

INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION BULLETIN

July 1966

MINUTES OF THE SECOND CONGRESS SINCE REUNIFICATION

(Eighth World Congress)

December 1965

(Published as a fraternal courtesy
to the United Secretariat of the
Fourth International)

40¢

SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

1966

Index

The Organization of the World Congress 1
Minutes of the Sessions 2
Congress Resolutions 16
Votes and Vote Explanations 21

Appendices:

(1) Amendments to the European document
from the English Section 28
(2) Letter to the English Section 37
(3) Resolution of the IEC July 1965 40
(4) Letter to the Australian Trotskyists
remaining loyal to the FI 45

* * *

Errata: Page 2, third paragraph from the bottom: read
"2 against, 1 abstention" instead of "2 absten-
tions, 1 against."

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE WORLD CONGRESS.

The second plenum of the International Executive Committee, following the Reunification Congress, which took place in December 1964, took the decision to convoke the present World Congress of the Fourth International. That Plenum immediately opened the preparatory discussion of the Congress. It decided on the following agenda:

(1) The crisis of the Soviet bureaucracy and the international communist movement, including therein the Sino-Soviet conflict.

(2) The situation in Western Europe and the tasks of the revolutionary marxists.

(3) The African revolution and the class nature of certain African states.

(4) The situation in Latin America.

In addition, the plenum decided that the Congress should also express its opinion on the initial results of the actions of the reunified forces of the international Trotskyist movement, and discuss the crisis of the Lanka Sama Samaja Party in Ceylon.

The discussion for the Congress was to have extended throughout 1965. The precise date of the Congress was decided at the third plenum of the International Executive Committee following the Reunification Congress, in July 1965. The July plenum also decided to remove the question of Latin America from the agenda, because there was not enough time for an adequate discussion. This question must be discussed at the first plenum of the International Executive Committee following the World Congress.

The United Secretariat has been placed in charge of the execution of the I. E. C. decisions.

The Bureau of the United Secretariat

=====

SECOND CONGRESS OF REUNIFICATION (EIGHTH WORLD CONGRESS) OF THE
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

First Day

The congress opens with the host section welcoming the delegates.

Preliminary Question

Pierre informs the delegates about the latest contacts with the Pablo faction: in November a conference of members of the International and members of the Pablo faction who no longer belong to the International took place in Paris.

With the exception of one point, we are unaware of the decisions taken at that conference.

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International received a visit from a delegation of this conference shortly before the holding of the World Congress.

This delegation presented a letter to the United Secretariat (see page three for the complete text of the letter).

Walter presents a draft resolution on this question after a report.

Discussion: Tom Peters, Livio, Pia, George Edwards, Saul, Marc,
Ramos, Christos

Motion: To close the discussion. Adopted with 2 abstentions
1 against

Resolution: (only those delegates whose mandates cannot be contested can vote). The resolution presented by Walters is adopted unanimously. -2 against (Tom Peters, George Edwards)
(see page 5 for the complete text of the resolution)

Livio proposes a commission of three comrades to see the supporters of Pablo: Walter, Karlo, Saul. The commission is unanimously accepted
-2 abstentions: Tom Peters, George Edwards.

LETTER FROM THE PABLO FRACTION ASKING TO ATTEND THE CONGRESS

November 22, 1965.

Comrades,

The following people presently in Paris:

Dennis (Australia)
Raoul (Latin America)
Paul (Cyprus)
Eric (Denmark)
Soren (Denmark)
Maurice (Holland)
Fritjof (Holland)

delegates to the congress from their respective sections,

Sal Santen
Michel Pablo
Maurel
Lenoir
Simone Minguet

members of the International Executive Committee and the United Secretariat elected by the 7th World Congress and the Reunification Congress,

Roger Foirier (1)

member of the International Control Commission,

Jacques Privas (2)
Berri (2)
Luisant (2)
Richard (2)
Jean (2)
Dumas (2)
Lerse (3)

members of the central committees of their respective sections,

Helene (4)
Serge (4)

members of the African Commission elected at the 7th World Congress and at the Reunification Congress,

request to be present at the Congress, with the aim of appealing against the measures taken in connection with the Marxist Revolutionary tendency to which they belong and to defend its political line at the Congress in accordance with the statutes of the International (all of Chapter 7 and particularly points E. F. G. H.)

.../...

NOTES OF THE UNITED SECRETARIAT

- (1) Comrade Roger Foirier has made it known that he agreed that the Pablo group be heard at the Congress, but following the rupture he stands outside of any organization.
- (2) These comrades no longer belong to the French section, consequently they are no longer members of its central committee.
- (3) This comrade is no longer a member of the Austrian section therefore he is no longer on its central committee.
- (4) The African Commission had not been elected by the Seventh World Congress nor the Reunification Congress but by the International Executive Committee. Later the International Executive Committee modified the composition of the African Commission to which these comrades no longer belonged after May 1964 (Article 15 of the Statutes).

RESOLUTION

Congress reaffirms the nature of the IVth International, World Party of the Socialist Revolution, as an organization of combat based on democratic centralism, which implies the widest rights of political discussion inside the movement (incl. the right to form tendencies in order to try to gain victory for one's ideas inside the movement), combined with the necessity of strict discipline in action, i.e. the application of majority decisions by minorities, especially in outside activities.

If the movement would tolerate the refusal to respect this discipline it would transform the International into a federation of tendencies lacking all efficiency, and would make it break with the organisational principles established and transmitted by Lenin, Trotsky and the whole communist movement prior to its bureaucratic degeneration.

These principles imply that World Congresses are not forums for oratorical contests or contradictory debates, but assemblies called upon to take decisions, binding for all those who participate in the discussion.

Under ordinary circumstances it would'nt be necessary to recall these elementary principles, elaborated in our Statutes, and in the whole tradition and past of our movement. But the congress finds itself faced with an appeal and a request of participation on behalf of a minority which for two years, has conducted itself systematically as a disloyal fraction which has constantly broken elementary discipline of the International, fighting against it as a hostile organization.

This fraction

- 1) Notwithstanding the fact that before and during the 7th World Congress it enjoyed full and unlimited rights to defend its positions; that it largely participated in a discussion conducted in 30 internal bulletins; that at the Congress itself it enjoyed a time for counter-reports at least equal to the time of reports for the majority; refused to recognize the Congress' political decisions, and has continuously defended in public the minority positions, rejected by an overwhelming majority of the Congress;
- 2) Started to publish a public fraction organ, in a form which violated openly the Statutes of the International, and whose English edition in Ceylon is handled by people who are not even formally members of the International;

- 3) Refused to apply the decisions of the May 1964 and January 1965 Plenums of the International Executive Committee, which called upon it to stop publishing this public faction organ;
- 4) Refused to recognize the normal and statutory modification in the composition of the African Commission, decided by the May 1964 Plenum of the I.E.C., and continued to present its public faction organ fraudulently as the "organ of the African Commission of the IVth International", thereby deceiving international working class and revolutionary opinion.
- 5) Refused to apply the decision of the January 1965 Plenum of the IEC, relative to the initially internal character of the discussion preparatory to the World Congress;
- 6) Attacked publicly in a slanderous and revolting way the normally elected leadership of the International as well as that of several sections, denigrating the international organization in its whole, its traditions, its strength and its perspectives;
- 7) Has ceased, for more than a year, to pay its normal dues to the International, and has completely boycotted the actions of financial solidarity led by the International for its militants and sections who are leading revolutionary struggles and are victims of ferocious repression, e.g. in South Africa and Bolivia;
- 8) Has ceased, immediately after the 7th World Congress and the Reunification Congress, at least as regards the "Algiers group", the Dutch section and the Australian section, to have normal statutory relations with the International leadership, to inform it about its activities and to consult it before deciding upon a given course of conduct, which places the International before the dilemma either to silently comply with a minority line for which it refuses to take any responsibility, or to publicly desolidarize itself with that line (the last scandalous example of this attitude has been the publication by the Frias group, without prior consultation with the International and without its agreement, of a statement dissolving itself, "stopping all relations with the Trotskyist movement and the IVth International", and proclaiming its agreement "with the theoretical and programmatic positions of the MIR" in Peru;
- 9) Has organized an international faction apparatus with its own parallel international "center", its own finances and its own internal bulletins, organizing its own international conferences and trips, without prior information or consultation with the International leadership or national sections, which is an additional violation of the Statutes;

- 10) Has expelled, without any previous procedure, from the "Algiers group" which it controlled, the members politically in agreement with the International, demanding from them group discipline as against discipline of the International.
- 11) Has organized, justified and covered the systematic violation of discipline in several sections, which culminated recently in an attempt of its French comrades to steal the paper of the French section and its finances, notwithstanding the fact that these comrades recognized to represent only a minority at the last section's congress, held regularly after a convocation approved of by the minority.

Every one of these disloyal acts of indiscipline mentioned above, and all the more so all these acts taken together, would have amply justified the expulsion of this disloyal minority from the International.

