



**Trotskyism vs. revisionism
in Marxism**

Debate notebooks

*editorial
socialista*

**Rudolph
Klement**

**1998
PLATFORM OF THE
INTERNATIONALIST
BOLSHEVIK
TENDENCY
(TBI)**

**Our split
with the PTS**

Compiled by Walter Montoya
and Ana María Ocampo

Edited by:



Internationalist Workers' League
Fourth International

1998

Platform of the
Internationalist Bolshevik
Tendency (TBI) against a current
that liquidates Trotskyism

Our split with the PTS

*editorial
socialista*

Rudolph
Klement

INDEX

Introduction	9
--------------------	---

CHAPTER 1

The nature of the current tendential struggle within the PTS

Against the rupturist policy of the majority fraction

Let's defend the unity of the PTS!	11
The misrepresentation of the positions of the CC minority, now TBI of PTS	13
A self-proclaiming and sectarian degradation that leads to opportunism, movementism and tacticism	17
A fractionalist method drawn from the functioning of the worst student methods and from the worst traditions of the outbreak of the Trotskyist movement.....	18
A national-Trotskyist policy on how to handle tendencies and fractions within the revolutionary party, extracted from the arsenal of centrism	21
The true Trotskyist tradition of how to manage a tendential struggle, within the party From the TBI we call to abandon the policy of rupture of the PTS promoted by the majority	24
Tradition and revolutionary politics	27
The majority fraction of the CC has been applying new statutes of the PTS without writing them down	31
The true paradoxes that are shaping the PTS, and even the current tendential and fractional struggle inside its ranks.	32
A pre-Aristotelian method of discussion applied by the majority fraction, which does not set a common object.....	34
What positions and deviations the TBI of the PTS is fighting against?	37

CHAPTER 2

The self-proclaimed internationalism of the majority fraction conceals a national-Trotskyist turn

An assessment made with a bike pump	39
Any current that deviates towards national-Trotskyism refuses to make a scientific definition of itself	41
The true character of our theoretical advances	42
The assessment of the majority of the CC is not measured with reality	43

An inevitable consequence of self-proclamation: we break, due to a propagandist conception, with the policy of the Liaison Committee that the meeting of the FT proclaimed	45
The majority of the Central Committee, with its self-proclaimed balances, forms “internationalist” cadres with a method opposed to that of Bolshevism and Trotskyism	47
A return to national-Trotskyism by the majority of the CC.....	48
The true “epidermal internationalism” of the majority fraction.....	50
The causes of this adaptation.....	51
A first example of what we say has already come out in La Verdad Obrera: a subjectivist conception of the crisis of the Fourth International	52
A second example: as a national refraction of self-proclamation, the struggle for the principled refounding of Argentine Trotskyism disappears	53
Down with the sectarian self-proclamation!	54

CHAPTER 3

The first response of Emilio Albamonte to P. A shameful response	55
A new invention: “the minority indulges in ‘populism’”. This contraption created by the Central Committee’s majority is meant to conceal their economicist, pacifist and ultra-unionist vision of the unity of the workers’ ranks.	55
A pedagogical conception of the party politicization	64
An anti-dialectical response and a subjectivist and theorist definition of the “little Marxist leagues”	67
In defense of... the consensus regime	69
The consequences of this conception are disastrous: the liquidation of the action program	70

CHAPTER 4

The Majority fraction falling off a cliff once again:

A revision to the Transitional Program and the Thesis of the Third International	73
A misconception about the working class that liquidates Trotskyist program.....	73
Pacifism, which denies that the Trotskyist program is the expression of the most exploited layers of the working class	76
Breaking with the soviet strategy	78

CHAPTER 5

The PTS has two mutually exclusive choices:

Either a Leninist Party or a Morenoist Party	81
In the tendencial struggle, a hidden self-proclaiming subjectivist faction becomes visible	81
The blow-up of the party leadership and the PTS.....	84
The document for the extraordinary congress of August 8 and 9, 1998: the greatest proof of the eclecticism of the consensus regime	88
For self-proclaiming Morenoism, as for our pre-congress document, the struggle among parties did not exist.....	90
According to the majority faction “The crash changed everything” including the revolutionary content of our tactics	92
The self-proclaiming party that is built in the spaces of the regime and renounces the struggle among parties, refuses to form cadres and members with a Leninist Trotskyist Soviet strategy	93
The Italian SR: an example of a very erudite revisionist National-Trotskyist center.....	98
The shameful chapter III, written as an offspring of... “Organizational problems” of Nahuel Moreno	99
The “35 and 35” of the MAS of the ‘90s: the other side of the same coin of the false intellectuals and the theorist and subjectivist party.....	107

APPENDIX

The “crisis of subjectivity” of Albamonte and the rightist fraction of the ex-PTS

The ideological misery of the revisionist and opportunist left	112
Introduction	112
Albamonte breaks with the Theory-Program of the Permanent Revolution.....	113
For Albamonte, the masses have everything to blame and not the treacherous leaderships.....	115
Menchevism vs. Bolshevism.....	116
The centrists and Menshevism	119
The “maturity” of the masses for Trotsky against the Menshevism of Emilio Albamonte.....	120
“The political backwardness of the American workers” and the misery of the national-Trotskyist thought of Emilio Albamonte.....	121

Consciousness according to Marxism	124
The Menshevik “theory” of the “advantage” of Emilio Albamonte: rightist Morenoism.....	125
For Albamonte, the masses are to blame even for the crisis of the Marxists	127
“Ideological Reversion”?	128
Bad memory	129
By the hand of the LRCI, everything ends in a capitulation to the governments of the bourgeois-workers’ parties in Europe	129
Take off the mask of Trotskyists	130

NOTES	133
--------------------	-----

September 1998

**For the re-foundation of Argentine Trotskyism
on principled bases
For the reconstruction of the
Fourth International**

**Platform Project of the International Bolshevik
Tendency (TBI) of the Party of
Workers for Socialism (PTS)**

On Friday, September 18, 1998, the TBI delivered this Platform Project to the PTS leadership, which refused to publish it immediately. As they have been doing from almost forty days, the majority fraction refuses to publish any material of the TBI until they have prepared a written response to it. They have also systematically refused to set up an organizing committee for the debate, and continue to publish circulars, newsletters, etc., unilaterally. All this configures a method that is completely alien to revolutionary Marxism and the most elementary democratic centralism.

Therefore, the undersigned, leadership of the Bolshevik Internationalist Tendency (TBI) of the PTS, are responsible for the publication of this Platform Project, and calls on all PTS comrades to adhere to it.

Pico - Tucan - Guillermina Sandoval - Ramiro - Walter - Pablo Cortina - Hugo Ramírez

**TBI LEADERSHIP REPORTS
THE LATEST ADHESIONS:**

At the time this platform was published, comrade Martin Cesar, founder of the PTS, former member of the Central Committee of the PTS and the editorial of Avanzada Socialista and Rebelion de los Trabajadores (Workers' Rebellion) adhered to it.

Fellow founders of PTS Cordoba regional and former members of the Trotskyist Left Group have also joined. We reproduce here their letter of endorsement:

"To the Central Committee and all PTS militants,

The undersigned, former PTS militants, to date as supporters, hereby inform you that:

After becoming aware of the tendential struggle within the party, and having agreed to read the minutes, documents and writings that express the different positions in this struggle, we have decided to adhere to the Platform Project of the PTS' TBI, therefore joining the ranks of the Tendency as active militants, to fight for their positions. We do it with the conviction of taking another step towards the struggle for the principled re-foundation of Argentine Trotskyism and the reconstruction of the Fourth International.

With Trotskyist greetings, former members of the Trotskyist Left Group (GIT) - founders of the PTS in Cordoba, Argentina."

CHAPTER 1

The nature of the current tendential struggle within the PTS Against the rupturist policy of the majority fraction

Let's defend the unity of the PTS!

In just twenty days, since comrades P and HR became a tendency of the CC on August 8, 1998, until August 30 same year, when a Plenary Congress was held, and without the minority of the CC having presented their political and programmatic documents, as it was well before the deadlines established by the Party, the majority fraction of Party's leaders declared the minority of the CC and today TBI of the PTS a "secret fraction". An internal and public fraction of the Party was imposed a definition against its will.

From the TBI we believe that these facts show from the very beginning (as we will demonstrate in this platform) what we consider was the collapse of the leadership methods and of the very same PTS leadership. It was the majority of the leadership with its partisan cadres which fractionated the whole Party from the very moment we declared ourselves a CC tendency, and also which carried out a microsurgery operation to end in a Resolution of an Assembly (not a true Leninist Congress) called with an anticipation of only 48 hours, in order to actually impose separate experiences before the minority had been able to complete its platform and its documents, and initiate -in common cells and with a common praxis- the political struggle within the party. We affirm that no other was the objective of the majority fraction from the beginning of the collapse

of the consensual methods the leadership of our party used to apply.

Today, while we are finishing to write this project of Platform, the majority of the CC has made public an Internal Circular No. 4 with the Resolutions of the last Plenary - Congress of August 30. It has been publicly discussed with the people influenced by our party, with the party's sympathizers, with the POR, and also with all the currents of the left, about the existence of a "*secret fraction, without a program*" inside the PTS. And all this, we repeat, barely 30 days after the discussion was just brought in, and without the documents of both the minority and the majority of the CC being yet presented. They also published a Circular No. 5 and a newspaper article signed by the leader of the majority fraction Emilio Albamonte, without the constitution of an ad hoc committee to organize the debate.

This bureaucratic-irrepressible hurry to take the Resolutions to vanguard sectors and Left Parties, without clear political positions, without our Platform, without an Organizing Committee to channel the debate, demonstrates the majority fraction has transformed the CC into a true public fraction. The majority fraction used the resolution of the Congress, both unfairly and in a bureaucratic way, in the "Plenary-Congress"; such resolution, as we have already stated, we

do not share, though we accept. But it is the majority fraction which is using fractional methods when acting over our periphery and the Left Parties of our country, and **this was not voted in the Congress**. It actually voted "...to establish a Joint Commission which supervises the publication of an internal bulletin with the documents of the factional struggle (...) The Fraction shall have its own space in the Party's newspaper and in 'Estrategia Internacional.'"

In our understanding, the latter was the mechanism to discuss before the vanguard. But what is more serious, the Congress did not vote at all the organization of cell meetings to condemn the minority faction, or to separate anyone who expressed a difference about the resolution of the Plenary Congress, although having accepted it. All those who wanted to know the documents of the tendency, even not having publicly adhered to it, would be brutally separated from the cells. All the comrades who are against the resolutions, in spite of having accepted them, are threatened by the majority cadres with the penalty of being kicked out the Party.

Ultimately, these facts demonstrate the majority fraction has used deceitful and factional maneuvers in applying the resolutions of the extraordinary Congress of August 8 and 9, the agreement Act of August 16, and now the very same resolutions of the Congress of August 30, to promote a divisive and rupturist policy of the party. Its true objective is to promote separated experiences, as we will demonstrate. Therefore, in the last Plenary Congress called by the majority with 48 hours in advance, from the TBI we demanded guarantees, not from a "commission of notables", but from the party's leadership, because between Congress and Congress, the CC leads. Now it is clear that, the majority does so with a rupturist policy, without a program, with an administrative policy depoliticizing the whole party; and it moves now in the same brutal way, carrying the issue to the political influence of the party and the rest of the left currents.

The facts, the crude facts show any honest member of our party that that this is the case. The discussion began when a minority in the CC raised bravely its differences in the "Party" point. The entire CC came to an agreement, everybody affirmed that in the concept of Party we did not have enough theoretical and political elaboration, and therefore there was no homogeneity in that issue. The entire Central Committee accepted this before the members in the extraordinary Congress of August 8 and 9. The informant of the CC, stated the leadership could

not discuss Chapter Three of the document about Party, there were differences, positions and semi-positions, at least, opposite positions about this, that is to say, there was not a homogeneous position. The same informant stated before the plenary session of the Congress that the CC would "remain silent" if the delegates decided to discuss the party topic concentrated in Chapter Three of the pre-congress document. As we stated in the unanimously voted resolution (see note No. 1) by the CC and by the same extraordinary Congress, it resolved to postpone the discussion and the decision on Chapter Three about party and statutes, to allow deepen that discussion and differences, with documents of the leadership, bulletins, minutes, etc. It was also decided to set up a recess to call for a new Congress session in the coming months. The discussion was about "*what kind of organization we should make to merge with eventual vanguard sectors that arise in the heat of class struggle ...*"

The same Congress voted a period of 30 days to write documents, minutes, where the differences would be presented, and deal with this discussion in the coming months, in a new extraordinary Congress.

On 8/16/98, a new agreement was signed by the CC, based on this resolution of the Congress and the party was informed of the constitution of a minority *tendency of the CC, and based on the resolution of the Congress, the CC estimates that "The documents can be elaborated and published in a period of approximately 30 days"* (See note N ° 2).

None of this could be done. Attributing the responsibility for the present situation to a small tendency endorsed by 26 comrades including two CC members up to now, is a fallacy. So, in these twenty days an intense activity with a factional, irresponsible, depoliticizing and confusionist method has been carried out by the majority of the party. This demonstrates its true conception (expressed earlier in the CC and then in the response of E.A. to the letter of comrade P. appearing in Internal Newsletter N ° 3 of 8/21/98): in a "revolutionary league defined by a revolutionary program" tendencies could not be accepted, since the leagues are defined only by having a revolutionary program. This means that if the PTS has a revolutionary program, "you cannot make tendencies," and those that arise, are "centrist, retrograde, right-wing, epidermic internationalism, pro worker, populists ... and without program or principles ". All the cadres of the majority were armed this way.

Against this position of the majority, the TBI of the PTS declares, together with Trotsky: *"The ideological life of the party cannot be conceived without provisional groups in the ideological field. So far no one has discovered another way to proceed. Whoever has made an effort to act contrariwise has simply demonstrated that his recipe was reduced to suffocate the life of the ideas within the party. Naturally, the groups are as much an "evil" as the divergences of opinions. But this evil is as necessary a component of the dialectic of the evolution of the party, as the toxins in relation to the life of the human organism.*" (Leon Trotsky, "The New Course").

But against any classic democrat policy of the adventurist and decomposed currents, of which the only purpose is just arguing, so that the sect stews in its own juice, in these 30 days we made three proposals to guarantee a debate on the basis of democratic centralism within the party. The first was the agreement reached in common before the Congress of August 8 and 9. The second was the act-agreement of 16/8. Both were an attempt to organize the debate patiently within the party; in common cells, organizing a public discussion on the newspaper before the vanguard. While these agreements were signed, the majority fraction broke them day by day, as we will show later. Therefore, on 8/26, we made a democratic proposal to the majority fraction to redirect the debate. 48 hours later an "Emergency Congress" was held, where the minority had no rights to convince the Party members, going cell by cell about the principles behind these proposals to the majority of the party. Proposals that today clearly demonstrate they were the only ones that could prevent a rupturist process imposed by the majority of the leadership, before the debate begins. (See note N° 3).

Meanwhile, the art of the majority fraction has always consisted in facing the party with resolutions already adopted, i.e., an irreparable situation, an accomplished fact. This is how they intend to use today the resolutions of the Plenary-Congress they called -to take this factional struggle without program and without principles to the vanguard, advanced sectors of the workers and students, and the rest of the Left, a question that the delegates hadn't voted at all in such Plenary-Congress. Thus, this demagogic method of factionalism, which permanently puts the party before a "fait accompli" has been the practice of the majority fraction since the beginning of the debate underway.

This hysterical and depoliticizing factional-

ist method against a current within the party is absolutely disproportionate. This current has not even considered overthrowing the leadership, on the contrary it meant to convince the majority and the party as a whole, of the need to abandon their current deviations and return to a revolutionary course. *"The internal regime of the party is a problem of greatest importance. It must be a truly democratic regime... Democracy presupposes not only a formal political attitude, but a pedagogical attitude towards the new militants and the workers' audience. It is fair to say that the leadership must act with respect to the bases with the same patience that the party must deploy towards the working masses".* (Trotsky, **Letter to Glotzer**, 9/11/37). The majority of the leadership feels that the emergence of a tendency and the critical way in which it has emerged in our party is like a blow on the nose. But in politics, whoever is guided by these blows is a poor revolutionary. The majority fraction has lost all proportions, and as Trotsky, our teacher, has already advised, *"people who have a propensity to make a mountain out of a grain of sand can cause a lot of damage to the party and to themselves."*

This factionalist policy of the majority is anchored in a conception that revolutionary parties or currents can degenerate only towards opportunism, and only if they are already vanguard or mass parties. That is, if they are *"small leagues with revolutionary programs in general"* they would be prevented *per se* from falling back into centrism, or degenerating into sects, that is, through sectarianism. And the fact is that since the crisis and degeneration of the Third International by Stalinism, the Trotskyist movement has been fighting not only against opportunism but also against sectarianism. Bolshevism was built against Menshevik opportunism and also against ultra-leftism. And what we have witnessed of the Trotskyist movement in Yalta and after 1989 has been no more than a process of degeneration due to opportunism or sectarianism of "little Marxist leagues with revolutionary programs in general" (since they all said they were worshipers of the Transitional Program, with which they concealed the centrist capitulations they carried out every day).

THE MISREPRESENTATION OF THE POSITIONS OF THE CC MINORITY, NOW TBI OF PTS

Since the Congress of August 8 and 9, the majority of the leadership of the CC has acted as a true fraction. Throughout the course of the Congress and in the houses where the delegates

of the interior slept, they organized discussions of all kinds and at all times, including in the corridors, affirming that a tendency of the CC had arisen *"without program and without principles"*. They said that this tendency of the CC was proposing, like the MAS, to solve the crisis in the party regime through the infamous "35 and 35" (proportion of "Marxist intellectuals" to working class activists in the CC, TN) as that party proposed to do when it broke in 1991, carrying union leaders and centrist workers to the central leadership to cover up for the crisis of their leaders.

It is a fake notion. On August 7, 1998, comrades H.R. and P. published a Platform to the CC to become a Tendency, and today we present to the party its central points: **first**, *"that the secretariat of the CC during this week has collapsed because it could not elaborate in common the document for the Extraordinary Congress on the crisis of the party regime that we are going through. In that discussion totally opposite positions appeared on the role of the paid professional activists, the mechanisms of revolutionary control in a revolutionary party, and also different positions on the character of the Leninist party were outlined."* **Second**, *"... our party, despite having made delimitations, and having achieved programmatic theoretical homogeneity, has not achieved homogeneity around a conception of a party and a construction policy. This is even worse because this elaboration could not be done while engrained and established in the vanguard of a concrete revolutionary proletarian movement ..."*, *"This limitation did not prevent us from subsisting and developing in the phase of public fraction of the MAS and later as a propaganda group, but today ushers us to a crash as a subproduct of the last two years in which we have developed a profound national-Trotskyist deviation with no less deep tactical and movementist deviations."* **Third**, we are involved in a discussion about *"democratic centralism and party regime (...)* and a balance on the PTS attempt to achieve a path to the proletarian vanguard". **Fourth**, *"the method of consensus in this issue that involves the principles of the Leninist party, would be doubly disastrous for the PTS and it would prevent an open political discussion, which is the only way to clarify the differences throughout the whole party."* **Fifth**, *"we understand that just as there is no way to go to the vanguard in general, i.e., without a political struggle among parties, we will not conquer a healthy centralist democratic regime or a revolutionary policy at the level of the national and international tasks that we have ahead without a struggle among wings, blocks and even tendencies and fractions, as it will be impossible to clarify the discussion when differences really exist..."* (What

a programmatic topic of the CC minority, which allegedly "has no program", that now has to be recognized publicly by the majority in its resolutions!). **Sixth**, *"this is the only possible method so the whole base and the cells of the party are not only an object, but also the subjects of the construction of their own revolutionary organization and the selection of their leaders"*. **Seventh**, *"We are then witnessing, the outbreak of the consensus method of the PTS leadership, which ended up turning into bureaucratic consensus of the highest leadership against the CC and of the CC against the whole party."* The fractional nature of the actions of the majority of the CC in this political struggle is an evidence of this. **Eighth**, *"The PTS has, as a Trotskyist Left, a great obligation, namely, not only to demonstrate that it is capable of developing a good discussion, but also to carry it out in a principled way, in a framework of camaraderie among comrades who consider ourselves to be all revolutionaries"*.

Among the resolutions that we proposed, it was our announcement of the constitution of a tendency into the CC, and also *"to elaborate in the immediate period the constitutive documents in relation to the points in discussion mentioned above. These topics to our understanding could not be resolved in the previous Congress, nor all the documents for the Extraordinary Congress end up giving an answer."* We also announce that we became a "CC tendency", and that we will call the base of the party when we have elaborated a written document. We explained that it was necessary that the cell of CC wrote about it, even clarifying that this discussion, once regulated and organized with documents, could be carried out in front of the vanguard *"in non-conspiratorial aspects, which surely we will deeply and extensively develop in our documents."*

So, the tendency of the CC did have a program, and it proposed to discuss the Party topic theoretically, strategically and programmatically. It was opposed to point the Third of the Congress Document -on the other hand, it was not even chickenheartedly defended by the majority of the leadership by then. And, in different responses to the TBI, they made partial corrections, without saying.

We believe that they said that we "did not have a program" because for any current that has deviations towards tacticism and movementism, the proposal of discussing the Leninist Party, a struggle of tendencies and fractions, the rupture of consensus, the analysis of failures to go to the vanguard and lessons drawn from all this, the relationship between cells as a subject of the con-

struction of their own party and a Central Committee with leaders who present their passport to the party, amounted to "not having a program". **For any centrist current in relation to the conception of the party, as it will be demonstrated throughout the course of this debate, the theoretical and programmatic elaboration about Party is not a question of concern. Considering these problems is "not having a program," according to a CC of national and regional leaders "who place the cadres according to their professions", with cells that abide uncritically by party politics, that is, depoliticized members, only docile executors of tactics. This kind of CC is in for the "concrete, concrete" party that only has to be filled with propaganda to raise its level, so why wasting time and "paralyzing the party" with tendency struggles?**

As we will demonstrate later, for the self-proclaiming intellectuals and semi-intellectuals of our party, the Party topic is not part of their theoretical concerns. To pose a program against tacticism and movementism, the political struggle of groups, tendencies or fractions within the Party, against the dead cells of the centrist tactical parties, against the leaders that hide behind the documents of the "synthesis" (that is, the consensus); warning about us having already 10 years of bourgeois democracy without connecting with the revolutionary subject, that is, the proletariat, and that, along with the national-Trotskyist deviation we drag on, we can degenerate and capitulate to the regime... It means "not having a program"!

We regret to inform the majority fraction that having a right conception of party and a party program for the different phases of construction of a revolutionary party, both nationally and internationally, is and have always been one of the keys to the constitution of the revolutionary movement in the 20th century. It is not at all accidental that in thesis 13 of the Theory of Permanent Revolution, Trotsky raises the relationship between the strategy of a party and its internal regime as follows: *"The present policy of the Comintern, its regime and the selection of its leading personnel correspond entirely to the demotion of the Communist International to the role of an auxiliary unit which is not destined to solve independent tasks"*. And those are precisely the centrist features of our party's regime denounced by the Tendency of the CC, today TBI. Those features were but the expression that through tacticism and movementism, we had started adapting to the regime of bourgeois democracy.

As Trotsky says, *"The organizational problems of Bolshevism are intimately linked to the problems of program and tactics."*

The history of the revolutionary movement is plenty of combats about democratic centralism, which expressed and concentrated fundamental political differences.

That is why, for example, around one single topic in the statutes, i.e., who was a militant and who was not, around that single issue, the RSDLP was divided surprisingly and Menshevism and Bolshevism emerged, expressing different conceptions and policies about the Russian revolution.

Then, the crisis of the Bolshevik party in 1922, when the "New Course" was voted, was a great discussion about the party regime, since most of the party workers had either died on the battlefield in the civil war, or they were occupying high positions in the Workers State, and the party's relationship with the workers' base had been greatly weakened. That is to say, the factory cells had been greatly weakened in the Bolshevik Party, and a new worker movement, coming directly from the countryside, and that had not participated in the revolutionary processes, flowed into the factories. These conditions produced the emergence of bureaucracy and suffocation of the Party regime. "The letter of the 46" and the fights of Trotskyism against the first signs of bureaucratization in the USSR were no other than the origins of the later Left Opposition. This great discussion on party regime and democratic centralism was expressing the germ of the two opposing currents that would later develop: Stalinism and Trotskyism; the latter being continuity of Bolshevism. Another example is the constitution of the Third International and then the establishment of the 21 conditions to purge its ranks of all opportunistic, careerist and social democrat elements approaching the organization.

Similarly, the continuity of Trotskyism in the '30s as a continuation of Bolshevism, the struggle against opportunist and movementist centrism and against the subjectivist sectarians who had a supra-historical vision of the party affirming that Stalinism was the continuity of Leninism, against which Trotsky wrote his brilliant work "Bolshevism and Stalinism."

The degeneration of the Fourth International and its transformation into a mere movement as a consequence of its adaptation to mass counterrevolutionary apparatuses had as a result the Trotskyism of Yalta, both the objectivist wing

that capitulated to every new leadership that emerged, and the self-proclaiming and ultimatumist (compulsive exigencies of purity and expediency in their plans) wing, with methods of construction copied from the currents to which they capitulated (Pabloites).

Yalta forged movementist parties as the Mandelites, self-proclaiming Parties in their own country, as Morenoites, to promote the tactics of RUF (Revolutionary United Front) around five ultra-minimum points in order to make any kind of agreements with whichever petty-bourgeois current, guerrilla, etc. The Lorites "caudillism" (excessive personalization of the leadership), and personalism (the Altamirism for example) and the internal regime of the party was the internal expression of its policy of Antimperialist United Front. That is, "caudillos" who would enter the AUF to make permanent fronts agreeing programs of socialism with rotting Stalinism and even with bourgeois nationalists, such as Gen. Torres.

Lambertites, with a totally decomposed internal regime, voted in all their Congresses for "the party of 10,000 militants", as an incentive for its machinery to work, while they were at the same time the conveying belt of the trade union bureaucracy of Force Ouvrière.

Mandelites elaborated a theory of organization that is "opposite" to that of Moreno's AUF. They stated the geometric progression theory related to construction, when their parties had two thousand, or five thousand militants. This was a great discussion in the Unified Secretariat in 1978. Mandel said that if you have 100 cadres you can have 1000 militants, with 500, five thousand ones, and thus he continued in geometric progression. It was a sample of petty bourgeois impressionism when their parties increased their members in Europe or in Mexico, as a late product of the 1968-76 generalized uprising.

All of them reneged on the conception of Leninist party and Soviet strategy. All of them had gone from small leagues of propaganda in a leap to vanguard parties, as a byproduct of objective processes of radicalization and different adaptations to the reformist directions of mass organizations. They were empiricists. They denied that a scientific preparation of the construction and a construction strategy were necessary in the preparatory phases. They were parties of fighters and sects that proclaimed themselves, and although they were leagues, and very small, for that case, they also betrayed or openly capitulated, like the Mandelites that sent all their militants into the Com-

munist Party for a longlasting period, and the uprising of 1968 found them all inside, except for the cell of Literature and Philosophy in the Sorbonne that had split a year before, and not accidentally it was the base for the construction of LCR as a vanguard party.

Thus comrades, the Yalta period was full of betrayals and capitulations of small Marxist leagues, in preparatory stages.

And let's not talk about the terrible outbreak of the Trotskyist movement since 1989!

We affirm that while in the Trotskyism of Yalta there was some theoretical and programmatic continuity due to partial political and fractional struggles, on the Leninist party concept, on the contrary, there has been a full, absolute discontinuity.

And therefore yesterday, as a minority tendency of the CC, we intended to deal with a theoretical, political, historical, and programmatic discussion, the so called (by the majority) "concrete problems" of construction. How much pedantry and centrist arrogance of our half-intellectuals! What blindness and theoretical inability to understand the problem of the problems to solve, namely the crisis of the revolutionary leadership of humanity and the reconstruction of the Fourth International deserves a great theoretical, strategic and programmatic discussion on this central aspect of the revolutionary theory, also to not degenerate as a current! How much pragmatism and centrist empiricism led us to write Chapter Three, a shamefully Morenoite one, as far as Party's conception is concerned, in the last extraordinary Congress, as we will show in this Platform!

Precisely, we wanted to deal with the collapse of the leadership's consensus methods, their conflict with the preparatory phase in which our little league is in since 1995, its national-Trotskyist deviation included, and the serious crisis, in our opinion, that was Chapter Three of the document presented in the Extraordinary Congress, and the fact that the previous Congress in April had not been able to solve this question from a theoretical and strategic point of view. This could have allowed us to make the Party and the leadership majority understand that the minority tendency had a great program, which only movementist and purely "practical" militants could not understand.

A SELF-PROCLAIMING AND SECTARIAN DEGRADATION THAT LEADS TO OPPORTUNISM, MOVEMENTISM AND TACTICISM

As we will demonstrate later in this Platform of the TBI, we formed our tendency with the purpose of fighting against Chapter Three of the document; a totally self-proclaiming chapter, tingeing and disqualifying all the revolutionary orientation of our party. Its axis is around *applying tactics* (which at this moment means to be built in the spaces allowed by the bourgeois). "*Let's strengthen the PTS*", by means of the slogan "*Come to the PTS*"; at the same time, the majority denies us the right to form a tendency, affirming we are a small Marxist League without any weight, therefore, without authority before the vanguard and the masses! As we will develop in another chapter, from the TBI we are fighting against a self-proclaiming policy that leads us to the swamp of opportunism, movementism and tacticism. We will demonstrate that the new definition of internationalism that the majority has developed (expressed on the vote fundament of EA, MR and JS) is, according to this process of self-proclaiming centrist deviation, trying to turn defects into virtues; that is, beautify the fact that we have not ceased to be, in ten years, a "national center", that we have not managed to merge with any left wing developed in the international Trotskyist movement, that we have not defeated in our country the rest of the centrist currents that speak in the name of Trotskyism; that our "international" magazine belongs to an essentially isolated national centre.

This transformation of defects into virtues has as a national refraction, i.e., the liquidation of the struggle to refound Argentine Trotskyism on principled basis as part of the struggle to expulse centrists and to defeat -before the vanguard and the masses- those who speak in our country in the name of the Fourth International.

Leninism and Trotskyism fought against both objectivist Menshevik currents that stated the movement was everything, that is, partisans of purely spontaneous movements, and self-proclaiming and ultimatist, that is, sectarian currents.

There were great discussions within the Bolsheviks against Bogdanovism, and from Trotskyism as the Left Opposition of the Third International against Stalinism in the third period, that is, its ultra-leftish and self-proclaiming period. They were discussions around how to establish an hon-

est relationship between the party, the masses and their vanguard. While under the leadership of Bogdanov in 1905, the Bolshevik party had an ultimatist position related to the Soviets, posing that if they did not accept the discipline of the revolutionary party, that is, its leadership, the Bolsheviks would leave them. Trotsky said that Lenin had to arrive to defeat that proclaiming and ultimatist policy and reestablish healthy, honest relations between the party and the mass organizations. Throughout the third period, the Left Opposition fought against the self-proclaiming ultimatism of the bureaucratic centrism of the Third International, which led it to the disastrous policy refusing to set up a Workers United Front to face Fascism in Germany, and culminated in the crushing of the German proletariat.

In the '30s, the Fourth International waged a theoretical and programmatic struggle but also fought to prevent the Bolshevik Leninists and their small leagues from degenerating in the way of either two dangerous deviations. The French Turn, that is, the entryism in the Socialist Parties, in France, in the United States and in Spain, was for the small leagues with a revolutionary program the way not to degenerate by sectarian (self-proclaiming) means, i.e., considering themselves as "THE Revolutionary" party. On the other hand, the fight against POUM's Andres Nin's opportunism, Belgian section's Vereckeen opportunism, the opportunism of Molinier in the French section, etc., were to prevent them from degenerating by means of direct adaptation to the counterrevolutionary apparatuses. That is why the Transitional Program has a chapter against opportunism and another against sectarianism, the two sides of the same centrist coin.

For this reason, for the Leninist Trotskyists, when a discussion about the regime starts, it is always a very careful discussion because political differences are expressed and if they remain hidden and unsolved, they may be in the path to deviations in one or another sense. They may have eventually consequences in the program and in politics, because the regime of a party, in the last instance, is the expression of the whole theory, program and politics; that is, the strategy that orients a party.

This also happened in the PTS in these 30 days of struggle of tendencies and fractions within our party. So in our opinion, the discussion that started around the Party issue and an unhealthy regime, movementist orientation and not at all, centralist democratic was the initial point, in our opinion, to witness that underlying political differences were deeper, and as we will see then,

the majority deployed their political flags according to the type of party they want to build.

A FRACTIONALIST METHOD DRAWN FROM THE FUNCTIONING OF THE WORST STUDENT METHODS AND FROM THE WORST TRADITIONS OF THE OUTBREAK OF THE TROTSKYIST MOVEMENT

a) The points mentioned in title 1 of this Chapter, which we have already described, were the points around which we became the minority tendency of the CC. Until the Congress of August 8 and 9, the tendency did not intervene as a tendency in the political points. Chapter Three was retired in common agreement to allow to develop a political discussion without premature divisions around the political points an immediate orientation of the Party, which were discussed in the documents.

But during and after the Congress, the majority of the leadership, led a fight against a supposed "workerism" of our tendency, began to deploy their true political positions, which they will later develop in these 20 days. Let's see the facts. The only conclusion, the key of the Congress for the majority of the leadership, was a mistaken oral intervention of comrade P, which was rectified in the same Congress, and then used fractionally in plenaries of the base (made from 72 hours after the end of the Congress) to accuse the comrade of "workerist" and "national-Trotskyist", that is, to the tendency of the CC; an irresponsible method, without writing a single position on the balance sheet of the Congress.

The same day Monday 10/8 they convened a CC session hidden to the party where they voted that "the Congress was a masquerade" and that "the only good thing was" that they had "managed to vote the resolutions of orientation" (the tactics, in the the majority's lingo) so that the party "does not stop" (?). Then with this unwritten balance sheet, and without downloading the verbatim record of the position of one of the critics, comrade. P., (which was used as (bad) example in the whole plenary of the party) and the interventions around it, plenaries of the base members were organized, where the voice of command was "against P.'s workerism" ... That is against our tendency. All along these, the ex-delegates continued in permanent session.

When, in the various plenary sessions, sev-

eral comrades questioned why such a discussion was opened without delivering to every member the written minutes of the Congress or the verbatim records authorized by those who had participated in said discussion, they were brutally attacked with the accusation of "*being members of the tendency*" (although the comrades did not even know that the CC internal tendency existed!).

This fractionalist attempt of the majority of the CC, using plenary sessions in a totally movementist way to settle a discussion that was just in its infancy, inventing a program to the minority, was made with small maneuvers extracted from the method of the student currents' swamp, and not from the tradition of Leninism and Trotskyism. That is, a method where the key is the maneuver to "win" the discussion quickly and at any cost, weaken the opponent and "unmask" them, and not to reach a common truth. This is how the entire swamp of student currents acts, and it is a legitimate method as a tactic to confront adversaries and enemies in the vanguard, but not within the revolutionary party. As Trotsky says,

"Leninism fights with fists and teeth, but war is impossible without cunning, without subterfuge, without deceit. Cunning in a victorious battle is a constituent element of Leninist politics. But at the same time, Leninism is the supreme revolutionary honesty with respect to the party and the working class. It does not use fiction, self-proclamation or false greatness. Leninism is orthodox, obstinate, irreducible, but it does not imply either formalism, dogma or bureaucracy. (*The new course*, page 50, Cuadernos de Pasado y Presente).

For the majority, if there are differences in the highest leadership, and above all, if those differences appear regarding points that were not discussed in Congress, it was a matter of inventing a program to the minority so to win the discussion easily, even before it started. On the contrary, if the comrades considered that different positions had been deployed in the same Congress, it was their duty to record or write off official documents with the authorization of those directly involved and respecting their right to correct them.

So Lenin recommends to all the militants of the Russian Social Democracy to carefully study the minutes (shorthand versions of the positions

held by the delegates and leaders in the Congress) to make their own vision and draw their own conclusions from the positions discussed and voted on in the same. And he was speaking about anything else than the Congress of 1902, in the pamphlet *"One step forward, two steps back"*. Thus we can see, in the Cahier Leon Trotsky No. 1, edited by Broué, the minutes of the Conference of the founding of the Fourth International, where not only there are the resolutions voted by majority and minority, and the proposed amendments, but the whole of the discussions developed by the delegates around each item of the agenda. Thanks to the existence of these acts, we were even able to know, for example (together with other decisive discussions) the exciting, rich and controversial discussion and the different positions that the slogan of the factory committees developed in that Conference. Conclusions that were later synthesized in the Transitional Program.

But, as we saw, all this offensive against the "workerism" of the CC minority tendency was nothing more than a smokescreen, as we showed in another chapter of this platform, to hide the real problems of regime that our party has, which do not come, precisely, from the small circles of revolutionary workers we have. When in fact the problem we have is just the reduced character of these circles of revolutionary workers. It is the social composition of the party that we have not been able to change in these ten years.

In its attack on "P's workerism," the majority fraction and its top representatives acted, as Trotsky would say in a letter to SWP's Hansen of 10/10/1937, as *"many intellectuals and semi-intellectuals terrorize the workers through abstract generalities. that paralyze the will to act. The official of a revolutionary party must have, in the first place, good ear, and only in the secondly a good tongue"*.

In the current debate the majority has played up their men and given a role to their *"new intellectual figures"* within the party. What a sad role! Comrades self-proclaiming as the *"writers of the international magazine"* in order to achieve weight in the party, say only a half truth about their sacrificial revolutionary militant craft. What a disgrace that we do not have intellectuals who write a single article -of decisive importance and with their signature, without first having consulted the secretariat, not once, but several times, and also after having torn and thrown many drafts! Tell the truth, all the truth, semi-intellectuals of our party! Nothing decisive, theoretically and politically of what has been written by our organization, has

been without first going through the discussion and correction by the top leadership of our party. We wish we had intellectuals (only revolutionary ones, not centrists) as Mandelism has them, like Bensaïd, etc., who with their signature, under their absolute responsibility, write books, brochures, articles even in *Le Monde*, etc.!

Perhaps, and we are convinced of this, with the rupture of the consensus and the bureaucratic methods of the party regime, the conditions will be created so that these semi-intellectuals *"with such a bad ear and such a good tongue"* can risk publishing their true positions, in books, brochures, in our newspaper and in the International Strategy, as was the tradition of revolutionary Marxism and Bolshevism. For these reasons, it was fair and correct the concern of P., who in his note of clarification on his speech in Congress, expressed concern about *"that impatience begins to dominate, that it obfuscates and leads some comrades to develop skepticism about the possibilities of building ourselves in the workers movement with the limitations and contradictions that it has today"*. Nothing fairer and more accurate!

This smoke screen against "workerism", used after ten years of our current without any weight in the industrial proletariat, was demeaning to the majority of the leadership, because we are revolutionary Trotskyists, and we affirm that beyond the initial phases of constitution of every revolutionary group, *"the class composition of the party must correspond to its program"*. Because our party, far from having the danger of *"workerism"*, and as a product of objective conditions and subjective crisis, *"if in the next period it does not proletarianize, it will cease to exist."* (Letter to the SWP, Leon Trotsky, 7/1 / 40).

Therefore, as quickly and stealthy as the magician who says "abracadabra, and... hey presto!... nothing here, nothing over there", they pulled out of circulation Trotsky's great work *"In defense of Marxism"* because it contains a complete program against the current positions of the majority of the leadership, against the excess of "yeast" on which the majority fraction is based; a program that we endorse in this Platform, and which we will unwind with total conviction so that it is voted by a Congress of our party. As we will demonstrate and raise in the chapter entitled "An outrageous response from E.A. to comrade P."

In all the actions of the majority fraction, it is incontestable that they not only act with incredible arrogance and disdain towards foundational leaders -that have been central in the construc-

tion of our party, as recognized publicly by the whole party (while the majority fraction says under the counter that ours is a tendency to save the prestige of an obfuscated leader who has been impatient because there are no immediate possibilities to make an entry in the labor movement) -but also towards dozens of workers and especially young workers who are grouping in the TBI and are its support and its fundamental basis, and that also, many times consciously, and others instinctively, have felt rejection and indignation for the factional politics of the majority. A question that in our opinion is a symptom, and a decisive incentive for the fight we are giving, to raise their level, and so they can be aware and expose inside the party everything that smells rotten in it, with the program of struggle.

Why is it that the majority of the leadership, which boasts of leading the majority of the party, and says with a hint of contempt that the TBI is a tiny minority, refuses to act as the leadership of this group of thirty young revolutionary workers and experienced workers? How much impatience, how much blindness, that will drive them away and leave them unable to merge deeply with vanguard workers radicalized processes that will surely have "less program", be "more workerist and nationalist", and with "more personalistic leaders" that the current TBI!

But this obfuscation of our semi-intellectuals of the majority fraction did not end only in this derailing. On the contrary, with a movementist, classical *modus operandi* of the different fractions in which Argentinean and international Trotskyism have burst out since '89, and acting in a truly caudillistic way, the cacophonous rallying of the party against the minority tendency of the CC was organized and also a fabrication of incidents against anyone who opposed such an aberration, or even against anyone suspected of being friends with a close friend of a friend of the two members of the CC in the minority tendency.

b) Both in these plenary sessions and in the response of comrade E.A. to P. 's letter clarifying his intervention in the Congress (Internal Circular No. 3), as well as in the newspaper that appeared as a bombshell the week after these plenaries, the majority began to unfold the political regime that was behind the consensus and that shaped this movementist way of carrying on the fractional struggle and of leading the party.

The facts, the hard and stubborn facts, show that from the initial plenary to the Plenary-Congress of 8/30, the majority of the leadership wrote two circulars that they have named "Ten-

dency and fractional struggle", without the slightest participation of the concerning minority tendency of the CC, neither in their elaboration, nor in their timing or in their publication. These two circulars are the Internal Circular No. 3, where they say blatantly that "there is no tendency struggle"; moreover, acting in a fractional way, they did not publish the letter of P. for the whole party on 19/8 or waited to have an answer, they incorporated incidents provoked by them and they issued a Circular of fractional struggle where comrade EA responded comrade P., (which is answered in the Chapter 5 of our platform here advanced) and as if this was not enough, in a CC meeting that they denied us that existed and to which we were not summoned, they voted and then published an Extraordinary Circular calling for an Urgent Congress within 48 hours. As we stated in the letter of H.R. and P. of 8/26 with the proposals to redirect the debate democratically within the party (this last one published in the Extraordinary Internal Circular of 8/27/1998 of Convocation to the Urgent Congress), the leadership marginalized the two members of the CC, HR and P. while they attacked any member suspected of belonging to the tendency, always by creating incidents.

In response to this situation the two above-mentioned comrades renounced the CC, and in a defensive way the TBI was established, backed by 26 comrades, who had discussed the draft of this Platform, decided to hand in Chapter 5 for the entire party on occasion of the Congress-Plenary of 8 / 30, and voted their delegates to join its sessions although it had been convened unilaterally and fractionally by the majority fraction of the CC. (See Report of constitution of the TBI, and the 8/29/1998 letter to the comrades of the CC and all the party's comrades - Also see note No. 4, published in the Extraordinary Internal Circular No. 3, one day before the Congress). We had not at all abandoned the organization. The convocation of the Plenary Congress of 8/30 was the culmination of a rupturist policy of the majority fraction, and for that reason we had proposals to redirect the debate in the organisms of the party, including in the maximum leadership, like any attentive reader of our proposals can draw as a conclusion.

