

# INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION BULLETIN

November, 1965 -- I

<u>CONTENTS</u>	<u>Page</u>
Editorial Note	2
Notification Sent by Minority in Africa to a Member of Majority	4
Minority Circular	5
Minority "Communique"	8
Pablo Begins His "Discussion" (A Statement by the United Secretariat)	10
A New Stage in the Internal Situation	18
On Pablo's Split	21
Anderson Denies Negotiating with LSSP Renegades	26
Letter to the Leaderships and Members of Sections of the Fourth International (May 20, 1965)	29
Letter to the Leaderships and Members of the Sections of the Fourth International (June 10, 1965)	34
Reply to Two Circular Letters of the Pablo Faction (By the United Secretariat of the Fourth International)	37

(Published as a fraternal  
courtesy to the United  
Secretariat)

45¢

Published by the

**SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY**

116 University Place New York 3, N. Y.

EDITORIAL NOTE

The material included in this issue of the Internal Bulletin consists of documents originally attached as appendixes to the minutes of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International.

Four items are copies of circulars issued by the Pablo faction.

These were the only documents to be received by the United Secretariat from the Pablo faction, presumably intended for the discussion in preparation for the scheduled World Congress, other than material offered to the general public in their faction organ, Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Editorial Note .....	2
Notification Sent by Minority in Africa to a Member of Majority .....	4
Minority Circular .....	5
Minority "Communiqué" .....	8
Pablo Begins His "Discussion" (A Statement by the United Secretariat) .....	10
A New Stage in the Internal Situation .....	18
On Pablo's Split .....	21
Anderson Denies Negotiating with LSSP Renegades .....	26
Letter to the Leaderships and Members of Sections of the Fourth International (May 20, 1965) .....	29
Letter to the Leaderships and Members of the Sections of the Fourth International (June 10, 1965) .....	34
Reply to Two Circular Letters of the Pablo Faction (By the United Secretariat of the Fourth International) .....	37

NOTIFICATION SENT BY MINORITY IN AFRICA TO A MEMBER OF MAJORITY

Alger, le 6 janvier 1965

Camarade,

Le Groupe africain (sans guillemets) ne saurait accepter ta demande d'assister à sa réunion de travail, car tu t'es placé délibérément, et explicitement, en dehors de sa discipline, travaillant même -- et toujours explicitement -- contre lui and avec les Cabral, sur lesquels tu connais bien notre opinion.

Salutations C.I.

Pour le Groupe africain,

Serge.

TRANSLATION

Algiers, January 6, 1965

Comrade,

The African Group (without quotation marks) is unable to grant your request to attend its business meeting, because you have placed yourself deliberately, and explicitly, outside its discipline, even working -- and still explicitly -- against it and with the Cabrals, of whom you well know our opinion.

IC [international communist] greetings,

For the African Group,

Serge.

MINORITY CIRCULAR

TO THE LEADERSHIPS AND MEMBERS  
OF THE SECTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL

Dear Comrades,

Disregarding the requests of a number of sections of the International, minorities of sections and cadres of the International, the Joe-Germain-Livio-Frank faction held their Plenum of the IEC without the presence of the leaders of the revolutionary Marxist tendency of the International, without lifting the sanctions taken against them, and without even letting Comrade Privas, a member of the CC of the French section and a member of the African Commission and who happened to be at the very place where the IEC was meeting, be admitted to attend!

Thus it was, in a narrow factional meeting, without any real political discussion, without any political document, that the decision was taken to convoke the WC for the end of 1965 and that the agenda for it was decided on.

In reality, the Joe-Germain-Livio-Frank coalition, which does not even bother any longer to camouflage its openly factional character, has already decided to break with our tendency, which it will seek to have formally ratified by a majority at the time of the World Congress.

To close one's eyes in the face of this evidence would mean becoming practically an accomplice to the split already perpetrated by this faction.

This faction no longer makes any bones about publicly attacking the revolutionary Marxist tendency, collaborating in A. and in Africa in particular with declared enemies of Trotskyism, with suspicious elements, even with agents of imperialism, such as those camouflaged in the Angolan movement led by Roberto Holden, against the African Group of the International, and declaring through its few emissaries on the scene that this group is no longer part of the International, and will soon even be formally expelled from it!

All this corresponds to the strict reality and we ask once again that the International Control Commission immediately investigate this faction in A. and Africa.

We promise for our part to facilitate the work of the Control Commission to the maximum, not by correspondence and written documents, as the Joe-Germain-Livio-Frank faction purposely asks, in order to expose us before their collaborators and the enemy forces who are working strenuously to destroy our work, but by furnishing them with all the necessary elements on the scene.

In reality, however, no matter what we do will have any effect on this faction which has already decided to break with our tendency and which is strenuously seeking without scruple to undermine and if possible destroy the work undertaken within the Algerian and African Revolution. This provides a measure both of the degree of degeneration of this faction, and the ravages it has already inflicted on the International. Because its bluffs concerning the present real organizational situation in the International, can only lull those elements who want to indulge in illusions in order not to have to react.

In the recent period the International has been in process of constantly losing ground on the organizational level, except in Africa, despite the greatest diffusion yet seen of the fundamental ideas of Trotskyism.

In Ceylon, in India, in Latin America, in Europe, the decline of the organizational forces of the International is increasing without the latter knowing about the real situation, whether in Ceylon, Bolivia, Chile, the United States, England, Belgium, etc.

The declines and the defeats are kept in the shadow, in ambiguity, in confusion, when they are not transformed into "victories" by operations of "compensation," like the one carried out at the last Plenum of the IEC which decided to reintegrate Moreno and his organization into the International, and to even include Moreno in the IEC as a member!

Thus an organization and a leadership which for years has practiced an arch-opportunist policy, openly pro-Peronist, gravely compromising Trotskyism in Argentina and all of Latin America, and which still continues to practice such a policy, enters without adequate preliminary information, based on documents, into the International and even the IEC.

This at the very moment when the only colonial representative in the US, Comrade Osmund (Ceylon) announces his resignation from the LSSP(R), from the IEC, and from the US, and rejoins the LSSP of Perera, Colvin, Tilak!

Is it not literally scandalous that the last Plenum which avoided discussing besides the Ceylonese disaster, the Belgium balance, the lowest electoral results ever registered by the SWP in the United States, at the same time approves the struggle against our tendency and against its work in Africa?

In reality, the fact alone that the struggle against the revolutionary Marxist tendency is conducted by a coalition so all-embracing and so "principled" as that extending from Germain-Frank-Livio to Moreno and to Peng in passing through Joe, shows to what degree the situation in the leadership of the International has become altered in the last years, to the profit of sectarianism, opportunism, confusionism.

This fact alone should open the eyes of those who, due to routine, organizational conservatism and other prejudices, let things go, do not react, and stand passive before the fatal disintegration of the organizational framework of the International.

But as for us, we are not inclined to abandon the banner of the Fourth International and of Trotskyism without defending it against the old and new "traditionalists" and their allies of all stripes.

That their factional blindness and the pressure of the enemy social forces which they are subject to, are pushing them to break with the most living part of the International, will not make us retreat a single iota from our determination to continue working for the unity of the organizational framework of the International and the real advance of the International in Africa, in Latin America, in Asia, in Europe and everywhere where our tendency disposes of forces and is developing them.

January 12, 1965

For the revolutionary Marxist tendency:

The Leadership of the African Group.

MINORITY "COMMUNIQUE"

The African Group of the Fourth International has just held its annual Conference. This registered a great success.

The agenda of the Conference included the three following points:

- (a) Internal situation in the International;
- (b) Draft Theses on the Algerian Revolution;
- (c) Draft Theses on the African Revolution.

The discussion of the African Draft Theses took place in the presence of a large number of representatives of different African revolutionary movements who all contributed considerably to the discussion.

All of the discussions were marked by a high theoretical and political level which showed the militant character of the group and its degree of integration in the Algerian and African Revolution. The Conference unanimously reaffirmed its confidence in the leadership of the Group.

The Conference regretted that despite the invitation addressed in time, no representative of the majority tendency of the IEC and of the US sat in on its work.

The Conference renewed its invitation to the two elements of the majority living in A. to cease their hostile activities against the African Group, in alliance with utterly discredited elements, hostile to Trotskyism, and to rejoin the ranks of the Group by respecting its discipline.

The work of the Conference will be published soon in the form of their final elaboration by the latter.

