

INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION BULLETIN

November, 1952

CONTENTS

DOCUMENTS ON THE CRISIS IN THE PCI (French Section of the Fourth International)

	<u>Page</u>
1. FOR A DECISIVE TURN IN FRANCE	1
2. THE RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE TENTH PLENUM OF THE IEC ON THE FRENCH SECTION	8
3. RESOLUTION OF THE POLITICAL BUREAU ON THE FRAMEWORK OF THE PREPARATORY DISCUSSION FOR THE CONGRESS	9
4. DECLARATION OF THE BLEIBTREU-LAMBERT TENDENCY ON THE AGREEMENTS CONCLUDED AT THE INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE	10
5. LETTER FROM COMRADE ALBERT TO THE BLEIBTREU-LAMBERT TENDENCY	12
6. RESOLUTION OF THE POLITICAL BUREAU OF THE PCI	16
7. RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE CONFERENCE OF THE MAJORITY OF THE PCI	18
8. RESOLUTION OF THE 11TH PLENUM OF THE IEC ON THE FRENCH PCI	21
9. UNITY OF THE PARTY WITHIN THE INTERNATIONAL	23
10. LETTER FROM DANIEL RENARD TO COMRADE CANNON	34
11. LETTER FROM CANNON TO DANIEL RENARD	41
12. UNITE FOR THE DEFENSE OF TROTSKYISM!	45
13. LETTER OF THE POLITICAL BUREAU TO THE MEMBERS OF THE PARTY	47
14. TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE PCI -- PREPARE THE 8TH CONGRESS OF THE PCI TOGETHER	50
15. THE BLEIBTREU-LAMBERT SPLIT RESOLUTION	54
16. RESOLUTION OF THE IS	54

Note: This material is reprinted from the July 1952
Internal Bulletin of the International Secretariat
of the Fourth International for the
information of our readers.

Published by the

SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY
116 University Place
New York 3, N.Y.

FOR A DECISIVE TURN IN FRANCE

(Speech of Comrade M. Pablo at the 8th Congress of the PCI -- French Section of the Fourth International.)

It is naturally disagreeable to have to speak to you again only a few years after the departure of the right-wingers on the need of some kind of a new beginning for our movement here in France.

In effect, the desertion of an important part of our organization which has just occurred unquestionably places us in a difficult situation and obliges us to begin again in large part the task which we started so many years ago: to build a genuinely Marxist revolutionary organization which has real ties with the real movements of the masses of the country.

In view of the very numerous setbacks we have suffered up to now in carrying out this task, some people will have a tendency to yield to discouragement or to skepticism as to the correctness of our ideas, or as to the objective possibility of accomplishing such a task.

In reality, if we have failed up to now in the accomplishment of this task it is not due to the fault of our ideas, which have passed the victorious test in so many historical events and in the practical success realized in several other countries, nor to the fault of a so-called national reality which is irremediably hostile to the construction of a Marxist revolutionary organization. I do not propose today to go into details in what I consider to be the principal reasons for this defeat. I will content myself with emphasizing the principal elements which have contributed to perpetuating the crisis of French Trotskyism and which have prevented it from resolving this crisis up to now in a progressive manner: the inability of crystallizing the nucleus of a stable leadership and of infiltrating the genuine revolutionary forces into the masses of the country in order to find a stable social basis among them. There is naturally an interaction between these two elements. The unstable social climate of the country whose economic potential corresponds neither to its political role as the head of an Empire which it can no longer maintain nor to its situation in Europe and in the world as a great power; the great shifts which this unstable international position creates in public opinion, dominated by sentiments, traditions, and reactions which are greatly influenced politically by the urban petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry, as well as the existence of a relatively very strong Stalinist movement, reacted as so many objective obstacles to the crystallization of a stable leadership and the establishment of a stable proletarian base.

On the other hand, such a result in any case could not have been obtained without a long experience of the movement itself which would have permitted the natural selection of a group of leaders and a concrete understanding of the manner of approaching the living forces of the working class and of acquiring a solid base there.

And such in reality is the general direction of the evolution of our movement in France.

Comparing our post-war movement, with all its still crying inadequacies, despite the crisis, despite the desertions we have known,

with what it was before the war, progress is manifest and important. However, it has not been sufficiently ample to counter-balance the influence of centrifugal forces and disturbing pressures from the outside so that the organization could attain genuine stability in its leadership and in its ranks.

As I have said, there is an interaction between a stable leadership and a stable proletarian base. But in reality what has been especially lacking up to recently in our French movement has been the crystallization of a group of revolutionary Marxist leaders, who could work patiently without sensational shifts and turns, and this for a whole period of years, so as to create a solid proletarian base.

It was not absolutely excluded that such a leadership would arise after an already very long experience of our national and international movement. And if it has not been created up to recently, the fault resides not only in objective conditions but in ourselves, in the inadequacy of a profound comprehension by our cadres and our active members in France in what are the necessary subjective conditions to develop and to consolidate a revolutionary Marxist movement, not abstractly in any country whatever, but in a given concrete country, France, having this and that concrete characteristic.

That is to say there was an inability to capitalize sufficiently on the concrete experience of the movement in France and to give it conscious expression through a team of cadres.

When we speak of the primary need of a stable group in the leadership, which has been lacking up to recently in our French movement, we do not only mean by that merely a group which is stable in its composition, but even more, a group which is stable in its profound convictions, in its Bolshevik line, in its real and profound loyalty to the International.

The other present danger in the country was of seeing the leadership being conquered by a kind of activism following in the train of events, of submitting to the influence of the sharp inherent changes in the international situation as well as to the pressure of a fickle public opinion, of losing its head every time, of going from enthusiasm to pessimism, of drowning itself in the accidental, the secondary, the ephemeral, and of never remaining patient and firm for a long period on a principled Marxist revolutionary line, while knowing how to adapt itself tactically to the turns imposed by objective evolution.

In the absence of such maturity and of such political stability, several opportunities were lost since the war and far from profiting from them the organization, on the contrary, has constantly declined so far as the extension of its influence is concerned.

The supposition is that with such a mature and stable team, had it fortuitously been the leadership of the French organization since the war -- there is no doubt that objective conditions allowed for it as they still do -- we could have had here in France one of the strongest sections of the International, counting in large numbers, hundreds of revolutionary Marxist workers.

In the desertion of the right-wingers, subjected at the time to the dominant influence of the Stalinists and in the present desertion subjected to the pressure of the new-anti Stalinist climate which prevails in the public opinion of the country, the common petty-bourgeois class character of both tendencies is evident. What is involved in the case of both tendencies, one opportunist, the other sectarian, which had superficially assimilated the program and the revolutionary Marxist policy of the International, are impressionist tendencies influenced by the dominant pressure of public opinion.

Both the right-wingers and the present deserters had the characteristic in common of completely turning their backs on the principled analysis made from an international point of view of the situation in order therefore to plunge into an activism which was euphemistically called broad mass work, of distrusting the International, to which they wanted to belong as a distinct national entity but without ever totally and unreservedly fusing with it.

The activist impatience of the right-wingers and their fundamental lack of faith in the correctness of a principled line made the party lose all the real possibilities which existed between 1944-1948 to polarize around itself a high number of elements discontented with the policy of the Stalinist and the Socialist parties. Similarly the political failure of the present deserters in understanding the changes which occurred in the situation since the Korean war, and the extreme irresponsibility of their conduct in the internal struggle in the party and against the International, has caused the party to lose real possibilities of successfully adapting itself to the new situation and of losing a year of work, of patient penetration into the Stalinist movement which would already have transformed the entire physiognomy of our movement here in France, as was the case with our movement in England.

It appears to me that to give primary importance as the cause of our difficulties and the lack of our successes here in France to the lack of a team of stable leadership is the first decisive step in understanding the past as well as in preparing a better future.

Such a leadership will reinforce its stability by basing itself on the one hand on the International, and on the other hand, on the broadening of its proletarian base.

It is possible, admitted and even inevitable, that the national cadres of a given country, despite all their good will, may not succeed in outlining a correct political line through all stages, in easily adjusting themselves to the different turns of the situation, etc. But their intimate, confident and loyal collaboration with the International can enormously facilitate their tasks and save their section from the malignant-type crises which we have known here and which arise above all from the injurious, unsettling role which was played by the confusion and irresponsibility of the leading elements.

Loyal collaboration with the International, confidence in it, is not limited to loyal collaboration or to confidence in this or that comrade of the International. None of us is exempt from political or organizational errors. But fortunately the International is not

restricted to this or that person. Through its line, the International expresses the reflection and the collective experience of our International movement which have been proved not once, not twice, but over a long period of years as more correct, more just, more mature, more valid than the line of any section taken by itself.

It is infinitely more probable that this or that section can be wrong than the International as a whole, and this is all the more the case when it involves not secondary questions but important questions, on which all the cadres of the International turn to it with seriousness and responsibility.

Such for example is the meaning of the line of the Third World Congress and the Plenums which have followed -- a line which has been approved, after reflection, almost unanimously by the international Trotskyist movement. Whoever doubts that must doubt the reality and the seriousness of the International as a whole.

The first reaction of a leadership is not to oppose the International but to desire very seriously to understand its line and to apply it. If a leadership has not yet reached that understanding of this necessary condition for its own functioning and for the health of its own section, it shows its own immaturity and all the dangers that can develop as a consequence of such a situation.

The stability of the leadership cannot be assured on the other hand in the long run if it does not succeed in penetrating the living forces of the proletariat of its country and of acquiring a solid base there as a result of patient work over a period of several years.

The very orientation toward such a field of work already shows the political maturity, the really Bolshevick character of the group which leads the organization.

Here in France, the living forces of the proletariat, not only now but for a long time have been constituted by the industrial proletariat of the factories, the mines, and the transportation system which follows the CPF. This is the concrete, indisputable, fundamental reality of the French workers' movement.

A revolutionary Marxist organization which does not want to be converted into a club of infantile agitators, sustained by the illusion of revolutionary activity, has to do the impossible to penetrate this nucleus and to establish a base there even if at the beginning this includes only several dozen real adult proletarian elements, well known in their field of work, and emotionally and mentally stable and serious.

The winning of such a base will soon reflect itself throughout the organization, in its internal atmosphere, in its procedure, in its policy, in its practical conduct.

Theoretically we have always been convinced of this fact. In practice, between 1944-1950 up to the Korean war, we have attempted to penetrate into the genuinely revolutionary forces of the French working class influenced by the Stalinist party, through a preliminary conquest of peripheral elements and currents.

I will not examine here to what degree the routine of this work caused us to deviate in practice from our strategic aim. But since the Korean war, which marks a decisive turn in the international situation, it became more and more evident that the manner of carrying through this absolutely necessary penetration had to radically change.

If the crisis we have gone through since this time in our French organization is not to have merely negative effects, but also a positive balance sheet -- as every important struggle in our revolutionary movement against ideas and forces, which, under the pressure of events, try to shake our program and to make it deviate from our revolutionary road -- then this should show itself in the concrete comprehension realized for the first time here in France by important numbers of cadres of militants, by the manner of working in the real movement of the masses in the country who have been summoned by the developments of the objective situation to rise to the level of proletarian revolution in the near future.

I am convinced that it is through this present struggle that all the experience acquired up to now by our movement in France will finally crystallize and is now in the process of consolidating a group of leadership as well as a revolutionary Marxist group which is determined to place itself firmly on the terrain of political realities and real revolutionary perspectives, both conditioned by the real evolution of the objective situation.

We will not cease to repeat again and again that the entire tactic set forth by the Third World Congress of the International in the different categories of countries is now conditioned by our fundamental estimation that the international situation is evolving irreversibly within a relatively brief period toward a world war of a given character and within a given relationship of forces.

This evaluation which we were the first to make not only within the ranks of the workers' movement, but even to a certain extent of all political movements no one dares to attack directly any longer.

It is not only our deserters who, despite their desire to the contrary who have found nothing to oppose to this analysis, but more and more this inevitable evolution of the situation becomes clear in the consciousness of all serious political movements and all serious political thought.

The difference between us and all others, including our deserters, is that we do not passively make this observation, we do not dream in the depths of our souls for another possible, more agreeable, easier evolution. But not wanting to lull ourselves with illusions, we attempt to act as of now in consequence of this position and in practice.

That is how we differ from all the centrists in particular who, frightened by the scope and the decisive character of the final struggle which is on its way, our caressing the sweet hopes of another evolution in the bottom of their soul, one which is theoretically possible but denied in practice by the real march of the situation.

Our deserters have raised a veritable hue and cry when the International in advance of the confirmation of events, but basing itself on the evolution of the situation toward war, set forth the general line of the policy which the Soviet bureaucracy and the mass CP's would be obliged to follow. This general line, which is not toward the right but a zig-zag, determines the dynamics and the perspective of the Stalinist movement in the countries where it has acquired a mass base.

To try to shake up the leadership of this movement from the outside between now and the outbreak of the war becomes impossible in the new conjuncture, and that is the primary reason which conditions the entrism tactic sui generis (of its own kind) within the ranks of this movement.

The second reason is provided by the observation that this movement will develop revolutionary tendencies, not through the conscious will of its leadership but through the pressure of the situation evolving toward war.

It is in these conditions that we have to seriously, responsibly reflect on the best way to influence the revolutionary process of the working class in all countries, where, today, on the eve of the final struggle, it is encased in large organizations which it will not want to leave before the test.

The question of entrism is posed in life.

The difficulties which we have encountered with this tactic arise from the training of some of our cadres in the previous period of independent struggle to attract and to organize workers around another pole of attraction.

There were among the most intransigent anti-entrists in England and in France workers who had been the banner-bearers of this tactic, correct in a given period, sectarian in another.

As your discussion comes to a close on the entrism tactic which you will henceforth have to apply in France, it appears necessary for me to once again insist on the following points:

A. Entrism neither destroys nor dissolves the Trotskyist organization, but transforms the terrain and the method of its work.

B. The publicity and propaganda field of our ideas (papers, magazines, pamphlets) as well as that of the revolutionary Marxist education of our members, does not disappear, on the contrary it should be extended.

Wherever we employ the entrism tactic we conceive of it with a parallel effort of still further disseminating the whole of our program, and our ideas, of making them live through various organs, papers, magazines, republication of the works of L. Trotsky, publication of pamphlets, etc. On the other hand, the Marxist revolutionary education of our members becomes more than ever a permanent, essential task. That is what we have been doing for sometime in

England, and that is what we should do on the same if not a larger scale, in countries where we apply an entrust tactic into the Stalinist movement. It is the task of the independent sectors to assure, to guide and to animate this essential activity.

C. We do not become propagandists of Stalinist ideas and methods, but skillful propagandists of ideas and methods of revolutionary Marxist struggle which, employed without the Trotskyist label, but concentrating upon one principal idea each time with the aim of activating the revolutionary maturing of the class without however being isolated from the movement and without being thrown out of it.