There, in our letter on 8/29, we affirmed that it was not a Leninist Congress, in which the minority of the CC could go down to all the cells to discuss and convince the majority of the party of their proposals, before the Congress, to redirect the debate with the 12 points that we have proposed for it. As we denounce, the majority of the CC abstained from making any proposal

to organize the debate, and they neither did it whatsoever in the Plenary-Congress, where they proposed to declare us a "secret fraction". That is to say they took to a demagogic summon to Congress "so that the base decides" to fight in it without a forewarning. Obviously, their true objective in calling for that emergency congress 48 hours in advance was to declare we were a "secret fraction". Such a democratic centralism! They prepared a Congress of rupture, which they hoped we would not attend, because of the analogy and the "tradition" they evoked was the Conference of 1989, held after the split of Bobbistas and Leonperistas from the party. We insist: as they saw that we did participate and fought in the same Congress because we integrated the plenary as part of our struggle to redirect the debate in all the party organisms, they declared us to be a "secret fraction".

c) As we said in the Declaration of the TBI of the PTS on the resolution voted by the Plenary Congress of 8/30/1998: *"we were a public tendency in the CC since 8/7/1998 and went public for the party since the Plenary Congress of 8/30"*. In it we affirmed (in front of the accusation that we "had not taken our base" to the plenary) that Leninist Congresses are constituted by the delegates, with no base, that our base was the only one did not rights in that Plenary Congress, because it had voted six delegates (as corresponded to us, according to the number of adherents we had), and at the proposal of the CC majority, they were not recognized by the Plenary-Congress. The base of the TBI, far from being "hidden", was for 20 days in the regional so that the majority had the opportunity to make it split from us before we, the minority of the CC could give our documents. Every one, absolutely every one who signed our declaration, had been tried to be convinced by the majority of the CC to repudiate the members of the CC minority tendency and stay grouped with the majority fraction. They refused to do so, however, and today they constitute the fundamental cadres in the constitution of the TBI of the PTS.

In that note addressed to the leadership of the party, we denounced that *"the key and the essence of the resolution voted by the Plenary Congress, proposed by the majority of the CC and from which they were the delegates, to impose us a treatment as a fraction of the PTS, pursues the central objective of preventing the existence of common base organizations within the party. This and no other is the objective of said resolution. The use of arguments such as "the party does not stop" seems out of place (...) Therefore the separation of common base cells prevents a common practice,*

which would have allowed to collectively reach the truth around the revolutionary positions that are questioned in this debate ... "

In that statement, the TBI declares it has decided *"to accept, although we do not agree with them, the conditions established in the resolution of 8/30, considering that the majority of the party and the leadership so demand and have voted, ..."* (See note No. 5).

A NATIONAL-TROTSKYIST POLICY ON HOW TO HANDLE TENDENCIES AND FRACTIONS WITHIN THE REVOLUTIONARY PARTY, EXTRACTED FROM THE ARSENAL OF CENTRISM

The resolution of the Plenary Congress states in its considerations: *"In Trotskyism of Yalta such an attitude would have meant a definition as secret fraction and the expulsion of dissident comrades, and that today Lutte Ouvrière of France has a public Fraction that only writes in the newspaper and presents its positions also in a factory bulletin, but it cannot act in the class struggle with full independence. And, let's not talk about the MAS; when it was our expulsion in 1988, they refused even to give us a page of the newspaper for (our) members in the CC although more than 500 militants adhered to our positions "*

On the contrary, we believe, and we will strive to clarify this point to all the militants of our organization, that this shameful consideration is a true party conception drawn from the arsenal of centrism and national-Trotskyism to guide the tendential and fractional struggles within the party, which dyes all the resolution the majority of the leadership made vote in the Plenary Congress of 8/30/98.

As we outlined in our letter to the party's leadership on 9/2/1998, the method followed by the majority of the leadership (that is, by the majority fraction) to redirect the debate democratically is almost a copy of the method the leadership of Lutte Ouvrière imposed to the Fraction of that organization in France. It is not a national invention; in fact, the resolution imposes separate experiences without common cells; that was what the majority of the leadership voted at the beginning of a debate. Far from what the above Consideration says, the leadership of LO forced a sector of the CC and the base members that had differences on two points of LO policy (the character-

ization of Russia after 1991 and the intervention of LO in the strike of 1995), against their will, to become an internal and public fraction. We regret to inform the majority comrades that such Fraction not only writes in the newspaper, in the international magazine and distributes its own factory bulletins (which are a first-order instrument for the conception of the party), but it has participated as a public Fraction in the march of intellectuals and immigrants against Debré's law (to which the majority of LO did not go), and was convener and participant of the first and second Workers' Meeting, together with the TR of the LCR and Voix des Travailleurs (meetings of which the majority of LO did not participate). They have participated publicly as a Fraction in the annual party of the LO. They participated as Fraction in the summer school of Pouvoir Ouvrier (French group of the LRCI) in 1997. They maintain relations as Fraction with the majority of the groups of the French Trotskyist movement. But ... they do not have common cells with the majority of LO, where on the basis of common experience and common practice they could have the right to convince the majority of the base of their positions. That right was totally denied to them.

Thus, Lutte Ouvrière, continuity of Yalta Trotskyism and part of the centrism of the post-89 Trotskyist movement, has given the recipe to the majority fraction of how to deal with tendencies, that is, very rapid splitting by the base (because if not, "the party becomes paralyzed", "there would be incidents "...) and full guarantees for the outside, as long as... there are no common cells! Alas! this is the version and the methods and the party regime to guide the tendency struggles defended by one of the most national-Trotskyist currents of the international Trotskyist movement!

This is a totally and absolutely undemocratic feature, so as not to discuss with the groups and tendencies that have differences within the party, in common cells, and only from there to organize public discussion in front of the vanguard. Actually, LO's nationalist Trotskyism, with its orientation policy, the inevitable fractional and tendential struggles within its party, irresponsibly copied today by the majority fraction, does not even reach the Menshevik centrism in the beginning of the century in Russia!

There, the problem in the different phases of rupture and agreements within the RSDLP was the existence of common cells of Menshevik and Bolshevik members even when their leaderships were in conflict. There was full democracy for the right, the left and the conciliators to express themselves; situation that sometimes led Lenin himself to make financial campaigns, as a maneuver to separate the cells when he broke with

the Mensheviks, so that the Bolsheviks could deploy their flags as in 1905 and in 1912 when the proletarian uprising began. That is why the Bolshevik cells, with the correct revolutionary program, at decisive moments could influence the Menshevik cells, as happened in St. Petersburg on May 10, 1912 uprising. It was because of that tradition, that Lenin presented his April Theses to both Bolsheviks and Mensheviks whose cells were oriented in a revolutionary way before even presenting them to the Central Committee in April 1917. Because for Leninism, the revolutionary cells were not objects to apply tactics with, the base of maneuvers of infallible CCs, but the constitutive organs, together with a Major Staff according to the circumstances, of the equation of democratic centralism. And we are not saying that we do not fight so the reformists and centrists have their parties and the revolutionaries ours. **What we are saying and affirming is that there is a national-Trotskyist current at an international level that has this method of "taking care of their base", in order to prevent the tendencies, blocks, groups of opinion, to exist and operate in a critical conjuncture inside their own party** . For this national Trotskyism, the first thing is "to brand and separate the cattle"; that is the role the national-Trotskyist centrist currents give to the cells and it is the one unfortunately the majority fraction has copied!

What Lutte Ouvrière does to guide the tendential struggles within his party, is "poumism", and of the worst kind. Thus, in his letter of July 2, 1931, to Andres Nin, who had joined the Bukharinist right wing of Maurin, Trotsky writes:

"At the beginning of the 1917 Revolution, most of the Russian Social Democratic organizations had a mixed character and they included in their ranks the Bolsheviks, the Mensheviks, the conciliators, etc. The tendency towards unification was so great, that in the Bolshevik Party Conference, Stalin, a few days before the arrival of Lenin, spoke out for unification with the Mensheviks. Some provincial organizations remained mixed until October Revolution. I see the Catalan Federation as a kind of similar mixed organization, an unbounded organization, comprising future Bolsheviks and future Mensheviks. This justifies a policy that leads to differentiation in the ranks and the first step in this way, is to denounce the political vulgarity of Maurin's policy. There can be no mercy in this matter. **The comparison of**

the Catalan Federation with the unified organizations of Russia obligates, nevertheless, to make some essential restrictions. The unified organizations did not exclude any existing social democratic group.

Everyone had the right to fight for their opinions within the unified organization. The question is different in the Catalan Federation; "Trotskyism" is included in the *Index* (black list, N. of R.). Every confusionist has the right to defend his confusion, but the Bolshevik-Leninists cannot openly raise their voice. In this way, this unified, eclectic organization delimited itself from the beginning from the left wing" (*Writings on Spain*, page 100, Library of Socialist Culture, our bolds).

The methods of forestalling democratic rights in order to prevent blocks, tendencies, etc., from discussing their positions in common cells, while giving all guarantees and "full democracy" to act as a public fraction, of Lutte Ouvrière, is a copy of the POUM. Lutte Ouvrière and its leader Hardy, seems to be "democratic" this way, but they deny the internal political struggle at all levels of the party, so to hinder the possibility for the members to draw common conclusions and to seek revolutionary truth through a revolutionary praxis. They are the continuators of Yalta's centrism, "separating the cattle" in an administrative way, when international and national events are beating their organization and so being the reason of those inevitably differences. It is centrism which gives full democratic guarantees to the outside, and none to the inside. And this is a cover of that national-Trotskyist center, which is forced to keep up appearances because it has a million and a half votes, and another expulsion (like Voix des Travailleurs) would harm *"the image of the organization"*, especially now that they are preparing to converge with Communist Left.

But what is more serious, the majority fraction, perhaps unknowingly, and pragmatically (very possibly because of the national-Trotskyist deviation we have), has copied a political action of French National Trotskyism, in this internal struggle that develops in our party. As we anticipated in our Declaration before the Resolution of the Plenary - Congress of 30/8/1998, not everyone in Yalta Trotskyism *"expelled the secret fractions"*. In it, we advanced how Morenoism in Moreno's life, did not usually expel its secret fractions. And we as an gave example the secret fraction, a well

"secret" one indeed, organized by B., J. and A. in the PST (in 1979, living in the most complete clandestinity, under the genocidal dictatorship of Videla!).

Morenoism was the Trotskyism of Yalta that at least kept the appearances when it felt safe as a majority, and thus allowed itself to canalize those tendencies and secret fractions which in general, did not question its centrism in its essence.

On the other side, Mandelism, which was in essence a semi-Menshevik movement, which built parties to adapt and capitulate to "any vanguard of the masses" (that is to Castroism, Sandinism, Maoism, Titoism, etc., etc.) channeled tendencies and fractions, precisely through movementism, transforming the party into a kind of federation of permanent wings and tendencies, without discipline in action to confront these treacherous leaderships, and then all its tendencies and fractions ended subordinated to the center. Thus Mandelism, through some supposedly ultra-democratic forms and permanent tendencies and fractions, has sterilized and still sterilizes the political struggle within the party, because nobody cares ultimately to convince anyone, but to maintain a movement that is a counselor of counter-revolutionary leaderships. And there are "separate experiences" and "total freedom of action in the class struggle," so much that, for example, the Mexican Mandelism ended with one wing in the bourgeois PRD of Cárdenas, and the other inside the petty bourgeois Zapatista movement!

The comparison with our experience as the TBI of the MAS remains inaccurate. In the first place, because we (it refers to the PTS before it was expelled from the MAS, TN) were a tendency and the leadership of the MAS never forced to declare ourselves as a fraction (which in that case we were, in fact), although it was openly known as one. In that party, the TBI, before the rupture-expulsion, was able to carry on during six months of internal political discussion (beyond the existing rarefied climate). The majority fraction of the PTS today has to explain why it was so impatient and obfuscated, and did not wait for 30 days so that we could present our platform and the debate could be initiated seriously and responsibly in the Party. They already forced the party to vote the division of the cells. Let's clarify, for the new comrades of our party, that after achieving a finished program like TBI in the MAS, around the point "internationalism" (however outlined in a completely centrist way) we were already beginning to form a tendency when many of the current leaders of the PTS were, in fact, a

true and lawful secret fraction.

This is so because that national-Trotskyist center that was in a sharp process of degeneration could not expel us from the beginning, because there were tens of thousands of workers and popular fighters to whom we had to respond. Undoubtedly, the degenerate centrism of the MAS of '88, could not at all give us a page in the newspaper, since it could not allow us to reach thousands and thousands of vanguard leaders, workers and students this way.

As we see, the different currents of centrism always used maneuvers according to their national-Trotskyist expediency to unleash or "channel" their tendency and fractional struggles. It was the most degenerate and most adapted currents of the Trotskyist movement (like Lambertism, Lorism, Healysm) that expelled mercilessly, using the worst methods of slander and moral accusations to break the spine of revolutionaries.

So it happened with the campaign of calumnies and moral accusations against Napuri, against Varga, by Lambertism; and recently, by the Lorism against Bacherer in Bolivia. The party regime of the Trotskyist parties of Yalta, which today their centrist heirs' post-89 continue, expressed the two currents between which centrism oscillated. That is, on the one hand, the ultrasubjectivists, self-proclaiming "revolutionary parties", where the apparatus was everything and the revolutionary base nothing and the vanguard the cannon fodder for their capitulations. On the other hand, the objectivists, for whom the movement was everything, the organization nothing, so to adapt this way to the treacherous leaderships. Objectivism and subjectivism, Lambertism and Mandelism, Morenoism and Pabloism, are the different forms that centrism acquired according to which regime and treacherous leadership it adapted to and capitulated. The internal regime of these organizations was only the expression of these adaptations and of the crisis of the Fourth International.

Thus, with the Hardy-Albamonte method, one of the most undemocratic in the Trotskyist movement, any comrade who decides to enter our tendency must be ready to break with the cell of the party to which they belong. It is a true bureaucratic method of internal terrorism in the party, so that the comrades who agree with our program or with a large part of it, cannot adhere to the TBI without leaving the PTS. What a shame, comrades of the majority fraction! How low you have fallen!

If they do not backdown from this method, and explain to the party the very serious consequences that it has, you will enter the annals of the Trotskyist movement -and be remembered along with Hardy-LO as one of the most bureaucratic currents of the Trotskyist movement regarding to the treatment given to its tendencies and fractions.

**THE TRUE TROTSKYIST TRADITION OF HOW TO
MANAGE A TENDENTIAL STRUGGLE, WITHIN THE
PARTY. FROM THE TBI WE CALL TO ABANDON
THE POLICY OF RUPTURE OF THE PTS PROMOTED
BY THE MAJORITY.**

a) As we have seen so far, the fractionalist politics of the majority is extracted from the arsenal of Yalta centrism and the outburst of the Trotskyist movement since 1989. The new comrades of our organization have been led to believe that this policy that the leadership has had with a minority tendency that has just begun its conformation is a principled one, and different from the Trotskyism of Yalta. As we have shown so far it is just the opposite.

We affirm that the majority of the leadership has taken a policy of breaking the PTS from the beginning of this discussion, and, in fact, its definition of our tendency as a "secret fraction", as well as the resolutions that it has made to vote in the Plenary Congress of 8/30, mean in fact to initiate separate experiences like internal and public fraction of the PTS, separating cells from the Party.

Should this fractional policy persist throughout the debate, not only would this rupturist policy be enshrined, but the PTS would demonstrate that it is incapable of showing to the whole of centrism how currents of the same party which both vindicate themselves as principled Trotskyists must argue within and publicly before the vanguard. We cannot do so, since the PTS CC has already opted for a method of the centrists, to settle this struggle within our organization before the political discussion begins.

From the TBI we insist that the proposals we make to redirect the debate are the only ones that guarantee the unity of the party, given the evident rupturist policy of the majority of the

leadership. We believe that the 12 points in our letter on 8/26/98 are the only ones that guarantee it. We denounce that the characterization of "secret fraction", the characterization and comparison of our tendency with Bobbism, Leonperismo or Cordoba's Pochismo (the last is the name given to the followers of the majority fraction in Cordoba, Argentina) are but the attempts and false characterizations the majority uses to prepare the base of the party for a split. That the majority, because of its caudillistic character and the need of saving their prestige by its leaders do not tolerate a tendency of high political and theoretical level, also of high militant and revolutionary quality that questions its policy. If this rupturist policy of the majority is imposed, the PTS would enter into a serious crisis. If you cannot contain a political struggle with a current that you have cataloged as having a high quality and part of the principled Trotskyism, you will be disqualified and in turn, with cadres and militants totally educated in the self-proclamation and in a false patriotism of the party, that will prevent you from merging in the future, through making principled agreements, with the left wings of the Trotskyist movement, or with vanguard sectors that are radicalized in a revolutionary sense in our country and internationally.

b) From the TBI we affirm that while Trotsky was alive, the Fourth International left a great legacy about how to channel tendencies and even fractional struggles within the Trotskyist leagues or parties.

Thus, before a fraction of the North American SWP leaded by Burnham and Shachtman, who declared themselves anti-defensist of the USSR when the war was approaching in the late 1930s, which was clearly revisionist in relation to Marxist theory, (they denied the dialectic and wrote against it!) and therefore could not be qualified as being a principled Trotskyist fraction (Trotsky correctly defined it as a petty-bourgeois one), the policy of Trotsky to lead the discussion was opposed by the vertex to which the majority of the leadership of our party uses today against a current that they themselves denominated as principled Trotskyist and of a revolutionary high quality! Let's see.

The discussion in the SWP began in September 1939 and ended in April 1940, when the fraction of Burnham and Shachtman broke with the SWP of their own accord and formed the Workers Party. That is, in the middle of the beginning of World War II, in a very difficult situation for the Fourth International, the internal discussion in the SWP lasted almost eight months, and only ended because, against the will and ef-

forts of Trotsky and the leadership of the SWP, the fraction decided to break away on its own. During those eight months, innumerable writings and letters were produced by Trotsky in which he states his advice and recommendations on how and with what purposes to channel the internal discussion. We will quote only some few examples:

"Two questions clearly arise for me from your letter of October 24: 1) A very serious ideological debate has become inevitable and politically necessary 2) **It would be extremely damaging, if not fatal, to link this ideological combat with the perspective of a split, a purge or expulsions, and so on.**

I have heard it said, for example, that Comrade Gould had said in an internal party meeting: "*You want to expel us!*" But I do not know how the other part reacted. For my part, I would have protested immediately with the greatest vehemence against such suspicions. I would have proposed **to immediately create a special monitoring commission to verify such claims and rumors.** If it were the case that a member of the CC launched such a threat, I would vote to censor a serious warning (...)"

[Comrades, remember in La Matanza where the members of the CC and the Control Commission, shouted at the comrades who refused to enter the majority fraction: "*Go away, out of the party!*"

"(...) If the leadership, on the contrary, opens a merciless combat against petty-bourgeois idealist conceptions and organizational prejudices, **but at the same time gives all the guarantees necessary for the discussion itself and for the minority,** the result will be, not only an ideological victory, but an increased authority for the leadership (...)

"Any serious and living discussion can obviously end in defections, departures, and even expulsions, but the party as a whole must be convinced by the logic of the facts that these inevitable results are **in spite of the best will of the leader-**

ship, and not as an objective of the latter, and not as a starting point for the whole discussion. This is, for me, the decisive point of the whole question." (Letter from Trotsky to Cannon of 10/28/1939 - *Oeuvres*, Volume 22, page 130-132, our bolds).

After six months of fractional struggle, with bulletins, lectures from the minority fraction, etc., which had not managed to bring the positions closer, with letters and personal articles by Trotsky intervening in the discussion, the newspaper where they expressed their positions, and even internal bulletins of discussion after the Congress, in case discussion had not been solved, Trotsky still recommended:

"I have received letters from other comrades in the sense that they would be happy to get rid of the opposition as quickly as possible. I can understand the reasons for fatigue and impatience. **Fatigue, like impatience, are not political feelings at all (...)**"

"The crisis you are going through is not the last. **If the party is educated in the spirit of being satisfied with getting rid of the opposition, they will have in the future a series of new splits of more or less the same dimension...**" (Letter from Trotsky to C. Moustakis, 3/19/1940, *Oeuvres*, Volume 22. pp. 226-227, our bolds).

A few days before the Congress, in which the break-up (of the fraction's own will) would take place, Trotsky continued to advise, in order to maintain the unity of the party, and to prevent, despite the profound political differences, that the fraction acted as a political factor independent of the party (that is, as a public fraction):

"I understand very well that you are satisfied with the current Secretariat. In case of split, it is undoubtedly, the best secretariat one could wish for. But, **if unity is preserved, you cannot have a secretariat formed only by representatives of the majority.** It could, without doubt, have a Secretariat of five members - three majority and two minority.

"If the opposition seems to doubt, it would be better to let it know infor-

mally: 'We are willing to keep Shachtman, not only in the political bureau, but also in the drafting committee; we are even willing to include Abern in the Secretariat; we are willing to take into account other considerations of this kind; **the only thing that we can not accept is the transformation of the minority into an independent political factor.**'" (Letter from Trotsky to F. Dobbs, April 4, 1940, *Oeuvres*, Volume 22. pp. 259-261, our bolds).

What a principled method, even with a completely degenerate current, that one of comrade Leon Trotsky, and what opposite to it is the one used today by E.A. and his followers, against a tendency that they publicly define as a principled Trotskyist one!

The majority leadership of the PTS, only 20 days after the CC minority tendency was established, when it had been established thirty days to download the documents, including those of the majority itself, the Chapter Three, before the political discussion had begun, without having made the maximum efforts to execute the above actions, without even taking into account our proposal of rechannelling the debate, has decreed that we were a "secret fraction", so that a resolution to separate the cells from the base was required, with the only purpose of forcing us to become an "*independent political factor*", that is, a public fraction of the PTS.

We understand that the true legacy of the Fourth International during Trotsky's lifetime was the maximum democratic guarantees within the party and also towards the vanguard, with public debates organized in the newspaper, maximum patience on the part of the majority, all efforts to preserve the unity of the party, taking advantage of the pure internal discussion to educate and raise the level of the party as a whole, censor all outbursts on the part of the majority against the minority, promote the leaders of the minority to common leadership positions in the Party if the Congress cannot settle the differences, to guarantee the Party does hit as one single fist outwards, while processing the most difficult internal disputes.

We insist again, the 12 points to redirect the debate proposed by the minority tendency of the CC, today TBI, were about this. The majority, drifting away from the true traditions of Trotskyism, ended up appealing to the traditions of centrism, to impose us conditions of a public fraction of the PTS, not allowing

common cells and not accepting any collaboration, as we proposed to address together the new international and national events, developing because the global economic crisis, while we finished preparing our platform. Not only this, but we were neither allowed to participate in the elaboration of the last two LVO, nor of the Internal Circulars No. 4 and 5; we were not allowed to go to the headquarters; and they said they would consider a proposal that we had made to intervene in common action fronts of the party, when they worked publicly with Circular N ° 4, where the Resolution of the Congress was published. That is to say, a rupturist policy that they took to the party as a whole, and from the TBI we were prepared to decisively save the unity unity. As Trotsky said:

"Any serious and living discussion can obviously end in desertions, departures and even expulsions, but the party as a whole must be convinced by the logic of the facts that these inevitable results occurred despite the best will of the party leadership, and not as an objective of the latter, and not as a starting point for the whole discussion. This is, for me, the decisive point of the whole issue."

A first characterization is obvious: the leaders of the majority fraction act shaped by the crisis that has marked the outbreak of the Trotskyist movement since 1989, and the new forms that it acquires today with the development of new national-Trotskyist centers since the proletarian wave that began in 1995. They show that they are imbued with empiricism, pragmatism, classics of the currents imbued by the methods of the students' swamp.

The majority fraction, in these 30 days of political struggle, has shown that its method consists of leading the debate by means of dramatic blows of effect, based on the self-proclaiming arrogance of a new national-Trotskyist deviation, which is far from measuring itself against the reality and the terrible crisis of the revolutionary movement, as it uses to be measured according to the small theoretical-political and programmatic advances of a current isolated at international level. The impatience to solve "very quickly, very quickly" and "concretely, concretely" this discussion is the classic attitude of a current that believes that you can grow up applying saving tactics that give a sense of militancy and action to more than 200 new comrades that our organization has gained, for which, undoubtedly, sepa-

rating from the cells the members of the TBI, "so that they do not paralyze" the party, amounts to "getting rid of a burden". Thus, the majority fraction is educating the new militants of the party, in a totally opposite manner to that advised by Trotsky. As a result of this, in various regions of the country, cadres and base members of the majority fraction repeat "if the TBI leaves the party, it has to look like we are not kicking them out". You are very wrong comrades, because we consider ourselves founders, constructors and part of our party and its theoretical, political, programmatic and organizational heritage.

We are categorically before a sectarian, self-proclaiming and self-sufficient deviation of the majority fraction, which through its action today, prepares new crises and splits in our party.

Adhering to the TBI today, is to fight against this fractionalist and rupturist, unprincipled policy of the majority fraction, and also against the sectarian, self-proclaiming, tactician and movementist course of the majority fraction.

TRADITION AND REVOLUTIONARY POLITICS

The majority fraction, by copying the arsenal of centrism to channel the tendential and fractional struggle within our party, has also brought up and developed the story of "tradition" to awaken partisan patriotism against our tendency, using the forms and definitions used within the whole Yalta's Trotskyism when tendential and fractional struggles within their parties started. A stuffed tradition, which repeats itself automatically, from generation to generation, but always at the service of defending the "infallible" Central Committees of centrism when they were questioned.

Here, too, the majority fraction has copied the gestures of centrism. Horrified, the members of the majority complained about the last Plenary Congress - Plenary of 8/30, because we did not accept a Committee of Eminent Persons of "great tradition" to act as arbitrators in the political struggle that has begun. They were horrified when we told them that it did not matter how remarkable and traditional these comrades were, they were going to define themselves for one of the sides in the political struggle and that what we demanded was a political proposal from the majority of the CC that guaranteed a democratic discussion within the Party.

We demanded an abrupt turn to change the party regime and the democratic centralism of our organization, because a tendency had emerged.

During the Plenary Congress, we told them and we repeated that the tradition of Bolshevism and Trotskyism avoided every automatism, and that it was renewed day by day, and it only had a reason of being if the party was capable of responding to external and internal turns demanded by the reality and the own construction of the Party. That the tradition version in the mouth of the majority fraction is nothing more than the worst conservatism and/or routine that has intoxicated the CC members.

We regret perhaps boring you with quotes, but we know that in our party there is a large majority of new comrades, without sufficient revolutionary training and education, and many old people seem to have put cobwebs in their minds and have forgotten that when we split the MAS they threw all the "tradition" on us, which ranged from the Trotskyism of Villa Pobladora to the dead and missing people, and ended up characterizing us, the TBI of the MAS, as a decomposed current. They said we did not reach the soles of the shoes of the fractions that Party had had like those by Vasco Bengoechea or even Santucho, who "had broken for his convictions in 1965, however wrong they were in his political positions". Meanwhile, the majority wants to throw away the "tradition" of the Conference of 1989, where we made a balance about the ruptures of Bobbism and Leonperism, as they expressed in their shameful Circular of convocation to the Urgent Congress. Enough, comrades, let's break with the Trotskyism of Yalta also in this aspect, and return to Leninism and Trotskyism, to recover the true meaning of the revolutionary tradition in the Marxist movement!

Trotsky said in 1922, in *"The New Course"*:

"In recent years we have spoken many times of the great importance of the theoretical and practical tradition of our party, and have declared that in no case could we allow the rupture of our ideological affiliation. But we must clearly specify the way of conceiving the tradition of the party... we will begin with historical examples.

...Let's take the classic Party of

the Second International: the German Social Democracy. Its traditional semi secular policy was based on the adaptation of the party to the parliamentary regime and the uninterrupted growth of the organization, its press and its finances. This tradition, which is totally foreign to us, had a semi-automatic nature: each day was derived naturally from the precedent and also naturally prepared the next. The organization grew, the press developed and the finances increased.

In this automatism the entire generation after Bebel, a generation of bureaucrats, of philistines, of obtuse spirits was formed, whose political shape was revealed as soon as the imperialist war began. In every Congress of the Social Democracy invariably they spoke of the old tactic of the party consecrated by tradition. And indeed the tradition was powerful. It was an automatic tradition, devoid of critical spirit, conservative, which ended by suffocating the revolutionary will of the Party.

The war stripped German political life of its "traditional" equilibrium. From the first moments of its official existence the young German Communist Party entered a period of crisis and disturbance. However, in the course of its relatively short history, it is possible to distinguish the role not only creator, but also conservative of the tradition that at each stage, in each turn, faces the objective needs of the movement and the critical consciousness of the Party. [This is dialectic, comrades of the majority!]. *In the first period of existence of German communism, the direct struggle for power represented tradition, the heroic tradition. The terrible events of March 1921 revealed that the party did not have enough strength to achieve that goal. It was necessary to change tactics and wage the struggle for the masses before restarting the direct struggle for power (...) It would be useful to recall the fundamental feeling that was expressed during the 3rd Congress of the Communist International. It is now evident that the turn that took place under Lenin's leadership (...) despite the fierce resistance of*

an initially considerable section of the majority of Congress, literally saved the International from the annihilation and disintegration with which it was threatened by the automatic leftism, devoid of critical spirit, that in a short time had been constituted in rigid tradition (...) This tactic lasted more than two years and gave excellent results. But at the same time, these new prolonged propaganda procedures were transformed into a new semiautomatic tradition, whose role was very important in the events of the second half of 1923".

Let's remember that the German Communist Party, by that automatic and conservative tradition, given by years of propaganda and winning the masses, was not, again in that moment, at the level of the task that was raised; that is, *seizing power*. Two years of the "tradition" of "fighting for the masses" created the routine and a conservative tradition which took away the revolutionary reflexes it needed to operate the abrupt turn of leading the masses towards the seizure of power in 1923.

How much conservative, automatic and routine tradition of our already old PTS, which was built fighting to ensure threads of theoretical and programmatic continuity, but in years of bourgeois democracy, and under a brutal national isolation product of the crisis and the outbreak of the Trotskyist Movement!

And Trotsky continues in the same work:

"It is evident that as a conservative element, that as an automatic pressure of the past, the tradition represents an extremely important force at the service of the conservative parties, and profoundly hostile to a revolutionary party (...). If one considers, for example, our Bolshevik party in its revolutionary past, it will be recognized that its most important tactical quality ... was, in short, to operate abrupt turns (...) but its strength was manifested in the fact that the traditionalism, routine, were reduced to a minimum, due to the clairvoyant tactical initiative, profoundly revolutionary, at once, audacious and realistic. In this consists and must consist the true tradition of the Party. The more or less large bureaucratization of the Party apparatus is inevitably accompanied by the development of

conservative traditionalism with all its effects ... The fact that the most conservative elements of the apparatus tend to identify their opinions, their decisions, their procedures and their faults with the old Bolshevism, and try to assimilate the criticism of bureaucratism to the destruction of tradition, is undoubted and constitutes itself, the unquestionable expression of a certain ideological petrification ... **Each decision before being adopted (in the Bolshevik party, Ed.N.) provoked great discussions, the mere reference to tradition was never a decisive factor. Before each new task, in each new turn, it is not a matter of looking for a non-existent response in the tradition, but of taking advantage of the whole experience of the party, to find for itself a new convenient solution to the situation and in this way enrich the tradition."** (our Bolds)

Comrades of the majority fraction, we do not have not look for, , in the Conference of 1989, in the old ruptures of circles that exploded without finding a path since 1989, but in new situations, in the new reality that shapes us, both internationally and nationally, and that are causing this sharp struggle within our Party. And as Trotsky says in the same work: "*Lenin was accused in his own party, not one but dozens of times of violating the tradition and repudiating old Bolshevism."*

You, comrades of the majority fraction, are still tied to the old conservative routine of the old leaders that emerged as a by-product of the outbreak of '89 in the international Trotskyist movement, and they continue to act and think like leaders of the fraction, and not of the party. So fanatical you are of this conservative tradition, that you have ended up acting like in 1989, at the moment when our own fraction exploded (PTS - MAS public fraction). Still behind the totally revolutionary tradition that we created as a propaganda group, when together we knew how to conquer a political, theoretical and programmatic patrimony, which today is a continuity of revolutionary Trotskyism. But today, comrades, "our little Marxist League", is no longer the old propaganda group, and cannot go back without degenerating, and has not succeeded after 10 years! to settle in the vanguard (although maintaining ties with it) or to break the international isolation.

This demands, comrades, in this transitory phase of our little Marxist League, a new tradition

that today goes against the routine transformed into an ideology by the majority fraction.

That is why we, from the TBI, affirm that the tradition is recreated when fighting within our party against that conservatism that rejects a party with wings, with tendencies, with fractions, to process the very serious contradictions that shape us. A League that on the other hand, arose as a result of the breaking of multiple fractions and of a selection that allowed us consolidate, from 1991 to 1995, as a propaganda group in our theoretical and programmatic delimitation with Morenoism. We cannot evoke that tradition anymore, even as doing it now on behalf of: "you do not make tendencies to little leagues with revolutionary programs".

The situation changed, as we have said; we can no longer be only a league of propaganda, and on the other hand because of the objective conditions and our own deviations, we cannot settle down in vanguard sectors. The international and national reality shapes us. **We are also children of the outbreak of the international Trotskyist movement.** We are part of a Trotskyist movement that is degenerating more and more to national Trotskyism, ever recreating wings or centrist currents that neither go all the way to a genuine internationalism, nor evolve revolutionary as left wings. Something that today is also copied, in our opinion, by the majority fraction with its new vision of internationalism expressed on the vote fundamentals of EA, MR and JS, as we will demonstrate extensively in this Platform.

Our characterization is that the majority fraction is voting for a new national-Trotskyist deviation, which is the refraction or copy in our country of the new transitory centers that we defined in the FT Resolution, though in a higher level. And that is why they are already copying Lutte Ouvrière, in the way they have channeled this fractional struggle into the PTS.

The crisis and the new emerging national-Trotskyist phenomena also shape us. And this is being expressed, whether you like it or not, in the tendential struggle within our Party. Accepting this as a fact, taking them as a reference in that struggle within our party, together with the struggle of parties at international and national level, we can find the revolutionary course, which is to recreate the tradition of our party. Everything else is conservative quackery.

The demagoguery that the majority fraction is using permanently is irreconcilable with the spirit of a proletarian party, because it is fallacious, because it gives a simplified solution to the difficulties of the moment for our party and the root causes that this tendential and fractional struggle has. In doing so, the majority fraction inevitably undermines the future, and weakens the party's confidence in itself from a strategic point of view. Therefore, paraphrasing Trotsky we could say that converting the traditions of our party, which are given in our struggle against the current to maintain the theoretical programmatic legacy of orthodox Trotskyism, into the banner of its current interpreters, the majority fraction, amounts the true revolutionary tradition of our party to ridicule, and transmute it into the official, conservative program of the majority fraction.

Therefore, even if they do not like it, even if they are showing, as they do, that they cannot support a serious, democratic and revolutionary tendency within our party, we affirm with Trotsky: wherever tradition is conservative, discipline is passive, and it breaks down at the first sign of crisis!

"Wherever, as in our party, the tradition consists of the highest revolutionary activity, the discipline reaches its peak, because its decisive importance is constantly verified in the action, hence the indestructible alliance of the revolutionary initiative, of the critical, audacious elaboration of the problems, with an iron discipline at the moment of the action" (and we proposed that to the comrades of the majority, when we called for not dissolving the common organisms of intervention, Ed.N.). We value the traditions of Bolshevism more than anyone, but we do not identify Bolshevism with bureaucracy or tradition with the official routine", concludes Trotsky in the chapter Tradition and Revolutionary Politics, pages 45-51, "The New Course", Cuadernos de Pasado y Presente.

THE MAJORITY FRACTION OF THE CC HAS BEEN APPLYING NEW STATUTES OF THE PTS WITHOUT WRITING THEM DOWN

Thus, with its fractionalist method, the majority is already voting and applying without writing them, a large part of the new statutes of the PTS, which it was proposed to write in thirty days, to be voted by an upcoming Congress, as follows:

1) If the majority decrees that a tendency is a "secret fraction", it is declared a public fraction.

2) If a tendency declares to be a tendency of the CC, to start the discussion, and presents initial points to open the debate, it "has no program."

3) It is forbidden to make tendencies and political struggles in the cells when differences arise, because "Cells become paralyzed"!

4) Every militant not only has the duty to abide in the action for what the majority of the Party resolves in the Congresses, but also and fundamentally, to agree, whether they like it or not, with the resolutions, if not they are out!

5) When there are no real tendencies or fractions, the majority of the CC Statute says: we are in the pre-congress period, and opinion groups, tendencies and fractions can be organized.

6) When there are no tendencies or fractions, the cells must control their leaders, the rents, they have all the rights, including for making cliques, and cliques within the cliques, for writing all the minutes they want, even secretly. This right ends when tendencies or fractions appear for real.

7) The Congresses are not constituted by their delegates, but by the presence of member by-standers that is the maximum expression of the party in it. Therefore, any base militant who is not a delegate and does not go to Congress, does not acknowledge it as such and therefore does not acknowledge the party.

8) If there are tendencies, and they vote delegates of political positions, if the majority decrees that they are fractions, they have no rights to have delegates in the Congress.

9) To have the right to write in the Party press there are two options: one, becoming a reporter of the open pages, and another, become a public

fraction and then be separated from the cells.

10) When a tendential struggle begins between comrades who consider themselves principled Trotskyists and revolutionaries alike, some are more "equal" than others: the minority fractions and much more if they are decreed as "secret" lose this right of equality, since they cannot be in the common cells.

11) It is an obligation of the party leadership, before the political programs and positions are known, to inform the periphery of the party and the entire Left, of the existence of fractions.

12) The minority is always responsible for disturbing the calm of the party, for making incidents, since the majority is unable to guarantee that this does not happen.

13) It is permissible in a revolutionary organization to work with Central Committees that do not record their discussions and decisions, when tendencies and fractions appear. It is forbidden to write balance sheets of the Congresses when real political differences arise, as well as to record speeches and transcript them with the authorization of the comrades who speak, when one of those interventions is used as the central political balance sheet of the Congress.

14) The consensus regime ends, only when there are people who are upset by it.

15) In a revolutionary party, "the Central Committee is everything", because between Congress and Congress, "the CC is the party". "Cells must function as small central committees," shying away from "artisan methods," distributing well the "revolutionary trades"..

16) The Organization Secretary should attend individually the meetings of the "axis of each regional" to discuss the problems of their regional and how to place cadres in their trades, in order to combat pragmatism, without accounting for actions to the CC. This can never be called a secret fraction. If a tendency arises that denounces that this is a fractional method to control the party, separated from politics, this tendency has no program.

17) But as finally, we are a "Marxist League with a revolutionary program", it is forbidden to make tendencies, fractions, wings and opinion groups, when these really arise.

18) All this is supported by the "tradition" of our party and of the international revolutionary

movement.

This, comrades, is not a bad joke. It is a mirror for you to look at yourself and see how you are shaping the PTS today. Because, although it seems incredible, this is how we are educating in this fractional struggle the majority of honest and hard-working new militants of our party, that is how the old revolutionary cadres of our organization are rearming. What a proposal of statutes can the majority present after this experience, which is worth more than a thousand writings and votes, because it is the living experience that today is shaping our party? What authority will this leadership have to hold truly revolutionary draft statutes, based on democratic centralism, if not for this fractional and rupturist politics, which is endangering the unity of the PTS, before the political discussion begins, or making it start in a stifling atmosphere, which can lead to a premature split, which is what ultimately the majority of the leadership is preparing ?

THE TRUE PARADOXES THAT ARE SHAPING THE PTS, AND EVEN THE CURRENT TENDENTIAL AND FRACTIONAL STRUGGLE INSIDE ITS RANKS

In the TBI's view, nobody can say, much less after the outbreak of 1989 and the Yalta Trotskyism, that there is some kind of continuity on the party question. And if yesterday we were able to delimitate ourselves theoretically and programmatically from Morenoism and centrism by going back to Trotskyism, the majority wants to avoid us going back to the sources, Leninism and Trotskyism, to look for a revolutionary course to get out of this quagmire that the PTS is in. Our party can no longer be just the old propaganda league that formed cadres, and still it is not a vanguard party fused with a real revolutionary proletarian movement of the vanguard, a process for which we have to prepare also theoretically, strategically and programmatically. And this is also a great internationalist task.

Nobody can deny that today the PTS is conducting this discussion when it has been already imposed on us, for a year, a detour and an expropriation of the mass struggle, and before the economic crash explodes in our country, that is, the burst of the Convertibility (the fixed 1x1 parity between the USD and the Ar. Peso), like the other

end of the rope that like hyperinflation strangles the proletariat and prevents its systematic and generalized irruption, thus liquidating the phenomenon of radicalization and civil war that occurred in vanguard sectors and in the periphery. Today our party is being built with tactics, in the spaces of the regime. And this *"is a great, extraordinary and very strong pressure to capitulate and build itself by adapting to it"*. The nonexistence of a bourgeois Left has left a great space to construct ourselves in the student, academic, intellectual, petty bourgeois and democratic spheres.

We are not comparing or affirming that the majority fraction is already the POUM, or Lutte Ouvrière, or the degenerate centrism of the MAS in the 1980s. But we believe that they show the first elements of sectarian and movimentist decomposition of a current like ours, molded for these international and national objective conditions.

These are the elements that are prevailing at a time when a second proletarian revolutionary wave is slow to arrive at international and national levels, and a radicalization does not develop, at a time the international economic crisis is developing in the center of the scene and contradictorily in our country the regime manages to maintain for the moment a wave of pacifism that is shaping us and pushing us more and more to tacticism, to construct ourselves in the spaces of the regime.

Ultimately, The paradox is that we are adapting more to the pacifist wave at the national level, in a moment it begins to be questioned by the international economic crisis, which already threatens our country (but still does not explode) and when international conditions become more and more objectively revolutionary.

International (and probably also national) events are preparing and accelerating, as a result of the economic crash effects, revolution and counterrevolution, beyond the rhythms and the conjunctures in which they may develop.

The conditions of economic explosion that began in Asia in 1997 have already given as a result, in some cases a blow to the working classes, as in Russia; or an immediate response, but this time defensive, like that of the Hyundai workers in Korea. Also these conditions have generated still valid expectations that this crisis does not arrive, as in our country. In other places we see revolutionary processes of a February type, as in Indonesia (which for the majority fraction seems to have disappeared). Along with this we see the resurgence of the phenomena of nationalism

such as Chavezism in Venezuela, or as in Malaysia, India or Pakistan. Meanwhile, the first bombs are heard, as a warning from imperialism in Sudan and Afghanistan. These bombings are expression of US imperialism's weakness, because last year it could not bring together another great coalition as that of 21 countries that crushed Iraq in 1991.

In short, the tendencies to the crash are developing in a moment that the working class and the exploited of the world at international level, due to the crisis of leadership, cannot give a decisive answer, neither can the different imperialisms and the bourgeoisie at the world level.

The maximum expression of this is Russia, where the outcome of the decomposition of the Workers State, the crisis and the current crash show that the film of reformism in reverse was wrong, and only with crash and new triumphant counter-revolutionary actions the capitalist restoration can be established definitely. But also the crash and the current material conditions, which make life unbearable for the working class and the masses, can recreate conditions for new and superior revolutionary actions of the proletariat and the masses.

It would be really impressive to talk about what it would look like if this crisis hits China, or ends up opening a crisis process inside the US, perspectives that are latent now.

As we see, it is incontestable that in these conditions, there is not and cannot be an evolutionary continuity of the wave of mass counteroffensive opened in several countries in 1995.