The Conference decided on a number of measures to develop the work of the African group and its organ.

The Conference unanimously condemned the splitting public attacks appearing in the press of the International against the African Commission and against "Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme," as well as an unspeakable letter from Pierre Frank appearing in the press of Roberto Holden, through which press Pierre Frank "informs himself" about the march of the Angolan Revolution and addresses from his office in Paris "his greetings to the Angolan fighters"!(1)

---

(1) See in the next Internal Bulletin of the revolutionary Marxist tendency the text of the letter of Pierre Frank attacking the African Commission, its organ and the activity of the militants of the



The Conference called the attention of the whole International to the extreme gravity of this ridiculous and irresponsible attitude at the very moment when the truth came out about Roberto Holden and his movement, and when the MPLA is regaining the confidence and support of all the revolutionary African forces.

January 12, 1965

The African Group.

---

African Group, as well as the utilization made of this letter by the organ of the organization of Roberto Holden.

PABLO BEGINS HIS "DISCUSSION"

A Statement by the United Secretariat

For almost a year and a half Pablo has been demanding the opening of a discussion and the convening of a World Congress. He has even demanded that it should be made public on the ground that the discussion involved only differences on the highest political and theoretical level which would be of interest and educational value to the entire vanguard of the workers international movement.

The Majority of the United Secretariat was hesitant about plunging into a discussion on a subject that had just been decided by a World Congress. The course taken by the Minority had grave implications both politically and organizationally. The assertions of the Minority that the discussion they envisaged would be only on the highest level appeared particularly light-minded, for it left out the logic of the development of the discussion and the weight of those circles outside the movement which the Minority felt compelled to address.

These forebodings, unfortunately, have proved to be only too well founded. Without citing the record, which has been richly documented and which is available to the whole movement, we will take up only the latest developments, for they, perhaps, are the most revealing of all.

At its last plenum, the International Executive Committee granted the request of the Minority to open an international discussion -- even leaving open the possibility of making at least part of it public -- and scheduled the World Congress for the end of 1965. In accordance with the democratic tradition of the International, the IEC placed on the agenda for special discussion the question that has been especially agitating the Minority: the Sino-Soviet conflict.

Our impression at the plenum -- we could, of course, have been mistaken -- was that the two leaders of the Minority who participated throughout all the sessions were not displeased at this decision.

But what was Pablo's reaction? It was typical. He at once began the "discussion" -- and on his favorite level.

In Algiers a comrade adhering to the Majority had made a formal request to attend the Minority conference that had been scheduled there and to which invitations had been issued. The reply to this comrade was not gracious acquiescence. Instead he was told to consider himself expelled. (See "Notification Sent by Minority in Africa to a Member of Majority.") In this way Pablo showed in action what he meant by his strictures to the Majority on the advisability of exercising wisdom and restraint in applying democratic

centralism to a minority. He was referring to the case when he is in a minority.

This is not the only instance of the kind. The Minority "Communiqué" of January 12, reporting the faction's Conference, refers to "two elements of the majority" and tells them to "cease their hostile activities" and to "rejoin" the Group "by respecting [!] its discipline."

We could supply additional facts about the scandalous procedures of the Minority in relation to Majority comrades in Algeria, but it is sufficient for the time being to simply point to what the Minority itself has written.

Let us now turn to the truly infamous Minority circular dated January 12.

In the first paragraph we are told that the IEC was held "without the presence of the leaders of the revolutionary Marxist tendency. . . ." That is not true. Two members of the International Executive Committee who adhere to the Minority position were present, as we have indicated above. They participated in all the debates and found the atmosphere, we are sure, not uncomradely even if the discussion at times was heated.

Perhaps Pablo does not consider these two comrades to be leaders. Perhaps he views them as incompetent to uphold the Minority position. We would not dispute him on this; he knows the difficulties of his position. But within the framework of the line developed up to now by Pablo we thought they made able contributions. We think that with the right line these two comrades are quite competent to represent the International on a leadership level.

It is true that Pablo was not present and that he remains suspended. However the complaint is not very convincing, since Pablo knows very well how to end the suspension. Just start respecting discipline!

As for Comrade Privas, we have nothing against him. We consider him to be an able leader of the Minority. But he does not happen to be a member of the IEC, not having been nominated to the IEC by the Minority at the last World Congress. Under these circumstances special permission had to be granted by the IEC to seat him as an observer. However, notification that Comrade Privas would, by coincidence, be traveling in the area where the plenum was to be held came only on the very eve of the meeting, too late even to be taken up in the United Secretariat for possible recommendation. At the plenum, for some reason unknown to us -- perhaps it was an error in arrangements -- Comrade Privas did not get in touch with the meeting; and the two Minority leaders present did not take up the matter. Perhaps they, too, failed to meet with him although he was in the same city.

It is stated in the same circular that Comrade Privas is a "member of the African Commission." Since when? At what session of the IEC was he elected? Here we see the other side of Pablo's organizational methods. Just as he issues arbitrary expulsion orders so he issues just as arbitrary co-optations. On the very highest possible authority, naturally -- his own fiat.

This brings us to the end of the first paragraph of the Minority circular. We could continue sentence by sentence in the same way and end up with virtually a book. To what purpose? Is this the kind of discussion Pablo has been seeking? Is this what the comrades of the Minority have been waiting for?

So far as we are concerned, we consider such a discussion to be an utter waste of time and we state flatly, we are not interested in it. We will answer here only the grossest items -- and that solely for elementary sanitary reasons.

Take Pablo's charges about the Cabrals, about our working with "declared enemies of Trotskyism, with suspicious elements, even with agents of imperialism" and similar filth of the kind once thrown at us by the Stalinists. Pablo was asked a year ago to place his charges before the Control Commission. He has not yet done so. Now he states that he will "facilitate" the work of the Control Commission, but "not by correspondence and written documents. . . ." And why not by correspondence and by written documents? Because, he says, this would "expose" him!

What he is saying in reality is that he does not have the slightest confidence in the Control Commission. If he presented his charges in documentary form, he infers, the Control Commission could not be trusted to handle them in such a way as to protect the interests of the movement!

The truth is that the United Secretariat has made its own investigation of these charges. It is quite ready and has been for a long time to present to the Control Commission what it discovered "on the scene." We are willing to do this through correspondence or in oral hearings. We are willing to answer any question the Control Commission cares to ask in the light of Pablo's charges. There are strong reasons for our believing that the Control Commission will reach no sensational conclusions but that it will discover a good deal of undue suspicions and gross exaggerations.

But a matter of principle is involved here. We point to the fact that the Control Commission is completely free to determine for itself the form of its investigations and that neither Pablo, nor we, nor anyone else except a World Congress has the right to sit in judgment over it or to demand that the Control Commission conform to an arbitrarily specified pattern. If the evidence cannot be reduced to written form, then Pablo acted with criminal light-mindedness in spreading his charges -- everywhere except before the Control

Commission! -- for they impugn the character and integrity of revolutionists and his own comrades and at the same time deny them the opportunity to reply and clear their names.

Let us take another point in the circular, the attack against Comrade Moreno for approving the Reunification Congress. First of all, gross misinformation of the most serious kind is included in the circular. Under the witch-hunt laws of their country, the grouping headed by Comrade Moreno cannot adhere to the Fourth International. Like the SWP, they can only indicate what they think of the political positions of the FI and its activities. Pablo, of course, is commendably sensitive about security problems when it comes to submitting charges to the Control Commission of the Fourth International; his voice rings out loud and clear about any dastardly maneuvers to "expose" his work before enemy eyes. But when it comes to an entire grouping, he becomes singularly careless. The reason for this insouciance is quite clear. The "most living part of the International"; namely, Pablo, does not happen to be involved. We hope that every comrade in the Minority will call him sharply to account for such irresponsible behavior.

There is nothing at all irregular in the IEC's pleasure at learning of the decision made by Comrade Moreno and his collaborators. This grouping, which is one of the strongest Trotskyist formations in Latin America, decided to take the option offered to all adherents or co-thinkers of the International Committee at the Reunification Congress. They could not do it earlier because of a series of circumstances quite beyond their control. Now, after thorough discussion, they have stated that they approve the holding of the Reunification Congress and consider that the documents ratified by that Congress constitute the basis for a principled reunification.