I would have this to say on the perspective of this tactic:

Before too long it will qualitatively transform our movement here in France and will give effectiveness to the active, conscious Marxist wing of the mass movement now influenced by the Stalinist leadership. Those of our members who for a certain time were in danger of degenerating because of the absence of an adequate milieu of work to fully develop their capacities, can now, as in England, become a leading cadre of a given sector of this movement.

Those of our comrades who have already begun to act in the spirit of the new tactic in the CGT trade unions, have been able to witness the qualitative change in their work, its effects on their own development when they act under the cover of being militants and cadres of the CGT (and not as militants of a third tendency labelled Trotskyist).

The same possibilities and the same effects for their own development will be concretized for our youth who will act as members of the UJRF (Stalinist youth organization), developing multiple initiatives (for example, organizing this organization themselves wherever it does not exist) and in reality little by little all our members (with a few notable exceptions) will find here and there some form of activity in the movement influenced by the Stalinist leadership.

Thus, after a relatively brief period of putting this tactic into practice, we will see as in England that the turn which we are realizing today, far from signifying a retreat -- by the fact that a certain number of our forces in France have for the moment preferred to follow the splitting leaders -- will on the contrary mark the most decisive step forward realized up to now by our movement in France.

Before us, in the several years to come, there will open the the perspective of the European Socialist Revolution, of the socialist revolution in Germany, in France, in Italy, in England.

This is now the next most probable stage of the development of the proletarian revolution in our time.

It is for this now relatively brief perspective, comrades, that you should prepare yourself as seriously as possible, that is to say, by integrating yourself firmly, with enthusiasm, with confidence

in the indestructible force of the program and of the ideas which we defend, within the real movement of the masses of your country, the movement which will be the force to evolve toward this revolution.

July 12, 1952

#

THE RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE TENTH PLENUM OF THE IEC
ON THE FRENCH SECTION

The Tenth Plenum of the IEC takes cognizance of the declaration of the representatives of the majority of the French section according to which they are ready to apply the decisions of this plenum regarding the tactical application of the line of the Third World Congress for France.

The IEC decides the following in order to resolve the organizational crisis of the French Section:

1. Until the next congress of the PCI the Political Bureau will be composed of the following comrades: Bleibtreu, Lambert, Renard, Garrive, for the majority; Frank, Privas, Michele Mestre for the minority, Albert representative of the IS designated by the IEC. The IS representative will have a decisive vote in case of a tie and will remain responsible for the work in France to the IS and the IEC during the three months following the congress of the PCI.
2. The congress of the party will take place toward the end of May 1952.
3. Preparatory discussion for this congress is based on the decisions of the Tenth Plenum of the IEC so far as the application of the line of the Third World Congress in France is concerned. The framework of the discussion will be fixed by a document emanating from the Political Bureau at the conclusion of the session of the IEC. The Political Bureau will contribute to the discussion, besides the documents of the World Congress and of the IEC, one or several documents of concrete application of this line in the essential spheres of party activity.
4. Within the framework of preparation for the congress, every member of the party -- including every member of the Political Bureau -- will have the right to express himself on all questions in discussion for this congress and to write whatever he believes necessary to defend his position, without prejudice to the capacity of the representative of the IS designated by the IEC to express the line of the IEC. The discussion will be carried on in an organized form and under the control of the Political Bureau.

5. The Secretariat of the party will be composed of four members: Comrades Bleibtreu and Lambert for the majority, Frank for the minority, Albert as representative for the IS with a decisive vote. Comrade Frank will be the political secretary; Comrade Lambert organization secretary, a comrade of the minority will be responsible for work in Stalinist front organizations; the other functions of leadership (the paper, trade union work, youth work) will continue to be carried on by comrades who are now in charge of it.

6. The members of the Central Committee who have been suspended will resume their positions with full rights. The Central Committee may be convened before the Congress if the Political Bureau deems it necessary.

7. Both tendencies on the central committee will make declarations relating to their acceptance of the present agreement. They will be brought to the attention of the International simultaneously with this agreement. Adopted unanimously.

#

RESOLUTION OF THE POLITICAL BUREAU ON THE FRAMEWORK OF THE
PREPARATORY DISCUSSION FOR THE CONGRESS (MARCH 31, 1952)

The Tenth Plenum of the IEC has opened the discussion in the PCI for its May 1952 congress. According to the statutes of the International and the meaning of democratic centralism on an international scale which is at the foundation of our world party this discussion in its essence should be based on the application for France of the decisions of the World Congress. The general meaning of this application is set forth by the political report adopted by the Tenth Plenum of the IEC.

In the following resolution the Political Bureau wants to set forth to all members of the party those problems which it deems necessary to consider resolved by the Third World Congress and the Tenth Plenum of the IEC and those problems which are now posed at the center of the discussion.

The Third World Congress and the Tenth Plenum of the IEC have set forth the following questions which are no longer in the realm of discussions for the party congress:

7. The orientation of the PCI should be entirely determined by the will to fuse shoulder to shoulder with the explosive revolutionary forces which are gathering within the Stalinist organizations with the aim of participating in organic fashion tied to these forces in the revolutionary risings of tomorrow which will allow the breaking of the hold of the Kremlin on the workers' movement. Therein is the profound meaning of the formula: To orient toward the communist workers. The concrete form of this orientation can only be a

combination of independent work and of entrust work within the Stalinist organizations or organizations in the control of the Stalinists. (CGT, UJRF, UFF, Henry Martin Committee, Peace Committee, United Trade Union Federations, United Trade Union Local, CPF, etc.) There is no question whatever of liquidating Trotskyism as an independent tendency in the workers political movement; on the contrary, a correct understanding of the situation can permit us to play an important role in the months to come. But what is involved is to understand that the independent organization should above all aid the entrust work by speaking in a language addressed essentially to the communist workers, and that the entrust work will broaden in scope as the war approaches.

#

DECLARATION OF THE BLEIBTREU-LAMBERT TENDENCY ON THE AGREEMENTS
CONCLUDED AT THE INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Ever since the Central Committee meeting of January 19 and 20, the Central Committee majority has affirmed its readiness to apply the tactical turn defined by the IS Bureau. It thus demonstrated once again its will for discipline, discipline which has been under all circumstances, total and impeccable in respect to the decisions of the World Congress and the French Commission of the World Congress, despite the strange accusation of "an undisciplined attitude" formulated by the IS Bureau.

But the Central Committee on January 20 refused to submit to the administrative measures taken by the IS Bureau in violation of the statutes of the International, because these measures were aimed to prevent a serious discussion of the problems posed by an entrust tactic, and to oppose the holding of its special Congress, and to destroy all guarantees of democracy in the party.

We unreservedly condemn the administrative methods employed by the IS Bureau, methods which the IEC could not approve but which it could only understand, methods which are the direct opposite of what a leadership should do when it has confidence in the correctness of its positions. Such methods are the price of political confusion and they express the logic of a revisionist tendency inside the International leadership which threatens the programmatic position of Trotskyism.

* * *

The political document adopted by the IEC is, in this respect, not free of confusion and contradictions, especially as it relates to the problem of Stalinism. Despite the confusion and the dangers of this document, the Central Committee majority will accept the discipline of the IEC because it is convinced that this discipline remains compatible with the defense, the safeguard and the reaffirmation of the programmatic ideas of Trotsky and his Transition Program; because it is sure that the Fourth International will in its entirety inevitably react against the threat of revisionism, as is

normal in an organization which represents the only programmatic and political capital of the proletarian revolution. In such an organization, temporary faults and deviations cannot find favorable objective roots.

* * *

The organizational resolution of the IEC on the French Question contains in itself a partial confirmation of this opinion. On a number of points it represents an implicit condemnation of the ultimatism of the IS Bureau. It represents a formal disavowal of the Bureau by its decision to the effect that a special Congress be held which will discuss the problems posed by entrism without slapping on in advance a censorship on the members of the leadership.

It does not call into question the need of the party's being led in practice by the members in whom the party has political confidence.

But on several points serious sacrifices have been imposed on us:

The first and most serious one is the denial to the Central Committee elected by the Seventh Congress of the right to designate its Political Bureau. A Political Bureau has been imposed which gives to a member of the IS, designated by the IEC for six months, and responsible to the IEC, a deciding voice which places him in the position of an arbiter in all disputed questions.

The same applies to the composition of the Secretariat.

Furthermore, the designation of Pierre Frank as Political Secretary was imposed on us against our will and we continue to consider this wrong for a number of reasons.

These measures were taken because the IEC, which could hear only two of the sixteen suspended comrades, was not sufficiently informed as to the reality hidden behind the accusation of an "undisciplined attitude" and has placed credence on the thesis of the IS which invoked "exceptional circumstances" as its justification.

* * *

Our acceptance of the decisions of the IEC demonstrates how erroneous and tendentious is the charge of being "undisciplined." How can one seriously affirm that a leadership representing the essential, living forces of the party, its big proletarian majority, seriously threatens the policy and the discipline of the International in January and in February accepts the decisions which were no different from the demands of the IS except for the guarantee of a discussion in a democratic congress which they include.

One cannot take seriously this story of a "menace" except if one thinks henceforth that democratic discussion of turns is a danger for the International leadership.

The majority of the Central Committee of the PCI has shown once again its unshakable will to preserve the unity of the party inside

the International and to oppose splits even at the cost of heavy concessions.

As to its political discipline it had no need of making such a demonstration for no exact charge could be made against it! It nevertheless affirmed that even if the IEC, by taking measures of expulsion and split, formally placed it outside the International, it would continue to apply the political line of the Third World Congress and of the organs elected by it.

The crisis terminated at the Tenth IEC Plenum is not an internal crisis of the PCI but a conflict which sprang up between a disciplined section of the International on the one hand and Pabloism on the other, which utilizes the confusions and contradictions of the World Congress -- where it could not impose itself -- in order to assert itself after the World Congress. The responsibility for the conflict is entirely the fault of those who on the occasion of a tactical turn call into question the programmatic basis of the International, launch attacks against the Transition Program and against the fundamental tenets of Trotskyism on the nature and on the role of the Soviet bureaucracy.

We remain, as we shall continue to remain, on the side of the International. We will continue to fight for the defense of the program and principles which are the foundation of our International, the world party of revolution.

#

LETTER FROM COMRADE ALBERT TO THE BLEIBTREU-LAMBERT TENDENCY

Comrades:

Having been refused the right by your leaders to speak to you, I am writing you my opinion on some of the important questions which you have been led to debate.

First of all, there is the question of your declaration on the question of the organizational agreement arrived at at the last Plenum of the IEC which is still pending. You must make a decision rapidly on this question. The IS will see whether it then has the need of sending the Organizational Resolution on the French Question to the sections alone or accompanied by the declaration of the minority, or accompanied by your first declaration. The latter will not fail to arouse a vehement reaction from the members of the IEC. In effect, it puts the decision taken by the IEC and the spirit in which that decision was taken in an absolutely false light. I do not think that it is in the interests of the French section to see a polemic started against it on the part of most of the members of the IEC which a declaration of the type of your first draft would inevitably provoke. No one asks you to remain silent on your opinions of the IEC agreement or to repudiate any of your political ideas. Say so briefly and simply, but without any useless and misplaced polemics on this occasion. If not, you will obtain not only from the

IS but from myself as well, I am sure as well as from other members of the IEC a response which such a polemic would deserve.

Then there is the question of your attitude toward the draft of the Political Resolution presented by Comrade Frank, a draft which is clarified by the resolutions of Comrades Michele Mestre (on trade union work) and by Privas (on entrism work). Even in the opinion of one of your representatives on the Political Bureau, Comrade Garrive, these documents represent the elaboration and the coherent application of the line of the 10th Plenum -- called "Entrism Sui Generis" (of its own type). We are naturally aware that you are in disagreement with this line, and consequently in disagreement with its application. However, the essential function of the 8th Congress of the party is not to listen to the expression of agreement or disagreement with this line but to apply the line. That is the way democratic centralism is applied on an international scale. After your national congress, the function of district meetings and unit meetings is not to discuss how well-founded are the decisions of your congress, but to discuss their application. After an international congress, the national conventions do not discuss in the first place how well-founded is its line, but rather its application.

In any case, your representatives at the 10th Plenum have taken the solemn engagement, by the resolution of agreement which they have accepted, to apply the line of the 10th Plenum. You know this very well, just as you know that there is no other way for you to be disciplined in the International after the party congress than to apply this line.

Consequently what is involved for you is to decide now what place the 8th Congress of the PCI will occupy on the road of the application of the line of the 10th Plenum, which means an important turn for the French section.

Either you will begin now to fight at the Congress "the coherent application of the line of the 10th Plenum" and thus, whether you wish or not, the whole of its line. In this case, the time remaining before the Congress of the party will in large part be devoted to a polemic which will not advance the party in its understanding of this line of "entrism sui generis," which will not make the party more capable of applying this line, which will increase its confusion, which will lower its cohesion, which will make the application of this line more dangerous in your opinion. You will thus not delay by a single day the application of this line, of which the great majority of the leadership of the International is convinced represents the only road to salvation for the party. You will only succeed in creating all the conditions under which the application of the line will occur with the maximum of havoc to the party. Is this really your aim? I still persist in not wanting to believe it.

Or on the other hand you can make known your different point of view from that of the minority on a certain number of questions of analysis of the situation, of political and social or economic evaluations, as well as on a certain number of proposals of concrete application of the line of the 10th Plenum made by the documents of the minority in this or that field of party activity, without placing in

question the whole of the application of the orientation of the 10th Plenum, which, in the opinion of the great majority of the International leadership, is also the application of the line of the World Congress for France.

In the first case, there will be no real discussion, but only a futile polemic which will convince no one. This polemic will be all the more futile in that it will be carried on, I hope, on the other hand with the conviction that the line of orientation which you will counterpose to the line contained in the documents of the minority, will not in any case be applied after the 8th Congress of the party, which, to remain disciplined in the International, will have to apply the orientation of the 10th Plenum in a coherent way. This would be an academic exercise unworthy of a revolutionary party, which would moreover cause enormous injury to the party by obliging it to effectuate a turn without cohesion or effective preparation. This would mean at the same time that it would be impossible for you to continue your role as leaders of the party after the Congress, whatever the results of the Congress. It would in effect be absurd for you to pretend to apply an orientation that you have violently fought on the very eve of its application and for which you have created an atmosphere of incomprehension or even of hostility within the party.

In the second case, there would be a really constructive discussion on each question you would raise, with the possibility of effective modification of the present documents, not only as to their letter but especially as to the orientation which will flow from that after the 8th Congress. There would then be the possibility of making a common effort within the party to better prepare to effectuate its difficult task. There would be the certainty that you would continue to play your role as leaders and that the organizational crisis which has raged in the party for more than a year would gradually disappear.