In the TBI's view, the new changes and new leaps that are up in the international situation, far from weakening and making secondary and anachronistic the seemingly "old" discussion (according to the majority) that we were processing about the party, makes it more acute, current and decisive. Our struggle against tacticism, against "arming" the party with a program of action transformed into a "profile" and against the evolutionist and economist vision of the majority, becomes more legitimate and more decisive than before. This is demonstrated in the majority fraction's refusal to raise as a central slogan the need for a general strike and a plan of struggle in the last LVO, as is also shown by the flyer taken by the majority to update the newspaper, where the emergency worker program is used as a recipe for socialist propaganda separated from the confrontation against the Parliament, which has been voting anti-workers laws. Also the confrontation with the bourgeois policy of national unity

of the establishment parties is separated from denouncing and demanding the bureaucracy that, with all its wings, has already allowed the approval of the labor reform, and from the need of a revolutionary re-grouping of the vanguard.

The combination of all these events makes the discussion of the theory and program of construction of the revolutionary parties turn more decisive, returning to the tradition of Leninism and Trotskyism, taken as an unblemished flag in our struggle as a Trotskyist left for the reconstruction of the Fourth International, under these new conditions that are developing. The struggle of the TBI against the shameful Chapter Three that does not prepare our party for sudden leaps in the situation, as we will develop later, in future chapters of this Platform, is key and far from stopping it, we will deepen it.

Precisely because we are a small league of propaganda with some ties with the vanguard, and today with advanced layers, shaped by the pacifist wave; also because we are isolated internationally as left wings of the Trotskyist movement with which we could merge and they could counterweigh us, still have not emerged; for coming from a national-Trotskyist deviation that prevented an offensive internationalist policy to hit on the national-Trotskyist centers and on the centrist phenomena that emerge in their wake; for not acting yet in a real revolutionary proletarian movement, which is the other great actor in the construction of a revolutionary party together with its General Staff and revolutionary cells, all this is what has allowed, in our view, the development of a self-proclaiming and sectarian current, expressed by the majority of the leadership.

Self-proclaiming and sectarian politics that in turn is the expression of the impotence, that for objective and subjective reasons we had had in the last ten years, to make fractions and win qualitative cadres from centrism, which decomposed vertiginously in recent years in our country. A self-proclaiming policy that is an impotent response to the existence of three centrist leagues that speak in the name of Trotskyism, together with our party that tries to build itself as the authentic Trotskyist left.

A self-proclaiming policy that has led us to liquidate the historical task of refounding Argentine Trotskyism, as a national expression of the struggle for the reconstruction of the Fourth International and the fight against centrism at the international level; a slogan that was subtly changed in the nefarious Chapter Three, for "Let's come to the PTS" and "For a new revolutionary

party" in general, as a dislocated inheritance of the old tactics of the MNPTR.

As consequence of the pressures to be constructed with tactics in the spaces of the regime and not in radicalization phenomena, we are applying a self-proclaiming policy.

These contradictions shape our party, built in ten years of bourgeois democracy, without direct intervention in the vanguard processes and in the processes of the most critical points of the struggles of the masses, in which we had no responsibility; for having been the Santillanismo the favorite son of the impotence of the centrism of the MAS in the '80s, and for not being the industrial proletariat, the revolutionary subject of our program, at the forefront of combat as a leader of the working class as a whole and the most exploited sectors, such as the unemployed, much less of the oppressed nation as a whole.

These contradictions are the paradoxes that shape us and push more and more towards the centrism of the majority fraction; those that have allowed it in only 30 days, not only have been able to split the party (composed of an absolute majority of new and self-sacrificing comrades, but without any tradition and experience in the revolutionary movement) with an irresponsible method and without a program, but having convinced them in fact, that we had to advance through separate experiences.

The tendential struggle in our party is the form acquired under these harsh conditions whose maximum expression is the crisis of the revolutionary leadership of the international proletariat, that is, the crisis of the Fourth International, and its refraction at national level. In those conditions, we are deepening the lessons of our attempts to break both international and national isolation; we are drawing lessons and sharpening the programs for the battles that as Trotskyist Left we have to wage today and in the future. We are adjusting the revolutionary theory with years of delay. It is the only way in which, inevitably, under current conditions we can orient ourselves in a revolutionary sense.

A PRE-ARISTOTELIAN METHOD OF DISCUSSION APPLIED BY THE MAJORITY FRACTION, WHICH DOES NOT SET A COMMON OBJECT

To all these terrible contradictions that hit our organization, the majority of the leadership tried first to create a smoke screen by shouting "Down with the workerist-nationalist-Trotskyist tendency!" And when it became clear that in our response to EA's economist trade unionist pacifist vision on the situation of the national and international working class, there is not a speck of populism, workerism or nationalism, he tried a new attack.

To split the party, they dared to say, going to a theorist and subjectivist position: *"We are the current that all centrists speak of"* (see the written vote basis of EA, MR, and JSM). But we proved them, in the Plenary Congress, as we will also do in this platform, that this is a totally national-Trotskyist vision, because, although we have an international magazine, we are a national party and not an international Trotskyist Left current which has already caused defeats and fractions to the centrists who speak in the name of Trotskyism at international level. That we have not surpassed our character of national center that has struggled to maintain an international point of view, that in spite of all the theoretical and programmatic efforts and by the national-Trotskyist deviation that we have been dragging for two years, the international isolation has not been broken. That we have to measure ourselves with what we said at the last meeting of the FT: *"that in this framework, any policy of sectarian or propaganda passivity, that does not declare full-scale war to the national-Trotskyist centers and that does not attempt to have an offensive policy towards the transitory centers that arouse at their side, condemns the principled Trotskyists to a harmless policy, strengthening the tendencies to an impotent self-proclamation, which can lead to sectarian degeneration"*.

That is why we voted for an internationalist offensive policy in the meeting of the FT and in its resolutions, of which from the TBI we consider ourselves fans until the end. And the comrades of the majority told us, in the foundation of their vote to the Congress, that the only thing missing were high level comrades and propagandists capable of explaining easily the theoretical elabo-

rations of our party. When we demonstrate that this was a subjectivist theory and that Marxism is praxis, that is, *the synthesis of theory and action*, they quickly ran away from that argument, and began to shout in Congress "*secret fraction, secret fraction!*" And "*You did not bring your base!*" Those have become the latest slogans that mobilize the party against the TBI (making us remember when the backward workers of the MAS, they told us "*You did not come to the Plenaries, You did not come to the Plenaries!*", to justify their refusal to discuss politics) although, on the other hand, the TBI of the PTS did go to the Plenary-Congress organized by the majority, with its delegates voted in a Plenary of the Tendency.

This is an anti-Marxist, Machiavellian and conspiratorial vision (not in the sense of a Leninist conspiracy, precisely) of the crises, outbreaks and struggles within the revolutionary Marxist movement.

Most of the PTS leadership have acted with a students' and confusing method to guide the debate. They jump from here to there, from one subject to other and from point to point, looking for a bombshell and "the slogan that mobilizes" to divide better. And they do not see that they are taking to the interior of the party, their outside policy of "taking advantage of opportunities". A question that will lead to new and more serious crises in our organization, and if we do not stop it quickly, we will crash against a wall.

Now, in front of the Chapter of our Platform that we anticipated the same day in the Plenary Congress (and they have not yet answered) they seek to hurry us up and hurry up the Party with the argument that "*with the crash everything has changed*". And when we proposed them to collaborate, to elaborate in common a declaration and a political position in front of it, they totally avoided this collaboration.

Surely, when we take out the platform, and show that we see in them an evolutionist and economicist vision of the crash and its relation to the class struggle and the crisis of revolutionary leadership, which are totally disarticulated among themselves in the Internal Circular N° 4, they will invent some other "novelty", some other self-proclaiming whimsy, to jump from here to there, and avoid the real political discussion that our party is in, instead of accepting the points where there is agreement, or there may be, or in the face of new events, the broadest collaboration to take advantage of all the forces at our disposal, to give the best revolutionary answers to new events.

This shows, in case there is need for one more example, that the majority of the leadership voted for the division of the party, and as many of its cadres in its regional offices say (as we have said before), the problem is "it seems as if we have not kicked them out."

This shows that the majority fraction concentrates, at the beginning of this fractional struggle, all the sectarian pressures that our current still has on, and all the pressures of adapting to the regime that act on our party, which is not at all "workerism", but they are the ties we have today with the advanced layers, which are constructing taking advantage of the spaces of the regime.

The movementist and non-Leninist method of organization of the debate and construction of the Party expresses a student-based current, that has not patience and looks down on the small groups of workers that under the banners of the Trotskyist program try to advance as revolutionaries in our Party. And as we will demonstrate in this platform, its self-proclaiming internationalism, is no other thing than the varnish for a new national-Trotskyist turn, which wants to transform the enormous weaknesses of the Trotskyist Left at international level into a virtue.

The majority of the leadership has shown to act like fraction leaders, like caudillos that are not more than the expression of the outbreak of the international and national Trotskyist movement, and not like leaders builders of the party, that with wings and tendencies and revolutionary equipment, fighting at the international and national levels, manage to overcome this critical phase of our organization and return it to a revolutionary course.

From the TBI we believe that we have achieved a great triumph in our organization in these 30 days: imposing the idea and the conception that there is no evolutionary way to a revolutionary vanguard party, and to provoking ruptures and fractions to the centrist currents that speak in the name of Trotskyism on an international and national level. That one cannot go to the struggle of parties, and have channels to the advanced layers and to the vanguard without a struggle within the party itself. That there is not a jump from the propaganda and action group to a vanguard party or to prepare for this change, in an evolutionary and peaceful way, as the whole base of our organization has been prepared. The process of reconstruction of the subjectivity of the working class and its phenomena of radicalization is a tortuous one, plagued by advances

and setbacks. The construction of a vanguard Trotskyist party in Argentina and the reconstruction of the Fourth International at an international level cannot be peaceful, evolutionary, and without any hard labor.

But we also affirm that we have been defeated so far, in our struggle to guarantee the unity of the party, against the rupture policy used by the majority of the leadership. Therefore, from the TBI, we call on the whole party, the base, the militants and the cadres, that regardless of whether or not they agree with the whole program of our tendency, to fight together against the rupturist policy of the leadership and to safeguard the PTS unity. To prevent even the resolution that we accept but do not share from the last Congress-Plenary, which will be used, as it is at this moment, to apply brutal terrorism against the base of the party, separating all comrades suspected of joining our tendency in the future, and to take towards the periphery and the vanguard an administrativist and fake vision of the crisis and the internal struggle in our party. Because if not, comrades, under what conditions can it be fulfilled the Resolution of the last Plenary - Congress in its clause d) "Authorize those comrades to go down to defend their positions in each of the party cells in meetings organized to such purposes" when we have already been repudiated as a secret fraction, condemned by all the cells of the party, before our written political positions appear? We regret to say this looks like when as the TBI of the MAS, we went to the cells and we had already been condemned beforehand as *"petty bourgeois who wanted to get the passport (of revolutionaries) and shied away from the tasks of the revolution"*! Moreover, when any comrade who wants to adhere to the TBI has to inevitably break with the PTS cells, due to the conditions imposed by the Hardy-Albamonte method!

We are materialists, and we know that prejudices and condemnations repeated over and over again are expressed in organization, as a predisposition not to listen to the minority.

It is an obligation of the majority fraction to prevent this situation, which does not even respect up to the end their own resolutions born of the deplorable method imposed by the majority fraction of the party.

That is why we will fight, and we call on the whole party to accompany us in one point, even if it is the only one: Down with the splitting-prone method of Hardy-Albamonte and

the majority fraction! Any comrade who adheres now to the TBI should remain in the party cells. All TBI comrades who have already been separated have to be reintegrated into their cells; and the Tendency, according to its adherents, has to be incorporated as such into the Central Committee and the National Secretariat of the Party.

We do not want to impose this point, we want it to be discussed in all the cells of the party, to achieve a true and democratic Congress that votes this resolution, to stop the rupturist policy of the majority. If so, on our part, we will not be interested in the label they put on us, they may call us however they want (fraction, public fraction, secret one, etc.). But to cause a premature rupture of our party, as they have already done, without finishing the political discussion in common cells and with common discipline in the action, will be a catastrophic defeat for the PTS.

Behind the label of "secret fraction" it is hidden a true policy of splitting and separated experiences imposed by the majority fraction. When we go to the cells to discuss, we will have to act as if we were in fact in a Liaison Committee; the internal discussion bulletins will be in fact like ones of two different parties. This is the true content of the Hardy-Albamonte method!

WHAT POSITIONS AND DEVIATIONS THE TBI OF THE PTS IS FIGHTING AGAINST?

In our opinion, in the response from EA to P; in the fractional article written by the majority of the leadership on the anniversary of Trotsky's death in the last LVO, on the experience of the degeneration of the SWP in the postwar period; in the bases of the vote to call the urgent Congress on 8/30; in the current articulation of the action program in the last LVO and in the flyer that the leadership of the majority fraction wrote, just when the law of labor flexibility in the Parliament was voted, which develops a beautiful program "in front of the catastrophe that threatens us", but it says nothing about the parties of the regime and the Establishment that together with the bureaucracy made possible the voting of that anti-worker law. In all these points, together with the last internal circular about the world crisis and the international situation, the majority have written and shaped their platform, against which we will fight from the TBI. To this one we can add the defense

that the majority of the leadership has made on Chapter Three of the document, and the eclecticism and consensus with which the documents of the Congress of August 8 and 9 were prepared. We will take as the majority's platform the non-principled method, taken from Lutte Ouvrière's arsenal that they have used to channel this fractional struggle. In short, we fight against:

1) A subjectivist and self-proclaiming vision of internationalism and of the international tasks of our current, which means a new national-Trotskyist deviation, via sectarianism and theoreticism.

2) An economicist and unionist vision of the entry to the combat of the proletariat, both in our country and internationally, whose continuity is a normative vision of revolutionary processes that is nothing but the other side of the coin with respect to objectivism.

3) This already has consequences in the action program that is liquidated by a general propaganda program, and as the article by Emilio Albamonte in LVO 39 demonstrates, they are already moving towards a revision of the Transitional Program itself, when he affirms that the TBI states "*as a rule, that it is the lower layers of the proletariat (unemployed and outsourced workers) that must impose their stamp on the upper layers (that is, on the most concentrated, privileged sectors) as they call them*". This is already an open review of the first four Congresses of the Third International and the Transitional Program.

4) A subjectivist and sectarian view, and therefore bureaucratic, of the small Marxist leagues and the struggle of tendencies in them, which has as a consequence in the outward intervention: movementism and tacticism, and the tendency to liquidate the action program.

5) A self-proclaiming policy that liquidates the internationalist task in our country to fight to re-found Argentine Trotskyism on principled bases, defeating the centrism that speaks in its name, now changed by a self-proclaiming slogan, "*Come to the PTS*" or "*Strengthen the PTS*", outside the struggle of parties and against centrism.

6) A self-proclaiming and propagandistic policy that expresses a sectarian adaptation to the international and national, historical and current paradoxes that shape us, as we demonstrated in this first chapter. For the majority, in all this fractional struggle, in all its answers for the explanation of this deep crisis that we are going through, paradoxes do not exist, that is, they deny the reality that shapes our party.

7) Against Chapter Three and the eclecticism that permeates the entire document of the extraordinary Congress of the beginning of August.

This has developed a Morenoist party vision, that is, a tactician, movementist one and of taking advantage of opportunities; it does not prepare the party and the cadres to face, from Leninism, the future challenges of fusion with the phenomena of radicalization of the workers and popular vanguard, to build a Leninist combat party. That is to say, they favor a Party, we repeat, adapted to the use of opportunities, imbued with the pressures of this pacifist and gentle wave that shapes us. It wants to fight pragmatism, as if it were possible in a movementist Party and without preparation for legal and illegal work.

8) A policy drawn from the arsenal of Yalta's Trotskyism and its maximum exponent Lutte Ouvrière, to guide the internal political discussion with non-Leninist methods and contrary to the legacy of the Fourth International during Trotsky's life; with a mechanical and automatic vision of the tradition, as we demonstrated in this first chapter, of the Platform of the TBI; all this at the service of a rupturist policy, which can provoke a split in our party, before the political discussion begins. And as the facts today show, for this they were prepared from the moment of the outbreak of the consensus methods of the highest party leadership.

9) From the TBI we fight, as demonstrated in this chapter, the clearly rupturist and divisive policy of the majority of the leadership, and we fight to maintain the unity of the party. We started by defeating the Hardy-Albamonte method to guide the political discussions in the PTS. We denounce that the majority of the leadership lies to the party when, on the one hand, it announces that it is a discussion between principled Trotskyists, and on the other declares us a secret fraction, and decides that whoever does not accept this characterization in base plenaries after the Plenary Congress sessions of 8/30, they are accused of not accepting the Congress, and therefore, they are out! To stay today in the PTS, you must present a certificate of absolute faith in the majority fraction.

Long live the PTS unity! Down with the splitting policy of the majority fraction!

For a democratic Congress that repeals and eradicates from the PTS the methods of Hardy-Albamonte, so that our party can return to a Leninist-Trotskyist democratic centralism!

10) Enough of smoke screens! The majority leadership defends and leans on the too much "leaven" we have after 10 years of existence, to

deny it the decisive weight in all the tasks of leading small circles of revolutionary workers that are in our ranks. By acting in this way, the majority of the leadership refuses to correct this error, and deepens in our party the separation between "intellectuals" and "workers". And it is the majority that separates intellectuals and revolutionary workers within the ranks of the party. From the TBI, we fight, as we will expose it in our Chapter "Leninist Party or Morenoist Party", for measures similar to those raised by Trotsky in "In Defense of Marxism" for the SWP of the United States in the '40s.

11) Against a mechanical economicist vision the majority fraction is beginning to outline of the new leaps of the international situation posed by

the deepening of the international economic crisis, its relationship with the class struggle and the revolution and the counterrevolution, expressed in the last Circular N° 4 and in LVO 39. And for the broadest theoretical, political and programmatic collaboration, to put all the forces we have, to explore and elaborate common revolutionary responses from Trotskyism, before the new events that are emerging in the international and national situation. There cannot be another day more in which the leadership proclaims, as it does now, the need to draw a joint declaration with the POR and the LRCI in the face of the international crisis, while it has refused, as they did, to discuss with the TBI a common response from the PTS before these serious events.

CHAPTER 2

The self-proclaimed internationalism of the majority fraction conceals a national-Trotskyist turn

AN ASSESSMENT MADE WITH A BIKE PUMP

In bulletin No. 3, in the "foundation of vote" signed by three members of the majority fraction, (EA, MN and JS) an assessment of our party is made at the international level. But, driven by the fractional struggle against a current that they denounce, although without proof, "*resistant to the internationalist turn*", they do nothing more than cast "light and more light" on their self-proclaimed conception, which conceals a return to the national-trotskyist deviation that we have been fighting, and that becomes an open rupture, the only truly "resistant" one, with the FT resolutions of the beginning of July this year.

The "foundation of vote" repeats a catalog of opinions about our magazine collected in the Trotskyist movement. Thus the opinion of Al Richardson, an historian of English Trotskyism, and Katz, "*one of the few Marxist economists in the country*", who praise our magazine for its theoretical level, plus the newspaper of Lora in Bolivia, Ernesto González from MAS, and the Bolshevik Internationalist League of Brazil, which

criticize us. It seems to say to "workerists" and "nacional-Trotskyists": "*See what great advances we have made! Everyone talks about us. How dare you criticize us?*". To end up finishing off the "tendency" with this "lesson" of internationalism, together with showing as a supposed advance that one of the main leaders of the LRCI "*had already praised our website*" (!), they tell us with the intention of a great coup: "*Another bad news from London!, confirming what was agreed by telephone, Ken Loach, the director of Land and Freedom, accepted an exclusive interview for the next issue of EI*".

The important thing is that in the middle of this attack of self-proclamation, the authors of the "foundation of vote" leave aside how an assessment is duly made, which consists in saying, first of all, how we are in the major orientation we voted for, namely, what the status of the main task or tasks that we voted for for the period is. The majority of the CC, with a non-serious method, more concerned with enhancing balance sheets with a bike pump to compete in "internationalism" with the "tendency", conceals what is the core of that an assessment should say.

Without denying the meritorious advances

such as the magazine and the theoretical elaborations expressed in it, which are a very important element in the fight against the right wings in the Trotskyist movement and those that we have called "transitory centers", and the bonds that (although weak) we have established with sectors of the Trotskyist movement, the TBI holds that the truth must be told: that despite these important advances, despite the efforts we have made the central aim of our struggle is so far advancing very slowly, for both objective and subjective reasons. All these advances that we are beginning to make in order to combat the national-Trotskyist deviation that we have been carrying out for two years are both necessary and insufficient. Moreover, what we set out as to where concentrate the most of our effort was to fight to break our international isolation, with an offensive internationalist policy, as expressed in the resolution of the last meeting of the FT, as we shall see later, to strike at the national-Trotskyist centers and the transitory phenomena that are emerging around them.

From the point of view of this objective, actually our relations with the LRCI are at least stagnant, unless you want to pull the wool over our eyes and pretend to make us believe that we are already going to a Liaison Committee with this current, announcing, as in the "voting basis", as another show against the alleged "resistance" of the TBI, a visit by "members of the top leadership (of the LRCI) at the end of the year". For the several months remaining for that visit (and all the experience and balance discussed and voted by our party about our relationship with this current), nothing indicates that the LRCI is about to hit a sudden turnaround in our critical relationships. This question, by the way, is carefully left in a "limbo", without clarification, by the authors of the "voting basis"! Is it perhaps that they want, due to the fractional struggle, to force the facts to show successes where there are none and thus show the party that there is nothing more internationalist than the majority of the CC? Although, precisely, the key point of the crisis with the LRCI is that they refuse to have, with a self-proclaimed "small LIT" policy, an offensive policy on the new emerging transitory centrist phenomena! And they also refuse to work by hitting the right-wing national-Trotskyist centers ! ... A Form in which they materialize their refusal to fight for the re-foundation of the Fourth International !

Do you remember, comrades, what happened when only a few months ago, Pouvoir Ouvrier, facing the last French regional elections, proposed calling to vote either the LCR or Lutte Ouvrière? Then, from London, the leadership of the LRCI imposed their democratic centralism

(again, the internal regime is an expression of politics), and forced them to call to vote the Socialist Party, which is in the imperialist government! And this after Pouvoir Ouvrier had participated in the Second Labor Meeting with all the transitory phenomena. That meeting that had voted as the only common resolution... no support for Jospin!

On the other hand, the agreement with the POR is only a small step forward in the framework of deep differences in strategy such as the "tactics" of the Anti-imperialist United Front that they support. Given the difficulties we have in moving forward in this regard, the "vote foundation" aims to impact with another dramatic effect: the pompous announcement that *"we have received the visit of a delegation of leaders of Lutte Ouvrière who for the first time come to discuss with our organization."* Though, what has it to do with fighting to come together and help other left wings arise in our movement? Was Lutte Ouvrière or not, part of the "centrism" and one of the national-Trotskyist "centers" that we have to defeat? This visit could have been celebrated by the PO of Altamira, which goes out of its way to make an agreement with Lutte Ouvrière from national-Trotskyist center to national-Trotskyist center. Comrades, blinded by your self-proclaiming zeal, beware of placing yourself so close to Altamira!

But it seems anything goes in order to impact a "resistant tendency", "epidermic internationalist" as they say orally (but do not dare to write). We are facing a "pastiche" of unconnected facts, some bordering on absurdity, that they are throwing over the heads of the TBI.

On the contrary, it is necessary to start from reality and not from self-proclamation so that it is clear to all the comrades that the resolutions of the Trotskyist Fraction are as valid as they were two months ago, when they were debated and voted. They held:

"f) That in this framework any policy of sectarian or propaganda passivity, one that does not declare war on the national-Trotskyist centers and that does not attempt to have an offensive policy towards the new transitory phenomena that emerge in its wake, condemns the principled Trotskyists to a harmless policy by strengthening the tendencies to an impotent self-proclamation, which can lead to sectarian degeneration.

g) From these characterizations, the coordination meeting of the FT considered that, in spite of the progress that the last two numbers of International Strategy have meant for our Fraction from the theoretical-political point of view, this conquest is essential but absolutely insufficient to declare war to the current national-Trotskyist centers that

usurp the banner of the Fourth International..." (our Bolds).

The "foundation of the vote" of Emilio Albam-ente, Manolo Romano and Jorge Sanmartino considers all this reached and surpassed, as it speaks of the "internationalist turn of the party that we have been giving tortuously for months, with the manifesto, with the three issues of the magazine, **and our progress in the struggle for a Liaison Committee for the reconstruction of the Fourth International, that is, the beginning of a stark struggle of parties, tendencies and fractions, both national and international.**" (our Bolds)

The majority fraction with its "foundation of vote" shows their true colours. For them, the international magazine by itself has already conjured up the danger of returning to the national-trotskyist deviation. Moreover, they consider against all evidence that we have already made "*progress in the fight for a Liaison Committee*" and, at the height of the delirium, that we are already in the midst of "*a overt struggle of parties, tendencies, and fractions, both nationally and internationally*".

As we will see later, this self-proclamation leads to disarticulating all the politics of the FT and to liquidate the internationalist task of the Liaison Committee and the few steps that we have taken in this regard with the POR, opening the danger of transforming it not into a process of fusion of wings of left, but to subordinating that policy to the maneuvers that at national level we can advance to dress ourselves as internationalist and boast about it. The national self-proclamative policy, based on unbridled subjectivist theorism, is the greatest enemy of tackling the fight for the Liaison Committee from a principled policy.

ANY CURRENT THAT DEVIATES TOWARDS NATIONAL-TROTSKYISM REFUSES TO MAKE A SCIENTIFIC DEFINITION OF ITSELF

As we saw earlier, the FT resolutions take note of our national-trotskyist deviation, condemn the sectarian passivity and mere propaganda, and start from our international isolation to then call to fight with an offensive internationalist policy over the "transitory centers" that arise on the verge of the right wings of the Trotskyist

movement. The majority fraction refuses to make a precise definition of who we are.

From the TBI we maintain that we must leave the bike pump aside and tell the truth: that despite the hard struggle that we have been carrying out, despite the fight against the national-trotskyist deviation for about eight months, and also because of that deviation, our party, after ten years of existence has not managed to merge with and be part of any international progressive development within the Trotskyist movement. And that is an objective, insurmountable fact, and whoever hides it, is taking us for a ride. The fact is that the FT objectively has not been able to overcome the fact of being, essentially, only a national group, that is to say the PTS, that tries to have an international point of view fighting to get out of the terrible isolation in which we were before the outbreak of the Trotskyist movement, in revolutionary fraternal collaboration with small groups of valuable and selfless militants in Mexico and Chile. To complete this definition and make it more concrete, we must say that because of our national-Trotskyist deviation we are two years behind in influencing the new phenomena that has occurred within the Trotskyist movement from '95.

The reality is that as a national "Marxist League" we have only withstood isolation. The truth is that our magazine is not the media of any international movement of the Trotskyist left already regrouped on the basis of strategic lessons but only one that, although as an important step undoubtedly essentially reflects the international positions of an isolated and marginal national group, with the collaboration of some militants and intellectuals of the international and national Trotskyist movement whom we correctly attempt to incorporate, and very good collaborations like those that came to us from Brazil on the peasant question. But beware of boasting about it to cover the worst of tacticisms, towards which we are falling apart, because if yesterday the MAS used the worker members to boast about its socialist character, let us not do the same with Ken Loach or Al Richardson. Stop this dangerous course, comrades.

The pressures that we have suffered these ten years because of our isolation are so great, that with respect to the groups in Chile and especially in Mexico we were acting as a typical "mother party", as a "small LIT", a danger against which, however, we had been alerting and questioning ourselves permanently thousands of times in these ten years. That is, the pressures on the PTS to act as a "mother party" were enormous,

and in the two years of national-Trotskyist deviation, by not voting for fair internationalist tasks, we ended up yielding to that pressure. So much so, that it assumed ridiculous proportions as that in the period in which A. and P. were co-directing the Mexican group, it mechanically applied the MOJUVOR tactic from Argentina to that country.

We deem very valuable our effort to collaborate in an internationalist and revolutionary way with these sister groups, including making very important political and programmatic contributions, but our pressure was always to act as a "mother party". If we slip to the self-proclamation of the majority of the CC, we will only reinforce the tendencies to continue acting in this way with invaluable cadres like those that make up the groups of the FT.

The resolutions of the FT have just ended, after many years, to break the logic of the PTS as a "mother party" with the initial groups of Chile and Mexico. For, as the resolution of the FT says, combating the conception of the "international framework" of centrism, *"We must break up to the end with this conception, incorporating the internationalist tasks in the construction of the party in decisively. These tasks derive from a particular refraction of the combats that are raised in the international field. Each group must define, from the common understanding of the tasks in which we have advanced in this last meeting of the FT, which are the internationalist tasks that each group must carry out. Failure to do so, pretending that the party is built with a sum of tactics, separating them from the strategy of fighting for the reconstruction of the Fourth International, would only lead to the construction of a centrist party that could get fat, but that will not pass the test of the decisive battles"*.

And if not, what was then the national-Trotskyist deviation about which you speak, comrades of the majority? Or do you want to tell the party, on the basis of the assessment-pastiche you carry out, that this deviation is overcome by publishing three issues of the international magazine, and that there is no pressure or danger towards a new deviation?

THE TRUE CHARACTER OF OUR THEORETICAL ADVANCES

The "foundation of the vote" says, arguing against those who supposedly despise the

theory, that: *"The current PTS would not exist, it would have really exploded, without the relatively important advances made in the theoretical field"*.

We cannot fail to agree with that statement. In particular, the indispensable revolutionary theoretical advances that we have recently shared, which we value as a condition not to degenerate during the struggle for the Liaison Committee and the programmatic fight with the centrists. Moreover, without this theoretical strength and the leaps that we must continue to implement in this regard, the entire strategy-program (programmatic lessons) and tactics (Liaison Committee) would drag us, like a leaf in the storm, to opportunism.

But these theoretical advances were not obtained by sitting in an armchair, "Garmendia-style", but burning the midnight oil, studying and discussing with other currents of the Trotskyist movement, which despite being all of them centrist, some contributions have made for us, although as a contrasting, deterrent example. That is why we argue against all of them about the economic crisis, the workers' states, etc.

The "vote foundation" maintains, quoting our magazine International Strategy, issue 3 (the blue one, so that all the comrades recognize it), that is to say, the issue at the end of 1993, that *"with a leadership unproven in the class struggle... if it has an incorrect theory and program, the hostile influences of the enemy classes creep through all the cracks and that organization is wallowed by events, as happened to the LIT in 1989"*.

Again, we can only agree with this general statement. The problem is that five years have gone by, with a mass counteroffensive in between, in 1995; new realignments in the international Trotskyist movement after the blow-up have taken place; plus our own national-Trotskyist deviation, our struggle against it and this year's magnificent resolutions of the FT, which locate the relationship between theory, program, organization and tactics in a different plane from 1993's. It is not possible to go back to 1993, when we were just a propaganda group that had to lay its theoretical and programmatic foundations to survive, to limit itself to tell others what to do, and educate cadres around this, where even the key was that we were already late for these elaborations and this delimitation with Morenism, which had already prevented us from being up to the circumstances when the MAS exploded. And we educated cadres saying with total clarity, that we had arrived late in spite of the foundational theoretical and programmatic advances of our party.

We formed Trotskyist cadres saying *"how late we arrived, how centrist we were when we broke the MAS!"* What an honest and sensible vision we had at that moment in the PTS of ourselves!

Therefore, separating the small theoretical leaps that we have given from the strategy, the program, the organization and the tactics, defining the PTS only by its theoretical advances, can lead us to an enormous national particularism, although this time a subjective one: That in Argentina a theoretical center has arisen, which, like Trotsky (according to the majority) will radiate its theoretical knowledge towards the world!

The majority of the CC, not taking into consideration the meeting of the FT in the center of its assessment, falls into a self-proclaimed position, which leads us to consider ourselves as another center of the Trotskyist movement. They seem to tell us that a new "little light" has already appeared that illuminates the world! **Instead of educating the new militants in the conception that even with what we are advancing, we still face the threat of degenerating because of sectarian isolation,** the "foundation of vote" is dedicated to measure internationalism, as it is spoken of us, through an enumeration of opinions where the meeting of the FT and its conclusions are put as a fact, at the same level... than the interview that we are going to be granted with Ken Loach!

Contrary to what the majority fraction thinks, they are considering weakness a virtue. Thus, the only thing they will educate are national-Trotskyist cadres, self-proclaimed internationalist, content with a lot of people talking about us, to whom the leadership proposes to vibrate for the international framework, but please, since they have the international framework... apply the tactics.

The TBI maintains, on the contrary, that one cannot be a completed internationalist if one does not face at each step the danger of national-Trotskyist degeneration that is being pushed by the collapse of the Trotskyist movement happening in 1989. If it is not confronted, as the resolutions of the FT propose, with a real plan to combat the national-Trotskyist centers; if the relationship between theory, strategy and internationalist tactics that concentrate the current internationalist tasks of our current is not correctly expressed. We have been isolated for ten years for objective reasons (the collapse) and subjective reasons (it took us two years to realize and vote on the fair internationalist tasks that today the CC majority is openly reviewing in its "foundation of vote" for fractional use); and

this is so because we are not yet part of a current of truly international Trotskyist left, because we have not yet come together with the wings of the Trotskyist movement collapsed in 1989 that are turning towards a revolutionary course. This is an undeniable fact. It cannot be avoided through shortcuts.

If we do not consider this, we fall into subjectivism and self-proclamation. We must begin by recognizing this and telling the truth to our members and sympathizers, instead of educating them in the false self-proclaiming balance sheets of the sects of Trotskyism in Yalta.

Contrary to the irresponsible and superficial assessment that is made in the "foundation of vote" by EA, MR and JS, the declaration and resolutions of the FT of July this year, as we have seen, warn against the danger of degeneration due to isolation and sectarianism. The truth is that, first as a Fraction of the LIT, and then as a Trotskyist Fraction, partly for objective and subjective reasons, we have not been able to come together with any of the sectors of the Trotskyist movement until 1995, because it took us years to delimit ourselves theoretically and programmatically, especially from Morenoism, because the revolutions that occurred did not follow the classical scheme we had hoped for and because of the terrible crisis of subjectivity. Then, in the phase that followed the reconstitution of national "resistant centers", no "center" of the left emerged with which we can converge. It is in this phase precisely, of reconfiguration of the Trotskyist movement when we had a national-Trotskyist deviation two year long, which led us to have no policy to intervene, for example, in France where Voix des Travailleurs emerged. Product of that deviation is that to processes like that, we must say it clearly and not enlarging us with an bike pump, we are arriving late.

THE ASSESSMENT OF THE MAJORITY OF THE CC IS NOT MEASURED WITH REALITY

The "foundation of the vote" of members of the majority faction speaks of *"important advances in the theoretical field."* But it hides that although its importance, we are deepening our analysis of the *"decomposing workers' states"* seven years after having elaborated that category, or presenting a vision of peasant struggles when it is already four years ago that the peas-

antry, for example the MST of Brazil, took center stage in Latin America, and this delay is inevitable because we are an isolated national group, which is part of no international current within the framework of the serious crisis of the Fourth International and the outbreak of '89.

The assessment of the majority fraction does not take into account this weakness that comes from the material bases described, nor it respects the proportions of things. **In the internationalism of the Majority, as measured by the congratulations or the criticisms that we receive, because they speak of us, it does not come to make a balance sheet by measuring ourselves with reality.**

In that case, whoever does not want to promote a self-proclaimed deviation, should say for example that we have not been able to enter Europe, that we have nothing to do with the crisis process of the LCR or the French LO. But certainly, as they tell us, "good news from London", let's stay happy because Ken Loach gives us an interview! (Let's clarify, so that later on they do not accuse us of contempt for the intellectuals, that we consider it very valuable that they, like Ken Loach, establish relations with our current, but we must keep the proportions!).

We have explained in different documents, such as those voted in the FT meeting in July this year, that the national-Trotskyist deviation we suffered was because within the framework of the situation that opened in '95, we had located ourselves as a "Center" of theoretical and programmatic elaboration. Convenient location that consisted not in not taking internationalist tasks but in not taking the just internationalist **tasks that the new situation opened in '95 imposed on us**: intervening in the crisis of the Trotskyist movement, inside the struggle of parties in order to make them fractions fighting centrism. It is on this axis, in how we are about the central task that we voted for ourselves, and to whose resignation we owe our previous national-Trotskyist deviation, that every attempt at serious assessment must begin!

We do not deny that the theoretical advances are the fundamental engine for the construction of an international current that can be called of the Trotskyist left. But the signatories of the "foundation of vote", by separating this aspect, fall into the position of the theory not as a theory-program, that is to say a constitutive part of revolutionary praxis, but reduced to the mere facet of a very important aspect (and in

which our current has endeavored to throw a sensible vision of reality), though one that castrated and limited in such a way, it is typical of the Marxist academic sphere. For this reason, the "foundation of vote" of the majority fraction introduces a conception that is oriented to academicism and theoreticism... and beware of this, comrades of the majority, because the more you advance along this path, the less sensible and correct the analyses will be.

Both the sectarian and the opportunist have a common method to dismantle the relationship between theory, strategy and tactics: take one of these aspects, give it a limitless value, and end in that way castrating revolutionary politics. The opportunist (and the sectarians too, since they are opportunists afraid of themselves) ends up absolutizing the tactics. The sectarian, this time, a "well illustrated" one, absolutizes the value of the theory without which there is no revolutionary praxis, separating it from the action, transforming it into dogma and, therefore, by a way contrary to the objectivist's, reaches the same result: the action ends up reduced to... tactics.

The "foundation of vote" considers that *"not to insist on the increase of theoretical activity at the moment in which the latent tendencies to the crash become more present... is an anti-Marxist absurdity that disarms us for the political struggle"*.

Again, we cannot be against this assertion. But easier said than done. Because we read and reread Internal Note No. 4 and La Voz Obrera No. 39, and we only confirm what we say: the previous statement in the mouth of the majority means only an analysis, which although very important, makes them end up being economists and academics, detached from the situation of the confrontation of the struggling classes, that is to say, detached from the class struggle, from the situation of the states, regimes and governments, and from the crisis of the revolutionary leadership of the proletariat, and also from the necessary correct adaptation of the action program.

In relation to the latter, a modest paragraph of Chapter 1 of our Platform, shows more effort to establish that link than the long three pages devoted to the subject in La Voz Obrera No. 39, where no attempt is made in the least to establish this fundamental relationship today, in 1998, to complete a correct theory and a revolutionary praxis.

They are so arrogant and self-proclaiming that they rejected the TBI's proposal to hold a

joint elaboration meeting on the outbreak of the global crisis. If they cannot accept this common elaboration with a minority tendency of our own party, how do they intend to establish links of theoretical and political collaboration with other currents of the Trotskyist movement with totally different conceptions and traditions?

AN INEVITABLE CONSEQUENCE OF SELF- PROCLAMATION: WE BREAK, DUE TO A PROPAGANDIST CONCEPTION, WITH THE POLICY OF THE LIAISON COMMITTEE THAT THE MEETING OF THE FT PROCLAIMED

In the meeting of the FT, an offensive policy and combat plan were ratified:

"Therefore, [the FT meeting] voted, along with systematically continuing the edition of EI, an offensive policy that is expressed in the call to immediately establish a Liaison Committee for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International, both internationally and in countries that, due to the existence of groups that coincide with this strategy, it can be put into practice. This call must be made with the method proposed in the Program Manifesto to seek agreements based on strategic and programmatic lessons of the great events of the world class struggle".

What remains, after reading the "foundation of vote", of the FT's policy of calling to form a Liaison Committee? Nothing, just the cover, the shape. Because vindicating both "*theoretical advance*" and intellectual praise separately from the program, from politics and from the organization itself, leads to only one side: to a conception of agreements in theory, and not on the basis of agreeing on programmatic lessons for the fight against centrism and influence the new phenomena. And would you believe it! Could it not be that the real reason why the visit of Lutte Ouvrière's leadership, the right wing of the Trotskyist movement, with the probable continuity of our relationship with the LRCI, is put on the same level as the "foundation of vote", besides the relation with an intellectual like Ken Loach, plus the praises of historians and economists, is because the major-

ity of the CC has began to be located like a "center" of theoretical elaboration that establishes relations with all the world, that is to say, with other "centers"? We have then to say the truth: with this orientation we will not be promoting a liaison committee to fight against centrism, but a base for setting up a "left" version of the MAS magazine, "Herramienta".

Or perhaps shall we carry out the Liaison Committee around the theoretical agreements, that is, the international magazine and our small but important theoretical advances? But if the tactics of the Liaison Committee arose precisely because we cannot advance one millimeter in converging with anyone around the theoretical problems alone! Unless we had come to the conviction that by the collapse of the Trotskyist movement, this was a path that led to self-proclamation, to build a... LRCI! Precisely for this reason we could not reach an agreement with the LRCI, because they proposed us to merge around a theoretical and programmatic agreement to advance to a common tendency. And we knew that this was not possible, because we are all part of the outbreak, everybody isolated trying to reconstruct threads of continuity of the theory and the program.

If this were the axis, comrades, we would have proposed the FT the task of calling to set up an international tendency around the *Estrategia Internacional* magazine. And precisely, this position had been already defeated before the meeting of the FT. The resolutions of this meeting are precisely against this position outlined by EA, JCh, and Ch., when they argued that the axis was to constitute an international tendency around getting correspondents to the magazine, which as a tactic, can be very good, even as part of the resolutions of the FT; but the point is that this was an impotent response that the comrades were trying to give after our failure with the LRCI.

Precisely, if we had followed this orientation, the Programmatic Manifesto Project and the method proposed in it to seek agreements based on strategic lessons, which concentrate the theory into a program, into revolutionary lessons, we would have been left in a vacuum. And based on these lessons, we must hit the centrists, separate centrists from revolutionaries, and from there, advance in the tactics of the Liaison Committee. For that reason, with the comrades of the POR, the difference is expressed in its programmatic-strategic policy of the Anti-Imperialist United Front, which repeats the strategy of Lora's revisionist centrism in Bolivia, very serious theoretical problems that surely, in the debate with the comrades in the preparatory committee will

be a great point of discussion, along with the programmatic aspects of it.

The self-proclaiming disproportion is already leading them to present the agreement reached with the POR, to form a Joint Committee, as if it were in fact a superior agreement to intervene on the centers, or a Liaison Committee, and not as what actually is a declaration of intentions to reach it. It is a very positive fact that this declaration of intentions had been agreed on, though in the hands of the majority it is transformed into an inflated balloon to be used in the internal fractional struggle. Because we know we have not achieved to get a common statement with these comrades about the latest Bolivian events and the trade union and opportunist politics of Lora in Bolivia yet. As far as we know, on the lessons of international battles we have not released an open letter to Voix des Travailleurs from France yet and much less about the Brazilian PSTU in which hard internal struggles are being processed. This declaration of intentions is in itself very positive, but the self-proclamation does not tell the truth to the vanguard and to the international Trotskyist movement of the true initial character of the relations with the POR. The majority published the agreements, without making a political characterization of them, breaking the Leninist apothegm, "The closer we get to a current, the more clarity we have to display about the differences that exist and the nature of the agreements that are made".

And what about the Grupo de Trabajadores Revolucionarios (GTR), which was also at our international conference? Every self-proclamation hides failures. In the newspaper, publicly, we do not give any explanation about the state of relations with the comrades that came out in the newspaper, with whom we signed the declaration on Iraq. In a magic pass, most of the CC made the GTR disappear.