While some comrades in the Minority at the Reunification Congress registered reservations about certain sectors of the International Committee, none of them voted against reunifying with any of these groups. The motion on reunifying all sectors of both the International Secretariat and the International Committee was passed unanimously. In the case of the Moreno grouping, one of its outstanding leaders, Hugo Blanco, was even acclaimed at the Reunification Congress and a campaign was unanimously launched there to publicize his case and organize aid for it.

At this late date, Pablo suddenly registers objections. But these are really directed at the Reunification Congress itself and its unanimous decisions, including his own vote. Does Pablo have any but the narrowest of factional reasons for this new attitude?

For the same narrowest of factional reasons Pablo paints a picture of losses, woe and disasters with regard to the organizational situation in the Fourth International. For our taste, we prefer the way Healy writes on the subject. Healy is at least more consistent;

he traces the "disintegration" back to its prime source -- Pablo. If the comrades think it over, we think that they must agree that it is not very plausible to lay the "disintegration" to either the reunification or to the leadership in charge since the reunification, and to claim that before then, under the "natural secretary," as one of Pablo's ardent disciples has hailed him, the Fourth International went only from success to success organizationally.

We do not claim that there are no problems. There are. But there are also some solid successes in a number of areas. Not the least of these is the recruiting of youth. We do not ask comrades of the Minority in isolated spots to believe this without seeing it for themselves; but they might ask their strongest grouping, the Minority in the French section, to tell them confidentially what has been going on there since they lost the leadership and the Majority put the organization on better footing. In the brief period since then, the French section has experienced encouraging growth; the section is becoming alive and much younger.

It is the same in other places where the unification has had an opportunity to begin to affect the work.

In the two areas where serious setbacks have occurred -- Ceylon and England -- the primary responsibility lies with local formations. In England Healy strenuously resisted the unification process. And among the adherents of the IS there has been resistance to uniting with each other. In Ceylon, the right wing pursued an opportunist political line that put them in opposition to the positions of the Fourth International; the center formation then capitulated to this pressure. But all these formations existed long before the Reunification Congress as everyone knows. In all fairness, however, it must be noted that in both Ceylon and England, sectors do exist which are loyal to the Fourth International, which stand on the program of the Reunification Congress and which are bound to begin registering important progress in the coming period.

In India, where the problems are of long standing, primarily because of extreme financial weakness and lack of a seasoned, full-time national leadership, there has been no qualitative turn one way or the other. The opportunities remain good; they require an extraordinary effort to be realized.

As for the other areas named by Pablo like Bolivia, Chile, etc., he only reveals his ignorance of the situations by what he says. This ignorance, the comrades in these areas will note, is somewhat colossal.

Now what is really behind Pablo's decision to mount an "attack" at this moment along organizational lines? Is it just his way of launching a discussion in preparation for the next World Congress?

We note a singular conclusion in the January 12 circular; name-

ly that the Majority "has already decided to break with our tendency, which it will seek to have formally ratified by a majority at the time of the World Congress" ("a déjà décidé la rupture avec notre tendance, qu'elle s'efforcera de faire avaliser formellement par une majorité lors du Congrès Mondial"). In another sentence the circular specifies "the split already perpetrated by this faction" ("la scission perpétrée déjà par cette fraction").

First of all, let us note that Pablo does not expect to win a majority at the next World Congress. Secondly, that he expects the next World Congress to pass an unfavorable judgment on his flagrant violations of the rules of democratic centralism. If his forecast turns out to be correct, it is clear that the Majority will face no particular problem related to the internal life of the International. But the Minority, obviously, will face a crisis. Thus the question the Minority leadership must decide -- and decide right now, inasmuch as the Congress has been scheduled -- is what is their perspective in relation to the Fourth International?

The Majority has demonstrated conclusively that it will not bow to ultimatums or blackmail, whatever the cost, that it will not be swerved by threats and that it is not taken in by pretences. It intends to stand firmly on the principle of majority rule and at the World Congress it will demand an accounting on violations of the rules of democratic centralism. This is not all. At the World Congress the Minority will surely be asked for an accounting on Pablo's activities in Africa. What is his actual work? What have his policies been? To whom is he accountable? In relation to the International -- aside from the rather ridiculous boasting about him being the "most living part" -- what has he accomplished? Is the "African" group recruiting? Does it have any Algerian members? Any Africans? Precisely what is its composition and areas of work? What does it contribute to the International in the way of dues, financial contributions? What about regular reports?

What will be the reaction of the delegates at the next World Congress when the Minority finds it can no longer evade these questions and the truth comes out?

To avoid crushing condemnation at the next World Congress, the Minority has no choice but to bring its violations of discipline to an end at once and establish positive relations with the United Secretariat. Is Pablo prepared to do that? The answer is that he "has already decided to break with our tendency," "the split has already been perpetrated"; and, as is standard practice among splitters, he seeks to throw the blame on the other side. He is already placing a question mark over the legitimacy of the next World Congress by talking about the manipulation of a "formal" majority against his violations of discipline.

The "strict reality" is that the Minority already exists as a separate organization. Besides its own political positions on all

key issues of the day, positions which are most often at variance with, or in opposition to, those of the International, it has had its own center for a long time, its own staff, its own public organ, its own system of finances, its own internal bulletin and its own discipline -- which, we gather from the report on their own conference, does not lack a vigilant note, an understandable precaution in an organization that makes its own dispositions of personnel on an international scale.

What remains in the ways of ties to the Fourth International? We can see only three shreds: (1) A misleading statement on the front page of their magazine, reading "Monthly review of the African Commission of the Fourth International"; (2) a policy of maintaining purely nominal membership in areas like France (in places like Holland it is less than nominal); (3) a policy of sending out circulars "to the leaderships and members of the sections of the International" berating and denouncing the Majority in terms that stand in glaring contrast to their fawning attitude toward the Khrushchevists and Titoists.

However, these thin ties still stand in the way of publicly attacking the majority leadership of the Fourth International. Is this the next point on Pablo's agenda? There seems to be no other meaning to the strange language in the January 12 "Communiqué" about "splitting public attacks appearing in the press of the International against the African Commission and against 'Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme.'" Nothing has appeared in the public press of the International but disavowals that this magazine is an official publication of the Fourth International, that the "African Commission" set up by Pablo is an official body, that pro-Khrushchevism is the official line of the Fourth International, or even that of a large minority. In one instance, a misdirected attack on Che Guevara was answered.

This was the mildest possible reaction in face of the confusion that was being deliberately created.

The truth is that the United Secretariat could justifiably be criticized, if not censured, for laxity in not responding publicly in a much more vigorous way to Pablo's flagrant development of a pro-Khrushchevist line in public and his utterly unprincipled attempt to palm it off as the position of the Fourth International. The ranks, we are well aware, are growing very impatient with a situation in which the United Secretariat appears to be maintaining a tolerant attitude toward Pablo's brazen efforts to establish a de facto federation of tendencies in place of the democratic centralist structure of the Fourth International.

What we have sought to do is to subordinate the entire organizational question in hope of clearing the way for a fruitful discussion on the political and theoretical level and to leave the bridge open for a Minority retreat. It would seem, however, that



Pablo is not really interested in this. He has made up his mind, it appears, to follow the logic of his course to the bitter end. This can hurt the International but, fortunately, not seriously. For the Minority, however, it spells certain doom.

As for us we intend to do precisely what it is incumbent upon the leadership to do -- defend the line adopted by the majority at the last World Congress. We will not shirk this duty no matter from what quarter or under what guise the line is attacked in public. The fate of the Fourth International hinges on its elected leadership standing firm on this principle.

February 14, 1965

A NEW STAGE IN THE INTERNAL SITUATION

A Statement by the United Secretariat

Under date of February 22, 1965, Pablo forwarded to the United Secretariat the following demand:

"Que notre tendance soumet dès maintenant à la discussion préparatoire au 8ème Congrès Mondial les Thèses sur l'Afrique et l'Algérie adoptées par la Conférence du Groupe Africain et publiées dans le numéro 12 de 'S.L.D.D.S.'"

"Des amendements-mineurs, ainsi qu'un texte préfaçant les Thèses vont suivre bientôt. Mais il ne faut pas attendre ces suppléments pour soumettre les textes cités à la discussion internationale."

["That our tendency submits as of now for the preparatory discussion for the eighth World Congress the Theses on Africa and Algeria adopted by the Conference of the African Group and published in number 12 of 'S.L.D.D.S.'"]

["Some minor amendments, as well as a document to preface the Theses will follow shortly. But these additions must not be awaited in order to submit the above documents for the international discussion."]

