

INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION BULLETIN

4/1
June 1966

ORGANIZATION REPORT

Presented by Pierre Frank

to the

Second Congress Since Reunification

(Eighth World Congress)

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

30¢

SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

**INTERNAL BULLETIN OF THE UNITED SECRETARIAT
OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL**

ORGANIZATION REPORT

Presented by Comrade Pierre Frank
to the
Second Congress Since Reunification
(Eighth World Congress)

Volume 1966 -- No. 4

March 1966

This organizational report, which covers the two and a half years separating the present Congress from the World Reunification Congress, will deal with the following principal points:

-- First, reunification, which was the major decision of the preceding Congress;

-- Then, activities of the leading bodies of the International (IEC and U.S.);

-- In connection with this activity, we will have to examine the case of the Pablo faction in particular;

-- A part of this report will be devoted to our sections and to the problems confronting them.

I will close the report with certain conclusions about our past activity and their relationship to the tasks we must accomplish in the future.

Reunification

The preceding World Congress was the one which brought about reunification of our world movement after a split lasting over ten years. All the comrades remember the conditions in which this was effected, which I will summarize briefly:

Political and organizational agreement was reached between the Seventh Congress as such and delegations from the majority of organizations belonging to the International Committee. A central leadership was elected, namely, an International Executive Committee which in turn elected the United Secretariat. The agreement had to be ratified by each of the organizations belonging to the International Committee.

I will therefore deal with two kinds of problems: (a) The organizations which accepted the agreement of the Reunification Congress and those which did not. (b) How the reunification has worked out within the central leadership and subsequently in the whole organization.

On the first point, aside from the Posadist organizations which ignored the Congress (these organizations are insignificant, except in Argentina, and it has declined there considerably), only two organizations which belonged to the International Committee refused to join in the reunification. These were the Socialist Labour League headed by Healy and the La Verite group of Lambert.

These two organizations are conducting a fierce struggle against the International; they wave the banner of "anti-Pabloism." Politically they manifest on the one hand an extreme sectarianism toward the working-class movement as it exists (the Labour party in Great Britain, the Communist party in France), and, on the other hand, a lack of understanding of the colonial revolution and of developments in the workers states. The Healy group displays these tendencies week after week. The Lambert group does so more rarely but when it does, it is in the form of a 250-page pamphlet, a peculiar mélange from which one gets the impression that the world of 1965 is identical with that of 1938 and is confronted by no new problems. It should not be glossed over that these two groups -- which have lost most of their old Trotskyist members -- are successful in influencing those of the youth who do not understand the structure of the labor movement in the old capitalist countries and who think that a revolutionary party can be built simply by denouncing the betrayals of the old leaderships and of the "Pabloites." In any event, these two groups are not so much a problem for the International as they are for the British and French Trotskyists.

All the other organizations accepted the reunification agreement adopted at the preceding Congress. We shall see

further on that the Pablo faction, which did not dare fight against the reunification at that time, has been unable to stay inside the movement. But taking all that has been said into account, it can be stated that the International has never, since the end of the war, gathered together the overwhelming majority of Trotskyists in the world as it has done now.

It is true that, despite reunification on the international level, there are still certain countries in which this has not been extended to the national level. There are some countries, but not many, where two Trotskyist organizations continue to exist. We shall examine these cases when the sections are treated one by one. But one thing is certain: none of these situations originates from differences over the international basis of the reunification; they all are related to causes of a national character. Consequently, we can conclude that the conditions and basis of reunification are not involved here.

In the international leadership, reunification proceeded with the utmost smoothness. In daily cooperation within the United Secretariat, and in the IEC, there has not been the slightest difficulty which might recall previous differences. I will add that the deliberate attempts of the Pablo faction to revive them were completely doomed to failure. Unity of thought has not been limited solely to the "16 points" of the basic charter or an evaluation of the present situation -- in accordance with the text on the dynamics of the world revolution. It has also been manifested in the relations with all the sections and groups in the movement. Of course every member of the United Secretariat had the consolidation of reunification as a primary preoccupation but I can state very frankly that none of us had to make any special effort to overcome past differences.

Summarizing, the balance sheet of reunification is very largely positive. At the last Congress our movement took a great step forward; on the one hand liquidating a division which had lasted for more than ten years; on the other hand, stimulating a new development such as has already begun. We do not want to close the door to those who might want to join us later, but it is my belief, that those who have refused to join the reunified movement at this time have done so not because of the reasons they proclaim publicly but because they differ with us on fundamental questions, from sectarianism in Healy's case to the total abandonment of Trotskyism in the case of Pablo.