The first road which is not really to the interests of the party is the road that you will inevitably take if you adopt a "counter-document" to the documents presented by the comrades of the minority, which represent "the coherent application of the line of the 10th Plenum," even in the opinion of one of your leaders.

The second road, which represents the interests of the party, is the road you will take if you elaborate amendments, if need be numerous amendments, to the documents of the minority.

Once again, no one asks you to abandon your ideas. You are asked only to act as responsible leaders, recognizing in practice democratic centralism on the international scale: before International Congresses, discussions within the sections are centered around the determination of line; after International Congresses, the leaderships of all the sections have to make an effort to apply the adopted line in a coherent way whether they are in agreement with the line or not.

Whatever the decisions of the 8th Congress of the party, the line to be applied after the Congress will be that of "entrism sui generis": the division of the party into three sectors, one sector

immediately realizing the entry, a second modifying its activity to be able to activate the entrust turn within the near future, a third continuing independent work. This regroupment of the party requires the revision of all sectors of activity, which is set forth by the documents of the minority. At the same time, it guarantees the continuation of independent work, with La Verite and other organs, with its trade union activity and its own youth work, with its recruitment and the satisfying of all its inherent needs. To discuss anything else from now to the Congress is in fact to have a Congress for nothing, to demoralize and disintegrate the party. Do not take decisions which will put such responsibilities upon you.

In discussing the agreement which took place at the 10th Plenum with your leaders, I have not left with them the slightest doubt that above all this agreement means the application of the line of the 10th Plenum, and the preparation of the party through an ample and constructive discussion for the best application of this line. At the time your leaders gave the impression of having understood that fundamentally and of not having any illusion about the possibility of elaborating "an intermediary line" of compromise between yours, as a minority in the International, and ours, that of the overwhelming majority of the International. They repeated that the only thing they desired from the agreement were organizational guarantees of such a discussion, as well as guarantees as to the existing regime within the party from the point of view of democratic centralism. However unjustified were such fears and suspicions which hide behind such demands for "guarantees," I never hesitated to give them sincerely. What has happened in the party since the conclusion of the agreement should confirm to you the complete loyalty and sincerity with which they have been applied on my part. It is not I who have fled political discussion. It is not I who have proposed or encouraged the slightest organizational measure tending to limit what is in fact the exercise of the daily leadership of the party by your tendency. Remove all unreasonable fears on this score from your mind. Our desire is to be able to collaborate with you in the leadership of the party. That this collaboration should base itself on the line of the 10th Plenum. It is not "capitulation" which is demanded of you, but the accomplishment of a duty which every Communist should consider it an honor to carry out.

With fraternal greetings,

Albert

#

RESOLUTION OF THE POLITICAL BUREAU OF THE PCI

May 3, 1952

(4 for -- Frank, Privas, Albert, M. Mestre; 3 against -- Bleibtreu, Gernier, Lambert)

In rejecting the document submitted as a draft of a Political Resolution by Comrades Bleibtreu, Lambert, Renard and Garrive, the Political Bureau is obliged to state the following to the entire party:

In form as in essence this document is a flagrant violation of the agreement concluded at the 10th Plenum by the representatives of the majority of the party, and of the guide-text adopted by them at the Political Bureau at the time of the opening of the preparatory discussion for the 8th Plenum of the party.

The line of the 10th Plenum, is that of entrism sui generis, the independent party adapting its evolution and its tasks to the primary needs of the entrism sector which should be progressively extended. The draft of the Political Resolution, which has been rejected, defines as the line the refusal of entrism, and substitutes for it a limited "fraction work" only for comrades who are not rooted in the working class.

Far from trying to apply the line of the 10th Plenum in France, to which however the comrades of the majority of the party on several occasions and in a solemn way committed themselves, their document fights this line fundamentally. It does so moreover in a veiled and dissembling way without daring to clearly counterpose a different orientation to it, feigning to ignore the decisions taken at the 10th Plenum and thus sowing the worst confusion in the party. The maneuverist character of the proposals of the majority of the party appear more clearly in their offer to adopt -- with amendments -- the document on entrism presented by Comrade Privas, while their draft of the Political Resolution implicitly and explicitly rejects the orientation put forward by Comrade Privas. That is why the majority of the Political Bureau has decided to incorporate this document in the Political Resolution adopted at the Political Bureau meeting of March 20, and to present both documents which form a single whole before the Congress of the party.

The party is placed before the need of an important and difficult turn in all spheres of its activity. This turn, made necessary by changing events in the objective situation has in any case been decided by the responsible organisms of the International. The draft of the Political Resolution presented by the majority of the 7th Congress of the party constitutes both a refusal to execute a turn, an attempt to do everything to prevent this turn from being effectuated rapidly, freely and with enthusiasm by the party, and an inability to counterpose an alternative to the path of party-building decided upon by the International leadership. The new Political Bureau cannot otherwise characterize such a document except as an undertaking of demoralization, division and disintegration of the party. The document presented by Comrades Bleibtreu, Lambert, Renard and Garrive was elaborated outside of the Political Bureau

and blocking all activity of the political committee for four weeks, without any discussion with Comrade Albert, who is responsible for the French section to the IEC, all the above mentioned comrades agreeing that he is quite capable of correctly interpreting the line of the Tenth Plenum. This document is the fruit of their refusal of correctly interpreting the line of the Tenth Plenum. This document is the fruit of their refusal for such a preliminary discussion which has been repeated in spite of repeated efforts by Comrade Albert in that direction. Under these conditions the very manner in which the document has been drawn up cannot otherwise be characterized by the Political Bureau than as a premeditated act of hostility to the line of the International, which is incompatible with commitments made at the Tenth Plenum. This document has no other aim than to perpetuate the crisis and the paralysis of the party.

At the same time it confirms the intention of the leaders of the majority tendency to continue an uninterrupted and violent factional struggle for the whole period of application of the line decided upon by the International, a period during which, according to the statutes of the International such a struggle should be removed completely to the background. On the part of the responsible leaders of the majority tendency in the party this represents a real rupture with the elementary organizational principles of Bolshevism. The Political Bureau consequently will be obliged to address itself to the next IEC meeting and to demand of it that for a long period the comrades responsible for such actions which are prejudicial to the party be considered disqualified as a tendency to exercise any post of leadership in the party.

The majority of the Political Bureau, designated by the Tenth Plenum, has sedulously abstained from manifesting itself as such in any way whatever despite the open and repeated actions of hostility toward the International on the part of representatives of the Political Bureau of the majority of the party (a campaign against the publication of the report of the Tenth Plenum in Quatrieme Internationale; the draft of the political resolution now presented, the maintenance of the declaration on the agreement of the Tenth Plenum which distorts the meaning of this agreement, etc....). It is only after these acts have accumulated, that it is now firmly decided to act collectively to execute the mandate which it has received from the Tenth Plenum: to defend the International and its political orientation in the French section.

The draft of the political resolution rejected by the Political Bureau runs the risk of diverting the discussion before the Eighth Congress and at the Congress itself in the meanderings of an academic futile polemic which is without any practical interest to the party. After the congress of the party it is the whole of the party which will have to apply, and to apply immediately, the line of the Tenth Plenum to remain disciplined to the International, to utilize possibilities which are open now more than ever in France. The Political Bureau calls upon the entire party to ignore the sterile polemic begun by the representatives of the majority and to pose for itself one single aim in the discussion before the congress: how to arm the party to the maximum for the most effective, the most fruitful possible application of the line already decided upon. Only this line permits the integration of Trotskyism in the revo-

lutionary struggles which are coming. Only this line permits the building of a genuine revolutionary leadership. For all districts and all units of the party there is only one slogan from now to the congress: Study and work to apply the line of the Tenth Plenum.

The Political bureau decides that the present declaration, together with Comrade Albert's letter to the majority tendency on April 22, be made known immediately to the entire party. It demands of the IS to also make them known to all members of the IEC.

#

Note: The following resolution is the resolution adopted by the Bleibtreu-Lambert tendency. It was read by Bleibtreu at the Eleventh Plenum of the IEC and has never been distributed in the PCI by its authors.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE CONFERENCE OF THE MAJORITY OF THE PCI

Meeting on June 3, 1952, the national conference of cadres of the majority tendency has examined the situation in the party and its relation with the International Secretariat.

Having heard the report of Comrade Albert, characterized by the reporter himself as an ultimatum and which signifies the prohibition of all political expression of the majority of the party in the discussion for the Eighth Congress and in the Congress itself, the conference has to draw the conclusion that this is a violation of the agreements arrived at the Tenth Plenum.

These agreements were based on the following points:

1. The majority accepted the constitution of the Political Bureau controlled by the minority, by virtue of the deciding vote accorded to the member of the IS designated by the IEC for a period covering the preparation of the Congress and for three months thereafter.

2. The IEC decided on the holding of a democratic congress which would guarantee the democratic expression of tendencies, of the submission of documents to a vote of the congress before treating of the problems defined in the guiding-document, total freedom of expression on all questions being moreover recognized for all members of the party, including members of the Political Bureau.

In order to remain in the International the majority accepted a minority leadership on the one condition that the Eighth Congress be democratically prepared.

To claim that the utilization of this right recognized by the IEC shows a lack of discipline, on the pretext that the minority expresses "the line of the IEC" and that the majority has disagreements with it, and to threaten the majority with sanctions for not having rallied purely and simply to the resolutions of the minority is to directly violate the agreement and to unmask a crude ruse perpetrated on the IEC and to the French Section.

Thus are explained the reasons because of which obstacles were created, first by ruse for several months, then by veto, to the publication of the declaration of the majority on the meaning of its acceptance of the agreement of the Tenth Plenum.

In his letter of May 23, and more clearly in his intervention of that day, and more clearly in his speech of that day, Comrade Albert eliminates all possibility of tendency expression in the discussion for the congress; according to him, the presentation of any kind of a political document by the majority is declared prescribed. The only out that he offers for the majority, is to draft in common with the minority a technical document of application and to withdraw all political documents under penalty of sanctions and its declarations on the agreements of the 10th Plenum.

The duplicity of such a proposal appears clearly in the refusal of Comrade Albert and the minority to accept the motion and a joint vote on the document on the practical problems of entrism, which is acceptable insofar as it is based completely in the sphere of underground activity. On such a basis, the numerical proportion between the entrism sector and the independent sector appeared as a secondary problem on which an agreement was possible.

The rejection of this possibility by Comrade Albert and the minority clearly demonstrates that their aim is not the realization of some kind of strategy by the party as a whole, but the political hara-kiri of the majority and its destruction.

This organizational attitude confirms our worst premonitions on the Political Resolution of the minority, in the form of a hypocritical exegesis of the documents of the 10th Plenum, which affirmed: "The independent sector maintains all present essential activities in the factories, the trade unions, the youth, and continues to recruit, from among the best elements within the ranks of the Stalinist movement on the part of our militants who carry on entrism work." They now take the obverse of this position and piece by piece destroy all the necessary activities for the existence of the independent organization.

It confirms the uneasiness caused among all members of the party by the publication in Quatrieme Internationale of the report of the 10th Plenum, an act whose significance has been correctly defined by the resolution presented by the majority members of the Political Bureau.

It clarifies the meaning of the opposition of the minority leaders to all criticism of the policy of the CP manifested among other things at the time of the publication of an article in La Verite on the Billoux report, an article which was reproached for not being content with emphasizing only the positive aspects of the turn, when the report of the 10th Plenum declared: "Our organs have the duty to fully develop our entire policy, in all its themes, to make a clear, unequivocal, concrete criticism of Stalinist policy, etc....without any limitations other than that of the language and the form which should be thought out in a manner to find a growing echo from the Stalinist workers and militants."

It appears evident today that the political differences have deepened, leading to incompatibility of the reciprocal paralysis of the tendencies.

Such a situation cannot be perpetuated without serious harm to the existence of the party and for its activities either in the entrust sector or in the independent sector.

In recent months, the struggle of the tendencies has only accentuated, causing a growing paralysis of the party. This could not be otherwise because of the fact that the minority, after the 10th Plenum and although it had obtained control of the Political Bureau, organized itself as a faction with a weekly meeting of all its members in a permanent headquarters. This unjustifiable factional activity has had only negative expressions such as the organized abstention of participation in the campaign for the circulation and the defense of La Verite.

In all spheres the minority had adopted a factional attitude of undermining the independent sector.

It has placed the party in the worst situation. In the sphere of organization and of activity as well as on the political plane, on the very problem of the existence of the party, such an incompatibility has been manifested between the tendencies as to neutralize and nullify the capacity of the French section for action.

Because of this fact, to attempt to maintain the status quo would be to court disaster. It is necessary to get out of it, to create the condition of genuine cooperation preserving the achievements of Trotskyism in France.

This in no case can be achieved by means of ultimatism, threats, sanctions, suspensions or expulsions.

The only road open, consistent with the need of combining the two forms of work, entrust and independent, is the adoption of a solution comparable to the one which exists in Austria; the recognition by the IEC of two organizations of the Fourth International in France.

In this way only the organizational and human conquests of Trotskyism can be safeguarded in France. In this way only can the correctness of this or that orientation be verified in experience. If it has confidence in its orientation, the IS should make itself the defender of such a solution, for the confirmation of its views through experience alone can eradicate all suspicions.

The recognition of the independent organization provides guarantees of discipline and expression on public political actions of the independent organization, which no one can deny, is based entirely on the programmatic foundations of Trotskyism.

* * *

The national conference of the majority unanimously rejects the ultimatum of Comrade Albert and addresses itself to the IEC to request

it to adopt the position which will permit a positive settlement of an impasse which can no longer continue.

It places confidence in the IEC to reject any ultimatic and destructive position.

It warns unequivocally that any measure of suspension, of sanctions, even veiled or deferred, against representatives of the tendency in the leadership, that any veto of a democratic discussion for the Congress will be considered as a splitting measure, of exclusion and of destruction of the PCI.

Such a measure will automatically be a splitting measure for which the International leadership will bear full responsibility.

The proletarian majority of the party is certain that the IEC will act with discernment, with a will to preserve the unity of the International and all its achievements, and will adopt the proposal for the recognition of two organizations in France.

(Adopted unanimously)

#

RESOLUTION OF THE 11th PLENUM OF THE IEC ON THE FRENCH PCI
(French Section of the Fourth International)

June 1952

Having heard and approved the general line of the report of its responsible representatives to the French section, the 11th Plenum of the IEC approves the general line of the report and:

Notes that the documents prepared for the 8th Congress of the PCI by the majority tendency of the 7th Congress are in contradiction with the line of orientation decided for France by the 10th Plenum of the IEC, and that despite the agreement made by the leaders of this tendency to apply the line of the 10th Plenum and to maintain the preparatory discussions of the 8th Congress within the framework of the application of this line;

Notes that the documents for the 8th Congress of the PCI adopted by the Political Bureau in their general lines conform to the decisions of the 10th Plenum;

Therefore decides:

1. From now to the 8th Congress of the PCI, no change will take place in the composition in the leading organisms of the party. The preparatory discussion will take place without any restrictions on the right of any member to freely express political conceptions.

