



Nahuel Moreno

**Report on the
General Council
to the CC of the
Colombian PST**

Nahuel Moreno

Report on the General Council to the CC of the Colombian PST

June 1981

Archive material courtesy of Fundación Pluma

English Translation: Daniel Iglesias

Cover and interior design: Daniel Iglesias

Editor notes: Daniel Iglesias

www.nahuelmoreno.org

www.uit-ci.org

www.izquierdasocialista.org.ar

Copyright by CEHuS Centro de Estudios Humanos y Sociales

Buenos Aires, 2024

cehus2014@gmail.com



Contents

Foreword	1
Report on the General Council to the CC of the Colombian PST	3
Poland is the other major axis of our intervention in the class struggle... 10	
The Constituent Assembly	12
Answers from Nahuel Moreno.....	20
Canada–Iran.....	24

Foreword

At the end of May 1981, a meeting was held in Paris of the General Council of the recently founded—in December 1980—, Fourth International–International Committee (FI–IC). It was the merger, which lasted a few months, of the Trotskyist currents headed by the Argentinean Nahuel Moreno and the Frenchman Pierre Lambert. This long report by Nahuel Moreno on the meeting reflects positively on the advances that were being made in the first months of the work of unification. An example is the discussions about Central America. In nahuelmoreno.org one can see the work of 1981, *Central America: Six Countries, One Nationality, One Revolution*.

However, this process was quickly affected by two political events that led to its failure. One of them was expressed at this General Council meeting. The French leader Luis Favre, surprisingly, in his speech, referred in passing to revolutionary politics in backward countries, vindicating the “anti-imperialist united front”. His approach was opposed to the approved programmatic document. Thus, a debate on its definitions was opened that quickly developed within the joint leadership, the publications, and was transferred to several of the national organisations that were in the process of unification in the different countries. That debate, which was just beginning, was not included by Moreno in the report.

The second fact was the change of policy of the International Communist Organisation (unified), OCI(u), towards the government of François Mitterrand, who on 10 May 1980 had won the runoff against Giscard d’Estaing. Amid correct general phrases, Lambertism veered towards a totally wrong policy of supporting the imperialist bourgeois government of the social democrat Mitterrand. Then added to this, among other things, there were also differences in political orientation towards Poland. In a few months, because of bureaucratic methods and the unprincipled recourse to promoting moral accusations to prevent fraternal and democratic debate, the unification was frustrated. In January 1982, in Bogotá, Moreno promoted the founding of a new international organisation, the International Workers League–Fourth International, to regroup his followers and add several organisations and leaders (such as the Peruvian Ricardo Napuri and the Venezuelan Alberto Franchesqui) who rejected the opportunistic and bureaucratic course of Pierre Lambert.

In nahuelmoreno.org this work can be complemented with, among others, the following:

1981: *A new leadership emerges*

1981: *The Mitterrand government, its perspectives, and our policy*

1981: *Letter to the CC of the Spanish POSI*

1982: *The OCI (u)’s Betrayal*

1986: *Our experience with Lambertism*

The document is a transcription of the recording of Comrade Moreno’s oral report, which was not reviewed by him. The document was scanned by Fundación Pluma from its clandestine records

of the Argentine PST, and it appears that three pages were omitted in two different places. Anyway, we decided to publish it because of the important topics discussed here.

The clarification of acronyms remains pending for future improvements in the publication of Moreno's works. We can say that S is Santi, a member of the Spanish PST, and Z is Zezé, leader of the Brazilian Bolshevik Faction (BF). Marc Lacaze of the French OCI(u) would be, at least in some cases, M; in other cases, M would be Mercedes. Luis Favre of the OCI(u) would be F, as his pseudonym was Felipe. Pierre Lambert is L and Camilo González of the Colombian PST is C. Moreno signed the internal works of the FI-IC as Miguel Capa.

The editors

February 2024

Report on the General Council to the CC of the Colombian PST

This is a difficult report to present in a short time, it was a very dense meeting, as much as the Open World Conference. They were eight intense days of work, of activity, with points of great importance, with great political, theoretical, programmatic and organisational advances of the General Council (General Council).

We'll attempt then to make a synthesis, which will necessarily be somewhat schematic and with the arrival of the materials, the publication of the resolutions and the supplements to them that many of you don't know, it will be possible to continue delving into what was the council meeting.

All the members of the General Council attended this meeting, and as special guests at the meeting were [female] comrade F, on account of which Poland and all the discussion of the General Council on Poland would be very useful for all the work there, from the perspective that she is going to Poland and accompany her husband and Comrade S, an old Spanish Trotskyist militant, because of the resolution that speaks about the point of Spain on the agenda of the General Council.

We are going to approach the report following the general outline of the balance of activities presented by M. This balance of activities was the one that gave the general framework to the entire meeting, and also allowed the different points that were subsequently developed to be framed within it. In it, the fundamental problems and the most important advances that have taken place in these five months of operation of the FI-IC, since the holding of the Open World Conference, were raised.

This report began by pointing out the two great tasks that the Conference had set before it. The first one specifies the program that had been adopted at the conference, the Theses.¹ You know that a large number of amendments were presented at the World Conference, some 23 or 24 amendments to the Theses, and delegated to the Executive Committee the discussion and approval or not of the amendments that had been presented. This was the first great task that remained since the World Conference. The second was to advance in the process of reconstruction of the Fourth International, a task that, given all the events of the class struggle after the World Conference, became more important and at the same time much more difficult to face, and became one of the fundamental axes of the FI-IC.

The big question to this problem of how we have advanced in the reconstruction of the FI-IC, is how we have advanced in the application and development of democratic centralism that would allow the FI-IC to function as a true Bolshevik party, concerning its sections and that these, in turn, adopt the functioning of democratic centralism. It was the great question and the great problem that had to be answered in this balance of activities, in this second great task left by the World Conference.

¹ It refers to the Theses written by Moreno for the unification and later published as *The Transitional Program Today*, available for downloading from www.nahuelmoreno.org.

To these two great tasks, we have to add (and this was the answer given in the balance of activities) the rest of the points that the General Council meeting contemplated. The agenda that took place was as follows:

- 1) Activities Report;
- 2) Report on the world situation (presented by Comrade M);
- 3) Portugal (presented by Comrade F);
- 4) Finances (presented by Comrade F);
- 5) Spain (presented by Comrade F);
- 6) Report on the amendments to the Theses (presented by Comrade L);
- 7) Poland (presented by L);
- 8) Report on Central America (presented by C);
- 9) Voting and Decisions.

Two commissions were set up: one on Spain, which reported on the relevant point on Spain, and another on Peru, which presented a resolution on the last item on the agenda, which was unanimously approved by the General Council.

From this agenda and the different points that were developed, we will try to make a synthesis, complementing the balance of activities.

The balance of activities raised five great axes to respond to the two great tasks posed by the World Conference —the programmatic advance and the process towards the reconstruction of the Fourth International. Those five great axes are:

1) The leadership, considered as the fundamental aspect that we had to study and analyse, whether or not there had been progress in the leadership of the FI-IC. This is a fundamental point because it is necessary to build a respected leadership and also one that functions as a true work team, and we can only achieve this —we all know this and we repeat it systematically in our parties— if that leadership is responding correctly to the problems posed by the class struggle and the parties, the national sections of this world party.

2) The second great axis is what has been the intervention of the FI-IC as a world party in the problems posed by the class struggle in these five months. In other words, this leadership, how it has begun to respond and how it has participated in the class struggle in the world since its setting up as the leadership of the FI-IC. In this aspect, there is a very important point: in this response to the events of the class struggle, how we have been building the sections of our world party.

3) The third aspect, how we have been getting closer in the functioning during these five months, to a world party functioning, and a Bolshevik functioning of a world party, which has to do with the point that we mentioned before as one of the great tasks left behind by the world conference, democratic centralism. In this regard, how the process of unifying the national sections is advancing, which is a central and fundamental part of the application of democratic centralism in our world party.

4) Whether or not we have managed to transform, as we advance in this process, our publications into collective organisers, fundamentally *International Correspondence*.

5) The fifth point is whether or not we have maintained a systematic battle to defeat the USec, to defeat it politically. This aware that the USec as a specific phenomenon is not going to disappear immediately because of the social roots that sustain it, maintain it, and allow it to continue subsisting despite the crisis that it has gone through for years and continues to go through.

To these five points that the balance of activities contemplated, we will add a sixth element in the report: how the analysis and the resolution that was presented and was approved on the world political situation affects or not, and what new elements it brings within the general line proposed by the Theses and accepted by the World Conference, of building Trotskyist parties with

mass influence, and how the balance of activities presented by the Executive Committee is or is not linked and intimately connected with the world political situation and with the objective processes that are developing in the class struggle throughout the world. These will be the six major points that we will develop and, in each one of them, we will introduce the new elements that the General Council brings with it, in the agenda that I mentioned previously and that was the one that guided all the discussions of it.

1.— The first point, on the leadership. Once again, to insist that this is the key problem of every party, that programmatic advances or programmatic unity are not enough, political agreements and the political line are not enough: we always have to ask ourselves what leadership exists to apply that program and to apply that policy. For example, I remember a discussion at the beginning of this year with the secretariat of the Colombian party, that there was not only programmatic unity, there was not only political unity but also a detailed plan for the newspaper, finances, how to face the electoral campaign, division of tasks, etc., and at the end (the meeting was with M and members of the secretariat of a party from another country) and asking M for his opinion, he said it seems perfect, wonderful, but what leadership is going to apply it? Is the leadership strong and solid enough to apply that plan, or not? We ask ourselves the same thing morning, afternoon and night —sometimes we don't even sleep!— in the leadership of the Argentinian party we are clear about the line, we have written very good documents, and there is total agreement on the documents, [but we still ask ourselves] which leadership is applying these documents, this political line? This is also the problem of our world party: which leadership will put the Theses into practice, which leadership will put into practice the resolutions that are approved, the organisational resolutions, and the number of tasks that will derive from all of this.

In this, there is a difficulty that the Executive Committee of the FI-IC had raised and is raising, which is at the international level, at the level of the FI-IC, the weight of inertia of our national parties, which leads to maintaining and perpetuating as leadership teams the old leadership teams. That is to say, the leadership teams of the Bolshevik Faction and the OCRFI [Organising Committee for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International], which, as we will see later, in some countries are very clear elements that have prevented, despite the programmatic agreements and political agreements, this weight of inertia has prevented a greater development and a greater acceleration of the unification process in certain countries. It is also expressed in another way, in not fully understanding what the World Conference meant, what the FI-IC means, and also what it meant concretely that at the conference we had chosen a leadership, an Executive Committee, and that this had chosen a Secretariat. For example, an anecdote in the same development of the General Council. When this first point of balance of activities was finished, I was discussing it with [Comrade] Z, and we reached this point, the integration of the national parties with the international leadership. And that day, the first day of the General Council, [Comrade] Z posed that it was very difficult for them to feel integrated into the international leadership and the FI-IC because it was more difficult to talk on the phone, letters too, there was a language problem, so she could only talk to [Comrade] M, who spoke Spanish, and M was from the BF, not from the FI-IC leadership. At the end of the general discussion, already discussing among several, we began to tease [Comrade] Z about her initial position, which she had totally changed in the end, saying that we are idiots, that we are saying and thinking that these were the difficulties of integration in the FI-IC.