Activities of the Central Bodies

I will now draw the balance sheet on the activities of the central bodies, the International Executive Committee and the United Secretariat. The sections have received the minutes of the meetings of these two organizations regularly. These minutes, because of their condensed form, are not clear enough and it will be necessary to try to remedy this situation. In any case, you have been able to get an idea from them as to the questions dealt with, their great number and their variety.

The IEC has met three times since the preceding Congress. The first session (May 1964) was largely devoted to relations with the Pablo faction. But it examined other questions, especially that of Cuba, a country Comrade Germain had recently visited. The main items on the agenda of the second Plenum of the IEC (January 1965) were the call for the present Congress, the question of Ceylon and the situation in Latin America (where Comrade Livio had recently been). The third Plenum (July 1965) was devoted in large part to documents for presentation to this Congress and to the Algerian question.

Insofar as the IEC is concerned, the principal difficulty confronting us is the same persistent problem that has been with us over the years; namely, the financial obstacles to more frequent meetings and greater participation on the part of non-European comrades in particular. At each meeting of the IEC, we have had non-European comrades present, but in insufficient number. Obviously, with modern means of transportation, leading comrades could easily be present without leaving their sections for any great length of time. Our movement would be greatly enriched if it were possible to have the IEC meet twice a year, with a greater degree of participation by leaders of non-European sections. This would contribute substantially to forging a broader international leadership. I emphasize: it is the financial problem only which hinders us here.

But as a result of this fact and despite our own wishes, the United Secretariat is performing a far greater role in the functioning of our movement than we would like. For it, too, material difficulties are substantial. The Bureau of the United Secretariat is itself not completely in one city; nevertheless, it has managed to meet, with rare exceptions, once a week. The United Secretariat has met regularly once a month, despite great material difficulties for some comrades. At the

first Plenum, in May 1964, we enlarged the United Secretariat: on the one hand to bring in new forces; on the other hand, to attempt to help our English movement. Some success has been registered on the first point; but as we shall see from the discussion of our movement's situation in England, we failed on the second count.

I want to emphasize immediately how necessary it is to make a maximum effort to enlarge the United Secretariat since, for a great many reasons, we are subject to many pressures in a reverse direction. National leaderships do not have too many leading comrades at their disposal. Although we are recruiting youth, they will not supply us with cadres for several years; at the present time, the cadres must be formed and this demands a great deal of work on the part of the national leaderships. It is also generally thought that those who have assumed the daily tasks of international leadership will easily continue to do so. This view is incorrect, not because the comrades in question won't do their best, but because the forces at the center are inadequate for the tasks which must be carried out. I will enumerate some of them.

Each member of the United Secretariat carries on a very voluminous correspondence arising from the division of countries among them; independently of this, a primary link between the center and the Trotskyist movement in its widest form has been assured by the articles which members of the United Secretariat contribute to World Outlook. Even though this publication is by no means an organ of our movement, not a single event of the slightest importance has occurred on which the center has been unable to supply a position, a line, by means of articles appearing in this bulletin. This publication has achieved high esteem inside and outside the International. Editions in various languages have been started, based on it as a model. But it must be understood that contributions by members of the United Secretariat to this publication, even when it was appearing fortnightly, are very time-consuming. A reorganization is now in process.

Theoretical organs in French, Quatrième Internationale, and in German, Die Internationale, have appeared with regularity. This was not the case, however, for organs in English and in Spanish, and we must make practical decisions at this Congress to end this intolerable situation.

With further reference to publication, the situation has somewhat improved without intervention on our part, as a result of the fact that bourgeois publishers have issued more works by Trotsky than in the past; on the other hand there is a shortage of pamphlets of an international scope dealing with current problems. Such pamphlets are indispensable as we all realize. But in order to get them, it is essential that international work be divided among a greater number of comrades, so that some of them will have the necessary time for writing.

I will only mention the fact that there have been many trips inside of Europe. In order to establish closer relations with sections remote from the center, the United Secretariat underwrote two trips to Algeria. Members of national leaderships made trips to China, Japan, and Eastern Europe.