Besides these documents, which the Fourth International has now been informed are submitted for its internal discussion preparatory to the next world congress, material of similar nature has been published in subsequent issues of Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme. Some of this refers to internal problems of the movement, as in the case of India; some of it, as in previous instances, is in opposition to positions adopted at the Reunification Congress.

It would be a waste of time to dwell on the contradiction involved in offering for internal discussion by the membership, documents that have been made public before being considered by the membership.

It is obvious that having been made public, such documents must necessarily be considered in public.

To argue that the documents are of such soundness that they would serve the movement to publish them, is beside the point. It is precisely these questions that must be determined in the internal discussion and settled by a majority vote. It is a violation of democratic centralism to proceed in any other way, for it means infringing the rights of the majority. These exist, too, and it is a mockery of democracy for a minority to flout them.

That the members of the Pablo faction have already discussed

these documents among themselves, ironed out whatever differences they have within their faction over any of the points, and approved the documents at a faction conference does not make the procedure any more democratic. It simply compounds the grossness of the attempt to prejudice a free discussion at its very outset by appealing to public opinion outside the International.

In this instance, Pablo precipitated such a discussion in violation of specific decisions of the International Executive Committee governing organization of the internal discussion. At its meeting in May 1964, the IEC rejected the demand to open a discussion at that time, so soon after a congress which had given its decision on the issues in dispute. At the January 1965 plenum which convened a world congress for the end of the year and opened the preparatory discussion, the demand to make the discussion public was rejected although the possibility was held open of making part of it public at a certain stage under guidance of the elected bodies of the movement.

In regulating the discussion in this way, in accordance with the established procedures of the Fourth International, the IEC was not motivated by fear of bringing the internal differences of the movement to public attention. It was concerned about safeguarding and maintaining internal democracy. A discussion of differences within the movement, involving points of sharp dispute, cannot be free unless the participants know that the differences will be threshed out before the membership without inhibitions because of the possible effect on relations with rival (or friendly) movements, and without the complication of pressure from such sources on the discussion. The democratic right of the membership to freely discuss and shape policy is violated if differences are taken to the public either prematurely or in a disloyal way.

Pablo's new flagrant violation of the rules of democratic centralism, coming on top of a series of previous increasingly serious violations, marks a qualitative change in the development of his factional course.

It is clear now that Pablo paid only lip service to the reunification of the world Trotskyist movement. In reality he did not swerve from the factional course begun before the Reunification Congress. Instead of joining in the effort to set up a collective leadership, democratically responsible to the membership, as the delegates at the Reunification Congress hoped would be the case, he proceeded to establish a dual center. He organized an international faction with a tight discipline of its own, its own financial structure, its own internal bulletin and its own public faction organ.

The Pablo faction progressively terminated normal relations with the leadership of the International elected by the majority at the last world congress. It has cut off all financial contributions to the International, including dues, and has not responded to

special appeals such as the campaign to aid the Bolivian comrades. The faction, however, is not without financial resources as can be judged, among other things, by the publication of a public faction organ in two languages and by the frequent trips which its members and leaders make internationally. The Pablo faction has paid not the slightest attention to repeated appeals for a change in course; instead it has more and more brazenly violated discipline, defied disciplinary measures, served ultimatums on the majority, searched for petty scandals as a protective screen for its divisive aims; and increasingly challenged in public the line established at the last world congress.

The advance publication of documents which Pablo says are intended for internal discussion in preparation for the next world congress closes this stage and opens a new one. The faction headed by Pablo has now emerged as an autonomous organization, deliberately offering a public challenge to key positions of the Fourth International. The dominant political coloration of this grouping lies somewhere between Titoism and Khrushchevism.

The grave decision taken by the leader of this grouping is not unrelated to the convening of the next world congress. The faction was faced with a crisis of perspective. It had rejected the decisions reached by the Reunification Congress; it had no hope of winning a majority at the next congress; it refused to follow the course of a loyal minority, as is their duty under the rules of democratic centralism. Only one alternative was left -- to complete the split which has been in preparation for a year and a half.

By cutting off their last important tie with the majority (which includes loyal minorities) of the Fourth International; i.e., joining in a common internal discussion in preparation for a world congress, the Pablo faction has completed the process of setting itself up as an autonomous organization. It is governed by a set of aims and rules that have now been definitively proved to be beyond alteration, modification or influence by the majority of the Fourth International. They are the aims and rules of an organization that is leaving the Fourth International; although as yet it maintains an "entrism" sector in the Fourth International as well as an "independent" sector organized around its public faction organ which is expressing the personal views of Pablo on all questions more and more freely.

The United Secretariat states that it would be a violation of basic principles to attempt to negotiate a "federal" structure with this grouping, since the Fourth International is bound by the rules of democratic centralism. The United Secretariat has no choice but to defend the Fourth International both politically and organizationally against the split engineered by Pablo. It proposes to do so publicly as in the case of any other grouping that has public differences with the Fourth International and is moving away from it. The United Secretariat adds as another point on the agenda of the next plenum of the International Executive Committee consideration of this new development in the internal situation.

ON PABLO'S SPLIT

(The following resolution was passed at the July plenum of the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International.)

At the Reunification Congress of the Fourth International in 1963, a tendency headed by Pablo, which had submitted documents in opposition to those presented by the majority, was granted better than full representation as a minority tendency on the leading bodies of the movement.

In addition to this, the Algiers group, although not constituting a section, was granted the same representation as a section. The delegates at the congress did this as a special measure to assure full voice and vote for members of the International who had undertaken a special assignment that made it impossible for them to continue participating in the normal life of the sections to which they belonged.

It was hoped that these measures would help facilitate consolidation of the reunification and would in particular help bring the leaders of the Pablo tendency fully into the collective leadership of the united Trotskyist movement.

But immediately following the Reunification Congress, this minority tendency, under Pablo's guidance, constituted itself into a faction which began hardening along political lines and then began violating the principles of democratic centralism.

Two months after the Reunification Congress, Pablo addressed himself directly to the rank and file, asking that they put pressure on the new leadership to immediately reopen the discussion on the Sino-Soviet conflict and to make it public. The Sino-Soviet conflict had been one of the principal issues that had just been decided on at the congress.

A little later, once again by-passing the elected leadership, Pablo began publishing a public faction organ called Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme. This was fraudulently presented as an official publication of the Fourth International under guise of calling it a publication of the "African Commission of the Fourth International." This public faction organ disregarded the positions and activities of the Fourth International, advancing instead the positions of the Pablo faction which were often in flagrant contradiction to those of the Fourth International.

In addition to this, the Pablo faction issued its own "Internal Bulletin" and circular letters, outside of any control by the elected bodies of the Fourth International. These were circulated, both inside and outside the movement, according to the whims of the Pablo faction.

Thus, proceeding step by step, the Pablo faction set up an international center, utilizing the Algiers group for this purpose, imposed discipline on its adherents separate and apart from that of the International, set up its own financial and organizational structure, cut off all financial and organizational support to the International, and launched its own public faction 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 IEC members belonging to the Pablo faction refused to commit themselves to abide by the discipline of the elected bodies of the Fourth International. The IEC was prepared to overlook the grave violations of democratic centralism committed by these members since the Reunification Congress provided they would agree to abide by discipline from then on. In face of the refusal of these members to abide by discipline, the IEC had no choice but to suspend them. Even then it was made clear that the suspensions would be lifted provided that those involved showed in action that they had decided to change their course.

Far from paying any attention to the grave warning that had thus been given them, the leaders of the Pablo faction continued to disregard the principles of democratic centralism more and more brazenly, showing increasing public hostility to our movement. Pablo refused to recognize the new African Commission designated by the IEC, inasmuch as its composition did not meet with his personal approval. The faction continued to publish its own internal circulars. Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme continued to carry the fraudulent claim that it was the "organ" of the "African Commission of the Fourth International."

The Algiers group convoked an international conference to which it invited people outside the Trotskyist movement. At the same time the Algiers group refused to seat comrades who loyally abided by the decisions of the Reunification Congress and who refused to accept the discipline of the Pablo faction. In fact the Algiers group, under Pablo's guidance, went so far as to "expel" these comrades. The excuse for this was that they could not be "trusted" because among their contacts in Algeria were "suspicious" elements. Asked to place his accusations before the Control Commission elected by the Reunification Congress, Pablo refused to do so in writing, demanding that the Control Commission should conduct its work by coming to hear him orally.