However in order to demonstrate once more its desire to regroup all those who claim to be Trotskyists, in the framework of an International based upon democratic centralism, Congress is ready to accept the presence at its sessions of all these minority representatives who have been delegated by their sections, on the express condition that these delegates undertake in advance and in writing to apply all decisions of the World Congress, including those which would apply to the prohibiting of all members of the International from writing, editing or distributing a public organ as "Under the Banner of Socialism" or any other public organ which would take its place and which would fulfil the same role of defending publicly in the name of the IVth International a political line rejected by the majority of the Congress and the leading bodies normally elected at that Congress.

Without this undertaking, the participation at the Congress of representatives of a minority which had till now systematically violated discipline would only be a force which would disintegrate the International and its organisational structure.

Presidium proposed for the first day: Alan, Saul, Edouard.
Unanimously accepted with two abstentions: G. Edwards and Tom Peters.

Proposed Agenda: First day: Sino-Soviet conflict
Second Day: European document
Third Day: African document
Fourth Day: Report of activities; Situation in Ceylon;
English situation
Fifth Day: Statutes, I.E.C. election.

Second Session:

I Sino-Soviet Conflict

Livio: presents the document. This document will be published separately in an internal bulletin.

Second day: First and Second Sessions. The agenda proposed for the week is unanimously accepted.

George Edwards: requests an hour and a half in order to present a counter-document in the name of the English section (R.S.L.)

Sirio: proposes 1 hour.

Proposition accepted unanimously; less 2 votes against (R.S.L.) and 4 abstentions.

George Edwards: presents the counter-document and requests that his protest against the time accorded be included in the minutes.

Discussion:

Gormely
Edmund
Jean-Louis
Ramos
Lewis

Discussion Continued:

Christos
Eric
Akhman
Tom Peters
Jacobs
Alan

George Edwards - Summary of the spokesman for the counter-document.

Livio: Summary of the spokesman for the document. The amendments of the French and Italian comrades and part of those of Comrade Christos are accepted. It is considered that the essential idea of Comrade Edmund's amendment is found in the text but it is accepted that this idea must be developed by concrete examples. It is considered that the idea of comrade Akhman's amendment is already contained in the text.

Second day: Third Session.

Report of the commission designated to meet with the delegates who are supporters of Pablo.

Walter presents the report. Two letters have been presented by them (complete text on page IO) one from Raoul (Peru) and Anderson (Australia) addressed to the "Assembled Delegates of the sections of the Fourth International" declaring that they will only reply to "the bureaucratic and unheard of declaration made by Walter" (see pages 5,6, and 7) "in the presence of the assembled delegates"; the other letter from Erik and Soren (Denmark) addressed to "the control commission of the 8th World Congress of the Fourth International" and "protesting against the disciplinary measures taken against us for having signed a letter". They demand to be present from the opening of the Congress.

The reporter proposes that the response to the first letter be a pure and simple refusal, and to restate the question of discipline to the authors of the second letter. The question is complex, adds the reporter, as the Danish section has always been a disciplined one. But on the other side, the two letters have from all evidence been prepared by common agreement. The reporter express the personal opinion that he would be in favour of the immediate admission of the Danish delegation, if Anderson's threat, to get into the Congress by force, is not connected to it.

Discussion: Jacobs
Gormely
Miguel
Werner
Eric
Livio
Eduard

Walter proposes a resolution

Pierre proposes an amendment

Discussion: Werner

Vote on the resolution: In favour 19, Against 6, (George Edwards, Tom Peters, Livio, Miguel, Christos, Ilario). For the text of the resolution: See page IO

Livio: explanation of his vote: the resolution is useless; he is for refusal, pure and simple.

First report of the credentials committee: Gormely.

To the Assembled Delegates of the Sections of the Fourth International

In reply to the bureaucratic and unheardof statement made by Walter to us on December 6, 1965, we state that we will reply to this statement only before the assembled delegates of whom we are the duly elected representatives of our respective Sections.

Anderson (Australia)
Raoul (Feru)

To the Control Commission of the 8th World Congress of the Fourth International

The two delegates of the Danish section of the Fourth International first protest sharply against the disciplinary measures taken against us for signing a letter asking that some comrades suspended and expelled in the period between the 7th and the 8th World Congress should be allowed to present their case before the 8th World Congress. No disciplinary action of any sort has ever been taken against us for breaking the discipline of the Fourth International. Both of us belong to the minority in the International (marxist-revolutionary tendency), but we are here present as delegates for the whole Danish Section, and as such we are asking to be present from the very beginning of the 8th World Congress of the Fourth International.

Søren and Erik (Denmark)

Resolution of the Congress

The World Congress:

- notes that the two Danish delegates have refused to sign the declaration demanded;
- notes that these delegates, even though being elected representatives of their section, participated at a secret faction conference organized by the minority, after having been delegated, where they accepted the fractional discipline of a disloyal group which, after three years of constant indiscipline, has decided to create an organization both independent of and hostile to the Fourth International.
- notes that the leader of the minority delegation by his behaviour and his irresponsible statements has manifested his contempt for the security of the Congress and that they have not dissociated themselves from this declaration and from these acts
- concludes therefore, not to allow them into the Congress.

Second day: continued.

11. European Report

Ilario: presented the report. This report to be published separately in an internal bulletin.

Second day: Fourth session.

Ilario: continuation of report.

Praesidium: declared that the amendments submitted to the commission will be included in the text.

Walter: proposed speaking time of 15 minutes for all and 30 minutes for George Edwards.

Sirio: proposed 15 minutes for everyone without exception.

Sirio's proposition was defeated. 1 for (Sirio), 4 abstentions (Pierre, Saul, Gormley, Marc), the rest against.

Discussion: George Edwards, Charlier, Walter

Third day: First session.

Election of new presidium: Marc, Pia, Lewis.

Gormley gave a report for the mandate commission:

a. Full Votes: Livio (1), Sirio (1), Ilario (1), Marchi (1), Pierre (1), Ramos (1), Eric (1), Sandor (1), Alan (1), Gormley (2), Erwin (1), Hans (1), Lothar (1), Pia (1), Bruno (1), Marc (1), Jean-Louis (1), Charlier (1), Christos (2), Edmund (3), Karlo (1), Saul (2), Valenzia (5), Albert (1), George Edwards (2), Tom Peter (1), Diego (1), Alfredo (1), Luis (1), Jose (1), Bianca (1).

b. Substitutes: Vallon (1), Dumoulin (1) for Sandor and Eric, Valin (1) for Charlier.

c. Consultative votes: Miguel, Perez (left before the votes), Akhman, Lewis Peter, Patrick.

d. The United States: an observer from the S.W.P.

Total: 41 votes, 6 consultative votes.

Third day: Continued

Discussion on the European document; Tom Peters, Ramos, Sirio, Jean-Louis, Patrick, Pia.

Livio: evoked the memory of the militants who have fallen in the struggle; Bolivian comrade Cesar Lora and the Greek student Petroulas assassinated by repressive forces of the bourgeoisie. The World Congress elects as **honorary presidents**. the Peruvian comrades Hugo Blanco, Vladimiro Valer, Daniel Pereyra, the Bolivian comrade Elio Vasquez and the Indian comrade Kanai Pal, parliamentary deputy, West Bengal, and who are all in prison. Salutations to militants imprisoned in a number of countries, (Peru, Bolivia, Argentina, South Africa,) to Algerian militants imprisoned by Boumeddiene regime; to young revolutionaries imprisoned in the Workers States. Congress pays homage to Trotskyists and friends of the movement who have died since the last World Congress: Jules Henin (Belgium), Art Preis (U.S.A.), John Baird (England), Alfred Rosmer (France) and Raphael Zakine who we have learned has died in Algeria.

The Chairman proposed to take the African document and to vote on the European document later.

Tom Peters asked for the position of the reporter with regard to the amendments submitted by the English section.

Ilario: the English section amendments are rejected.

III African Document

Livio: presented the report. This report will be published separately in an internal bulletin.

Third day: Second session.

Livio: finished the report. Then he gave his personal position on the nature of certain African states.

The chairman proposed a longer speaking time for the African delegates and those presenting a particular position. This was accepted.

Discussion: Edmund

Lewis: this contribution will be published separately in the internal bulletin and in "Quatrieme Internationale (concerning Nigeria).

Walter

Third day: third session

Livio announced the arrival of the Danish comrades. He proposed that given the fait accompli, they be admitted. The proposal was adopted.

Discussion on the African document: Albert, George Edwards, Saul, Akhman, Christos, Tom Peters, Jacobs

Election of an English commission: Alan, Sirio, Pierre, Walter, Miguel; the commission can be attended by any English-speaking delegates and observers.

Agreed to include Edmund in the commission.

Tom Peters asked that Alan be removed from the commission. Request defeated.

- - - - -

Fourth day: First session:

Erik and Soren asked permission to make a declaration.

The chairman asked that the political discussion on Africa be finished before hearing their statement.

Discussion on the African document: Sirio, Miguel, Ramos, Gormley.

- - - - -

S T A T E M E N T

- made by the Danish delegation,
- to be incorporated in the published report of the Congress.

The Danish Delegation refuses to take part in the political discussion because they judge:

- that the representation at this Congress is deliberately very one-sided:
- that the representivity of a certain number of delegates who have taken part in the discussion is very doubtful.