Generally speaking, Western Europe provides many opportunities to meet revolutionary militants coming from all continents. That is one reason, among others, why the international center should be maintained here. But one conclusion to be drawn from the experiences of members of the United Secretariat who have gone to Latin America and Asia is that comrades sent out by the center, if they are to be effective in aiding remote sections, must not be subject to a time limit by the pressure of central tasks; they must be able to dedicate a great deal of time to the sections, to be at their disposal for leading schools, etc. This presents two kinds of difficulties: first, how to resolve the problem of maintaining sufficient forces at the center despite the prolonged absence of a comrade; second, to find the necessary resources. Even a modest perspective should envisage two major trips a year.

As a contribution to internal life, we must issue the Internal Bulletin regularly. For a while, we were not too successful in this, for we found ourselves caught between writing articles for World Outlook and the demands of the internal struggle with the Pablo faction. Eleven Internal Bulletins were issued for this Congress.

The United Secretariat has participated in schools organized by various sections for cadre education, and in some cases has organized schools itself. This has been carried out in the French and German sections also in the English for colonial militants, and in the Danish section. In European sections, if the sections themselves take responsibility for the material organization of schools, the United Secretariat will

easily be able to contribute. As for schools outside of Europe, we have already noted the conditions for making this possible.

Among other tasks of the center, I must mention that of demonstrating solidarity at the present time in several countries. This task demands repeated efforts to secure resources, not always directly from the movement itself, but through the intermediary of appropriate organizations. But we must learn how to persuade circles which are inclined to contribute in behalf of solidarity. Difficulties arise from the inexperience of many comrades in this sphere. I hope participants in the discussion will make suggestions on this question.

I will now report on the finances of our movement....

The Pablo Faction

I now come to the question of the Pablo faction to which members of the United Secretariat devoted an enormous amount of attention. The comrades have received abundant material on this question: three large Internal Bulletins, minutes of the United Secretariat and of the IEC containing documents of this faction, and answers by the United Secretariat or the Majority of the International. We also have at our disposal a collection from Pablo's organ Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme which presents Pablo's positions and shows the evolution of his ideas.

On the organizational level, things are very clear. Less than two months after the last World Congress, Pablo demanded a reopening of discussion on the Sino-Soviet conflict, one of the questions most debated at that Congress. He did so in a letter addressed directly to all members of the International, in which he questioned the good faith of the representatives of the majority within the United Secretariat. After this declaration of war, one attack followed another in crescendo. Pablo pleaded poverty and declared that we prevented his attendance at meetings held in Europe by not contributing to his expenses; but he made numerous trips to Europe on his own during which he did not contact us, meeting only with members of his faction or comrades whom he thought he could win over. Less than six months after the World Congress, while claiming to be destitute, he launched Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme.

If an organ addressed to Africa was the only thing involved, there would have been no arguments nor any difficulty.

Everybody understands that the potential area for differences on Africa is very wide and bears no necessary relation to overall tasks. But from its inception Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme has been a public-faction organ defending a line contrary to that of the International on questions decided by the World Congress. Pablo knows enough to realize that this behavior, even though the majority was not attacked by name, forced the United Secretariat to publicly disavow his public organ, appearing under the name of the International and defending positions contrary to those of the International.

I do not want to describe all stages of the battle, for it has been more a battle than a political discussion. During the course of the battle, Pablo rode one horse after another -- proceeding from the question of the site of the International Committee to that of the split in Ceylon; from Bolivia to India; from England to Japan. I think that each of these episodes has now been pretty much forgotten and Pablo himself has abandoned most of them. But this uninterrupted series of complaints, a new one for every occasion, month after month, had a profound political significance. Each item only had relative importance, but taken as a whole they revealed a most powerful need on Pablo's part to dissociate himself from the organization at any cost and for no matter what reason. In the struggle he was conducting, it was not enough for him to say that the majority was wrong, that it had an incorrect line; he had to label the majority, together with the organization that followed it, as corrupt, rotten, without a future, etc.

Pablo's about-faces have been very rapid and occasionally very striking. Thus, at the moment when the majority of the LSSP was betraying Trotskyism, he placed the responsibility for this betrayal on the United Secretariat, which presumably had an opportunistic attitude. Three to four months later, he discovered that the SLFP, the party of Mrs. Bandaranaike, had an anti-imperialist program and even an anticapitalist one. Several months after the last World Congress, he demanded that a Congress be called practically without preparation. And then, when the present Congress was convoked about eleven months ago, he demanded -- just a fortnight before its scheduled opening -- that it be postponed for six months. His suspension, decided by the Plenum of the IEC in May 1964, was the minimum any leadership could do without inviting total disintegration of its organization.