At its plenum in January 1965, the IEC decided to call a world congress of the Fourth International. The members present, including two leaders of the Pablo faction who had not been suspended since they had not been involved personally in any violations of discipline, agreed unanimously to this. A commission was designated to publish the Internal Bulletin during the discussion period, and it was agreed that a member to be chosen by the Pablo faction would

be included in the commission. The demand by the minority leaders that the discussion be public was not rejected, but was left open for later decision in the light of the progress of the discussion.

The Pablo faction, instead of utilizing these decisions to make a retreat from their untenable position, paid no attention to them. Immediately following the plenum, they published in Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme documents which they claimed were being submitted as part of the internal discussion before the world congress, thus violating the decisions of the IEC and once again disregarding the authority of the leadership of the Fourth International elected at the Reunification Congress.

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

Members of this faction have attacked the United Secretariat for publicly dissociating the Fourth International from Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme and have charged that the intention is to expel them before the world congress.

The truth is that the leaders of the Pablo faction were perfectly aware that the act of taking public positions in contradiction to those of the Fourth International, while at the same time claiming that their faction organ was an official publication of the Fourth International, would compel the elected leadership to draw public attention to the fraud and to publicly counter the arguments advanced by the minority. It was precisely because of the grave character of the political differences that the leadership of the Fourth International wished to avoid a premature public discussion and to prevent the discussion as a whole from taking a course that could threaten the unity of the movement. Some of the leading members of the Pablo faction have had long experience in tendency and factional struggles and know that these can end in splits unless both sides cooperate to prevent such an outcome. They acted in cold deliberation in forcing the International to disavow Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme and its positions in opposition to those of the Fourth International. They acted similarly in pursuing their violations of discipline for the past eighteen months. There is, as they well know, a solid basis in their own acts for their continual predictions during this period that they were about to be expelled. If the United Secretariat and the International Executive Committee have not resorted to the expulsions called for by the flagrant violations of discipline committed by certain members of the Pablo faction, it was because the leadership elected by the majority remained faithful to the commitments made with regard to enforcement of discipline during the period between the Reunification Congress and the next world congress.

As to their participation in the next world congress, the members of the Pablo faction know that the congresses of the Fourth International have never been mere forums at which views are exchanged. Congresses are held to decide on political policies which then become binding on all, both the majority and whatever minorities there may be. Not only have Pablo and his colleagues shown by their course of action that they do not have the slightest intention to abide by majority decision at the coming congress, they have affirmed just the opposite in unmistakable language: "The revolutionary-Marxist tendency of the Fourth International...will never agree to being identified with such a line, for which it places the entire responsibility on P.Frank, L.Maitan, E.Germain and a few other hardened champions of a dead past without a future." (Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme, No. 17, May 1965.)

Again, in a recent bulletin, Pablo declared in an article bearing his signature that this course of action is the fruit of a well-ripened decision:

"Some years ago, I made the firm decision to 'take my distance,' to distinguish myself politically from Germain and his team, in order to get the ranks of the International to understand, and whoever wishes to or is able to understand..." (Documents, No. 9, April 1965, page 23.)

To call the majority of the International "hardened champions of a dead past without a future" and to baptize his faction the "Revolutionary Marxist Tendency" is a thin cover for Pablo's decision not to recognize the authority of the next congress any more than he did the past one. Under these conditions, to shout about the "violation" of internal democracy and "expulsions" in advance of the next congress, the decisions of which are rejected in advance, is pure hypocrisy. It is nothing but a transparent maneuver aimed at placing responsibility on the majority of the International for this group's split with the International, a split which they themselves have already announced through their own public declarations.

Pablo was well aware that his faction constituted but a very small minority at the Reunification Congress. He is just as well aware that it has lost ground considerably since then. He knew that to remain in the Fourth International, his faction had to abide by at least elementary discipline. He was indifferent to this because he is no longer interested in the Fourth International; and he is no longer interested in our movement because it plays no role in the line he is now projecting. His hopes are based on virtually nothing but the process of "de-Stalinization" in the official Communist movement.

In the light of these considerations, the International Executive Committee approves the declaration made by the United Secretariat May 24 in reply to the split declaration published by the Pablo faction in issue 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 for the appropriate organizational decisions.

ANDERSON DENIES NEGOTIATING WITH LSSP RENEGADES

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International received the following letter, dated July 15, Sydney, Australia, from Anderson, who represented Pablo in a recent tour of the Far East:

"It was [with] amazement that I read the minutes of your June meeting which contained the following statement:

"'Pablo group reported to have sent a representative to Ceylon to negotiate with the leaders of the reformist LSSP who were expelled from the movement for entering bourgeois coalition government. Pointed out in discussion that this represents a complete turn from time Pablo was accusing the United Secretariat of not being fractional enough in relation to LSSP. The turn corresponds with Pablo's rightist politics and his course away from the Fourth International.'

"As the 'representative' referred to, I hope you will place this true statement of the facts in your next minutes.

"During the month I spent in Ceylon, I met once for one hour with Tilak, and once with Colin, and lastly once with Anil. I addressed an LSSP student meeting on Algeria and their Kandy local on the same theme. At no time did I enter into any form of 'negotiation' with the LSSP leadership. On the contrary, with the LSSP(R) leaders and Central Committee I held many discussions and if you wish 'negotiations.' I informed them in detail on every discussion I had with a leader of the reformist wing.

"Your 'reporter' is therefore telling a deliberate untruth.

"In fact, we, the Revolutionary Marxist tendency in Ceylon, in our principled struggle for a correct revolutionary orientation there have carried out a struggle against the opportunist degeneration of the former leadership, while you remained silent, just as today we also combat the ultra-sectarianism of the LSSP(R) Majority led by Edmund, of which you are equally aware, but which you cover up for the sake of 'anti-Pabloite unity.' But such 'unleadership,' can only fail in the future, leading to the collapse of the present sectarian tendency in Ceylon which is going into deeper and deeper isolation. Your political cowardice in Ceylon endangers the very existence of Trotskyism there. Only our tendency is carrying on a struggle for the historic future of our movement there.

"Clearly for you in any case, the question of a principled struggle from 1960 on against the opportunist tendency of NM and others, was equal to calling for 'fractional' activity. There is the true position on our so-called 'rightist politics' of which you have alone been guilty in relation to Ceylon. Your present indulgence in ultra-leftism there is only the reverse side of the coin. Both owe their existence to your lack and even abdication of leadership which is proving so disastrous for the International.

"With revolutionary communist greetings,

Anderson."

In reply to the above, the United Secretariat does not propose to be diverted by Anderson's references to the relationship between the Fourth International and the LSSP leadership "from 1960 on" or by the attack he levels against the comrades of the LSSP (Revolutionary). Suffice it to point out that the alleged "silence" of the leadership of the world Trotskyist movement in face of the opportunist degeneration of N.M. Perera and Co. included a public statement adopted at the Sixth World Congress, a public declaration by the comrades of the Socialist Workers party published in The Militant, consideration of the whole problem at the Reunification Congress of the Fourth International in collaboration with the comrades in the leadership of the LSSP left wing, and Comrade Pierre Frank's participation at the LSSP congress in June 1964, in consultation with the left wing, in opposition to the proposal to enter the bourgeois coalition government.

So far as the public stand of the Pablo faction is concerned, Anderson appears to believe that discretion is the better part of valor. A few short months of observing Perera share power with Mrs. Bandaranaike was sufficient to cause Pablo to abandon a position inherited from a "dead past without a future." An article in the February-March 1965 issue of Under the Banner of Socialism, entitled "CEYLON: A New Situation," informs us that nothing less than "Peoples Committees" -- whatever that is -- had been "recently formed" by Mrs. Bandaranaike "to resist the extra-parliamentary reactions of the Right," and that the situation "is rich with great revolutionary [!] possibilities." Moving fast to catch up with the dynamic Perera, Pablo like him discovered the "leftwards political evolution" of Mrs. Bandaranaike, and called on the "genuinely Revolutionary-Marxist wing" in Ceylon "to even envisage its critical support to the Government that may be formed by the Coalition..."

Events have passed severe judgment on Pablo's ludicrous predictions; but it is now part of the record that he and Anderson, moved by the worst impressionism, embarked only a few months after Perera on the same right-wing course as that traitor. No amount of fast talk about "from 1960 on" can change that fact.