2. After the Eighth Congress, the PCI as a whole should, in order to remain disciplined to the International, carry out the decisions in the documents proposed to the congress by the present Political Bureau.

3. After repeated violations of promises made before the International, and obvious obstructions placed in the application and preparation of the line of the Tenth Plenum on the part of the leaders of the majority tendency, they can no longer be considered either as inclined or as capable of leading the party on the road of an adequate application of this line.

4. For this reason the Central Committee and the Political Bureau designated by the Eighth Congress of the party will be composed of a majority of comrades who, in advance of the congress, will have defended the line of the Eleventh Plenum within the party.

5. All those who, after the Eighth Congress, refuse to apply the decisions in the documents adopted by the present Political Bureau, or refuse to recognize the leadership constituted conforming to point four of the present resolution, will automatically place themselves outside of the International and of its French section.

The Eleventh Plenum of the IEC reaffirms that it does not ask of any member of the PCI to abandon his political opinions or does it seek the suppression of his rights to participate or to organize a faction. It demands only that the necessary guarantees be given for the application in disciplined action of a political line which the overwhelming majority of the International considers as the only line which will reform the French organization, will restore its growth and will lay the basis for the construction of the future revolutionary leadership of the French proletariat.

That is why it calls upon all members, cadres and leaders of the majority tendency to join in advance of the Eighth Congress in the elaboration of practical measures of application of the line of the Tenth Plenum. The maximum of comrades ready to do that should be integrated in the organisms of leadership designated by the Eighth Congress within the framework of point four of the present resolution.

The IEC instructs the IS to address a letter to the PCI explaining and motivating the adoption of the present resolution and the rejection of the proposal of the PCI for a division into two distinct organizations each having its own leadership.

#

UNITY OF THE PARTY WITHIN THE INTERNATIONAL

Letter of the International Executive Committee to all Members of the French PCI:

Comrades:

The Eleventh Plenum of the IEC has had to concern itself once more with the evolution of the French section. The preparatory documents for the Eighth Congress of the party have obliged us to reexamine the situation in your organization and the developments of the factional struggle which divides it. This was inevitable from the moment when it found itself face to face with documents elaborated by the majority which came from the Seventh Congress of the party, the documents being manifestly contrary to the line established for the French organization by the Tenth Plenum of the IEC.

The Principal Political Differences

Analyzing the situation of the French workers movement and its dynamics, within the framework of our international perspective, the Tenth Plenum of the IEC arrives at the conclusion that the first stage of the revolutionary upsurge in France would be opened by the anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist action primarily by the militant workers of the CP. To actively and effectively participate in these actions, to be able to influence them in the sense of the construction of a new revolutionary leadership, it is necessary to, in advance of the decisive events, to integrate the maximum of our members within the Stalinist and Stalinist-front organizations. This idea, textually repeated by the Resolution of the Political Bureau on the framework of the preparatory discussion of the 8th Congress -- a resolution approved unanimously by all the representatives of the majority of the party -- is the central idea of the strategy of the construction of the party as the International conceives it. This idea is explicitly rejected by the draft of the political report presented by the majority (page 19, last paragraph; page 23, last three paragraphs; page 17, next to the last paragraph which explicitly postpones the entrism turn to some future time).

Drawing the organizational conclusions from this strategy of the building of the party, the International decided that the documents of the 10th Plenum of the IEC on the application of the tactic of entrism sui generis in France, that is to say the existence both of an independent sector and of an entrism sector, the first being subordinated to the needs of the second and continuing all of its own activities (recruitment, press, youth work, trade union work, etc.) and while naturally defending the entirety of the Trotskyist program. The guiding text adopted unanimously by the Political Bureau, including the representatives of the majority, clearly expressed the same idea: "What is involved is understanding that the independent organization above all aids the entrism work, by speaking a language addressed essentially to the Communist workers, and that entrism work will broaden to the degree that war approaches." The draft of the political report presented by the majority for the 8th Congress expresses the opposite idea: that entrism work ("fraction work") in Stalinist organizations remains necessarily

subordinated to independent work up to the war or to the revolutionary upsurge. (Page 19, 3rd paragraph, etc.)

Analyzing the special tasks which flow from the present situation of the French workers' movement so far as the independent sector is concerned, the 10th Plenum of the IEC had arrived at the conclusion that the organization of an independent tendency within the CGT is no longer justified. The trade union document presented by the majority to the 8th Congress of the party continues the whole of the old trade union orientation of the building of an independent trade union tendency around a national union paper.

On the fundamental questions of orientation, the documents prepared for the 8th Congress of the party by the majority tendency are therefore opposed to the line of the 10th Plenum which this tendency had however promised to apply. On the contrary, the preparatory documents for the 8th Congress of the party adopted by the Political Bureau now functioning in the PCI based themselves as a whole on the line of the 10th Plenum. Under penalty of calling into question the seriousness of its convictions in its own line, the International leadership could not fail to examine the consequences which flow from the presentation of documents thus characterized to the Congress of the party.

The Political Differences in the Light of Recent Events

The documents prepared by the majority tendency do not limit themselves to presenting a line of orientation opposed to that of the 10th Plenum. They still conduct a veiled polemic against this line which can only sow confusion and make still more difficult the understanding by the whole of the PCI of what the International wishes and says. (See especially pages 15-17 of the political report of the majority.)

However, the problem under discussion is not so complicated. Up to the spring of 1951, the whole of the party had a common conception, which was correct for the past up to the end of 1950, as to the strategy of the building of the party. This conception was expressed as follows in the Resolution of the Central Committee of the party at the time:

"At the stage the party is today, it will be able to strengthen itself numerically, to win over, to organize and to educate a proletarian vanguard in its ranks and to solidly extend its influence if it is capable of demonstrating above all in action its capacity to organize and to lead currents which aspire to independence (the two blocs) in and around the working class, in order to strengthen ourselves as the pole of attraction for the Stalinist militants...."

This conception of the building of the party, flowing from the organization under our leadership of more or less different peripheral currents "aspiring to independence from the two blocs," was effectively applied by the party: the brigades, "Unite," MRJ, etc. Such a conception is no longer applicable today. The reason for this is not only because these "currents" tend to disappear with the polarization of class forces on an international and national scale,

but especially because even hypothetical successes in the organization of such currents will not make our liason with the vanguard communist militants easier but more difficult. They will no longer feel themselves drawn to a "more effective" organization, but only to the clearest, most unequivocal affirmation of the defense of the USSR, the Peoples' Democracies, China, the colonial revolution, of a communist and revolutionary strategy in France itself, of a revolutionary and communist struggle against the approaching war.

Now, these vanguard communist militants of the CPF are the essential elements who will constitute the revolutionary party of tomorrow. To fight at their side regardless of the conditions, even when they fight momentarily isolated from the effective support of the large working masses and from "independent currents," as on February 12, as of May 28 and June 4, is a question of life and death for our future fusion with this vanguard and our program. The choice of the principal milieu of activity of the party is therefore posed in an imperative manner. This principal milieu can only be that of the vanguard militant communist workers in the CPF. It can only be those who on May 28 were armed with clubs and not those who remained at home. And as these militants will not be ready to leave their party in a period of accentuated struggle with the bourgeoisie against it, and of the radicalization of its line in action, the only road in practice to find this milieu of work, so as to integrate the maximum of our forces within it, is entry within the Stalinist mass organizations and within the CPF itself.

The representatives of the majority tendency counterpose no other coherent conception to this clear and unambiguous conception of the building of the party. They no longer defend the old orientation of the 7th Congress; they do not present any new conception. All their efforts are brought to bear to diminish the understanding and the application of the new orientation, surrounding it with reservations, conditions, and restrictions which are so numerous that they become inoperative in practice.

However, recent events have confirmed the orientation defended by the International in a striking manner. Can one really still doubt that there is a real left turn of CPF, not only in slogans but also in action? Can one seriously call into question the effect of this radicalization, bureaucratic as it is, on the militants of the vanguard, and speak of a "lack of combativity of the militants for diplomatic objectives" after the Ridgeway demonstration? Can one really still speak of a "false problem of consolidation" after May 28 and June 4? Of course, it is not all of the masses who vote for the CPF or the CGT to whom our characterization of growing combativity applies, of the hardening of the revolutionary aspirations, of consolidation around the CPF. To our mind these characteristics in France apply in the first place to the 30, 40 or 50,000 militant communist vanguard workers in the factories. These are the vanguard communist militants who constitute the bulk of the forces of the revolutionary party of tomorrow. These are the militants who remain the general staff of the working class and who will lead the great battles of tomorrow, when the masses are ready to engage in such battles. These are the militants who represent the decisive elements for the victory or the defeat of the future French revolution. These

are the militants with whom we are trying at all costs to connect ourselves; it is they who constitute our essential milieu of work on which we will concentrate our members.

Necessity of Independent Organization

It is precisely because our entire conception of the building of the party is connected to the necessity of integrating ourselves into this vanguard milieu, of step by step aiding in its progress, through its own experience which we should share with it in the application in practice of our program, that the maintenance of the independent organization is indispensable in our opinion.

The consolidation of the vanguard communist militants around their party does not exclude but on the contrary implies that these militants are posing again and again numerous questions as to the ineffectiveness of the policy put forward by the leaders of their party today as yesterday. Never since 1944 have these militants been as solidly attached to their party as on May 28 and June 4. Never, however, have they posed so many questions as after these two actions, which have clearly manifested the gulf between the communist vanguard and the broad masses who are not for the moment ready to follow it in their advance actions by according it all of their sympathy.

Entrism is necessary because even the best constructive criticism made from the outside will not permit our militants to effectively connect themselves to the vanguard communist militants. The maintenance of the independent organization is necessary because even the most effective entrism work cannot, at the present stage, respond within the CPF to the questions and the doubts which are being raised by these vanguard militants. The combination of entrism work and of independent work, is the combination between integration of the vanguard communist milieu and its political propulsion -- two tasks which cannot yet coincide at the present stage. It is for the purpose of safeguarding all future possibilities without failing to prepare this future from now on.

The accusations of the majority of the party against the International that it desires to eliminate independent work are absurd. The two principal proposals of independent activity in recent months have been made in the Political Bureau by members of the International Secretariat: the proposal to draft a program of action of the party around the united front and a government of the united front, as well as the proposal for participation in the partial elections in the second sector of the Seine district. The differences do not concern the maintenance of the independent sector but of its function. At bottom, leaders of the majority tendency are nostalgic for for the good old days and are trying to orient the independent sector toward the old tasks "of organization and of leadership of independent currents." The International on the contrary affirms that the independent sector should reorient its activity in the sense described above, in order to organically complement the work of the entrism sector. It is convinced that it is only on this road that the independent sector will be able to recruit new forces for Trotskyism in France. Only a correct political orientation will result in organizational strengthening. An orientation of work which no longer corresponds to reality will never obtain any organizational successes.

Impossibility of an "English" Solution

For the same reason an "English" solution is absolutely inoperative in France. (To speak of an "Austrian" solution is absurd, for neither of the two Austrian organizations carries on independent work; in Austria there are two clandestine organizations all of whose work is carried on in the SP). For the International, entrlist work sui generis implies the maintenance of an independent and public organization and press. The division of the party into two organizations should not consequently result in two independent organizations, each with its public press and agitation, which is indispensable to the success of entrlist work. This would be an absurd solution which would make a mockery of our International and would discredit it if there would be two French organs published in France, both speaking in the name of the International with a different language and political orientation!

To that another thing has to be added. The International is convinced that the course proposed by the majority document is a course of suicide for the organization. It is convinced that an orientation which goes counter to what is required by the objective situation is condemned to rapid decomposition. For that it has an eloquent precedent: precisely what happened to Haston's organization. The formal continuance of Haston's organization in the International did not save it from the decomposition that resulted from its false orientation. At the close of its evolution, more than 90% of its members were outside of our movement. Despite the unforeseen success and the expansion of the entrlist work in Great Britain, only an infinite minority of the Hastonite organization was able to integrate itself into this work, after the irreparable loss of years for decisive integration. The International does not desire to carry on a worse policy toward its French section. It does not want to accept as an accomplished fact the loss of 90% of the members of the majority faction. It does not merely wish to preserve appearances. It desires to maintain the whole of the party united in the International. It cannot accept the proposal which in its spirit definitively seals the fate of the majority of the party.

These comrades have said: The separation of the organization into two groups will permit the test of experience and convince one or the other. Why the haste? Why not give the party the necessary time to learn from experience? Those who use this language show that they have not yet understood the acceleration of the pace of events, that even the Ridgeway demonstration has not yet taught them anything. Can one reasonably believe that we have before us four to six years before the decisive events in France, as was the case when we applied the separation in England? Is it not obvious that we have already experienced a great delay in the application of the new orientation in France, given the brief period which separates us from decisive events and the still necessary period for integration into an organization we are entering? Is it not obvious that we are about to lose, because of the party crisis, a unique opportunity to rapidly realize the integration of the maximum of our forces, which occurred during recent events when the communist militants, having to fight in isolation against the bourgeoisie, were so much more open to all practical action of solidarity at their side? The

party as a whole has to know how to carry on such actions of solidarity, but it has lost an exceptional and favorable occasion to realize our new orientation, that is to say, to derive organizational conclusions from these actions, which were favored by numerous approaches made to our members by members of the CPF themselves.

Why Has the Crisis Broken Out So Suddenly?

The representative of the French majority of the IEC read a resolution to it adopted by "the national conference of the cadres of the majority faction," meeting on June 3, which up to then was concealed from the leadership of the party and the IS. This declaration, reinforced by oral declarations of Bleibtreu's to the IEC, represents an open and calculated threat of split. It declares in advance against accepting any organizational solution which would be taken by the International on the pretext that such a solution would represent "a veiled or deferred sanction" against the majority leaders.

This resolution sharply aggravates the party crisis and extends it to the point of a split and a break with the Fourth International.

Such a decision of extreme gravity, taken by leaders of the majority faction, seeks in vain for justification in the attitude of the IS or a representative of the IEC toward this tendency. The affirmations contained on this score in the resolution cannot otherwise be characterized than as lies.

Never has the IS, nor the representative of the IEC in the Political Bureau limited the right of discussion of any member of the party whatever. Never has the IS nor the representative of the IEC limited the right of the constitution of factions within the party. On the contrary, in Comrade Albert's letter to the majority faction as well as in his oral declaration made before the June 3 meeting -- a speech made at the beginning of this meeting which then took place without his participation, despite his demand formulated before the leaders of this tendency to be able to participate in the meeting at least partially -- explicitly confirms that as in any Trotskyist organization, freedom of discussion before the Congress will be full and complete in the PCI.

The present session of the IEC has once again and solemnly confirms the same rights in order to remove from those who are preparing a split all possible pretext and to make short shrift of all the slander.