These facts mean a complete deterioration of the political discussion, which is not a discussion of a genuine World Congress of the Fourth International, but rather that of a political debating club.

- - - - -

Fourth day: first session (continued)

Discussion of the African document: Pierre
Michel
Diego

Livio: reply by the reporter.

Election of a new praesidium: Sirio, Akhman, Ramos.

Fourth day: Second session.

A letter from Iran was read (see Volume 1966, no. 2 of the Internal Bulletin of the United Secretariat) containing the correspondence of the Congress.

Erik requested to make a statement on the irregular character of the Congress.

The Chairman allowed 10 minutes for the discussion of this request: five minutes for the Danish delegation and 5 minutes for the contrary point of view.

Erik: put the case for his request.

Pierre: put the case for the contrary point of view, according to which a discussion of the regularity of the Congress should be held back until the discussion on the activity report.

Vote: For the request of the Danish delegation: Erik, Søren, George Edwards, Tom Peters.

Abstentions: Karlo, Charlier
23 against.

The request was rejected.

IV. POLITICAL RESOLUTION

Walter: presentation of the report. This report will be published in an Internal Bulletin.

Discussion: Charlier
Edmund
Akhman
Bruno
Gormley
Marc.

Fourth day: Third session

Discussion: George Edwards
Ramos

Fourth day: Third session (continued)

Discussion: Valentia
Miguel
Sirio
Lothar

Fifth day: First session.

Discussion: Alan
Livio
Pia
Tom Peters
Karlo
Jacobs
Saul
Diego
Albert

Walter: reply of the reporter.

Fifth day: second session.

Gormley gave a supplementary report of the credentials commission.

the Danish comrades will have 2 votes. This brings the total of voting delegates from 41 to 43. The number of consultative votes remains 6.

The Chairman allowed one hour for the Danish delegation; the time to be divided between the two delegates.

Erik: on the right of the minority to be present at the Congress.

Søren: on the un-representative character of the Congress.

Reply by Livio.

Fifth day: third session.

Report of the commission on the European document: Charlser.

V. ACTIVITY REPORT

Pierre: presentation of the report. This report will be published in an internal bulletin.

Discussion: Edmund
Bianca

Sixth day: First session.

Hommage to comrade Raphael Zakine who had just died in Algeria.

Discussion of the report (continued): Letter from Greece read.
Participants: Søren, Erik, Miguel, Eduard, Dumoulin, Walter, Ramos,
Marchi, Gormley, George Edwards, Tom Peters, Manoubia,
Christos, Marc, Akhman.

Sixth day, Second session.

Discussion: Valenzia, Saul, Diego, Patrick, Albert, Livio.

Pierre: replied as reporter.

Votes: (see special chapter, page 21)

Proposition by Tom Peters that parts of the letters from the Indian comrades (on the Sino-soviet conflict) and from comrade Peng (on the African discussion) be published. This was agreed to, and the letters will be found in the Internal Bulletin Vol. 1966, no. 2.

Discussion on Ceylon

Edmund gave the report.

Sixth day, Third session.

Karlo gave the contrary report.

Contribution by Livio.

Some amendments were referred to the I.E.C. for their consideration the next day.

Edmund replied to the discussion.

Discussion on England:

Pierre: report of the commission.

George Edwards: report.

Discussion: Patrick, Tom Peters.

Seventh day:

Discussion: Gormley, Edmund, Alan, Lewis, Karlo, Ramos.

Pierre: reply, Votes (see the special chapter)

Election of the IEC and Control Commission (vote). Statutes: the Congress received a **project** to open the discussion for the next World Congress and submit it to the International for discussion.

Closing of the Congress.

RESOLUTION ON THE NAMING OF THE CONGRESS

The World Congress resolves to adopt the name:
Second Reunified Congress (8th World Congress)

By this designation, it aims to underline above all the continuing real importance of the reunification for the Trotskyist movement itself, and at the same time to mark its continuity since its foundation in 1938.

At the Reunification Congress, in 1963, it had been decided by general agreement that the study of the causes of the split of 1953 would be held over to a later period, since this study, although politically and historically important, was not indispensable for the determination of the policies of the International in this immediate period. This decision has shown itself to be perfectly correct by the fact that since the Reunification, the leadership of the Fourth International has functioned in a homogeneous manner.

RESOLUTION ON THE PABLO FACTION

The World Congress approves the resolution of the July 1965 plenum on the Pablo faction and notes that this faction, constituted as an independent organization, has by this fact placed itself outside the ranks of the Fourth International.

RESOLUTION ON THE SPECIFIC POLITICAL TASKS OF SOME SECTIONS

(this part of the political resolution, which constitutes point 8 of Chapter VIII, "Our tasks", is internal; the public text of the political resolution will be published in "Quatrieme International".)

(a) In Bolivia and Peru, the situation continues to favor important advances on the part of the revolutionary Marxist forces. The unification of these forces must be completed, and their positions consolidated in the movement of the Peruvian peasant masses and the Bolivian miners, while at the same time systematically seeking to widen this fighting front to take in the labor unions in Peru and the peasant communities in Bolivia. The revolutionary Marxist forces will continue to draw all the necessary consequences of the fact that the dictatorial regimes in the two countries leave the people no other recourse but armed struggle in self-defence against the fierce repression and attempts to reduce their already miserable standard of living. In Peru, the overthrow of the corrupt regime of the oligarchy constitutes a task of extreme urgency for the workers and peasants. The overthrow of the Barrientos junta, without the succession to power of a reunified MNR more than ever confined to the perspective of the national bourgeoisie, remains the number one strategic objective in Bolivia.

(b) In Argentina and Chile, the revolutionary Marxists will continue their work of regroupment within the vanguard of the workers' movement, in order to counterpose a pole of attraction to the process of demoralisation provoked by the opportunist policies of the traditional working class formations.

(c) In Ceylon, the LSSP (Revolutionary Section) will work toward the construction of an independent mass revolutionary party. In its general lines, the party will be guided by the acknowledgement of the strategic necessity for a united front of the working class parties and organisations around actions in defence of the proletariat against the government and capitalist class. Flowing from this is the tactical necessity to advance concrete proposals for anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist struggle, with the aim of effectively dissociating the workers parties from the SIFP. The party shall be firmly orientated toward the recruitment and politicization of young workers, and toward patiently winning back the best among the old Trotskyist elements whom the opportunist policies of the leadership of the reformist LSSP are leading into disarray.

(d) The most urgent task facing the revolutionary Marxists in India is the consolidation and reinforcement of a centralised Trotskyist organisation. The S.W.P. constitutes a first important step toward such a centralised

organisation, without which organisational tactics like entrism can only pay off in defeats, as the past experiences of entrism in the S.P. and R.C.P. demonstrated. The Trotskyist organisation will pay particular attention to developments in the Left C.P. without neglecting the necessity for independent work.

- e (a) In South Africa, the semi-fascist regime of apartheid leaves the people no other way out than through a resolute armed struggle towards its overthrow. The first task in this direction is the creation of the largest possible united front to unleash this struggle. The revolutionary Marxists will work with every means at their command for the implementation of this orientation, while retaining the political and organisational autonomy of all the proletarian forces, with the continuing objective of opening up in this country a process of permanent revolution which will end in the expropriation of the imperialists, the South African capitalists and the large white farmers alike, and the creation of an African workers' state.

RESOLUTION.

In 1963 the 7th World Congress of the Fourth International issued a call for the reunification of the International. In accordance with this policy representatives of the RSL and the IG voted in favour of uniting their organizations in Britain.

Even though it was clear that there were political and tactical differences between the two organizations it was hoped that reunification would be a major step forward towards the building of a revolutionary marxist organization in Britain able to take full advantage of the many political opportunities existing for us there. It was also expected that a reunited movement would be in a better position to counteract the attacks made upon the Fourth International by the leadership of the Socialist Labour League.

In September 1964 a reunification took place. It proved to be short-lived because the spirit for mutual cooperation did not exist and because a collective leadership did not evolve to consolidate the two forces. In essence the reunification was in form only.

In January 1965 the reunification broke down and the former IG members on the National Committee of the reunified organization withdrew from the National Committee. Though no formal split took place the two groups reverted back to function as separate organizations.

The policy of the International is for one Trotskyist section in Britain and we deplore the present fragmentation of the Trotskyist movement there. We consider this to be an abnormal situation.

It is apparent to us that RSL is unable at the present stage to carry out the policies of the Fourth International because of serious political and tactical differences with the International. On the other hand the IG has shown that their policies are more consistent with those of the International. Both groups operate, in varying degrees, outside the direction of the international leadership and do not measure up to the responsibilities required of a normal section.

Neither organization has proved to be able to defend the positions of the International against the sharp political attacks made on our movement by our political opponents in England.

It is with regret, therefore, that we have come to the conclusion that the International cannot take the responsibility for all the actions of these two groups or recognize either of them as the official section of the Fourth International in Britain. Membership of both organizations continue to remain members of the FI.

In the light of recent experiences it is not a practical proposition to consider the possibility of a new reunification in the near future, desirable as this may be.

We consider the two groups to be sympathising groups and expect both groups to work closely with the International with the aim of building a strong, dynamic, revolutionary marxist mass party in England.