As for Anderson's effort to "correct" the minutes of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, the question is very simple and perfectly clear and Anderson will not be able to evade it: what was his purpose in opening relations with the leaders of the reformist LSSP while he was in Ceylon?

Pablo's emissary denies that he engaged in "any form of 'negotiation'" with the Perera crew who were expelled from the Fourth International for entering a bourgeois coalition government in flagrant violation of the most elementary principles of the world Trotskyist movement. He refuses to admit to more than the little fact that "I met once for one hour with Tilak, and once with Colvin, and lastly once with Anil."

Anderson has drifted so far from the principles of the Fourth International that he puts these renegades on the same plane as the comrades of the LSSP(R) and even uses their first names as if they were bosom companions!

No doubt it is by mere inadvertence and not by political cowardice that he fails to mention what his meetings with these despicable betrayers of our movement were about, what the objectives of the two sides were, and exactly how far things went in these charming tête-à-têtes in the back alleys of Colombo. We are thus left completely in the dark as to what advances from Pablo the representatives of N.M.Perera were able to report back to their leader, or what response this renegade deigned to transmit to Anderson for Pablo's consideration. We are left uninformed as to the progress of this rapprochement and what kind of outcome can be expected as the coming scenes unfold. How then can we come to any conclusions on the very important question of Anderson's talents as a marriage broker?

In any case, the leaders of the LSSP (Revolutionary) appear to have correctly sized up the nature of Anderson's objectives in Ceylon. Comrade Edmund Samarakody indicates this in a letter:

"It was clear to us that Anderson's visit was to help the Pablo group to make contacts with sections of the LSSP (reformists). He has met many leaders of the party. He has made arrangements through Nagendra (he is now with the reformists) to publish in Ceylon 'Under the Banner of Socialism' (this is already out). He has obviously set up a nucleus here."

The nucleus is in the LSSP (reformist) where place can no doubt be made for any admirers of Pablo in view of his second thoughts about Mrs. Bandaranaike and his public indication of how well he appreciates Perera's reasons for cutting loose from a "dead past without a future."

May, 20th 1965

TO THE LEADERSHIPS AND MEMBERS OF SECTIONS OF THE  
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Dear Comrades,

It is our duty to draw once more to your attention the extreme gravity of the internal situation of the International, created by the fractional intrigues of the present U.S.

It is now clear that the U.S. acts with deliberate intention to guarantee a split at the next World Congress, and it has already achieved this split with a whole tendency of the International.

We are in May and no progress has been realised in a truly democratic preparation of the World Congress, assuring the effective participation of our tendency.

Our documents and articles for discussion sent to the U.S. for several months already, are ignored, with the futile pretext that some of them were already published in the organ of the African Commission: "Under the Banner of Socialism".

Our letters to the U.S. posing a series of questions to which we request a reply, are equally ignored, as well as our repeated request to place the charges before the Control Commission.

The documents of the U.S. do not reach us at all or those we have been able to gain access to were several weeks late, making impossible the dialogue with this leadership on the preparation of the World Congress. Thus both the March and April reports of the U.S. reached us on May 12, 1965.

The measures of suspension and exclusion are striking our comrades in France, Belgium, Austria and elsewhere, preventing these comrades from participating in the preparatory discussion for the World Congress. (1)

(1) Let us recall the typical case of Comrade Vereeken, Member of our tendency in Belgium, who, following his request to publish a text for discussion in the internal bulletin of his section, was notified in reprisal for the fact that he had written an article in "Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme" that "the right to publish articles in the internal bulletin" was withdrawn from him for two months! Immediately after this period had elapsed the majority fraction of the Belgian section has leaped over to a new degree in the "escalade" by suspending this comrade.

In these conditions, what can be the right to participate in the discussion for all the comrades who are regular contributors to

The international and external attacks against our tendency designed to justify "ideologically" the split with our tendency are multiplying.

In reality there will be no democratic information of the rank and file of the International on the differences, neither a democratic discussion nor a democratic World Congress. There will be a meeting of representatives of the Majority who will pronounce our "exclusion from the International".

All this under the pretext that our tendency takes no notice of the "discipline" and does not respect "democratic centralism"; and all this without a deep thorough going examination of the political differences and without taking into consideration the numerical and political importance of our tendency.

Now, comrades, remember that our would-be "indiscipline" is manifested on the following questions:

-- to have edited "Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme" without the previous authorisation of the U.S., when the smallest group of the International has the right to do as much the same and to create its own instrument of work in the milieu where it operates.

-- to have defended in this organ positions contrary to those of the Majority, most particularly on the Angolan Revolution and the Sino-Soviet conflict.

-- on the Angolan Revolution, the U.S. wanted to impose on us the defense of Holden Roberto against the MPLA in Algeria and in Africa.

Such an attitude on our part would be tantamount to our political suicide, Holden having been rejected by all the Workers States, by the entire African revolutionary left and even recently excluded from the Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference in Ghana!

"Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme" and the "suspended" members of the IEC and the U.S., that is, practically the entire leadership of our tendency?

On this score, Comrade Pablo wrote to the U.S. on the 22nd February 1965: "Our tendency request a responsible answer concerning our rights as a tendency consisting of several sections, minorities of sections and cadres of the International, in the preparatory discussion of the World Congress and the World Congress itself. We pose this question because the sanctions taken by the Belgian section against our Comrade Vereeken make us fear that at least certain leaders and cadres of our tendency that you will maintain as "suspended" will no longer have the right to participate in the discussion and at the Congress. We ask you to speedily clarify this question whose importance cannot escape you".

No answer from the U.S. has reached us since then!

As to our "indiscipline" concerning the Sino-Soviet conflict, that is, our refusal to give "critical support" to the Chinese CP and its bureaucratic leadership, the dramatic events of Vietnam have just given the final blow to the appreciations and illusions sown by the factional leadership of the U.S. in relation to the Chinese leaders. Comrades, observe that against the attitude of this latter in our respect, attacking us on several occasions publicly and stating publicly the differences in the International our tendency had avoided public criticisms. But this attitude on our part is no longer possible for the factional leadership of the U.S. pursues itself unremittingly to publicly discredit our tendency and to justify the fact of its split already practiced with us.(2)

Comrades, remember too that we proposed to constitute a body to lead the work in Africa under the political responsibility of a member of the U.S. Majority and this was also rejected.

A responsible leadership which is not seeking a split at any cost with a whole tendency of the International would have avoided to pose unacceptable conditions (as the defence of Holden against the MPLA and the dissolution of the African Commission) and would not have behaved with extreme bureaucratism towards the most active and living sections of the International.

A responsible leadership would have sought to maintain the organisational unity of the International, therefore recognising the real situation of the existence of our tendency, of what it represents and the conditions of its work in certain fields so important for the future of our movement.

Such a leadership would have responsibly discussed with it to determine the conditions of collaboration within the same organisational framework, of the preparation and holding of the World Congress of the Statute of the tendency after the World Congress, etc...

It is untrue that we are demanding a world "federalist" organisation, and that we reject in principle the discipline of a majority line decided upon at a democratically prepared and conducted World Congress.

---

(2) After numerous public attacks against our tendency, against the African Commission, its activities and its organ published so much in "World Outlook" as well as in the "Internationale" (not to speak of organs outside our movement such as the "GRAE" bulletin of Holden Roberto, mixed up in this game by the trust and confidence of Pierre Frank and his fraction), on which we ourselves responsibly refrained from publicly answering up to now, the last attack published in "Quatrième Internationale" of March 1965, by its irresponsibility, its determination to denigrate the work accomplished by the tendency in Africa and the blow that it inflicts thus to the very prestige of our movement, could not remain without a reply. (See "Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme," No. 17, May 1965 and "Under the Banner of Socialism," No. 6).

Still now, we are decided to seek again the conditions allowing the coexistence of tendencies inside the same organisational framework and to avoid in extremis the organisational rupture that they are preparing to "officialise" by the holding of a fractional Congress from which we are already actually excluded.(3)

Now it is incumbent on the base of the International to avoid this.

Demand the convocation of an IEC Plenum with the presence of the "suspended" comrades and the nomination by this plenum of a mixed commission which will prepare the World Congress.

Send your representatives to the Plenum.

Demand the cessation of public attacks and the raising of the sanctions which strike at our tendency.

Demand that from the Plenum emerges an agreement on the preparation and holding of the World Congress guaranteeing the unity of the International.