In reality something else is involved. What is involved is a necessary choice between freedom of discussion as an oppositional and minority tendency in the International, and the responsibilities as a leadership of a section, whose task is to prepare an adequate application of the line of the International.

What Comrade Albert said and wrote to you, and what the International repeats to you today, comrades of the majority, is this: You cannot demand both the prerogatives of an opposition and those of leadership in the period following the World Congress and the 10th

Plenum. Either you conduct yourselves as an opposition continuing the fight and to obstruct the application of the line. In this case, the effective application of the line requires another leadership and you yourself will have to decide, if you want to be honest and loyal to the International, to abandon the leadership voluntarily. Or you have to commit yourself to apply the line of the International, as you did in the 10th Plenum. Thus the discussion on your part has to limit itself to problems of application, and cannot call into question the line itself. You yourselves have taken a commitment in this sense by voting for the document at the Political Bureau meeting. It is by breaking this commitment, of which your resolution of June 3 does not breathe a word, just as it is completely silent on the primary basis of the agreement of the 10th Plenum, which was the agreement made by your leaders to apply the line of the 10th Plenum that you are terribly aggravating the crisis of the party.

The International Is the Only Possible Framework
for Revolutionary Activity

Therein is the entire functioning of the International, therein are all the principles of democratic centralism which have been called into question by the attitude of the cadres of the majority faction and their resolution of last June 3. In substance this resolution says to the International: We are in disagreement with your line. We want full rights to fight it. At the same time we do not want to abandon the leadership of the party. Anything that you may do to guarantee the application of your line, whether in the framework of the statutes or not, we will split.

The International, under peril of destroying its own foundation, cannot cede to such blackmail. It declares before the French party: we have fully guaranteed all rights of expression of International minorities, we will continue to strictly guarantee these rights. But at the same time we have the duty toward the French overwhelming majority of the International to give all guarantees that its line is effectively applied. After having reposed our confidence for almost a year in the majority of the PCI and in its formal commitments of disciplined conduct, we note the evidence of destruction made of this application; we note the rupture of commitments made by the majority leaders, and we confer the leadership of the party, as we have the right to do according to the statutes of the movement, to those who have shown themselves ready to apply the line. After having fully enjoyed the rights of an international minority, the majority tendency has now to demonstrate its will to fulfill its duties as an international minority.

To refuse to observe these duties, is to trample upon the principles of democratic centralism and to break with Bolshevism in practice.

Irresponsible elements in the majority tendency are beginning to employ a more significant language: after all, what is the International? Above all it is the program. It is not much else. The leadership is very weak. For the most part, its organizations are a bluff. If we leave, we will still apply the program. That is what matters.

This is the language that the right-wingers literally employed before their split with the International. It must be clearly said: Such language is the language of people who are preparing to betray Trotskyism!

The International above all is the program. But a program is embodied in an organization, in cadres, in a common living experience, in continual development, and not only on a printed paper. The International has certainly neither Lenin nor Trotsky in its leadership. But it possesses today something that it has never possessed: solidly rooted cadres in the movements of their respective countries, who have begun to apply in practice its program and have enriched it and are daily enriching it with experiences which can only be derived from practice. This collective experience for the first time has permitted the constitution of a collective, homogeneous, international leadership spread over the five continents whose bonds are, as is evident to anyone who knows the extreme weakness of our apparatus, pure bonds of ideas, of common orientation. That is an indestructible force because of the solidity of its conviction. Never in the past has such a cadre existed on a world scale. All working class actions, all the experiences of struggle in 40 countries, are subsumed in the experiences, the ideas and the practice of this cadre. Outside of it, no effective revolutionary action is possible in the world.

Policy today is world policy. Even the most perspicacious genius would be incapable of elaborating such a policy in his head, his private chamber, his city or his country alone. "Trotskyism in one country" is the worst of aberrations. The collective international elaboration of the political line, the constant verification of the general orientation by concrete experiences in the principal countries of the world is required to arrive at a correct analysis of the world situation and consequently to fix a correct line of action. Outside of this collective elaboration, there is place only for abstraction or crass empiricism. It is precisely because the majority tendency has been engaged for a year and a half in "elaborating" outside of the collective experience of the International that it has inevitably piled up errors and political incomprehension, every break with the international Trotskyist organization will inevitably lead to a break with the Trotskyist program.

Nothing would be more lightminded and irresponsible than to play with the idea of the International. Our entire movement, our entire tradition is based essentially on this idea. Each International incarnates the historic interest of the proletariat in a given epoch of struggle, of defeats and of victories of the international proletariat. Gigantic events upsetting the life of millions of men are necessary to decide the fate of an International. Is there someone among the members of the majority tendency who would pretend that such events have proved that the Fourth International has failed in its task, and that it is necessary to build a new International? But how explain that such ideas appear only in France? Or is it necessary to make contact with other supporters of a new International: Muniz, Shachtman, the Bordiguists? Unless they reply to such questions, the principal militants have no right to

break with the International. They can say at the utmost that their International is seriously wrong, that its errors have even the gravest effect, but that as long as there is no other historical implement of the world revolution than the Fourth International, then anything is preferable than to separate oneself from it. It is therefore necessary to apply the decisions, to submit to its discipline, and, by preserving its ideas, its factional rights and its right of expression, to wait for new conditions which will demonstrate to the international majority that they are wrong.

The Break With The International
Is A Break With Trotskyism And The Revolution

At a time when this threat of split is held over the International and its French section, the International Executive Committee again solemnly addresses itself to the members, cadres and leaders of the majority faction in the PCI so as to keep them from the road of political suicide which they are taking.

Reflect on the course that you have followed for eighteen months, comrades of the majority. Reflect on the succession of differences between you and the International. This struggle began with your criticism of the IS letter to the Yugoslav Communist party which you consider too "violent." Who have events proved right? You recollect your differences on the Thesis of the 9th Plenum? Do you recollect your differences on the time element of the war, on the conclusion of a compromise between the Kremlin and Wall Street, on the character "of the war of the bureaucracy"? Do you recollect your characterization of the documents of the World Congress as "confused" on the question of Stalinism? Slipping from position to position; silently abandoning one after another the differences which were proclaimed the day before with such violence, you have now come to the point of preparing a break with the International on differences about which you use the term "confusion" while events have proved you wrong time after time!

How explain this astonishing evolution? How explain the fact that while all of the sections moved through discussion to a common line, you removed yourself further and further from this common line? All the members of the IEC have indignantly rejected the slanders of your leaders on "the manipulation of the apparatus" of the National. This is not only insulting but ridiculous for anyone who knows our international movement knows that no force exists which could oblige our cadres to take this or that position. If someone had told you during the attack against the IS letter to the Communist Party of Yugoslavia or during your struggle against the Thesis of the 9th Plenum that the logic of your struggle would lead to a break with the International by your refusal to apply an almost unanimous decision of the IEC, you would have condemned this as slander. Nevertheless, you have come to the point of cold-bloodedly preparing a split with the International! There is only one possible explanation for this evolution, only one materialist explanation which cannot be imputed to demonology (the successive "crimes" of Frank, Pablo, Albert, etc.): YOU ARE BEING PUSHED BY HOSTILE CLASS FORCES, despite your intentions, despite your will. The enormous, objective pressure of the opposing class forces in the world and particularly in France, in a period of extreme tension of social contradictions which are on the threshold of a universal and final

settlement, that is the only explanation of your struggle against the International and your threatened rupture with it. This pressure is not reducible to individuals; it cannot be imputed to "agents"; but it is the objective, undeniable resultant of the general direction of your evolution and of your action. ONLY THE PRESSURE OF THE OPPOSING CLASS CAN LEAD PARTIES OF A REVOLUTIONARY ORGANIZATION LIKE THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL TO BREAK WITH IT ON THE THRESHOLD OF THE DECISIVE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE. Take note of the forces which are weighing on you, and stop before it is too late.

You characterize yourselves as a proletarian tendency, comrades of the majority. What determines the social character of a political tendency, is not only, and not even in the first place, the social composition of this tendency; above all it is the objective meaning of its political position and of its evolution. No proletarian tendency abandons the Fourth International and Trotskyism; only petty-bourgeois tendencies break with it. However, you have already begun to break with Trotskyism. For International discipline is an integral and essential part of the Trotskyist program which cannot conceive of "ideas" as separate from "organization," from the spirit detached from the flesh. By breaking with the international organization, your break inevitably with the Trotskyist program will become deeper because the objective forces which impel you will be freed from their principal curb which is your adherence to the International. Shachtman too, when he broke with the International, abandoned neither our characterization of the USSR nor even entirely the defense of the USSR. He also it appeared broke on "conjunctural" questions on side issues. His evolution confirmed the rule: every tendency breaking with the international organization has degenerated to a petty-bourgeois tendency, removing itself from the camp of the revolution.

The International Executive Committee has been unanimous, and it has expressed the view that the whole international Trotskyist movement, such as the letter of an American Trotskyist leader has confirmed to you in denouncing as criminal the idea of a split from the International. It adds that such a split perpetrated on the eve of the French and international civil war would be a veritable desertion in the face of the enemy. It would be the exact replica on the eve of the Third World War of the desertion of Shachtman on the eve of the second imperialist war. Those who would commit such an act, cannot hope to be judged otherwise by the whole International, by all its sections in all countries and by all Trotskyists except with the mistrust and the hatred which such a betrayal would merit.

The International Executive Committee appeals to all members, cadres and leaders of the majority faction to remain faithful to Trotskyism and to maintain the unity of the PCI in the International. Declare openly and as soon as possible that, despite all your differences, you will respect the decisions of the 11th Plenum. The International guarantees you not only your free right of expression and your right as a faction, but even as broad as possible an association as you desire in the new leadership which will be formed at the 8th Congress of the party. It will be ready to discuss with you all plans for the reorganization of the party and for the composition of the leadership. The only condition it makes is to respect the

decisions of the 10th and the 11th Plenums. Show in deeds that you are ready to carry out your duties as disciplined militants of the International and that you will again be, as in the past, an integral part of our world party.

At this crucial moment of your existence, the IEC declares to all members of the majority tendency: Far from wanting to expel you, as the ridiculous slanders pretend, we want to do the impossible to keep you, each of you and all of you together in the International. We know that in your innermost selves you hesitate before committing the irreparable. Silence those who criticize this hesitation. That is more to your honor than everything you have done in the last eighteen months. Your whole existence as communists, as revolutionists, is at stake. No group outside of the International has been able to remain Trotskyists. Trotskyism lives and will live in France whatever you decide. For Trotskyism is the revolution in our epoch. No force in the world will destroy it. But your life as revolutionists can be and will be destroyed if you commit the crime of split. It is neither a shame nor a "capitulation" to apply the discipline of your own International. Others, greater than you and we, have done it despite extremely profound differences. That is the example to follow! That is what should inspire you in again taking the road of respecting the organizational principles of Bolshevism, so that you may remain in the camp of the Fourth International which is the camp of the world socialist revolution.

The International Executive Committee

June 7, 1952.

#

Paris
February 16, 1952

Dear Comrade Cannon,

I am taking the liberty of writing you today because I think that you are one of the most qualified comrades in the Trotskyist movement for evaluating the situation in our section and the dispute which currently places the French party in opposition to the International Secretariat.

I have read In Defense of Marxism and The Struggle for the Proletarian Party; the exertions, struggles and experiences through which the American Trotskyists, and you especially, have passed, give you the necessary background for telling me what you think of what we are doing here.

All the leaderships of the Trotskyist sections are now in possession of a document from the International Secretariat dated January 21, 1952, concerning the French section.

However, this document in its five pages of text does not give an exact version of what is taking place. It does not present a political view of the situation but strictly an administrative version of the dispute. From a reading of this document it could be concluded that the leading comrades of the French section are acting stubbornly and sulking at the decisions of the IS merely from whim.

The facts are really altogether different. Nobody in the International is unaware of the differences which have opposed the French majority to the IS up to the World Congress. These differences have been expressed in votes and in documents. The French majority has tried to clarify the nature of these differences, especially in the period of preparation of the Seventh Congress of the French Party.

But the differences which set the French Party in opposition to the IS were settled, if not solved, by the Third World Congress. And this found its expression in a resolution of the French Commission of the World Congress, a resolution which the Central Committee of our section unanimously approved, insofar as it is the line for applying the policies adopted by the Third World Congress. To say, as the IS does, that the French majority has "continued" in practice to wish to apply the line of the Seventh Congress of the PCI is inaccurate and refuted by the entire attitude and policy as applied by the French leadership from the World Congress up to now.

Let me begin by stressing that Pablo, in opposing any vote at the World Congress on the documents which our delegates presented there (especially the 10 theses drawn up by Comrade Germain and adopted by our Seventh Congress), and this upon the contention that the International had not discussed them, was by this token unable to have our positions condemned by the Congress.

The truth is that whatever the spheres of activity of our party, nothing has given rise to the slightest criticism by any of the leading bodies of the International regarding remissness in applying the line laid down by the last World Congress.

In "youth" work a draft resolution was presented to the Political Bureau. It gave rise to a certain amount of criticism, especially on the part of minority comrades. A parity commission of PB members was elected. This commission submitted a new, revised youth document, which was finally adopted. It is some four months since this resolution has been applied. Its application has called forth no important criticism, neither in the ranks of the minority nor from the IS.

If we take trade union work, up to and including the last meeting of the National Contact Commission of "Unite," this work has gone ahead on the basis of complete agreement between the majority of the French Party and the IS. A document on directives was submitted unanimously by a commission of which Comrade Frank was a member. It was subsequently called into question anew by a totally different document with which I will deal presently.

Finally, the last sphere but not the least: our central organ, La Verite, has never been questioned in any fundamental way, by anyone whatever, for not having applied the line of the Third World Congress. What is more, Comrade Pablo stated to a meeting of the Paris Region that La Verite was showing "the obvious progress made by the French leadership in applying the political line laid down by the Third World Congress." But if, as the IS letter declares, the French leadership "continues to wish to apply the line of the 7th PCI Congress," where would this be more evident than in La Verite? Our paper, the principal external expression of our party, is best capable of reflecting in the light of events, the political positions of the leadership which publishes it.

Thus, since the Third World Congress, the French leadership has effectively endeavored to apply the policies of our International "with understanding and discipline." Further, it has maintained complete silence inside the party on the ever new demands imposed upon it by the IS. Inadequacies may have shown up here and there. They were inevitable. But this was in no sense willful. If it were so, if the leadership had really desired to carry out a different line, this would have revealed itself not accidentally in episodic and piecemeal cases, but in the entire activity of the party, in all spheres, daily, and at every step. Examples of such an undisciplined attitude would be so numerous that there would be no difficulty in presenting a great many of them.

But the letter of the IS nowhere makes any precise, clearly formulated accusations.