VOTES

(For good comprehension of the votes, please refer to the report of the credentials commission and to the supplementary report of the credentials commission, pp. 11 and 15 of the minutes.)

i. vote on a proposition of the delegation from the Danish Section:

Proposal for a Congress decision

-submitted by the Danish delegation
-to be discussed and voted upon.

This Congress decides:

- 1) To call immediately for a democratic World Congress to be held in 12 months from now with the full participation of all tendencies in its preparation and holding.
- 2) During this period a profound discussion - on the basis of documents submitted by all tendencies - should take place.
- 3) A modus vivendi is to be worked out by all tendencies in common for that period.
- 4) All public attacks to cease in that period.
- 5) All expulsions and suspensions against the minority tendency to be lifted immediately and all tendencies reintegrated in sections which have suffered a split.

Rejected by 37 votes against, 6 votes in favor (Karlo, George Edwards, Tom Peters, Erik).
Consultative: 5 against.

Declaration.

My vote for the Danish Resolution in no way questions the legality of the 2nd Reunification Congress of the Fourth International (8th World Congress)

--Karlo

- ii. Activity report: text of the report will be published in a separate internal bulletin.

For: 38

Against: 5 (George Edwards, Tom Peters, Erik)

Consultative: 5 in favour.

Adopted

Declaration A.

On the activity report: I vote for with the following remark: that it is necessary that the United Secretariat take the initiative for personal contact with Comrade Pablo in Greece to examine the possibilities of definitely avoiding a split, on the basis of respect for the Statutes and the Resolution of the I.E.C. of the F.I. of July 1965.

--- Christos.

Declaration B.

Statement of the British delegates on the activity report:

The British delegates vote against the activity report on the grounds that Comrade Frank correctly criticised Comrade Pablo for advocating and acting as an "advisor" to the Soviet bureaucracy and to the liberal Greek politician Papandreou. The British comrades pointed out that this was a "mirror image" of the activity of the United Secretariat in advocating and acting as unpaid and unsolicited "advisors" of Tito, Castro, Breznev and Mao. This disoriented the cadres of the movement and hampered the winning over of militants from the Stalinist movement. The reporter refused to answer or even mention them in this reply.

Declaration C

Submitted by the Danish delegation.

The activity report as presented by Comrade Pierre is unacceptable

-as it contains attacks on the policies and activities of the Revolutionary Marxist Tendency of the Fourth International, while the comrades in question were not allowed to attend the Congress and defend their positions, and

-as the acceptance of the report would mean approval of the actual expulsion of this tendency.

iii. Resolution on the Pablo faction; the text is published in the part of this bulletin devoted to adopted resolutions.

For: 36

Against: 5 (George Edwards, Tom Peters, Erik).

Abstentions: 2 (Christos)

Consultative votes: For: 3

Against: 2 (Akhman, Lewis).

Declaration A

Statement of the British delegates on the United Secretariat resolution concerning the minority tendency:

The British delegates vote against the resolution on the grounds that, while we disagree with the organisational indiscipline of the minority tendency since the last World Congress, we consider that the handling of the dispute by the majority facilitated, and was equally responsible for the splitting of the forces of the International.

Declaration B

I would propose a motion as follows:

The World Congress approves of the action of the Plenum on the Pablo faction and its characterisation of the faction, condemns the activities and ideological trend of this faction and its undisciplined actions, and calls on the faction to review its stand in re-integrating itself with the International. Should it fail to do this, the Congress empowers the IEC to take disciplinary actions against the Pablo faction in accordance with the statutes of the organisation.

---Lewis.

iv. vote on a proposition of the Danish delegation.

Proposition

of the Danish delegation, to be discussed and voted upon:

The Congress agrees to condemn the methods which - under different pretexts - were employed in order to keep the Danish delegation away from the Congress. Such fractional methods should be seen in the light of the fact that no disciplinary measures have been taken against the loyal Danish Section or against any of its members.

For: 6 (Bruno, George Edwards, Tom Peters, Erik)

Against: 37

Consultative: For: 1 (Peter)

Against: 4.

Rejected

v. Vote on the name of the Congress: the text is published in the part of this bulletin devoted to adopted resolutions.

For: Unanimous, except for 2 against (Erik)

Adopted

Declaration

(submitted by the Danish delegation).

This proposal is an attempt to draw the attention away from the fact that the majority leadership at this very Congress have helped to split the International — only two years after the Unification Congress.

vi. Proposal of a motion that in order to make the week of the Congress easier, it is necessary that the Congress be at least ten days long, and asking that the IEC prepare the next Congress in this fashion. Motion adopted unanimously

vii. Sino-Soviet Document: Amendment proposed by Comrade Edmund. (1)

For: 5 (Edmund, George Edwards, Tom Peters).

Against: 25

Abstentions: 11 (Lothar, Pia, Bruno, Jean-Louis, Valenzia, Erik).

Consultative: For: 3

Against: 1 (Miguel)

Abstention: 1 (Peter.)

Rejected.

(1) The text of this amendment is not published, the person responsible for this bulletin not having it at his disposal.

Declaration A

I agree with the general line covered in the document, but think this clear concise statement valuable. Among other things it will be useful to combat ultra-left "criticisms" of the text.

-- Patrick

Declaration B

We are voting against Edmund's amendment, not because of Livio's arguments, but because this text does not make the essential distinctions between the Soviet and Chinese bureaucracies, and we ask that the contents of this amendment be integrated in a different form.

--Dumoulin,

--Ramos

-- Marchi

-- Albert.

viii. Sino-Soviet Document: This amended text will appear in the Journal Quatrieme Internationale.

For: 37

Against: 3 (George Edwards, Tom Peters)

Abstentions: 3 (Pia, Erik)

Consultative: 5 in Favor

Adopted

ix. British document on the Sino-Soviet conflict. (appeared in the internal bulletin before the Congress .)

For: 3 (George Edwards, Tom Peters)

Against: 36

Abstentions: 4

Consultative: 5 against

Rejected

x. Albert amendment to the African document:

Text: "The designation 'workers' and peasants' government' is premature, and in any case leads to confusion." (On Algeria)

For: (Marchi, Jean-Louis, Christos, Edmund, Karlo, Valenzia, Albert, George Edwards, Tom Peters)

Against: 20

Abstentions: 6 (Erwin, Pia, Hans, Valin, Erik)

Consultative: For: 2

Against: 2 (Miguel, Peter)

Abstentions: 1 (Patrick)

Rejected

xi. vote on the African Document: This amended text will appear in the "Quatrieme International".

For: 33

Against: 3 (George Edwards, Tom Peters.)

Abstentions: 7 (Jean Louis, Valin, Edmund, Erik).

Consultative: For 5.

Adopted.

xii. Vote on the proposal of Comrade Livio: this text has been published in the internal bulletin before the Congress.

For: 2 (Livio, Ilario)

Against: 30

Abstentions: 11 (Erwin, Valenzia, George Edwards, Tom Peters, Erik)

Consultative: Against: 5

Rejected

xiii. Vote on the Political Resolution: this text will appear, amended, in the "Quatrieme International", except for the last part which will be found in this internal bulletin.

For: 35

Against: 6 (Livio, Ilario, Albert, George Edwards, Tom Peters).

Abstentions: 2 (Erik).

Consultative: For: 5.

Adopted

xiv. Vote on the general line of the document on Europe: this text will appear with the amendments in "Quatrieme International".

a) British Amendments. (enclosed) For: 3 (George Edwards, Tom Peters).

Against 38

Abstentions: 2 (Erik)

Rejected

b) general line and accepted amendments:

For: 37

Against: 3 (George Edwards, Tom Peters).

Abstentions: 3 (Erik)

xv. Vote on the English commission. Alternative vote. for the text: see pages 19-20 of this bulletin.

-text of the commission: 32

Adopted

-text - George Edwards: 6 (Karlo, George Edwards, Tom Peters, Erik).

Rejected

✓ text - Edmund: 3 (Edmund)

"

-abstentions: 2 (Saul)

Resolution: George Edwards.

The Congress stands by the normal procedure for uniting groups. It stands for one united section in Britain. It asks that a decision be taken on the basis of a full discussion, and that a majority decision with regard to tactics be taken after a full discussion; that the minority be guaranteed full democratic rights; that a conference be called in six months. The Congress rejects the expulsion of the British section and its reduction in status to that of a sympathetic section because of political differences expressed at this Congress.

Statement on his vote by Comrade Patrick.

I consider that the resolution (adopted--cf. p.p. 19-20; NDLR) exaggerates the weaknesses of the International tendency. I support the resolution because I am confident that, by the next Congress, we will have demonstrated the correctness of our policies and our organisational methods.

XVI. Election of the CEI and of the CCI

-for: 37
-against: 1 (Carlo)
-abstentions: 2 (Erik)
absent: 3 (George Edwards, Tom Peters)
-consultative: for: 4
absent: 1 (Akhman)

AMENDMENTS TO U.S. DOCUMENT ON WESTERN EUROPE, PROPOSED BY
BRITISH SECTION.

