Parties, 25, 31-32, 111, 127, 151; POR as, 174-175; transformation of YCP into, 96
- Unified Secretariat, 3, 14, 22, 27, 46, 90, 103, 104, 108, 155, 182; in Bolivia, 138
- 'United Class Front', (OCI), 123-7
- United Front (policy), 23-4, 59-60, 123-5; FI struggle for, 95, 59, 192
- United Socialist States of Europe, 105, 159, 184, 191, 192; part of revolutionary programme, 61-2, 185, 190, 179, 188, 193
- United Socialist States of Latin America, 179, 180
- United States of America, 2-4, 7, 19-26, 33-7, 42-3, 54, 69, 100, 105-7, 140, 154; anti-war movement, 108; bourgeoisie, 37; capitalism, 34; class struggle, 110, 179; Democratic Party, 103; GM strike, 189; Labor Party, formation of, 34; Negro movement, 3-4, 22-3, 25, 34, 43, 55, 108; perspectives for 3rd IC Conference, 37; petty-bourgeois radicals and SWP, 110; postmen's strike, 189; pragmatism, 21; proletariat, 43, 57, 179, 180, 189; railmen's strike, 189
- United States imperialism, 13, 17, 22, 26, 41, 48-9, 52-7, 64, 99, 100, 141, 168, 178-9, 189; and Arab revolution, 136; dependence of Indian and Pakistani bourgeoisie on, 149; in Vietnam, 50
- Uruguay, 179
- Virodhays* (Ceylon paper), 152
- Venezuela, 172, 179; CP, 182; groups, 170; MAS, 182
- Varga, M., (Hungarian Section), 6, 134-137
- Vietnam, 2, 12, 25, 26, 33, 41, 42, 45-51, 103-4, 134-5; peasants and proletariat of, 41, 48-9, 55-6, 147-8, 179; Vietnam, North, 48; 'Peace in Vietnam and against NATO', 103; 'Victory to the Viet Cong!', 80, 147; Vietnamese people, right to self determination of, 56; section of FI, 147, 148; and its collapse, 97, 98
- Voix Ouvrière*, 7, 88, 89, 115, 157; participation in 3rd Conference, 5, 6, 86; statement of, to 3rd Conference, 64-74; speech to 3rd Conference, 75; struggle against, 90, 83, 87, 90, 111-113, 131, 151
- Waldeck-Rochet, 158
- Walloon movement (Belgium), 18
- Warsaw Pact, 186, 192
- Wilson, H., 141
- Wohlforth, T., 36
- Workers Councils, 10, 11, 185, 193; in Cuba, 19
- 'Workers and Peasants Government' (slogan), 173-176
- Working class, international, 2, 7, 43, 45, 51, 120, 122, 167; youth as one of most exploited sections, 25
- Young Socialists, 6, 33, 54-5, 85, 95, 105, 108, 127, 140-2, 195-8; amendment at Essen rally, 196, 198, 199; National Committee, 140, 197; support for Arab revolution, 141
- Youth, 54-5, 95, 105, 111, 125, 140-141, 153, 169-72, 184-91, 199; at Essen Rally, 184, 196; cadres, of SLL, 129; in Latin America, 172; International Conference of Revolutionary Youth, 190, 198; movement, reformists and stalinists in, 108; Negro, struggle against racism, 189; radicalization of, 131; revolutionary struggle of, 85, 185-6, 190-1, 196; organizations (France 1968), 157
- Youth International, 105; of Arab countries, 141
- Youth Commission, 33, 80, 81, 139
- Yugoslavia, 101; revolution, 93, 95, 96
- Zionism, 134-137, 141, 149

In today's conditions of capitalist crisis, only the International Committee of the Fourth International stands on a record of fighting for revolutionary leadership in the working class. To carry forward this struggle now, when every revisionist tendency is striving to turn the working class back into the arms of the bureaucracy, an understanding of its history is essential.

Founded in 1938 in conditions of crushing defeat for the working class, persecuted by the ruling class and the Stalinists, the Fourth International has survived only by the most ruthless struggle against liquidationism in its own ranks. Revisionists like Pablo saw nothing but the strength of the bureaucracy in the relations between the classes after the Second World War, and refused to analyze the contradictions in the inflationary boom, which has now turned into its opposite. The Socialist Workers Party of the United States never carried through Trotsky's struggle against pragmatism within it, and split from the Pabloites in 1953 only to carry out a thoroughly unprincipled 'reunification' with them ten years later.

Volumes Five and Six of this series bring together the documents of the struggle against the opportunist Organisation Communiste Internationaliste of France, which openly repudiated dialectical materialism and split from Trotskyism in 1971. Their publication strengthens the basis laid in the previous volumes for drawing the lessons of the fight against revisionism since 1951, and training the cadre to build mass revolutionary parties as sections of the International Committee.