Some indications have already been given of the weakness of the Pablo group and I will not revert to that. Something must be said, however, on its activities and relative strength in Algeria. The Danish comrade mentioned a circulation figure for Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme which does not correspond with the facts; these are well known to us because it is printed in the same print shop which does Quatrieme Internationale, as well as the organ of the French section.

Work for the Algerian revolution began as a labor of support to this revolution and it was undertaken by the whole movement; it was not a monopoly of the Pablo faction. All the European sections and several non-European sections participated. From that time on we were confronted with a problem, especially in the French section; the problem created difficulties but did not result in the formation of tendencies. In carrying out our pledge to the FLN, we cooperated, of necessity, with the top of the FLN. But under these conditions, was it not possible to organize a rank-and-file Algerian Trotskyist group which could eventually conduct a struggle against the leadership -- even given the necessarily illegal and underground conditions? I emphasize that leading comrades in the French section who are presently with Pablo discussed this question and saw a danger in not seeking to benefit from the sympathies manifested toward us. In practice, we did not give a clear answer and an Algerian Trotskyist group was not established nor was an effort made to establish one.

When Algeria became independent, Pablo undertook some contact work in leading circles and among the cadres but did not try to organize even a small group. The Algerian group consisted only of European comrades -- and they were soon exclusively from his faction because he expelled the others. I will give an example which in my mind is fully symptomatic of the organizational ideas Pablo ended up with, ideas in which the fundamental Bolshevik concepts of party organizational lines were erased. At the last World Congress, when we elected our main leading body, the IEC, the Pablo faction asked us to add an Algerian to the proposed list, without any consideration of tendency. We told the Congress then that we had no principled objection but that even if it was necessary for security reasons, to refrain from mentioning the comrade's name to the Congress, members of the International Secretariat had to know his name. We were then provided with a name. Two months later, Comrade Lenoir, Pablo's alternate in the United Secretariat, went to

Algeria and we gave him the task, among others, of seeing the Algerian comrade and exploring with him ways he might cooperate in the work of the International leadership. What was Lenoir's report? When Lenoir spoke to this comrade, he answered that while he was willing to collaborate with us in Algeria, he was not even a member of the Fourth International. We can hardly blame the Algerian for this situation; only Pablo's organizational ideas.

I come now to the political differences. It must be clear that our organizational attitude was not determined by Pablo's political ideas but by his undisciplined behavior. But Pablo's political ideas determined his organizational attitude, for politically he kept going further and further away from the Fourth International.

If we read the back numbers of Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme we must come to the conclusion that it is not a Trotskyist organ. Points of view on essential questions are presented that had always been rejected by our movement. It is possible, as has been done at this Congress, to discuss whether or not the Ben Bella government was a workers and peasants government. But in Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme we find three or four different definitions of the Algerian state, not one of which is Trotskyist. We are told that it is a "preworkers state," a "state which is not completely workers," a "people's state developing toward a workers state." We are here at a World Congress, not at a school for new members, so it is unnecessary to comment on these definitions.

Quite recently Pablo came out with an appeal for volunteers for the Vietnam war. But in his May or June number, several months after the beginning of Johnson's escalation, he developed a virtually Khrushchevite position. He stated that the Chinese might be partly responsible for unleashing a world war and he advocated flexibility on the Soviet side so as to let the Americans get out of this affair without loss of face. We cannot possibly refrain from publicly stating that this has nothing in common with Trotskyism, with the Fourth International.

At the opening of this Congress, we distributed the text of an editorial in the Dutch organ published by followers of Pablo. The Dutch organization has, among other attributes, the characteristic of lagging behind on Pablo's sharp turns. In this editorial they still stand on his positions as of last May and give them an even more outrageous form.

Regarding Greece, Pablo began by giving advice to the EDA and to Papandreou; he only discovered our comrades in the Greek section several months later. At Cyprus, he met Archbishop Makarios and found him a man "full of charm," wearing a "discrete gold cross." I am not inventing these words; they are to be found in the organ of the Pablo faction. This defies description.

I don't want to delve into the question of "de-Stalinization" and Pablo's evaluation of developments in the USSR, since this is a point that has been discussed for years and much has been written on it. We know that he practically identifies "de-Stalinization" with the political revolution, contrary to the position he defended jointly with us at several World Congresses.

All this shows that it is not a question of one bad or incorrect article appearing in Sous le Drapeau, which might happen in any organ of our movement here or there; an entire political outlook is involved. I add that these articles are not the work of young comrades. Pablo is the main editor of the organ and most of the articles mentioned are by him, though some may carry a pseudonym.