Rewrite following section on the Common Market on the following lines:-

(Quote) page 3: "Under the prevailing conditions of economic expansion - even though it is slowed down - the trend towards the progressive economic integration of the capitalist countries of..... and ending: a "flight forward", that is, the application of the Common Market level of "anti-recession" techniques which have proved their efficiency on a national level ('European programming' 'managed currency' on a European scale, etc.) This "flight forward" would require creation of a strengthened European executive and a European currency. "These would constitute a decisive stage in reaching the point of no return for the Common Market".

Along the following lines:

- 1.-in the last epoch the productive forces have grown beyond the confines of not only private ownership, but the national state. This elementary proposition of Marxism is the basis of our appreciation of the contradictions of capitalism at the present time.
- 2.-The bourgeoisie in its own way is compelled to recognize these facts by the very development of the economy itself. The two superstates, Stalinist Russia and Imperialist America--for the future Stalinist China might also be added-- have continental markets comprising huge resources and populations, with a mass market in consonance with modern productive forces. The "small" states of Britain, Germany, France, etc. have too narrow a market for their productive resources on a national scale alone.
- 3.-An additional reason for the attempt to group the common market countries together was, the desire of Germany and France to organise some sort of grouping, which could hope to compete with the power of the giants America and Russia. From being a major force in world politics Europe had been reduced in power as a consequence of the second world war.
- 4.-Another spur to economic integration has been the further development of the International Division of Labour through trade, due to the economic upswing of the last 20 years.
- 5.-The Common Market was largely a condominium of Germany & France.
- 6.-The Common Market contains within itself all the antagonisms of the various national bourgeoisies comprising it.

7.-The attempt of the bourgeoisie to try and get a "rational" organisation of production in Europe is inevitably doomed to fail. It will collapse because of the vested interests of the national bourgeoisies.

8.-The Common Market succeeded even to the extent that it has been successful on the basis of the growth of the economy and the gigantic economic upswing, which gave the basis for compromises between the interests of the national bourgeoisies.

9.-Already cracks have begun to appear in the Common Market (De Gaulle's agricultural policy) new contradictions will appear in the coming period.

10.-The incapacity of the Bourgeoisie to overcome the national contradictions will be demonstrated in the first serious slump. It will cause the collapse of the market and a frantic attempt to put the burden of collapse on each other.

11.-If national Stalinism in the Balkans with incomparably less contradictions than the regimes of private ownership cannot unbalkanise the Balkans, then it is unconceivable for the capitalist powers in Western Europe to succeed in abolishing the national contradictions. The vested interests of the national state, of the monopolies and the trusts, are too great to be overcome by a "rational" division of the spoils, or a so-called Europeanisation of Capital.

12.-The existence of the national state, of separate armies, etc., separate bureaucraties, etc., are an indication of the entirely separate interests of the bourgeoisies of these countries. DeGaulle's "independent" foreign policy and "independent" attitude even to N.A.T.O. are an indication of the conflicting policies, reflecting the conflicting interests of these powers.

.....
 BONAPARTISM & DEMOCRACY.
 =====

Strike out and rewrite sections quoted below on the lines of the comments which follow.

"A prolonged crisis in classical bourgeois democracy, leading to attempts to install a 'strong state' each time a sudden turn in the political, economic or social situation gives it urgency from the bourgeois point of view and it is made feasible by the weakening of the resistance of the labour movement."

Section Political Evolution in Western Europe to top page 7 ending "foster political apathy among them".

1.-The prolonged economic upswing has had as an inevitable result that in the metropolitan countries of the West, capitalism has been able to show its "liberal" face.

2.--Under these conditions there has been a "flowering of democracy" for a whole historical period. To speak of "democracy" in the abstract is to fall victim to the worst illusions of parliamentary cretinism.

3.--In the epigram of Trotsky "democracy is the system where everyone can say what they like, on condition that the final decisions rest in the hands of finance capital."

4.--As the writings of the classical Marxists demonstrate : the essence of democracy for the working-class --which is our primary concern --- are the elements of the new society within capitalism (here we deal with the political elements) the workers organisations and rights, trade unions, shop stewards committees, political parties, Co-ops, and the rights which go with these organisations, the right to organize, the right to strike, participate in political life, free press, etc.etc.

5.--The decisive section of the bourgeoisie, monopoly and finance capital, prefers to rule in a "democratic society" were they can exercise the maximum of control on the organs of the State.

6.--In even the freest democratic capitalist societies (Great Britain) the illusion is fostered that Parliament "takes the decisions". In reality monopoly and finance capital dictates the policy of all the Governments, whether conservative, radical, socialist, popular front, etc etc. ("Wilson the supposed "Left" bowing to the banks and monopolies in Britain.)

7.--The enormous strength of the working-class potentially, with its organisations intact, reinforced, healed, without the psychology of defeats as in the pre-war period, indicates the necessity for the bourgeoisie to proceed with great care and caution on the question of the State, etc.

8.--Apart from the Fascist States (which by the way with the loss of mass support are transformed into Bonapartist States) only in France has a regime of Bonapartism or personal power been installed, in the metropolitan countries.

9. Marxist analysis would indicate that the reason for this lies as always in the social crisis of the regime.

10.--The Algerian ulcer and the crisis in French society provoked by the unending Algerian war, the interests of the French settlers in Algeria, which were in conflict with the decisive interests of the French bourgeoisie, the discontent in the army compelled to wage in Indo-China and Algeria losing colonial wars, the fury of the paratroop colonels and other in the French armed forces; the incapacity under the old parliamentarian system to resolve the problem: all these led to the need for the supreme arbiter. DeGaulle could be presented as the savior standing above the classes and 'factions' representing the "nation", etc.

11.--These (for this period) entirely exceptional reasons led to the victory of "personal power" in France.

12.--In the history of arbitrary and dictatorial systems under capitalism, even in France, the rule of De Gaulle must be the most "democratic" Bonapartism which has ever existed !

13.--The working-class has suffered a secondary but not decisive defeat in France. The rights and organisations of the working-class remain intact, and have been even strengthened during the last years.

14.--Compare the Bonapartism of Primo de Rivera in Spain, where only the reformist party and trade union leaders were allowed to function legally, where there was a serious curtailment of the rights of the working-class, where the revolutionary syndicalist Unions and the communist organisations were illegal. Primo de Rivera balanced between the monarchy, the bourgeoisie, landlords, peasants and workers. Primo de Rivera also came to power as the result of a colonial war --the war in Morocco. But examine the differences between the regimes (leaving aside other factors) --and one can see immediately it was the social crisis provoked by the capitalist crises in the inter-war period (in this example of Spain) which dictated the character of the Bonapartist system in that country. In France, on the other hand, it is the period (temporary) of an expanding capitalism, which dictates the character of Gaullism.).

15.--For a demonstration of the roots of Bonapartism and personal power in the contemporary world, it is necessary to look, not at Western Europe, but at the colonial world. The impossibility of developing capitalism and solving the contradictions within society, within the framework of the modern world, leads to the appearance of Bonapartism, one-party rule, dictatorial regimes, the rule of the Messiah, in one country after another. Both bourgeois and proletarian forms of Bonapartism in these countries owe their appearance to the unresolved crises, which cannot be solved within the national framework. (see colonial document R.S.I.).

16.--What is democracy ? To see the problem from the viewpoint of the the fractions of the bourgeoisie in an abstract way is entirely wrong. These are the secondary features. The decisive consideration is the existence of democratic rights for the working-class. In this sense, if anything, for a whole historical period there has been an extension and reinforcement of democracy in West Germany (in spite of the illegality of the C.P.), Italy, France, Britain, and Western Europe generally .

17.--Bonapartism is rule by a sword--a military police State. A regime in which the State raises itself above society and becomes "independent" of the classes struggling within it, only in the last analysis representing the ruling class. Balancing between the classes sometimes the arbiter can lean on the oppressed class and strike blows at the ruling class.

18.--Bonapartism represents a regime of crisis, a reflexion of irreconcilable conflicts within society, the impossibility of "compromise" It represents a situation where the bourgeoisie finds it difficult, if not impossible, to make large concessions to the masses. .../32.

19.-The bonapartism of von Schleicher, Brüning, Von Papen in Germany represented this process perfectly. Rule by decree--the declaration by von Schleicher that in ruling the nation "first came himself, then his horse, then the parliament!"

20.-In revolutionary situations where the classes are struggling irreconcilably against each other, the tendency towards Bonapartism again appears, e.g. the element of Bonapartism in Kerenskyism.

21.-Where a developing class is incapable of fulfilling its historical role and the old reactionary ruling classes are forced partially to fulfill the function of an underdeveloped or betrayed revolution again the State tends to assume an "independent" role -- hence the element of Bonapartism in Bismarck's Germany.

22.-Bonapartism under present conditions in the advanced countries, just as the regimes of democracy, with the economic centralisation and concentration of capital, can only be the rule of the narrowest circles of finance-monopoly capital.

23.-The conditions for Bonapartism or the "strong State" as sketched above are not in existence-- at present !

24.-A new and inevitable social crisis of capitalism will produce tendencies in that direction.