The Marxist revolutionary tendency of the International solemnly declares once again that it will not by itself break this unity; that it considers its coexistence with the tendency that represents the present leadership of the International as possible; that it does not stand for a "Federalist" conception of the International, that it will apply the discipline of a democratically prepared and held World Congress, guaranteeing its statute as a tendency and taking into account certain demands of its work.

Comrades it is for you to decide that the International remains united, in acting consequently and intervening resolutely against the split.

You must no longer ignore the real situation, the facts, the repeated warnings, the intentions of the ones and of the others.

Do not maintain the illusion that we are going united towards

(3) Thus, the texts of the majority have not reached us; our texts for discussion are not published by the U.S.; no reply has been given to the letter of Comrade Pablo requesting precisions about the conditions of participation of our tendency in the preparatory discussion for the World Congress. We are "suspended" from the IEC and U.S. and can no longer participate in their meetings; we are even no more informed about their convocation (it seems that a Plenum of the IEC would be held incessantly without us even being even officially informed; the date and place of the World Congress would also be already fixed without us having any knowledge of it!).

Thus, the black out becomes systematic.



the World Congress when actually our tendency is already excluded from the preparation of this Congress and when the factional leadership of the U.S. states clearly, for those who want to listen and to understand, that the Congress will only have as its aim the final guarantee of our exclusion already put in practice from now.

The organisational split between the present tendencies of the International is not inevitable. An organisational compromise acceptable to both tendencies is still possible in what concerns us.

For that, it is only necessary that you intervene energetically and in time, demanding and imposing such a resolution.

With fraternal greetings,

The Revolutionary Marxist Tendency  
of the Fourth International

20.5.65

TO THE LEADERSHIPS AND MEMBERS OF THE  
SECTIONS OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL\*

June 10, 1965

Dear Comrades,

In its number of May 28, 1965, "World Outlook" published a document of the SU entitled: "Pablo Breaks with the Fourth International."

This is the provocative reply of Walter-Livio-Frank-Joe to our declaration published in No. 17 of "Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme."

The title and contents of this document are significant. They express the desire and decision of these elements, who now believe they can achieve their aims, to proclaim -- to begin with -- the "expulsion" of Com. Pablo from the "Fourth International."

First of all the personal struggle which these men are conducting against Comrade Pablo must be noted, because the declaration published in No. 17 of "S.L.D.S." is signed collectively by the revolutionary-Marxist tendency of the International and does not bear the signature of a single comrade.

The permanent tactic of these men is always to seek to explain that everything that is "bad" is due to a single man, to ignore deliberately, irresponsibly and in a narrow factional manner, the existence of a political tendency within the International, to minimize it and to denigrate it, in order to gain credence for the view that a split with it does not seriously injure the International after all.

It must be likewise noted that our declaration was made after multiple, repeated public and internal attacks by them, all tending to politically discredit our tendency.

Now, no revolutionary militant, and with all the greater reason no revolutionary tendency that has any self-respect, can agree, in the name of "discipline" and of "democratic centralism" to commit political "hara-kiri" by not defending itself and letting the worst political slanders be spread against it.

Our tendency has carefully avoided up to now replying publicly to the slanderous attacks of these men, showing proof thereby of extreme responsibility.

---

\*This circular letter was received by the United Secretariat in French and attached in that language to the minutes of its meeting of August 21-22. The translation given here was prepared by the United Secretariat inasmuch as it has not received any English version from the Pablo faction.

But as soon as it became clear that they were getting ready to politically "justify" their organizational split with our tendency by presenting us as deserters from Trotskyism and the Fourth International, it was our imperative duty to defend ourselves.

Taking our legitimate political defense as a pretext, they have now advanced another step in repressing our tendency and publicly announcing -- before any preparatory discussion for the World Congress, and before it has met democratically, with the full and complete participation of our tendency -- a so-called break by Comrade Pablo with the Fourth International, in order to justify his "expulsion" which they will probably pronounce at their factional Plenum of the IEC, convoked without preparation, in secret, without the effective participation of our tendency.

We had already foreseen this course for a long time and we have denounced the intentions of these men.

They are eager to break with the revolutionary-Marxist tendency of the Fourth International, in order to amputate from the latter its leading wing so as to avoid being denounced inside and outside the International for their policy of bankruptcy and disintegration of a big part of the sector of the International which they control.

What is happening at present is a new version of the split perpetrated by the Americans in 1953, carried out by the same men who at that time committed this crime against the Unity of the International, allied today with some renegades who have turned against their own past and their own political line of former days.

The style of the present splitting operation is in the best tradition of the Americans, who tolerate no opposition whatsoever that puts a question mark on their line and international leadership, and who, without an objective ideological discussion, quickly degenerate into a struggle to the "finish" and a split.

It must be asked what are the social forces pushing these men to perpetrate at present with such haste, the most disastrous split within the International.

In any case, their calculation to be able to continue to monopolize the name and the prestige of the International amputated from its revolutionary leading wing, is proving to be completely mistaken.

We are against the split, we are disposed to coexist with their tendency within the same organizational framework, provided that they respect, however little, tendency rights and the interests of the work of the International in a number of sections where it is our tendency and no one else that is assuring this work with the greatest success.

But if, blinded by their factionalism and under the irresistible pressure of enemy forces weighing down on some of them, they go

beyond the fundamental interests of our movement, let them know that the revolutionary-Marxist tendency of the Fourth International will continue its existence, openly defending Trotskyism and the International.

And History, which will judge both sides, will, we are certain, cast its vote in our favor before very long.

The Revolutionary-Marxist Tendency  
of the Fourth International

IN REPLY TO TWO CIRCULAR LETTERS OF THE PABLO FACTION

In an envelope postmarked Paris August 14, 1965, the United Secretariat received two circular letters sent out by the Pablo faction, the one dated May 20, 1965, the other June 10, 1965, which complain, among other things, about getting the documents of the United Secretariat "several weeks late" [!].

The two circulars constitute a gross attempt by this disloyal and undisciplined faction to give sections and members of the International a false impression of their real conduct during the past two years, of the reasons that led the leadership of the International to take disciplinary measures against some of them, and of the whole process that has led them to split with the Fourth International.

The circulars claim that the only charges of "indiscipline" which the leadership of the International has been able to place against them are: (1) the fact of having published Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme without prior authorization from the United Secretariat "when the smallest group of the International has the right to do as much the same and to create its own instrument of work in the milieu where it operates"; (2) "to have defended in this organ positions contrary to those of the Majority, most particularly on the Angolan Revolution and the Sino-Soviet conflict"; (3) "on the Angolan Revolution, the U.S. wanted to impose on us the defense of Holden Roberto against the MPLA in Algeria and in Africa."

This is a complete misrepresentation of the truth, something which says much about the contempt which Pablo and his faction hold for the International, its program, its organizational principles, its official organs, statutes, sections and members.

Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme is not the organ of a section. It is only sections, or established groups in countries that do not yet have sections, that normally publish organs without prior authorization of the international leadership. The masthead of Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme does not state that it is the organ of a small group (which would come somewhere near the truth); it makes the fraudulent claim of being the "monthly magazine of the African Commission of the Fourth International." The affirmation that "the smallest group" has the right to publish its organ, no matter what the nature of the group and without prior authorization, is ridiculous. A group operating in a country where a section exists does not have the right to "create its own instrument of work in the milieu where it operates" without the authorization and control of the leadership of the section. A group that claims to constitute a regional bureau or commission of the International, does not have the right to proceed without the control of the International, as is specifically stated in the statutes of the International. In publishing Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme without seeking prior authorization and without putting it under control of the International, the Pablo faction committed a

flagrant violation of international discipline which can be placed at the head of a long list.

The leadership of the International, in reacting to this rupture of discipline, had the right to order the faction to immediately stop publication of this organ. It did not do so. What it did do, at a meeting of the International Executive Committee regularly elected by the last World Congress, was to change the composition of the African Commission, as was its right under the statutes, and designate a commission to take charge of Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme composed of Pablo and two representatives of the International majority. The leaders of the Pablo faction refused to apply this resolution of the IEC, refused to submit Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme to the political control of the leadership of the International, and continued to proceed as if the IEC did not exist. This can be listed as a second violation of discipline.

But in reality, the thesis that Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme is the organ of a national group or section, comparable to the other organs published by the international Trotskyist movement, is a fiction that no one can defend in good faith. What it is in reality is a public faction organ. Publication of such an organ is completely contrary to the organizational tradition and rules of our movement. Irrefutable proof that this is the true nature of this organ is the fact that its English edition is put out by members of the LSSP (Reformist), who are no longer members of the Fourth International, but who are without doubt members of the Pablo faction! What would any section of the International say if some of its members, aided by elements expelled from the section, published a journal using the name of the section and claiming that it was only a "regional organ"? This constitutes a third violation of discipline.