In point of fact, there are two clearly distinct phases in the struggle between the IS and the French leadership. The first phase takes place after the Third World Congress, a period during which the party was orienting itself in its work on the basis of the French resolution. This application takes place with some necessary adjustments. Then there is a second phase whose date can be established precisely: it is December 6, 1951 when the IS issues a document entitled, "For the reorientation of our trade union work in France."

This document, of which it was not known whether it was a mandatory resolution effective upon its appearance, or a contribution to the discussion of the trade union problem in France, called into question

anew the decisions and documents of the Third World Congress. The stupefaction and indignation which such a document raised in the leadership of the French party were well founded. It was no longer a question of interpretation, of doing a job of exegesis on one sentence or another: this text was in fundamental and formal opposition with the text of the French commission of the World Congress.

For instance, in the French resolution, the following statement is made: "The necessary turn in the activity of the French party which results from the world turn in the situation does not in any case mean the abandonment of activities engaged in and of results achieved in such activities. On the contrary. . . , etc."

The text of the IS explains: "In order to realize these objectives which are possible right now, it is necessary not to attempt to set ourselves up as a distinct tendency (within the CGT), which is not objectively justified at the present stage -- but to integrate ourselves there by promptly becoming the best workers for the unification of the trade union movement, by taking everywhere a clear unequivocal position for the unity proposals of the CGT, and by skillfully maneuvering as regards the Stalinist leaders so as to allay their suspicions about us and so as to let them consider us as useful instruments for the unity policy." (Emphasis in the original.)

About all this, the letter of the IS dated January 21 does not say a word; in this way it makes the dispute between the French party and the IS incomprehensible. The opposition which manifests itself on administrative and organizational questions can only find their explanation in the light of the political positions of each of the opponents. Every other way of trying to clarify the discussion can in fact only muddy it up.

This is all the more true when one considers the January 14 letter of the IS to the members of the Central Committee. There too, and anew, the CC found itself confronting totally new positions contrary to the letter and spirit of the Third World Congress. The question was that of entry into the CP but of a very special kind of entry, "sui generis" as the IS itself described it. Independent work was to be subordinated to this entry. ("Independent work must be understood as having for its main aim the aiding of 'entrlist' work and is itself to be directed primarily at the Stalinist workers." -- "Entrlist work will develop in scope as we come closer to war." Letter of the IS to the members of the CC).

But the World Congress stated precisely: "In the countries where the majority of the working class still follows the CP, our organizations, of necessity independent, must direct themselves toward more systematic work aimed at the ranks of these parties and of the masses which they influence." (Theses on International Perspectives and the Orientation of the Fourth International.)

This is so true that the Italian comrades, whose political situation is analagous to ours in many ways, have elaborated a resolution for work directed at the workers of the CP. The question of entry is envisaged and resolved in the following way: "This 'entrlist' tactic does not exclude but presupposes independent work. . . "

"Taking these requirements into account, we reach the conclusion that independent work must not be liquidated, but that on the contrary, it will be necessary to assign additional forces to this work." The Italian comrades, in writing this, believe they are applying the line of the Third World Congress. But to say, as does the IS, that this Italian resolution "advocates a tactic identical to that proposed by the letter of the IS of January 14 to the CC of the French party," constitutes a refusal to understand the obvious. The position of the IS in France makes independent work a supplement to entrust work; the Italian comrades are doing just the reverse. It is necessary to have a certain amount of political myopia to identify these two positions.

In my opinion the IS is seeking to mask the real reasons for the discussion by accusing the French majority of not wanting to apply the line of the Third World Congress and of wishing to substitute the line of the Seventh Congress of our party. Truthfully, the French leadership is not in opposition to the IS but to what we in France have labeled "Pablism." That is what is involved. And today, under the cover of our international leadership, Comrade Pablo is trying to have his own positions carried out. When the French majority says that the trade union resolution, as well as the letter of the IS to the members of the Central Committee of January 19 and 20, is not the honest expression of the World Congress, it is only expressing in another form that Pablism did not win out at the Third World Congress. To convince oneself all one has to do is to return to the article, "Where Are We Going?" and to the theses of the Third World Congress.

The struggle in which the French party has found itself engaged and in which I am taking part, has had for its setting the punitive action of the IS in suspending the majority of the Central Committee, a measure directed against all the living forces of the party, against everything which directly or indirectly touches working class and trade union work. This punitive measure is unjust and unjustifiable. It is a suppression of all genuine leadership in all spheres of work. And how does the IS explain this measure? By charging "political and organizational decomposition." And upon what does it base this charge? Upon hearsay and gossip. But where the leadership of a party is decomposing politically and organizationally that ought to be confirmed by other means than by the charges of minority comrades. Decomposition, if it is political, must show itself in documents, and especially in the documents submitted precisely to the CC Plenum, where the majority was suspended. Political decomposition should also show itself in our central organ, La Verite, of which ten issues have appeared since the World Congress. This aspect of the question of political decomposition of our leadership is all the more important because allusion is made in this letter, to Shachtman, to the POUM, to the Yugoslavs. Those of our comrades who participated in the Second World Congress took a stand against the proposal to recognize the WP as a "sympathetic section." Since that time we have neither said nor written a word which could justify an amalgam with Shachtman. No basis for comparison exists between our position and that of the POUM, to which Verite has replied in connection with its attacks against our Third World Congress. No position of ours is the same as the Yugoslavs against whom we have been conducting an offensive for over 18 months in all spheres where they have shown themselves (brigades, trade unions, youth). In what, directly or indirectly, does the argumentation employed by the French leadership resemble the positions taken by Shachtman, the POUM, the "Yugoslavs"?

In NOTHING. And there you have an unprincipled amalgam which can only condemn those who make use of it.

As for the decomposition of the leadership of our party from an organizational standpoint, what are the symptoms which reveal this? Have members resigned? Has the paper failed to appear? Have directives not been issued in order to initiate this or that action at this or that moment? If the leadership is decomposing as the motor force of the party, what better test than the last strike movements of February 12 as a verification of this? But there again, as in the past, our leadership, conscious of its experience, of the situation in the party caused by the violent coup of the IS, proved itself equal to the greatness of its task.

All this tends to demonstrate that a bad cause has the need for bad methods in order to defend itself. And this likewise explains why for us the struggle against Pablism is not a struggle of secondary importance. The French majority has acquired the conviction in the course of many months in which it has been opposed to Pablism, that the latter means the destruction of Trotskyism, at least in Western Europe. The sharpness of the struggle, on both sides, can be explained or justified solely in this perspective.

If we return to the question of trade union work, we see in the French resolution of the World Congress, a resolution which our CC has adopted, the following perspective described in these words: "The agreements which have served as basis for 'Unite' (essential element of the trade union work of the French section) are taking place under the hallmark of free expression for the various currents gathered together around this paper. The general activity of the party in 'Unite' continues without any changes." This is clear and without the slightest ambiguity. Four months after these lines were written, we can read the following sentences from the pen of the IS: "It is necessary not to attempt to set ourselves up as a distinct tendency" as against the Stalinists. What is the meaning of such a sentence if not to deliver ourselves bound hand and foot over to the Stalinist bureaucrats. For us, however, the perspective is clear: the situation in the French trade union movement is such that it imposes upon us the requirement not to surrender in any way the orientation laid down by the French resolution of the World Congress. That variations in Stalinist policy require of us this or that tactic is obvious. But it is a question of something quite different in the foregoing text of the IS.

If we return to the question of entry into the CP, our perspective is clear. We are not hostile to the examination of this possibility, and we had already formulated it well in advance of the letter of the IS of January 14 to the members of the CC. But for us it was above all a matter of fraction work which cannot change the work of the independent party and above all cannot in any way change the independent character of the Trotskyist program with reference to Stalinism. Not only do we think that this fraction work in the CP is necessary and indispensable, but we say that this idea of entry in the CP must be considered by the whole party as the eventuality for which we must prepare ourselves in the perspective of great social upheavals and continued upheavals in the Stalinist apparatus. For Pablo it is quite another thing that is involved. It is a matter of pure and simple

integration into Stalinism, ascribing to the latter the accomplishment of a certain number of historical tasks that Trotskyism is incapable of fulfilling.

Politics has its own logic, and particularly the politics of Pablo. Did not he state to the CC of the 19th and 20th of January that "the Transitional Program" was an inadequate instrument for effectively judging what Stalinism is at the present time? This may appear as a momentary error of Pablo, but since this statement, this idea has made its own way, and at the last meeting of the Parisian region, Comrade Frank, a member of the IS, stated that it is an incorrect idea of the Transitional Program when it states that the "Third International had definitely passed over to the side of the bourgeois order." And has not Comrade Corvin, member of the Central Committee, also said that to speak of the oscillations of the Stalinist bureaucracy means to put in question the workers' character of the USSR, adding that we will no longer see oscillations, but hesitations by Stalinism in accomplishing the tasks of the revolution. Has not Comrade Mestre, member of the Political Bureau, stated that entry sui generis has become necessary because "Stalinism has changed"? All this is evidently not a product of chance. All this only expresses, in our ranks, the growing pressure of Stalinism upon the petty bourgeoisie of Western Europe which finds its echo in our organization.

This explains why I have personally stated that confronted by such positions the party must rise, unanimously, to condemn such crimes. I am not concerned with creating an atmosphere of hostility in the French section "against the International" as the letter of the IS implies. I am concerned with defending the essential programmatic foundations of our movement, which is its wealth and which is its surest guarantee of victory.

The position which I have taken in this battle is the product of all the experience which I have accumulated during years of membership in the working class movement and particularly of my struggle for Trotskyism in the Renault plant. To create the notion that our opposition to the Pablist line proceeds from an infantile anti-Stalinism is to conceal the real character of Pablistism, as it is revealing itself every day increasingly, every day more clearly. Today Pablo is compelled to call into question the fundamental ideas of the Transitional Program in order to prop up his line. What will happen tomorrow?

The methods used by Pablo have caused me to reflect a great deal and I have in particular relived the struggle which Trotsky conducted against Shachtman, Burnham and Abern in 1939-40 in the American section. The methods used by the IS are absolutely the reverse of these. Trotsky, and all the American comrades at his side, fought politically and tried to convince the SWP comrades by the widest possible discussion and the most fundamental. In particular, Trotsky constantly turned towards the party's working class base, addressed himself to it, used the best pedagogical forms so as to accomplish this, that the discussion would at least serve to educate the party. Here, we see the working class base of the party disdained, because it is the majority. We see fundamental questions evaded under false pretexts. To an entire leadership which is opposed to its line the IS replies: "SUSPENSION" and justifies itself by insults.

From all this the party (and when I say party, I mean the whole International) can only lose. It is impossible to destroy a Trotskyist section under the pretext that it does not share the personal ideas of Pablo on the role of the Soviet bureaucracy and on "centuries of transition." To destroy is not the role of a leader of the International: his role is not to destroy the human foundation of all politics, entrism or otherwise.

My letter has no other purpose than to warn you of this danger, to explain the situation and to ask your opinion. I hope I have accomplished my task.

With fraternal Bolshevik-Leninist best wishes, dear comrade, I am

Daniel Renard

New York, N.Y.
May 29, 1952

Daniel Renard
Paris

Dear Comrade Renard:

I received your letter of February 16. Copies were also distributed to all the members of our National Committee, and in formulating the following reply I have had the benefit of discussion with them on the matter. If I have waited so long to answer, it is only because I am always reluctant to intervene in the affairs of another party without knowing all the pertinent facts and the people concerned. I make this explanation to assure you that I meant no disrespect to you by my delay in answering your letter. Just the contrary. My purpose was to give your communication the serious and deliberate answer it deserves.

In the meantime, the Tenth Plenum of the IEC has taken place, and its basic document on "The Tactical Application of the Third World Congress Line," as well as its Organizational Resolution on the French situation, have been received here. We have also received a copy of the "Declaration by the Political Bureau Majority on the Agreements Concluded at the International Executive Committee." These documents -- the Tenth Plenum decisions and the Declaration of your Political Bureau Majority -- seem to me to advance the dispute to another stage and to throw more light on it.

I have used the intervening time, since receiving your letter, for an attentive study of all the relevant documents, including those above mentioned. Naturally, from such a great distance I cannot feel qualified to pass judgment on the many secondary questions and personal antagonisms which are unfailingly involved in such a sharp dispute as your party is now experiencing. However, the general picture from a political point of view now seems clear enough to justify me in offering you and the other French comrades a frank opinion, as follows:

I think the Third World Congress made a correct analysis of the new post-war reality in the world and the unforeseen turns this reality has taken. Proceeding from this analysis, the Congress drew correct conclusions for the orientation of the national Trotskyist parties toward the living mass movement as it has evolved since the war. Further, the Tenth Plenum, in its basic document on the tactical application of the Third World Congress line, has faithfully interpreted, amplified and concretized the line of the Third World Congress as regards its tactical application under the different conditions in the different countries.

I note your statement that the majority are "not hostile" to the "idea of entry into the CP" as "the eventuality for which we must prepare ourselves." That would seem to put the majority in basic agreement with the line of the IEC and clear the way for a jointly-elaborated program of practical actions leading to an agreed-upon end. The differences seem to be reduced to questions of timing and pace. I should like to remind you, however, that in a fluid situation timing and pace can be decisive for the success or failure of an action. In such a situation, where an objective is agreed upon in principle, my own preference would be for decisiveness and speed.

I disagree in part with your formulation of the question of entry as "above all a matter of fraction work which cannot change the work of the independent party and above all cannot in any way change the independent character of the Trotskyist program with reference to Stalinism." Two different questions, which ought to be separated, are combined in this formula.

Of course, neither entry, nor any other policy or tactic which could be devised, can "in any way change the independent character of the Trotskyist program with reference to Stalinism." But "the work of the independent party" in France, in the present historical conjuncture, can and must be radically changed, and that without unnecessary delay, for there is not much time left to seize the opportunity now open. We must get into the movement of Stalinist workers while there is yet time and by such means and methods as the situation permits, not those we might prefer or arbitrarily insist upon.

A policy of maintaining the French party as an essentially independent party, with fraction work in Stalinist-controlled organizations as supplemental and secondary, would turn the necessities of the situation upside down. The situation in France now imperatively requires a policy of entry (of a special kind) into the Stalinist movement. The independent party and press should serve, stimulate and guide the entrant movement, not substitute for it or contradict it. It is true, as every Trotskyist knows, that the independence of the revolutionary vanguard party is a principle. Its creation is an unchanging aim of the revolutionary vanguard, always and everywhere and under all conditions. The function of the party, however, is not to exist for itself but to lead the workers in revolution. Further progress in the construction of a revolutionary party, capable of leading the revolutionary masses, requires now in France a wide and prolonged detour through the workers' movement controlled by the Stalinists, and even eventually through a section of the Stalinist party itself.

The aim to build the Trotskyist party into a mass party remains fixed and unchanging, but the road toward it in France is by no means a straight one. If our French comrades should grow stubborn and formally insist on the functioning of the independent party as the primary and most essential work in the given situation, the living mass movement with its unbounded revolutionary potentialities would certainly pass it by and leave us with the form without the substance.