Indeed, the GTR is a weaker group product of the collapse of Morenoism; it does not have a clear definition on internationalism, it is totally centrist about it, but it does have positions on different international aspects, which are different from ours. The explanation we would have to give is that out of impatience and arrogance, in fact in the last meeting with them, we treated them as if they were our base, telling them that "they were not cadres coming to a higher level", and in fact we broke relations with them without finishing the discussion at all and fighting to maintain a common discussion framework. This self-proclaimed deviation, this new national-Trotskyist turn, is expressed in the fact that agreements are

made and unraveled, groups such as the GTR appear and then disappear from the center and the LRCI returns to it, now the POR is placed in the center... (and the TBI is kicked off the party and the cells). All unprincipled maneuvers of a national center that only seeks "cover-ups" in a tactician way to cover its true policy, which is to build in the spaces of the regime via the Ceprodh and the Courses, but that means "capturing" new members only in order to strengthen the sect.

Their real positions are to make a national "theoretical center", and as agreements in theory and general programs cannot be done as they were during "Yalta Trotskyism", the only thing that remains is the International PTS Commission, as yesterday for the MAS there was the LIT on the second floor of Perú street office.

We made it clear that the "test" that ends up unmasking this is that the POR, and Comrade Gamboa in particular, acted in a much more principled and democratic centralist way than the majority of the CC with the TBI: around the discussion of Anti-imperialist United Front the comrades have internal tendencies. One of them defends Antiimperialist United Front tactics. Comrade Gamboa brought the leaders of that tendency to all the meetings between our parties to establish the Joint Committee. And the majority of the CC, who act copying the method of Hardy-Lutte Ouvrier, did not invite the TBI and excluded us from the last meetings held after our proclamation in tendency, because ultimately, the rottenness of our internal regime is the expression of the new national-Trotskyist turn of the CC majority.

That is why, quickly, in the middle of the fractional struggle, most of them are re-deploying their true positions. Positions that were not encouraged to raise at the meeting of the FT, though they are what they actually think, as is shown today. They were really uncomfortable with the resolutions of the FT, and for that reason, in this fractional struggle, they hastened to demolish them with their "foundation of vote".

Tell the truth to the party, comrades of the majority! Say that because of the slowness in having immediate success in our international policy of Liaison Committee, you are preparing a luxury burial to that internationalist policy! And also that you are turning to national-Trotskyism in the form of a fight against an invented "workerist tendency" that is "resentful" towards the intellectuals.

**THE MAJORITY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
WITH ITS SELF-PROCLAIMED BALANCES SHEETS,
FORMS “INTERNATIONALIST” CADRES WITH A
METHOD OPPOSED TO THAT OF BOLSHEVISM AND
TROTSKYISM**

When we say that in the assessment-pastiche of the majority the theoretical advances are absolutized, we are not talking about the need to organize the assessments around the “practical” successes or failures. On the contrary, we consider that, just as success is not synonymous with talent, in the task of fighting centrists who speak in the name of Trotskyism, we can fail in our goal of decanting left wings, making centrist currents move forward that turn to the left, in spite of the best theory and correct program, and revolutionary tactics that we may have to take this fight forward. Because this does not depend only on us, but also on the development of objective conditions (if there is a leap forward in radicalization or not, if the crash decomposes the forces of the proletariat before it gets to intervene again, etc.). But we have already defined that this is a process that cannot be spontaneous, that there must be a Trotskyist left that consciously proposes it and in the service of which our theoretical and programmatic advances must exist.

Surely if we fail, this would be a huge pressure to degenerate. Though degeneration could be resisted with cadres that, in the first place, have given a correct fight at the right moment; and secondly, they are formed not in a national exclusivism of a theoretical center, but in a true internationalist strategy and conception, that is, a common and profound understanding of internationalist tasks. And thirdly, failure would not be a strategic defeat if we have cadres and militants aware of the need to fight against this isolation and not educated in the easy way that the authors of the “foundation of vote” propose to us. On the contrary, with a academicist theoretical conception like the one that the majority of the CC is beginning to develop, we will be far from maintaining the threads of continuity even when we fail, and of forming cadres that have a true militant vision of the struggle for reconstructing the Fourth International.

This is the only conception that ensures the continuity of that combat! It is the same method with which Trotsky and the Left Opposition formed cadres conscious that the defeat of the German revolution and the isolation of the USSR

were leading to the degeneration of the workers' state, against the vision of Stalinism that transformed that isolation in a virtue, saying that the way out was “socialism in one country” in the '20s. The victory of Stalinism and the degeneration of the USSR (and those were big defeats and failures!), thanks to the existence of those cadres formed by this hard struggle led by Trotsky, did not prevent them from maintaining the continuity that later led to the formation of the International Left Opposition first and the Fourth International afterwards; that despite the defeat in the USSR, there were cadres and organizations to intervene in revolutionary processes such as in Spain and France in the '30s. Trotskyism did not separate the theory, the program, the organization and the tactics in its internationalist struggle, a unity that constituted a true revolutionary algebra of Bolshevism, which had united and concretized them in the seizure of power in Russia and in the foundation of the Third International. Thus, in the confrontation with the Stalinist national exclusivism that led to the pseudosocialism in one country, the theory gave fundamental leaps, fighting it in Russia and in China (the latter a struggle that would lead to the complete elaboration of the Theory of the Permanent Revolution), in the midst of a fierce struggle of parties, both theoretical, programmatic and revolutionary tactics, first as an Opposition within the Third International until 1933, then as an internationalist league, later as a pro-Fourth International movement until the foundation of the Fourth International in 1938.

And it could be said that this fight failed: Stalinism succeeded in the USSR, the German proletariat was defeated -sold out by Stalinism and Social Democracy, with the Popular Fronts betraying in France and Spain. The centrism built parties of several thousand militants, such as the POUM, the SAP, the ILP, from which there are no traces now. But Trotsky was able to realize his greatest work: founding the Fourth International and giving continuity, after similar defeats, to Bolshevism, and leaving us all his theoretical, programmatic and action legacy, as a continuity of it.

He did it, however, by putting the theory, the strategy, the program and the tactics, as tools of a phenomenal struggle of parties, which throughout a period acquired the character of a civil war, as was the struggle of Stalinism to annihilate Bolshevism, that is, Trotskyism in the USSR, and the counterrevolutionary policy of Stalinism to act as a fifth column annihilating the Trotskyists and any organization that had to do with Trotskyism or that approached the revolution, such as in Spain.

The struggle within the Third International, from the revolutionary processes of the East first, and then from the West, to try to reverse this process of degeneration of the USSR and the Third

International, was a phenomenal struggle of parties between Trotskyism and Stalinism. This is the time when Trotsky won the Cannons, the Nins, and many others, although unfortunately many of them, like the latter, degenerated into centrism. It was also a fierce struggle against centrism in the '30s, with tactics such as the Block of Four, the French turn, etc.

Your self-proclaimed theoreticism hides the worst opportunism. It rejects the necessary struggle of parties and, therefore, is national-Trotskyism. In other words, rejecting the struggle of parties, they distance themselves from the struggle to rebuild the Fourth International and thus solve the crisis of the revolutionary leadership of humanity, which cannot be done except through a phenomenal struggle of parties.

And as we will see later, infected by the academic sphere of the bourgeois university, the majority fraction gives Trotsky the role of being only a provider of dialectics and theory so that the groups do not degenerate, as expressed by the shameful supplement (the anniversary of the death of Trotsky published in *La Voz Obrera*) issued by the Majority. What a subjectivist reductionism!

With the method drawn from the experience of Bolshevism and Trotskyism, that is to say, the revolutionary movement of this time of crisis, wars and revolutions, we must form cadres in which it is assumed, that without revolutionary theory there is no revolutionary praxis. That the theoretical elaboration is a fundamental part of any internationalist current, without which there is no possibility of any international and national revolutionary praxis. But also formed in the conviction that every inch that we deviate or delay in intervening with our political struggle against the national-trotskyist centers and the transitory phenomena that emerge from them today, every step we take away separating the theory of strategy and the revolutionary tactic to fight them offensively is a kilometer that the dangers advance of our national adaptation and the degeneration of our current, dragging us to the nationalist self-proclamation, renegading on the facts of fighting to rebuild the Fourth International to solve the crisis of revolutionary leadership of the proletariat internationally.

A RETURN TO NATIONAL-TROTSKYISM BY THE MAJORITY OF THE CC

Proclaiming the "theoretical advances" and the repercussions of the analyses of International Strategy without linking them with the resolutions of the FT, without making a real assessment of the state of our internationalist policy and in particular of our tactics of the Liaison Committee means that the majority fraction is fleeing from the tasks that we voted for performing the internationalist turn and the resolutions of the FT. As an expression of our difficulties in advancing in these tasks, that is, in the struggle of the parties within the Trotskyist movement, the majority fraction wants to return to the national-trotskyist deviation from which we come: to consider ourselves only a center of "theoretical elaboration". The majority fraction is the truly "regressive" and "resistant to the internationalist turn"!

For that reason the only deficit that is spoken of throughout the "foundation of vote" is when it says that "in the turn we are still performing, **most belated is the formation of high-level propagandists** who in turn are able to explain simply, that is to popularize these concepts for workers and youth" (our bolds). This is the most complete demonstration of the break with the resolutions of the FT, as the danger of degeneration is not taken into account at all, and precisely the opposite idea is considered: that a new "theoretical center" has appeared which only lacks the "propagandists" who as apostles make the "good news" known. Though, what is this but "Garmendism" in its pure state, or propagandism in the best style of Andrés Romero, the MAS and its magazine "Herramienta"? Could it be that the sectors of the CC influenced by the success of the Marxist Courses and who were proposing in the CC to go to the workers' movement with socialist propaganda have convinced the entire CC?

The resolutions of the FT say:

*"The tasks that emerge from the characterization above proposed imply that all the groups that make up the FT must prepare all of our cadres and members in this internationalist fight against all the currents that usurp the flags of the Fourth International. **This means breaking with the conception of internationalism that we drag from Centrism.** For Centrism*

internationalism was summed up in the need for an international framework. The international tasks were not an asset of the organization; contrariwise, they were delegated to the International". (our Bolds)

And for that reason, some lines below the resolutions sustain:

"...Not doing it, supposing that the party is built through a sum of tactics, separating them from the strategy of fighting for the reconstruction of the Fourth International, would only lead to the construction of a centrist party that could fatten but will not pass the test in front of the decisive combats. **In this direction, it is necessary that the fight against the centrist currents that usurp the name of Trotskyism and for the reconstruction of the Fourth International is not only for propaganda but becomes incarnated in the daily struggle of our cadres and members against the different centrist groups and in the propagation of internationalist ideas towards the most insightful sectors of the vanguard**". (Bolds in the original)

But the "foundation of vote" of EA, MN and JS has decided to break with this important passage of the resolutions of the FT. For the majority, the magazine is the "international framework" and what is missing is the good national propagandists to "*popularize these concepts among workers and youth*". We emphasize the *national*, because we hope this paragraph that we quote is not intended to mean that they want to reach with propaganda the workers and young people of the world (!!!). To cover up this centrist conception of internationalism, they want to convince us that now, with the mere publication of three issues of the international magazine, we are in a "*overt struggle of parties, tendencies and fractions*" (!!!).

Tell the truth, then! For you, comrades of the majority, the great problem, the great delay we have is not about how we end up breaking with "*the conception of internationalism that we drag from centrism*", it is not how we advance in that sense in "*the daily struggle of our cadres and members against the various centrist groups*! "

You are boasting so much that do not even consider the delay with which we arrived, and we

will arrive always if our isolation subsists, at the theoretical elaboration. For you everything is fine and only "*high level propagandists*" are lacking who can explain the "revealed truth" in the Rio de la Plata! This is nothing more than the defense of an internationalist place as a new "resistant center", of course "a very enlightened" one!

But if this is not the case, and the delay is as you say, are we going to say then that the PO, at the national level, has beaten us the first place over the popularization of the need for the struggle for the Fourth International, as we have been stating, because we lack "*high level propagandists*"? The majority of the CC, in order to tease the "tendency" with the international achievements, has gotten into a tremendous mess -in what world do they live? We who live in the world of the FT resolutions, are with them when these resolutions say immediately after the previous quotation:

"The delay of voting an offensive policy in this sense, as a consequence of the national-Trotskyist deviations, has been expressed in the case of Argentina (re-read the previous words once more, comrades of the majority: it does not speak of "propagandists") in that, in spite of the advances of the different tactics and the fact that the PTS has surrounded itself with an audience, it has been the Partido Obrero which (as a cover and for a policy of opportunist regroupment) has been ahead of us in the agitation and popularization in sectors of the vanguard of the correct idea to refound the Fourth International. "

Comrades of the majority, things cannot be changed with impunity. The resolutions of the FT are still in fresh! We also wonder: what "peculiar astral combination occurred over Buenos Aires sky" in those days when they were voted? Because they cannot be forgotten so quickly!

As we see, theTBI and the resolutions of the FT on the one hand and the majority of the CC on the other differ on what axis is "the most belated" of our international struggle, and on how to educate our cadres and members accordingly as revolutionary internationalists. This new conception of internationalism, we sustain from the TBI, is simply an adaptation of a party pushed to conform, independently of its will, with the relative successes of tactics such as the Ceprodh and the "Marxist Courses", a party for which only an "internationalist vision" would suffice to complete its political personality.

The majority fraction, however, do not realize they are deploying a centrist vision of the inter-

national tasks of the party. Like with every centrist position, there is a danger for the party of completely falling apart. But the classic conception of the German Social Democracy before the First World War was that internationalism meant building a national mass party (federated with other national mass parties) and a theory of Marxism that embodied the experience of the mass movement, what was nothing more than accumulation of theoretical elaborations, plus some tactics. And are they going to come to us saying that the German social democracy did not have great theoreticians, like Bebel and many others? Well comrades, can you realize that it was more than 90 years ago; that the era has changed, and moreover both theory and programs embed in parties that in turn represent class sectors, i. e., reformist, counterrevolutionary, revolutionary, centrist of all kind, ones who are in a fierce struggle among themselves for winning over the vanguard and the masses? And that you cannot say lightly, that the only deficit of our internationalism lays in the lack of *"formation of high level propagandists"*?

We are in a time of crisis, wars and revolutions; no mass parties can be built with more tactical theories alone. That is pure anti-Leninism. It is a purely social-democratic conception. This ends up in your self-proclaimed centrist deviation, empirically, pragmatically, almost without realizing it. Comrades, do you intend to stop at some point? We insist again, stop! Stop following the steps of a wing of the totally socialdemocratized Trotskyist movement, the Garmendias, the Aldo Casas, the Italian SR, etc.

THE TRUE "EPIDERMAL INTERNATIONALISM" OF THE MAJORITY FRACTION

In the "first response" of EA to P., the latter is accused of allegedly not being "impressed" by the struggles of the Korean proletariat, General Motors in the USA and the UOCRA workers in Argentina.

Of course, it is very important that party activists be excited, vibrate and be deeply interested in the struggles and experiences of the world working class, that they follow them and discuss them passionately. But this is only one aspect of the formation of truly internationalist members and cadres. This passion must be part of a true Trotskyist internationalist conception and a cor-

rect internationalist strategy of combat, i.e., extracting the revolutionary programmatic lessons from those struggles and also from international events, to transform them into tools of offensive political struggle against the centrist currents that speak on behalf of Trotskyism nationally and internationally. Detached from this strategy of combat, to vibrate and get excited about the workers' struggles of the world is reduced to a true "epidermic internationalism", repeating the "Morenoist" gestures, which educated its cadres and members in a mandatory and hollow "vibration" with the international class struggle, which was a mere loincloth of a national-Trotskyist policy, i.e, a lot of internationalist "feeling" in the ceremonial acts to cover up the formation of a party only interested in getting many votes and some deputy. Let's not forget that Moreno said that "we had to vibrate" with Nicaragua and El Salvador, while the MAS in Argentina, full of the worst opportunistic tacticism, was in pursuit of "making Zamora an MP."

The entire new "Internationalism of vibrations" of the majority fraction, being detached from the struggle of parties at national and international level and away from an internationalist strategy of combat, is "epidermal".

On the contrary, the campaigns, such as the one in Iraq that we conducted last summer, or this we are promoting around the figure of Leon Trotsky, only acquire a revolutionary meaning and will be a link in our internationalist politics based on this consistent Trotskyist logic. Outside of it, it will be an international campaign that is not articulated with a corresponding theory, strategy, policy and revolutionary organization.

THE CAUSES OF THIS ADAPTATION

This tendency to looking back in the majority of the CC is not accidental. After the meeting of the FT, the "paradoxes" of the PTS have deepened. The international economic crisis hits a new leap ahead of a new proletarian wave like that of '95. This situation of delay of the worker movement, now aggravated by the tendency to a crash in a new leap of the economic crisis, has affected all the "projects" of construction within the Trotskyist movement.

Starting from the mass counter-offensive initiated in 1995, the national-Trotskyist centers were strengthened, and prepared, with an evolution-

ary vision of the development of the counter-offensive, for a growth of the trade unions and the traditional organizations of the workers' movement and the masses, and to go up that way. Actually, this preparation consisted in a greater adaptation to the reformist parties and the union bureaucracies, with which, if the radicalization (radicalization that the counter-offensive initiated in 1995 had not brought) was going to find them in the opposite bank alongside the counterrevolutionary leaderships. That is, the same as the French LCR trying to position itself as the "left of the plural left" of the Jospin government; as the PSTU in Brazil, trying to take advantage of the space left by the PT's turn to the right, by raising the policy of returning "to the PT of the origins"; or as Lutte Ouvrière, standing to join the Communist Left of the French CP that is now in government with Jospin; or the PO of Argentina that ends next to the Italian group Proposta within Rifondazione Comunista, which in turn supports the imperialist government of Olivo. Yet, all these projects go to waste because with the economic crisis and the tendencies to the crash, there cannot be any "PT of the origins", there cannot be an evolutionary growth of a current to the "left of the plural left".

Against these projects of the national-Trotskyist centers, transitory centers have emerged, which although in their criticism of the orientations of the right raise progressive aspects, they do so from a nationalist and not at all internationalist logic, as for example, Voix des Travailleurs, a Fraction of Lutte Ouvrière, in France.

Our national-Trotskyist deviation of the last two years, instead of pushing us to voting an offensive policy, prevented us from hitting those transitory centers for trying to push them to the left and keep them from becoming photocopies of the national-Trotskyist centers. Only through a fierce struggle of theoretical, programmatic and political parties with these currents could we have made them advance.

However, for the abovementioned reasons and because the world economic crisis was put at the center of the scene before there came a second proletarian wave that would render a radicalization, the national centers could not go up with their projects and the transitory centers were stagnant at their side, also because precisely the tendencies to the crash had liquidated any possibility of a gradual evolution of the mass counteroffensive opened in 1995.

The centers on the right have begun to show instability. In our country this is seen in the crisis

of the MST and the MAS as working class left, although not of the PO, which is betting to go up by repeating an electoral phenomenon similar to that of LO in France.

While the Trotskyist left, the FT, which for objective and subjective reasons (the national-Trotskyist deviation) could not break its isolation, is forced to draw theoretical conclusions, with a delay of seven years to boot. The deepening of this "paradox" is a terrible pressure to return to our previous existence as only a "Center" of theoretical elaboration. That is why the resolution of the FT is great, which defines that, under conditions where there is no radicalization, only with a conscious policy of the Trotskyist left, with an offensive to intervene and strike on these currents, there may be a possibility of turning them towards the left and be able to converge with them, or with sectors or molecules of them.

Our own history proves, on the other hand, that this has been the case. Because the more isolated we were, in the midst of our national-Trotskyist deviation, the less theoretical and programmatic advances were made (or among other things, what is a national-Trotskyist deviation, if not this?). On the contrary, we move to the left, define our method of international construction and our Liaison Committee tactic, through the struggle and delimitation with the LRCI and its self-proclaimed policy, which defended and keeps defending the conception of Yalta's Trotskyism, of a center around which tendencies are formed, something impossible to apply today after the blow-up of the Trotskyist movement. And even, our own conformation as PTS, our theoretical advances, we have achieved through a fierce struggle of parties, in delimitation with Morenoism, in demarcation with the own fractions that arose to our interior, like Garmendism, and in struggle with the English WRP. Currents that even made us great partial contributions that helped us to move further and further to the left in our delimitation and theoretical elaboration. As for example, Garmendia's and WRP's criticism of Moreno's theory of democratic revolution gave us important elements to advance in our delimitation and in the affirmation of the conception of the Permanent Revolution. It was even the WRP itself that raised for the first time that the Fourth International had to be reconstructed, when we still had not broken with our conception that "the" International was the LIT.

It is symptomatic then, and not at all a coincidence, that the meeting of the FT and its reso-

lutions are mentioned only when passing on the "foundation..." and not to give a central reference and guideline to the balance they make, and instead replace it with an "internationalism" measured by the repercussions of what we write. The majority fraction is determined to abandon those resolutions in favor of a different conception, which moves away from our correct internationalist tasks, although they continue to be repeated ritually only as coverage of the return to a new national-Trotskyist deviation.

The majority fraction believes in the "foundation of vote" that denying the progress of our current (which no one, much less the TBI does in this discussion) is "destructive." We affirm that this irresponsible and self-proclaiming vision, if not corrected, is the prelude to major disasters for our organization.

And the majority of the CC want to put such a contradiction in the thimble of the supposed "workerism" and "populism" of a tiny minority of the CC! But that is to say one thing and do the opposite, because the demagogic cry of "internationalist turn!" hides a return to a new version of the national-Trotskyist deviation against which so much effort we have been fighting together. This paradox of our party they want to resolve by starting from a theoreticist and propagandistic conception, that is, contradicting the resolutions of the FT. When EA says, as in his response to R, that the "little Marxist leagues" are defined by their program, he is just preparing the way to renounce to the fight of parties and be again a supposed "center of theoretical elaboration". If the Trotskyist left adapts in this way to this pressure of the new international and national situation, it will irremediably degenerate.

A FIRST EXAMPLE OF WHAT WE SAY HAS ALREADY COME OUT IN LA VERDAD OBRERA: A SUBJECTIVIST CONCEPTION OF THE CRISIS OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Both in the CC and in the plenary sessions after the Congress, by using the "workerism" argument of R. a position has begun to be outlined that holds the study of Marxist theory and dialectics in particular is in itself a guarantee against any deviation. We make ours the arguments that P. raised in his letter against this misrepresentation.

But let's leave aside the oral statements: The most categorical expression of this new subjectivist conception is already developed in writing in the supplement of the last newspaper dedicated to Leon Trotsky, edited under the absolute responsibility of the CC majority. In an unsigned article, the history of the Fourth and the explanation of its centrist degeneration, in particular that of the SWP of the USA, begin to change very much in favor of the new subjectivist conception according to which the dialectic, the theory and the program are everything:

"...This path followed by the SWP (that of its centrist degeneration) is explained not only by the material pressures (the American working aristocracy was social base of McCarthyism during the post-war boom and the Cold War) but because, **in short**, Cannon only partially followed Trotsky's advice in the struggle against the petty-bourgeois fraction. Without Trotsky, Cannon's analyses during the post-war era permanently suffer from a lack of dialectic, which together with the underestimation of the theoretical education of the party, favored centrist adaptation to the American working class as it is".

We are facing a new -subjectivist, rather idealistic interpretation of the crisis of the Fourth International. According to it, the centrist degeneration was not fundamentally caused by, as we have always stated, the political and programmatic adaptation to the apparatuses, due to the fact that the CP against the predictions of Trotsky came out of the war strengthened and at the head of the deformed workers states in Eastern Europe; the emergence of petty-bourgeois leaders who were at the head of revolutionary processes to divert and defeat them, or ultimately bureaucratize the new workers states that emerged as the Vietnam and Cuba; the capitalist boom and the formation of a labor aristocracy in the central capitalist countries that took the workers' movement from the scene until '68. No, in short (that is, the ultimate cause), everything would be due to analyses lacking in dialectics because of the absence of Trotsky, to the low "theoretical" level and "to following only partially the advice of Trotsky". Result of which, the role of Leon Trotsky is reduced to that of a professor of dialectics and Marxist theory, and not that of a personality that condensed the so far greatest experiences of the revolutionary proletariat in the 20th century besides being the continuity of theoretical revolutionary Marxist

thought.

This means that Trotsky alive, for the majority fraction, was a counselor of dialectic, and that in this way, with such advice, the American Trotskyism, was built on a bed of roses, as it is clear after reading the same article. There is an idealistic and evolutionary vision of the development of American Trotskyism from its emergence until the death of Trotsky. On the contrary, and anyone who reads Cannon's "History of American Trotskyism" can confirm it, the truth was that its entire history, from its emergence with the "three generals without an army", through the foundation of the SWP in 1938 and until Trotsky's death, is the history of the struggle of its tendencies and fractions, which arose around each important turn imposed by reality.

But returning to the explanations given in the article, we can say that the objective, material causes of the crisis of the Fourth International are in another part of the article. But this would only confirm that we are before an eclectic formulation, where one thing and the opposite are said at the same time. And the eclecticism in the formulations is, anyone who has any political experience knows it, the first step to start changing conceptions gradually and surreptitiously.

A SECOND EXAMPLE: AS A NATIONAL REFRACTION OF SELF-PROCLAMATION, THE STRUGGLE FOR THE PRINCIPLED REFOUNDING OF ARGENTINE TROTSKYISM DISAPPEARS

International self-proclamation is just the other side of the coin of national self-proclamation. Thus, chapter 3 of the pre-congress document, which the majority of the CC has ended up defending in its entirety, as we will see in the rest of this platform, is organized around the tactics to "strengthen the PTS." As we will demonstrate, it is a document to place us as one more of the 5 or 6 national sects that compete for the name of Trotskyism. However, we can predict the disappearance of the programmatic point of the principled refounding of Argentine Trotskyism as an expression of our struggle for the reconstruction of the Fourth International.

What does this mean? We maintain that when defending Chapter Three, the majority of the CC is supporting a policy of national construction, of many tactics such as the CEPRODH, the Marxist Courses, the Leon Trotsky Center and the campaign for the latter's demand, not to organize the best of the vanguard for the struggle to defeat centrism nationally and internationally, but to tell the vanguard: "come to the PTS". In this way, and with the disappearance of the struggle for the principled refounding of Argentine Trotskyism, the members of the TTO groups and the new militants, which are many in our organization, are not recruited for the struggle of the Trotskyist left against the centrism embodied in the MAS, the PO, and the MST. On the contrary, the majority of the CC helps to form in our party the conception that the PTS is "the" Trotskyist party.

This position has nothing to do with the tradition that comes from the Left Opposition, a tradition that must be brought to light for our struggle against centrism and for the reconstruction of the Fourth International, and much more after the collapse of the Trotskyist movement from '89. The left opposition recruited and formed cadres (while considering the III International as centrist and not as counterrevolutionary, that is until '33) for the fight as a revolutionary left of the world communist movement led by Stalinism. Any other position was considered a capitulation and a renunciation of the struggle against the degeneration of the communist movement. This is what Trotsky tells Andrés Nin, leader of the Spanish Left Opposition (which was not a small group but had more than two thousand members) in a letter to him:

"You speak of the backwardness of the Spanish workers and the need to make them aware of the fundamental ideas of communism before raising the questions of the Left Opposition..."

"I confess that I do not imagine being able to give a lecture on communism to the most backward workers without raising the issues of the Left Opposition at the same time. If I gave a lecture on communism to groups of backward workers, Spanish or not, I would clear the way from the beginning with the following statement: In communism there are several currents. I belong to such a current and I will explain how this task focuses on the tasks of the working class."

"To conclude, I would call the workers to join the organization that defends the points of view that I have just explained. Otherwise, propaganda and agitation would acquire an academic character, be devoid of an organizational axis and, in short, help the adversary, the centrists and the rightists."

In opposition to the teachings of Trotsky, with the self-proclamation militants are formed for a party that "fattens" via successful tactics and "goes up" without obstacles, and not, as it has been a tradition in our current since its foundation, as part of a fight to the death for making fractions to centrism, dividing and defeating it, and thus re-founding with all the honestly revolutionary sectors of our movement the Trotskyist party in Argentina, which is the main national reflection of our international politics. Although they repeat this in a ritual way, we affirm that the policy of the CC majority acquires an "academic character" that would only "help" our adversaries, the "centrists" and "rightists" of the MST, the PO, and the MAS.

Through a subjectivist conception, the orientation defended by the majority of the CC comes, as the extremes meet each other, to the same positions as the objectivists, i.e., self-proclamation. But not in an opportunistic key like the latter but this time in a sectarian key, that takes to ignore - thus capitulating to centrism that appropriates the flags of Trotskyism in our country. We state that the proposal of the majority breaks with our political and programmatic conquests and with our tradition to approach dangerously similar proposals (in a new national-trotskyist deviation) to those of *"Come to the MAS"* of the '80s and early '90s, or to the PO's with its *"Let's build the Workers' Party"*.

DOWN WITH THE SECTARIAN SELF-PROCLAMATION!

From the TBI we call to confront and defeat the theoretical and self-proclaiming vision of the majority of the CC; we warn that as a product of it we are before a national-trotskyist, sectarian and self-proclaiming deviation of our party, which under the banners of a supposed "internationalist turn", conceals serious elements of adaptation, via tacticism, to the bourgeois democratic regime.

In times of crisis, wars and revolutions, there is no place with a revolutionary future for social-ist-democratized theorists and tacticians that inaugurated a current of the Trotskyist movement such as the Italian SR that has a large international journal of a national theoretical center, or the MAS and to its side, the Garmendism. From the TBI we call to face this new national-trotskyist course that will end up being one more wing of this academic and social-democratizing current of the Trotskyist movement.

From the TBI we fight for a principled internationalist policy to push forward our struggle for an International Liaison Committee based on programmatic lessons to rebuild the Fourth International by cleansing it from centrists and revisionists.

We state that the majority of the CC is the real fraction, hidden under the regime of consensus, resistant to the true internationalist turn expressed in the resolutions of the Trotskyist Fraction. We say "hidden", because they kept their mouths shut and did not dare to show their true positions at the FT meeting, and then they started a reaction along the line against their resolutions, which today comes to light on the "foundation of vote" by Emilio Albamonte, Manolo Romano and Jorge Sanmartino. Either you are with the resolutions of the FT, or with the shameful "foundation of vote"! Here is the kern of this discussion.

That is why we proclaim:

Down with the sectarian self-proclamation!
Long live the theory, strategy, program and tactics of the FT placed at the service of the struggle within the Trotskyist movement to purge its ranks of centrism and take steps in the struggle to rebuild the Fourth International!

Down with theoreticism, subjectivism and propagandism, the other side of opportunist objectivism!

Long live the struggle for the principled re-founding of Argentine Trotskyism!

For a party that forms internationalist cadres, true fighters aware of the reconstruction of the Fourth International and the struggle against centrism in their ranks!

CHAPTER 3

The first response of Emilio Albamonte to P. A shameful response

A NEW INVENTION: “THE MINORITY INDULGES IN ‘POPULISM’”. THIS CONTRAPTION CREATED BY THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE MAJORITY IS MEANT TO CONCEAL THEIR ECONOMICIST, PACIFIST AND ULTRA-UNIONIST VISION OF THE UNITY OF THE WORKERS’ RANKS.

If we leave aside the irresponsible method of discussing through a moral act organized by the majority fraction in San Martin, so then to be able to invent arguments against the minority; if then we leave aside once and for all that the comrades of San Martin say that P. said, and then comrade E.A. says what the comrades of San Martin say P. said; and finally if we really want to deeply discuss our positions and conceptions and unravel this confusing web spread by the majority, we have to say that the new invented nickname of “populism” is still a smokescreen, and it does not exist in the least in P’s letter.

And as we are discussing with E.A.’s letter, we can say that his response to P’s alleged

“populism” is nothing more than a sum of loose arguments disconnected from each other, with an amazing lack of dialectic, to conceal a totally democraticist and pacifist vision of the re-composition of the unity of the workers’ ranks. And we are going to show it by analyzing what E.A. writes. His method, both here and in other discussion topics and as we have demonstrated in our whole platform, is to dissolve a concrete discussion into general truths, what has taken him to an a-historical, that is, anti-dialectic position. Let’s see.

First, P. in his letter refers to a specific, concrete intervention of comrade V. in the Congress, regarding the discussion established at that time. We say this in the hope the term “concrete” does not bother comrade E.A. Dialectical logic does not negate formal logic, but rather incorporates and surmounts it, in order to explain the concrete via successive approximations. And the concrete discussion (that is, a sufficiently determined one) was that comrade V. answered P. in the Congress to then P’s totally “workerist” (that P. later rectified, both in the same congress and in P’s subsequent note) with in its turn an also totally mistaken position.

V. said that in Astillero Río Santiago (ARS) they had had an assembly where they had shown solidarity with the construction workers, and that all the workers felt the same hate before the fact of the two worker deaths per day in the construction industry. Beyond any discussion about the 1970s, on the "working aristocracy" or the upper layers of the 1970s (which we will quickly address below) in this concrete discussion, comrade V. was totally wrong. Comrade P, in his letter that attempts to clarify his intervention in the congress, does not say at any time that the most exploited workers are those who have the most hatred and are the ones who are going to lead the revolutionary uprising in Argentina, as E.A. intends to make him say. P. says only that Comrade V. had responded unilaterally in denying, in relation to this concrete, relative discussion, that in the working class there are both more exploited and more privileged sectors. And P. goes on insisting that the working class is not homogeneous as its different layers live different material experiences; and that comrade V. was forgetting (and we are talking about the 10,000 construction workers who took to the streets because they die like flies every day) that in his factory (the ARS) that does not happen. For P. that explains, in this concrete discussion (we repeat, sufficiently determined), that there were 10,000 construction workers winning the streets, and not a huge march of all the workers of the ARS, carrying on their shoulders the coffins of five deceased workers that have died in the stands. Or, may be there was such a march, and we did not notice, or did comrade V. forget to inform it at the congress?

In short: it is not the same, we repeat, in this concrete situation today, the hatred that leads the construction workers to win the streets and to put a milestone in the program of struggle of the Argentine working class, as with their cry "Murderous bosses", forcing the most pro-Menem bureaucracy in the country to lead it (that is, to confront in a way the government they are addict, TN), that the hatred that can move the workers of the Shipyard (notwithstanding their solidary attitude in their assembly), who still "see" the possibility of negotiating and obtaining concessions from the Duhalde provincial government (Duhalde was a vice-President to Menem, and then governor of the province of Buenos Aires, where the state owned ARS belonged. TN) at this particular moment. It is possible that if they do not get these concessions, they will be preparing to fight to get them. And quite possibly, in the heat of these pressure struggles, many of his

illusions fall, and a class hatred revives against the paternalistic bourgeois policies of Duhalde. But it is not what is happening today. And this inequality in hatred, produced by different concrete material situations, is also the expression of inequality in action. While in ARS there is a process of regroupment of forces, election of delegates and a predisposition for the struggle (with much more consciousness, organization and previous experience), in the construction industry, on the other hand, it is almost spontaneous hatred what brings out the workers to perform a magnificent action, and dialectically, without the experience and awareness that ARS workers have. Whether you like it or not, this is the law of unequal and combined development, which expresses itself in sectors that are very backward in organization, consciousness and experience, which can, under extreme conditions, be the vanguard at a certain moment.

And Whether you like it or not, comrades of the CC majority, as Lenin says, class hatred, under extreme conditions, can be a great engine of the revolutionary action of the proletariat, that is, in this case, the development of its spontaneity (which, as we have said so many times, is the embryonic form of the conscious). This is the meaning of what P. says in his letter, *"the class is not homogeneous and that its different layers live different material experiences"*. It is a concrete response; but it is undeniable that, unfortunately, because it has been no more than seven months that we have him as a rented leader, and at the same time managing and directing a regional and not in the maximum tasks of theoretical-political elaboration alone, comrade P. cannot express himself completely clearly and to the end this rich dialectic of consciousness, experience and action and the inequalities within the working class. But not for lack of dedication on the part of the comrade, but because the top leadership of the party (HR assumes his fundamental responsibility in this) has not involved comrade P. nor comrade V. (who responded to P. with very low level in the Congress) in the maximum theoretical, political and strategic elaboration of our organization.

We also do not know of any invitation to these comrades from the comrades of the CC who prepared the Marxist courses that were developed in the Buenos Aires University (UBA) and in the La Plata University (UNLP), to prepare them in common. In the case of HR, we must also say that the maximum bureaucratic traits were expressed in that he discussed for

hours and days the script of the article of Estrategia Internacional (EI) No. 9, with a comrade of the CC that signs it, without the participation of P. and V. or other militant workers of the party. Therefore, comrades, let us not be afraid of the low level and of the workerist traits of the comrades. This is our responsibility. But the problem is that E.A. does not respond to P. in his long letter of reply to the program proposed by P. to resolve this contradiction, which is *"to promote all comrades who come from the working environment to leadership posts at all levels of the party. It can be a great learning school for them."* And this programmatic point of the letter of P., that comrade E.A. does not even deign to answer, we make it totally and absolutely ours

But, to tell the truth, together with Cannon and the tradition of Bolshevism, we are convinced that in this tendential struggle within the party, and also around the theoretical, political and programmatic struggle within the international Trotskyist movement and in the fierce struggle of parties in the forefront, not only comrade P. and V. may raise their level, but the whole party, and especially the large number of invaluable comrades who have joined our party in last two years, from the student movement, the democratic movement and more intellectual sectors that we are regrouping in the Marxist courses in the UBA and the ULP.

The positions developed by comrade P. in his letter, have nothing of "populism" in them, but are a concrete response to a particular and specific discussion developed in our Congress. And the only "populism" we see is that of E.A. is confusing the base of the party and arm it with two or three slogans that mobilize it against CC minority.

Second, the next assertion of comrade E.A. is that "class hatred" does not come mechanically from the degree of exploitation of each sector of the working class. E.A. says in his answer: *"But to deduce from this, in an anti-dialectic way, that class hatred is mechanically deducted from the degree of exploitation of each sector, and that even this has its reflection in a small league, is to go to a populist conception, both far from Marxism and opposed to all the historical experience of the entire Argentine and world proletariat. Do you forget, comrade P. (the tendency, the fraction?) that they were the privileged ("aristocratic", according to P.'s conception) workers of the SMATA of Cordoba, those that resisted the remove of the English Saturday, gave beginning to the Cordobazo, and trans-*

formed their class hatred in milestones of class consciousness (historically known as Classism, TN) ahead to the most oppressed sectors of the Cordobese proletariat, although together they have starred in the Cordobazo?"

Again a general statement against which no one can be against of, such a general it is. And we believe that, comrade P. either. But "class hatred", "conscience" and "action" are terms relative to a given moment. For example: removing the English Saturday (i.e., the extra payment of extra hours worked on Saturdays, TN) from SMATA workers in 1969, as part of a discussion on collective bargaining agreements, which lived in the consciousness of a class that since '45 and the Peronist Resistance had defended them as conquests, woke up class hatred, linked to the existence of a dictatorship (that of Gen. Onganía and the military, which had staged a coup. TN) hated by the workers and the people as a whole, and with Peronism banned since 1955, and led to the events of the Cordobazo, the Rosariazo, etc., that shocked the 1970s. Pretending to say, through a ultra-unionist vision, that the Cordobazo was caused because "they took out the English Saturday" from the metalworkers and autoworkers, is such a "concrete, very concrete" position that it ends up being insufficiently determined, that is, not explaining reality in its complex and multiple determinations. It is from this ultra-unionist position on the '70 with which E.A. tries to arm the party to prepare for future eruptions of the proletariat at the end of the '90s.

But the working class of the '70s was a historically given working class. It had not (as in the 1990s, TN) three million non registered workers and three million unemployed in it, nor 40 or 50% of the registered workers were precarized as short-term contracted or sub-contracted (through agencies) workers (that is, with less benefits or lacking labor rights whatsoever as "self contracted craftsmen"). It had not suffered the tearing caused in their ranks by the counterrevolution of 1976, the defeat of Malvinas War, the hyperinflation of late 1980s and the peso Ar / US dollar parity of the 1990s and the bourgeois triumph of privatizations yet. Again, a concrete example is here dissolved (that the workers started the Cordobazo because they were taken off the so-called English Saturday, which, as we have clarified before, is a half truth) into a general truth, that is, an a-historical one, to invent and discuss around the alleged "ultra-tradeunionism and populism" of comrade P. As Lenin would have

said, comrade E.A. is lost among three pines; unfortunately with him lost, that he lost, the entire base of the party runs the risk of being confused. We are not going to tell him he is irresponsible, that despite being a professional (that is, he receives a rent for his party work, TN) for many years he says such anti-dialectical incongruities, because although we are convinced that he is wrong, he is defending his ideas.

Comrade E.A. and members of the majority who helped him write his letter, did not take into account that working class of the 70s was part of the old Argentine labor movement of Yalta, born and forged while the regime of import substitution was in power. In their whole letter of response, they do not see that we are talking about the Argentine labor movement of today, which is not equal to that of Yalta. What an "internationalist" vision they have of the new Argentine labor movement! They have forgotten nothing more and nothing less than what they are describing are revolutionary processes that took place during the order of Yalta! They are hoping that, as in 1969, and according to their particular analogy, the upper layers of the industrial proletariat will break out when they are taken out some partial labor gain, as when "they were taken out English Saturday". Just now, comrades, in which world and in which country are you living?!

From 1945 to 1976 the Argentinian proletariat entered revolutionary struggles and opened up revolutionary or pre-revolutionary situations in Argentina, starting with the generalization of the economic struggle that was transformed into a political struggle, and which was then contained, either by Bonapartist coups or by the manipulations of a bourgeois leadership, namely, Peronism. Or they entered the direct political struggle against the dictatorships that tried to attack all their conquests. This process crystallized in a great trade union consciousness with a lot of hatred against the bosses, and very little hatred (except in important vanguard phenomena that could not lead the working class as a whole, due to the crisis of the revolutionary leadership) against the bourgeois leadership of Peronism, which has molded and manipulated the political consciousness of the working class for decades, and still continues to do so.

Thus, since 1945, we have seen different vanguard sectors and fringes of the class that, by "different material experiences", entered the battle leading the entire working class. In 1945 it

was the meat workers, who worked the longest hours ever so that the Argentine bourgeoisie could supply the Allied armies in the WWII and fill their pockets with money, and they fought for the time guarantee (that is, a minimum living wage not subject to the amount of meat processed, TN). (Sorry to tell you, E.A., there were the most exploited sectors that gave rise to this new workers movement that emerged in the postwar period, as they had been, in the 1930s, those of construction, which advanced in the first conquests of the unions by industry, and were betrayed by the Communist Party).

In 1955, in the Peronist Resistance (thus it was called workers resistance to the military dictatorship emerging from the civic-military coup, named "Revolución Libertadora", that ousted the 2nd Peron administration and banned all political parties, although centering its repression on labor trade union and factory organizations and Peronist popular bases, TN), to give only some decisive examples, it was the metallurgical workers who were at the vanguard of the fight against the military dictatorship, and who confronted the attempts of the Libertadora to impose a very similar increase in productivity and exploitation of the workers to those who the CEA (Argentinean Enterprises Chamber) bosses are trying to apply today. And in the '70s, it was the auto workers but, as we will explain below, not only because "bosses wanted to take out the English Saturday."

In all these processes, the working class in Argentina during Yalta, fought for collective agreements and for conquests that they had achieved and that the different "democratic" governments and military coups wanted to take away. Comrade E.A. and most of the CC forget, that the auto workers in the '70s were the vanguard because the bosses wanted to snatch all their conquests as "privileged" workers, at a time when the employers needed higher productivity, higher exploitation rate, because they had to guarantee a new renewal of machinery and for that they needed to make large investments, and they tried to make the workers pay for it by taking out their conquests and increasing productivity. It was not just for the English Saturday: the auto revolt of the '70s in Cordoba was the rebellion against the chronometers of the "Measure-timers" that "whipped" the workers to make them produce by complying hellish rhythms of production. Anyone that knows about the Rosariazo, the Cordobazo and the SITRAC-SITRAM (revolutionary upsurges of working class fighting in Cordoba and Rosario, Argentina, the first two;

"classist" trade unions conquered by combative metal & autoworkers in both factories of FIAT Cordoba, the last ones; all of them in the late '60 and early 70s. TN), knows that the latter was born when a worker of the 300 who worked in the furnace of the factory (the most exploited of the FIAT!) started to cry in the dining room and told his companions that he was coming from the doctor, who had told him that he suffered impotency because with the 1200 °C of heat from the oven ahead and the cold of the ventilators from behind, he could not function sexually with his wife any more.