At the bottom of Pablo's orientation is a concept openly declared in issue No. 17 (May 1965). It is stated there that "the revolutionary Marxist tendency will never permit itself to be identified with a line which gives complete responsibility for its implementation to Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, Germain and other hardened defenders of a dead and futureless past." To come to us after writing this and propose a "modus vivendi," threatening that otherwise the battle will become public, was not serious. The fight was already made public.

The fundamental idea in his "declaration" was the following: The present period is the most revolutionary that humanity has witnessed, which is true. Under these conditions, it is stated, theory is often behind reality. Which we will not dispute. It is at this point that his "declaration" becomes interesting. We are now told that this is true for the official Communist movement and it is also true "for the historical movement known by the name of the Fourth International." And what conclusions does Pablo draw from this? The main one is that the past of organizations no longer counts; it is a "dead past." It matters little that the Communist parties were tools of the Soviet bureaucracy; that is the "dead past." The Trotskyist organizations insured the continuity of Bolshevism as against the Soviet

bureaucracy; that is the "dead past," except to petrified elements like us. At the present time, the Communist parties, the Trotskyist organizations and other Communist groups are all organizations whose ideas have not kept pace with reality.

Under these conditions, the objective according to Pablo is to create an International in which all tendencies will be gathered together, a democratic International which will allow the "revolutionary Marxist tendency" -- that is to say, Pablo -- to bring enlightenment so that their theories will catch up with reality. This declaration, then, no longer poses the problem of building a new international revolutionary leadership; for him, the problem is to build a democratic Communist International in which the play of tendencies will solve all of humanity's problems.

I will not dwell on the illusory character of such an objective, an International in which all Communist tendencies would be found together, a democratic International containing all these tendencies. But this idea has already had practical consequences for Pablo. Actually, since his return to Europe, his main activity has not been directed to building an organization. He is using the limited group around him -- as he tried to use the International two or three years ago -- which is actively involved in committees for one thing or another, to exert pressure on the movement and in organizations in one form or another. We do not wish to say that such committees should not be created, that we must not participate in them or support them. We have never been against that, but they cannot be a substitute, as the Pablo faction is virtually making of them, for the task of building a new international revolutionary leadership and new revolutionary parties. And if the Pablo faction has reached that point, it is because action corresponds to innermost thought, even though not all the comrades who are in this faction are conscious of their new orientation, and even if some of them think they are defending a better line for the Fourth International.

The State of the Trotskyist Movement

I now come to the sections and organizations which belong to the Trotskyist movement. I will deal unevenly with various countries in this part of the report keeping in mind the fact that there are delegates present who will be able to

report much better than I on their own national organizations.

In the very first place, a few words, necessarily general in nature for obvious reasons, about our activities in the workers states. We have not ceased to maintain, and to some degree develop, contacts inside these states. Conditions in these countries are extremely difficult in view of the rigid control exerted over all media of expression and reproduction. We get our material through, but not always regularly. It is not easy to change such a situation, as it would be necessary to have larger material and human forces. Politically, various signs attest to the development of ideas in the same direction as ours. We draw the attention of the comrades to the trial of Communist youth which took place this summer in Poland.

Let us now begin with the continent of Asia.

We have had contacts with former comrades in Vietnam but cannot speak of an organized activity on their part. In Hong Kong, a group of Chinese comrades are carrying on a limited activity. This group has contributed financially to the International; it is in regular contact with Comrades Peng and Chen, who cannot attend this Congress for reasons beyond their control. They have sent a letter to the Congress which is in the dossier that has been put at the disposal of delegates to the Congress.

From Indonesia, we have for some time been receiving a publication issued by Comrade Ibnu Parna. Insofar as we were able to evaluate the contents, his line seemed close to ours on the Sino-Soviet conflict and he was making substantial use of World Outlook. After the recent events we sent him a note aimed at getting news about the situation of comrades. Up to the present day we have received no answer.

In Japan, following the Reunification Congress and Comrade Okatani's trip to Europe, the two organizations merged, which is all to the good. However, reunification was accomplished under conditions which were not clear to us. The letters we receive are brief, not very explanatory. We had hoped for a while that we would have a delegate present at this Congress. According to official information we have received, the proportion between the majority siding with the International majority and minority holding the point of view of the Pablo faction is three to one.

Ceylon is a problem which will be dealt with in a separate part of the agenda. That is why I will limit myself now to saying that the International must give a great deal of attention to this section. The split with the reformist wing has not left a clear situation in the section.