The breakup of the coalition on the trade union field around the paper, "L'Unite," was a progressive development for our party. Those reformist trade unionists who make a speciality of "anti-Stalinism" in order to cover and justify their pro-imperialist policy are an international breed, and they are well known to us. They are not fit allies for Trotskyists in the United States, in France or anywhere else. The logic of their Stalinophobia inexorably impels them to the right, and no tactical diplomacy on our part can arrest the process. On the other hand, the French Stalinist workers, by the logic of the irreversible international trend of things, must be impelled more and more on a radical course. It is a matter of life and death for our comrades to establish connections with them and form an alliance with them against imperialism. The disruption of the "L'Unite" coalition, provoked by the right wing, should be taken as a fortunate and most favorable springboard into this new and more fruitful arena.

As far as the anarchist phrasemongers are concerned -- in the United States, in France, or anywhere else -- time-wasting parleys and coalitions with them for the purpose of waging the class struggle against the imperialist bourgeoisie would make a mockery of things which ought to be taken seriously. This would not be revolutionary politics but a substitute for it.

Your letter, Comrade Renard, as well as the Declaration of the Majority of your Political Bureau on the Tenth Plenum, explains the political essence of your position in the conflict as opposition to "Pablism." You define this as a revisionist tendency, aiming at "pure and simple integration into Stalinism" and thereby a capitulation to it. This question, as you may be aware, has a history in the Socialist Workers Party and is, consequently, familiar to us. As far back as 1950, when the new tactical turn was first indicated, the Johnsonites attempted to terrify the party with the scare of "Pablism." They sought to construe a struggle in the International Trotskyist movement of "Cannonism vs. Pablism." Since we were fully in favor of the new tactical turn from the start, we did not see any ground for such a contradistinction of tendencies, and said so when the question was first raised by the Johnsonites -- an answer which no doubt hastened their departure from our ranks.

We, for our part, are orthodox Trotskyists since 1928 and thereby irreconcilable enemies of Stalinism or any conciliationism with it, not to speak of capitulation. I do not think I overstate the case if I say that should any kind of a pro-Stalinist tendency make its appearance in our international movement, we would probably be the first to notice it and to say: "This is an alien tendency with which we cannot compromise." We do not see such a tendency in the International leadership of the Fourth International nor any sign nor symptom of it.

We judge the policy of the International leadership by the line it elaborates in official documents -- in the recent period by the documents of the Third World Congress and the Tenth Plenum. We do not see any revisionism there. All we see is an elucidation of the post-war evolution of Stalinism and an outline of new tactics to fight it more effectively. We consider these documents to be completely Trotskyist. They are different from previous documents of our movement, not in principle or method, but only in the confrontation and analysis of the new reality and the tactical adjustment to it. It is the unanimous opinion of the leading people of the SWP that the authors of these documents have rendered a great service to the movement for which they deserve appreciation and comradely support, not distrust and denigration.

I am sure that the International movement will not sanction or support a factional struggle based on suspicion of future intentions which cannot be demonstrated, or even deduced, from present proposals and positions formulated in documents. Nobody can learn anything from such fights, and the party is bound to be the loser. If you comrades of the majority should insist on a struggle against a "revisionism" which is not evident to others, you could only disorient a number of worker comrades in the party ranks, isolate them from the other cadres of the International movement and lead them into a blind alley. Unfortunately, this has been done often enough in the past history of the French party by impulsive leaders who did not take thought of their

course or heed the opinions of International comrades who sought to help them with friendly advice. I earnestly hope it will not happen this time.

It would be far better, in my opinion, to lay the suspicions aside -- or, in any event, not to make them the axis of discussion -- and try to come to agreement with the IS on practical steps toward an effective penetration into the movement of Stalinist workers -- leaving the different views as to the prospects to the test of experience. Political tendencies which are not clearly revealed cannot be fruitfully debated. If there is in fact any illusion about Stalinism on the one side, or a fetishism of formal independence on the other, the test of experience will mature and clarify such errors and make it possible to deal with them politically. Conversely, if there are no serious differences latent in the conflict, experience will eliminate any ground for suspicion in either respect.

An entry into the Stalinist workers' movement and eventually into the Stalinist party itself, under the given conditions, with its rigid bureaucratic structure, is an extremely difficult and dangerous undertaking in the best case. It will be all the more difficult if there is no unity in the party leadership. The situation would be made many times worse if the French party has to be punished with one more unnecessary split. This possibility cannot be ignored.

Don't deceive yourself, Comrade Renard. There is great danger of a split, even though both sides may have renounced any intention in this regard. A split is implicit in the situation as it has been developing in the recent period. In my opinion, the best way to avoid such a calamity -- perhaps the only way -- would be to shift the discussion for the time being to a concrete step-by-step program, worked out jointly by the party leadership and the IS, to effectuate the imperatively-dictated entry into the Stalinist workers' movement and eventually into a section of the Stalinist party itself.

Along that line -- if our judgment is correct -- the French party should soon get into a position to expand its influence and prepare for the great role which history has assigned to it in the approaching war and revolution. You can surely count on the sympathy and support of International comrades in this great endeavor.

Yours fraternally,

James P. Cannon

JPC:ra

UNITE FOR THE DEFENSE OF TROTSKYISM!

Letter of the Political Bureau to all Members of the Party:

Comrades,

The signs are accumulating every day to prove that the leaders of the ex-majority are preparing an early split of the party.

For two weeks they have not been participating in meetings of the Political Bureau, which were convened in agreement with them.

They are cynically violating the discipline of the party. Witness Garrive who at the Youth Commission secured the rejection of the decisions of the Political Bureau made in his presence and which he was instructed to carry out.

They are going to illegally convene the Central Committee of the party on Sunday, June 29, without the approval of the regular session of the Political Bureau and by decision of a faction meeting.

The majority of the Political Bureau and the leadership of the International is carefully following these split maneuvers, but is abstaining from taking any disciplinary measures. They are conforming strictly to the decisions of the 11th Plenum of the IEC which prohibits all alterations in the organisms of the leadership of the party before the Congress.

But the majority of the Political Bureau has the duty to inform the entire party of the significance of these splitting acts. They all have a common aim: To utilize all provocations to prevent the holding of the 8th Congress of the party!

For in truth, the meaning of this Congress is strikingly set forth by recent events in France. The splitting leaders of the ex-majority have openly declared they will not apply the decisions of the 11th Plenum of the IEC, that they will violate International discipline and by this fact will place themselves automatically outside of the International.

However, these splitters know that happily there does not exist a majority in the party in favor of the split with the International! That is why they want to prevent the holding of the 8th Congress of the party.

They have proved this intention not only by declarations of this kind made at party meetings. They have proved it by fixing the Congress of the Youth Organization on the same day as the Congress of the party, despite a contrary decision made by the Political Bureau on June 15, the past Political Bureau in which the ex-majority leaders attended, a decision made with their full agreement.

In any case their actions are not at all astonishing. The ex-majority leaders are following the logic of their position. Only Shachtman and Chaulieu are frantically applauding their split with the International. Only imperialism and the Stalinist bureaucrats will profit from it. Whoever prepares to desert to the enemy by

trampling International discipline underfoot can only logically also trample underfoot the party's legality and its internal democracy.

But these maneuvers will be unmasked!

Already we have the signatures of a third of the members of the party to submit to the Central Committee, members who demand, as is their statutory right, that the party Congress take place at the regularly fixed date.

We call upon all members of the party who have not yet given their signatures to send it immediately to the leadership and thus to stay the criminal hand of the splitters.

When the house is on fire, political differences can no longer be an obstacle in unitedly combatting the disaster. We appeal to all members of the party desirous of remaining in the International not to elect delegates to the Congress who, regardless of tendency and political conviction, do not promise to defend the recognition and the respect of the decisions of the 10th and 11th Plenum of the IEC.

There is place only for political corpses and traitors outside of the International. In the International there is place for all Trotskyists whatever their differences, on the condition that they submit to International discipline.

We repeat once again in full agreement with the International leadership: despite all provocations and all undisciplined action -- which would have justified a thousand times the expulsion of those who have committed them -- that in order to clear the air in the party and to permit it to engage in its new period of activity with the minimum possible losses, no leader or member of the party will be expelled from the organization provided he declares his readiness at the 8th Congress to accept International discipline and to apply the decisions of the 10th and 11th Plenums of the IEC!

Thus the situation is clear and unmistakable. Everyone must choose: either to remain in the International, enjoying all democratic rights but at the same time strictly observing International discipline; or by refusing to recognize these duties of discipline and therefore automatically deserting the world party of the socialist revolution.

Trotskyists, unite! Against the splitting maneuvers, against the deserters! Make the 8th Congress a striking demonstration of loyalty to Trotskyism and the International! Long live the Fourth International and its disciplined French section!

The Majority of the Political Bureau:

Albert, Frank, Mestre, Privas.

June 26, 1952

#

LETTER OF THE POLITICAL BUREAU TO THE MEMBERS OF THE PARTY

The Coup de Force Against Trotskyism Has Been Prepared!

Comrades,

As we have previously stated to all members of the party in our letter of June 26, the meeting of the Central Committee of June 29, 1952, illegally convened, was the occasion for a coup de force against Trotskyism and against the Fourth International on the part of the splitting leaders of the ex-majority faction.

At the very beginning of this gathering, before a single political question had been examined, the members of the Central Committee faithful to the International were suspended and removed from the meeting by force. This latter measure was also taken with regard to the representative of the International Executive Committee of the French section.

This unspeakable bureaucratic action represents an open violation of the decisions of the 11th Plenum of the IEC which prohibited all changes in the composition of the leading bodies of the PCI before the 8th Congress of the party. By so acting, the leaders of the ex-majority faction have begun to consummate the split with the International prepared prior to the 11th Plenum.

The majority of the Political Bureau, placing itself on the grounds of the legality of the International which is the only ground of legality in the party, declares null and void all decisions taken after the time the CC has ceased to exist because of the expulsion of the tendency loyal to the International.

It appeals to all members of the party to ignore all decisions of the June 29 meeting or of any body constituted by this meeting.

The only legal leadership of the PCI is the Political Bureau designated unanimously by the 10th Plenum, as well as the CC elected at the 7th Congress which could be "convened when the Political Bureau deems necessary," as was provided in the resolution of the 10th Plenum which was accepted and voted for by Bleibtreu, the representative of the ex-majority of the party on the IEC.

The Technical Apparatus of the Party Has Been Placed in Safekeeping

Faithful to their custom of duplicity and of political camouflage, the splitting leaders have not dared to invoke the only genuine reason which prompted their aggression against the tendency of the party faithful to the International: the fact that they have been and will be denounced before the entire party as splitters, deserters of Trotskyism and of the International and fought as such deserters deserve to be fought.

They have preferred to use as their pretext the fact that the majority of the Political Bureau has placed the technical apparatus of the party in safekeeping and has refused to return it to the splitters.

All Trotskyists will rejoice to learn that the majority of the Political Bureau has succeeded in saving the technical apparatus of the party. Everything that belongs to the party belongs to the International. We are not members of independent national sections, but of a single world party of the socialist revolution.

The Political Bureau is responsible to the IEC, which has designated it, for the party and its property. The International would have been correct in demanding an accounting from the Political Bureau if it had left the party technical apparatus in the hands of the splitters who have already fought and will continue to fight the International and Trotskyism. This apparatus was acquired through heavy sacrifices on the part of members of the French section and by numerous sections of the Fourth International. It was not acquired so that Bleibtreu and Lambert could embark on an adventure outside of the International.

Those who conduct themselves as enemies of Trotskyism and of the International should expect to be treated as such. To remove the technical apparatus of the party out from the reach of such enemies is the elementary duty of every Bolshevik.

In agreement with the International leadership, the Political Bureau is placing the technical apparatus at the disposal of the French section of the Fourth International and of its regular leadership to be designated at the 8th Congress. It promises to publish all documents submitted to the 8th Congress of the party by any member or tendency of the party.

The Petty-Bourgeois "Moralists" Unmasked

In truth, the hypocritical "moral" indignation on the part of the Bleibtreu-Lambert splitters has nothing in common with proletarian or communist morality. They have sabotaged the application of the line of the International. They have sabotaged the political discussion of the 8th Congress. They have stopped the publication of documents for this Congress. They no longer participate in the meetings of the Political Bureau and sabotage the daily work of the party. We do not know what "rights" they will stand on today, although they have and are violating the elementary duties of militants of a revolutionary organization. They have not even the right to claim surprise: everyone of their actions was foreseen by the International leadership, which each time warned them in advance of the consequences such actions would inevitably entail. They are consummating a split today with the International, they are doing it knowingly having prepared this crime against Trotskyism for weeks.

It was with full awareness that they once joined the Fourth International not as to a federation of "national" parties, but to a world party with a single political line, a single international leadership and a single discipline. If they refuse today to recognize this discipline, it is because they have already made the decision to desert the Fourth International.

It was with full awareness that they declared their readiness to apply the line of the Third World Congress and of the 10th Plenum

of the IEC. If today they declare that they cannot accept this line because it would signify "destruction of the party," this means that they have knowingly lied to the International and to the party by signing the agreement of the 10th Plenum.

It was with full awareness that they presented a resolution to the 8th Congress of the party violating the line of the 10th Plenum of the IEC while they had been warned in advance that such an act of duplicity would entail their disqualification as a leadership for the International.

It is with full awareness that they now refuse to execute the decisions of the 11th Plenum of the IEC, although they had been warned in advance that such an action of indiscipline would automatically place them outside of the International.

Thus, after having played out their miserable comedy in the International and in the party, the splitters are now removing their mask. It is with full awareness that they leave the International, that they break with Trotskyism and the revolution.

The Deserters Leave, the PCI Continues

It is futile to dwell upon the "political" pretext invoked by the splitters to justify their crime. "Pabloism," "capitulation to Stalinism," all these slanders have been piled up in the dustbins of Shachtman, of the Yugoslavs and their ilk who have gone over in practice to the imperialist camp.

History will quickly explode these pretexts as it has exploded the pretexts of all the renegades who break with Trotskyism.

In reality what is concealed behind these slanders is the uneasiness and the very real feel of the splitters of being "discredited" before Stalinophobe public opinion as well as in certain trade union circles. This is an exact repetition of the betrayal of Shachtman who also capitulated before a violently Stalinophobe public opinion and preferred to break with the Fourth International rather than break with all those who refuse to join their fate to the workers and to the revolutionary movement because it is momentarily directed by the Stalinists.

That, and that alone, explains the panic which took hold of the splitters after the publication in Quatrieme Internationale of the political decisions of the 10th Plenum. This panic presaged their future rupture with the International.

