

THE INTERNAL SITUATION IN THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL  
(Part II of the Resolution on the International Situation)

A. The Program of the Fourth International

As was inevitable, with the development of the world crisis, the differences in the Fourth International have now become perfectly simple and clear.

Trotskyism 1934-1950

From 1934-1950 Trotskyism based its future upon this program: 1) that the Communist Parties of the world were reformist parties; that is to say, in the period of revolutionary upheaval they would inevitably defend bourgeois private property and support the bourgeois national state in its imperialist wars. W. Z. Foster, Ben Davis, etc. would join the American bourgeoisie; Harry Pollit would join British imperialism and Thorez in France would join the French bourgeoisie. Stalinism would disintegrate along national lines, as did the Second International, and the Fourth International would be the only internationalist movement. 2) that the Russian bureaucracy was preparing to capitulate to private property and the politics of the imperialist powers. Stalinism in Russia would be unable to defend state property and the Russian state against imperialism. The defense of these would fall to the Fourth International.

In 1947 "Johnson-Forest" opposed these parts of the program as being totally false. It claimed that the abolition of private property without proletarian power did not constitute the proletarian revolution but was merely a more advanced stage of capitalist degradation.

"Johnson-Forest" drew the following conclusions:

- 1) The Stalinist Parties had repudiated and would repudiate national defense all over the world.
- 2) Under conditions convenient to it, Stalinism planned to destroy private property and seize power from the bourgeoisie.
- 3) The Russian bureaucracy was the unshakable defender of state property and of Russia against opposing imperialisms.

As late as 1950, the Fourth International, in the face of the obvious facts and the political opposition of "Johnson-Forest", continued to assert that Stalinism and the Russian bureaucracy were capitulators to private property and the bourgeois national state.

### "Under Pressure of the Masses"

However, since 1950, the Fourth International has been compelled to abandon what has been the foundation of its politics. The new policy is not exactly clear, but its direction is unmistakable:

- 1) It now teaches that the Stalinist parties are not exactly reformist parties, but have invariably lined up in the past with the Russian bureaucracy. This, however, is treated as if it were a mere historical conjuncture. It is implied that if in war Russia should face a perspective of defeat, the Stalinist parties will or may turn back to their own bourgeoisie.
- 2) To this it adds that under the revolutionary pressure of the masses, the Communist Parties will break away from the Kremlin and "outline a revolutionary orientation."
- 3) It gives no discernible answer to the question as to whether the bureaucracy in Russia will defend state property and the U.S.S.R. against American imperialism, or will capitulate to private property.

It is obvious that this new policy has nothing in common with the orientation of the Fourth International towards the Social-Democracy in 1934, known in our movement as "the French Turn." The "French Turn" was based upon the inevitable betrayal and collapse of the Social-Democracy in a revolutionary crisis. This new line is based upon exactly the opposite conclusion. It is based upon the theory that the masses can and will convert Stalinist parties into revolutionary parties.

To these ideas "Johnson-Forest" had already replied in 1947 as follows: 1) Stalinism, like Menshevism, cannot be transformed by the revolutionary masses into anything revolutionary. On the contrary, the greater the revolutionary force of the masses, the greater the need for Stalinism to crush the proletariat, i.e., to carry through the counter-revolution. 2) Stalinism, in theory and practice, abolishes private property, repudiates the defense of the bourgeois national state and seizes power from the bourgeoisie, not because of any revolutionary pressure, but because that is its program. But it does this the more surely to destroy any independent action by the revolutionary proletariat, i.e., to crush the revolution. 3) To leave ambiguous the question whether seizure of power by the Stalinist parties is revolutionary or counter-revolutionary will encourage pro-Stalinist and pro-Menshevik tendencies in the Fourth International.

"Johnson-Forest" now asks that the Fourth International, before it finally adopts its new policies, takes note of the rapture with our past which is involved.

Bolshevism came into existence and exists to fight the representatives of bourgeois society within the proletariat.

The whole future of the Fourth International, as conceived by Trotsky, was based upon the fact that in imperialist war and revolutionary crises, the bourgeois class roots of Stalinism would inevitably impel it over to the side of the bourgeoisie and thus open the road for the Fourth International to lead the revolutionary masses.

Since World War II it has become absolutely clear that Stalinism does not capitulate to the bourgeoisie but expropriates it and is in mortal conflict with world imperialism.