We do not have an Indian delegate at the Congress as a result of difficulties in securing a passport. A letter from the Indian comrades is in the dossier of communications which have been addressed to this Congress. The decision made by the comrades to form a structured organization openly operating as Trotskyist is in our opinion an excellent one under present conditions. In this country, where political problems are becoming sharper all the time, there are very many Trotskyists, but for years now they have not had, if indeed they ever had, a centralized organization, not to mention an open organization. So that the entrust experience could not have positive results and there was no means for carrying out work on the national political level.

Of course we must be aware that the organization established today is far from corresponding to the need. Last year, when I went to India, I became convinced that very strong local tendencies could not be overcome by argument. An organization expressing itself, an organ appearing -- these are the necessary initial steps in order to regroup the waverers. The formation of an open independent organization is not, in our view, in contradiction with an entrust policy into the left CP (in certain Indian states anyway). But this does not seem to have been firmly grasped by the Indian comrades, who have had two profitless entrust experiences because they disregarded what we consider to be a fundamental rule: whatever the specific problems of any entry may be, the operation does not imply a weakening of organization; on the contrary, it demands the maintenance of a strong centralized organization.

The comrades who have taken charge of the public independent organization have asked the Congress to recognize it as the section of the Fourth International. It appears to me that there is some misunderstanding here. We have had an Indian section for many years. Its organizational state may have left something to be desired, but that did not mean there was no section. In our view, the steps these comrades have just taken constitute a reorganizational measure; they are forming the section and the Congress therefore does not have to recognize it as a new

section. We believe the Congress will share this point of view and also, that it will call upon all Indian comrades to join the Trotskyist organization, whether publicly or not depending on individual cases, and to set up a strong national leadership having close ties with the International.

We have established relations with Iranian revolutionary militants. For the moment there can be no question of a Trotskyist organization, only of educating cadres politically, especially with clear ideas on relations with the national bourgeoisie.

In Iraq there is a functioning organization which is led by young revolutionists who take their positions on the basis of the theory of permanent revolution. We have the closest possible relations with them and must consider them as being with us even though they are not formally an organization of the International.

Our comrades are continuing their activities in Israel, especially in communist Arab circles.

In Lebanon we have some contacts. This is the country in which an Arabic edition of The Permanent Revolution has been published.

Let us proceed to Africa.

The activities of our movement in Algeria have already been discussed under another point on the agenda. The political authority of our movement continues to be high. Boumedienne had no intention of wasting his time when he selected the French weekly, le Nouvel Observateur, as the place to attack the Fourth International, making a carefully calculated amalgam there.

We have relations with another Maghreb group. We maintain these relations but the group is going through internal difficulties which would not be helped by intervention on our part.

The Nigerian comrade will supply the necessary information on the situation in his country and on the organization he represents.

Our movement must give a great deal of attention to South Africa. We had no contact with South African Trotskyists for years but this is no longer the case now. Politically there

is agreement on the general line of struggle to be waged against the fascist regime of Verwoerd. What is needed by the South African revolutionists is substantial material assistance for beginning the struggle in the form which it demands.

The question of Australia already came up under another point on the agenda. Over half the organization is with us as against those who follow Pablo. These are youth forces who admit to their own lack of experience; but they are youth and that is the first guaranty for the future. Our assistance will necessarily be limited to correspondence.

Let us now proceed to the Americas.

The Canadian comrade will report on the activities of his organization. Here we want to express our thanks for the aid the Canadian comrades have given for several important tasks of the International.

In the United States, the SWP has made serious progress in youth circles now becoming radicalized by the Vietnam war and by the Negro question. This progress has made Healy uneasy (he is conducting an unbridled campaign against the International and against the SWP). He has been trying to reconcile two small sectarian groups against the SWP. We have had a chance to meet several of the youth who belong to the American Trotskyist movement. We are certain, in the light of the steps the SWP is taking to educate them politically, that they guarantee replacements in the years to come for comrades who have unswervingly defended Trotskyism over so many years without any perspective of immediate success.

In Cuba, the Posadas group has publicly broken with "the Fourth International"; in this case, the reference is to the Posadas faction and Posadas has publicly disavowed the group. Apart from this, there are many militants in Cuba, whether members of the leading party or not, who know our positions and share them. Our activity there is mainly concerned with a deepening of theory and to meet this need we must settle the question of the regular appearance of our theoretical organ in Spanish.

Our contact with a group of Jamaican revolutionists continues; but the multiplicity of our tasks has prevented us from devoting much time to them.