The split of the ex-majority leaders undoubtedly delivers a blow to the party. But it is not a fatal blow. The Rouses and Navilles, the Parisots and Soudrans (former leaders of the right-wing who split in 1948 -- Tr.) have left, the Fourth International, its French section continues. What these erstwhile renegades were not able to destroy, their pupils, Bleibtreu and Lambert will also not destroy.

The PCI continues. Its legal leadership is regularly preparing its 8th Congress convened for July 12, 13 and 14. All districts,

all units of the party will be represented there.

There is place for all Trotskyists, regardless of political differences in the PCI, on the condition that they are disciplined to the International and observe its statutes.

In all voting for delegates, demand that the delegates commit themselves unequivocally to observe International discipline and to apply the decisions of the 10th Plenum of the IEC.

In all the party meetings, defeat the maneuvers of the splitters by adopting resolution of loyalty to the International and for the recognition of its decisions.

Trotskyists, unite!

For the defense of your organization and your program!

Long live the Fourth International and its French section!

The Political Bureau

June 30, 1952

#

TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE PCI --
PREPARE THE 8TH CONGRESS OF THE PCI TOGETHER

Comrades,

This a grave moment. The split of our organization is about to be consummated. In accordance with the decisions of a "Central Committee," from which all loyal members to the International have been amputated, Bleibtreu and Lambert have begun "to expel" members of our party in several branches. Members of the Paris district committee are being "expelled." The party headquarters is closed to half of the organization. The party itself does not approve these splitting acts. Its real unity sentiment has been manifested this week. The Renault branch on July 2 voted by 7 votes against 5 for a motion requesting the leaders of both tendencies to jointly prepare the 8th Congress of the party. The Courbevoie branch has voted a similar resolution.

The time has come for all members of the party to transcend differences of tendency and to act to save the unity of the party, to prepare the 8th Congress of the unified organization.

Bleibtreu and Lambert would like to throw the responsibility for the state of split which exists within the party on the "theft" of the technical apparatus of the party. It is through this "theft," they say, that the agreements have been broken. One cannot imagine a more crying distortion of the reality? The agreements of the 10th Plenum provided for a Congress which would discuss the application of the line of the 10th Plenum on the basis of an agreement between the tendencies of the party. When was this agreement violated? On

June 27? Or rather from the time when the representatives of the ex-majority presented preparatory documents for the 8th Plenum to the Political Bureau which were contrary to the decisions of the 10th Plenum, that is to say, since the beginning of May? From this time on, the representative of the IEC openly announced to the leaders of the ex-majority that they had, in the eyes of the International leadership, broken the agreement of the 10th Plenum. They communicated this opinion to all the "cadres" of the ex-majority tendency. It is a simple trick to invoke the so-called "theft" in order to conjure away everything that has happened for eight weeks in the party.

Bleibtreu and Lambert want to have the party believe that the placing in safekeeping of the technical apparatus of the organization caused the state of split. But at the 11th Plenum of the IEC, Bleibtreu openly declared that he would not accept the decision of the International organization. They were warned that, on this basis, they would automatically place themselves outside of the International. Between the 11th Plenum and June 27, for four weeks, they piled up undisciplined declarations and actions. They repeated in all meetings that they would never accept the "ultimatum" (that is what they called the decisions of the leadership of their organization, the application of democratic centralism on an International scale.) In other words, they have therefore declared that they would split the organization at the Congress on July 14. But when the tendency of the party loyal to the International took them at their word and said to them: "If you have really decided to leave, we are going to prevent by all means your taking the apparatus of the party which belongs not to you but to the French section of the Fourth International." Then these heroic "defenders of the principle of struggle to the bitter end against Pabloism" pretend: What, we want to split? But it is not true! It is you who have begun by "stealing," etc., etc.

This lack of political courage is not surprising. It is the faithful expression of the blind-alley position in which the leaders of the ex-majority tendency have gotten into by carrying out their unprincipled struggle in the International and in the French section. When the question is posed to them: "Why are you breaking with the International?" one immediately obtains from them two contradictory answers. Some say, because of Pabloism. And others say: Because of ultimatums. Still others say: We don't want to break, it is you who are expelling us.

But what remains of these allegations after serious examination? "Pabloism"? But according to the ex-majority leaders this strange invisible malady of the entire International, except for a tendency of the PCI endowed with a very particular clairvoyance, already existed at the Third World Congress, it existed between the Third World Congress and the 10th Plenum, it existed at the 10th Plenum itself. Why did the Bleibtreu-Lambert tendency accept "ultimatums" from the Third World Congress and the 10th Plenum, decisions which they suddenly discovered today signify "the ruin of the party"? Why have the leaders of the Bleibtreu-Lambert tendency promised before the entire party and the entire International to apply such a "policy of ruin" in February only to retreat with fright before the same perspectives in the month of May.

"Ultimatums"? When the recognition of International discipline, of the needs and necessity for every section to apply the line of the International whatever its differences with them, is explicitly provided for by the statutes of the International. Comrade Marin, then a leader of the Bleibtreu-Lambert tendency, actively participated in the drafting of these statutes. Why were they not "bureaucratic" and "ultimatistic" at that time? Why were they not at least so stigmatized when this point of the statutes was applied to the British section, to the Italian section, to the Spanish section? Naturally, it is always easy to be in favor of discipline when one is politically in agreement with the leadership. The quality of a proletarian revolutionary is manifested precisely when discipline must be applied when one is in disagreement! The leaders of the Bleibtreu-Lambert tendency have shown themselves pitifully deficient in this quality.

"Expulsion." A beautiful argument in the mouths of those who are doing the expelling -- a parody of expulsion which neither the party nor the International naturally recognizes -- of comrades of the party not for violation of discipline but for their feelings and their ideas because they refuse to break with the leaders of their tendency. There were many occasions in the last two months when the International could have expelled Lambert, Bleibtreu and Co. if that was really its aim. On many occasions they sought expulsion by their unspeakable and irresponsible attitude. But the International did not cease to repeat in conformity of the principles of Trotskyism: Never will anyone be expelled from our organization for his ideas, for the defense of his ideas within the organization or for the exercise of his right to form a faction. But all those who refuse to recognize and to apply the decisions of the leadership -- which represents 95% of our world organization -- all those who violate the fundamental discipline of the International, threaten our most precious achievements, our reality as a single world party and from that time on have nothing in common with our movement. The practice of the International, which is the most democratic organization that has ever functioned, which has given rights to minorities like the Lambert-Bleibtreu tendency which the Third International before its degeneration never allowed for minorities, has always strictly conformed to this principle. It will act in the future as it has acted in the past.

Thus the split Lambert and Bleibtreu are preparing is going to be an unprincipled split in the worst sense of the word. They know very well that the differences expressed up to now would never justify a split with the International. They are very well aware that for the overwhelming majority of the members of their own tendency, the Fourth International remains the only revolutionary organization in the world. They have no principled reply to give to the questions: "But in this case, why not recognize discipline and the decisions of this organization, even if you are in disagreement with it?" They are obliged to seek their "reasons" in slanders borrowed from the worst enemies of our movement.

Bleibtreu and Lambert want to place the party and the International before the accomplished fact of the split, they want to prevent the holding of a Congress of the whole of the organization which can pronounce itself on this vital question for every revolutionist: membership in the Fourth International, as the only world revolu-

tionary organization, implies recognition of its International discipline. This maneuver must not succeed. The appeal of the Renault branch and the Courbevoie branch should be heeded by the whole party. The majority of the Political Bureau agrees with this appeal. It has immediately addressed the leaders of the Lambert-Bleibtreu faction inviting them to engage in discussions immediately, to make a joint Congress technically possible. Thus the party would have another opportunity to judge who the splitters are.

We maintain our positions in strict conformity with the principles of the organization of Trotskyism:

We are for the maintenance of the unity of the party and against the expulsion of anyone for opinions or faction differences.

We are for the holding of a Congress of the united organization, on the basis of a census of the party taken by a commission designated previously by members of both tendencies, a commission which had already concluded its work.

We are for the application of international discipline which is the only condition required for membership in the Fourth International of any member in general agreement with the Trotskyist program.

We are for giving the widest guarantee to the international minority so that it can exercise its rights as a tendency within the organization.

We are for the immediate transmission after the 8th Congress of the party of the party's technical apparatus to its leadership constituted within the framework of International legality and naturally to be returned to the local headquarters of the party if, however, this international legality is recognized by those who have illegally appropriated the control of the headquarters and have stupidly kept it closed since June 27.

Thus the choice is clear: Everyone must choose whether or not he wishes to belong to the Fourth International. There is place in the International for every member of the PCI despite what has happened. No one has been expelled. The only condition required to remain in the International is the condition required for membership in any proletarian organization: to recognize and apply the decisions of its regular leadership, while having the right to fight them within the organization. All those who want to remain Trotskyists should accept this condition. For in it is summarized principle No. 1 of the Trotskyist program: Loyalty to the revolutionary International, the only effective instrument of the class struggle in our time.

The Majority of the Political Bureau

July 5, 1952

THE BLEIBTREU-LAMBERT SPLIT RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE - Meeting in emergency session, on June 29, 1952, the Central Committee

considering the agreement of the Tenth Plenum broken by the splitting actions of the minority of the International Secretariat and at the instigation of the latter; rifling of the local headquarters of the party on June 27; a decision justifying this measure after the event made in the name of the Political Bureau by the minority faction of the Political Bureau and Comrade Albert, etc.

Therefore, designates a new Political Bureau composed of the following comrades: Bleibtreu, Lambert, Renard, Garrive, Laforge, Lequenne, Lefevre, Leroi, Stephane Just; and declares that all members who solidify themselves with the splitting actions and measures place themselves in consequence outside of the party.

- Adopted unanimously.

#

RESOLUTION OF THE IS

1. Between the 10th and the 11th Plenum of the IEC, the IS in its relations with the French section has strictly applied the letter and the spirit of the 10th Plenum agreement: to associate the two tendencies of the PCI in the application of the line of the International before, during and after the 8th Congress of the party. The representatives of the IS to the French leadership have particularly tried to draw the leaders of the Bleibtreu-Lambert tendency into a joint preparation of the political documents for the 8th Congress of the party. The leaders of the Bleibtreu-Lambert tendency have replied to these efforts of many months by refusing any prior discussion with the representatives of the IS and of the IEC, and by drawing up political documents in faction gatherings which are opposed to the line of the 10th Plenum. They have therefore broken the agreement of the 10th Plenum which provided not for a completely sovereign Congress of the PCI -- which would have been unconstitutional after the Congress of the International -- but a sovereign congress only within the framework of the application of the line of the 10th Plenum. The breaking of the agreements of the 10th Plenum by the leaders of the Bleibtreu-Lambert faction was carried through despite all the warnings of the members of the IS who explained to the representatives of this faction that such a violation of commitments taken before the whole International would entail their disqualification to lead the French section.

2. The 11th Plenum of the IEC, drawing its conclusions from the violation of the agreements of the 10th Plenum by the leaders of the Bleibtreu-Lambert faction, decided that the application of the line of the International in France could only be guaranteed if the leadership of the French section was composed in its majority of comrades who had shown their willingness and capacity to apply this line in practice. At the same time it warned all the members of

the PCI that only those recognizing the decisions of the International as applicable to the entire party, that is to say only those who recognize International discipline, could remain members of the Fourth International and of the French section. It finally decided that this change of leadership would only occur at the 8th Congress of the party and that from now to the 8th Congress the leadership of the party would remain unchanged as of the 10th Plenum of the IEC.

3. The resolution of the 11th Plenum of the IEC, just as the letter sent by the IEC to all members of the PCI, set forth at the same time that the only condition for belonging to the International and its French section was, as is required by the statutes of the International, recognition and the application of International discipline in action. The IEC gave its solemn guarantee that, as in the past, no member of our International organization would be punished for his ideas, for the defense of his ideas within the organization or for the creation of a faction.

4. Already in the course of the 11th Plenum session, the representative of the Bleibtreu-Lambert tendency in the IEC announced to the members of the IEC that his faction had decided not to recognize and not to execute the organizational decisions which would be taken by the IEC so far as the leadership of the French section is concerned. His words allow no room for doubt as to the decision of the leaders of this faction to split with the International. For once, the actions of these leaders were in harmony with their words. After the 11th Plenum they no longer participated in many of the meetings of the Political Bureau so as to be able to violate its decisions openly elsewhere. Then they ceased all participation in the work of the Political Bureau, illegally convening the Central Committee without consulting the Political Bureau or the Secretariat, solely by factional decision, and excluded from the party members remaining loyal to the International. They thus clearly manifested their determination to prevent the holding of the 8th Congress of the party by all means, as they would no longer have been able to obtain a majority for a split with the International in this Congress. This decision was previously decided upon by their sabotage of the publication of the political documents of the Congress, and their sabotage of political discussion in the party, and by their decision to set the date for the Congress of the youth organization on the same days as the Congress of the party.

5. The IS completely approves the decision of the tendency of the PCI remaining loyal to the International who refuse to recognize and apply all decisions taken by the Bleibtreu-Lambert faction in violation of International discipline. It especially approves and greets the efforts successfully undertaken by this tendency to prevent the splitters from pre-empting the technical apparatus of the party which is the property of the International. It declares as illegal the following decisions taken by the Bleibtreu-Lambert faction and calls upon all members of the party to disregard them.

a. The convening of the CC on June 29 which was neither proposed in advance or decided by the Political Bureau and Secretariat of the party regularly constituted at the 10th Plenum and recognized by the entire party.

b. The "suspension" of members of the Central Committee loyal to the International, in violation of the decision of the 11th Plenum which prohibited all alterations in the composition of the leading bodies of the party before the 8th Congress.

c. The designation of a new "Political Bureau" which violated the same decision of the 11th Plenum.

d. The expulsion of comrades, who place themselves on the ground of International discipline, in violation of the statutes of the International.

e. The decision of the Bleibtreu-Lambert faction to sabotage the 8th Congress of the party regularly and democratically convened by its regular leadership.

6. The IS reminds all members of the PCI that only those who recognize and execute the decisions of the 11th Plenum and of the 8th Congress of the party convened by its regularly constituted leadership since the 10th Plenum will be considered as members of the International and of its French section. All those who refuse by any acts whatever to recognize and to apply the decisions will be automatically expelled from the International after the close of the 8th Congress.

The IS calls upon all members of the party to manifest their loyalty to the International and to Trotskyism by defeating any splitting adventures. The Fourth International remains open to all Trotskyist militants who recognize its program and its International discipline. Those who break with it under vile pretexts will be treated as renegades and enemies of the organization.

The French section of the Fourth International will continue to be built with all revolutionary militants who apply in practice proletarian internationalism and who thus show themselves worthy of the historic task which their International calls upon to resolve.

The IS calls upon all sections of the International on the occasion of the 8th Congress of the French section of the International to manifest their full and complete solidarity with all the French comrades loyal to the World Party of the Socialist Revolution.

International Secretariat

July 1, 1952.