Unable to explain this in terms of its foundation program, the Fourth International now gives to Stalinism the possibility of playing a revolutionary role. For Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky, the labor bureaucracy and its parties might claim and pretend to be revolutionary in ordinary periods, but in the revolutionary crisis, and under the impact of the masses, their class roots and counter-revolutionary nature would appear. The Fourth International now preaches an absolutely opposite doctrine. It claims that such parties may be counter-revolutionary for long periods but in the revolutionary crisis, and under the pressure of the masses, they will become revolutionary. This destroys the necessity for the Fourth International.

This doctrine also implies that an uninterrupted course of falsification of history and doctrine, betrayals and deceptions of the proletariat, assassination, frame-ups, and every possible corruption, as detailed for years in the literature of the Fourth International, can be the preparation for a party which will lead the masses in the building of socialism.

#### Why a Fourth International?

There is here involved the very theory of classes. Leninism led the proletariat against Menshevism as the class enemy inside the proletariat. Trotsky sought to do the same in relation to Stalinism. The Fourth International must recognize that it now faces the necessity of evolving a theory which gives its own existence a class basis in opposition to Stalinism.

Unless it does this, it will have nothing but tradition, its principled past, and its good intentions, between it and the equivocation, violent oscillation from side to side, and rhetoric, of centrism and left-Menshevism. These have already unmistakably appeared and in the most renouncing form.

The consequences for our movement are already clear. a) The Stalinists everywhere propose to defend Russia. By this they mean to ensure, in all possible ways, the victory of the Russian Army. On this fundamental question, "Johnson-Forest" propose the only policy which can prepare us to tear the masses from Stalinism. The policy of Pablo and Germain contains nothing but the seeds of confusion for the European movement and for the European masses. b) What exactly is a counter-revolutionary party, what is a contrist party, what is the relation between these and a Bolshevik Party — all these are now questions to which the leaders of our movement can give no clear answer. c) Worst of all, there is now no clear answer as to why a Fourth International is needed, except as a perpetual Left Opposition to Stalinism.

None of this can in any way be called the policy of Trotsky. Trotsky's defensism in Russia was based upon his theoretical expectation that the Russian bureaucracy would as a social grouping inevitably become the champion of private property. Hence the defence of the nationalized property by the world proletariat would be led by the Fourth International against the bourgeois and Stalinism. Similarly defeatism in Western Europe would lead the Fourth International to the head of the masses, because the Stalinists would be on the opposite side, the side of the bourgeois.

These theoretical premises were wrong. But the policy did not break with the basic theory and practices of our movement for a hundred years. The present policies of the Fourth International are entirely new and are in such contradiction to the needs of our movement and its past that they will have to be changed.

B. The Facts of Experience

In a whole series of articles, resolutions and documents, "Johnson-Forest" have made clear that the basis of the present dilemma of the Fourth International is its adherence to an analysis of world politics which is now outmoded. It is from this, and nowhere else but this, that arises its inability to say what Stalinism is and what is its own role in relation to it. All that is needed here is to show in as simple a manner as possible the direct connection between this false analysis and the political dilemma of the Fourth International.

No Longer Export of Surplus Capital

The bankruptcy of capitalist production compels not the export of capital for surplus profits; it compels the dominant capitals to seek to incorporate and submit to their domination the total national capital of other nations. The smaller national capitals, such as Britain and France, continue to resist but they are steadily being forced into a situation where their capital, manpower, scientific knowledge, etc. are being incorporated into the service of U. S. capital. The same process is being followed by Russia. This is the process of statification of production and centralization of capital on a gigantic national and international scale. This is the economic movement that has destroyed five imperialisms competing for redivision of the world and has substituted two gigantic masses of capital competing for total centralization.

In this change is to be found the basic economic reason for the differences between the reformist parties of World War I and the Stalinist parties of World War II. Whereas the Social-Democracies each remained attached to its own national capital, in World War II and since, the Stalinist parties attach themselves to one of the competing powers, and the Social-Democrats to the other. It is the development of world economies and world politics which has caused the change in the character and politics of the labor bureaucracies. Trotsky could not see this in 1940. As long as the Fourth International will not recognize this and draw the conclusions, it will continue to vacillate as to what Stalinism represents and be unable to work out a clear policy. This analysis will not solve all problems, so vast is the scope of world problems and the innumerable complications, advances, retreats, attractions and repulsions of actual historical situations. But without such an analysis no single problem will be solved.