25.-Not every attack on the rights and organisations of the working class is Bonapartism. Certain comrades made this mistake in respect of Mc Carthyism in America, which they described as fascist. No more did the Taft-Hartley anti-labor laws or the Teff Merthyr anti-labor laws in Britain in the 1900's represent "bonapartism".

26.-The tendency towards reactionary legislation in relation to the Unions is an expression of the enormous strength of the workers organisations and their defensive and offensive capacity to protect their gains and to gain a greater share of the wealth they are producing. The bourgeoisie is trying to restrict this. The attempt to restrict the right to strike etc. etc. can under present conditions only provoke explosions and a radicalisation of the working class.

27.-The enormous power of the working-class accumulated in the last period in the metropolitan countries (see R.S.L. document) indicates the futility of such measures under present conditions.

28.-Laws passed by parliament or the State are meaningless unless backed by social forces --that is the meaning of the organisation of the petty-bourgeoisie and lumpen-proletariat (i.e. fascism) at a certain stage by the bourgeoisie. The forces of the State itself are never sufficient under conditions of relative democracy with the workers organisations intact.

29.-Parliament for decades has preserved the illusion of power, while the real decisions are taken in the boardrooms of the monopolies and banks.

30.-Cabinet Government in Britain, Presidential rule in America, are expressing more and more the fact that only a thiny clique makes the final decisions.

31.-Under all regimes, as Trotsky pointed out in his last writings, the tendency towards centralisation and concentration of capital leads to the greater and greater fusion of the trusts and monopolies with the State.

32.-Parliament is the arena for secondary questions just as the United Nations, in relations between States ; decisive questions are settled by the top layers of the bourgeoisie in the pressures they exert on the Government, and in the actions and pressures of the masses.

33.-In documents of the International and in propaganda for the movement stress must be placed on the positive features, on the one hand of workers democracy, and on the other hand of the negative features of so-called parliamentarianism.

34.-The Western European document contradicts itself in almost every paragraph on this question. It points out that the French bourgeoisie under present conditions, believes it to be impossible to have Gaullism without De Gaull! A frail basis for a regime ! It indicates that only the peculiar conditions in France as sketched above led to the exceptional appearance of bonapattism. "Personal power" -- "the strong State" -- ,will disappear with their founder.

35.-Documents of the Inetrnational must be absolutely clear and firm on the tendencies of development of social forces and regimes.

36.-The next stage forward will be marked by upsurges of the proletariat. Only the proletariat being defeated --serious defeats-- could lead to the appearance of the phenomenon of the Strong State.

=====

THE BRITISH BOURGEOISIE AND STOP- GO.

=====

Page 3, Western European document: "in Great Britain the bourgeoisie were likewise quite divided over the adviseability of the Tory economic policy known as "stop-go"...nevertheless, given the persistence of the fundamental contradictions of the capitalist system.".....

Strike out and rewrite on the following lines:

1.-The policy of stop-go was forced on the bourgeoisie by the economic crisis of British capitalism and the fundamental structure of the economy inherited from the past. That the economic policy of the capitalists is not determined by arbitrary decisions or by conscious estimates but by fundamental workings of the economy is demonstrated by the fact that the Labour leaders were compelled when in power (as british Marxists predicted) were compelled to adopt more far-reaching and stringent deflationary measures than even the Tories.

WILLIE BRANDT AND A "WORKERS GOVERNMENT".
 =====

page 14 : "it must also be formulated in such a way as not to appear manifestly absurd (a workers' government headed by W.Brandt is hard to conceive): that is, the trade unions, the mass workers parties..."

Rewrite section on W.Brandt on following lines:

- 1.-The slogan of a workers Government is intended to mobilise the workers on an independent class basis.
- 2.-To whom is the slogan of a "workers govt." under W Brandt absurd ? Certainly not to the millions of workers and trade unionists who vote Social Democrat. To the Trotskyists then ? It is absurd to equate the feelings of the masses with those of a tiny advance-guard. In addition, it is very dangerous to have illusions in so-called Left Social democrats like Mollet and Wilson formerly.
- 3.-Marxists start from the basis of the existing organisations & leaderships. Wilson or Gaitskell or Willie Brandt are fundamentally no different from one another but fulfill fundamentally the same role. If there is a difference it is only that of the environmental circumstances.
- 4.-A workers govt of Wilson is no more or no less fantastic than that of Brandt.
- 5.-The Soviets, in Russia had at their head in 1917 for a whole period up to the end of October, Dan, Tseretelli and others of a like character. These were no more, no less counter-revolutionary than Brandt.
- 6.-This did not prevent Lenin from demanding that they take the power with the support of the Bolsheviks, and with the promise of a "peaceful" struggle for a majority in the Soviets on that basis.
- 7.-The self-same social-democracy in Germany which has now adopted a Liberal programme, yesterday put forward, albeit demagogically, the demand for the United Socialist States of Europe.
- 8.-Tomorrow, under the influence of the events, they can adopt even more radical slogans.
- 9.-To "compare" the leaders of social-democracy from the point of view of "good" Socialists or "bad" Socialists is to make a fatal error.

.....
 EUROPEAN ECONOMY.
 =====

Rewrite and develop the economic section on Europe on the following

lines:

- 1.-Trace out the differences between 1918-39 & 1945-65.
- 2.-Point out that given the betrayal of Stalinism and Social-Democracy the political premises for an economic boom were prepared.
- 3.-Thanks to American imperialist aid economic recovery in Western Europe was very rapid after the Second W.W.
- 4.-Due to a series of circumstances a protracted economic boom has taken place.
- 5.-This boom in no way invalidates the basic economic analysis of capitalism by Marx, Lenin and Trotsky.
- 6.-The possibility of such a boom was foreseen by Lenin and Trotsky under certain circumstances.
- 7.-The causes of the boom and the overcoming temporarily of the basic tendencies, to periodic slumps lies in the following factors.
 - A.Destruction of consumer and capital goods during the war, the effects of which according to the United Nations economists were only overcome by 1958.
 - B.The Armaments race and the production of fictitious capital and as a by-product the tendency towards inflation throughout the Western World.
 - C.The development of new industries, plastics, electronics, etc.
 - D.The general construction boom in all W. European countries America and Japan.
 - E.The investment boom in all W. European countries which this has involved.
 - F. The development of world trade and a further intensification of the international division of labour, especially between the metropolitan countries.
 - G. The colonial revolutions temporarily creating new markets for capital goods.
 - H.The inter-action of all these factors resulting in a spiral-development of production.
8. We reject all Keynesian theories that it is state action on the part of the capitalist govts. which has prevented the development of deep recessions or slumps.
9. We reject the theories of Jay, Strachey, Crosland and Shonfield and others on these lines. We reject the statement of the U.S. document
...../36.

which says "Even in the latter case (recession), however, it would be only a recess on and not a serious economic crisis like that of 1929 or 1938. The reason for this, amply considered in previous documents of the International, is the possibility which imperialism has to amortise crises by increasing state expenses at the cost of continually lowering the purchasing power of money."

10.-Every boom, especially a protracted upswing of the present type has as its consequence theoretical revisionist conclusions. Bernstein in the early years of this century, even the limited boom of 1924-29, produced "theories" of these type.

11.-The measures fiscal, interest rates etc. "deficit" financing are no more effective than the measures of "pump priming", "new dealism" of Roosevelt, popular frontism, etc of the pre-war period.

12.-State expenditure in a market economy derives its funds either in taxes extracted from the entrepreneurs and therefore affects dept. 1 of capitalism, hence the howls of the bourgeoisie of all countries against "state expenditure" or alternatively derives from the consumers affecting dept. 2 of capital i.e. the working class. So-called "deficit-financing" is merely a variant from the above.

13.- The consequences of the boom lies not only in the pressure of capitalism manifesting itself in theory but has enormous consequences on the workers movement.

14.-The further degeneration of Stalinism and Social Democracy in W. Europe and the metropolitan countries are both cause and consequence of the economic upswing.

15.-The complete putrefaction ideologically of Stalinism and Social-Democracy in the metropolitan countries is due to the pressure of capitalism on the tops of the CP-LP-TU's. The separation of the labour bureaucracy from the movement was already sketched out by Lenin. Under present conditions, the W. European CP's tend to become partially reformist agents of capital.

16.-The growth of productive forces for a temporary period has as its consequences a tendency to polarisation of class forces on the classic lines sketched in the Communist Manifesto (see RSL, col.doc.) reduction of the peasant, petty-bourgeois shopkeepers, etc.

17.-The white-collar workers standards are approximating those of the skilled workers, automatisisation etc. results in trade-unionisation and makes them receptive to the ideas of the Labour movement.

18.-Continuation of the boom will involve further automatisisation which will mean mass unemployment at certain stages.

19.-All the factors making for boom eventually in turn prepare for slump at a later stage.

20.- New 1929's are inevitable.

21.-Dialectically the development of the productive forces while strengthening capitalism temporarily enormously increases the power and cohesion of the proletariat.

22.6 The wounds of the pre-war and first post-war defeats of the working-class are now healed: further development of the contradictions will involve mass struggles of the working class.

(An analysis of the causes for the economic upswing published by the RSL will be republished for international circulation). November, 1965.

January 19th 1966.

From the World Congress of the IVth International to all members of the R.S.L.