The leaders of the Pablo faction not only continue to publish Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme outside of the control of the IEC, thus violating an express decision of the international leadership; they also continue to present this faction organ under a false label as the organ of the "African Commission of the Fourth International" in face of the fact that the African Commission elected by the IEC has nothing to do with this publication. This constitutes a fourth violation of discipline which happens to be a particularly flagrant example of the way in which they refuse to recognize decisions of the leading bodies which do not please them.

The plenum of the IEC, held in January 1965, decided to open the discussion for the next World Congress. A discussion to run for almost a year was envisaged. The minority had full opportunity to pursue that "unhasty" discussion which it claimed to seek within the movement. The same plenum also decided that the discussion would be opened internally in the movement, reserving the right to decide later whether the discussion should be made public or not. It went so far as to designate a commission on publications, with minority representation, with the aim of organizing the discussion in such a

way as to avoid any procedural complaints. Instead of designating their representative to participate in this commission, and submitting their documents in a normal way for the internal discussion, the Pablo faction began by immediately publishing them in Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme, thus violating the express decision of the January 1965 plenum of the IEC. This constitutes a fifth violation of discipline.

Long before the January 1965 plenum of the IEC, the Pablo faction had been sending out letters and circulars to the members without consulting the leadership of the international. Some of these documents were sent out indiscriminately, being received by people outside the International. Rarely were these circulars ever sent to the leadership of the International, some of them coming to its attention only when inquiries were received from recipients of these documents. This course of by-passing the leadership in conducting factional polemics culminated in the faction issuing its own "Internal Bulletin." This procedure was in complete violation of the movement's procedures in organizing an internal discussion. This constitutes a sixth violation of discipline.

The sections of the International with a leadership adhering in the majority to the Pablo faction; that is, the Dutch and Australian sections, cut off financial support to the International, contributing instead to the Pablo faction. The Algiers group has never contributed a cent to the International. This constitutes a seventh violation of discipline.

Leading members of the Pablo faction travel from one country to another, leaving their own sections in order to go to other sections, and even organize "international tours" without prior authorization from the International leadership and without even notifying their own sections or the International leadership, a procedure in glaring violation of the provisions of the statutes. This constitutes an eighth violation of discipline.

The Pablo faction complains about sections taking measures against violations of discipline committed by this faction in various countries. The case of Vereecken, a member of the Belgian section, who was suspended, is cited as an "example" in the May 20, 1965, circular letter. A truly striking example! This member of the Pablo faction was the public editor of the open Trotskyist organ published by the Belgian section. He publicly joined the new socialist party of the left in face of the fact that a resolution of the section's leadership specifically prohibited him from doing this. He openly and publicly opposed the political line of the comrades of the section in this party. He sent internal bulletins to people who were not members of the section, thus jeopardizing the work of the section. The example shows how individual members of the Pablo faction arrogate to themselves the right to choose what sector of work they prefer and to conduct themselves as they see fit. If they are censured for such flagrant violations of discipline, they shout "bureaucra-

tism." But aside from that, they remain "firmly attached to the principles of democratic centralism."

In each of the sections where it has small cells, the Pablo faction systematically organizes their public activities independently of the leadership of the sections and in violation of the discipline of the sections. This constitutes a ninth violation of discipline.

As a tenth example of the violations of democratic centralism committed by the Pablo faction, we point to their expulsion of comrades in Algeria who support the majority position and who loyally abide by the positions adopted at the Reunification Congress. These comrades were expelled because they did not agree with the minority position. Their protests against this extremely bureaucratic action, taken where Pablo was on the scene, have been published in the minutes of the United Secretariat.

These are instances of violations of discipline solely on the organizational plane. As for violations of political discipline, these are innumerable. It is utterly grotesque to present things as if the only "indiscipline" committed by the editors of Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme was in connection with the line relating to the Angolan revolution and the estimate of the reciprocal relations between the Khrushchevist and Maoist bureaucracies. In reality almost all the major articles in Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme violate the line of resolutions adopted by the Reunification Congress and the meetings of the IEC or break with fundamental positions of the Trotskyist movement. To cite only a few:

(1) An article on the Chilean elections, affirming that a second "socialist regime" might be established in Chile along a different road than the road of guerrilla warfare taken by Cuba; namely, the road of "elections." (Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme, No. 7-8, p. 9.)

(2) An article on the situation in Ceylon, affirming that after the departure of some of the rightist members of the SLFP, the coalition government had changed in character, was no longer a "reactionary bourgeois alliance," and that the Bandaranaike-Perera coalition government was contributing to the development of a situation "rich with great revolutionary possibilities" and not of a victory for the reaction. (Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme, No. 13, p. 14.)

(3) An article on the crisis over Vietnam which affirmed that the effect of a line such as that voiced by Peking and vigorously advocated by Havana, the line of standing up to U.S. imperialism and doing everything possible to defeat it as in the Korean war, would really only be "to provoke" Washington and thus heighten the danger of a nuclear war. (Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme, No. 15, p. 11.)

(4) An article on the downfall of Khrushchev, presenting things as if this event were a victory for the "neo-Stalinists"



endangering the process of "de-Stalinization" in the USSR. (Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme, No. 11, p. 8.)

All these examples show the extreme political irresponsibility of this faction, particularly when they present their views as being the views of the Fourth International. Pablo is shrewd enough to know that the International had no choice but to file a public disclaimer that it held views of such nature which could only completely discredit the Fourth International in the eyes of the international revolutionary vanguard. The International had no choice but to dissociate itself from the irresponsible attacks against a Cuban leader like Che Guevara, from the slanders levelled against the leaders of our movement (such as the slander that Germain was "against self-management"), the suppression of all criticism with regard to the policies of the Titoist and Khrushchevist bureaucracies.

The publication of articles of this kind -- which expressed the line of Pablo that had been rejected by a huge majority at the last world congress --- was thus nothing but an outright provocation. Pablo took the inevitable public replies of the United Secretariat as an excuse for launching extremely violent attacks against the international leadership.

It is significant, moreover, that while the replies of the United Secretariat to the anti-Trotskyist positions of Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme consisted of mere declarations disavowing political responsibility, the public polemic unleashed by Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme against the United Secretariat since the May 1965 issue (No. 17), has not only attacked the ideas of the Fourth International, but still more the organization itself and the men leading it, resorting to slanders that would be unthinkable to anyone who still considered himself to be a member of the Fourth International, echoing Posadas' anti-international poison against the "Europeans" and "North Americans," echoing the Healyite poison against reunification with the International Committee, insulting militants who have devoted their entire lives to building the Fourth International, speaking repeatedly of our organization as representing "a dead past without a future," etc., etc.

And after all this, Pablo makes the cynical claim that he remains an adherent of democratic centralism and is against a federalist concept of the International!

For us, democratic centralism means the widest and most complete freedom of discussion before and during a congress. But after it is over, the minority must loyally carry out the decisions of the majority. Pablo insistently demanded this on many occasions when he was secretary of the International. This is what he promised to do when the possibility of reunification came up in 1957-58. This is what he refuses to do when he is in a minority, claiming the right for his faction to publicly advance its views on all the international questions in dispute and to determine for himself what the activities

of the members of his faction shall be and what line they shall follow. In addition, he publicly proclaimed in the May 1965 issue of Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme that he will "never" abide by the line of the majority. To claim in the light of this that he is an adherent of democratic centralism, even when he is in a minority, is nothing but a crude attempt to pull the wool over the eyes of the membership of the Fourth International.

Any discussion on the basis of such "oaths" is useless so long as the conduct of the Pablo faction in practice consists of nothing but an endless chain of violations of discipline. There has not been the slightest indication up to now that the Pablo faction intends to break this chain and begin to conduct itself loyally, abiding by discipline. In light of this, no conclusion is possible except that the leaders of the Pablo faction have deliberately decided to split with the Fourth International and have chosen to play the role of a "tendency" within the "Communist movement on the road to regeneration," while at the same time snaring some Trotskyist militants by seeking to foist onto the United Secretariat the responsibility for a split which has been coldly and deliberately prepared and executed step by step during the past two years.

United Secretariat of the  
Fourth International

August 22, 1965