This weight of inertia is a difficulty that the EC has encountered and will surely continue to encounter for a while in order to advance towards democratic centralism, in the functioning of a Bolshevik party. However, the balance that we draw from the General Council is that progress has been made much faster than we thought in the FI-IC Executive Committee, progress has been made in functioning as a leadership team of the FI-IC, and some elements indicate, in our way of seeing without a doubt, these advances that have been achieved. Just one would suffice: the number of documents, resolutions and activities that the EC of the FI-IC has presented to us in these five months of functioning as EC.

I don't know whether the same thing happens to the Colombian party as to others, we are not capable of responding to the avalanche of documents, materials and tasks that the EC of the FI-IC

is constantly putting to us. We had not started the Polish campaign when its second part began: Kuron and Michnik. We hadn't started in either of the two and another was coming, and the UNEF [National Union of French Students] congress was coming our way, and the campaign in El Salvador, and the freedom of Osvaldo, who was in custody. It is such a large number of materials that I think no one from the leadership has managed to read them, not even 20%; I don't know whether the same thing has happened to you here. The impression I received in the General Council is that the same thing happened to everyone, and to Z too. It was a locomotive that was crushing the parties in the application of the resolutions, of the policy, and of the activity that the EC of the FI-IC permanently proposed. Let's not even talk about it in Spain. The Spaniards cursed throughout the balance of activities report because they didn't have time to apply the campaigns, and they criticised the EC because they didn't have time and because they weren't told how to apply them, and they couldn't do it because everything came to them very fast, very much one thing on top of another.

The other point that is also decisive and objective is the progress that has been achieved in the fine-tuning of national policies through the initiative of the EC. A very key point that we will develop later, specifically, is Spain; the EC's immediate response to the *coup d'état* in Spain, which appeared in *International Correspondence*, has been the decisive and fundamental factor so that now, after the General Council, we see much more clearly the progress there and the possibility of unifying the two organisations, which in the World Conference were fighting on absolutely all points that had to do with politics, with organisational issues, etc., etc.

The other aspect that points to this integration of the leadership team and that was raised by the comrades of the EC, M in particular in his balance of activities, but that for us of the General Council, who came from our national parties with that weight of inertia, was a reality in the General Council, and it is that the memory of the factions, as posed by M, of the existence of the factions, was a memory of childhood, of the earliest childhood in the functioning of the EC. And so it was in the functioning of the General Council as well: in the discussions, there was not a single factional alignment, and in all the controversies that took place in the General Council there was not a single alignment that insinuated the possibility that the OCRCI or the BF had met to discuss that point to see how they would confront the positions of the other faction that existed before the World Conference. On the contrary, there was a permanent intertwining between members of the OCRCI, and members of the BF, beating each other regarding each one of the points, which indicates the dynamics of that leadership. There was no point where there was not a great discussion, great divergences, great differences, and great agreements coming out of each one of these points, being raised as to how to continue discussing the differences that still exist, without paralysing that EC, the Secretariat, or the General Council.

The other aspect that [Comrade] M pointed out about this problem of functioning as a leadership team, is the role and the time that had been dedicated to the amendments of the Theses. It was one of the great tasks that the World Conference left, to study the amendments to the Theses that were presented, to adjust the program, and to decide which ones were accepted or not. And in practice, because of the concrete political demands of the class struggle, and because of the demands of the national sections, the amendments to the Theses were studied in the last month, and almost basically to fulfil the task that had been assigned, to present them to this General Council. This leadership team that began to function after the World Conference, like every Bolshevik leadership team, already with some fundamental programmatic agreements, dedicated itself, not to continue discussing the minutiae and the smallest aspects of the theory, but to see how with this programmatic framework, that the World Conference had given, began to respond and intervene in the class struggle, and began to build single sections and strong sections of this Fourth International.

And the other aspect is the response to the class struggle. The number of campaigns that were carried out: first the one in El Salvador, which unified the entire FI-IC; second, that of Poland, which has been a permanent campaign with different stages during these five months.

The campaign on the USec, propagandistic, which has been appearing systematically in *International Correspondence*; the preciseness of the programmatic documents, that is, all the work

around the amendments to the Theses and the Theses themselves; the centralisation of this set of activities, all of them were activities centralised by the EC, still with weaknesses, multiple weaknesses, but with an effort and great progress in centralisation, which has allowed many countries of the world to strike together around El Salvador, around Poland, etc., etc.

The other two aspects, the centralisation, progress and regularity of *International Correspondence* and the weekly notes of the EC have been a very useful and effective instrument in the functioning of our national parties.

One last aspect that we believe to be quite positive is the issue of finances. We are very close to the goal that the World Conference gave itself of contributions to the EC of the FI-IC itself. Almost the entire amount of the contributions set for the national sections has been collected, missing only a few thousand dollars. There are only 5,000 dollars in dispute, which corresponds to the sections that have not paid even a penny and have not said when they will pay. This is an advance that we believe to be of great importance that totally differentiates the FI-IC from the functioning of the USec. Those of us who were in the BF and the USec, I think we didn't even know how much we had to contribute to the USec, they never asked us to account for anything.

With these elements, the conclusion raised by the activity report is that progress has been made in consolidating the leadership and in its functioning as a team. In other words, the EC is a new reality of the FI-IC. What was a project in the World Conference, we believe we can now say that it is a new reality in the functioning of the FI-IC. M raised that it was necessary to study why this phenomenon occurred, what were the bases that allowed the structure of this leadership team to have been set up so quickly, its operation and its effectiveness in responding to the great problems that had been posed to the World Conference. One hypothesis that he raised for us to study is whether it responds to the common experiences of the two parties, which are the pillars and were the pillars of OCRFI and BF. Coincidences and common experiences that, for example, were expressed in a polemic that was topical in the face of the meeting of the General Council, old in Trotskyism, on whether or not Latin America is a nation. There are sectors of Trotskyism that argued that yes, it is a nation; and the two pillar parties of the unification, the French and the Argentinian, each one on their own, responded to this that no, Latin America is not a nation; they are different nations with the need for unity in a federation of republics, it is not a total unity. And with this what the Theses raise, the worker tradition of both organisations, the permanent defence of internationalism of both organisations, the break with Pabloism and the fight against Pabloism of both organisations, etc., elements that everyone knows from the study of the Theses.

This, as I have insisted in this entire aspect, became for those of us who went to the General Council, who were not in the EC, a concrete reality that we could see and feel every day in the General Council meetings, during the eight days of discussion. The General Council itself is perhaps the greatest expression of this leadership team which is the EC. A General Council with written resolutions, in all aspects, with agreements on all points, with divergences within the team that were brought to the discussion of the General Council and that some of them will perhaps be brought to the discussion of the entire International through *International Correspondence*; with a homogeneous functioning and permanent control of the functioning of the General Council meeting. It was not an anarchic meeting at all; it was orderly, disciplined, with well-prepared, elaborated, and presented reports, which allowed us to get through this number of points and made it possible to achieve great programmatic, political, and organisational advances from this eight-day General Council meeting. For all of us who attended this meeting and who are not members of the EC, this General Council was like a shockwave of what the FI-IC means, of this new reality that it is, and of how we are quite chauvinistic and have not understood but 10% of the new reality in which we are active, in the FI-IC.

2.- Intervention in the class struggle as a world party. Here the World Conference raised two great axes: El Salvador and Poland, which were a good decision of the World Conference because they were the two great objective axes of the world revolution during those five months. The EC of the FI-IC, elected in the World Conference, responded to these two great axes, and around these two great axes, it is worth highlighting two more facts that were of great importance in the General

Council. 1- The world congress of UNEF, which is taking place at the moment, was part of a secondary campaign carried out by the FI-IC and which could become a fundamentally important event for our International, and could even give rise to a mass organisation at the student level, due to the presence at this congress of a delegation from the Polish Student Solidarity union. The report that our UNEF comrades who are holding the conference, if I'm not mistaken, gave us close to 40 organisations that had committed their participation in the congress, representing some 30 or 40 countries.

The fact of the participation of Student Solidarity from Poland is decisive, but it also has the participation of very representative organisations such as a union of Asian students, which brought together national student organisations from 18 countries, almost all of them single student organisations from those 18 countries.

The other fact, that was a special and particular point of the resolution on the world situation, is the French elections, which culminated in the first run with the victory of Mitterrand, and which now continue with the legislative elections that must take place in the course of this June. In this aspect of intervention in the class struggle, the EC also raised a question. Not only how we have responded, and what has been our policy in the activity, but if that activity that we have developed around these fundamental axes raised by the World Conference and the new events that were taking place in the world political situation, whether or not around that political response and that activity, the FI-IC and our national sections had strengthened. That is to say, whether or not we have strengthened the world party and the national sections around this political activity. This must be a permanent question for us in each of our parties, from the methodological point of view, when we face a political activity of the mass movement and give a response to the processes and phenomena of the class struggle.

Let's touch on the two central items. First, El Salvador and then Poland. Regarding El Salvador, first of all, it should be noted that we emerged from the World Conference with great political weakness in this regard because no resolution would systematise and define our policy as a whole in the face of the Salvadoran revolution and all the rise that was being experienced in Central America at that time. This is because of the weaknesses of the Central American comrades and also because of the weaknesses of the then Parity Committee that tackled the World Conference and its preparation. This led to the absence of a political document that would arm the entire International and in particular the Salvadoran and Central American comrades, which meant that during this period there were two lines for El Salvador: one developed by the Salvadoran and Central American comrades, and the other, the one raised by the EC of the FI-IC.

The line of the EC pointed out that if the final offensive failed, there would be a semi-triumph of fascism in the cities, and that therefore our comrades were required to develop a very political propaganda activity, presenting the Trotskyist program, to build and strengthen the Trotskyist section there. The Salvadoran comrades argued that action continued to be the fundamental task, and therefore all activity in El Salvador should revolve around it, without agreeing either with the general characterisation of the situation. This led to a confrontation —let's put it that way— between the Salvadoran comrades and the EC, which could only be resolved through the facts. The characterisation made by the EC of the FI-IC became so evident that the comrades ended up accepting this reality. In addition to this path of facts, the permanent discussion that the EC stimulated and developed with them, to win them over to the policy that the EC proposed, and to make them abandon the policy they were developing and practising in El Salvador. The result of this is that we managed to save the lives of the vast majority of our Salvadoran comrades, keeping them as Trotskyist leaders and cadres of the International. We believe that if they had insisted on their position, there would be many more deaths than we have there at this moment. This problem that the World Conference and the functioning of the EC and its relations with the Salvadoran section and the other Central American sections raised during this period, we believe is resolved in the General Council. And that it is resolved with the approval of a resolution that politically arms the whole of the International, and in particular the comrades of Central America, and that we believe is an important political advance that arises from this meeting.

You do not know yet the axis of this resolution, we will reproduce it, but it is given by an amendment that M presented to the project that was published in *International Correspondence*, which gives it a totally different framework from the resolution on *International Correspondence* and in that framework, it locates the tasks that we Trotskyists have to develop in Central America.