Dear Comrades:

The World Congress of December 1965 had on its agenda the particular problems of our movement in England. In addition the Congress set up an "English Commission" in which your two delegates participated and which had many sittings during the Congress. After considerable discussion, the Congress passed with an overwhelming majority vote, a resolution submitted to it by the commission (see attached resolution--in this internal bulletin see page 19). The Congress also decided that along with this resolution it would send this covering letter to the comrades of the R.S.L. in order to give the reasons behind the decision and explain to you its implications.

The Congress decision means, substantially, that the International recognises that there is no official section of the Fourth International in England at the present time and that the International has withdrawn from the R.S.L. the status it had conferred it several years ago of being the official section.

Why did the International come to such a grave decision ?

For several years now, the International has been greatly disturbed by the situation in which the Trotskyist movement in England finds itself, and especially with the relations between itself and the R.S.L. There is also another unsatisfactory element for us,-- the apparent inability of your group to reply to the attacks on our world movement by the Healy organisation which by its statements and activities presents itself in the public eye as a Trotskyist movement, thus discrediting Trotskyism in England and internationally. We do not think that the R.S.L. is capable of dealing with this situation; and even if it wished to, we feel the policies of the R.S.L. renders it impossible for you to fight Healy politically. It is also our belief that you have a poorly functioning organisation that is not up to the standard required of an official section of the Fourth International. At the time of the Reunification World Congress in 1963, we were of the opinion that the unifying of the RSL with the IG would create a stronger organisation and therefore open up greater possibilities to improve the situation. Unfortunately the fusion concept, though accepted in principle by both groups in 1963, was only implemented one year and a half later with great reluctance on their part. The actual unification was never consummated in common work, and such as it was, only lasted one month or two. It is our opinion that although the responsibility for this failure could be equally divided between the RSL and IG, the RSL by having assumed a preponderant numerical majority in the leading bodies of the common organisation, bore an especially heavy responsibility to be extremely sensitive and to work hard to create the atmosphere and conditions to maintain a working and viable united organisation: it did nothing to that end.

It is our conclusion that after the failure of the reunifi-

cation of the RSL and the IG, nothing can be done in the immediate period ahead by the International to bring a change in the situation, in England, or in the relations between the two groups. Moreover, the situation is such with the groups, that the International feels it cannot take any responsibility for the activities and statements of both groups; the decision of the World Congress on England is meant to acknowledge this fact. To recognize in a given country an organization as being an official section of the Fourth International means many things -- it means especially a relationship between the International and the section which unfortunately did not exist in England, and a role which the R.S.L. is not prepared to fulfill.

It goes without saying that you are entitled to the political views you have defended inside the International, views which, of course, are different from those held by the overwhelming majority of the International, but it is necessary now to state that it is simply untrue, as some of you may mistakenly believe, that the International is unaware of the special positions of the RSL on international questions. On the contrary, the R.S.L. has already presented them to at least three World Congresses, gatherings which have had as delegates attending them, very qualified comrades from our sections around the world who have not misunderstood the positions of the RSL. As for written contributions to the preparatory discussions before the congresses, you cannot blame the International if the leaders of the R.S.L. have written little or late.

But the duty of a section is, among other things, according to democratic centralism, to make known publicly the policies and statements of the International, despite whatever differences a given section may hold with those positions. This the R.S.L. has never done. Comrade J.D., one of the leaders of your group, never attended one single meeting of the United Secretariat even though he was elected formally to that body. Astounding as it may seem, the R.S.L. has never paid its dues to the International, a thing -- we think -- you would never tolerate from a local branch in your organization. And, we regret to add, the R.S.L. has never fulfilled any of the most elementary duties of solidarity, as for example when the International launched an appeal to all sections for financial aid to our Bolivian comrades who are working under great difficulties and hardship.

This unfortunate relationship of the RSL to the International is neither accidental nor recent. All previous attempts to bring about a change have failed. The effort to unify the RSL and the IG was the most recent. Therefore the World Congress could have made no other decision; the status quo could not be maintained. To bring about a reunification within a certain time-period through the opening up of a discussion between the two groups, as was suggested by your representatives at the Congress, is totally illusory. The record shows us that there is no basis, nor will, for it.

What is the full implication of the decision taken by the World Congress?

First of all it should be clear to all concerned that no member of the RSL is expelled from the International. The Statutes of the International have always contained clauses according to which groups are linked to the International without them as such being recognized as official sections. Usually this has occurred when a group is organized in a country where there was a deep crisis in the Trotskyist movement with time being necessary to bring new developments.

We repeat : none of you has been expelled. The main change between the present and the former situation is that groups, in contrast to sections have voice, but no vote at World Congresses. We, of course, expect that groups will fulfill their duties to the International, as is set out in our Statutes. The future relations of the RSL to the International rests in your hands. We hope that the decision taken by the W.C., far from taking you further away from us, instead will have the effect of making your organisation understand more fully what is required of it in its duties and relations to the International.

The W.C. decision, obviously, does not mean that the Int'l and its leading bodies will not give the utmost attention to the situation in England, and when possible, do their best to give organisational and political assistance to British Trotskyists with a view of reconstructing a viable and genuine section. The present political circumstances in England at large are of crucial importance, not only for the British workers, but also for the whole of the European working-class movt. It is essential that there be a Trotskyist organisation able and capable of presenting its views and policies to become a pole of attraction to the revolutionary vanguard. England is the main country in Europe to which the United Secretariat will devote its efforts, precisely because the political situation, is so important and the state of the movement so precarious.

In conclusion, we are asking you to bring this letter and its contents to the attention of all members of the RSL and we request of you that you give a member of the U.S. an opportunity to present a report on the W.C., including of course an explanation of the decision taken on England.

Yours fraternally.

Concerning the Pablo Split

(Resolution of the International Executive Committee (IEC) of the Fourth International)

July 1965

At the Reunification Congress of the Fourth International in 1963, a tendency led by Pablo, which had submitted documents in opposition to those presented by the majority, received as a minority tendency a more than proportional representation in the leading organs of the movement.

In addition, although it did not constitute a section, the Algiers group received the same representation as a (regular) section. The delegates to the congress made this special provision in order to give the right of voice and vote to members of the International who had undertaken a special task which rendered impossible their continued participation in the normal life of the sections to which they had belonged.

It was thus hoped to contribute to facilitating the consolidation of the reunification by aiding in particular the leaders of the Pablo tendency to participate fully in the collective leadership of the unified Trotskyist movement.

But immediately after the Reunification Congress this minority tendency constituted itself under Pablo's leadership as a fraction which began to crystallize and harden politically and then to violate the principles of democratic centralism.

Two months after the Reunification Congress, Pablo himself appealed directly to the membership to demand that it exert pressure on the new leadership to reopen immediately the discussion on the Sino-Soviet conflict and to make public that discussion. The Sino-Soviet conflict had been one of the principal questions on which the Congress had just declared itself.

Shortly after, and once again bypassing the elected leadership, Pablo began to publish a public fraction organ called "Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme" (Under the Banner of Socialism). Fraudulently presented as an official publication of the Fourth International through its name -- "organ of (what Pablo chose to call) the African Commission of the Fourth International" -- this public fraction organ ignored the adopted positions and activities of the Fourth International, advancing in their place the positions of the Pablo fraction -- positions often in flagrant contradiction with those of the Fourth International.

Moreover, the Pablo fraction published its own "internal bulletin" and correspondence completely outside the control of the elected bodies of the Fourth International. These were distributed outside as well as inside the movement, according to the whims of the Pablo fraction.

Thus, proceeding step by step, and utilizing the Algiers group to this end, the Pablo fraction established an international centre, imposing on its adherents a discipline distinct from that of the International. It established its own financial and organizational structures, cut its financial and organizational support of the International, and launched its public organ in opposition to the publications of the International.

At the May 1964 Plenum of the International Executive Committee, held one year after the Reunification Congress, several members of the I.E.C. belonging to the Pablo fraction refused to commit themselves to respect the discipline of the elected organs of the Fourth International. The IEC was prepared to pass over the serious violations of democratic centralism committed since the Congress, the moment that they agreed to submit to discipline in the future. However, in the face of their refusal, the IEC had no other recourse but to suspend them. Even then it was made clear that the suspensions would be lifted the moment those concerned demonstrated in practice that they had decided to change their course.

Far from heeding the serious warning addressed to them, the leaders of the Pablo fraction continued to violate the principles of democratic centralism in a more and more open fashion, showing a growing public hostility toward our movement. Pablo refused to recognise (the authority of) the new African commission designated by the IEC, insofar as its composition did not meet with his personal conceptions. The fraction continued to publish "Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme" which continued to bear the fraudulent sub-title of "organ" of the "African Commission of the Fourth International". The fraction continued to edit its own internal memoranda.

The Algiers group convened an international conference to which it invited persons not belonging to the Trotskyist movement. At the same time, it refused to admit comrades who had loyally respected the decisions of the Reunified Congress by refusing to accept the discipline of the Pablo fraction. In fact, the Algiers group, under Pablo's leadership, even "expelled" these comrades on the excuse that they could no longer be "trusted" because of "suspect" elements among their acquaintances in Algeria. Asked to place these accusations before the Control Commission elected at the Reunification Congress, Pablo refused to do so in writing, demanding that the Control Commission function by coming to hear him orally.