Of course, all the workers in the automotive factories were from the workers' layers that had the most conquests in relation to other sectors of the class, they were even the most cultured, since many of them came from the industrial schools of Cordoba. The aspiration of these technical students was to progress in these automotive factories. But under these material conditions, they could not fulfill this golden dream, and ended up becoming one of the most advanced vanguards that the Argentine labor movement have given.

That the Cordobazo only took place because the "working aristocracy" was taken out the English Saturday is a Morenoite reductionist vision of these events. Precisely, the employer's attack and the workers' response occurred at times, starting in 1968, when the policy of the bourgeoisie was to stop them from being "privileged". That is why there, too, in the bowels of automotive factories, the vanguard were -as a source of inexhaustible resources of energy in combat- the most exploited comrades among the "privileged". Because if this was not the case, the FIAT workers would have continued copying the gestures of Salustro (Director of FIAT factory in Cordoba) and his managers, and sponsoring schools as they had been doing so far.

The course of these revolutionary actions of the proletariat in Argentina in the 1970s was also an expression of the revolutionary essays that, between 1968 and 1976, shook the world of Yalta, at the end of the postwar capitalist boom.

In the workers' movement of Yalta, there was no such thing as the structural strife that exists today in the Argentine working class, as the outcome of many defeat, some of which are of a historical nature and others of a conjunctural nature, and so many betrayals. And this is also a concrete discussion, and therefore, historically determined. Here nobody is saying that,

for example, for the American working class to start fighting and enter the revolution, we must expect that their standard of living falls to that of the Bolivian or Argentine workers. Before that, as demonstrated by the (1997-98. TN) General Motors, Caterpillar, UPS, or construction workers strike in New York, there will be great class struggles and battles, and why not, revolution and counterrevolution. But again we remind the majority of the CC and especially those who are preparing an article about the situation of the world labor movement, that the UPS strike began with the demand of part-time workers to work full time and to collect the same hourly wage as full-time workers. And let's not forget that the workers of General Motors, of which we say they are labor aristocracy, went out to fight because the bosses did not want them to remain so, and not only because they were taken a partial conquest like the English Saturday, but because the bosses closed the factories and these workers went to swell the ranks of the lowest and most abandoned sectors of the American working class, such as, precisely, the unemployed. Can you understand that not only in Argentina has Yalta come to an end? Undoubtedly, we quickly need to advance in a new theoretical elaboration on the world proletariat as of 1989, and as part of it, of the Argentine working class.

From the minority we affirm that in the answer to P. (who only tried to explain to the party his position in the Congress) he finds himself, suddenly, qualified with a new nickname taken from the gallery of the majority fraction: "populist". This is a smokescreen to hide that the majority have the vision of the world proletariat and our country as if we were still in Yalta. Could it be that this shift to the right of the national situation, the delay of a second proletarian wave radicalized nationally and globally has already numbed the neurons to the members of the majority of our party?

This is a concrete discussion, referring to the experiences and the degree of heterogeneity of the different layers of the working class, about how they are going to enter the struggle, and how they are already doing it in this new workers' movement that has been brewing. Comrade E.A. says *"nobody can deny that in the proletariat there are both more exploited and more privileged sectors, and that the entry of the former to the political scene is a sure sign of the beginning of a true revolution"*. The problem that E.A. does not respond is why from 1993 until today, except for sporadic explosions of political struggle and mass political strike, the vanguard

of combat have been the most exploited layers of the working class. And without us still managing to enter into a "true revolution". E.A. has the obligation to say, before characterizing P. as a "populist", if he agrees on that since 1993 the vanguard have been, not the meat processing workers, not the metalworkers, not the auto-makers workers but the public servants of the inner country that had a monthly wage of 150 pesos and were owed six months in arrears (E.A. has forgotten the Santiagueñoazo, where to be able to collect their wages the public servants burned everything, only -unfortunately- armed with hate but also with certain instinct, attacking the buildings of government and the houses of the bosses' politicians!). The public servant-sof the inner provinces were the vanguard of the revolts and of a phenomenal resistance to the Menem three terms government. A government that at that time was supported by the upper layers of the proletariat in the consumer cycle (of course, in relation to the scientific definition of labor aristocracy it would be an overstatement, even at that moment, to call labor aristocrats these Menemist unionized layers that used to throw the leftovers from the factory dining room to the subcontracted workers who washed the bathrooms in the factory, telling them: "Here, you starving losers, have this").

They were then the unemployed, as we saw in the uprisings of Cutral-Có (in the south, TN) and Jujuy (in the far north, TN) those who entered the civil war, albeit fleetingly and spontaneously, in the interior. Meanwhile, the sectors of the industrial proletariat entered into decisive struggles (except for mobilizations of unions for partial claims such as that of SMATA -autoworkers union, TN- in 1994) only when they were brutally attacked, or had closed their factories, or were dismissed, to accompany the reconfiguration process of the new economic concentrations that developed in Argentina under the advance of imperialist domination and transnational corporations. That is to say, when they wanted to convert them into one of the lowest layers of the proletariat, fire them, take them out of all the collective agreements, close the factory, throw them out like dogs or hire them back under conditions of slavery (and not just to get them out of the "English Saturday").

Thus was the revolt and the mutiny of the workers of Ushuaia that led to the death of Victor Choque; or the case of the workers of the resistance, with whom we performed an act in Casa Suiza (downtown Buenos Aires City) in 1995, or those of Aurora in the southern Great

Buenos Aires zone. And even if you, the comrades of the majority, do not want to believe it, also that of the workers of the ex-Cormec who build SITRAMF, not like in '70 because they were taken out English Saturday, but because they were kicked out, and dismissed without termination indemnification; on a new material base, they got up, threw the UOM (metalworkers union, TN) sold outs and confronted SMATA (autoworkers union, TN).

E.A. and the majority do not explain this contradiction that has been going on for five years -many more if we take into account the dismissals of state companies, Entel (Telephones, TN), Somisa (Steel Forges, TN), etc. -. Because the privileged layers were taken out far more than the English Saturday and have not reacted as they did in the '70s. And comrade E.A., who thinks like a meta physicist (i.e., an anti-Marxist who thinks based on an idea that he believes is reality, and not based on material facts and their material causes), cannot explain it. Or is he going to tell us, and the party, that the higher layers have not been augmented a million times their rhythms of production and exploitation, a million times more than the metal mechanics of the 1970s, and have not yet been able to intervene decisively in combat yet?

That is why we are not in a "real revolution", just the opposite of what he says. Could it be that he is waiting for the irruption of the industrial proletariat as in the '70s only because of attacks on conquests like the English Saturday? That is ultra trade unionism, and of the worst kind; it is pacifism that surrenders to 15 years of bourgeois democracy! The industrial proletariat, under these conditions of crisis and tearing of its ranks, has demonstrated in all these years that it can only enter into offensive struggles, unite its ranks and lead the entire working class, when it enters into political struggle, either when there is crisis of the above, or when the regime wants to take their conquests in a generalized way, with Bonapartist methods. This was the case in 1992, when Cavallo (Menem's Minister of Economics, TN) decided to enforce the labor flexibilization laws; this happened again in 1996, after the so-called "Tequila crisis" and the Menem government crisis, when the industrial workers' movement broke out in general political strikes. And it is because of unemployment, because of the convertibility and betrayal of the leaderships that subordinate these political struggles to the parties of the regime and to the social pacts, that in the economic struggle the proletariat feels power-

less, and that from factory to factory the capitalist whip and offensive have the upper hand. That is the reason of the difference with the '80s and the phenomena of "new leaderships" that developed in that decade. Today these phenomena are episodic and disappear under the attack of the employer or end up getting on their knees in front of it, as in Siderar and the SITRAMF, or the telephone workers.

Then, comrades, comrade E.A. and the majority say *"the entry of the most massively exploited sectors to the political scene is a sure sign of the beginning of a true revolution"*. The problem, we repeat, is that we have not been able to enter into a "real revolution" yet because the upper layers, the most concentrated sectors of the proletariat, are contained and subjugated by the bureaucracy and the regime in social pacts and imbued with ideology and customs of the powerful Argentine middle class. That is why the most exploited sectors have already begun to enter the scene but the proletariat has not managed to unite their ranks. yet

The key to this problem, comrades, is the deepening of the state-ization of the unions driven by the bourgeois democratic regime to sustain itself for 14 years, and not because they have not won conquests like the English Saturday or the conquests to the most high (do the comrades of the majority of the CC know that even the upper layers have to work on Saturdays and even on Sundays during 10 to 12 hours?). To the current proletariat and its layers that still remain unionized, the state-ization of the unions has been mining their strengths and their conquests, separating them from those short term-contracted workers in the factories and the unemployed.

We affirm that in the semicolonial countries there is a state-ization of the unions that is causing this catastrophe, i.e., a division of the workers' ranks under semi-democratic bourgeois regimes, and these regimes are based and remain on this state-ization for now. This is the dialectic of the state-ization of the unions and Bonapartism for the semi-colonial countries according to the Trotskyist theses about the unions expressed and corroborated by life itself, with the particular characteristics that the fall of the Yalta order has opened.

For us, the bourgeois democratic regime and this relationship with the nationalized trade unions and through them with the working class, where it is clear that the bureaucracy is the great sellout of all the conquests, cannot

be maintained indefinitely because we are in a semi-colonial country, where there is no "bourgeois democracy for a hundred years", or unions as they were in the old reformist era. Therefore, what the CEA and the establishment are preparing, with this pacifist and sweet wave of today, is to rebuild institutions capable of attacking the working class violently (and not precisely under democratic forms), in order to impose the collective agreements factory by factory, to transform the Argentine proletariat into the Malay proletariat, that is, to provoke a defeat of the likes the Chilean proletariat has suffered.

Thus, it is very possible that the emergence of the proletariat can come, as shown in 1995-'96, as a response to Bonapartist attacks (such as the CEA is threatening with, i.e. labor flexibilization, which so far it could not concrete due to the mass counter-offensive); due to a crisis within the ruling class that allows the generalized political irruption of the proletariat, or through a reconstitution of the vanguard that under a revolutionary program is able to take up the fight and intervene to defeat the treacherous bureaucracy and make more economic the irruption of the industrial proletariat and the unity of the workers ranks. We are not denying specific and short periods of partial economic struggles; however, the minority of the CC believes that we are in a phase of mass political struggle, while the majority, on the other hand, expects a partial attack on the upper strata capable of provoking a new Cordobazo, when these partial attacks have already happened in their vast majority.

Moreover, at the time of writing this platform we may be witnessing the generalization of the outbreak and the international economic crisis, in Asia, in Russia, which is already beginning to hit Wall Street, in our country the stock market fell 11% on Thursday August 27 alone. Perhaps, very probably, as our national document states, the deepening of the crisis and even a crash come before a second attack of the masses. Again, to hope that in these conditions, the upper layers of the proletariat would enter the fight because this or that partial conquest are taken away borders on the ridiculous (the only thing you cannot come back from). It is very possible that an economic outbreak in Mercosur and Argentina leaves the working class and the other exploited classes "shocked" at first. But it will surely end up undermining the bases of support of the regime and the government. We must not forget that both at the international and national levels, the masses hit first, before the economic cri-

sis was here. Very possibly, due to the crisis of those at the top, workers' and people's unity will be recomposed and a mass action will be restarted. We cannot foresee this today, nor that the already existing crisis expressed in the weakness of the government and the regime to impose the flexibilization and the gaps that are opening up in the Social Pact make the masses return to stick again in the national political scene. It is almost certain that whoever has a ultra-tradeunionist, economicist and pacifist vision, this interpretation will seem full of exaggerations. Even some spirits will argue that they coincide basically but that it is necessary to polish it to get rid of any excess. We can only say that the famous oral argument that the party leadership had more and less exaggerated views on the situation and perspectives, ultimately expressed, during the existence of the consensus regime that has fortunately exploded, different political positions and conceptions.

We oppose the position of E.A. and the majority of the Central Committee, who see a pacifist and economicist path for the irruption of the unionized or "privileged" layers of the working class (without Bonapartist attacks or revolutionary crises in the heights), an ultra-unionist path (only caused by an attack to partial conquests) and do not see that the unionized proletariat could only go on the offensive in mass political struggle. This is a vision, ultimately democraticist, that does not see that in semi-colonial countries, as the Trotskyist thesis on trade unions explain, the policy of state-ization of these cannot be sustained indefinitely, nor can be bourgeois democracy. That the current pacifist wave is a great expropriating trap of the mass struggle that prepares new Bonapartist attacks and the exhaustion of the social pacts and the bases with which the bourgeois democratic regime and its parties must maintain the consensus to survive.

The vision of the majority denies that SITRAMF's great struggle was because they were dismissed without termination payment and then taken back for \$ 1.20 an hour, and that an attack of these proportions on the entire proletariat would mean the beginning of a period of confrontation between revolution and counterrevolution. This vision dismembers the action program of the revolutionaries and in this way cannot implement a real program to unite the unemployed and the employed, the upper and lower layers, on the basis of life itself and not through metaphysical dreams of a mechanical repetition of the '70. Because, com-

rades, we are going to tell you a secret: the labor movement of Yalta does not exist anymore. Your theory ends in the vulgar and pacifist economicism of believing that the '70s will be mechanically repeated under these new international and national objective conditions. But comrades, that is precisely the vision of the MAS of 1980, of the MST, of the PO and of all the centrists, who see the evolutionary and peaceful way that scenarios of great economic struggles can be repeated by partial attacks to partial conquests that end deriving in general political strikes and in the revolution, as were many of the revolutionary processes that were opened in '1968 -'74. If this "theory" were true, there would have been about twenty proletarian revolutions in Argentina in the last ten years. Fortunately the bureaucratic consensus in the leadership of the party has come to an end, a consensus that prevented us from displaying the true ideas that each of the leaders of this party have! Unfortunately, we have to display and debate our respective positions under conditions of burst and tendential struggle, a challenge that we fully assume.

But it must be clear that in order to promote the fight against an invented "populism", the majority deploys a position that runs the risk of not leaving stone on stone of all the theoretical and political baggage that we have elaborated on this question, including the balance that we have made of SITRAMF.

Undoubtedly, populism tends to develop when the lower layers of the proletariat are abandoned to their fate and contained with charity and bourgeois welfare. Undoubtedly, populism has been strengthened because only the fundamental battalions of the proletariat have entered the scene in political struggle, to which the populists, such as the PTP and Santillan were responsible for diverting and putting at the feet of the opposition bureaucracy and the latter to turn, at the feet of the Alliance. But this, comrades, does not make P. and the tendency populist; it raises sharply that only from a proletarian, revolutionary and Trotskyist strategy and theory **that fights economicism, pacifism and ultra-unionism, we will be able to fight and defeat populism, which is ultraleft tactically and deeply reformist and opportunist in its program and politics. Let's not forget, that Santillan and the PTP are children of MAS's pacifism and economicism.**

Indeed comrades, we lack a new theoretical leap in our development on the new workers movement and specifically the role of the

industrial proletariat and its most concentrated sectors at international and national level, and the prospects of its entry into national and international (and this chapter does not pretend to be such). Indeed this delay in our development has led to many partial errors, both sectarian and opportunistic; therefore this development becomes essential to carry out without further delay, because imbued with and confused by this national pacifist wave, most of the leadership, unless the majority of the leadership puts a limit to their out-of-all-proportion inventions and attacks, can take steps that dangerously lead to ultra-unionism, pacifism and economicism, ie, to tacticism and to degrade the program in it. Only from this vision can be understood the transitory role played by the slogan "Work for all", for example, articulated with a sliding scale of wages and work-hours and a workers' plan to exit the crisis. That is why we have been arguing against the position of Altamira's PO that is calling for general strikes for wage increases with a minimal program, and we have opposed to it revolutionary action programs to prepare and organize the general political strike. Of course, we do not deny circumstantial periods of economic struggle or pressure, but these are the exception and not the rule, as Trotsky explains in *"Whither France?"* because not all the crises are equal to each other.

Only from this perspective and situated from here the value exists of the whole revolutionary Trotskyist program to unite the workers' ranks, which very possibly, because of the objective conditions, achieve their unity, or set great milestones in that sense, in great battles of masses rather before than the Trotskyists can be a majority fraction in its midst.

Maybe it is because of that economicism and ultra-tradeunionism of the majority (whose counterpart is the propagandism and the abstract program, or "profile"?) they have issued a newspaper where in the midst of the stock market crisis, with three marches by the opposition trade unions to prevent the labor flexibilization bill of Erman González (labor Minister) and the official CGT from being voted; after a mobilization of 10,000 construction workers in the streets that raised the slogan of "murderous bosses", with brewery workers beaten by Córdoba police and the same happening with the public servants in Jujuy, the majority refused to readjust the action program and raise (as proposed by the minority three days before the newspaper comes out), that the organizing axis of the action program should be the ap-

peal to the national strike

Thus, the fighters against the alleged "populism" of the minority tendency, have gone to the right -with the worst propagandism, in love with their own profile- of even the populists themselves, who on their left, issued their newspapers and their agitation by calling to the general strike. What a shame!

In the congress (and we ask that the intervention of **HR** be transcribed immediately) there was much discussion with comrade members of the current majority of the CC and many of their unconditional supporters today, who were crying out for a "profile" for the party. As if the Trotskyists had a different "profile" to our revolutionary program to fight and die for. In the Congress we patiently explained that "profile" and "identikit" was a centrism policy, and that what we had was a program of revolutionary action, which was combined and articulated according to the objective needs of the masses. That the slogan "Down with the Argentine bosses' dictatorship!" was not for us as the slogans "Socialism or misery" or "No payment of (the external) debt" for the MAS, but that it was articulated, even if we agitated it at a certain moment, to a program of revolutionary action. And this, which was one of the key discussions of the congress, was not deeply discussed in the plenary sessions.

As we see, again subjectivism is the other side of the same coin as objectivism. The result is the same: undermining the revolutionary action program and falling in love with the so-called "profiles" (minimum or maximum programs totally dis-articulated, plus some catchy slogans).

Now we understand, as we will develop it in the next points, why the Workers' Plenary voted by the congress is for the majority a tactic to explore (and also a secret one, as it does not even appear in the newspaper), because ultimately they do not see the need today to push it because there are no new leaderships or fighting and combative workers. That is why they do not see a Plenary that is a progressive step in the sense of a political regrouping of the vanguard as explained by HR at the congress. Starting from a gear that is an agreement with the GTR and the POR (part of the fight for the Liaison Committee), to strike on centrism with a policy of demand (fighting between parties) and to point at the new leaderships and progressive phenomena that have arisen as a by-product of the struggles of these

last months, in order to strike on Stalinism, with the political axis that the working class must regroup with an independent policy, regroup its ranks, face the Social Pact and break with a politics of submission to the parties of the regime. And from there, with a progressive pole of action for the class, to promote the rupture of the isolation to which Stalinism and treacherous leaders submit the vanguard.

We learned that at last Sunday's meeting with the POR, the majority of the CC proposed the organization of a "nationalist and anti-bureaucratic Plenary," and that the POR, which is for the Anti-Imperialist Unique Front, of course, accepted quickly. This move has nothing to do with what the Congress decided based on the intervention by comrade HR, which of course, we propose once again that it be transcribed and downloaded to the whole party. Contrariwise, the move towards the POR does have a lot to do with the vision of E.A. and the majority of the party leadership, which in fact proves to be a ultra-trade unionist and evolutionary one, and by that way, national-Trotskyist.

In other chapters we will refer to the rest of the response of E.A. to the minutes of P. and the limitations of the letter of P. But that does not mean we do not say that while trying to combat a supposed "workerist" danger in our party expressed in a circumstantial intervention by comrade P. in the Congress, what is brewing is a position that from subjectivism and propagandism (and all this coated with a veneer of supposed dialectics), proves to be the other side of the coin of workerist objectivism typical of a "party of pure fighters" who believe they are fighting.

We have already announced that in this respect the response to the letter of E.A. does not intend to settle the necessary theoretical elaboration on the international and national labor movement that we owe ourselves. But comrades, here again there is a smokescreen and a loss of proportions, because where there is more empiricism, pragmatism and lack of theoretical research in our party is in the area of a national educational policy, the situation of the student movement and the democratic movement, where our party has 90% of its forces, if not more, with channels to the advanced layers of those movements totally influenced by the petty-bourgeois center-left, and for which for months we have been promoting tactics after tactics and no theoretical elaboration that deserves the name of such. Where are the theses on democratic tasks and the proletarian revolu-

tion in Argentina, which could have prevented us from dissolving in the Ceprodh (a pro-Human Rights group) for six months, ending in acts of May Day where we did not know whether we were speaking as Trotskyists or as vulgar democrats? Where are the theoretical theses on the national educational panorama and the student movement and the political phenomena, or of advanced layers or ideological phenomena, and their relation with the processes of the working youth, to articulate a strategy that finished defining this game (whether we shall be building again the JTRTE, or a Table of Combative Students, or do we put all the youth tactics together in a provisional Table?) once and for all? This is also part of the necessary theoretical elaborations that we need in order not to deviate from the national Trotskyism, that is, to adapt to the regime by means of tacticism.

The danger that today threatens our party is not that we have 50 or 60 shop stewards and union positions in the CTA or MTA, for example. Or labor leaders who are directing the hotel strike in New York as the SWP did. The material pressures of adaptation resulting from the paradoxes that the leadership today wants to deny come from the round-trip channels that we have opened towards the youthful and democratic vanguard. And this is what is wanted to hide to the party in the name of fighting the "workerism" and "populism" of P. and the minority tendency.

But so much disproportion, so much disappearance of the scene of the paradoxes that shape us, of the Circular N° 3 of January of '98 and of the resolutions of the FT of how to fight those paradoxes (resolutions that the majority wants to replace today by "courses of dialectics"), are only a symptom that we are on the verge of a new national-Trotskyist deviation, almost identical to the one that led us to give centrist features to our organization after 1995, because we considered ourselves only an "International Theoretical Center".

A PEDAGOGICAL CONCEPTION OF THE PARTY POLITICIZATION

With an oral method, in its desire to disqualify P. and H.R., the majority of the CC has held innovations such as "*in a league, you do not make tendencies.*" It is also argued that "*no tendency is*

made for one sole point. These arguments are repeated today throughout the party.

For our teachers, however, the struggle of ideas within the parties, organized in wings, blocks and tendencies, was the central engine for a party to find the right direction.

But, you can tell us, they referred to mass parties, not to a "little Marxist league" like the PTS. We regret to say that the existence of tendencies, and even by a single point, is proved in "small Marxist leagues", as happened in the US section in the 30s, about applying or not entreism to the Socialist Party (what is known as the "French Turn"), as well as in the French league itself. Trotsky's writings are full of his interventions in the rich struggle of tendencies that ran through the parties of the Left Opposition, none of which surpassed the stage of "little Marxist Leagues". The history of the Fourth International, after World War II, which is for the most part that of "little Marxist leagues," was traversed by a furious struggle of tendencies and fractions.

Together with our teachers, we state that the struggles of wings, blocks, tendencies and even fractions are the main school of politicization of a revolutionary party and of selection of leaders as held by the founder of Trotskyism in the USA, James P. Cannon, when he tells in "The History of American Trotskyism" about the factional struggles in the nascent communist movement, in his country, after 1917:

"The new movement had to find new leaders; Those who came to the first line were mostly unknown men, without much experience and without great personal authority. It took many long and fractional struggles to see who the most qualified leaders were and who the accidental figures were. The administrations changed quickly from one convention to another... All this was a process of selecting leaders in the midst of internal struggles. Was there another way to do it? I do not know. A body of leaders with authority, able to maintain a continuity with the strong support of the party; I do not know how or where that class of leaders can be consolidated if it is not through internal struggles. Engels once wrote that internal conflicts were a law proper to every political party. Certainly it was the law of the development of the American communist movement of the early times. And not only of the young communist party, but also of the first days of its authentic successor, the Trotskyist movement." (Our Bolds).

The majority of the CC is developing, in opposition to this, a pedagogical conception of the politicization of the party, which is to raise its level with the study of Marxist theory, and dialectics in particular, an academic position that denies the political struggle as the main school of politicization and selection and training of cadres and leaders. That is why we end up holding the position that *"no tendencies should be made"*, because they deny that the central issue of the politicization of the party is the political struggle of wings, tendencies and even factions within it, within the framework of the political struggle against enemy currents. This contradicts the founding documents of our tendential and fractional struggle as TBI against the leadership of the MAS.

Against a pedagogical conception of politicization and the issue of raising the level of the party, although in a different situation but one that allows to see his view, Trotsky writes in *The New Course* (1923):

"In a series of articles recently appeared, it is about demonstrating that to revitalize the party it is necessary to begin by raising the level of its members, after which all the rest, that is, worker democracy, will be added. indisputable that we must raise the ideological level of our party so that it can perform the gigantic tasks that are its responsibility, but **this pedagogical method is insufficient and, therefore, erroneous...**

The party can only raise its level by performing its essential tasks, that is, by directing collectively (thanks to the thought and initiative of all its members) the working class and the proletarian state. **The question must be approached not from the pedagogical point of view but from the political point of view ...**"(Our Bold).

According to his pedagogical conception, E.A. explains his balance sheet -his because it is not the same that the organization has written so far -in his "first response", about the crisis of the comrades of the CON and MNPTR, *"as a product of our bureaucratic methods and above all (that is, the fundamental cause, Ed.N.) of the inability of the entire leadership to explain pa-*

tiently and without pedantry the foundations of the Marxist dialectics"(Our bolds). According to this conception, the crisis of the comrade workers who were in the CON was not due to deep bureaucratic errors such as having dissolved this organization and passed these workers to the base without discussing, and then having dissolved them in the Ceprodh all in the framework of a national-Trotskyist deviation, but because we did not give them a lot of dialectic courses (Let's just say that if comrade E.A. wants to change the balance of the CON, he has the right to do so. What he cannot do is not warning that he is changing it and doing it surreptitiously in the middle of a political discussion, so copying one of the worst gestures of centrism).

In support of his subjectivist and pedagogical conception E.A. quotes the advice Trotsky gave the SWP in *In defense of Marxism*, and also to the Belgian party, on the need to raise the theoretical level of the organization through internal propaganda. Let's clarify that P. in his letter is fully in agreement with this need as a fundamental issue (and makes proposals in this regard that E.A. also ignores). Therefore, E.A. is trying, uselessly, to break in open doors. But such pedagogical concern prevents him from answering the proposal of P. about the promotion of workers, advice given by Trotsky to the same party, at the same moment and ... taken from the same book where E.A. extracts his quotation! We repeat with P.: Speaking about *In defense of Marxism*, we must read it through!

We believe that we have shown that for Trotsky, who does not deny and gives great importance to the political education that intellectuals must give to the workers, the main thing is their (workers', TN) participation in the leading bodies, "*a high political school*". Instead, a subjectivist and pedagogical conception distances us from Trotsky teachings.

The majority of the CC has begun to make, empirically, a pedagogical response: only much study of theory and in particular of dialectics, to raise the level. We state that it is a false and dangerous conception because it begins to lean towards the answer that the MAS centrist direction gave, which responded to the criticism of the TBI with the slogan "consolidate and politicize" -which in fact were many courses (written in the likes of abridged junior high school textbooks) by Mercedes Petit-. As we see, if one falls into sectarian subjectivism, and that danger is carried by the conceptions that the majority of the CC has

begun to develop, the same conclusion is reached as from the opportunist objectivism, which ends up being only the two sides of the same coin.

In the "reasoning for their vote", E.A., M.N., and J.S. accuse the "tendency" of "*transforming this important deficit (the shortage of propagandists) into a resentment against the intellectuals*". But let's contrast again what E.A. says with Trotsky's thought on the attitude of workers and petty bourgeois about dialectics within the party, in *In defense of Marxism*:

"Pretending that every member of the party is familiar with the philosophy of dialectics would be inert pedantry. But a worker who has gone through the school of class struggle, obtains from his own experience a certain inclination to dialectical thought. Even if he does not know its name, he is willing to accept the method and its conclusions. With a petty-bourgeois it is worse. Naturally there are petty-bourgeois elements linked organically to the workers, who pass to proletarian positions without an internal revolution. But they constitute an insignificant minority. The thing is very different when it comes to the petty bourgeoisie educated academically. Their theoretical prejudices have already taken final form from the school bench. Since they had managed to learn a great amount of knowledge, both useful and useless, without the help of dialectics, they believe that they can continue life excellently without it. In fact, they make an exception with dialectics when they cannot sharpen, polish and deepen theoretically their instruments of thought and insofar as it does not force them to break with the narrow circle of their daily relationships, and when confronted with major events they easily lose head and relapse in their petty bourgeois habits of thought".

The majority of the CC would say before this: "*What a workerist*" Comrade Trotsky was! *What a "populist" program full of "resentment against the intellectuals!"*

AN ANTI-DIALECTICAL RESPONSE AND A SUBJECTIVIST AND THEORIST DEFINITION OF THE “LITTLE MARXIST LEAGUES”

P. develops in his letter a position, based on fearing that in the situation of backwardness of the working class and lack of radicalization in which the party develops its activity, plus the excessive weight of the petty bourgeois sectors within it together with the pressures we receive via the Ceprodh and the academic media, “anti-workerist” conceptions begin to develop in the party, skeptical of our possibilities of construction in the working class. He has posed a problem, which we share, in the same sense in which Trotsky states in his correspondence with Cannon, leader of the SWP:

“But there is a problem that, regardless of the greater or lesser speed of the process in the next period, has an enormous importance for us: I am referring to the social composition of the party. The greatest attention should be paid to this.

The party has only a minority of genuine factory workers. In the beginning this is inevitable for any revolutionary party, especially in the United States. The non-proletarian elements are a very necessary yeast, and I think we can take pride in the good quality of these elements. But there is a danger that in the next period the party will receive more “yeast” than it needs” (*“The social composition of the party”, extracted from Texts on the Democratic Centralism, Antidoto Editions, Spanish*).

In another letter, quoted by Trotsky himself in *In defense of Marxism*, he writes about the promotion of workers:

“I have pointed out hundreds of times that the worker who remains ignored in the normal conditions of party life reveals remarkable qualities in a change of situation when general formulas and fluid pens are not enough, when it is necessary to know the life of the workers and its practical qualities. In these conditions, a well-endowed worker reveals self-confidence and also reveals his general political capacity.

The predominance of intellectuals in the organization is inevitable in the first period of party development. At the same time it is a great advantage for the political education of the most gifted workers... It is absolutely nec-

essary that at the next congress as many workers as possible be introduced into the local and central committees. **For a worker, the situation in the governing bodies of the party is at the same time a high political school.** “(*Our Bolds*).

However, in his response, E.A. ignores the question posed by P. and answers him with another problem, that is, he changes the topic being discussed, not respecting not only the dialectical logic, but even the formal logic, that is, the need to keep the same topic discussed during a discussion.

EA answered P. (who had raised a specific issue such as the pressures of reality, among them the pressure of other classes and class sectors on the party), with the abstract argument of how the character of our organization is defined, if it should be defined by the program or by the class from which its members come, which is a topic that is not under discussion. And he argues:

“The Marxist conception defines the small revolutionary worker leagues (and, therefore, their worker or intellectual leaders) **not because of the direct and immediate pressures to which they are subjected**, or because of the social place where they operate, but by their program and the strategy that they raise and defend not only in the local sectors where they intervene, but also at the national and international level. “(*Our Bolds*).

And a few paragraphs below:

“If we do not measure it that way [for the program], the PTS from its birth would not have been an increasingly Trotskyist revolutionary proletarian organization, but a petty bourgeois organization of students ...”

If you are going to defend the need to know a lot about dialectics you have to start by applying it in this discussion and not dissolve a concrete issue in an abstract one, or replace a problem for another in the middle of the discussion. Let's see what Trotsky says in *In Defense of Marxism*, even though we are once again making a long (however necessary) quotation:

“Vulgar thought operates with concepts such as capitalism, morality, freedom, workers' state, etc., con-

sidering them as fixed abstractions, presuming that capitalism is equal to capitalism, moral equal to moral, etc. Dialectical thinking analyzes all things and phenomena in their continuous changes while at the same time determining in the material conditions of those changes the critical moment in which A ceases to be equal to A, a Workers' State ceases to be an equal to a Workers' State.

(...) The dialectical thought gives to the concepts -by means of successive approximations, corrections, concretions- richness of content and flexibility; I would say, even, up to a certain succulence that to a certain extent brings it closer to the living phenomenon. There is no capitalism in general, but a given capitalism, in a given stage of development. There is no Workers' State in general, but a given Workers' State, in a backward country, within a capitalist siege, and so on."

The conception of E.A.'s letter is anti-dialectic. It means that there is no a "given" party, which develops its existence in certain material conditions of the working class and other classes, of the vanguard, of the political situation, with the crisis of the Fourth International, etc., but an abstract party, one "in general", defined, once and for all, by its program.

E.A. can disagree with us on how the reality shapes our party, or maintain that there is no danger, or that the danger is "workerism". What he cannot do is to deny the problem correctly posed, with "*richness of content*" and "*certain succulence*", very dialectically, in P's letter.

E.A.'s abstract definition, although correct in general, does not serve as a tool for Marxist analysis of the PTS as it is "given" today, unless we develop the character of a self-satisfied sect that is contented to say how revolutionary its program is. A party with a correct general program may deviate, and it will probably deviate, here and there, in its concrete activity. The programs, however revolutionary they may be, are carried out by people of flesh and blood, leaders and militants who are facing all kinds of pressures and dangers of adaptations.

If they are not corrected, these deviations can be transformed into adaptations (a leap of

quantity into quality, a dialectical law). History is full of parties that kept on paper an essentially correct program, while degenerating (and conversely, a party like the Bolshevik was the most revolutionary in history, with an incorrect program regarding the peasantry, in addition to a incorrect theory about the character- and the social subject of the revolution). The "vulgar thinking" cannot understand these contradictions because it "operates" with static abstract concepts.

Of course, the definition of a party **begins** with its program. But dialectics allows us to incorporate other concepts, which in a **hierarchical** combination, give us a "*certain succulence that in a certain measure brings it closer to the living phenomenon*". On the other hand, the view that the definition of the program is enough to characterize the PTS (or any other small Marxist league), as in its beginnings, is insufficiently determined for the question that is in debate, that is, it is static and therefore vulgar. We could make an abstraction of that element, fundamental undoubtedly, when we broke with the MAS (abstraction that we never really did because we were always aware of the excessive weight of the students in our organization), because the core aspect was the political-programmatic delimitation. For that moment, that definition was enough.

But for the purpose of discussing how a party that has long since left the political-programmatic delimitation stage is going and is planning to move towards vanguard parties, linking to sectors of the vanguard and having responsibility where we intervene, such a definition It is totally insufficient.

That is, the PTS is not equal to the PTS! We have already existed as a party for 10 years, in attempts to break out of national isolation and to fight against the danger of a national-Trotskyist degeneration, in the attempt to become a vanguard party and to defeat our competitors, centrism and Stalinism. The "first response" method of E.A. liquidates the fact that unlike when we broke away with the MAS, we have defined the PTS not only because of its old propaganda group features but also because of the new action group feature.

Is it licit, or not, to ask whether the possibility of adaptation and even degeneration of our party, under certain conditions can jump from possibility to inevitability (another dialectical law that vulgar thought is incapable of understanding)? Is it lawful, or not, to think and

discuss, the ways and measures to combat it? But a subjectivist conception, such as the one that E.A. defends in the name of the majority of the CC, ends up denying this danger, because it implies that the correct program, and the handling of Marxist theory, particularly dialectics, are a guarantee that this does not happen. We are facing a supra historical vision of the party that denies parties are shaped by reality. Of course it is key that without a correct theory there is no revolutionary praxis, but that theory is not acquired "in slippers". On the contrary, the parties are forced to enter the battle with the weapons they possess and improve them in the heat of that struggle. Trotsky argues that the theory for a party is like science and technique for a country, which are what define the outcome of a war. But he explains that for the parties it is the same as for the countries, which cannot wait evolutionarily to count on all the advances to enter one, but in general they are forced to get involved without having yet all the necessary preparation, and to resolve that contradiction to the heat of the war itself.

This conception liquidates in a stroke, most of what we have written about the party in the last year, ignores that we had a "democratist" deviation in the serious error in the march against Clinton that came to question the leadership, that in the incidents of January with the disappearance of B. there came to light elements of adaptation to 15 years of bourgeois democracy, which was why the "quality" of our party was questioned. And fundamentally, it denies the causes of the national-Trotskyist deviation, as they are explained in the resolutions of the FT meeting: Are they going to tell us after all this that reality does not mold a "little Marxist League"? In what world do they live?

IN DEFENSE OF... THE CONSENSUS REGIME

In his letter, P. proposes two measures, albeit partial, to combat the dangers he sees, (which refutes the accusation on P. and HR being a "tendency without a program"): the promotion of workers to leadership positions and that the discussions of the CC be downloaded in minutes to the party, so that all the members can form their own opinion about the positions of the different leaders.

E.A. accuses P. and the "tendency" of being "populist". But, if E.A. is a fan of defining cur-

rents only by the program, he should explain what these two proposals have of populism (because we do not see anything of populist in them), even if they are partial, as P. himself is careful to clarify. Both are taken from the common baggage of our organization and from a serious study of *In defense of Marxism*.

E.A., on the other hand, in his "first response", shows an irresponsible attitude, because instead of answering these proposals seriously and responsibly written by P., he only polemicalizes with the things that P. would have said according to San Martin comrades. His expression: "*Finally a first document to discuss*", is a bluff and a demagogic overture because actually he ignores what P. has written.

To the last of the two proposals of P., E.A. answers: "*Who can oppose that all party members know the positions of the leaders, the discussions, and the process by which a synthesis is reached?*"

Actually, this response is to save face, as he finally does not give it any importance, because then says: "*If so far we have not done it, I do not believe it is because many comrades made a cult to 'teamwork', to 'consensus'*". E.A. would seem to say something like: "I agree, but since no one complained..." As if that were the way a leader has to act: on demand.

We regret to tell comrade E.A. that the party has been complaining for a long time. That there are more than enough reasons, and not precisely discovered by the TBI but written in the documents of the party, to think that the party regime is insane. Or does he consider the crisis of the comrades of the CON and their withdrawal only as a temporary malaise? Are not the crises of the Cordoba regional and worker zones such as Campana without the leadership's balance sheets for more than a year, or the dangers of adapting to the bourgeois democratic regime and even centrist degeneration, which were a constant and the theme of the main party documents in the last year? Why all these symptoms, being E.A. one of the main leaders of our party, did not make him think of this way out before?

EA confirms in spite of himself that P. and the "tendency", and not he or the majority of the CC, are the first ones to pose this proposal in a concrete way. If it is true that they agree, E.A. and the majority of the CC have the obligation to recognize that the "tendency" is right, at least at this point, and stop dividing the party by repeating that the tendency "*has no program*".

**THE CONSEQUENCES OF THIS
CONCEPTION ARE DISASTROUS:
THE LIQUIDATION OF THE ACTION PROGRAM**

As we see, adopting a subjectivist conception threatens not to leave stone on stone of Leninism and Trotskyism. The immediate consequence is propagandism. If, as E.A. says, the "little Marxist leagues" are characterized by the program, inevitably, although E.A. does not clarify it, this means that he is referring to its general and historical program, which would be the guarantee against all adaptation and degeneration. Is that if the "leagues" are characterized by the program over a period of 10 years, as the PTS, this cannot mean anything else than the general program that the "league" votes (and corrects) in the Congresses.

But together with this program, it is mandatory to define a revolutionary action program, that is to say, the set of slogans articulated for each concrete situation of the class struggle. This is the case either for a small propaganda group that does not intervene but only forms and educates cadres in this way, as well as for vanguard parties that have the responsibility to intervene. By definition, this revolutionary action program is constantly changing, because it adapts to different more or less short periods or situations of the class struggle. For that reason, it cannot be the basis of the E.A. definition, which as we have already seen covers a period of ten years.

The different slogans of our general program, and even some that are not in it but arise from the concrete situation, change its hierarchy and its importance in the program of revolutionary action, ceasing to be for the agitation to become for the propaganda or vice versa. The slogan of General Strike or Walkout sometimes we agitate it never isolated but as part of a program of action -as it should be now- and sometimes disappears from it.

It is this action program that ultimately defines whether the intervention of a party is revolutionary, or whether it is leaning towards sectarianism or opportunism in the face of the counterrevolutionary leadership of the mass movement, or if it is capitulating to some phenomenon of reality, in a given situation. As we see, inevitably, there is a dialectic, a close and contradictory relationship between the program even of a "little league", and reality, -even though E.A. wants to separate them with

his conception that the fact that reality molds us- it is secondary. This relation is not contemplated by the subjectivist conception in the "first response" of E.A., for which the only thing that is worth is the general program, which can be translated into that there is permission to capitulate in the concrete intervention.

Both objectivism and subjectivism liquidate the revolutionary action program. Objectivism, for whom the masses and the movement are everything and party and program are secondary, reduces it to finding and formulating the "two or three slogans that mobilize". Morenism formed cadres in this conception, for which a small party could direct the mobilization of the masses if it was capable of finding those slogans. Of course, the "two or three slogans" reduce the action program to a minimal, opportunistic program.

For subjectivism, on the other hand, the party and the program are everything. This variant liquidates the revolutionary action program by way of going with the whole program to the masses. It is a sectarian and propagandistic conception.

In the MAS, in the late '80s, when it was a large vanguard party that aimed to gain mass influence, this last conception began to develop. In this social-democratizing conception, if the party embraced the masses, to the point that there would be no soviets, it was a question of making much propaganda of the socialist program.

Objectivism and subjectivism end up being two sides of the same coin, both liquidate the revolutionary action program, either by opportunistic or sectarian trail. To a subjectivist and propagandist conception, i.e., going with the whole program to the masses, it is where the majority of the CC is moving quickly in both newspaper issues Nos. 38 and 39.

There is not a glimpse of a revolutionary action program in any of the two issues. Let's recall that No. 38, with its cover proclaiming only "*Down with the bosses' dictatorship*" was published before the rally to the Congress called by the CTA-MTA on the day of the Labor Reform vote. It did not arm to intervene at that concrete time, along with the most furious denunciation, with the demand to the "opposition" bureaucracy for a general strike, nor with any policy of independent organization of the vanguard since the slogan of "*Worker Plenary Meeting*" had disappeared.

Subsequently, although the betrayal of the bureaucracy now puts the slogan for a general strike on a more educational level, it does not appear either next to that of *"Emergency Worker Plan"* in No. 39, which does not clarify how to impose that plan. As can be seen, both slogans that appear on the Front Page: *"Down with the bosses' dictatorship"* and *"Emergency worker plan"* end up being used in that way, just like MAS's "Socialism or misery".

We find in La Verdad Obrera Nro. 39 an article entitled *"In the face of the catastrophe that threatens us, the working class must fight to impose an emergency worker plan"* where a program appears that is a long list that goes from *"Down with the labor reform!"* to that of *"For a Workers and Popular Government!"* and that of *"Federation of Socialist Republics of Latin America"* going through **the entire PTS program**. Presented together as the response to the "crisis", we are not facing a revolutionary action program but rather a true electoral platform.