Nationalized Property Without Proletarian Power

The centralization of capital is the fundamental law of capitalism in our time, and this dictates the social and political development in the constituent parts of each mass of capital.

- 1) It is a law of capitalist accumulation that accumulation of wealth at one pole is therefore, at the same time, accumulation of misery, agony, of toil, slavery, ignorance, brutality, mental degradation at the opposite pole. Experience has shown that it is in the countries of nationalized property and planned economy without proletarian power that this antagonism between the accumulation of wealth and the accumulation of misery assumes its ultimate form.
- 2) It is in the nature of capitalist production to produce an industrial reserve army of labor kept in degradation and equalization. This reserve army of labor
  - a) degrades the conditions of labor and living standards of the actual producers;
  - b) is kept at the disposal of capital to be sent into production where and

whenever capital needs them. It is the absolute general law of capitalist accumulation that the greater the energy of wealth, the greater is the industrial reserve army, the greater is official pauperism.

Experience has shown that it is in the countries of nationalized property and planned economy without proletarian power that the industrial reserve army is most highly organized, maintained in concentration camps solely for the needs of capital and reduced to a state of official pauperism and slavery unknown in capitalism so far.

3) Inherent in monopoly capitalism is the tendency to the domination of the bureaucrat, the master, the official, the arrogation of economic and social privilege to a diminishing number of magnates, the organization of production according to a single plan, and the consequent reduction of the work of the proletariat to military penal labor.

Experience has shown that it is in the countries of nationalized property and planned economy without proletarian power that these tendencies reach their ultimate and complete form.

#### Complete Degradation

4) Inherent in monopoly capitalism is the degradation of women.

Experience has shown that it is in the countries of nationalized property and planned economy without proletarian power that the degradation of women has reached its ultimate form.

a) They continue to have thrust upon them the task of bearing and rearing the producers of the next generation under the most backward and inhuman conditions of capitalist housing, capitalist wages, and the miserable circumstances of capitalist domestic economy.

b) At the same time they have been forced into heavy industry to work under conditions of extreme hardship and degradation.

c) There have been reimposed upon them in Russia the most reactionary laws in regard to marriage, abortion and divorce.

5) Monopoly capitalism is distinguished by its wholesale corruption of the press, literature, the arts, public information and public communication of all kinds.

Experience has shown that it is in the countries of nationalized property and planned economy without proletarian power that all means of communication without any exception are organized for the maintenance of the rule of the masters and the corruption of the intelligence, morals and manners of the whole community.

6) Monopoly capitalism produces political reaction, deprivation of democratic liberties, freedom of speech, freedom of organization.

Experience has shown that it is in the countries of nationalized property and planned economy without proletarian power that this deprivation of democratic liberties has become total.

7) Monopoly capitalism has increased national chauvinism, intensified racial hatreds, anti-Semitism, open and concealed, division between class and class,

majorities and minorities, nation and nation.

Experience has shown that it is in the countries of nationalized property and planned economy without proletarian power that this national chauvinism has been carried to an extreme undreamt of in modern civilization. The Russian drive into Europe has been accompanied by a renewal, concealed but no less vicious, of the propaganda of Slavs vs. Teutons. The determination of the Russian rulers to destroy the German people has no parallel in modern history. Since the property has been nationalized in Eastern Europe, the Iron Curtain has not only cut these countries off from the rest of the world. It is the policy of the Russian rulers to keep the citizens in the satellite countries separate from one another so that today a worker in Bulgaria is more isolated from a worker in Czechoslovakia than he has been since the industrialization of Europe.

8) Monopoly capitalism increases imperialism, the domination and economic exploitation of small states by more powerful ones.

No state of monopoly capitalism has ever exploited, dominated and subordinated to its economic, political and military will smaller states to the degree that it has been done by Russia, the state of nationalized property and planned economy without proletarian power.

9) To establish and maintain its domination at home and abroad, monopoly capitalism established the most brutal and barbarous of state forms.

But nowhere, not even in Fascist Germany, has the state form attained the unbridled savagery and the barbarism of the Russian state, the state of nationalized property and planned economy without proletarian power.

These are the facts of experience. They cannot be denied. Nobody, except supporters of Stalinism, attempts to deny them. It is because it refuses to see that these ghastly experiences can be explained only by the laws of capitalist production, as analyzed by Marx, that the Fourth International finds itself unable to work out a consistent policy.