Very schematically, later you will know and study it in detail, this resolution raises the following aspects:

The first of these, which is fundamental to all the other problems posed by the resolution: Characterising Central America as a nationality, as a unit. In practice, what does this mean? If you look at the resolution that appeared in *International Correspondence*, this resolution it is posed: that in El Salvador there is a revolutionary stage of civil war; in Nicaragua, there is an open revolutionary process; in Guatemala, there is a revolutionary process; in Costa Rica, there is a rise of the mass movement and in Panama that rise begins. And in Honduras, there are also traits of a rise.

In other words, it is a partial characterisation by country of the situation in each one of them without seeing the links and ties that exist in the entire Central American situation and that, therefore, loses unity, loses homogeneity by proposing the policy for all comrades from Central America and how they should develop and apply that policy. Ultimately, the resolution does the same as imperialism. Imperialism divided Central America and balkanised it to dominate it better. We accept this balkanisation and this division when making our analysis that leads us to not have a correct policy in the face of the entire process that this region of the Americas is experiencing. This is the first big aspect. And it raises it differently from what it would be for the whole of Latin America with the element that I raised before, that in Latin America there are formed nations, specific, different from one another, with common ties, with a tendency, but only a tendency, towards unity. In Central America, the characterisation we make is that it is a nation and that it needs its unity to solve the problems raised at this moment, in order to advance in the revolutionary process. This means that the slogan we raise for Central America is not the Federation of Central American Socialist Republics, but that of the Socialist United States of Central America. And for Latin America, we maintain the slogan of Federation. Furthermore, it leads us to characterise the situation of the class struggle in Central America as a revolutionary situation as a whole with different rhythms and unevenness. Otherwise, we cannot understand why there is this rise in Costa Rica, and why Honduras, which is the most backward, is also experiencing a rise in the mass movement today. This is what is happening in Guatemala where there is a revolutionary process that imperialism hides. Or in Panama (I don't know whether you read about the Panamanian student demonstrations these days...).

This revolutionary process was opened by the triumph of Sandinismo against Somoza, which strengthened the entire Central American process. Furthermore, it leads us to pose that the strength of the Central American revolution is not solely given by the process of civil war that is being experienced in El Salvador. It is this unity that gives that strength. This is why what happens in El Salvador or Nicaragua is so important for imperialism. Because it knows that the advance of the revolutionary process in Nicaragua or that the guerrillas' triumph in El Salvador, is going to question all imperialist domination in Central America and not only in those countries and, at the same time, it will be a trigger and a stimulus to the Mexican revolution and the very rise of the mass movement in the US, due to all the links that are established between those countries. Otherwise, we would not understand the importance that imperialism gives to a small country, which has no great economic importance and which is concentrating a large amount of the efforts of diplomacy and politics in the world when it also has the problems of Iran and the entire world rise.

The second aspect is that, because of its immediate objectives, and of its characteristics, we have to define this revolutionary process as a workers' and anti-imperialist revolution. The immediate objectives in some of these revolutionary processes are aimed at ending totalitarian regimes as happened in Nicaragua, with dictatorships established in almost all of Central America. They are directed against imperialism but, because of what the Theses state, that is, because of their class dynamics and the enemy they face, we have to define it as a workers' and socialist revolution. The other major axis of this draft resolution, which totally modifies the framework of the one that

appeared in *International Correspondence*, is the analysis of the policies of Stalinism, and Castroism, and the role played by these national, revolutionary petty-bourgeois movements that exist in Central America: Sandinismo, the FPLN, etc., etc.

For us, Stalinism and Castroism make the same effort that imperialism is making. That is, they try to see how they stop this revolutionary process. And, from the point of view of Stalinism and Castroism, it is a consciously counter-revolutionary attitude.

In the report that [Comrade] C presented, he quoted from a report from the US Department of State that was absolutely conclusive regarding this, in which, ultimately, it said: we are not concerned about the presence of Fidel Castro or the intervention of the USSR because both of them are a factor of stabilisation of the revolutionary rise; they are sectors that are with us to see how they stop this process. This is the analysis, absolutely textual, made by this minority of the State Department.

This aspect is very important to understand the whole problem of the final offensive and to arrive at a more precise characterisation of it. If this analysis is correct, we cannot say that the failure of the final offensive was political or military errors by the Salvadoran guerrilla but rather that it was a manoeuvre designed and applied by Stalinism that entered the front of unity with the guerrilla and when entering there its task was to see how it slowed down the revolutionary advance developed by these petty-bourgeois movements and organisations. That is, we can no longer continue saying that those of the Farabundo Martí Front were wrong, that they made a tactical or military mistake and that they wrongly launched the offensive. What we have to say is that Stalinism consciously went in there to see how it stopped this process and organised a counter-revolutionary operation called the final offensive to seek the defeat and crushing of the guerrillas.

And here we have to differentiate the role of Stalinism and Castroism from the role of these petty-bourgeois nationalist leaderships, not directly linked to Castroism and Stalinism. They, in the first stage —like the FSLN did— play a revolutionary role, both in the struggle to overthrow these dictatorships and in the anti-imperialist struggle. But, due to their class character and their program, they have weaknesses and lead this revolution to its death. *The difference, then, is that they are not consciously counter-revolutionary.*

These are the general elements of the resolution on Central America approved by the General Council. And in these general elements, we must completely redo what appeared in *International Correspondence*, modify the elements of the program, and the slogans that are raised there and we believe that with this the International is thoroughly armed and we thoroughly arm our Central American comrades who, among other reasons, are also in crisis because of this problem of political frame.

This is about El Salvador. We believe it is a very, very important advance of our International that allows us to put together our functioning and activity in the class struggle much better.

Poland is the other major axis of our intervention in the class struggle

In the balance of activities presented by M, he said: “It would be enough for us to mention one fact to say that there is great progress in the EC of the FI–IC: the entry of Trotskyists into Poland. Bigger than the Simon Bolivar Brigade, besides being the most spectacular victory of the International since its foundation. The fact that Baluka has returned to Poland and that he is developing there the activity that he is developing.” Among other things, on Wednesday of this week [comrade] B, leading a workers’ delegation from Szczecin, appeared before the Polish Council of State to request the registration of the Polish Socialist Labour Party. We do not know what was the result of this but it is a fact of great importance.

Thus, all the discussion we did about Poland was marked by this element: the presence of Trotskyists in Poland. And, around this fact, two more facts that have to do with the whole process of the political revolution and the activity of the FI–IC. While we were at the General Council meeting (or perhaps a few days before) the news was received of the release of two French comrades, militants

of the OCRFI in Czechoslovakia. You know that they were taken into custody full of materials, a campaign was carried out, and in less than 15 days they were released. We believe this is also an expression of the political situation and the crisis of the bureaucracy, but a very concrete expression of the activity carried out by the FI–IC and how it is facing the political problems that arise. And the other [element], which we already mentioned: the UNEF Congress.

In addition, all this activity deployed about Poland, the different campaigns that culminated with the entry of Trotskyists into Poland, produced for the General Council meeting, an entire elaboration of the EC that translates into a political resolution that we believe is also a great theoretical, programmatic advance that thoroughly arms our entire International about what is happening in Poland, which we have characterised as the vanguard of the entire process of rise of the world revolution that is being experienced at this moment. This resolution is already known to you, it is the one that appeared in *International Correspondence* approved together with the draft amendment presented by M.

Very schematically, because you have already read it, I want to present the axes of this resolution. First, the characterisation of the advancement and deepening of the process of political revolution in Poland that we had already done at the Open World Conference. That is, pointing out that it is the vanguard of the whole process of the rise of the world revolution., within the context of these two elements raised by the Open World Conference resolution, the new facts produced in the development of the political revolution: the meaning and perspectives of the general strike, where the following aspects are framed: first, that the general strike raises the problem of power in Poland, that is, it is a confrontation between Solidarity and the Government sustained by the PZPR [Polish United Workers' Party], which poses to the Polish masses the problem of power and, at the same time, the problem of the party. They are questioning the hegemony of the PZPR in Poland. Thirdly, the advance of the organisation of the masses in Poland and, especially, the advance of Solidarity and, particularly, the organisation of the peasantry in Rural Solidarity. The fourth element is how this process of organisation concretises the worker-peasant alliance, without forgetting the unity with the student movement and the intellectuals. And finally, the general strike raises, more or less immediately, unity with the Polish soldiers. And it begins to put on the agenda the need for Soldiers' Solidarity. When this process takes place, a new stage of the political revolution process in Poland will have opened.

The second major element raised by the resolution (at least in the Algerian party it was a big discussion in recent months) is the problem of dual power. The resolution clarifies this problem by stating that there is a dual institutional and centralised power: Solidarity, on the one hand, and the government and the PZPR on the other. Among these elements, the Church with Walesa at the head, playing to remake the entire bourgeois regime. If it succeeds, there would be a new form of dual power: on the one hand the bourgeoisie and on the other the workers' state.

The other general element of the resolution is to raise all the historical and objective bases of the political revolution in Poland— the economic crisis, the oppression of the mass movement by the bureaucracy and the national oppression by the Kremlin. On the other hand, this character of the regime, its totalitarian character, leads the regime to employ methods of civil war against the mass movement and the working class.

And, lastly, the fact that the economic crisis —produced by the incapacity of the bureaucracy and its terror of the mass movement— leads the bureaucracy to submit to imperialism and turn to it as a point of salvation in the face of this revolutionary process. This is an aspect of fundamental importance in the entire characterisation of the Polish revolution that leads to the last general element before raising the programmatic aspects of the resolution: pointing out the imperialist counter-revolution as a fundamental enemy of the process of political revolution that is developing. at the moment in Poland. Because, although many sectors participating in the struggle in Poland do not see imperialism as their direct enemy, these links and ties that exist between the bureaucracy and imperialism give the political revolution the character of a revolution against imperialism. The entire program follows from there: to develop and consolidate the popular power today expressed

in Solidarity (with all the slogans that emerge from there and that are in the resolution), to patiently educate the masses and, the last great point of our program, which is where we are going to dwell on.

The Constituent Assembly

We are going to dwell on this aspect because it was the one that centralised the discussion in the General Council and it was announced in *International Correspondence* that it would be like this. There was an amendment proposed by Stephan Just, who had voted for the entire resolution as well as the amendments, except for the Constituent Assembly one. This discussion polarised the entire discussion of Poland and enriched the discussion on the other elements of characterisation and on the program itself. Stephan had his position and the rest of the General Council was for approving the Constituent Assembly slogan. The vote was one against and the rest in favour.

What did Stephan propose? Three central points: 1) The Constituent Assembly slogan is not a programmatic slogan and Trotsky in the *Transitional Program* never presented it as a programmatic slogan but as a tactical slogan that responded to a certain moment of the class struggle. 2) Because of the bourgeois-democratic character of this slogan, it does not fit in the process of the political revolution because the process of the political revolution takes place within the dictatorship of the proletariat (deformed, degenerated or whatever we want, but within). 3) The development of the productive forces that take place in the workers' state through the expropriation of the bourgeoisie develops and strengthens not only the productive forces but also the organisational mechanisms of the working class. That is, this economic fact has a consequence on the organisation of the workers' movement. Therefore, due to this fact, the appropriate slogan is that of the Soviets and this great slogan we cannot oppose another different one. And within the Soviets, the different forms that they may adopt. It may not be the classic Russian form and those that have occurred previously, but always within the framework of this new form of organisation resulting from the development of productive forces.