Comrade Livio will give a detailed report on Latin America. The situation is very complicated. Beside the Trotskyist organizations, there are a great many revolutionary groups. I therefore emphasize again how important our Spanish magazine is for promoting political clarification -- and consequently regrouping -- which is essential to the future progress of the Latin-American revolution.

Let us end with Europe.

We have already expressed to our Danish comrades our understanding of the fact that young revolutionists, operating under uninspiring conditions in their own country, naturally tend to react vigorously on subjects transcending their national problems. We have pointed out that it remains true, nevertheless, that they must think of tomorrow and the day after, that is to say, that educational work must be done, cadres formed, and positions taken on problems of the Danish working-class movement, however limited these problems may be.

In Sweden, new developments are taking place which will probably permit a beginning for our movement in this country.

At the other extremity of Europe -- Cyprus -- relations with our comrades remain limited.

In Greece, our comrades were in the front ranks in the struggles of last summer. They have been able to win forces among the youth. Our comrades, who have experienced so many years of illegality, have never been demanding toward the International, and I believe it should find means for helping them. It should be possible for the Italian section to send comrades occasionally in order, for example, to give courses on the formation of youth cadres.

In Austria, as we know, conditions deteriorated badly and were unfavorable to the assimilation of youth elements at a time when some of them were turning toward our movement. It is to be hoped that we are finally out of this intolerable situation and that some progress will finally take place.

For Austria and for Switzerland, an important problem is tied up with the publication of our theoretical magazine in the German language. For 1966, this will appear legally in Germany. This is all the more necessary because of developments in Germany, especially in student circles.

We are following ideological developments taking place in the Spanish movement with the objective of building a Spanish section. On the level of theory, great progress has been made by certain groups of Spanish militants. But this is taking place in the midst of a general confusion such as exists nowhere else.

In Belgium, the Trotskyists did a job inside the Social Democracy which everybody in the International considered excellent until factional considerations came into play. But excellent it was and it allowed our movement to renew its strength, while at the same time it was performing the main task of the entry, that is, the formation of a left wing inside the Social Democracy. However the close governmental collaboration of the BSP with the bourgeoisie resulted in a situation where the official party leadership was able to choose the time to present the left with this difficult alternative: capitulation or exit from the BSP. The left broke with the BSP. The Belgian Trotskyists are now in a new situation. They are working in an organization which is still far from revolutionary but in which they are no longer in the position of a minority opposing a reformist leadership. New problems are before them; and while there must be an experimental element to this new activity, it is nevertheless necessary to proceed rapidly with a theoretical study of the problems posed by these new conditions.

England, more specifically the problem of the state of our movement in Great Britain, constitutes a separate point on the agenda. An exceptional situation in the working-class movement exists as a consequence of the policies of the Wilson government and this could give birth to a mass left if there were a pole of attraction for the latter. Unfortunately, this does not exist, and it is in large part due to the deplorable state of our movement. The designated English Committee has met several times and will have definite proposals to make to the Congress.

On the subject of France, I cannot here discuss the problems posed by the presidential election. I will merely say that the FCP, in taking a position for the Mitterrand candidacy, has taken a giant step onto the "Italian road." Our section, the ICP, has profited considerably from developments taking place among the youth. We have recruited more than twice what we lost in the Pablo split and this recruitment is continuing. Our organization is being rebuilt in the provinces. The first problem we must solve is that of assimilation, of educating new members.

There is also the problem of forming a new leadership, for those who left with Pablo were old comrades, politically demoralized, but with organizational experience and in some case leadership experience. Another problem confronting the French section is that arising from the multiplicity of groups and organs; it is very difficult for the youth to become oriented amidst such confusion, since practical political experience is very slight in all the groups. Most important of all is the problem resulting from the fact that the youth find the CY unattractive, even though they feel the strength of the FCP and the CGT in the working class: besides, entrust work for the youth is not practical inside youth organizations. The ICP has recently held an active workers' congress; it discussed these questions and is going to try some experiments in order to find answers to these problems.

In Italy, developments in the Italian CP must be followed by our whole movement since they presage many of the things to come in other Communist parties. Our organization has expanded greatly under these conditions. It has recruited appreciably, both numerically and politically. The problem of a left wing within a Communist party and a mass Communist party at that, is being posed concretely. Our Italian comrades will tell us their experiences and the lessons they have drawn from them.

Some Conclusions

I would like to draw some conclusions for the future from this report.