#### What Can the Fourth International Reply?

Against these facts of experience the Fourth International advances two theories to support its view that these states are workers' states, part of the new society.

1) That the basic reason for this monstrous degradation is not the mode of production but the scarcity of consumption goods. The monstrous state arises as policeman to guarantee the unequal distribution.

The Fourth International will have to abandon this theory of consumption as the guide to the understanding of the Russian state. But the only theory it can substitute is the Marxist theory of the laws of capitalist production. What we have facing us is a gigantic centralization, capitalist production in its absolute essence without private property, and side by side with it and in deadly antagonism to it the corresponding socialization of labor on an equally gigantic scale.

2) It is claimed that these regimes "increase" the productive forces.

The chief and primary productive force is man. Capitalist production and capitalist theory disguise this. It is socialist production and socialist theory which establishes this.

Even empirically the proposition that these regimes "increase" the productive forces and therefore are new, cannot stand examination. A rapid growth of the productive forces in certain spheres remains a characteristic of capitalism in its extreme stage of degradation and decline, as is shown by Japan before World War II and the United States between 1940 and 1946. What is decisive is the productivity of labor. These supposedly new societies have demonstrated already that they offer nothing new in the social organization of labor and exceed the traditional capitalist societies only in the brutality and propaganda with which they have to hound the workers overwhelmed and beaten down by the capital-labor relation.

C. The Strategy of World Revolution

The revolutionary strategy of the Socialist United States of Europe was never so concrete.

At all times and in all countries today the predominating aim must be the preparation at all possible levels for the overthrow of bourgeois society, the creation of the workers' party, the creation of the workers' state, or the state of the workers and farmers. The road out of the crisis is a road of blood, of suffering and heroic efforts by the masses of the people.

The Crisis is Total

If the revolution breaks out, particularly in Europe, the rival state capitalisms will intervene and turn it into an imperialist war. If imperialist war breaks out, revolutions, civil wars, national wars, are certain to result and become part of the imperialist war. Europe and Asia in particular face devastation and bloodshed. The peoples of America since World War II have repeatedly broken out in mass demonstrations and sometimes in bloody revolt. They will be drawn into the world-wide conflict. Elections in Italy become a battleground for politics and war preparations all over the world. Outbreaks in Korea, crisis in Germany, threaten to engulf the whole world in war. A strike in the United States or a strike in France disrupts the capitalists' attempts at recovery all over the world. Moscow and Washington are racked by events in any corner of the globe. Politics and economics, war and peace, national and international, no longer can be distinguished.

In the first World War, the successful revolution broke through in Czarist Russia, the weakest link in the chain of several imperialist powers. At the end of World War II, the whole of Europe, the center of Western civilization, and of Asia, the colonial hinterland, was torn by revolution. These were crushed on a continental scale by the counter-revolutionary forces of American and Stalinist imperialism, rushing in from both sides. Today capitalist society moves into World War III from where it left off at the end of World War II. To depend today on outlying weak links in the imperialist chain from which the successful revolution can spread is self-defeating. As the imperialist rivalry of America and Russia moves to a climax, the whole world must be prepared for the perspective that, at any time, the highly developed proletariat of

either of the two remaining powers can break out in revolution and that precisely in this lies the greatest assurance for the success of the world revolution.

#### The Creative Power of the Masses

The accusations of pushing this nation and the world towards the destruction of civilization, which the most highly-placed executives of the American Empire have hurled at each other in public, marks a still deeper stage of the intellectual and moral decay of society. It will be difficult to find any section of society which does not know that every step taken today brings nearer an unavoidable catastrophe, the end of which no one can foresee. At such periods, as history has repeatedly shown, it is among the inarticulate masses that the consciousness of decay and the need for revolt have penetrated most deeply. But the proof of this, as again history has repeatedly shown, is seen only when the revolution has actually begun in the violence with which stage by stage the old is uprooted and in the realization of the incredible creativeness of the revolutionary masses. These do not merely supply the brute force of a revolution and indicate the steps by which it is to be achieved. They establish forms of social organization so new and so extending the boundaries of human thought that official society and its most gifted philosophers have to spend decades slowly working out what the revolutionary masses have already made simple and clear by their own revolutionary action.