Therefore, the slogan of a Constituent Assembly in Poland does not fit either because it means reversing this advance in the form of organisation of the proletariat.

These three main elements summarised Just's position, maintaining the fundamental axes of his amendment. With these arguments, Comrade Just proposed from the outset that the final part of the draft amendment be eliminated. The final paragraph said: "Certainly, if the masses decide for a Constituent Assembly elected by universal suffrage, we will not oppose it, but we will participate. The concrete analysis of such an Assembly would determine how to characterise its class content." This is the phrase he removes from the draft amendment on the same grounds that he has put forward, that the entire process of political revolution occurs within the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the phenomenon of productive forces develops the organisational forms of the workers' movement, therefore, we cannot wait in this process to determine the class character of the Constituent Assembly, because it went against his central argument by which he opposed the slogan of the Constituent Assembly.

What is raised in the discussion that takes place in the EC around this? The first very important aspect is the method with which we should approach the discussion. Let's read the sentence again, to see whether the argument is clear because it is very subtle. He says, "Certainly, if the masses decide for a Constituent Assembly elected by universal suffrage, we will not oppose it, but we will participate." Here, Just is addressing a possible argument: if the Constituent Assembly takes place, what do we do there? Do we oppose it, do we call the mass movement to boycott it or not? Or do we say that we participate in it? Faced with this possibility, which is likely to occur in the Polish revolution, Just says that we would not oppose it, that we would participate in it. The second part of that same paragraph states: "The concrete analysis of such an Assembly would determine how to characterise its class content." That is, he is proposing that when this Assembly occurs, we have to see who constitutes it, specifically whether it is bourgeois or proletarian. If the Constituent Assembly votes to return to private property, it will be bourgeois; on the contrary, if it votes to continue

with the nationalised property, it will be working-class. Just was even clearer in the CC of the OCI [Internationalist Communist Organisation], where he read sections of our book, declaring himself a disciple of it, where we say that the dictatorship of the proletariat adopts different forms and that in this case, the Constituent Assembly would be a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In other words, in no workers' state, there can be two class contents, there is always only one, whatever form it takes.

The discussion that took place around this issue was very rich. Surely, I will not express even 10% of the richness of the discussion. Firstly, several comrades raised the methodological problem, that is, with what method we should approach this discussion. The first aspect that was emphasised in this discussion is that every category that we Marxists use arises from reality, and we use it to act again on that reality, to have a weapon with which we intervene in this revolutionary process. But as long as we are aware of a problem, and this is that every revolutionary process enriches and develops the theoretical categories that we are developing and with which we are dealing. In other words, in every revolution, we have to see what is the old, and what new elements it is posing to us, and in this case, we are facing the first process of political revolution in the world. That is, a large number of new elements will emerge, which will require us to readjust our slogans and categories previously defined and extracted from the process of class struggle, and other revolutionary processes, according to the dynamics of this one that is being experienced now, which is new. [comrade] L expressed this in another way. He argued that every revolution is a rupture and a continuity with the state of affairs that existed previously, and he referred to Lenin's category "after the October revolution, we have a bourgeois state without a bourgeoisie". That is, the October revolution brought the proletariat to power, there is a workers' state, controlled and led by the working class, but which at the same time keeps some features of the old bourgeois state that existed before the triumph of the revolution: the distribution, the bureaucracy, the apparatuses, etc. It is a new state, there is a rupture because the working class is in power but there is also continuity because some of the old forms of the old bourgeois state are kept.

This is how L expressed the method with which the discussion was to be approached. Traditionally, the slogan of the Constituent Assembly is a slogan of bourgeois democracy, which we have applied in revolutionary processes in which the power of the bourgeoisie was questioned, never in a workers' state. Thus, we have to see what elements of this old slogan remain in the political revolution, and what new elements we have to incorporate into it, which will allow us to arm ourselves and respond to the process that is currently developing in Poland. This was the first major aspect that the discussion specified.

The second, in which many facts and elements are provided, is that the historical memory of the masses in Poland is broken; the Stalinist bureaucracy broke it. Furthermore, the Polish masses have been living under a totalitarian regime for 30 years, that is, with the concrete experience that this daily experience produces in them. Comrade F gave us lots of examples: what does dictatorship of the proletariat mean for a Pole? It is totally different from what it means for us when they, the masses in general, hear "dictatorship of the proletariat", the first thing they think of is the 30 years of totalitarianism and oppression. If we go from the outset with the great slogan of the dictatorship of the proletariat, people will refuse, saying that they have already had 30 years of dictatorship of the proletariat, which have been years of repression, totalitarianism, prison, deaths, etc. But at the same time, F noted that in vanguard sectors and even in some sectors of the working class itself, a phrase began to become popular: what you have done is the dictatorship over the proletariat and not the dictatorship of the proletariat. But still, for the broad masses, this slogan means repression, totalitarianism, etc.

And just as it happens with this expression, it also happens with a large number of slogans and expressions, categories that we use calmly in our countries, but which mean totally different things for the Polish masses. Faced with this fact, we then have to answer, within what the Theses propose, that the initial stage of the political revolution will be a democratic stage.

The other aspect, which M raises, tells Just why he, who is [illegible].

Another element to clarify the discussion and substantiate why the slogan of Constituent Assembly starts from the same thing that Just proposes: that everything, within the framework of the political revolution, is framed by the dictatorship of the proletariat, including this slogan itself. In this, Just is right, everything is in that framework but this does not mean that we can assimilate everything to the Soviets. The slogan of a Constituent Assembly is one thing, and it occupies a certain role, different from the slogan and the role played by the Soviets, in the process of political revolution, even when both are framed within the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is the same thing that arises when it is said that the Soviets are not the same as freedoms, although there comes a moment in the process of political revolution in which the Soviets take the fight for freedoms as one of the aspects of all their activity. But we cannot confuse these two elements, they are different things. And the role that the Constituent Assembly slogan plays at this moment is the one that is posed in the draft amendment that M presents to the General Council, and that is approved by it.

In Poland, we have to do the same as we do in other countries, look for slogans that promote and develop the mobilisation of the masses. Here M posed a concrete problem to Just, so that he would bring his argument down to earth and not leave it within the framework of the *Transitional Program*, and this is, what slogan do we use for the Catholic masses in Poland? Catholics are millions in Poland, the Pope went and gathered crowds. Walesa is a man of the Church to the bitter end, and he remains the head of Solidarity. To all those Catholic people who follow the Pope, the Church, what do we propose? Because they are mobilising, they are the armchairs that are supporting Solidarity, the ones that were willing to go to the general strike. What do we propose to them that allows the mobilisation they are doing to be promoted and developed much more? Shall we propose the Soviets to them, with all this problem of historical memory and the concrete experience of the Polish masses? Is that what we should propose? As Just proposed in a general way, although with other variants and maintaining the different variants that exist, but precisely the type of organisation that the masses reject for all the concrete experience, and for the entire objective the Church gives itself by participating in the process of political revolution? Or do we have to look for a slogan that allows us to address the Catholics, that they see it as something natural, typical of them, that pushes the mobilisation, at the same time questioning the government and the PZPR, as well as the entire bureaucratic regime, which is this Constituent Assembly? Because this slogan of the Constituent Assembly plays such a role, promoting the mobilisation of the masses, within the characterisation of the Theses, of the democratic character of the first phase of the political revolution, and also allows us to address concretely all the Poles who are mobilising and fighting against the regime, against the bureaucracy, against the PZPR, which is its main pillar, to overthrow that totalitarian regime.

One last aspect regarding the argument of the productive forces and how this is reflected in the process of organisation of the working class, which leads it to privilege the Soviet-type organisation, the only one that can exist within the process of political revolution. This problem of the development of the productive forces, of the expropriation of the bourgeoisie that has developed in the workers' state, poses a dilemma: either capitalist restoration, developed by the bureaucracy, not as a mechanical or exhaustive phenomenon, or political revolution and deepening of the socialism. There is no other alternative in Poland, either the process towards capitalist restoration advances, due to all this phenomenon of bureaucracy and its links with imperialism, etc., or the political revolution develops and triumphs and socialism deepens. That is the dilemma posed in the face of the whole problem of the productive forces posed by L.

Within this dilemma, some slogans help develop one or another alternative, not just the slogans towards the organisation of the proletariat, towards confrontation with the bourgeoisie, towards the strengthening of the worker-peasant alliance, etc. So, within this dilemma, where these slogans fit, either slogans that help the development of the political revolution, the mobilisation of the masses so that it triumphs, or slogans that lead to the restoration of capitalism. There is no middle term, and within this framework, we have to achieve clarity on these aspects, to see our slogans.

With these elements, the resolution presented by the Executive Committee is supported and approved, in the draft amendment presented by M, without Just backing down from his position, he maintains it and votes against M's.

The other aspect that was already raised from the same balance of activities, and was later taken up in other points on the agenda, has to do with the subjective factor, the process of party building in Poland, and the possibilities that the political revolution opens up for the Fourth International and Trotskyism, and what variants we should then take into account. This is also very important in the face of approaches that may move towards sectarianism, or in the face of opportunist deviations in the process of the political revolution. They can go towards sectarianism by the way that we Trotskyists, who are those who have the *Transitional Program*, an analysis of the process of political revolution, are the only ones who can lead and build the party of the political revolution. Understanding this, as the physical Trotskyists, of flesh and blood, affiliated with the Fourth, as the Trotskyist party that we are building in Poland, the official section of the Fourth International. Until this happens, the political revolution cannot triumph; this is a sectarian variant, which discards any other series of possibilities that Trotsky had already raised and that are raised in the Theses, which we and the General Council support. In other words, the possibility of the emergence of centrist, Trotskyist-like, revolutionary currents, which direct the process of political revolution. What is the FI–IC’s task in this? To win over for the Fourth those centrist currents that lead the political revolution, and even give them the leadership of the International, that is, the orthodox Trotskyists, who founded the FI–IC in the World Conference, who suddenly in a year will hold the congress for the reconstruction of the Fourth, etc., we remain in the minority within that international that leads the party or current that led the political revolution in Poland.

This is a variant, a possibility, which is even closer thanks to the existence of the FI–IC because we have a leadership that raises this possibility, which would not be raised with the USec. But this possibility exists and is part of our slogan of Trotskyist parties, of an International with mass influence. Imagine an International led by those who made the political revolution in Poland, it would quickly acquire mass influence, even though we orthodox Trotskyists may be in a minority there. So, the whole process of party-building has to take into account these real possibilities, which can arise in any way: from detachments of the PZPR, from all this questioning of the PZPR leadership in the rank and file cells, this can give rise to a new political party, or a new political current that aims to overthrow the bureaucracy and make the political revolution; or it can come via Kuron, who decides to make his political party; or by way of an independent workers’ party that emerges from Solidarity. It can come by any means, or by a combination of all these elements, or several of them. Thus, all our tactic of building the party that will lead this process has to take these possibilities into account, so as not to make a sectarian mistake in applying a political line in Poland. This is the other element that requires discussion and which will be incorporated into the resolution approved at the Conference.