At its January 1965 Plenum, the IEC decided to convene a world congress of the Fourth International. This decision was taken with the agreement of all those present, including two leaders of the Pablo fraction who, not having been personally implicated in any violation of discipline, had not been suspended. A commission was struck off to publish an Internal Bulletin during the discussion period, and it was decided that a member of the Pablo fraction, chosen by it, would be included in that commission. The demand by the leaders of the minority that this discussion be conducted publicly was

not rejected, but left open for a later decision in the light of the discussion.

Instead of utilizing these decisions to beat a retreat from its untenable position, the Pablo fraction paid no attention to them. Just after the Plenum, it published in "Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme" documents which it claimed constituted part of the internal discussion for the congress, and which were submitted as such, thus violating the decisions of the IEC and ignoring the authority of the leadership of the Fourth International elected at the Reunification Congress.

At the same time, in its public organ, this fraction was dissociating itself more and more from the traditional positions of the world Trotskyist movement. In issue no. 17 (May 1965) there was published a declaration which in fact announced that the fraction was splitting from the Fourth International.

The members of this fraction attacked the United Secretariat for having dissociated itself publicly from "Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme" and accused the United Secretariat of **intending to exclude them before the World Congress.**

The truth is that the leaders of the Pablo fraction knew perfectly well that the public expression of positions contrary to those of the Fourth International in what was at the same time stated to be an official publication, would oblige the elected leadership to draw public attention to this dishonesty, and to publicly refute the arguments of the minority. It was precisely because of the serious character of the political differences that the leadership hoped to avoid a premature public discussion, in order that the discussion not take a turn endangering the unity of the movement. Some leaders of the Pablo fraction have a long experience of tendency and fraction struggles and know that these can end in splits if the two parties do not co-operate to prevent such a development. But they acted just as coolly in forcing the International to disavow "Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme" and its views in opposition to those of the Fourth International, as they did in carrying out their violations of discipline during the past 18 months. Moreover, as they know very well, their own actions lend more than a grain of truth to their repeated prophecies of their impending expulsions. If the United Secretariat and the International Executive Committee have not resorted to expulsion for the flagrant violations of discipline committed by certain members of the Pablo fraction, it is because they have faithfully respected their commitments on the methods to be used in enforcing discipline during the period between the Reunification Congress and the next Congress.

As to the question of their participation in this next World Congress, the members of the Pablo fraction know that the Congress of the Fourth International has never been a mere forum for political "exchanges of views". Congresses are held to decide policies which become binding on all, not only for the

majority but for all minorities which might exist. Not only have Pablo and his colleagues shown in action that they have not the least intention of submitting to the majority at the next congress, they have even declared exactly the contrary in unequivocal language: "the Revolutionary Marxist tendency of the Fourth International... will never allow itself to be identified with such a line, for which it places the entire responsibility on P. Frank, L. Maitan, E. Germain, and several other hardened champions of a dead past without a future." (Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme, No. 17, May 1965).

In a recent document, Pablo again declared in an article bearing his signature that this course is the fruit of a carefully-studied decision: "Several years ago I took the firm decision to 'take my distances', to differentiate myself politically from Germain and his group in order to make it understood to the members of the International and to whosoever wants or is able to understand..." (Documents, no. 9, April 1965, page 23)

To call the International majority champions of a dead past without a future, and to baptize his fraction as the Revolutionary-Marxist tendency, is a thin camouflage for Pablo's decision not to recognize the next congress any more than he did the previous one. In these conditions, it is nothing but pure hypocrisy to utter cries about the "rape" of internal democracy and "expulsions" before a congress, the decisions of which are rejected in advance. It is nothing other than a manoeuvre seeking to throw the responsibility for the group's split with the International or the International majority -- a split that the group has itself announced through its public declarations.

At the time of the Reunification Congress, Pablo was well aware that his fraction constituted no more than a very small minority in the International. He knows just as well that he has lost considerable ground since then. He knows that to remain within the International means that his group must at least respect elementary discipline. To all this he is indifferent. The Fourth International no longer interests him, for it plays no role in relation to the line he projects: he places virtually all his hopes on the "destalinization" process in the official Communist movement.

In the light of these considerations, the IEC approves the United Secretariat's decision of May 24 in response to Pablo's split declaration in No. 17 of "Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme". It refers the question of the course taken by the Pablo group in Algiers and other countries since the Reunification Congress to the next World Congress which will take the appropriate organizational decisions.

To all Australian Trotskyists who have remained loyal to the Fourth International:

Dear comrades,

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International addresses this appeal to you in the name of the recently concluded World Congress.

The relations between the Int'l and those individuals who have hitherto been at the head of the Australian Section have completely deteriorated. Ever since the W.C. of 1963, the journal published by them has been nothing but an Australian version of the Pablo publication Scus le Drapeau du Socialisme. The decisions taken by the Int'l in accordance with the resolutions adopted by our W.C. were never made public to the revolutionary vanguard of your country; and the few letters sent to the U.S. by this "leadership" were only a repetition of Pablo's slanders.

The 1965 Conference of the Australian Section was not a gathering of all the comrades; it was not in any way representative of the movement because many of those who shared the views of the Int'l were prevented from attending, contrary to the practices of democratic centralism.

This conference voted upon, and accepted, a document which stated that the Australian organisation was now a member of the so-called "Revolutionary Marxist Tendency of the Fourth Int'l" which is the name used by the Pablo organisation.

Prior to the W.C. of the Fourth Int'l in December 1965, the Pablo organisation held an int'l conference in Paris and actually constituted itself as a separate movement, distinct from the Fourth Int'l. It elaborated its own rules and discipline, and a document (now published in French "Le marxisme et notre époque") that revised from top to bottom the positions that have been defended by the Fourth Int'l since its inception. Anderson, the Australian representative, after attending and participating in this conference, had the gall to demand the right to participate in the World Congress and openly boasted that he would enter the Congress by force if necessary and that force would be required to expell him from it. It being obvious to everyone that this was nothing but an organisational maneuver calculated to destroy and to prevent the Congress carrying on with its work, participation was refused him and others when they rejected a request from the Plenum of the W.C. delegates that they give assurances that they would accept the decisions arising out of the Congress.

The W.C. adopted by an overwhelming majority a resolution which stated that the Pablo group, because of its callous indiscipline and because of its existence as an autonomous organisation, has placed itself outside the ranks of the Fourth Int'l. It is self-evident that no one should expect that Nigel, Anderson and the others to pull back from their break with our movement. To have any illusions on that score would be disastrous. Therefore, the decision of the W.C. has released you of all obligations towards

them. It is your duty and responsibility to take the appropriate measures to re-constitute the Australian Section of the Fourth Int'l and to carry on with its tasks.

At this juncture, despite our desires, material difficulties prevent a representative from the U.S. from visiting your country, so therefore the assistance we can give you in this primordial task to-day is essentially of a literary nature. To begin with, we would like to suggest to you the following procedure. Those comrades who receive this letter should send copies to all who wish to remain within the Int'l. A group of comrades should, with as little delay as possible, call a national conference to constitute a provisional body which would have the following tasks:

- 1) to maintain normal and regular relations with the leadership of the Int'l;
- 2) to prepare a national conference within an appropriate time-period to discuss the documents of the W.C. (which will be issued in a few weeks) and elaborate a line of work for the Section;
- 3) to coordinate in the meantime the activities of the comrades.

We have no objection, of course, to any other procedure, providing it is quick and efficient and, naturally, the Int'l is always ready to advise you in these matters and will give whatever help is at its disposal.

We were very happy to learn that those who remained loyal to the Fourth Int'l are young and active comrades. We can assure you that Pablo has gathered around him only a small coterie of people, mainly older comrades who like Nigel, it is true, have upheld our ideas and traditions for a long time and in a most difficult period, have now lost faith in the future of our movement and have broken, ironically, with the Fourth Int'l at a time when the movement is recruiting in many countries, young comrades whose numbers are many times the few we have lost to Pablo.

It goes without saying, participation in the mass movement is a life and death necessity for Trotskyists; but with it all matter of alien pressures are brought to bear upon us and we can only resist them and maintain our integrity if we have organised ourselves around our program, with our own discipline in order to carry on coherent and effective activity.

The task of reconstructing the Australian Section of the Fourth Int'l is for you a first priority? Probably it is a task which for most, if not all of you, is new. It will raise many problems, many difficulties now unforeseen confront you, but we are confident that you will be able to meet them and achieve your purpose and we will for our part give you all the help we can on this matter.

Our movement has gone through crises which were much bigger than the one you are now facing. We have no doubt that you will overcome the present difficulties rapidly. Rebuild a new center for the organisation, strengthen and develop your links with the Int'l

...

i.e; with the Trotskyist movement all over the world, and elaborate your tasks and perspectives. The International is hopeful that you will set swiftly and that very soon a reconstructed section will once more proudly carry the banner of Trotskyism in Australia.

Long live the Australian Section of the Fourth Int'l !

Long live the Fourth International !

January 19th, 1966.

The United Secretariat,