This period has already begun and is approaching a climax. The road to freedom in Europe is the revolutionary association of millions of workers in Western Europe and the proletariat and armies of Russia, against both the monstrous tyrannies that now dominate the world. Tremendous upheavals and mass migrations of peoples will lay the foundation for a new Europe. The industrial power of China with its four hundred millions of people is just about equal to that of Belgium. The idea that Mao-Tse-Tung and his cohorts of bureaucrats will lead China on the road to stability is sheer fantasy. A total reorganization of Europe and American economy, possible only by the proletariat, is the first requirement for establishing the basis of orderly progress among a billion people in Asia and the awakened millions of Africa. The great problems of relief for tens of millions, the creation of modern economic and social structures in the backward areas, these can only be the result of the joint actions and the mutual education and experiences of whole peoples. Bourgeois society has not the forces or the means or methods to undertake such creations, even if it possessed the economic resources.

The series of transitions by which, in the vast upheavals that face us, an admittedly small organization can be transformed into a party of millions, is a vain, idle - and in nearly all cases - a defeatist speculation. What is required is that with the consciousness of the greatness of its past and the certainty of its future, the vanguard perform the duties which face it. The mass creates its own organizations, overthrows sections of the old order, follows leaders, rejects them, and through this process meets the vanguard party which also has developed in the crisis.

The strategy of world revolution in the present period is of necessity to be derived from the analysis of the changed conditions. But Marxism is not and never has been a blueprint for concrete politics. The United States aims to incorporate the national capital and national resources of British capital into its own capital. British capital feels equally the impulsion. But to base politics in Britain on the theory that the British government is a



satellite of United States capital would be a glaring stupidity. The states of Eastern Europe are satellites, but Mao-Tse-Tung is not a satellite of Russia. Conflicting forces within the subordinate nations delay and impede and resist openly the processes. Not to be excluded at all are partial and open or concealed attempts at isolation, neutrality, etc.

#### D. The Test of Experience

"Johnson-Forest" claim for their theory that it and it alone over the years has been able to maintain a firm consistent theoretical basis in harmony with the aims and methods of Marx and Engels, of Lenin and of Trotsky.

Concretely it is the theory of "Johnson-Forest" which led them to pose the falsity of the analysis of the Fourth International of the Stalinist Parties and hammer away at it until objective world developments forced the Fourth International to ask itself the same question. At the same time this theory enabled "Johnson-Forest" to pose critical support to the Communist Parties in, e.g., France and Italy, and to expose the Shachtmanites and sectarians on the question of CP-SP-CGT.

Still more concretely the theory of "Johnson-Forest" enabled them

- a) to support in the past and still support national revolutionary movements in Europe and Asia;
- b) at the same time to point out years beforehand that any national revolutionary movements in areas such as Korea and Eastern Europe which did not disentangle themselves clearly from one or the other of the dominating imperialisms would be doomed to demoralizing disaster, an analysis that has now been proved to the hilt in the case of Korea.
- c) to point out that the revolutionary forces in Yugoslavia were the workers and peasants in opposition to the Yugoslav bureaucracy and that the Yugoslav bureaucracy would prove to be the agent of the counter-revolution within the workers movement. These conclusions the Fourth International has sacrificed in favor of the now incredible doctrine that Titoism was on the road to Leninism. This doctrine the Fourth International will have to abandon and however hesitantly find its way back to mobilizing the Yugoslav workers and peasants against the Titoist bureaucracy.

Every succeeding year and every succeeding event justifies the theory of "Johnson-Forest."

#### The Class Struggle Against Bureaucracy

The Fourth International seeks to justify its mistakes or to explain its policies on the ground that it must "intervene on the side of the masses." "Johnson-Forest" wish to make it clear that this conception as a guide to the tasks of revolutionary Marxism is as new as the other political discoveries of the Fourth International. "Johnson-Forest" will, when the occasion legitimately presents itself, show that from 1848 to the death of Trotsky, the Marxist vanguard always had as its specific task the exposure and defeat of those radical intellectual and later, those bureaucratic elements which in the name of the struggle against capitalism, introduced among the revolutionary workers ideas and practices which theoretically and practically impeded the preparation of the socialist revolution. Marx and Engels fought the plan-hatching intellectualism of Proudhon and Lassalle. They established

that the basis of exploitation is in production and not in the market. After the Paris masses had shown them the way, they concretized the theory of the state in the conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat as opposed to all state-socialism and peoples' state. Leninism was in its time the struggle first against Russian Menshevism; then against European Menshevism, and then inside Russia itself, against the theories of intellectuals, bureaucrats and undialectical theoreticians in every sphere; not least against abstract theories and concepts of organization and plan which were not rooted in the creative force of the masses as shaped by the concrete objective development of capitalism. This was the preparation for the revolution and this they carried into the masses. It is the theoretical crisis in the Fourth International which produces this new theory of Marxist politics as being "intervention on the side of the masses."