These are the most important elements about this point in the balance of activities, of how we have participated in the class struggle, with all the consequences it has in strengthening our parties, our sections, and fundamentally in strengthening the FI–IC. With absolute certainty, none of our national parties, with perhaps few exceptions such as the OCI, which has been one of its pillars in intervening in the class struggle, has thoroughly accompanied this process.

The other point is to act as a world party with united sections. In this, the fundamental link has been the OCI, the banner of the campaigns for Poland, and Czechoslovakia, in its same campaign for the 10,000 militants. We want to quickly point out those countries where there has been progress or where there have been problems in this process of building the single sections. In Venezuela, as the comrades already know, there was a unification (which, on the contrary, had to be stopped, before the world conference they were already about to be unified, and by pure chance M and L found out and stopped it, until the celebration of the World Conference, [so] they adjust things better, etc., there was no problem there. Rather, the problems have arisen after the unification: it is one of the few organisations that has not contributed a single peso, that has not said when it will do so, it has only said that for now it has many problems and cannot, besides not having paid a single *International Correspondence*. As a result of this, a resolution and a very harsh letter were approved, where the possibility of expulsion or separation is raised if the Venezuelans do not comply with contributions and the money from *International Correspondence*. A criterion that will be applied to

all sections, and that is part of the advances of the party building policy, which in the amendments to the Theses, this General Council approved.

In Portugal, progress was made. With a lot of pain, blood, blunders and mistakes, the line to move forward was to dissolve the party that responded to the BF, liquidate it as an organisation for all the mistakes it was making and because it was a total obstacle, not only for unification but for the prestige of Trotskyism in Portugal. Then a course was set that until now has been extraordinary: declare it dead, with a burial not of first but of last class, and that everyone joins the organisation that was part of the OCRFI. The OCRFI comrades acted in an exemplary way, they gave it great participation in the leadership (while they did not deserve a single comrade in the leadership). They managed to agree on a political document, which has not been approved by the General Council since it is somewhat ultimatumist, whoever reads it thinks that in Portugal we take power in two days since it calls for the creation of workers' and peasants' committees, the only thing left to say is all power to the committees that are in this role, and led by them, by this new party that arises from this unification (or rather, dissolution and entry into one of the parties) in Portugal. The political document will continue to be discussed with them, to see whether they adjust the line and adapt it to the Portuguese political situation.

Peru is the greatest advance and leaps in the unification of our parties. At the World Conference, it was one of the countries where the most problems existed, and a commission was made of both parties that almost never reached an agreement, they always ended up at odds, and they always had to call an arbitrator. It was L who went to resolve the problems of unification. There were tactical and programmatic differences that translated into organisational matters. In the General Council, the comrades have voted, that from 15 to 18 July of this year, the unification congress will be held, based on a political document approved by mutual agreement by the two organisations, on how the leadership should be constituted, with names, distribution of tasks, Secretariat, Executive, etc., etc. That is, it has been a great success of the Peruvian comrades, helped by the EC of the FI--IC, how they have been carrying out the unification process, which opened immense perspectives for Trotskyism in Peru. It is going to be a big, strong party, and if it achieves a good line because of all the experience, tradition and weight as political and mass leaders that the OCRCI comrades have, it will be a good integration and a good leadership team, which can produce a qualitative leap for the Peruvian party. M states that he believes that, within a short time, it will leave the Colombian party far behind, and that the Peruvian party will become one of the main, if not the main, Trotskyist party in Latin America.

In Brazil, with these anecdotes from Z, the weight of inertia is explained. There is a programmatic agreement, a political agreement, on all fronts where there are militants from the two organisations working together with the same line, etc., but the unification is paralysed and, on the contrary, has begun to retreat. The only possible explanation is the weight of inertia of the old organisations of the BF and OCRCI in both leaderships, which they see only theoretically (since the World Conference they keep saying that when they unify in Brazil, it will be an explosion because everybody in the world is dividing and the Trotskyists are the only ones who are unifying). And in practice, they do nothing to unify, even though there is total agreement. There is no reason or justification why unification has not been carried out, unlike Peru, and it is stagnant and in retreat, due to this weight of inertia, which does not understand the importance of the FI--IC, of the unification, the power that the new party can be, a new leadership team qualitatively different... There is chauvinism, first in the face of all international work (*Brazil, the greatest country in the world*), and then there is partisan chauvinism in both organisations, each one wants to maintain its old structure, its old team, the people it knows... We believe that with the participation of Z, and the discussions that were held in the General Council, the entire unification process in Brazil will accelerate but it has to overcome the weight of inertia that exists in the leadership of the two parties.

In Mexico, it did not look as serious as in Peru, during the World Conference everything seemed much easier. But because of multiple errors on both sides, they are in a quite complex, serious, difficult situation. As M said, "the shelf collapsed in the unification in Mexico." Now a leader is going to travel to Mexico, to see whether he can get the leaders of the two organisations to become

“friends” and change this chaotic situation, which in the short and long term does not bode well from the point of view of the building of a single section.

And the last aspect which we are going to expand a little is Spain. We are going to dwell on it because it was one of the points on the agenda of the General Council and because it raises a special situation in the entire discussion, that in this [two pages seem to be missing from the scanned document].

This was what the [Spanish] PST comrades lost sight of. For them, the regime was totally different, bourgeois-democratic where the Cortes were the fundamental pillar of it, everything was resolved in the Cortes,² and the king did not play any role within that bourgeois democratic regime, which had some Bonapartist elements, including that of the monarchy. And despite all the events that took place during the *coup d'état*, the attitude of the king and his behaviour, the comrades continued to hold that characterisation, clarifying that in the last period, the Bonapartist elements had been strengthened, but without changing the characterisation of the regime.

The coup proved that the EC's characterisation was correct. However, M raised a question, which was posed in the framework of the discussion, within those concessions that the regime is forced to make, the legalisation of unions, parties, etc., the functioning of the Cortes and the call for elections is also part of the concessions, or isn't it? Does it respond to the same phenomenon by which parties and unions were legalised as a result of the rise, or not? Or is it a decision made by the regime, not understood as a concession to the mass movement? It seems that this question is answered favourably, because of all the support that the PST has had, calling for elections, which Felipe Gonzalez³ and the other sectors of the counter-revolutionary apparatuses are beginning to support. In any case, it is a question that remains posed, which must be further studied to be answered.

This discussion about the regime in Spain is very important for our International as a whole because it presents us more generally, what makes or would be this revolutionary stage, of imminent revolution, and which brings with it the following aspect: every dictatorship or Bonapartism that exists in this [illegible], when it feels weak in the face of the rise of the national and global mass movement, seeks modifications to the structure and internal functioning of the regime, to adorn it with democratic clothing, maintaining the essential Bonapartist character of those regimes. It is, for example, the great discussion that is currently taking place in Argentina, about how to keep the fundamental elements of the regime and the dictatorship of Videla,⁴ and now of Viola,⁵ to give an opening that adorns that regime but keeps its essential features. What political plan do we have to deal with this? This is also what the Salvadoran Junta is considering. Amid the process of civil war, it is considering calling elections next year. Does this change the essential character of the Salvadoran regime? And by calling elections, why do we have to say it is already a bourgeois democratic regime? What the General Council asserts is the opposite, the essential character, the tendency is that Bonapartism, when it feels weak due to the rise of the mass movement, looks for these solutions, which are called rotten Bismarckist⁶ solutions. Before the regime completely explodes, the bourgeoisie itself adopts a Bismarckian solution, making some concessions to keep

2 **Cortes Generales** (General Courts) are the bicameral legislative chambers of Spain, consisting of the Congress of Deputies (the lower house) and the Senate (the upper house).

3 **Felipe González** (born 1942) is a Spanish lawyer, professor, and politician, who was the Secretary-General of the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party (PSOE) from 1974 to 1997, and the 3rd Prime Minister of Spain since the restoration of democracy, from 1982 to 1996. He was one of the main leaders of European Social Democracy.

4 **Jorge Rafael Videla** (1925–2013) was the general who led the genocidal coup of March 1976 together with Admiral Massera and Brigadier Agosti. Between 1976 and 1978 he served as the de facto presidency of Argentina, of that first Military Junta of the genocidal military dictatorship known as the National Reorganisation Process (1976-1983).

5 Roberto Eduardo Viola (1924–1994) was an Argentine general who briefly served as president of Argentina from 29 March to 11 December 1981 during the genocidal dictatorship already mentioned. Viola succeeded General Jorge Rafael Videla.

6 It refers to **Otto von Bismarck** (1815–1898), a German statesman and politician who served for decades as chancellor under the Hohenzollern monarchy of Prussia. He was one of the key figures in international relations during the second half of the 19th century. During the last years of his life, he was nicknamed the “Iron Chancellor” for the determination

the fundamental structure of the regime. This is a fundamental aspect because we are facing this problem of the political regime almost everywhere, in the face of the situation of global rise and this period of the imminent revolution.

That discussion that takes place with the Spanish comrades manages to win the two top leaders for the EC positions. M passed through Spain after the General Council, and in principle, there is a general political agreement between the two organisations, which facilitates and opens the possibilities towards advancing, now with much more solid political and programmatic bases, the unification process in Spain. That is, the OCI, and especially comrade L, have accepted that the main line is to go to the Cortes, stand for elections and surround the Cortes with everything. It is the element that unites them even in daily practice. The main line is new elections to the Cortes, with our full participation, and the PCE-PSOE government still with the king but always denouncing the monarchy, which was the discrepancy that existed with the PST that, by accepting that the great enemy is the monarchy, the entire tactic of the General Council was accepted. The official document of the PST already appears in *Informations Ouvrières*⁷ itself, almost as an official document of the OCI.

4.– This point is about publications as collective organisers. This is very brief because we have all experienced it. First, the importance of the EC's weekly notes, which we believe have not been used thoroughly and in all their richness by the national parties. It should at least be a point on the agenda for discussion at the Secretariat meeting, at a minimum, in all national parties, and it should also be discussed in the Executive. Regarding *International Correspondence*, we believe it is an extraordinary tool for all our parties, we believe that there is a leap as well but, in any case, it was suggested that a balance was needed between the form and content of the magazine. At the moment, 14 to 15 thousand copies are being sold regularly, and about 5,000 more irregularly, which are for example those from Algeria, which come out every three months, those in English, German, Portuguese, etc., that sales are reduced because it is difficult to sell them in French or Spanish, and there are also small editions in Greek and German that complete this figure of 5,000 copies sold irregularly.

[A page seems to be missing from the scanned document. **Editor**]

The McCarthyite witch hunt and the State Department barred known leftists from leaving the country — unless, of course, they were being deported. As a consequence, we could not present our point of view at the Congress where the international struggle culminated, and Pablo took factional advantage of this situation. That is, in our opinion, they made Mandel appear as if in agreement with the FBI, to prevent them from going to this meeting, and not present their counter-reports, like they made Pablo appear to agree so they could not leave the country on that occasion either.