I return first to the reunification. We have not yet garnered all the benefits from this. It is true that we now include the bulk of Trotskyist forces; but on the outside are to be seen groups conducting a fierce struggle against us. Starting with this Congress, we will put the emphasis on work directed outwardly, and this should allow us to capitalize on the new opportunities resulting from reunification.

In a number of sections, especially the oldest ones, which have for years been at a standstill for various reasons, we are now witnessing renewed recruitment. This has revealed itself in the very composition of this Congress, where half the delegates are coming to a World Congress for the first time. One of the characteristics of our movement and a manifestation of its vitality is this fact, that the best part of the revolutionary youth is moving toward it. As a result, a primary

task for the coming period, a task international in scale will be the formation of new cadres and leaders.

We must make the greatest effort to insure regular publication of our organs. There is no valid reason for failing to fulfill this task. There is no lack of material to publish. There is a public for our publications. This task could be accomplished with relative ease by a few sections, with the literary collaboration of members of the United Secretariat.

Comrades must direct their attention to the question of the international center. While those who are leaving our movement find no lack of stones to throw at the members of the United Secretariat, comrades within the movement, on the other hand, tend to think that the United Secretariat members can almost perform miracles. The truth is the other way around; the center, that is to say, the IEC and the United Secretariat are a dependent function of the strength of the whole movement.

Under present conditions of transportation, the IEC could play a much greater role in our movement, a role which it should normally have, if we had sufficient financial means for comrades living in the most remote areas to travel by plane. This would contribute to creating a wider leadership by comrades who are simultaneously involved in the daily activities of their sections.

The United Secretariat continues to remain in Europe and we have no reason whatever to make concessions to the purely demagogic propositions both of Posadas and of Pablo, which are not aimed at improving the functioning of the center but rather at introducing conditions for its disruption. Europe is still the place where conditions at present are the most propitious for its functioning, with the best sources of information about the whole world, with the best conditions for comrades to meet, and not solely European comrades. But the center's means are inadequate at the present time.

A few more comrades, somewhat greater financial and technical means, these are necessary prerequisites. We are doing a great deal with inadequate means but this holds a danger. Everything cannot be sustained at the breaking point indefinitely.

On the financial level, the statutes anticipated that the International would receive a sixth of the income of the sections. This was a high percentage which no section has ever paid. But

I am convinced that if we receive about ten percent, which corresponds to the payments by several sections, this would give the International considerably increased means and would facilitate carrying out many tasks.

A more serious objection is that sections still have too few cadres so that it would be difficult, if not impossible, for them to spare even a single leading comrade for a rather long period. We understand this argument well, all the more so because all the members of the Secretariat are involved in the life of their European sections, participating in their daily activities, and are familiar with the activities of most of the sections by virtue of this participation. We do not want -- under a false pretext of "Bolshevism" -- to force comrades into making decisions which would in the long run prove more costly than any immediate benefits that might result. We know that the absence even of a single comrade can under certain conditions create a crisis. But we are convinced that realistic solutions are possible. For example, consideration should be given -- as was done in the case of Comrade H, following the preceding congress -- to the idea that leaders of remote sections should make arrangements for a more protracted sojourn in Europe on the occasion of a congress or of an IEC session, so as to be able to participate in the daily activities of the international center for a period of time.

As regards Europe, we request that the strongest sections should immediately associate youth leaders with the United Secretariat in some appropriate way. This would only make limited demands on their time but would contribute to preparing new international cadres for our movement.

Here is the plan of work which we believe can be guaranteed as a minimum for the year 1966:

- Contributing articles for publication in World Outlook; effecting a reorganization which would permit a French edition in addition to the English one.

- Publication of organs of which the English one, however, presents very great difficulties.

- A trip to Asia.

- Continuation of the campaign for the Bolivian comrades; the success it had last year must be guaranteed in 1966.

-- Publication of pamphlets and books. A specific plan has not yet been set up on this subject.

We have completed a certain number of practical proposals regarding work of the United Secretariat which we will submit to the IEC elected by this Congress.

In conclusion, I would like to state that we made every effort to present the truest possible report on our movement, both from the standpoint of presenting the mass of accomplished work as well as the holes and gaps in this work. The situation in many countries is favorable for our movement, and comrades are legitimately concerned with making the most of the opportunities open to them. But they should not forget that they cannot do so by ignoring the center or weakening it. No section can hope to make progress at the expense of the center. On the contrary, one of the conditions for the most fruitful exploitation of opportunities is to have a strong international leadership.