Actually, the sectarian, in the words of Trotsky, is just a frightened opportunist. Therefore, although this program speaks of everything, it is **pure opportunism** because, in addition, it does not say anywhere which is the first condition to apply the *"Emergency Worker Plan"*. The slogan, which cannot be lacking in any program that claims revolutionary in this situation is precisely what the majority has "forgotten": the slogan of *"Down with the (bourgeois) economic plan!"*. That is, the call to defeat the "convertibility" (the parity 1 peso= 1 US dollar imposed by the bosses' government, TN), which is the "all-out war on labor" that employers, imperialism, government, opposition and bureaucracy have agreed on. Along with this slogan, there has also disappeared, as we have seen, the need to mobilize to impose it, i. e. a general strike or stoppage that is the first step of a plan of struggle to pull the economic plan down.

Regardless of global "trends", the crash has not happened in Argentina yet, and if it happens, if the decisive intervention of the workers' movement does not prevail by imposing its way out, it will be in the form of the blowup of the "Convertibility Plan" in the conditions imposed by the big bosses and Imperialism. On the contrary, the big employers have voted that "convertibility" is maintained. That is, they bet that with recession, unemployment and flexibility, they will domesticate the labor movement and weather the crisis. So far (which does not mean that they could not change if they see it necessary) the most concentrated of the monopolies

believe they do not need the crash, that is to get rid of the "convertibility" and the "stability", because they still count in their favor with the panic that the previous outbreak, the 1989 one with the hyper-inflation, caused in the workers movement and the masses. For the proletariat, as the Transitional Program says, inflation and stabilization are *"two extremes of the same cord"*. They bet, for now, the blackmail over the labor movement, i.e., that regardless of the hard struggles that have been taking place since 1996, it accepts that unemployment and flexibility are preferable to another "hyper" and that the middle class for the same reason accepts to tighten the belt, with the story that it is a temporary inconvenience. Of course, if this is not the case, the whole weight of the crisis will fall on their shoulders in the form of a bang, which shows that the crash is the consequence that neither of the two classes in conflict has been able to decisively tip the balance to its favor, but that is not what is happening now.

In the absence of this dialogue and these slogans to explain the need for the workers to anticipate the bourgeoisie by defeating the economic plan and then open the possibility of imposing an *"Emergency Worker Plan"*, our "internationalists" of the CC majority, that have been announcing in the circulars and documents against the TBI a future supposed deep response to the new situation of economic crisis and of "tendencies to the crash" against the "national-Trotskyism" of the TBI, end very low, in a "socialist way out" MAS style, which would be applied within the convertibility and without a revolutionary struggle in the streets (that is, through the elections?). Such a program is so general that in the cover of La Verdad Obrera No. 39 it is presented as a recipe *"in the face of the **global** economic and political commotion that threatens us"*, that is, it is the universal recipe that the PTS launches from Argentina. Such a "lighthouse of the world"!

What is the matrix of the propagandism of the majority of the CC ? An evolutionary conception of the entry into the scene of the most concentrated proletariat through the continuation and generalization of the *"mass counter-offensive in some countries"*. If this is the case, it is enough to wait, carrying on socialist propaganda until the workers' movement decides to enter. But this vision is far from establishing a true and profound relationship between *"the current situation of the world proletariat and its relationship with the current economic crisis"* as members of the majority argue against us in Circular No. 5.

The reason is that the majority cannot present on the relationship between the crisis and the tendencies to the crac, or the crac itself, and the situation of the workers' movement, more than a vulgar and superficial vision. To begin with, because everything cannot be included under the label of the *"situation of the world proletariat"*. What is this "situation" that the majority of the CC speaks about? Is it the one of the Korean workers who were already hit by the crash and respond defensively like the Hyundai workers? Or perhaps the Argentine working class, which after hitting before the crisis, and then betrayed by the bureaucracy and stuck in the Social Pact, is now paralyzed hoping that the crisis does not break loose? Or perhaps the Russian working class for whom the crash is developing before their eyes, establishing objectively revolutionary conditions that raise the possibility of their intervention through revolutionary actions? The superficial "global" analyses of the majority do not allow them to distinguish the colors, that is, the richness of the situation.

From Circular No. 4 they pretend that this view differs from the "catastrophist" PO-type one as well as from that of the "new phase" theorists such as the MAS. They forget and have made disappear that there is a third non-Marxist vision, which is the evolutionist that does not see for example that the economic crisis and the crash tendencies do not allow for an evolutionary continuity of the *"mass counter-offensive"* of '95, which does not mean that objectively revolutionary conditions are not developed, but quite the opposite; but we already know, the rope is not named in the house of the hanged man.

If what we have just said seems exaggerated, the central article of analysis of the world economic crisis, signed by Juan Chingo and Julio Sorel, follows the same delirious path: *"While day by day we follow the course of the crisis and the world class struggle, we put all our energies in propagandizing and **agitating** (!!) a workers' emergency program (like the one we express in the pages of this same issue of La Verdad Obrera) so that capitalists pay the crisis"* (our bolds). Reconsider it, comrades: "agitate" a program that has (we have counted them)... 57 slogans! That is the answer-recipe to the *"economic and world political upheaval"*? Do you want to think a little bit again?

The majority of the CC says to follow Lenin with his famous pamphlet *"The catastrophe that threatens us and how to fight it"*. From this point of view, it is correct to present such an "emer-

gency plan" to educate the vanguard. But far away were Lenin and the Bolsheviks from going with this entire program to the masses, before which they never stopped agitating, even educationally, the slogans of their revolutionary action program such as Peace, Bread and Land! All the power to the Soviets! Or in their respective moments: Everyone against Kornilov! or Out with the bourgeois ministers!

Because if not, it is inevitable that serious opportunist errors of the right will be reached in the concrete intervention, as in the recent march called by CTERA, the school teachers' union: while the Stalinist PTP withdrew with a large column before finishing the act demanding the general strike, the blurred column of students who respond to us, who was silent in the agitation of this point, was forced as all the left to keep up with the Stalinists. Do they want to convince us that the "little Marxist leagues" are not shaped by reality, as in this case, in which they are capitulating to the strong feeling of the middle class of the Federal Capital, which is a fan of "Convertibility"?

In the same La Verdad Obrera no. 39 there is, however, a sad simulation of an "action program" in the article entitled *"For a meeting of workers' organizations that want to face the offensive of the bosses"*. It is the same method of mixing slogans, where the slogan *"Down with the economic plan!"* is not raised, but yes, there is the one of *"Down with the presidential institution!"*, at a time when Parliament has just to vote the Labor Reform Bill with the complicity of the Alliance (then an opposition party, it would win the next election and ascend to the presidency, TN), that is why this article brings the novelty that being a more concrete article than the one about the world crisis, does not raise a single word about the need to repudiate and break with the bosses' parties. We would be facing a *"workers' meeting"* to *"face the offensive of the bosses"* that... does not call to break with and fight against the bosses' parties!

The majority of the CC has ended in the worst opportunism in the form of a supposed "internationalism".

Comrades of the majority, we say to you again: Stop! Do not follow the path you have taken! It starts with an attack on the supposed "workerism" of P. and declares something as apparently harmless as that the "little leagues" are defined by the program, and look where it comes!

CHAPTER 4

The Majority fraction falling off a cliff once again:

A revision to the Transitional Program and the Thesis of the Third International

A MISCONCEPTION ABOUT THE WORKING CLASS THAT LIQUIDATES TROTSKYIST PROGRAM

For E.A., talking about "labour aristocracy" in a backward country like Argentina is a "theoretical atrocity which leads directly to populism". In order to provide fundaments, he uses the Leninist definition of labour aristocracy as a phenomenon of imperialist countries, which E.A. explains as a "*layer of the proletariat in the central powers that get benefits from the crumbs falling off colonial exploitation and were and are the social base of big reformist parties and counterrevolutionary labour bureaucracies that led to imperialist war.*" And he adds:

"Stating that in our country there is a labour aristocracy in the Leninist sense is a theoretical atrocity or something new that we have not heard of; unless the comrade (*tendency? Fraction?*) states that Argentina has become an imperialist power. The

fact that in a semi-colonial country the working class is not homogenous, that is, it comprises different layers with varied degrees of privileges (v.g., in permanent staff and outsourced; natives and immigrants; employed and unemployed; unionized and non-unionized) has nothing to do with the statement that in our country there is labour aristocracy... Is this anti-Marxist statement a new outburst of comrade P? Or is it a brutal expression of their sliding towards populist positions by comrade P and the tendency, which they had started outlining in the Congress and in the letter? .

Firstly we would like to point out that E.A. will have to discuss with Trotsky and the Transitional Program to keep holding this atrocity that leads him "straight to..." reformism. E.A.'s assumption that labour aristocracy exists only in the imperialist countries does not belong to Marxism. It is a complete distortion, which has devastating consequences, as we will see.

First of all, comrade E.A., in a hurry for giv-

ing his "first answer", has forgotten that there is "labour aristocracy" in... the bureaucratised workers states. By quoting the Leninist thesis without considering that it stated the degeneration of II International but could have never mentioned a posterior phenomenon like the bureaucratization of the worker state, E.A. liquidates a whole chapter of the Transitional Program, namely... political revolution!, that has as its slogans, "Down with the privileges of the bureaucracy! **Down with Stakhanovism! Down with the Soviet aristocracy** and its ranks and orders! Greater equality of wages for all forms of labor!" ("Stakhanovism", does it ring a bell, comrade E.A.?). Just to add some clarification, a few lines later the program states: "it is necessary to drive the bureaucracy and the **new aristocracy** out of the soviets." (Our bold)

As we can see, the statement that "labour aristocracy" is only a phenomenon of imperialist countries, as E.A. says, is not true. And Trotsky does not just use "aristocracy" lightly, as a synonym of "bureaucracy", since he cared to name them separately. This proves he is talking about two, although connected, different categories.

The programmatic consequence of what E.A. states is, clearly, liquidating political revolution and transforming it into democratic revolution (!), since it would amount to merely eliminating political oppression and bureaucratic dictatorship and restoring soviet democracy. On the contrary Trotsky states, in the Transitional Program, that there are two elements that spark political revolution: "A *fresh upsurge of the revolution in the USSR will undoubtedly begin under the banner of the struggle against social inequality and political oppression*". If we go deeper, what other thing do national conflicts in the former USSR express (even if in an entangled, deformed way) if it is not the confrontation of the working class from the oppressed nations and Chauvinism of Great Russia's working class? We rule out the idea that, in order to keep his statement, E.A. could dare to say that the former USSR is a new imperialist country. We feel we are not exaggerating when we state that E.A.'s position has terrible consequences for the program.

Although this should make E.A. think on the statement he has so lightly issued, it could be argued that he is right as regards the semi-colonial countries. That would be completely false. E.A. is so blindly eager to discussing P. and TBI's "populism" and "work-

erism" that he has run over Marxism on his way.

Trotsky says in 'Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialist Decay':

"Colonial and semi-colonial countries are under the sway not of native capitalism but of foreign imperialism. However, this does not weaken but on the contrary, strengthens the need of direct, daily, practical ties between the magnates of capitalism and the governments which are in essence subject to them – the governments of colonial or semi-colonial countries. **Inasmuch as imperialist capitalism creates both in colonies and semi-colonies a stratum of labor aristocracy and bureaucracy**, the latter requires the support of colonial and semicolonial governments, as protectors, patrons and, sometimes, as arbitrators. **This constitutes the most important social basis for the Bonapartist and semi-Bonapartist character of governments in the colonies and in backward countries generally. This likewise constitutes the basis for the dependence of reformist unions upon the state.**" (our bolds)

E.A. looks for shelter, like anyone who wants to distort Marxism, in ambiguous expressions like "layers with different degree of privileges." Because for him, everything comes down to the lack of homogeneity in the working class due to different degrees of exploitation, the kind of working relationship, national origin, etc. He talks as a sociologist. Trotsky, on the other hand, is more accurate with concepts and says: "strata of labor aristocrats and bureaucrats," using a category, "labor aristocrat" taken from Marxist heritage and from Lenin (unless people wanted to say that by using this "theoretical aberration", Trotsky has broken away with Marxism). Trotsky widened the Marxist category of aristocracy to the Worker States and backward countries, not by breaking up with Lenin but by extending the concept to new phenomena that Lenin did not witness.

Trotsky is not talking about the lack of homogeneity of the working class due to inequalities of capitalism, but about the phenomenon of bureaucratization and state-ization of unions by imperialist mo-

nopolies, of a "stratum of labor aristocrats" coming as an excrescence of the bureaucracy. This "stratum of labor aristocracy and bureaucracy" is so important for him that, as we have seen, he considers it as the *"the most important social basis for the Bonapartist and semi-Bonapartist character of governments in the colonies and in backward countries generally" and for the "the dependence of reformist unions upon the state."* Can E.A. deny that there are thousands of shop stewards in our country enjoying plenty of privileges, for example acting under commission as "agents" of the AFJPs (private agencies that administrated compulsorily the workers retirement savings in exchange for huge commissions and "administration expenses" that slashed the part of the future retiree, TN), without it being an "imperialist power"? Can E.A. deny that there are workers of SOMISA (former State Steel Works, now in private hands, TN) who not only have higher wages than the outsourced workers –the latter being the majority in the plant- but who also get a share of the corporation profits through the "Participated Property" (Some minimal stock given to the remaining workers after the privatization of the huge state companies to divide them from the rest that was laid off and sometimes, some of them hired again by outsourcing agencies, TN) imposed by monopolies as part of the privatizations and defeats suffered by state workers in the State companies? We affirm that in the companies where workers suffered defeats during the '90s, monopolies and international financial capital –like Trotsky says- imposed a "stratum of aristocrats" who get the crumbs of the profits made by monopolies. We state, crystal clear, that privatized companies fired over 300,000 workers; that in those companies the majority, or at least a large number, remained working as outsourced labour with miserable wages and flexibilized; and that there is a small minority who collects profits from the shares and Participated Property, who are labor aristocracy that support Cassia, Brunelli, Lescano (bureaucrats that manage the unions which sold out the public servants, allowed for and benefitted from the privatization of the very important industrial, railway and energy state companies, TN). It is a law, like Trotsky says, that whenever there is imperialist domination, there is "a stratum of labour aristocracy and bureaucracy".

E.A. denies the history of the Argentinean working class by denying the existence of

a "labour aristocracy" in our own country, in Trotsky's widest sense and not in the restrictive one posed by Lenin in his first definition. Where were the "yellow" unions led by Stalinism, Socialdemocracy and the Radicals (from the bourgeois Radical Civic Union Party, TN) during the "Libertadora" dictatorship based on, if not on a "stratum of (labor) aristocrats"? What was if not reflected in 1945 division between CGT N°1 led by the anti-worker Socialist Party –based on the white collar workers and privileged sectors who were the rank and file of the Democratic Union (a coalition between social democracy and Stalinism, both of them worshippers of "democratic imperialists", which denounced Peronism as a form of fascism, TN) and of cooperativism (mostly in the hands of the CP, TN)- and the New CGT led by Peronist bureaucracy and political Peronism which manipulated the most exploited strata, called "cabecita negra" (black heads, TN) by the "gorilas" (anti-worker mid and high middle classes, TN) of the Democratic Union? What was the origin of Sitrac-Sitram unions in Cordoba –later the grassroots of classism-, if not a "labour aristocracy", where most of the leaders were members of the Radical Party while the former were pro-bosses unions comprising privileged workers, created by the bosses to divide the UOM (Metalworkers Union) and the Smata (Autoworkers Union)?

As Trotsky said, by acting as servants and jailers under the command of the state dominated by imperialism, these labour aristocrats and bureaucrats undermine their own ground. That is the dialectics of the state-ization of the unions and Bonapartism in the semi-colonial countries, which our professors of Marxist Courses cannot understand.

Of course "*labour aristocracy*" is more developed in an imperialist country than in a backward country. If this is what E.A. means, it is a platitude. The label "*labour aristocracy*" is relative; obviously, in semi-colonial countries the scale is lower and less differentiated. But this is a sociological vision from bourgeois universities. Together with "*labour aristocracy*", E.A. has forfeited the law of uneven and combined development, narrowing the working class in a national-Trotskyist vision, though Trotsky stated "*This law can be observed in the most diverse spheres of the development of colonial and semi-colonial countries, including the sphere of the trade union movement.*" (Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialism).

PACIFISM, WHICH DENIES THAT THE TROTSKYISTS PROGRAM IS THE EXPRESSION OF THE MOST EXPLOITED LAYERS OF THE WORKING CLASS

Unfortunately, with this conception, if the Majority of the CC supports it, they will be dragged to pacifism. Because denying the existence of labour aristocracy in semi-colonial countries means forgetting the struggle within the working class against counterrevolutionary reformist leaderships and against the bureaucracy, by diluting the material base of this struggle. Like E.A. himself states, reformist parties and counterrevolutionary bureaucracies get a social base from labour aristocracy. According to the Transitional Program, *"Opportunist organizations by their very nature concentrate their chief attention on the top layers of the working class". The problem is E.A. sees the problem reduced only to imperialist countries, since for him, in a country like ours -against what Trotsky considers a key issue that, we repeat, is the "the most important social basis for Bonapartism and semi-Bonapartism"- is just a question of "a higher or lesser degree of privilege", which means the different layers are "more or less" the same. This shows semi-colonial countries living in an idyllic, unreal, pacific world where the struggle between revolutionary parties against counterrevolutionary parties and bureaucracy is reduced and minimized.*

But even if this vision is sociological and superficial, this should not prevent E.A. from stating that the **Trotskyist program is the expression of the most exploited layers of the working class**. The problem is that according to the new conception inaugurated by the Majority of CC -if it is taken all along the line-, this notion would amount to the worst kind of "workerism" and "populism".

Once again, let's go to the Transitional Program:

"The sections of the Fourth International should seek bases of support among the most exploited layers of the working class".

Now what? But if this is not enough, let's get more quotations. The following one is taken from the Congresses of the Third International in the time of Lenin:

*"By actively defending this layer of the working class (the unemployed, Ed.N), **by supporting the most oppressed section of the proletariat**, the Communist Parties are not championing one layer of the workers at the expense of others, but are furthering the interests of the working class as a whole. This the counter-revolutionary leaders have failed to do, preferring to advance the temporary interests of the labour aristocracy. **The more unemployed or short-term workers there are, the more important it is that their interests become the interests of the working class as a whole, and the more important it is that they are not subordinated to the interests of the labour aristocracy.**"*

But E.A., who cannot allege that he is not aware of these basic documents of the Third International, says the opposite. In La Verdad Obrera N° 39, E. A. accused us, in the article "Intense (Intense? Ed.N.) internal discussion within the PTS", of creating "a sort of theory in a document presented on the day of the Congress (Chapter 3 of the current document, presented separately and before the issue of this platform, Ed.N.) **posing as a norm that the lowest layers of the proletariat (unemployed and outsourced workers) must impose their mark to the highest layers, i.e., the most concentrated sectors, 'privileged'** as they call them." (our bolds)

Let's ignore the fact that E.A. is a conjurer, who attributes to us h words we have not used like the expression "lowest layers", which we have not used in our document, and he supplants with it words we did use like "the most exploited layers"; and he confuses "the most concentrated sectors" with "the privileged" ones. Are they going to deny that in Siderar and Somisa, just to name two examples, the highest layers, unionized in the UOM, work alongside thousands of workers, deeply divided from them, that are contracted by outsourcing agencies or, if they are lucky, under the collective agreement of the construction workers' union (which have less benefits and a lower wage than the UOM's, TN? Will it be that this division does not exist in ARS?

Leaving that aside, the least we can do is to protest against the nonsense we are reading: How do we, "populists" of the TBI, says E. A., dare even think of stating that the most ex-

exploited sectors "impose their mark," –namely their interests- over the "temporary interests" of labour aristocracy (like the Third International states)? This is "scrambledism", he cries. We wonder: if this path is followed, under which programmatic "norm" are the revolutionary cadres and members going to be educated, either E.A.'s or the one of Lenin's Third International? We wonder; how is the unity of the working class going to be achieved in order to defeat bosses' greed?

The Third International states *"The Communist Party, as the representative of the interests of the working class as a whole, cannot merely recognise these common interests verbally and argue for them in its propaganda. It can only effectively represent these interests if it disregards the opposition of the labour aristocracy and, when opportunities arise, leads the most oppressed and downtrodden workers into action."* This must sound like "populist" delusions to the Majority of the CC!

However, in E.A.'s conception, even when he repeats the generic truth that the *"Trotskyists program... (struggles)... for unifying in a revolutionary way the most exploited sectors (like the unemployed) of the proletariat with the most concentrated sectors,"* the party is a sort of glue for putting together different sectors of the working class, which is unified by the propaganda of the program, against the Third International which stated that the only way to do it "effectively" is, "when opportunities arise", against "the opposition of the labour aristocracy". That is to say, through violence if it is necessary. We are sorry to say that once again E. A.'s position is a breakaway with what revolutionary Marxism states, in pursuit of a propagandist conception.

We do not know how to solve a struggle in a factory where what is coming are re-entrenchments, attacks on collective agreements and threats of lay-offs, and where there are many outsourced workers –as happens in most of Argentina factories- unless we follow the "norm" stated by Third International. Naturally, before such scenario different sectors of the factory would tend to unify, but inevitably outsourced workers may hesitate at first; "If we go on strike, they will kick us out," the workers would say rightfully. So, there would be union bureaucrats, as for example, Gutierrez (of the UOM, TN) did many times, who would say "Guys, go on strike with us and if you are attacked, we will defend you." This argument may convince them and then they would go on

strike against re-entrenchments, lay-offs, etc. But, how can this unity be held "effectively"? Only if from the beginning of the negotiation the first point is "outsourced workers must become permanent-staff ones".

If the revolutionaries allowed a different policy, we would be signing that the division in the strike has started. Because any concession to the permanent-staff workers by bosses would be used by the bureaucracy to divide –and leave some other conquests along the way as they always do- by saying, *"let's grab this; it's better than nothing," or, "we'll lose the bonus, but lay-offs are worse."* And if any honest worker dares asking the bureaucrats about the outsourced workers, they would say *"Legally, they do not belong to the union and there's nothing we can do, but if one of them is attacked, we will see what we can do; we will study each case individually."* We can kiss unity goodbye.

On the contrary, the revolutionaries struggle to unify the working class "effectively" (and not to "glue" it). That is why we defend that the first point of a list of demands must be that outsourced workers become permanent-staff ones; whether they grant us that or the negotiation is over. And the first organizational point to keep this unity is the "Strike Committee" where the outsourced workers must have a proportional representation. That is why we are fully aware that the "organic bodies" of peace time must be changed in times of war. And this cannot be achieved unless it is by imposing the "mark" of the "most exploited layers" (or "low" ones, as E.A. likes to call them).

The conception defended by E.A. and the Majority is already having terrible consequences regarding the practical adaptation to the "high layers" of the proletariat and the bureaucracy. For example, in Rio Santiago Shipyard (ARS). In La Verdad Obrera #39, after the great victory achieved two months ago with shop stewards elected in a voting by showing hands, the internal commission belonging to the ATE (State Worker Union) union bureaucracy held a meeting with the bosses and the ATE secretariat. Then the internal commission brought a proposal before the assembly of workers: 100 outsourced workers would be part of the permanent staff in exchange of "social peace", which was rejected naturally. However, a few days later they came back adding the bargain about wages to the proposed 100 workers; they lost again but this time they got a bigger support.

We wonder if our comrades had a policy of calling to expel the bureaucrats from ARS so they cannot enter another assembly. The article does not say a word about it, being this a very important political question.

We do not know either, it being equally important, if our comrades called immediately to create a struggle committee with higher representation of the outsourced workers, who are taken hostage in this situation, which should become the leadership of the struggle by posing the slogan, "Down with traitors and scabs! The condition to any negotiation is that all outsourced workers must become in permanent staff!", "only the struggle committee conducts the bargain", etc. If that was not the policy, if we did not pose the need of a grassroots insurrection to topple the old leaders and substitute representatives of the outsourced workers, we are starting to bow down. They may say this was the policy (which is really striking since it is not mentioned in the paper) and that the centrists and the PTP prevented this from happening. Then, why are they not denounced in the paper?

The body of shop stewards of ARS, which emerged against a bureaucratic maneuver, had paths to follow: either moving towards a true factory committee, by posing the immediate organization of outsourced workers with direct representatives; or becoming what it is today: another "new leadership". The policy of our union fraction in ARS, unfortunately, is following the steps of centrism. An anti-Marxist conception of the working class, eventually transforms our union fractions in elements of pressure over the bureaucracy or in "new emerging leaderships", in the best case scenario. Can they deny that this is a good example of how the most privileged layers of the working class pressure and shape our party and distance us from a revolutionary policy? But everything works if it is a case of fighting against "populism"!

BREAKING WITH THE SOVIET STRATEGY

We do not want to keep providing quotes. We feel that everything is clear throughout this polemic about the path to follow by the most concentrated sectors of the proletariat and its highest layers in order to enter the picture, which is a key issue for the revolution. But we must bear in mind that we

are before a conception that reduces the role of the most exploited and oppressed sectors to a secondary one, because they are waiting for the high layers of the proletariat to enter the picture, like in 1968 (during Yalta period), repeating this experience mechanically. E.A. is wrong in defending a mechanical vision of the entrance of key battalions of the working class into the picture, against any Marxist analysis of the relationship between capitalism's crisis, "tendencies towards a crash" and the situation of the labour movement, which we have proven to be pure evolutionism. (We have to point out that while we were writing these lines, we received Bulletin #5 where three members of the Majority of the CC debate with us. We are not going to answer here the amount of distortions and falsifications they do of the real positions of our document. They have just repeated E.A.'s mistakes by increasing them).

But this infatuation on the working movement of Yalta, with the undeniable role played by labor high layers in events like the "Cordobazo" and under the spell of Yalta order, leads E. A. and the majority to develop a "theory" on the working class that denies the role of the most exploited layers of the proletariat and the relationship of the Trotskyists party with them. Unfortunately, this vision shares points of view with the privileged layers and, whether E.A. likes or not, the "labour aristocracy", which do not give any rights or organization to the outsourced and unregistered workers; however, when they are forced to fight, they remember both the latter exist, call them and say: "Guys, if you support us, you might get something as well."

We must bear in mind that E.A. has written that he is against the "norm that the lowest layers of the proletariat (unemployed and outsourced workers) must impose their mark to the highest layers, namely the most concentrated sectors, 'privileged' as they call them."

Whether E.A. likes it or not, his conception capitulates to the "high layers" of the proletariat and through them to union bureaucracy, by liquidating the factory committees, and not just that; it also abandons any Soviet strategy. The "Soviet organisms" of the Majority would be very strange because in them, by E.A.'s "norm", it would be forbidden that the most exploited workers impose their "mark" -namely the revolutionary demands of the Trotskyist program- to the "high layers". That is to say, E.A. and the Majority of the CC -against those who defend the Trotskyists program, which is the only one

that allows the unity of the working class- defend as a "norm" for the Soviet organisms, the same submission to the "high layers" that unions impose on the "lowest layers", in the best case scenario with a unionist program.

They are breaking away from revolutionary Marxism. They have become defenders of Soviets ruled by the bureaucracy and counterrevolutionary parties, namely the petty bourgeoisie, like the conciliating soviets of the Russian Revolution from February to September 1917. Comrades, be careful with the consequences of what you are saying! Because, where can this negation of "lower layers" imposing their "mark" lead you, if not to accept, "under certain circumstances", the open violent attack by the bureaucracy based on the "high layers", against the "lowest" layers? Comrades, please bear in mind the experiences of Cutral C6 and Jujuy last year!

How else can this confrontation be solved if not through a "combat"? Are you trying to say that you believe, like the MAS, that just with peaceful propaganda of the Trotskyist program we can achieve the unity of the proletariat over the material interests and influence of the enemy classes? Comrades, you are revising Marxism and the common stock of the PTS!

On the contrary, for the Transitional Program the relationship is the other way round. Our fight within the Soviet organisms is for breaking this submission. That is why it is related to the factory committees,

"The prime significance of the committee, however, lies in the fact that it becomes the militant staff for such working class layers, as the

trade union is usually incapable of moving to action. It is precisely from these more oppressed layers that the most self-sacrificing battalions of the revolution will come."

Once again: too much "populism"! The issue of the unity of the working will be solved through a revolutionary Soviet way, as a "Chief Staff to enter the fight" of the most exploited layers of the proletariat. Such perspective is annulled by E.A.'s unionist, pacifist and economic vision. It states that the struggles of the most exploited layers are subsidiaries and must hold the line until the most concentrated battalions enter the fight in economic struggles; for him, any other vision is "populism".

If this path is followed, it would end up denying the soviet perspective, which is precisely based on the *fact that Soviet organisms answer to that "new layers of the oppressed will raise their heads and come forward with their demands. Millions of toil-worn "little men," to whom the reformist leaders never gave a thought, will begin to pound insistently on the doors of the workers' organizations."* (*The Transitional Program, Soviets*). Before this, the Majority of CC must be wondering in panic, "won't these backward workers, toil-worn 'little men' want to 'impose their mark'?"

Shame on them! Under the smoke screen of fighting against "populism" and "workersim", the intellectuals of our party have developed conceptions that could be heard in lectures for shop stewards organized by CTA, chaired by Bilbao and friends, and other "Marxist intellectuals" of center-left.

CHAPTER 5

The PTS has two mutually exclusive choices:

**Either a Leninist Party
or a Morenoist Party**

IN THE TENDENCIAL STRUGGLE, A HIDDEN SELF- PROCLAIMING SUBJECTIVIST FACTION BECOMES VISIBLE

The majority faction applied a factional "surgery" in order to leave the TBI outside the party structures. They launched an attack saying our current is a "secret faction" inside our party. Against all this, we affirm there has been a blow-up in the top party leadership. There has been a blow-up that demolished the consensus with which this leadership has been working at least since November-December 1997. Nobody who is at least a bit serious can say comrade Hugo Ramirez, one of the top leaders of the party, who enjoys wide prestige among broad sectors of the party membership, has organized a "secret faction" to try a de facto "coup d'état" within the party against the majority of the leadership. Had he done this before the above mentioned blow-up, today the TBI would not have comprised only 26 comrades that gathered together in defense against the anti-democratic actions of the majority faction. Nobody can doubt that at least 100 comrades would have been called to be part of this "secret faction" long before the

blow-up that happened within our leadership in the beginning of August 1998.

The TBI emerges as a defensive response to the blows received from the majority of the CC outside any Leninist democratic centralism. Then the TBI has become (and will become each time more) an offensive tendency facing all the positions that were deployed by the majority faction in the debate. The majority positions have nothing to do with what we have been elaborating together all these years. They have nothing to do even with the documents and memos that we have written during the last six months, which are now also questioned by us to a large extent.

We were brave enough to tell the party the truth; which things we agree and which we do not agree on the last elaborations -something we will go further on later in this chapter. The majority faction, **a hidden faction that came forth deploying new banners**, does not even act with this elementary responsibility of telling the party that in this factional struggle they are changing in a broad fashion what they have elaborated and written themselves. That because it is a confusionist faction that performs

microsurgery to try and change stealthily the party policy and elaborations, without saying what they are changing. With an empiric pragmatic method they are deepening a centrist national-Trotskyist turn in our organization.

As we have proven above in this entire Platform, we, as a tendency, will discuss the points in which we have differences, the issues which we think are deep deviations in the party policy, program and regime. They will not move us from this position. We do not consider ourselves a different party from the PTS. We will keep on discussing the main issues which, as we understand it, are the causes of this deep deviation and the collapse to which this deviation might take us.

The majority faction has rejected any proposal for common elaboration regarding the analysis of the new issues that are surfacing because of the changes in the international situation. With the typical arrogance of academicians who believe they know -and can solve- everything on their own, they have refused to work and elaborate jointly with the TBI. In 30 days, they have not accepted any of the collaborations we proposed them. For us, the tendencies to the international crash and the economicist evolutionist position developed by the majority faction, far from narrowing the differences, make them even more acute. So we affirm that -as it is proven in the next point of this chapter- in the bursting of the party leadership, a hidden faction has emerged and come to light. It is raising its banners. If it takes over the party, the acute centrist features that we already have will be sharpened. These new banners and temerarious positions of the majority can be summarized as follows:

a) The majority faction has broken away completely with the conception of internationalism and the resistance struggle we waged as a Trotskyist left for not degenerating in Argentina, including with the strengths and limitations of the last international turn we started last summer, which became concrete in last July FT (Trotskyist Fraction, international current of PTS), meeting and resolutions. This means a new national-Trotskyist deviation promoted by the International Commission of the PTS, which wants to be the "little lighthouse of the world", with a theoretic subjectivist deviation that became concrete in the document "fundament of a vote" for calling to an Urgent Congress, signed by Emilio Albamonte, Manolo Romano and Jorge Sanmartino. This document is essentially opposed to the resolutions voted in the last FT meeting. They even deny what we wrote in

Part 2 of the pre-congress document of June 25th 1998: "We have not stopped being a group within the Argentinean Trotskyism that publishes its literature in Spanish, with even less international relationships than a national-Trotskyist sect as PO. This is a result of the non-existence of sectors that clearly turn left among the main currents of the Trotskyist movement; but also it is a result of our national-Trotskyist deviation, that made us to explore deeply the possibilities of a Liaison committee for the reconstruction of the Fourth International only after the Congress".

As could not be otherwise, the intensifying of these centrist national-Trotskyist features have taken the majority faction to copy Lutte Ouvrière's anti-democratic anti-Leninist way of handling the tendency factional struggle within the party.

However, most serious, and which proves that we are before a national-Trotskyist centre that deepens every deviation we had, is that they separated us from the cells. They did not allow us to stay as part of Estrategia Internacional Magazine editorial board as we, the TBI, requested. This shows that the International Commission of the PTS acts as the leadership of a "mother-party" because we were also separated from the editorial board of the paper which we have long strived for it to be an organon of the entire FT. That is, we acknowledge that -according to the majority fraction- the 3 August Plenary Congress of the PTS has ousted us from the Trotskyist Fraction... without the FT groups' resolve or even knowing.

No doubt we are confronted by a hidden faction that is fledging its real positions.

b) The majority faction, in just thirty days, has coined a definition adapted to its factional interests, according to which the Marxist leagues are defined only by their program in general. And since the PTS is revolutionary, therefore any tendency that arises within it is regressive. The establish this rigid definition without starting from the fact that ours is a Marxist league of propaganda and action, with ties in the vanguard and advanced layers, as it is defined in the last documents of the party, which today the majority faction revises. League that is built today essentially in the spaces of the regime, and where the only drawback would be, according to the majority, "not having sufficiently adept propagandists capable of capturing people for revolutionary Marxism", i.e., for the PTS.

Again, this faction that was hidden under the consensus regime now takes flight.

c) The hidden faction that has emerged in this struggle of tendencies has changed without saying all the balance sheets, both of the MNPTR, which apparently now would be the cause -as our party's first attempt to approach the workers' vanguard and merge with it- of all the national-Trotskyist evils of our organization (see Article by Emilio Albamonte of La Verdad Obrera No. 39, and the Internal Circular Note No. 5, the response of T. Moreira, Manolo Romano and Jorge Sanmartino to Chapter 5 of our platform, page 8). For this majority faction, all the paradoxes that mold our party have disappeared. Circular Interna No. 3 of February 1998, where we stated that we have been in the bourgeois democracy for 10 years, and that there had started, in the face of that crisis and the previous arrest of more than 140 comrades in the anti-Clinton march, a process in which the revolutionary character of the highest leadership was questioned, due to their democratism and legalism. Where we affirmed that a process of petty bourgeois dilettantism (not at all of "workerism", comrades of the majority) was worsening that added to the national-Trotskyist deviation and was leading us to degenerate by tacticism and democratism due to our dissolution in the Ceprodh .

Thus the emergent hidden faction **now denies the paradoxes that are shaping us.** Not only those that come from the 10 years of bourgeois democracy, but those that push us more and more towards centrism as a byproduct of our international isolation.

d) The hidden faction that has come to light today, has deployed a position according to which the Ceprodh and the Marxist Courses have only positive aspects, adding that in those places we only have still to start "gaining for the PTS" (see article by Emilio Albamonte in LVO No. 39). The fact that we are building in the middle of a deviation of the mass actions and without any radicalization within the masses has disappeared from the analyses, though we have been rising those two warnings in all documents since December 1997. For the majority, the most serious danger is "workerism." In fact, they are thus resigning to maintain, in this preparatory phase, a deep work in the workers' movement, starting from what has already been conquered, both in it and in the Workers' Youth. This shows that the majority faction wants to be built through gaining people for the PTS in the academic and democratic media, and the only thing that they regret is not having a national electoral legality. Its conception looks like two peas in a pod, to the tactician and movementist conception of MAS of '88, as it could not be otherwise, but this time,

presented in a very "erudite" wording.

e) For the majority faction, "the economic crash has changed everything", while the only thing that they have elaborated on the crash have been two purely analytical pages of La Verdad Obrera, with vague forecasts so general that they can never be said to be wrong. But this is no more than an attempt to adapt their theorism and tacticism (i. eg., they made disappear the tactics of the Workers' Plenary, all those that have to do with the construction of a Workers' Youth, putting an end to its campaign, and the National Plenary of Combative Students) to general propaganda campaigns to appear on television (such as the Ceprodh, nudging with the MST to see who puts the Party logo in front of the cameras) or the campaign for Leon Trotsky Center, taken as one more campaign of signatures and detached from a real strategy of combat against Stalinism in all areas. And of course, starting the Marxist Courses.

f) For the hidden faction that has emerged in this struggle of tendencies, "the crash changed everything", including the revolutionary program of action that disappeared and was replaced by a general program of "Workers' Plan in the face of the catastrophe that threatens us", that even goes (in the words) as far as the dictatorship of the proletariat, but that is not assembled or articulated with the struggle to defeat the current economic plan, with the confrontation to the "national unity" hoax and the parties that support it, or with the need to resume the path marked by the struggles of Cutral Có, Jujuy and the general strikes. It is a program that does not combat the parties of the regime, Convertibility (it seems that the Workers' Plan is to be carried out within the convertibility regime of the bourgeoisie and imperialism [*convertibility: one Argentinean peso equals one US dollar. TN*]) and is an universal emergency workers' plan, a recipe for all the countries of the world. Here the boasting of the majority faction reaches its peak, transforming Lenin's pamphlet "The catastrophe that threatens us and how to fight it", September 1917 (which was to form cadres and explain patiently to the broadest vanguard of the Soviets to prepare it for the urgent task of seizing power) in a recipe for general, classical propaganda typical of the sects that go with their entire program to the masses. That is why the Workers' Plenary, the National Combative Students' plenary disappear... because "the crash changed everything", and seemingly also the revolutionary action program of our party!

That is, theorism, tacticism and going with the whole program to the masses, liquidating the

revolutionary program of action, adding a "profile" to "sell many newspapers".

As we can see, from the TBI we were right when we affirmed that the party regime, which we saw as movement-oriented, with cells that only applied tactics, and the CC organized in regional "axes" just to promote them, was an expression at that time of a deep deviation in politics, one that already corresponded to the deep deviations that we were dragging and that now have stuck a qualitative leap forward in the hand of the policy that the majority is driving, which besides is expressed in a totally undemocratic form and extracted from the arsenal of Trotskyism of Yalta with which they have carried out the factional struggle, first against two members of the CC and today against the TBI.

THE BLOW-UP OF THE PARTY LEADERSHIP AND THE PTS

Collapse, blow-out, are the terms that most itching and hives causes to the exponents of the majority faction. We do not understand why they are so scared of these terms. Or, we do believe we understand why they reject it outright. They do not understand how to speak of collapse if the majority faction has continued publishing the newspaper, directing "tactics", and even now they talk about releasing the Estrategia Internacional on a monthly basis. They seem to say: "Now we are better than before! What kind of collapse do they speak about?" "Only two CC members have declared a tendency, and they are a tiny minority comprising a few founding cadres!"

For us, their having applied such a sudden turn in conceptions, in politics and even deepened in this factional struggle the movementist and bureaucratic elements, mean a true COLLAPSE of the PTS that, as a revolutionary current, is being dragged to a centrist brink by the majority faction, with a method of *fait accompli*. And centrism collapses, or anyone that comes dangerously close to it (as is the case today of our party) also collapses. You can make it collapse in the form of blow-outs or blow-ins, or collapse in installments, like it is happening in our party, first with the molecular loss of many valuable comrades in the last months, with the loss of comrades with whom we had not completed a merging, as the former GIT of Cordoba, with splits

towards the Partido Bolchevique, as the former youth of Cordoba or, in the present case, with the emergence of a principled and leftist Trotskyist current, the TBI of the PTS.

Whoever lean dangerously to centrism and begin to collapse, do not like to talk about their collapse. They want to show a reality of their party that does not exist. They are afraid to look at themselves in the mirror and see that a scratch may be becoming a dangerous gangrene.

The most important thing for us (let the majority take care of their image), however, is that this collapse began in the highest echelons of the party, because **as demonstrated and it began to unfold in this struggle of tendencies, even before the vanguard and the national and international Trotskyist movement, new positions began to emerge that were impossible to contain without collapsing amidst a consensus regime that tried to cushion them, to moderate them for months, until it burst.** And it could not be otherwise. The only principled position was that of the TBI, which tried to settle them in an organized debate, with a serious and loyal struggle of tendencies within the party, and drawing lessons from it towards the whole of the vanguard and the Trotskyist movement, maintaining despite this, party discipline in action. That's why we fought before and now against our separation from the base cells the majority faction has imposed.

The TBI is which tries to give a deep response to this collapse, as we demonstrate in this Platform. The TBI is which affirms, as we do now, **that these positions deployed today by the current members of the majority faction, have been constantly insinuated by them in recent months.** Not only, as we have already shown, in relation to the internationalist turn, when they proposed to publish an Estrategia Internacional with international correspondents (a kind of global La Verdad Obrera). **Moreover, when the CC secretariat discussed the articles on the global economic crisis of El No. 7, some members of the International Commission, headed by Christian Castillo and Juan Chingo, were firm supporters that during the boom of the 2nd postwar period there had been a strong development of the productive forces, against the opposite position of HR. Moreover, they thought that it had been the period of greatest development of the productive forces of the**

entire history of capitalism. This position, which was polarized with another one immediately labeled "estagnatist", did not reach anyone's knowledge. And the comrades did not write those positions under their signature and their responsibility. This discussion was left resting for later... and nor was it communicated to the whole party, so that all the members could study, position and argue about this exciting theoretical discussion at the end of the 20th century!

Also their positions began to be suggested when they commented that socialist propaganda was central to open the work in the workers' movement, positions promoted by Christian Castillo and Jorge Sanmartino, which now materialize with their issuing the program of "workers' solution to the crisis" and the policy of "selling many newspapers".

All that is needed is for the leaders of the majority faction to obtain the exclusivity to impart Marxist Courses in all the state universities, as Comrade Manolo Romano is trying to do in Neuquén and Comrade J., in Córdoba, so to build a movement of academic Marxist Courses, as our "theoreticians" of the International Commission of the PTS came up with so many times, at every step transforming circumstantial, episodic tactics, in the real strategy of construction.

And as it could not be otherwise, lowering in each one of these tactics the action program while disconnecting them from the whole of the revolutionary strategy and program.

Starting December 1997, the members of the current majority faction screamed in the CC, "Let's dissolve the CON, everyone inside the Ceprodh!". After the 1st May, they defended in the CC a position that affirmed that we had done "great MayDay ceremonies" because we had outnumbered the other centrists in attendance, while in fact we had carried out shameful events, where it was not clear whether we were Trotskyists or vulgar democrats.

Consensus means what we wrote in Chapter III of the pre-congress document, that we had not created a discussion commission with the CON leadership comrades to completely gaining them for the PTS when we gave that violent and nonstop turn to Ceprodh. But that is demagoguery! Because even though we had done twenty thousand congresses with these comrades under our direction, it was for them to vote to be all dissolved in the Ceprodh.