This last element marks this tendency of the SWP and its consistency in going to the bottom of its opportunistic deviation. This leads us to propose that the USec is an overall phenomenon, with two parts, the SWP and Mandel's wing, but revisionist as a whole. The practical conclusion that we draw from this point is that the reconstruction of the Fourth International is not subject to the breakup of the USec.

The last point is the political resolution and the perspectives that this opens for the FI-IC. First, the general characterisations raised by the Theses, by the Open World Conference, are reaffirmed. In this general framework given by the World Conference, the following new elements are raised, or elements already raised in that general political resolution but which it is necessary to continue marking in depth. The first of them: national explosive situations are maintained, without there being a solution for them. El Salvador, despite the counter-revolutionary counteroffensive of the entire policy of imperialism, the revolutionary situation and the civil war are maintained and everything seems to indicate that it will not be defeated easily. The political situation in Poland —the political revolution is maintained and deepened despite all the efforts of the Kremlin bureaucracy,

with which he pursued his political objectives, fundamentally the creation and maintenance of a system of international alliances that would ensure supremacy and security. of the German Empire.

7 Weekly paper of the OCI(u).

imperialism, and the Church to stop this revolutionary process. The revolutionary process in Nicaragua has not been defeated, it remains open. The struggle of the masses and the Iranian people, there is also a lull but without there having been a defeat. That is, with advances and setbacks, these national revolutionary situations are maintained, maintaining the global framework of a situation of revolutionary rise throughout the world. We believe this is one of the elements of this stage of imminent revolution.

The second aspect is the importance of the French elections. They mark the crisis of the Fifth Republic, the defeat of the bourgeoisie, and the defeat of Stalinism—which has been one of the fundamental pillars of support and maintenance of that Fifth Republic. And here in France, we see the beginnings—observing the differences and proportions with the political revolution in Poland—of what will be in Poland, where a sector of the mass movement begins to break with the Stalinist apparatus, which opens new perspectives for the rise of the mass movement in France and throughout Europe. This crisis of the Fifth Republic is a point of destabilisation of the situation throughout Europe, and of imperialism.

Third, the policy of imperialism at this time focuses on correcting the errors of the Carter policy but maintaining the continuity of its fundamental elements, and with the central objective of stopping and slowing down the revolutionary rise of the mass movement. In this same framework, it seeks to redefine the terms of peaceful coexistence with Stalinism, and this is seen in all politics, the approaches of Reagan and Haig towards the USSR, the danger of communism, Castroism, etc.

The fourth element, Stalinism maintains its policy of peaceful coexistence but with differences from previous stages. Within the framework of maintaining this policy, it has a new *fundamental* concern, which is how to stop and restrain the revolutions in progress and the process of rise of the mass movement, it is no longer how to take advantage of it to better negotiate with imperialism; now its fundamental concern is the same as that of imperialism, how to stop the revolutions and the rise of the mass movement because it already has it inside, in Poland, in Afghanistan, etc.

In this context of a crisis of imperialism in general, the weakness of European imperialism leads to the strengthening of the hegemony of American imperialism. Although American imperialism is in crisis, as the crisis of the Europeans deepens, it leads to Yankee imperialism becoming stronger, always within the framework of the crisis.

And the other aspect is the vanguard role played by the political revolution in Poland, during the rise of the world revolution.

The last point, of great importance because it allows us to draw practical conclusions from this balance of activities, is that the revolutionary process today is global in nature (some differences were hinted at here but they were not discussed in depth in the General Council). Concretely, this means that 1) the importance of the European proletariat is relativised by this global character of the revolution. That is, the fact that the Polish revolution is today the vanguard cannot make us lose sight of the fact that, at this stage of the imminent revolution, as the rise of the revolutionary struggle continues, in the short or medium term it places once again in the agenda the revolution in Iran, or Nicaragua, or that the Salvadoran revolution gains new strength, and even for us not rule out the possibility of the American proletariat appearing in the process of world revolution, which would be qualitative, or the Chinese proletariat, which is beginning to know the effects of the political revolution in Poland (pronouncements have already been made by sectors of the Chinese working class that are beginning to demand free and independent unions). If stimulated by all this global rise, the crisis of imperialism, and the crisis of bureaucracies (China's is very serious), this embryonic process develops in China, and it may come to the fore at any moment. This element of the global character of the revolution brings that first consequence, the relativisation of the role of the European proletariat, without removing all the importance of the process of its rise, in this specific juncture of the class struggle in the world.

2) The other great element and great consequence of this is what it represents for the FI–IC. The role of the two pillar parties, as the only possibilities of building parties with mass influence, are also relativised at this moment by this objective situation of the class struggle. That is, at the

moment, in many countries, we Trotskyists have posed before us building Trotskyist parties with mass influence, first of all, because of the objective situation: there is no possibility of building a Trotskyist party with mass influence evolutionarily and gradually, nor does the possibility of building them solely and exclusively of a national nature, it has to be within the framework of this process of world revolution. That is, the possibility of the existence of Trotskyist parties with mass influence is expanded also because of a second aspect of fundamental importance, which is the existence of this international leadership, of the Executive Committee of the FI–IC.

M gave the example of Bolivia: if there is now another Bolivia of 1952, Trotskyism, because of the existence of the EC of the FI–IC, is going to fight for power; it may not succeed but it will fight for power. If we were in the USec, that would not be the situation. In Poland, all these variants and possibilities for the International, including that of the centrist parties, are also a reality for Trotskyism, to build an International with mass influence because of the existence of this leadership. The great thing about the stage of the imminent revolution is that, with the existence of this leadership, we are, permanently and in different places, presented with the objective conditions to build Trotskyist parties with mass influence.

Thus, with all these elements, the great conclusion that the General Council draws is that the conditions are ripening for the holding of the World Congress, in the march towards reconstruction, and for it to proclaim the Fourth International reconstructed.

Within this framework, for example, a very important controversy arises about the anti-imperialist united front and its meaning, where F poses a position totally contrary to the one raised in the Theses, which M had supported. The controversy was raised, as there is agreement on the amendment of the Theses, and possibly it will be published in *International Correspondence*. In this controversy, M and Just confronted F, which ended because of time constraints and because there was unity on the specific point on the agenda, that is, it is a divergence to be resolved, a controversy.

There were also divergences on the national problem and the necessary delimitation of us Trotskyists in all those movements of national self-determination and liberation, our differentiation and clear limitation, within a policy of unity of action with all nationalist, petty-bourgeois or bourgeois currents which are participating or developing the struggle for national self-determination. It is another element that we have to continue discussing; this point was discussed at length as a result of Spain, Ireland, and Canada, there is great progress, but a series of aspects still need to be settled.

Also, about the tactic of the united front and our behaviour in these policies, and the clear delimitation concerning the allies or those sectors with which we participate, something that has been raised at this time in the French elections, our policy of pushing with everything around Mitterrand, of the triumph of socialism, but at the same time the delimitation. In the document approved by the CC, presented by L, it was proposed under the formulation of combating hopes in the very field of hopes, that is, taking advantage of the hopes of the masses to combat these hopes, delimiting ourselves from our ally —let's put it that way— of that moment, Mitterrand's SP.

The problem of unions is another point that was left posed in the Council, how we work in them, what type, whether dependent or revolutionary, the difference between the totalitarians and those that have a greater range of freedom, within the unions dependent on the bourgeoisie and the state.

But despite these points, because of the method, the progress in the leadership team and how the problems of the class struggle have been faced, because of the kind of discussion and elaboration that we are carrying out, I believe the conditions are ripening for the world congress, and to declare the Fourth [International] rebuilt and, as M proposed in the next General Council, this will have to be one of the points on the agenda.

Answers from Nahuel Moreno

Question: What would be a federation and what would be a nationality or single nation?

We believe that Central America is either a nation, or a nationality, or there are very strong tendencies towards it. We believe that in the world there have been two exemplary processes, which are the US and the USSR.

The USSR created a federation of states, of different nationalities, such as Ukrainians, Belarusians, Muslims, etc., with totally different languages and customs and geographical areas. The October Revolution came and, although it was called the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, what it constituted was a federation of states. In the United States, the directly opposite process occurred: it was not a federation of nationalities, with different geographical sectors, but rather a nationality with strong different national elements (for example, there it is very common to say what origin one comes from, to say that one comes from Italians, Germans, etc.), but no one can dispute that it is a nation and a nationality. That was the entire process of the constitution of nationality: the strongest and most determinant element was not a centrifugal process of formation of many nations and nationalities (although that centrifugal tendency existed), but the predominant factor was the formation of a single nation because it was expressed as a single nationality in the fact of the predominance of the English crown and of the English language, this in general terms, both in the north and in the south. That was the unifying factor, plus the fact of capitalist colonisation of the entire country.

In Latin America, through a process that comes since the colony and then through independence, it is a fact that Brazil, Argentina, and Chile exist. If we say: let us unite to make a revolution with Chile, it is done but to kill all Argentines, not for unity. Instead, if we say a federation, everyone will continue to exist as a nationality: the Chilean, the Argentine, the Bolivian, but we are going to unite because it is a necessity for economic development, but in a federation where the states are respected so the masses can understand it. Because today, the masses go through their states, their republics as such. We believe that Central America is not like this, it has been united since the colony, which had Guatemala as its centre, it was the Captaincy of Guatemala. All the revolutionary processes that took place in this century were for Central American unity.

None was for Latin American unity (except for Castroism, which was abstract in this sense). We believe that in Central America there is a nationality, or at least a strong tendency to form a nationality or a single nation; a predominant tendency. Instead, we do not see in Latin America the tendency to form a single nation, under any circumstances. If there is a revolution in Mexico, we do not see the possibility that 50% of those who fight there will be Brazilians, we do not see it in any way. The theory has to reflect the real processes: it is said that in the guerrilla of the Sandinista Front, 60% of the combatants were Central Americans and not Nicaraguans (Camilo gave this statistic). Because there is a strong tendency; even car license plates are not national but Central American, the same [identity] document is valid for all of Central America and there are hundreds of thousands of Central Americans who work from one country to another or live in different places as relatives. In addition to all this, they have a geographical place and a common language.

For example, the strength of the Salvadoran revolution: the final offensive fails and they have not been defeated, and this is the case not only because the Salvadoran masses are very strong but because these revolutionary processes are intimately linked to Guatemala and Honduras. They are families or people that are together, and it is impossible to differentiate whether they are from one country or another. Thus, the fact that they are part of a general revolution, which tends towards unity, gives greater strength to what is called the Salvadoran revolution. That is why we want to make Central America a kind of United States of America, that is, to tend towards a single Central American state. Whereas, in the rest of Latin America, we do not want a single state but a federation, recognising those that exist; later, in a higher stage, already socialist, will come the elimination of the borders. We believe that only we Trotskyists take up this slogan, which is the truly anti-imperialist one, which will unite and can give us enormous perspectives because imperialism, Castro, and Stalinism speak only of the Salvadoran or Nicaraguan revolution since they also want to prevent it from being a single revolution.