#### E. Pabloism and the Fourth International

"Johnson-Forest", in opposition to the Schachtmanites and every variety of bankrupt opportunism, look upon the struggles of the past year as a complete vindication of its positions of the past. The Fourth International is now face to face with the contradictions of its own position. Only an enemy of Marxism can fail to see the immense progress which this represents.

The only political lines before the Fourth International with positions on every question of the revolution and the counter-revolution are the positions of the majority in opposition to the positions of "Johnson-Forest". But it would be a complete abstraction to say that the main struggle in the Fourth International lies between the majority and "Johnson-Forest".

#### Pabloism and Cannonism

The actual concrete truth is totally different. The main struggle lies between the tendency represented by Pablo and what we may call the tendency represented by Cannon. Their apparent agreement on a political resolution does not in the slightest degree represent any common position on the policies of Trotskyism as represented by Cannon.

This tendency has striven to maintain for over twenty years the traditions, the theory and practice of Marxism. It has been permeated with the general premise of Bolshevism that the antagonism between Trotskyism and Stalinism is an antagonism of class. It has been in the vanguard of all struggles against petty-bourgeois elements inside the International. Like "Johnson-Forest" it was hostile to the vacillations of Pabloism in the years following World War II in France, which had such disastrous consequences for our European movement, and whose real origin can now be seen. It is not in the slightest degree accidental that the first and firm reaction of the Cannon tendency to the theories of Pablo was an uncompromising reassertion of the counter-revolutionary character of Stalinism and the reaffirmation of the principle that there can be no creation of a workers' state without the proletarian revolution.

This tendency has, however, found itself unable to resist the ideas of Pablo. But there are already concrete signs enough that the Pablo tendency represents the greatest danger that has ever threatened the Fourth International.

In strict theory Pabloism subscribes directly or by default to

the basic revisionism the Stalinists have constructed to bolster their claim to be the overthrowers of capitalism.

Its total retrogressionism can be seen in these facts. Instead of analyzing world capitalism and guiding its thinking by the present stage of capital-labor antagonism and the total character of the revolution that is before us; instead of beginning at the highest stage of the previous revolutionary development, the October Revolution; State and Revolution; the Leninist position in 1920, Trotsky's conversations on the Transitional Program, it repudiates State and Revolution and places as the principle by which the Fourth International must be guided in its revolutionary struggles the degeneration of the Russian Revolution.

Every line written by Pablo merely exemplifies this fundamental retrogressionist thesis. It is a total capitulation to Stalinism. His only strength is the fact that he holds as a weapon the analysis that Trotsky left to the Fourth International. Trotsky may have gone wrong in his analysis, but he started from the premise of the fundamental class antagonism between Trotskyism and Stalinism. He never departed from this and any attempt to prove that in Trotskyism is contained the basis of Pabloism ends by destroying the foundation on which Trotsky built and making completely futile his whole life work.

#### "Johnson-Forest" Meets Challenge

"Johnson-Forest" has no illusions whatever about its own positive role in the correction of the false policies of the Fourth International. But it has always held firmly to the conviction that the whole theoretical and practical heritage of a hundred years of Marxism in general, and specifically of Bolshevism, rests with the Fourth International.

The theory of the self-acting proletariat faced the theory of "nationalized property" and to the surprise and confounding of all the renegades and the sneerers was openly and freely discussed. The question has been posed. Nothing on earth will prevent its arising again and again within the ranks of the Fourth International. It will arise and be solved in Leninist terms because the present theory of the Fourth International is in fundamental opposition to its very existence as a revolutionary organization and the whole past of which it is the inheritor, the repository and the guardian. It is more than probable that the practice of the Fourth International may be changed before the theory. But at the present moment the primary theoretical task is the destruction, root and branch, of the theories that have been put forward by Pablo and which have been successfully challenged so far only by "Johnson-Forest".

"JOHNSON-FOREST"

May 21, 1951