Consensus means that the current members of the majority faction took two months to accept that in the period starting in April, with the heroic struggle of Rio Turbio, until June, molecular processes developed in the vanguard, against all the forecasts by our organization. And they refused to accept it because those processes aimed to actualize a turn towards the proletarian vanguard. And they only accepted it when these processes were channeled by the union bureaucracy that took the lead in them, that is, when they had already been controlled and it was too late for our party to take a new turn towards the workers' vanguard. They breathed a sigh of relief: "We can keep calm with what is ours". That is to say, affirming everywhere that "Backward workers like those of the Cordoba Brewery, we do not even see them in our party!", "Alas, they do not even have a copy of the AntiDhuring under their armpits!". "In more than ninety days of taking a factory and confrontation with the police, how is it they did not have time to read it!", "I am not convinced, I am not convinced, that it was important to win a party cell among the workers of the Brewery! ", say the cadres in Cordoba that were won over by the majority.

Consensus means that since the previous Congress, two prominent leaders of the former JIRTE have been insisting, as they even stated at the April Congress, that their position is in fact to constitute a new JIRTE, an independent Trotskyist Youth. This is a discussion that comes from months ago. We have proposed a Youth Commission of the CC; we have also proposed that they organize and lead youth plenaries, but we have never encouraged them to write their positions and fight for them in the party as a whole. A true bureaucratic-demagogic policy is what we have developed in the consensus regime of our organization. And in Chapter III we regret... not having done the same with the workers of the former CON.

Consensus means that undoubtedly, there are differences about the assessment of the MNPTR. In all the documents that we have written in the last year, we claimed it as a tactic and a revolutionary attempt from our party, in spite of it having led us to strategism and propagandism due to the objective conditions. Then we opened a discussion of what would have happened if we had really connected with a sector of the workers' vanguard, in the midst of the national-Trotskyist deviation. We concluded that precisely because we did not propose to dissolve into the workers' vanguard, but rather strengthen a Trotskyist

section in it, if that section had developed, very possibly those workers would have exerted a syndicalist pressure on us, but also very possibly if a proletarian boom developed in our country, they would have forced us to turn left, either as a counterpoint to the syndicalist or workerist pressure of that current, or due to a turn to the left of the whole situation. Quite possibly, we would have been obliged to accelerate the development of our internationalist turn. However, we cannot assure this today, they are counterfactual hypotheses.

In the youth plenary after the August 8 and 9 congress, comrades Christian Castillo and Juan Chingo stated that the MNPTR and La Verdad Obrera tactics were really the cause of our national-Trotskyist deviation, while they claim a somewhat overacted repentance in front of an audience totally pressed by the center-left, and self-criticizes themselves for having been "the Taliban" (fundamentalists) of the workers' movement in the university.

Comrade T. Moreira insists on the MNPTR -in an appendix of a supposed response to supposed positions of ours on the famous Chapter V of our Platform- in the same sense as the abovementioned comrades. No one explains how is it that great conquests of ours remain from that period, such as the La Verdad Obrera's denouncers, and a newspaper that on that basis showed that sectors of advanced workers could participate, in their own way, in the construction of our revolutionary movement.

As we see, after having made different attempts for two years to link ourselves to the the vanguard and a real revolutionary proletarian movement, and having failed in this over and over again, different layers of comrades have been created in the party that have drawn different lessons from this intense activity in the last period.

This is also the case with the lessons of SITRAMF and our intervention in it, which led us to cut with the ex-GIT comrades. We refused to write a position as a leadership, both a balance sheet and our own point of view, shielding ourselves by saying that this had to be discussed around the central documents of the CC. Thus, a very interesting note, written by G. de Córdoba, was left in a drawer to languish unattended; the note stated that we could not establish ourselves firmly in the factory because our program did not fight uncompromisingly for the contracted workers, who were the first ones left behind by the new leadership that emerged and then went to the right, i.e., the leadership of Gallo and

company.

There is a letter by HR addressed to the comrades in Córdoba, where it outlines the position that we did not perceive the transition of a leadership that emerged based on a factory committee and direct democracy (in a moment when we tended to coincide with some wings or sectors of it), to a leadership starting to transform itself into a "new leadership" and so to act and subordinate itself to compulsory arbitration and the State, a change that began to prepare their pass over to the UOM bureaucracy. That is to say, we were unable to see the turn from left to right and from right to left in the transitory phenomena of the vanguard.

Meanwhile, many workers were critical and withdrew when we imposed their dissolution into the Ceprodh. Others, like the South comrades, dissented but from a right wing position, as they criticized that the tactic had failed and we did not go up "quickly, quickly", and so they could not be stars in the sky of the MNPTR; as a consequence they also broke up with our organization.

Therefore, comrades, we affirm that our tendency within the CC was totally progressive and revolutionary, breaking this consensus that was de-politicizing the party. Look at what rich discussions on strategy, theory, program and revolutionary lessons we were preventing all the members of our organization from developing! The majority faction is an obfuscated bureaucratic faction, which with administrative resolutions wants to cover up and conceal that the only possibility that our party assimilate these "failures", these deviations, and learn collectively, was in a party with wings, with opinion groups, with blocks that tried to give an answer, that allowed politicizing and raising the level of the whole party.

A party like that, in true effervescence for taking lessons, would have been a million times stronger against the pressures for capitulating. A million times better prepared to try and draw these lessons and link them to the lessons of the international class struggle, and to the struggle among parties within the Trotskyist movement.

That is why, as a tendency within the CC we affirmed that the secretariat was acting as a faction against the CC, and this in turn as a faction against the cadres and the party as a whole, because it impeded this political struggle, suffocated it.

And today, the majority faction wants to hide these terrible contradictions that led us to a collapse, under the supposed existence of a "secret faction". What a depoliticized and depoliticizing shame! What a low level! Because they do not realize that they are still tied to that consensus, and that when the bogeyman tale of the "secret faction" is over, they will collapse again between them and the party base, unless they degenerate totally as a sect.

"(You created a)Tendency solely for bothering!",shouted Emilio Albamonte to protect his cadres against the Tendency in the CC. Though, *you are the tendency for bothering the party*, comrades, and also for bothering what we have conquered together in these hard battles against centrism and revisionism.

And meanwhile, in the midst of all this eclectic "great elaboration" of our party in recent months, cornered by the paradoxes that did not stop shaping us, the party rank and file were isolated, only carrying out the tactics unattached to any strategy (given that the latter did not exist), tactics that were reworked at each step according to the lurches of what issue prevailed or not in the consensus regime. **This led to a profound depoliticization of the party as a whole, despite we were realeasing the magazine each time more frequently, and theoretical and international articles were becoming increasingly sophisticate.** As Trotsky said: ***"The party can only raise its level by performing its essential tasks, that is, directing collectively (thanks to the thought and collective initiative of all its members)... Ours is a party: we can have rigorous demands with respect to those who want to enter and remain in it; but once you are a member of a party, you have the right to participate. For that single fact, of all its actions. The bureaucracy annuls the initiative and thus prevents the raising of the general level of the party".*** (The New Course).

Because there was no other way out than to process these discussions that took place, other than to try to develop the positions that were under discussion all the way, to take minutes from the CC of the different positions. Let the leaders of the CC write and show their passport, and not secretly and stealthily in the footnotes, as they did in the last Note No. 5, changing -in small font in note 3- all the balance sheets that we have been elaborating. We should have shied away from making compromise agreements like the ones we did so many times. We would have to have downloaded all the positions and wings that

were in the CC to all the cells of the party, so that they could intervene in that discussion and in the elaboration of the international turn, the strategy and of the tactics that the whole of the leadership was concocting behind the party. That is why there were two Congresses, in April and August, none of which could resolve the discussion about the party, and with what strategy and what program to go all the way to overcoming the paradoxes that shape us, with a revolutionary perspective.

That is why we believe that the point in the Platform of the Tendency of the CC about fighting for a winged party is a revolutionary one, it is completely fair and correct, as it proposes that the rank and file participates in the discussion and synthesis when there is one, via the central committees' proceedings, via internal bulletins of discussion, via open discussion in the newspapers, and via articles written under the exclusive responsibility of the signers in Estrategia Internacional. Therefore, we claim that with this struggle of tendencies, far from being the PTS destroyed by Machiavellian "secret factions", the different positions that were subsumed under the consensus regime are trying to express, in a much more honest and loyal way to the party and the vanguard.

It was high time to break the routine and conservatism of the tradition of the initial propaganda group. And today the majority faction, which does not want to break with that routine and conservatism in the methods of leadership and in the party regime, is making both the party and all its cadres conservative by hiding this crude truth.

The two former members of the CC and today members of the TBI, especially HR, were responsible, as far as they are concerned, for maintaining this consensus policy, which, as we will demonstrate below, was expressed in documents and in eclectic policies for the whole of the party. This is something the majority faction does not recognize or want to recognize. But unlike what E.A. writes in his reply to P. (when he says that "he had not realized" that there were comrades who disagreed with this regime) we believe that we were part of it, beyond our level of consciousness, and that only condemning and exposing it to the whole party and constituting ourselves as a tendency of the CC first and then as the TBI, we actually assume all the responsibility that was set on us as leaders, to try to correct it and reverse it in a tough struggle within our party. And we do it without prejudice or fear of losing "medals",

“prestige”, without demagogic and populist mea culpa, and without fear of being left alone and in a minority since we are totally convinced that we are giving a fair fight.

And as we have already seen, one of the clearest examples of this consensus regime is the new positions, which the majority faction is now deploying once the consensus has collapsed and the members of the TBI have been disengaged.

When the consensus regime breaks that tried to hide the different positions and wings that began to express themselves in recent months in the heat of the paradoxes that were shaping us, inevitably leads to collapse and bursts, because it is not a democratic centralist regime that allows open and fraternal discussion of differences policies between leaders and grassroots members of our party.

In Morenoism, the equivalent of this regime of consensus was a supposed monolithism around the great personality of Moreno by all the members of the MAS Central Committee. But when he died, the true positions of each one of those leaders and of all the wings that were in it came to light, and the MAS ended up exploding in right and center wings, workerist and centrist currents that evolved from the center to the left, like ours, before the first pressures of reality.

We inherited that regime of consensus from the stage of propaganda group, (only of elaboration of the theory and program), which played a great progressive role in our party, since there were 80 or 100 cadres who participated permanently in these political and programmatic elaborations, in many conferences, and allowed us to form 80 or 100 Trotskyist cadres. Yet, we wanted to maintain that consensus regime when, starting with the mass counter-offensive, we started a turn to the vanguard in 1995, and that obstructed even the development of party defenses that would have prevented us not to derail to national-Trotskyism.

So in this sense for the TBI and its program, the alternative is unsubduable, for Marxist leagues that try to go to the forefront or do not want to degenerate as self-proclaiming impotent sects: either a Morenoist party, where the leaders have a large centralism, that is, compliance with the general secretary and in our case the consensus of its most important leaders; or a Leninist party, with great discipline in the action but with wings, blocks, groups, and revolutionary syntheses made for the party and also for the vanguard,

which it wants to lead for later leading the masses and taking them to the seizure of power.

But where all this ends up being crystal clear, is in the total eclecticism of the documents that were presented to the last extraordinary Congress, that undoubtedly can be taken, for that reason, in favor of any of the positions that are today in discussion, an eclecticism that will drag us into the mud of centrism if we do not fight it openly.

THE DOCUMENT FOR THE EXTRAORDINARY CONGRESS OF AUGUST 8 AND 9, 1998: THE GREATEST PROOF OF THE ECLECTICISM OF THE CONSENSUS REGIME

As we have been announcing in this Platform, the eclecticism, far from clarifying the political positions, only manages to confuse the party. The maximum expression of this is the documents presented on 6/25/98 with the title “Boletín Pre-Congreso Extraordinario (Extraordinary Pre-Congress Bulletin) No. 1” and the Annex entitled “Agregado del CC al documento para el Congreso Extraordinario (Addenda of the CC to the document for the Extraordinary Congress)” on “The role of the struggle among parties in the strategy of the PTS-LVO”.

Any attentive reader who dispassionately wants to study the bulletins of that pre-congress, and even those who feel “hurt” because in that Congress it was not possible to discuss the point about “Party”, may realize that these documents are the pinnacle of eclecticism. And today, thirty days after the collapse occurred, nobody can say irresponsibly, without committing a crime against pragmatism, that “if there were comrades who disagreed with the consensus regime, they were not aware of it”, or “We have voted all documents in full conscience”, meaning that they did not sin, and that the only sinner here is the tendency. Let us leave aside the pragmatic irresponsibility of the majority faction, and go to the facts, to the utter facts, to demonstrate what we say.

From the TBI, we not only affirm that the paradoxes are insufficiently developed and that they must be completed with what we are contributing, both from the international and national point of view, in Chapters 1 and 2 of this Platform. We also affirm that we are all together in front of an eclectic document, which is the one that currently guides all the

activity and the course of action of our party.

As it is very clear, comrades, that all of Chapter II tries to "solve" what the Congress had not "resolved" last April. There, while we state that the paradoxes continue to deepen as we warn that it is necessary *"to begin to overcome the social composition of the majority middle class of our party, achieving for example a solid working minority in our party (today attacked violently by the semi-intellectuals of our party), it becomes an essential task but clearly against the current"*; there we also affirmed that the deepening of our paradoxes means that *"tactics have allowed us to fill up (the party) with people without the emergence of a radicalization in the political situation"* There is also the famous quote where we give a true definition of the international isolation in which we are (as mentioned above). These are all questions that today, with the document "fundament of a vote" and with a kind of "follow me" (as the Argentinean president said in the '90s electoral campaign, TN), the majority faction forgets and keeps silent.

But together with this, Chapter II elaborates on and summarizes what is the way to link the tactics with the strategy, what **the central nexus to join them is**. It says *"the link between tactics and strategy is focused on hierarchizing the role of the PTS-La Verdad Obrera, and this cannot be understood as PTS + tactics (...)* We do not want to move now from tacticism to an apparatus policy PO-style to make empty and self-proclaiming political campaigns that will lead us to rot the ties we have won with vanguard sectors"(page 19).

The key of that document is the phrase "strengthening the PTS". There begins its total and absolute derailment. Of course it explains that the PTS is not considered "the" party, and that this *"orientation must be expressed in La Verdad Obrera and the political campaigns that we launch as PTS, and it becomes concrete in the institutions that we propose to conquer like the Leon Trotsky Center... or in exploring the possibility of forming a Liaison Committee with the POR and the GTR..."* Here already the nationalist derailing is total. Of course, for this PTS that is necessary to "strengthen", we must "revolutionize the newspaper" to sell many, we must launch a "bold youth project" (today kept under the carpet by the majority faction)... where *"the goal is to make full use of our comparative advantage over the centrist currents within the youth, and to propose a political project that links tactics with the Trotskyist strategy of construction of the PTS."* Here we are not in plain bankruptcy, but in the bottom of the well of the most absolute self-proclamation. And... Oh, we forgot! to complete

this project of tactics + "come to the PTS", there was a big weak leg in our orientation: it was necessary to conquer first the "national electoral legality of the PTS".

But what a beautiful policy to make a "small MAS" in this preparatory phase, caused by the detour, the pacifist wave and the national-Trotskyist deviation! What a nice Morenoist party we wanted to build in our Chapter II! Yes, comrades, even if they do not like it and now they ask us "Also Chapter II?" Yes, also Chapter III! Re-read it, pages 16 to 23!

A Morenoist party because it is wrong to have tactics and even conquer national legality to fight on the terrain of the enemy? No, comrades. The morenoist party was a genius of tactics, which even took it quite up, but that party transformed them into strategy because it was a self-proclaiming and ultimacist party. So much self-proclaiming the MAS was that it came to postulate (of course, it did not have 300 members, it had 5000) that the Soviets did not develop in Argentina because there existed the MAS, and it even said the Soviets were going to be inside the MAS.

For this reason, the document did not pass the test of the upheaval of Neuquén students that came up desynchronized from the national student struggle, nor of the stubbornness of those "backward workers" of the Córdoba brewery, of DIATSA, Turbio, Jujuy, etc., etc., which in a molecular and totally isolated way resisted the attacks that the bosses were launching. Because, how to unite these isolated, molecular phenomena with "Come to the PTS"? It took a bit of good sense, against so much pedantic and subjectivist self-proclamation, on the part of a party essentially of Buenos Aires City, when the processes were developing peripherally, in the interior of the country, as it has been happening in recent years. Reality hit us a little, it did not let us be Morenoists under these laughable forms today of wanting to imitate it.

The link that could unite this rich reality with our tactics and with our internationalist strategy could not be our tiny PTS. The laws of history are stronger than any apparatus, especially if it is a very small one, no matter how self-proclaiming it may be. You have to measure yourself a little bit with reality! The smack that this reality gave us, led to comrade Hugo Ramírez proposing an amendment to the document, also empirically and still under that consensus regime, essentially correct in content, but without going all the way, without questioning the whole of the document, since it was part of that consensus regime.

This amendment is contained in the Addenda to the document entitled "The role of the struggle among parties in the strategy of the PTS-La Verdad Obrera". This Addenda that changes the whole axis of the strategy of the PTS-La Verdad Obrera's, and focuses not on "come to the PTS" but on the strategy of fighting matches within the vanguard. That the way to articulate the tactics with vanguard phenomena and the advanced layers (for others delayed and molded by the center-left in relation to this vanguard) and the party was precisely the role of the party struggle. For that reason, in that "addenda" we stated *"the big danger we have is that as a product of both our national-Trotskyist and Tacticist deviations, as well as the tactical triumphs that have surrounded us with many new comrades, we have the illusion that it is possible to build a Trotskyist party within the worker and youth vanguard without taking decisive steps in our struggle against the Stalinist and centrist currents that influence this vanguard and the advanced layers"*.

And then it was added: *"at a national level it has been a centrist trait (expression of the deviations that we have been dragging) not to fully carry out the struggle among parties with the currents that influence the vanguard, as we began to discuss in the II Congress"*. After insisting that we had absolutely no policy for Patria Libre, the PTP, the so-called Marca Universitaria, we insisted: *"That is why we are a weird Trotskyist party that has not won honest comrades over from Stalinism and has not provoked it an important defeat anywhere"*.

And after denouncing MAS's projects of "unity of revolutionary Marxists", we insisted again: *"Our struggle for a Liaison Committee for the reconstruction of the Fourth International is unthinkable unconnected from fighting both the Stalinists and the centrists of PO, MST and MAS"*.

We affirmed that the worker and youth vanguard and their advanced layers can only acquire class consciousness "if they clearly recognize their enemies". And we asked ourselves, after defining molecular processes of struggle and vanguard at the national level, such as the Turbio, the Cordobese Brewery, the Neuquén student struggle, etc.: *"What can unite this inequality from the point of view of revolutionary politics? Precisely the struggle among parties seeking the vanguard sectors to be aware of the inequality of the situation of the masses and the responsibility of the leaderships in this regard, and for sectors of the advanced layers to be able to assimilate the experience of the vanguard through the political struggle."*

*Otherwise, we would contribute to turning dumb the advanced and disconnected layers of the vanguard processes (...) This is why it is necessary for the party as a whole to understand the importance of the struggle among parties... **The features of a propaganda league outside of the struggle among parties can be interpreted as abstract propagandism, that is to say, restricting the role of propaganda to general theoretical explanations or popularization of our program and not to put all this to the service of a deep understanding of our strategy for the confrontation with other currents. The propaganda must be directed and ordered around this fundamental link of our revolutionary strategy***". (Our Bolds).

And after raising the terrible flaws of La Verdad Obrera's in this struggle among parties, we ended by saying: *"The exploration to set up a Liaison Committee, the campaign for the vindication of the figure and the work of Leon Trotsky to separate Stalinism and Trotskyism in the vanguard and the advanced layers, the national political campaigns around the most advanced phenomena both of struggle and of vanguard, and the set of tactics and policies outlined in the document are articulated through the struggle among parties, to strengthen to the PTS based on the strategy proposed"*.

FOR SELF-PROCLAIMING MORENOISM, AS FOR OUR PRE-CONGRESS DOCUMENT, THE STRUGGLE AMONG PARTIES DID NOT EXIST

The degree of depoliticization to which the consensus regime in our party has led, deserves for us to be extensive in our quotes, since we want to show that:

In the first place, this Addenda of the struggle among parties destroys the whole chapter II of the document, and we did it without saying it, only stating that "everything is articulated through the struggle among parties", while in chapter II, everything is articulated around tactics + "come to the PTS", a question that shows the worst of the eclecticism to which the consensus regime had led us. But comrades, we wrote Chapter II, the majority faction does not question it. And with that chapter, all party members are armed to "apply the tactics", which, as we will see later, ends up rendering these tactics impotent and only useful for "fattening" the party. **In the**

Morenoist party the key of the tactics consists of taking advantage of the opportunities and "occupying spaces"... of course, in the regime.

Therefore, when we split from the MAS, and even much earlier, during Moreno's lifetime, the term "vacuum of leadership" had been coined. Our party is at a serious risk with its tactics, detached from this struggle among parties. Indeed, there is a policy of national unity in the transition to '99. To the left of the center-left there is "room to occupy for building oneself" that everybody, both centrists and Stalinists are scrambling to occupy. Today it is also pressing us to occupy it without defeating our enemies and adversaries, which would be the only way to take advantage of it in a revolutionary way. We affirm that working for Marxist Courses and Ceprodh disconnected from this struggle, do not hurt anyone of them, and possibly fatten us, but with a rank and file membership that accompanies us today, but will end up voting for Meijide and De la Rúa in 1999 (candidates of the bourgeois parties UCR and Frente Grande, which made the "Alliance", TN), as Trotsky said about the Rooseveltians in the unions in the USA (who fought together with the Trotskyists but in the elections they voted Roosevelt).

It is symptomatic to see how in the left each one "respects the spaces of the others" that they conquered in the interstices of this rotten semi colonial regime.

The MAS saw a "vacuum of power", which would enable it to go up without any effort and build a vanguard party in Argentina. It collided with Garcetti, collided with Ubaldini (union bureaucrats, TN) and ended up embracing the Communist Party, and when the bell of the first rounds of the 1989 Hunger Revolts sounded, many of its members educated in that easiness ran away without a trace.

Chapter II, written by us, comrades, is a Morenoist shame about "taking advantage of opportunities".

Secondly, today we say that the Addenda on Struggle among Parties does not go all the way, because it does not attack the liquidation of our slogan, refraction of our international policy, "for the re-foundation of Argentine Trotskyism". Without it, there is no real confrontation with the rest of the other centrist groups. It is to build the PTS in a vacuum, or to believe that we can make a leap to the vanguard party without defeating the rest of the currents that speak in the name

of Trotskyism and the Fourth International in Argentina.

The struggle to build a new revolutionary vanguard party is inseparable from the struggle to refound Argentine Trotskyism and defeat the centrists nationally and internationally. "Strengthening the PTS" to fight for "a new revolutionary vanguard party", as is the current formulation of our party, is to believe illusively that the spaces that we know how to conquer in the regime will take us on that path, without any serious effort for defeating the rest of the centrist currents, and what is more serious, without defeating Stalinism.

Refounding Argentine Trotskyism with close ties to the vanguard and defeating the centrists is inseparable from the fight against Stalinism that for five years has led the best of the vanguard at the feet of the opposition bureaucracy, and the latter at the feet of the regime and the American embassy and the establishment.

Thirdly, because it is unthinkable to reach, in this preparatory phase, a party of "1000 or 2000 members", all of them revolutionaries (that is, not PI or center-left type) if not through this combat to bite, where none of our tactics, policies and campaigns can be promoted without a policy of unity-confrontation, and without fighting to death against the centrist, reformist and left bourgeois currents (sheltered in the human rights organizations and the CTA) and their "spaces".

From there, how dangerous it was that in Congress, comrade FL (faithful to Chapter II that he wrote) suggested that the Leon Trotsky Center campaign was in fact a propaganda campaign similar to those about Cuba or Iraq. That is, propaganda campaigns that only "strengthen our profile", and then capture and strengthen the PTS.

In this phase, it is definitive to clarify that, oriented from this point of view, these campaigns can turn into Morenoist campaigns. And we do not doubt that Morenoism did extraordinary campaigns with which it "strengthened" the party. But this great campaign around the figure of Leon Trotsky, disjointed from the struggle among parties in the democratic movement, the student movement and the workers' vanguard, and the strategy of launching an offensive, using all our potential and the rest of the tactics like the Workers' Plenary or the National Plenary of Combat Students, etc., against our enemies and adversaries, are campaigns that would only "fatten" the PTS.

This campaign for the figure of Trotsky, if separated from the struggle for the re-foundation of Argentine Trotskyism on principled bases by confronting centrism and Stalinism, is inevitably a propaganda campaign, which will not end up being offensive towards the rest of the centrist currents, disarticulated as it would be of this powerful slogan of our construction program.

That is why we affirmed in the last Congress-Plenary of 30/8, that the more the MAS grew in the 1980s, the more degenerated it became, full of union members of the "new leadership", and with the collapse of the PI (Intransigent Party, TN), which "space" the MAS hurried to occupy. That reality took it more and more to the right, and increasingly to a even greater self-proclamation.

Fourth, while for Bolshevism the recruitment was a selection, either through mergers or direct organization in the cells of the party, but always a rigorous selection, based on the policy, program, strategy and tasks they selected, with a plastic organization that adjusted to the different changes in the situation, for the Moreno party the recruitment meant fattening by taking advantage of opportunities. It was a party of that grew through campaigns and in the spaces of the regime, and not through the revolutionary use of these spaces.

Today, La Verdad Obrera's groups are incorporated into our organization outside of this struggle against the reformist and centrist currents; separated from the struggle of our party for the re-foundation of the Argentine Trotskyist like re-faction of our fight to reconstruct the Fourth International. This automatic capture of the tactics to the La Verdad Obrera's groups, outside of these tasks and politics, is just "fattening". Not a selection. And therefore these groups end up transforming themselves into study groups so that they better apply with us ... the tactics. In short, they are auxiliary groups for the application of tactics of a self-proclaiming group.

When we promoted the MNPTR, we fought to organize groups of La Verdad Obrera's, that is, of workers and "denouncers" from the workers' concentrations with which we wanted to merge, organized around a program of revolutionary action. We wanted these groups of La Verdad Obrera's to arise as a result of radicalization processes at the beginning of the mass counteroffensive in 1995-96, and with them we proposed to organize the elemental

forces that were outside our party, with a policy of transition towards them, taking the experience of the Russian Bolshevism of 1910, with its Pravda of denouncers. This could not be achieved due to the lack of a proletarian upheaval and a process of workers' militancy.

Unlike those, the current groups of La Verdad Obrera-PTS do not come from a fusion, but from a direct organization in our ranks as a byproduct of the "success" of our current tactics in the spaces of the regime.

That is why for the TBI program, the alternative is inescapable: there is either a Morenoist fattening party based on tactics and the smart use of opportunities, with cells that only apply tactics, to which Morenoism sought to raise their level with its campaigns to "consolidate and politicize" after each wave of struggle; or new cells of revolutionary Trotskyists organized as builders of the Trotskyist left, in a struggle both at the international and national levels to rebuild the Fourth International and re-found Argentine Trotskyism. Cells that are won and incorporated into our organization from a deep understanding of the struggle against the treacherous leaderships, to fight to clarify before the vanguard and the advanced layers who the friends, the allies are, and who are the enemies of the working class and the people.

ACCORDING TO THE MAJORITY FACTION

"THE CRASH CHANGED EVERYTHING" ...

INCLUDING THE REVOLUTIONARY CONTENT OF OUR TACTICS

Thus, from the Congress of August 8 and 9 on, the majority faction "promoted the tactics" detached from the real revolutionary strategy for this preparatory phase. And of course, as "the crash changed everything", it also changed everything that was revolutionary in our tactics, including the struggle among parties. **Thus the National Plenary of Combative Students** disappeared just at a time when the wave of school take-overs was taking place in the Federal Capital and the great Buenos Aires, even boycotted in its democratic coordination by the Stalinist forces and centrism. The central slogan of our party became "Come to the BREA" (Block formed by PTS, TN), just at a time when the process of the Neuquen student vanguard began to recede. And in this way the Neuquen vanguard is left without prospects; the

same happens to the combative students who are occupying schools in Buenos Aires, and so the vanguard that seeks a national perspective in Neuquen becomes isolated.

Thus, as we repeat the 57-point program to the masses of the Emergency Workers' Plan, the centrists and Stalinists feast on the masses by dividing the vanguard and the student struggle.

"The crash has changed everything, the crash has changed everything!", they shout like a parrot. It is now that the Workers' Plenary becomes more urgent than ever, in order to discuss and fight for an independent working-class alternative for the vanguard and to combat against the apparatuses that have subordinated to the (equally treacherous) CTA, the MTA and the CCC "opposition" to the official bureaucracy. Only from this policy, used as a lever, could we be in a position to influence with our policy for the National Plenary of Combative Workers Organizations, as we stated in the last newspaper. Contrariwise, the self-proclaiming ones refuse to create and to fight to put in place the gears that allow us to strike on the new leaderships, Santillanism and centrism.

"The crash has changed everything, the crash has changed everything!" So much has it changed that our campaign for the working youth has disappeared in the last two newspapers. Through that campaign our party could have not only taken roots in this sector (again, it is the most exploited of the working class, although the party majority does not like it) and strike on all the organizations of the left that have put their influence on sectors of the workers' vanguard at the service of making them kneel in front of the opposition bureaucracy.

Meanwhile, Ceprodh raises its democratic profile by fighting against Videla, but it does not declare itself at all an enemy of Judge Garzón, a "hero" of all human rights organizations in Argentina. It does not promote a systematic campaign (and not loose statements) against that imperialist judge of the Spanish State, jailer of the Basque nationalist patriots. And also the Ceprodh is mute about the political prisoners like those of the events of La Tablada. These two silences demonstrate a total adaptation to the democratic environment, a total respect for the "spaces" of each organism. This silence is the enemy of using the tactics for the phenomenal struggle among parties that is established, to combat the treacherous

leaderships, to select revolutionaries. That is, this silence is the enemy of giving our tactics a truly revolutionary content. And what is more serious, our newspaper has not been systematically campaigning on this issue either.

Oh, we forgot! Good news comes from the bourgeois university. The Marxist Courses reappeared in this second semester. And another good news: the propagandists of this theoretical center of the highest level we have will come out in time, to convince of the benefits of socialism.

Eclecticism, the consensus regime that tried to hide the terrible pressures that like a simmering boiler over our party and our leadership, has led to this, making it explode when the water boiled and the boiler could not withstand the pressure.

The majority faction, which in this factional struggle has not once named the paradoxes that shape us, gets annoyed with the term collapse. And also with the causes that have made it occur, which in this Platform we try to explain.

Comrades of the majority, we tell you again and again, the collapse is the centrist adaptations to which you are leading the party, with your national-Trotskyist and self-proclaiming deviations! The collapse is called Morenoism in the orientation and in the tactics that, in a sense of taking advantage of opportunities, you are promoting.

The collapse is the despolitized growth that is fattening of our party, alien to our strategy of refounding the Argentine Trotskyism and fighting for the reconstruction of the Fourth International.

For now, this collapse comes in installments, like the tearing of an onion, as it happens to the rest of the centrist forces. And this process has already begun in our organization, and you have refused to allow a loyal tendential struggle, with documents, between principled Trotskyists as we consider us all, using the worst methods of Hardy-Lutte Ouvrière. Copying the latter's methods, they show that they are in a self-proclaiming process as a Morenoist party. Let's remember that it was also visited by Lutte Ouvrière with which it established fraternal relations.

THE SELF-PROCLAIMING PARTY THAT IS BUILT IN THE SPACES OF THE REGIME AND RENOUNCES THE STRUGGLE AMONG PARTIES, REFUSES TO FORM CADRES AND MEMBERS WITH A LENINIST TROTSKYIST SOVIET STRATEGY

If it advances on this course, the majority faction and its unbridled tacticism, to the service of the construction of a self-proclaiming and subjectivist party will not leave stone on stone of all that we have accumulated in common in these years.

The tendencies to transform tactics into strategy has been always a feature of all centrist currents that adapted to counterrevolutionary regimes and apparatuses.

In Estrategia Internacional No. 4/5, we said: *"Essentially because of the contradictions between the ultra-objective conditions for the socialist revolution and the backward consciousness of the vanguard and the masses, on which not only the bourgeoisie and its parties act, but centrally the reformist and bureaucratic leaderships of the workers' movement, there is an inescapable need for the revolutionary party to apply all kinds of tactics and class maneuvers to help overcome that existing gap. The tactics, which belong to the field of the immediate, that is to say, of the needs and the immediate consciousness of the masses and their vanguard... **acquire in our revolutionary epoch, of great oscillations, a circumstantial, episodic, character and are completely subordinated to the revolutionary strategy.**"* (Page 28, from the article "On the minimal and democratic demands and the tactics of the revolutionaries").

And later, referring to tactics regarding small groups and parties, it says: *"That is, a small group that, without being deeply committed to revolutionary principles and strategy, turns tactics into the key to their action, will lose inevitably the dialectical relationship, turning the tactics into desperation, based on its little confidence in the revolutionary strategy, **the historical role of the working class**, the need for its independent organization"*.

And below, it insists: *"It is precisely this lack of solidity of small groups that translates into opportunistic desperation, in the belief that a tactic or a maneuver can resolve the deep contradictions of reality, which leads to "forget" the subordinate character of the tactics, turning them into strategies in themselves... **However, for the***

small groups, for whom the central task is their anchoring in the strategy and the revolutionary principles, that same task must be accompanied by every kind of tactics to link themselves to the vanguard sectors and advance in the political struggle against centrist or opportunistic groups or parties. This political struggle becomes essential for its delimitation and consolidation in an independent strategy... However, the possibility of applying them in a principled way is intimately linked to the anchoring of the same in the revolutionary strategy. Because otherwise the sectarian panic is transformed into the loss of great opportunities, or the tactic loses its character and becomes a strategy in the form of opportunistic desperation for ceasing to be a small group."

Thus, the utter subjectivist theorism and its other side the immediatistic tacticism, disown and liquidate the strategy of defeating the treacherous leaderships in fierce, both theoretical, programmatic as well as political struggles among parties. And so it was written in our past elaborations, without anyone raising their voices against.

But this was not stated in our pre-conference documents. This we tried to solve with an amendment about the struggle among parties, although a centrist one as it did not go all the way. But against this intent the academicism and tacticism arose of that hidden and dormant faction that existed in our party and which today the majority expresses.

But this struggle among parties at international and national level, key and fundamental in the preparatory phases to articulate the theory with the strategy and the tactics, and not to degenerate, has its maximum expression in the acute revolutionary moments and can succeed sweepingly, even in spite of being a little Marxist League, when embryos emerge of self-organization of the masses, of direct democracy, Soviets in perspective..

That is why centrists and reformists are mortal enemies of the Soviet strategy, because in these organizations of self-organization of the masses there are the watchful eyes of the masses in action, who day by day judge the actions of these parties, and can quickly, from their own experience, get rid of them (centrists and reformists. TN), provided there is a revolutionary core capable of having prepared in previous years to give these decisive battles. Moreover, for this reason, striving to extend and develop these pre-Soviet organisms when they

tend to emerge, presupposes a fierce struggle among parties. That is why Trotsky, in *Whither France?* (November 1935), in "Popular Front and Committees of Action" states: *"While for the revolutionary masses the question of life or death is to break the resistance of the social-patriotic apparatuses united, the left centrists consider the 'unity' of these apparatuses as an absolute good, above the interests of the revolutionary struggle. It cannot build action committees more than the one that has understood to the end the need to free the masses from the traitorous leadership of the social patriots"*.

Theorism and propagandism on the one hand, and tacticism on the other, Morenoist party of utilization of opportunities, separated from the strategy and the struggle among parties in all the preparatory phases, that is, self-proclamation, form cadres that are not prepared for the most phenomenal struggle among parties that signifies the entrance into sharp revolutionary situations and the fierce struggle among parties in future soviets, or in the embryos of self-organization of the masses.

An academic and purely theoretical view, which transforms theory into dogma, separated from strategy and action, refuses at the present moment to address proper internationalist tasks to combat centrism and revisionism within the Fourth International. It prepares self-proclaiming cadres, complacent with their "national center". And as it could not be otherwise, in its daily action it tends to capitulate at every step to bourgeois democracy and the national pacifist wave that intoxicates us.

For the TBI, both the objectivist Mandelism seen in Yalta, and ultrasubjectivist Morenoism had something in common, like two sides of the same coin: they renounced the struggle among parties in the preparatory phases. That is to say, they stopped fighting against the treacherous leaderships; the Mandelists by way of becoming their advisors; the self-proclaiming Morenoists inviting everybody to "Come to the MAS". One was built in the spaces of the regime, the other on its verge and adapting itself to any leadership that was directing radicalized mass processes.

For us, both sectarian or opportunist impatience before acute revolutionary situations arrive and tend to emerge organisms of dual power, prevent from preparing revolutionary cadres for a time when that struggle among parties can succeed, becoming more acute and fierce, but at the same time clearer and simpler before the masses and

their vanguard. Because if there are no fitted out cadres in this struggle among parties in the previous, preparatory phases, where the theory, the principles, the program and the circumstantial tactics are in a correct correspondence, they will be impotent and unable to act with tactical flexibility and ideological intransigence, not giving in to the siren songs of the popular front and the blows of fascist counterrevolution in the acute revolutionary moments.

In Trotsky's letter to Reus, of 11/13/35, he states: *"Between fascism and us there is a race of speed, but the content of this formula needs to be analyzed from the revolutionary point of view. Will we know how to give the masses a revolutionary framework before fascism crushed them? It would be absurd to believe that we have enough time to create an omnipotent party that could eliminate all other organizations before the decisive conflicts with fascism or before the outbreak of war. But it is quite possible in a short time -the events help- to win the broad masses not for our program, not for the Fourth International, but for those Committees of action. But once created, these action committees will become a great springboard for a revolutionary party. In a Pivert Action Committee, for example, you will be forced to have a language completely different from the stutter of the Revolutionary Left. The authority and influence of the courageous, determined and clairvoyant elements would be immediately duplicated. It is not about one more issue here. It's a matter of life and death"*.

The self-proclaiming and tactician party does not prepare cadres to take advantage of the greatest and real opportunity that the revolutionaries have, anchored in the Soviet strategy, to defeat the treacherous leaderships, as the struggle within the soviets includes the fiercest struggle among parties.

So it was with Russian Bolshevism, which from the moment Lenin arrived with his *April Theses*, until October 1917, entered this fierce and stark struggle among parties against Mensheviks, SRs, anarchists, etc. But Bolshevism had prepared a party, in thousands of fights among tendencies and factions to its interior, in the bitterest fight against revisionism and Menshevism, anchored in the follow-up of the last word of the international Marxism. And still, in that very hard struggle among parties in which Bolshevism was immersed, it did not stop for a moment tearing itself internally, in very hard factional struggles in the most acute moments of the revolution, as happened with Kamenev and Zinoviev when they went out to denounce the insurrection that the party was preparing.

This had not been fully understood by Rosa Luxemburg and Liebknecht in Germany. For Lenin and Trotsky, their delay in breaking with the Kautskyite center at the height of the revolution had not allowed them to forge a mature, totally independent revolutionary party that could defeat treacherous leaderships and lead the first German revolution to victory .

It was Lenin who, with more perspicacity drew the greatest lessons from the Paris Commune of 1871, where Proudhonists and Blanquists impeded the revolutionary triumph, and from which Marx had already concluded that a struggle among parties was inevitable, as one of the fundamental lessons from that revolution, where Marxists did not have a single militant. Based on these lessons, Russian Marxism, and its most acute leader, Lenin, disentangling the cobweb that the German social democracy had woven, as a continuity of Marx and Engels, and shaped by the character of the era that was anticipated in Russia at the beginning of the century, could elaborate the theory of the Party and with it forge the fundamental tool, in theoretical, political, programmatic and tactical struggle against the social-patriots at the international level and against Menshevism in Russia. Lenin's quote saying that since Trotsky understood the party problem he became the best Bolshevik is not a passing sentence. Because the Bolshevik party of October had these two tributaries: a correct revolutionary theory on the dynamics of the revolution, and a correct revolutionary theory on Party, which became a material force with the Bolshevik Party leading the first revolutionary triumph of history, in a fight to death within the soviets themselves, against the conciliatory parties that supported the imperialist government, like the SR and the Mensheviks. Moreover, the party was able to seize power and achieve the worker-peasant alliance, breaking the SRs and proposing unity even to the left SRs, based on the program for the land problem they were raising. And so they achieved a majority in the soviets and took power, in a fierce struggle among parties applying tactics of confrontation but also of unity, to unmask them before the vanguard and the masses: from there they coined the phrase "on Kerensky's shoulder, let's shoot Kornilov ", without thereby stopping for a moment denouncing the provisional government .

As we see, the Bolsheviks did not "respect the spaces" that the Mensheviks and SR conciliators had conquered in the Soviets. With program and tactics of unity and confrontation, to expose and divide them, and allow the masses to make

their own experience of the correctness of the program of the Bolsheviks, they managed to direct those masses to the seizure of power.

That is why in that phenomenal struggle of tendencies and factions in their interior, and the struggle among parties at the international and national level, Bolshevism forged its theory, its strategy, and its cadres capable to rise to the occasion at the decisive moments.

That is why the construction of the Fourth International in 1938 was the continuity of that Bolshevism, which in a phenomenal struggle among parties, including a civil war against Stalinism, in a struggle against centrism, managed to maintain the legacy of Leninism and Bolshevism, and the unblemished flag of revolutionary theory, program and strategy.

The Bolshevik-Leninists and Trotskyism in the 1930s had bold policies and tactics to combat Stalinism both theoretically and programmatically: the Block of Four, the so-called "French turn" to work on the emerging mass centrism that were emerging, the "unity of the communist ranks" in Spain, before 1933 and the betrayal of Stalinism in Germany.

And it seems incredible that at the end of the 20th century we are discussing with people who tell us (when we want to discuss Leninist party and democratic centralism) "(you are a) faction without program, faction without program!", "Regime problems are secondary"! And comrades, we get out of the pod for telling them that they are falling apart into a semi-Menshevik position, and a deeply nationalistic one for that. If they persist in this, the struggle to rebuild the Fourth International will be nothing more than a litany, like the one repeated by the WRP that the Fourth International was needed for everything, which was nothing more than a cover for a deeply national-Trotskyist center, one more of those that swarmed in Yalta and boomed from the collapse of the Trotskyist movement in 1989.

This continuity of the struggle among parties as an inseparable part of the theory, strategy and program, that is, as an indispensable condition to defeat treacherous leaderships, fight centrism (who does not like to talk about himself) and fight for to resolve the crisis of the revolutionary leadership of humanity, it was completely broken by the Trotskyism of Yalta, and today by the national-Trotskyist centers that emerged from the collapse of 1989.

Due to their opportunistic or sectarian

degeneration, Yalta Trotskyism and the one that emerged as a result of the outbreak in 1989, all their national-Trotskyist centers in different countries and internationally, have always respected each other their "spaces". Yesterday in Yalta the leaders of the different tendencies sometimes made unprincipled agreements and subsequently broke them, also unprincipledly. The most scandalous example of this was the International Committee of 1953, which "respected" Pabloism its space and allowed it to continue with its "entrism sui generis" into the Communist parties, refusing in this way, to use the enormous forces that the IC counted to defeat Pabloism and refound / rebuild the Fourth International.