Question: I am not very clear about [Comrade] Just's argument about the productive forces in Poland.

Just thought that for us (I clarify that almost the entire rest of the Council was against it, and I was one of them, so perhaps my explanation is partial) he explained that the extraordinary development of the proletariat in the Eastern countries and Poland, insinuating—it seems to me—that this led to Soviets, to the revolutionary process, that it was linear, that the triumph of the political revolution was unstoppable, etc. And we, as the “pessimistic” wing, believe that for 40 years we Trotskyists have been leaving ourselves in the lurch too much by saying this kind of things, like that the French revolution is going to happen in four years, that the Fourth International is going to have 20 million members in the year 1948 (and, if anything, there were 400 of us around the world!) ... Then we take what the *Transitional Program* says, which says that it is not inevitable that the proletariat will triumph, no matter how many workers there are, no matter how much industry develops, and no matter that there are millions of workers more. This facilitates the struggle and makes it more acute, but as the *Program* says, there are two alternatives, socialism or barbarism: the proletariat can always be defeated, otherwise the existence of Trotskyist parties would not be necessary. This proposition that, automatically, the more workers there are, the more successful one is, leads to Hitler, which was where there were the most workers in all of Europe at the time.

And the concept that the fewer workers there are, the less the revolution can be carried out, led the Mensheviks to propose that the workers' revolution could not be carried out in Russia. So, the legend of the many workers is not such because the decisive factor is the party. Where there were fewer workers, but there was a great revolutionary party, the triumph was achieved: Russia. And where there were millions of workers and productive forces to burst, but there was no party, Nazism triumphed. In this revolutionary epoch, there is no guaranteed victory, so we read to Just the quote where Trotsky, in the *Transitional Program*, says the same thing as we do for Russia and where he does not say that the political revolution is guaranteed but that there are two alternatives: either we return to capitalism, or we achieve the political revolution and advance. Our fight was defending that phrase of the *Program*, which goes against all economic mechanism or determinism: the greater industrial development, the working class wins.

Question: What relationship does this controversy have with that of the Constituent Assembly?

Possibly for him, the Assembly is not important because with his criterion, that by having so many proletarians the Soviets are inevitable, it is possible to call a national assembly but of Soviets where everyone can vote. Since the proletariat is so numerous, it is not ruled out that there will be universal suffrage in the Soviets: if everyone is a worker and everyone goes to the Soviets, then we expand it a little by putting up a sign that says “anyone who wants, come and vote”. Then the Soviets became the expression of universal suffrage and the National Congress of Soviets can be called the Constituent Congress, or the National and People's Congress. This is, in fact, the discussion with Just whether, due to the strength of the proletariat, the Soviets are the same as the constituent or any other issue. The underlying discussion is that.

For us, those of us who defend the Constituent Assembly, this is a historical category totally different from the Soviet, even if it exists under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Constituent Assembly today means, specifically, the right of Catholics to have their party, to bring the discussion down to earth, and not only the right but we believe we must be the champions, telling the Church to make its party, telling it that they are servants of the bureaucracy because they don't want to make their own party. And they don't want to make it because they are currently in favour of the existing bureaucratic communist party. The Church is terrified of having to make its party, thus this is the only way to win over the Catholic ranks, so they see that the Church is with the bureaucracy because the entire working class says: Walesa is a skilled maneuverer, he is a genius, but he is against the bureaucracy. When we tell Walesa to make his party so that he takes power, and he says that under no circumstances, we will be beginning to defeat him. And according to Just, we should not say this to Walesa, because then it would be forming a bourgeois party. And here comes the issue of memory: in the USSR it is another thing, if the Russian proletariat maintains the historical memory,

then they say that priests do not come to the Soviets, we are not going to propose that they come or that they play their part there. This is why the slogans are for each stage of the revolution.

The crime of Stalinism is that today the power in the mass movement in Poland is the Church, and we have to respond to this Stalinist crime with a policy. And Just's policy is the recitation of the Program, which was the very fraternal discussion we had with him, to whom we posed that the Church exists in Poland, so what policy do we have? This is when we quoted the example of Trotsky in Germany when the Chamber of Deputies elected Hitler, a fascist, who was elected by universal vote. Trotsky proposed that if the revolutionary process began quickly in Germany, it was necessary to call, not for elections, but for this ultra-right Chamber to meet to oust Hitler. Always thinking about what the masses think. Then, if it was seen that the deputies of that chamber were for ousting Hitler because the petty bourgeoisie broke with him, Trotsky said that this was the great line. Hitler was going to tell them not to meet, and the petty bourgeoisie, which is very formal, was going to reply to him that if they met when they were going to elect him, why they shouldn't meet now that they wanted to oust him, therefore, the more and more petty bourgeois were going to turn to our side.

So, Stalinism has lowered the consciousness of the world proletariat so much that we find that in a workers' state, the Church is the leader of millions of men. Then we have to respond with a policy, and the Constituent Assembly is formidable. After all, we do not appear as ultra-leftists, because we tell them, why don't you make the party, win and take power? Then they are going to say that under no circumstances; so, are you the allies of the communist party? Are you for the CP to continue to rule? It is a formidable line, it is not the Soviets, which precisely is very possible that they will develop with this line, that is, create revolutionary workers' organisations to impose the constituent assembly. Organs of struggle, which fight against the bureaucracy and propose a Constituent Assembly, until most likely, as in the Russian revolution, they are forced to carry out a violent revolution to impose the Constituent Assembly. Along the way, we are discrediting the Church and the opportunists.

Thus, the constituent is not the same as the Soviet. Yes, it is an organ of the proletariat, good or bad, but an organ. That is, the dictatorship of the proletariat can take different forms.

Question: What relationship exists, in Poland, between the party and these centrist currents?

For us, this is the fundamental point. Why are Poland and the USSR going to be decisive? Why are we entering a stage that is going to be Trotskyist? Because it is beginning to be so for objective reasons. In Nicaragua, there was an FSLN, which fought with weapons in hand against Somoza, there are guerrilla organisations in El Salvador. Organisations like the FSLN, etc. will inevitably emerge in Poland, not for guerrilla warfare but for the political struggle. In Nicaragua, it was posed to overthrow Somoza but in Poland, it is posed to overthrow this dictatorial and totalitarian government, like Somoza's (later we will see the differences, as theorists, but as a political phenomenon, it is a monstrous totalitarian regime). Do you know who Baluka is? What happened to him has happened to tens of thousands of people. He is a young man, who leaves as a sailor, stops at a port, and meets in a café a guy who speaks Polish. So, he chats with him, they go out drinking, etc., like a good Pole... The point is that he spent two or three days with that guy. It turned out that this guy was a left-wing émigré from the regime but Baluka was a simple sailor who didn't know anything. Well, they gave him life imprisonment, nothing less than life, for having chatted in a port with someone he didn't know.

All workers' states are full of such cases, everybody comes in and out of prison, and this gives a special mettle because not everyone enters Poland as a Trotskyist. Because we have seen the Polish newspapers, where on the front page and in large letters is his name, and where they say he is a Trotskyist. They interview him on television, and the media attack him, but they still do interviews with him, etc., where they say that he is a Trotskyist. It's incredible, it's historic, the beginning, but it's something that I thought I was going to die without seeing.

That's Baluka. Now, let's return to the problem of centrist parties. In this objective situation, parties have to emerge that begin to say that these people must be ousted, it may be spontaneous, with

a low level, etc., but they will inevitably emerge. But the difference between the FSLN of Nicaragua and the FSLN (let's call it that) of Poland is that in Nicaragua you can say that it is a bourgeois-democratic revolution, you can ally with the bourgeoisie, etc., but here comes the advantage that Poland is a workers' state, the only thing they can say is that they are for a political revolution, whatever name they want to call it. From the moment they say that they want to overthrow the bureaucracy with violent (and we see that the Church does not want it) insurrectional forms and methods, they are already Trotskyists, and this does not happen to us in Nicaragua. On the contrary, the FSLN is a wall for us to reach the masses but in Poland, this does not happen. Not in Poland; they come and say: we want to mobilise the masses, to violently overthrow this dictatorial and scoundrel government—in the name of Christ the King!— to impose workers' democracy. And we, what are we going to tell them? Long live Christ the King!

That is what we call centrist organisations, it is the pure Trotskyist program, except that with Christ the King. We already had this experience, with the anarchists in Catalonia, advised by Trotsky. The revolutionary process in Catalonia forced the Friends of Durruti⁸ and the libertarian youth of Barcelona to begin to propose, without abandoning anarchism, that a workers' revolution had to be carried out against the republican government, after May 1937. Trotsky advised their few followers to unite, that they eliminate the problem of the discussion of the dictatorship of the proletariat, of anarchism and Marxism, they are for the workers' revolution and this is where unity comes in. In other words, any current—we call them centrist because they do not understand Trotskyism—of masses that begin to consider making a revolution against the government that exists in Poland, is unconsciously Trotskyist. It is a highly progressive centrism; it stops being so when it says there is no need to make a revolution, that you can make a pact. That is, the great obstacle of Stalinism, because of the laws of dialectic, and of the paradoxes of history, becomes a colossal ally. Because, when the revolution enters the countries where Stalinism dominates, it then becomes extraordinarily positive, as we pointed out in the *Theses*. That is, any current that goes for the revolutionary liquidation of the CP government is going towards Trotskyism. Whereas, the Trotskyist program in other places is the program of historical needs, because against Somoza it is immediate, but against Somoza there are many; whereas, for revolutionary methods against the bureaucracy there is only one organisation in the world: Trotskyism on a world scale.

That is then what we call centrism, and we are expecting it to happen. For example, what will happen with the Polish CP? Perhaps we are facing a historical event, very big, in which Baluka and everything goes to a fifth order. The thing about Baluka is propagandistic, the important thing is these great processes, and notice that the history of Czechoslovakia is repeating itself. This country was invaded by the USSR because the CP met amid a terrible mess to liquidate the old party and make a new one. Now too, the USSR is saying that what worries it most is the PZPR congress because perhaps that centrist party will emerge there, the party that would break the PZPR.

This centrist party thing has to be very clear because it is currently basic for our International, for we have to get used to the fact that we are going to advance through great leaps and prepare ourselves for what [comrade] Eduardo said, perhaps for a mass International where we are a minority but a revolutionary International made up of all these parties that are emerging and that we are going to receive with open arms, despite the shortcomings they may have.

Canada–Iran

In particular, there was a very big discussion about Canada because the comrades proposed a constituent for Quebec, the French zone. We were against it. Felipe and I corrected the entire text of the comrade and proposed that it be voted on, and Lambert completely refused. He said that he had not met a major opportunist on the national issue and that he did not accept corrections being made,

⁸ **The Friends of Durruti Group** was an anarchist group in Spain. It was founded in March 1937 and named after deceased anarchist hero Buenaventura Durruti.

that what had to be done was to completely reject the document, and so it was done, fundamentally for raising the constituent of Quebec.

We believe that the great line is a Constituent Assembly of all of Canada. This is also reflected in Spain. Lambert indicated to Comrade Raul, reflecting the opinion of the Secretariat, that they were guilty of a serious mistake that had been committed in Spain, the Constituent Assembly of the Basque country. The great line is a national constituent, not dividing the nationalities that exist in a state, because the great task is: for each state a party and a single revolution. For example, the Bolsheviks tried to mobilise all the masses of the Russian empire to overthrow it, and they did not raise constituents everywhere but rather they tried to concentrate everyone to confront the central axis, the capitalist state. So, the great line is Canada's break with the British crown, a Constituent Assembly to make a republic and there, yes, the right for the national self-determination of Quebec. And then there, I do have doubts as to whether or not a Constituent is proposed for Quebec, within this program, for having been a colony different from the English colony. Because it occurs to me that, perhaps it can be argued, and this is my definition, that Quebec is a colony of the English colony, which in turn is a colony of the British and an imperialist sub-metropolis of the Yankees. But we have to continue studying this.

What we believe is that it is necessary to clearly define the delimitation with the petty-bourgeois currents. That is to say, every petty-bourgeois current has a program, a method and a policy different from ours, although it plays a progressive role. The FSLN in Nicaragua is never for democracy and the self-organisation of the working class, as a matter of principle, it is always for Bonapartist control of the workers' movement, whether by guerrilla or whatever.

This discussion has to do with the comrades of the POSI from Spain, who had said in a bulletin why they did not criticise the ETA attacks, whatever their nature. And we believe that ETA committed a crime when it killed the engineer because it helped the reaction, which was a true political crime that weakened them enormously. Also, in *International Correspondence* itself we published an article, to see how it must be permanently delimited and with what tone, because the [Spanish] PST delimits itself by actually supporting the apparatus, or by playing from the left into the hands of the CP and the PSOE, instead of sticking to ETA, to hit on the CP and the PSOE, and from there make the criticism.

Eurocommunism: it is one of the theoretical points in which I believe the most progress has been made.⁹ It seems to me, although I do not know well the discussions of the OCI and the OCRFI. I'm going to touch on the Bolshevik Faction. You know that with Mandel we had a great discussion, very interesting, us defending Trotsky's position, that we are now going further because we worked with some quotes from him, which some comrades —demonstrating the high level of the General Council— asked that they be incorporated but we decided not to do it because they are precisely the ones we are going beyond. It is very interesting as a theoretical improvement: we believe that... but before that, let's see what Trotsky said. He said that as they bind themselves to imperialism, communist parties transform into social democratic parties. Mandel said that as they distance themselves from Moscow, they become Eurocommunists —ceasing to be Stalinists— they may become social democrats or revolutionary centrist Trotskyists. Faced with this, we defended Trotsky's traditional position, and I had the impression that the OCRFI comrades said that they were still Stalinists although in Moscow there are different factions, which does not make them stop being Stalinists, therefore there are no currents that question the Moscow line.

The Bolshevik Faction said that Stalinism could never change its reformist character; this was the great fight with Mandel. But now we have made progress in something very important: first, it has been accepted that the Stalinist parties suffer two pressures —that of imperialism itself and that of Moscow— and at a certain moment, the pressure that responds to imperialism begins to win. So, what we have made progress on is the following: just as you cannot move from one regime to another without a crisis, the communist party cannot become social democratic without a crisis,

⁹ See *Capitulation to "Eurocommunism"*, letter from Moreno to the United Secretariat, February 11, 1977. Available at www.nahuelmoreno.org.

because it is qualitatively different from a socialist party. The socialist parties are not a product of the counter-revolution but of the revolutionary rise (although they are degenerated). The communist parties are a product of the counter-revolution, which therefore depends on Moscow. To become a social democrat, that is, to go directly to serving imperialism as a transmission belt in the workers' movement, a crisis has to occur. There is no possibility of any CP in the world going there, united, without any crisis. In other words, we have added the phenomenon of crisis and the impossibility of peacefully transforming a communist party into a social democratic party without crisis. It may go over to the side of imperialism, it may break with Moscow, but creating a new type of party.

And the other problem is also that we call national Stalinism that of the countries where power has been taken. This gave rise to many discussions because [Comrade] Just, above all, said that it was Stalinism because it depended on Moscow and theoretical definitions have to match reality, which is ultimately true, but Moscow and Peking are about to engage in a war. Whereas, for us, and this has already been voted on by the General Council, there is national Stalinism, which clashes and has or hasn't friction with Moscow because it reflects the national bureaucracies. There are national bureaucracies in degenerated national workers' states and those bureaucracies again are Stalinist. The best proof is Castro because he does not come from either the CP or the Third International and yet he ended up making a pact with Moscow and transforming his movement into a communist party. Why? Because it is the party of the Cuban workers' bureaucracy, which is not the same as the Russian bureaucracy, just as the Chinese workers' bureaucracy is not exactly the same as the Russian one.

But these national bureaucracies, with their national communist parties, have an entire Stalinist policy, of safeguarding the bureaucracy, of socialism in one country, of peaceful coexistence, that is, the entire Stalinist scheme because they reflect the same sector as Stalinism, only in other countries, they can become independent from Moscow without ruptures within their party for the same reason that, without rupture, they were able to expropriate the bourgeoisie. In other words, the mass movement takes them beyond what they want in the break with the bourgeoisie. As a byproduct of this break with the bourgeoisie, the break with Moscow arises, only where a workers' revolution was carried out and they took power. Elsewhere, there is no possibility of national Stalinism.

Question: So, what would the truly Eurocommunist parties look like, that is, if there was a crisis?

We believe that there was a crisis, for example in the Italian CP. There is a university that does the internal analysis of the CP and it shows that 75% of the cadres are with Moscow, against Berlinguer¹⁰ (the professional cadres, of the apparatus), waiting for the opportunity to break it. But Berlinguer has a majority in the ranks, that is, it is a situation on the verge of explosion.

In the Spanish CP too, everyone says that there are factions, etc., that is, Eurocommunism is a situation of crisis, on the verge of explosion: one sector is going to stay with Moscow and the other with imperialism, it is not that it will continue working as a united party, as Mandel believed, that is, following the pressure of the mass movement. That is, our main fight with Mandel is that there are two pressures, Moscow and imperialism; centrist currents may emerge in the explosion but the fundamental thing is the two forces, which lead to the breakup of the party. In the Italian party, it has not yet exploded but the Spanish party is ready: 250 leaders from Madrid signed a statement calling for Carrillo¹¹ to be fired because he does not provide enough democracy and is not linked enough to imperialism (they believe that Carrillo is too much with [disrupted]).

In any case, this must be seen as a process, the Italian CP has not broken with Moscow either, it has been balancing the situation but it is heading towards this crisis.

I really want to insist on the possibilities that are opening to the International, Poland..., although we should not exaggerate because all the organisations are very young but, frankly, we have

10 **Enrico Berlinguer** (1922–1984) was an Italian politician. Considered the most popular leader of the Italian Communist Party (PCI), he led the PCI as the national secretary from 1972 until his death during a tense period in Italy's history, which was marked by the Years of Lead and social conflicts, such as the Hot Autumn of 1969–1970.

11 **Santiago Carrillo** (1915–2012) was General Secretary of the Communist Party of Spain (PCE) from 1960 to 1982.

never had such a favourable situation. In Colombia, we do not see it very clearly, it may be because there is a little more bourgeois democracy so the CP is more in the opposition but in other parts of the world the CPs are shoring up the most reactionary regimes: in Brazil the military government; in Argentina, they shore it up more and more; in France, they put everything on the line for Giscard d'Estaing¹² to win (now, on the contrary, they run and offer everything to Mitterrand). They are like this throughout the world, increasingly to the right, in opposition to the mass movement that is increasingly moving to the left. So, despite the extreme youth of our cadres and our leadership, the FI-IC is already an extraordinary milestone: we may say that it sells 15,000 [copies] of its organ, it is a success never seen before. That there is a public Trotskyist in Poland, from the point of our movement is something immense, from the point of view of the Trotskyist party that we need in Poland, it is nothing, but it is qualitative. And we have these qualitative facts everywhere: I go through Spain and there is an Iranian group won over for our politics, they are high-level young comrades, from the fedayeen, etc.

It is a widespread phenomenon. I showed in the activities report, the demonstration of our group in Los Angeles, led by Petroni: it is nothing for the USA, it is a drop of water or less because there were 200 or 250, with their newspaper, which sells more than a thousand; but for our international organisation, they are historical facts. For the PST, which five years ago was the Socialist Bloc, that now has fighting brothers in Los Angeles who hold a parade of 250, is extraordinary for the movement as progress. So, in this sense, without exaggeration, the Council was a huge success, and we are truly moving forward.

For me at least, since I'm already old, I notice it this way: we made so many mistakes but now, having an international leadership will prevent you from making them. The division of Trotskyism was tragic, that everything is unified gives communicating vessels, this means that wrong experiences are made much faster and that many mistakes are not made. For example, the fact that we begin to clean up the finances here, that the Colombian PST begins to have a small printing press is also a consequence of the International. This discussion about the regimes that was held about Spain is very important for Poland because this error of the Spanish PST comrade produces a deviation that leads to revisionism, it is useful for Brazil where they have a similar discussion, in Poland, we might have it tomorrow: that the bureaucratic regime, which was already forced to accept Solidarity, Rural Solidarity and Student Solidarity, perhaps soon they will be forced to recognise independent parties, then many will come who say the political revolution has already been made when it is a rotten regime that makes those concessions, but a regime that still exists (tsarism continued existing although conceded the Duma) then we would stop the process of permanent revolution. It is a great discussion, although it may seem about words, in essence, it is the discussion of the permanent revolution of the *Transitional Program* method. So, comrades, the existence of the FI-IC really is a very high point, which we still do not realise. Yes, if we notice it, then we have to be very happy with the meeting of the General Council, which showed that it is already a leadership because it responded to concrete problems of all countries: in Canada, Ireland, Peru, Poland, France, and at the same time to the great general problems of the class struggle.

We all came very happy; it was much better than we thought. The meeting started a little cold, we all looked at each other, it was an attitude somewhat similar to that of the World Conference where almost everything was already done, but it was soon seen that in this sense it was qualitatively different from the Conference. Because it is dynamic, and strong, with a leadership that is already beginning to discuss, tempers begin to heat up, we begin to respond to burning problems of the class struggle, but not the general programmatic theoretical response but quite the opposite. This was the General Council. It was a fundamental milestone; it was the first time that I've seen an international leadership functioning. This is why all of us who attended you will see us very happy, starting with me, since the first world congress I attended, the first executive and international secretariat that I have known was in 1948, quite a few years ago, and yet it is the first time that I see an international leadership functioning. Comrade Lambert said that we were far, far above what had been achieved in

¹² Valéry Giscard d'Estaing (1926–2020), was a French politician who served as President of France from 1974 to 1981. In 1981, despite a high approval rating, he was defeated in a runoff against Mitterrand, with 48.2% of the vote.

Trotsky's time. And I want to add to this —and I have more experience in international organisations than comrade Lambert (he himself asked me whether it was similar or not)— that it is also far above the leadership that existed after Trotsky's death: there has never been anything like it, within these historical limitations. It is the first time I have seen a truly international leadership at work