The collapse of our movement since 1989 caused the emergence of wings and parties of all kinds. And from '95, when the tendency to stabilize of the new national-Trotskyist centers in the different countries began, Trotskyist centrism continued to be built by respecting the spaces of each other. For example, in the different currents of English centrism, this is symptomatic: for Militant, the SWP does not exist, they are ignored. The LRCI, which built its own international with "democratic centralism", refuses to work on centrist phenomena, because it considers them crystallized. Meanwhile, everyone is arguing how they "position themselves" to grab chunks from Labor and go up.

In France, the LCR is built on the verge of the "plural left", on social movements and in the sectors of service workers. Meanwhile, Lutte Ouvrière, is built almost exclusively in the elections and in the factories with an underground job. For its part, Lambertism is built in Forcé Ouvrière, union center of which board they are part. But all of them capitulate, whether to the Socialist Party, the Communist Party or the trade union bureaucracy, respecting each other the "spaces" in which they capitulate. Precisely, the impotence of the transitory centers that have arisen is due to their incompetence (or lack of will) to elevate themselves to an internationalist vision and a consequent internationalist program to rebuild the Fourth International, and therefore they are unable to confront all the way this panorama of "mutual respects" of the French Trotskyism. And hence their capitulation.

In Brazil, the PSTU has placed itself on the "left" of the PT, while both Lambertism and Mandelism, one from the unions within the CUT and the others as Lula's advisers in the PT, respect each other religiously their different forms of capitulation.

This is how centrists act, respecting spaces. And the same is happening in our country, where the MST is in the same space with Stalinism, the PO in the electoral space covering itself with the slogan of the Immediate Refoundation of the Fourth International, and the MAS trying to form a socialist current propitiating the unity of the revolutionary Marxists.

And, directed by the majority faction, the PTS, increasingly self-proclaiming with its slogan "come to the PTS" and its construction in the university and the democratic youth, and now with its Leon Trotsky Center campaign (oriented more and more dangerously as a propaganda campaign) is led to strengthen its own Trotskyist space, its own "stage".

The abandonment of the struggle for the re-foundation of Argentine Trotskyism on principled bases as part of the struggle against all national-Trotskyist centers at national and world level; its replacement by "Come to the PTS" that fights for a new revolutionary party in general, and more tactics only directed to "strengthen its own space", is due to be part -in our country- of the panorama that has emerged in the world Trotskyist movement and we described above.

By using the Liaison Committee, which is not yet such, as a maneuver of a national apparatus, and only as a publicity stunt for our national center to go up, as we showed in chapter 2, it ends up nicking the edge of the offensive policy that we voted at the FT meeting.

Unless a bold policy is launched from a principled position of unity and confrontation over the space of others, and our tactics are a battering ram to also strike the space of the centrists, we will end up being part of the scenario of English Trotskyism, of French Trotskyism, of Brazilian Trotskyism, etc. That is, we will also be liquidating the struggle to rebuild the Fourth International purged of revisionists and centrists. This is why we neglected to take any action around the PO event and its imposture of proclaiming to refound the Fourth International, and we failed to develop an offensive policy to unmask it. They continue with their campaign, and we with ours: no policy of exigency, of unity-confrontation to unmask them.

We must realize that only as a part of a national and international offensive policy of fierce struggle among parties, our Estrategia Internacional magazine, our tactics and our program will acquire a true internationalist character.

Comrades, it is clear that, as we said in our first platform as a tendency within the CC, a new delimitation has risen around The Party point. Delimitation that started from the notional conquests already elaborated in the propaganda group phase. But as our arrogant semi-intellectuals of the majority faction think that in a "little Marxist League there is no place for tendencies and factions, because it has a revolutionary program" and therefore, it is not prone to degenerate, they forgot the international and national paradoxes that shape us and ended up lost in tactics.

And like any theorist who detaches theory from strategy, program and tactics, they ended up denying a rich theoretical discussion to the party, which in The Party point tries to resume the legacy of Bolshevism and the Fourth International during Trotsky's life, starting from what has been already elaborated and conquered by our current, and advancing on a necessary delimitation in The Party point, which would allow to enrich and deepen, as we are doing here from the TBI in this decisive question at the end of the 20th century.

We affirm from the TBI that with this category of *struggle among parties*, we must complete enriching the theory that on The Party we wrote in Estrategia Internacional No. 4/5, because this category arms us for the most decisive moments of the Soviet strategy and also for its preparatory phases. And it is armed with our theoretical and programmatic program that we are going to struggle to prevent our PTS from degenerating into the self-proclaiming mud of the Trotskyist sects of Yalta. And we do it as a tendency, since in the consensus regime that today has broken out, it was impossible to carry out that struggle until the end. These are our flags. This is our passport. The majority faction has none, except for the empirical and eclectic lurches of taking advantage of the opportunities of a current that adapts to bourgeois democracy any time more and more.

THE ITALIAN SR: AN EXAMPLE OF A VERY ERUDITE REVISIONIST NATIONAL-TROTSKYIST CENTER

The Soviet strategy and the struggle among parties can also be denied on the self-proclaiming and theorist side, as does a whole wing of post-89 Trotskyism. There is a whole wing of

the Trotskyist movement that no longer dreams of building itself as in Yalta, yielding to this or that apparatus with the illusion of going up. Contrariwise, and reneging the dictatorship of the proletariat, reneging the red terror, they end up giving up the struggle for a Leninist combat party, and run head-first into a social-democratic conception. Its representatives are the Aldo Casas, the Italian SR, the Garmendias, etc., who with a brilliant level and illustration, are liquidating and not leaving stone on stone of the Leninist theory of The Party, among other things.

It seems that for our Marxist professors there is no need to engage in a fierce fight with this wing of renegades of the Trotskyist movement, since they do not even mention them among the "sample buttons" of the editorial of the last Estrategia Internacional.

This social democratized wing of the Trotskyist movement ends engaged, as do the Yalta nostalgics like LO and PSTU, in a struggle to build parties that liquidate all barriers between reformers and revolutionaries. If not, what is the policy of unity of the revolutionary Marxists of the MAS in Argentina, or the slogan "tutti le colori" (all the colors. TN) of the Italian SR? We remind the comrades of our party, that this social democratized current, which are Stalinophobes, devoted to fight the Stalinophiles (who, like Bandiera Rossa and Proposta, are within Rifondazione Comunista), have launched a magnificent campaign, very just, on the other hand, to vindicate Pietro Tresso, whom Stalin assassinated in France during the Second World War, to prevent him from reaching Italy.

This tactic, on the other hand, is put at the service of strengthening one of the most recalcitrant national-Trotskyist centers that emerged in the post '89, as is the Italian SR. That is a true national-Italian Trotskyist theoretical center that publishes an international magazine "tutti colori", of high graphic quality, which is the envy of the whole world Trotskyist movement, and in which from time to time some parties and groups write and discuss with it, as the Argentine MAS, the South African WOSA, Socialist Action, and - another good news from London! - the LRCI also has written for them.

The Italian SR produced a special debate magazine on the question of the International at the end of the century and the regroupment of the revolutionaries, in which the LRCI and practically the majority of the currents of the Trotskyist movement wrote.

Could it be that having forgotten this "sample button" in the editorial of our latest international magazine was caused by the pragmatism that overwhelms us? How strange, comrades, because you had said that the campaign for the figure of Leon Trotsky that we were doing in Argentina had been taken from the experience that the Italian SR was doing around Pietro Tresso. Could it be that from time to time, through pragmatism, between theory and tactics, we lose the strategy, and end up copying the disarticulated tactics of centrism and post-'89 National-Trotskyist centers?

From the TBI we believe that the majority faction embodies a current that struggles to be built as a new national center, that bypassing the struggle among parties and by stating that the discussions of regime and party are "secondary", as E.A. does shamefully at the beginning of his article in La Verdad Obrera's No. 39; as very empirical and pragmatic people, they end up always copying the road-map of their construction to some of the national-Trotskyist centers, either LO, SR or Morenoism.

This contempt for the Leninist theory of organization leaves our party as a leaf in the storm, in the struggle to rebuild the Fourth International. This issue is secondary to a student current impregnated of caudillismo, which seeks to build itself taking advantage of the opportunities in the "leadership void" that the putrefying semicolonial regime in Argentina offers them.

That is why, in everything it has written, the majority faction always accuses this social-democratic current of the Trotskyist movement, for its vision of "harmonic globalization", for its vision of "new phase" of imperialism. But it never criticizes it about the conception of Party it has. The majority faction never suggests that this democratized social vision leads the SR to liquidate the conception of a Leninist party; that is to say, the majority faction never questions the SR that the conception of the party that corresponds to that vision is one of "theory + propaganda + tactics", with which social democracy was built at the beginning of the century.

THE SHAMEFUL CHAPTER III, WRITTEN AS AN OFFSPRING OF... "ORGANIZATIONAL PROBLEMS" OF NAHUEL MORENO

E.A.'s article in La Verdad Obrera's No. 39 begins by raising a very serious inaccuracy, which he shall have to be responsible of before the vanguard and the international Trotskyist movement, when he says beginning with the title itself that there is an "intense internal discussion in the PTS". Well, in a month, which was the deadline we had agreed, only now the TBI delivers its Platform, while the majority has already fired all its volleys, inventing a theory, a program and conceptions that, according to them, would correspond to our tendency.

And this it does as if the discussion had already ended, making throughout the article ultimatum characterizations, without any foundation or quotations, that made us remember the ridiculous ultimatum launched against the PTS by Jorge Altamira years ago, i.e., "PTS= RIP", that blessed the characterization that he has made of us. From the TBI, we continue to argue that the political discussion has just begun.

But what most invalidates that article is its beginning. There they state that the discussion began "*on relatively minor points such as the relationship between a series of political deviations of the party in the last two years and the internal party regime...*". No comment. For E.A., head of the majority faction, party problems and their relation to tactics and deviations, are secondary points. The majority faction strips naked. For them the discussion of the Leninist party at the end of the century is a secondary problem. The problems of the party regime, much more.

And then, that same quote he ends as if he were surprised: "*...the questioning of all the politics of the organization widened quickly.*" **The semi-Menchevik and centrist trait of the majority faction finally came to light, since for the Trotskyists "the problems of the internal regime of the party, the problems of organization and of Bolshevism, are linked to those of program and tactics."** (Leon Trotsky, *Stalin, the Great Organizer of Defeats*, Yunque Editor, p.209- see *The Third International After Lenin*) And Trotsky continues in the same quote, adding: "*It was supposed, from the theoretical point of view (yes, theoretical, comrades of the majority) ... that these principles implied the absolute possibility of the party to*

discuss, to criticize, to express their discontent, to choose, to dismiss, while allowing an iron discipline in actioning. If democracy was understood as the sovereignty of the party above all its organs, centralism corresponded to a conscious discipline, judiciously established, in order to guarantee the combativeness of the party “.

For us, the problem of the party and its internal regime is a key problem, from a theoretical, political and programmatic point of view. But for a current as the majority faction, this is a secondary problem, and that is why it always ends empirically, copying the party building program and party regime from the arsenal of centrism.

We affirm that Chapter III is a copy of the organization's theory of Nahuel Moreno, about which he wrote a brochure in July 1984, called “Problemas de Organización” (*Organizational Problems*).

Let's see what Chapter III says:

a) After accepting that there is a quality crisis of our revolutionary praxis, it affirms that *“it is revealed in recent months in a strong pragmatism that by definition means to develop what allows for an immediate success, underestimating the more strategic issues, using artisanal methods to advance revolutionary politics”*. Then, after developing the different examples of pragmatism and tacticism, it rises that both pragmatic and artisanal methods are opposed *“to conquer a true Bolshevik character of both the cells and the leadership of the party.*

b) That pragmatism is favored by the artisanal methods *“typical of any small group, prevailing in the leadership, cadres and members.”* From this point of view *“we do not promote the members in revolutionary trades according to their qualities”* affirming that there are no scientific plans of division of tasks. *“There are no comrades who develop either as worker or student leaders, nor as organizers, propagandists, speakers, agitators or publicists, in general; everyone does everything.”*

c) Of course, all this is crisscrossed by the lament that the cadres are not located *“as Trotskyist strategists, but according to the success or failure of the tactics”*. And it continues its lamenting when it affirms that *“cells do not act as what they really should be: the organic link of the party with sectors of the workers' and youth movement, expressing the reality and acting as a permanent corrector.”*

d) Then it lists the crisis of different comrades who for different reasons suffered a crisis, from the MNPTR (National Movement for a Revolutionary Trotskyist Party, tactic adopted by PTS, TN) comrades to the old members who dropped out.

e) It states that *“a revolution is needed in the organization of the party”* that starts from winning for Trotskyism the new comrades who are members of the PTS. Redefine the role of tools, such as the newspaper, the Leon Trotsky Center, Estrategia Internacional.

f) It raises then that it is necessary to realize *“a new hierarchical organization of the party structure”* where the CC is being expressed through instruments such as Estrategia Internacional, La Verdad Obrera, documents and bulletins; and where the cells, *“the other key institution of the party”*, should discuss not only the tactic but also LVO and Estrategia Internacional. It says: *“It is a key point that the teams make a clear statement, even when it is possible, by writing meeting minutes on the agreements, nuances or differences with the central policy.”* It insists again that each cell must select one or two tactics to apply on its front, and that it must act as *“if it were a small CC, that is, considering itself with the responsibility of making decisions that if they do not take them, nobody will.”*

g) It poses that it is necessary to form cadres teams where the comrades who lead the new LVO groups are organized and also, of course, the public leaders and comrades who have responsibility before the vanguard, betting on the development of *“revolutionary personalities”*. And of course, *“that in the Regionals that have several dozens of members and several intervention fronts, the role will be important of the regional political commissions in the sense of integrating the various activities, not only the international and national construction strategy, but also the political phenomena, the tradition and the revolutionary history of the area where they operate. In that sense we see a key role to set the party in the Regionals.”*

From the TBI we affirm that:

1) Such a deviation in the regime described in that chapter, did not make us think or deepen in the notion that it was a byproduct of a party that was drifting to centrism for taking advantage of opportunities in the spaces of the regime.

The internal regime of a theorist party applying purely tactics is full of pragmatism,

movimentism, dead cells, cadres that are not strategists, because just the revolutionary strategy and action program are which disappear, dissolved in the application of tactics that at each step degrade them for adapting themselves to the regime and seeking immediate successes, when there are no radicalization processes or a real proletarian revolutionary movement.

2) For Morenoism, as for Chapter III, the key of **artisanal methods** and pragmatism is given because there is no scientific division of tasks, of "revolutionary trades", that is, of propagandists, organizers, agitators, publicists, administrators, etc.

This is morenoist organization theory. In that booklet Moreno says that the organizer would have to be a great psychologist to detect the qualities of the cadres and members and thus be able to "locate" them. Moreno was encouraged to write it. The representatives of the majority faction said it when they reported to the secretariat of the CC, without encouraging themselves to write it, that they individually led as secretaries of the organization from their home, discuss with the axes of each regional the location of each cadre and militant in it.

The centrism of Yalta, as the majority faction that defends this chapter, confounds the absence of division of tasks and functions for the daily action in the revolutionary party with the artisanal methods.

But for Leninism, artisanal methods were economism, trade unionism and tacticism, by which all Russian Marxist groups were imprisoned by the Tsarist police. The key to combating artisan methods was legal and illegal work, for which professional members were needed, which was the principal "profession" that Lenin spoke of first, and then Trotsky in his struggle to build the Fourth International.

Only from this point of view can the different functions and tasks be considered, and only in function of that legal and illegal work. And it seems incredible that at the end of the 20th century we have to be discussing the same thing that Russian Marxism discussed at the beginning of the century. This is the continuity of Bolshevism and Trotskyism that the centrism of Yalta prevented us from keeping.

In the Plenary-Congress they wanted to answer that it was for Russia where Czarism was, and not for example, for the German Social

Democracy before the war when there was full legality. It seems incredible comrades, we need to remind you that Russia anticipated the change of era, generalized to the whole world in 1914, time of crisis, wars and revolutions. And because they were just on the contrary to that anticipated change of era, the social democracy and its parties ended up as cuddly kittens at the feet of imperialism in World War I.

To these positions outlined by some of the semi-intellectuals of our party, the Third International has already responded in the **Theses on the structure, methods and action of the Communist Parties** approved in its Third Congress. This document proposes:

"Thesis 53. Functional variations can occur in the current life of a Communist Party according to the different phases of the revolution." But deep down there is no essential difference in the structure that should lead to a legal and an illegal party. It must be organized in such a way that it can adapt immediately to the changes in the struggle (...) Communists must fulfill their preparatory revolutionary work in all situations and always be ready for the fight, since it is often impossible foresee the change of periods of ebb and flow, and this prediction cannot not be used to reorganize the Party, since usually the change is too fast and often comes completely by surprise ".

And further on, it adds, in Thesis 54: *"The legal parties of the capitalist countries have not yet fully understood the preparation as their own task in the face of revolutionary uprisings, against armed battles, and in general, against the illegal struggle. Too often the party organization is built with a view to prolonged legal action and according to the demands of everyday legal tasks. "*

3) Preparing cadres for the construction of a Leninist combat party, fighting pragmatism and artisanal methods, means that we must realize our party lives in the most absolute world of bourgeois democracy and legality. That if we had been in the heart of the confrontations of Ushuaia, Jujuy, Cutral Co and Tartagal **our artisanal methods would have been measured in battered, detained comrades, fleeing their homes with nowhere to go, and without the possibility of intervening decisively in those events with more force than in legal work.**

And now that accusing us of "revoltists" is fashionable, we wish you, comrades of the majority, had learned something from the revolts, and of the elements of civil war that took place on the edges in Argentina, during the process of mass counter-offensive. So we indeed would have written, with large bold letters, that the biggest deviation of our party was the construction of a party in Federal Capital and Great Buenos Aires, oblivious to the most advanced processes of the fighting that took place in our country. A party that as such has been centrally built in ten years of bourgeois democracy in our country, with a view to a prolonged legal action and according to the demands of everyday legal tasks.

We would have remembered that due to this legalism and democratism, of which the leadership is responsible, yes, comrades; under our responsibility, and we included ourselves, in the first row, more than 140 comrades were marked by the bourgeois state. We would have educated the party against petty-bourgeois legalism rising **there is no essential difference in the structure that both a legal and an illegal party should strive to get .**

In the documents that today support the majority faction, the Leninist term of "conspirator" and "professional members" that fight the artisanal methods, does not exist. They fill their mouths talking about "People's Tribunes", giving this Leninist term a socialist propagandist character and that today goes with "the whole program to the masses". Precisely, the Leninist definition of professional revolutionaries is to carry out legal and illegal work in a party prepared for the great convulsions, time of crisis, wars and revolutions. Therefore, every professional militant is above all, a great conspirer, against the established system and against treacherous leaderships, true police of the bourgeois state within the labor movement.

That is why Leninism is not the party of the insurrectional slaves as was the heroic movement led by Spartacus to face slavery, but that of the professional conspirers' revolutionaries. This category of professional revolutionary conspirers is opposed to the notion of insurgent slaves, because not all those who made insurrections like the thousands that were in the history of capitalism, not all the insurgents, are part of the revolutionary party. That is why Bolshevism is a selection and General Staff, that is, a party of professional revolutionaries who conspire.

Lenin says in the What is to be done?: "To such an extent is the conspiratorial character essential

condition of such organization, that all other conditions (number of members, their selection, their functions, etc.) have to be coordinated with it".

Let's see comrades of the majority, those who began by denying this Leninist character of the revolutionary party, those who converted Leninism and Trotskyism into semimenchevism from the construction point of view, are already grouping themselves in the ranks of the social-democrat wing of the Trotskyist movement. Social Democrats that the only "conspiracy" they see are the ones they find in their "secret factions", when their little or big apparatus are threatened.

Bolshevism is a SELECTION. That is why Lenin said, against the Mensheviks, in the same *What is to be done ?*: *"It is easier to catch ten intelligent men than a hundred imbeciles. This axiom (which will always be worth the applause of a hundred imbeciles) it seems obvious only because, in the course of your reasoning, you have jumped from one question to another (...) I will tell you that it is much more difficult to catch ten intelligent men than to a hundred imbeciles (...)* **By "intelligent men" in the matter of organization it is necessary to understand only, as I have indicated it in several occasions, the professional revolutionaries, the same thing if they are students or workers who they are forged as such professional revolutionaries. "(Our bolds).**

Will we now be treated as narodniki, that is, populists and rebellious, ultra - Leftists?

Comrades, the movement and pragmatism are the consequence of a party that is not scientifically prepared with professional members to go through the different phases that bring the events. They are nothing more than the organizational expression of a deviation from adaptation to bourgeois democracy.

We are not going to raise here the set of conspiratorial measures that our party never took, because they can only be understood by a party that votes and adopts the resolutions of the Third International, and confronts the pressures of the bourgeois democratic regime that shapes us. But we will also clarify that only a healthy regime, based on democratic centralism that allows a revolutionary selection of its members, that will make unbearable for the amateurs and eclectics their lives in our party, will be a great guarantee and will the foundations for legal work and will set up the basis for a serious legal - illegal work in our organization.

4) Trotsky already argued that the

fundamental preparatory work for forming trained cadres in this legal and illegal work, following Lenin's argument against the German, English and Dutch ultra-leftist, was to work in the unions led by the prison guards of the bourgeois state, and work in the workers movement and in the factories controlled by the foremen and bosses. That is, where legal and illegal work is essential, carried out far from the ears of the informers, the bureaucracy and the managers, even though outside, and episodically, the broadest bourgeois democracy exists.

But we know that for the majority faction, the greatest pressure we have to degenerate is "workerism". Those backward workers who can infect and prevent our internationalist turn. As if we had many union workers who are bringing us the pressure of a backward workers movement! When what is happening is completely upside down. The real challenge of our party is nothing more than to use the partial weight of our different isolated tactics to concentrate them in the realization of a deep work in the most important worker concentrations in Argentina.

Because to correct this situation is to see the class struggle of our country as a refraction of the international class struggle, where Indonesia, Albania, Ecuador, Brazil, and also the crash that prepares more new and serious convulsions, they are a foretaste of what can happen in Argentina, and that they are not exactly another fifteen years of quiet bourgeois democracy.

Because new and bigger theoretical, programmatic and strategic leaps, new and bolder tactics are also proposed, but at the service of achieving a solid settlement of our party in key places of the Argentine proletariat. This and nothing else meant Trotsky's alert to the American section when he said that "The class composition of the party must correspond to its class program on the American section of the Fourth International is proletarianized or will cease to exist."

And our party is already threatened by it, for being built for ten years in bourgeois democracy, and for having in our bosom too much leaven of invaluable companions who come from the student and democratic environment, but if we do not educate them in this sense, they are and they will be the real pressure for our own degeneration.

The majority faction is still like the lapwing, it squeals on one side and lays eggs on the

other: so far this factional struggle, while shrieking that the "crack changed everything," the only thing they refuse to change is the nefarious Chapter III, a copy of "Problemas de Organización" by Nahuel Moreno, and all the eclectic policy that runs through the entire document in its various chapters.

5) We already showed in the chapter which speaks of the outbreak as the "desertion" of comrades, against what is proposed in Chapter III, they were only the first symptoms of an outbreak "in installments", comrades that by right and left, or powerless, in a partial way, they left our organization, anticipating this outbreak of the maximum party leadership.

For the majority faction, the problem was "bureaucratic methods of leadership". Again, an administrative and demagogic vision, which, like the accusation of "secret faction" today to the TBI, tends to separate politics, strategy, program and tactics from the crisis in the party regime.

The "bureaucratic methods" (and we hope that they do not make any incident for this term, comrades of the majority), were and are the expression of the national-Trotskyist tendencies and of centrist adaptation that our party has been dragging along and expressed in its Consensus regime that drowned the political struggle inside the party.

6) We have already seen how the self-proclaiming turn is only allowing us to capture groups of LVO that are automatically constituted as the best tactical applicators.

But let's go to the core of the relationship between the Central Committee and the cells that Chapter III proposes. Because this is already "Problemas de Organización" of Nahuel Moreno with forty degrees of fever. We believe that Moreno would not have encouraged so much, to such a bureaucratic and centrist conception of the party.

In relation to the LVO groups, the disjointed inheritance of our MNPTR tactic, today the detractors of the MNPTR use it in a centrist way. Same as Nahuel Moreno who said that the key was to go first with the newspaper, and then organize new groups. For Moreno, also one of the keys of the organizational revolution that he proposed for the MAS, whose axis was to strengthen the MAS, was to gather these groups to act, that is, to develop tactics. Of course, outside of any struggle among parties, of all strategic vision,

and those of course had to make propaganda. Moreno included in the "party revolution" of course also a "revolution in the cadres" to which the leaders had to "locate them" according to their "professions", and went so far as to say that "if a cadre is not useful, he is not responsible for it but of the regional leadership that has not been able to locate him in an activity where he is useful, nor stirring up him, nor motivating him for the activity".

While for the Leninist party, it is the struggle among parties and within the party itself that revolutionizes cadres and teams, in a party with wings, with tendencies, when there are differences, with central committees writing minutes so that all the teams can influence the politics of the party, and can be seen from their sector and their specific task as part of a whole, everything that can affect, aligning, rebelling, criticizing, putting the cell against the direction, etc. Everything else is cheap demagoguery and impotence of the Morenoist party.

That's why it draws attention when Chapter III raises in relation to the teams that "this is the other key institution of the party" and regrets that the teams ... for the tactics have been playing a secondary role in the decision making on the Policy to be implemented. But, how can they not be tactical teams if we do not allow them to discuss the life cycle and its relationship with the postwar boom and the development of the productive forces and the programmatic consequences that all this led to the Trotskyism of Yalta? ! But how can they not be tactical teams if we prevent them from discussing SITRAMF, our crisis in Cordoba, the Campana crisis and the action of Stalinism that prevented the powerful proletariat from sweeping away with Miguelism retaking the threads of continuity with the '75! How can they not be tactical and depoliticized teams with such a consensus in the Central Committee, which prevented them from doing themselves, fighting for their positions in the party!

And even the terrible international isolation to which we are subjected is a great depoliticizing pressure that pushes party teams to tacticism, an issue that cannot be solved only with the propaganda of the apostles sent by the national theoretical center of the international magazine. This is a very important issue, which can raise the level. But we already know, with Trotsky and Lenin, that this is not just a pedagogical problem, but that the political struggle is a true motor that forces the members to raise their level and to study.

But this is not all. The self-proclaiming Party has prepared for the party teams a new and great task so that they are not dead and but living ones. In that shameful Chapter III that the majority faction defends and continues to raise as a flag, and against which it has not been written to single word (and more than 30 days have passed since your commitment to do so), let's listen comrades what it says: **"From here on, it is key that the teams speak out clearly, even when it is possible to write minutes, nuances or differences with the central policy. Only through this survey can the CC know the different political tendencies that are expressed in the party, on the degree of acceptance of the policy by the members, and in case there are significant differences in important sectors of the party, to convene to the Congresses (even if they are not requested by colleagues who have differences) "**.

We put this in bold, comrades because this synthesizes the most scandalously bureaucratic and centrist policy and at the same time demagogic, of a caudillistic and student leadership that pragmatically has written this that hides their true convictions..

From the TBI we affirm, black on white:

a) According to chapter III, the cells must prepare minutes, write their differences and nuances so that the leadership knows the degree of acceptance of their policy, and the cells have no right to know what the true political positions of the different members of the CC, leadership's nuances, or knowing the minutes of discussion and the foundations with which their resolutions are taken.

b) That is, they cannot influence anything, they cannot align with this or that position. They are teams of tactical applicators where they can differentiate themselves around how they are applied and not around how the whole policy and the strategy of the party are defined. Since immediately afterwards it says that "each cell must select one or two tactics to apply on their forehead." And when there are many people who complain, what the populist demagogue does?: he calls for Conferences or Congresses in order to play it down the situation. Suffocated cells like that can only provoke cultural revolutions, just like Morenoism.

c) And then these people have the effrontery to write that the party's cells are "the other key institution together with the Central Committee", moreover, demanding them to act "as small central committees, that is, considering

themselves with the responsibility of making decisions that if they do not take them nobody will." That is, decisions on tactics, and not on the whole national and international party policy, day by day, as it should be in the true democratic centralism in which Leninism was educated, which was a permanent clash between the CC, the cells and the reality in which they intervened, on the whole of the strategy, the policy, the program and the tactics of their party. Only then will there be living and not dead cells of the movementist and self-proclaiming Party. As Trotsky says in "Stalin, the Great Organizer of Defeats, before the lucid members of the Central Committee finish elaborating the theory and the program, anticipating the changes that can be operated in reality. This is democratic Leninist centralism, because without this action of active cells, there will be no people's tribunes. **Demagogues!**

7) Meanwhile, the Central Committee expresses itself through the newspaper, the international magazine and the internal bulletins, without minutes, without public positions of its leaders, without minorities and circumstantial majorities!

Comrades, we have already assumed, and especially comrade HR, all our responsibility for permitting this shameful Chapter III, which infected the collective conscience of our party.

Do the comrades know that in the statutes of the Bolshevik party in its beginnings, then liquidated by the Trotskyism of Yalta, not only the Central Committee was voted in the Congress, but the Editorial Committee of the newspaper, where the leaders wrote, even earning a salary for it? And when there were differences, when the struggle arose, it was around the constitution of that drafting committee? Do you remember, comrades, that when the Russian Social Democracy broke in 1902, Martov and Vera Zasulich were left with the writing of Iskra? Do you remember that in 1910, Stalin who was on the editorial board of Pravda refused to publish Lenin's articles, because Lenin denounced that Stalin capitulated the Czarist Duma and made all kinds of agreements with the Mensheviks? And Lenin had to send to Sverdlov to regain control of Pravda? Don't you remember when in the middle of the Russian revolution, before Lenin arrived, with all the prestige they had as old Bolsheviks, Kamenev and Stalin evicted the Pravda editorial office and took over its leadership in a right-wing turn to support the progressive measures of the provisional government and the workers of Viborg sent letters saying "Down with the scoundrels who write that capitulatory policy!"?

Do you think, comrades of the majority faction, that making the newspaper revolutionary you only have to change the color and layout, while the CC remains hidden behind documents and official positions?

But this conception of the Central Committee, the role of the leaders and the revolutionary cells, means that the **"CC is everything", "it is the Party between Congress and Congress"**, as it is underlying in what is written in Chapter III, and as you have said and orally say the maximum leaders of the majority and their cadres.

In 1922, 46 comrades rose up writing a letter and opening a great discussion on party's regime, against Stalinism that began its process of turning into bureaucratic centrism! If against positions like this, the embryo of the Left Opposition began to be forged! But if precisely the equation of democratic centralism defines that the CC is not everything, even between congress and congress!

And this does not mean that the character of a party is not defined by the character of its General Staff, if it is centrist, revolutionary, counterrevolutionary. And in our case, for what the majority faction defends today, it is evolving from revolutionary to centrist.

8) How different from how Bolshevism was educated, is the conception of the majority faction! Because without this Leninist method, which guaranteed strong political struggles inside and at the same time to hit in action as a single fist, how else can you control the leaders in a party? This conception was based on what Lenin said: *"The only principle of serious organization to which the leaders of our movement must abide must be the following: the most severe conspiratorial discretion, the most rigorous selection of affiliates and the preparation of professional revolutionaries. If we get these qualities, something much more important than "democratism" is guaranteed, namely: full and fraternal mutual trust among revolutionaries. "(Lenin, What is to be done?)*

Therefore, the discussions were very hard and even violent in the Bolshevik party, but when they were exhausted, because they were truthful, those differences were over, they were episodic, and there was no resentment among the revolutionaries. Unlike the Trotskyism of Yalta, where the centrist adaptation created resent groups, leaders with their bases, and interests of small apparatuses over the general interests of revolutionary politics..

Has the majority faction said the tens and tens of new comrades that in every decisive turn of the Bolshevik party emerged tendencies and factions, and that the leadership always fought so that they did not shut themselves, producing unnecessary ruptures, or maintaining themselves as permanent hidden groups? This method would be followed by Trotsky during his lifetime until the foundation of the Fourth International.

The faction previously hidden and now majority of the PTS does not educate in this. Because in the last instance, as Lenin says, the most iron discipline that the revolutionary proletariat needed to maintain itself in power after having conquered it in October 1917, how was it forged, how was it achieved? For him, it was in years of struggle and combat: **"First, by the class consciousness of the proletarian vanguard and by its fidelity to the revolution, by its tenacity, by its self-denial and its heroism. Second, to establish the closest contact that is, in the sense of merging to a certain extent with the broadest masses of workers, primarily with the proletariat, but also with the non-proletarian working masses. Third, because of the correct political leadership that this vanguard exercises, because of the correctness of its strategy and its political tactics, provided that the broad masses have been convinced, by their own experience, that they are correct, without these conditions it is impossible to achieve discipline in a revolutionary party, truly capable of being the vanguard's party, whose mission is to overthrow the bourgeoisie and transform the entire society. Without these conditions inevitably all attempts to implant the discipline are spoiled, and they end in phraseology, buffoons. On the other side, these conditions cannot arise suddenly. They only form through prolonged efforts and hard experience. Its formation is facilitated by a successful revolutionary theory which in turn is not a dogma, but acquires its definitive form only in close connection with the practical activity of a truly mass movement and truly revolutionary."** (Lenin, "Left-Wing" Communism: An Infantile Disorder. Our Bolds).

And when the tendency of the CC stated that one of the serious crises that was pushing to our party degeneration, was not to had merged with a real revolutionary proletarian movement, they told us "pro workers, pro workers!".

Because we are convinced that if we have merged with the left wing of the world Trotskyist movement, and with radicalized sectors of the vanguard in Argentina, the majority faction could

not lead to this reaction in the whole line inside the PTS. Because the students and revolutionary vanguard workers, cannot be organized or led as things, as applicators of tactics, and with messianic organizers who direct personally through the "axes" distributing the trades. They could not have been led with silent central committees. With cells that do not control the leaders and at the same time they lead direct tactics like the Ceprodh or the Marxist courses, and are not controlled at all by the revolutionary cells. When the CC "is everything" you decide with movimentist methods the politics and the revolutionary cells not organized in factions in the fronts of intervention, where the whole policy is discussed and voted as a refraction of the international and national strategy.

"The CC is everything" for having been isolated from a real revolutionary movement, and for the lack of radicalization, ends up negotiating with the leaders of the tactics, the Ceprodh and the Marxist Chairs, transferring the consensus method outwards.

How different from Bolshevik education, that for years and years educated in which the leaders had to convince the cells first, and then going with them towards the vanguard and the masses! Daughters of this conception of party were the cells of the workers of Vyborg, educated for years by Bolshevism. Daughters of this revolutionary party theory were the Bolshevik cells that in St. Petersburg in 1912 led in the May Day uprising, with their program, to the Menshevik cells, when all the leadership of that Regional was imprisoned.

Tell us comrades, from where this Central Committee got so much authority to impose so much discipline that it even left out of the party teams, before starting to discuss, a minority tendency of the CC followed by tens of young comrades and revolutionary workers.

Another iron alternative: for the Moreno's party, the cells are tactical applicators and the CC is everything ... all hidden behind documents and newspapers written by scribes of the elegant Bonapartism of its general secretary or its consensus team. For Leninist party, democratic centralism forms and educates leaders and personalities with positions and revolutionary cells that, through these positions and their own ones, acquired by their relationship with the vanguard and the masses, control of the party as a whole, even the organs of their leaders.

g) The only thing you will be able to tell us is that it does not apply to the "little leagues". But it happens that we are not any league, we passed our initial phase of propaganda group, and as our documents state, as a national party we have been left in an unwanted phase: nor can we be the old propaganda group, nor can we be a vanguard party yet, because of the objective conditions. And the proof of this is that it is precisely with tendential struggles and factions is the way we are taking lessons from our failures to go to the forefront and on our isolation at the international level. So as to prepare cadres and members, and a more settled party with ties to sectors of the vanguard and the advanced layers, for the next collisions and crises that are being prepared, under the new revulsive events of the international situation.

Before this, from the TBI we affirm:

a) That the majority faction tries to go backwards, that it is a retrograde faction and so, cannot end otherwise promoted to propagandist and theorist party that gets fatter liquidating the action program and going with the whole program to the masses. That is, the old PTS but "fatter".

b) We affirm that the majority faction sees the possibility of building a vanguard party in an evolutionary preparatory phase, when it affirms and defends in the nefarious chapter III *"that in those regional ones that have tens of members and several intervention fronts, the role of the regional political commissions would be important, in the sense of integrating the various activities, not only in the strategy of international and national construction, but also to the political phenomena to the tradition and to the revolutionary history of the area where they operate. A key role to establish the party in the Regionals"*. **That is to say that we can march to large regionals, jumping to build a vanguard party, without mergers, without radicalization processes, without defeat of the centrist parties and Stalinism, that is, without any effort.**

We believe that the characteristics of an action Party arrive when the party, taking advantage of the positions it has achieved, use them to strike centrally at the national level.

c) With Trotsky we affirm that by sectarian degeneration, the "small leagues" can degenerate either as much, or worse and more quickly than the big opportunist groups, like the group "Que faire?" (What is to be done?), against which he wrote **The Class, the Party and the**

Leadership-Why was the Spanish Proletariat Defeated (1940), defining it in the following way: *"In Paris, a newspaper, Que faire? is published And I do not know why it considers itself Marxist, although in reality it remains within the framework of the empiricism of the bourgeois intellectuals of the left and of those isolated workers who have assimilated all the vices of the intellectuals"*

We affirm that we are not yet *Que faire?* But we are on the way to its sectarian degeneration, if the party does not stop in this road to which the hidden faction yesterday and the majority faction of the PTS now, is taking us. The degeneration by sectarianism has caused perhaps more monstrous phenomena in the sects than in the great mass or vanguard parties that have degenerated, because the former's leaders, precisely because they are in small groups, do not have on them any mechanism of control by the vanguard or the masses, and usually, when they defend the control of their small apparatus, they use to be more despotic, more bureaucratic and devoid of any program.

Therefore, from the TBI we will fight to change and send to the trash can Chapters II and III, that is, the consensus documents, and instead, and based on our platform, we have began to set the basis in this preparatory phase, taking the legacy of Bolshevism and Trotskyism, to form revolutionary internationalist cadres and members who set out to lay the foundations of a Leninist combat party in Argentina, with a healthy and true democratic centralism, in struggle against the centrists and the treacherous leaderships, as part of the struggle to refound Argentine Trotskyism in the struggle to rebuild the Fourth International.

**THE "35 AND 35" OF THE MAS OF THE 90:
THE OTHER SIDE OF THE SAME COIN OF THE
FALSE INTELLECTUALS AND THE THEORIST AND
SUBJECTIVIST PARTY.**

For the new comrades, we want to inform you that the majority faction has tried to ridicule the position of Comrade P. when it states that it is necessary to take the workers of the party to leadership positions, so that they participate in a school of political and revolutionary formation. They attempt to ridicule this position of Comrade P. in his letter, equalling it with the policy of the MAS to "bring 35 union workers to the CC", when

this party was breaking out and in the middle of a crisis in the 90s, so that along with the other 35 of the apparatus and the CC, they could prevent the dissolution. It was a demagogic policy of a centrist apparatus. For in the MAS each Regional leader had his "delegate" or his "worker leader" next to them, who among other things helped them and were supported by the "worker wing" when there were cultural revolutions and outbreaks in the Regionals, so that those leaders would not fall.

This ridiculous and gross falsification of the positions of the TBI accompanied the silent and stealthy removal of *In defense of Marxism*, which, with great fanfare, the majority faction had wanted to use against the alleged "workerism" of P. and the then-minority of the CC. It was removed in silence, almost without anyone noticing, while P. insisted in his letter that he had adopted that great program as his own and wanted to transform it into a current party program.

It is clear that many times centrism takes elements from Trotskyism to deform and adapt them to their convenience, as did the leadership of the MAS when looking for support so that their centrist party did not explode in their hands.

From the TBI, and throughout this platform we have argued, that the danger of degeneration of our party does not come from the existence of a right wing made up of tens and tens of union delegates and union leaders. Unfortunately, due to our marginality in the workers movement, we do not have this pressure, except in a very small way in comrades who occupy trade union positions in ATE and in Brunelli's (Metalworkers Union Bureaucrat, TN) delegates staff. But they are very few.

The real pressure we have is that which comes from the academic, student and democratic media at a time when there is neither radicalization, nor workers and masses ascent. The real pressure we have is the decomposition of the Trotskyist movement that in the 90s broke down and crystallized in various sects from which we could not drag any current to the left, due to our slowness in conquering the theory and the program.

Our danger of degeneration comes from our international isolation, which is already producing this theorist and academist deviation of the majority faction.

And although they do not like it, the pressures have become because we have not managed to come together with a real revolutionary

proletarian movement, in these ten years past. Ten years in which old Stalinism and old centrism of Yalta have both broken down, sending home and demoralizing an entire generation of the workers' vanguard. The favorite son this demoralization that Stalinism and centrism created, is Santillan and his CCC (Organization mainly of unemployed workers born in the Argentinean north revolts in the '90s, TN), which has acted as a true counterrevolutionary left leg of the treacherous trade union bureaucracy and the regime.

And a serious danger comes from the academic and petty bourgeois media in the capital, where there is no emergency of a bourgeois Left in this preparatory phase. And this situation can cause, as it is already doing, that sectors of that bourgeois "vacuum" of the regime, come to us because of the triumph of our tactics in those sectors.

The real danger we have in front of us, after ten years of existence and isolation, and due to the configuration of the international and national Trotskyist movement, is the influx of new intellectual elements coming from the student movement, which push us more and more to occupy the empty space on the left of the center-left. They influence us as a leaven in our ranks, at a time when the atomization of the vanguard and advanced layers of the proletariat continues in our country.

Comrades, Trotsky oriented the American Party during the whole 1930s, not as you say "contributing the dialectic". Our teacher, from the beginning of the 30s to the 40s, first advising, and then through a fierce fight, aimed to guarantee the proletarian and revolutionary character of the American SWP.

Already in 1933, when Trotsky said that it was necessary to leave behind the previous work that had been carried out by the Left Opposition (which he considered of a "preparatory" nature), when he was pushing the struggle to leave behind the propaganda circles and start the transition to be Combative political organizations of the proletariat, he wrote: *"A revolutionary is formed in a climate of criticism of all that exists, including his own organization, only firm discipline can be achieved through conscious confidence in the leadership, that's why the problem of the internal regime is extraordinarily important for us: the advanced workers should be given the possibility of conscious and independent participation in the construction of the party and in the direction of the whole of its politics. The young workers must have the possibility of thinking, criticizing, making*

mistakes and correcting themselves ... "This will be possible Trotsky continued," if our organizations, basing themselves on the solid principles of Marxism, are ready to fight irreconcilably, with democratic methods, all opportunist, centrist and adventurous influence. "

On October 10, 1937 in a letter to Cannon on the social composition of the party, Trotsky insisted on the danger that too much leaven meant, more than the party needed. And he insisted, as we stated in Chapter 3 of our Platform, that *"for a worker the situation in the governing bodies of the party is at the same time a high level political school".* In the same letter, it gives a way out: *"in your ranks there is an important sector of non-worker Jewish elements. They can be a very valuable asset if the party manages to gradually remove them from a closed environment and link them to the factory workers in their daily activity. I think that orientation would also generate a healthier atmosphere in the party (...)* We can only set a general rule: *the militant of the party that in three or six months does not win a new worker for the party, is not a good militant. **If we gave ourselves that general orientation and verified the practical results week by week, we would avoid a great danger, namely: that intellectuals and white-collar workers suppressed the workers, condemned them to silence and transformed the party into a club of high-level discussion, but absolutely uninhabitable for the workers.**"* (Our Bolds)

In that same year, Trotsky writes to Cannon, as we mentioned in Chapter III, a letter reaffirming *"I have pointed out hundreds of times that the worker who goes unnoticed in the normal conditions of Party's life, reveals remarkable qualities when the situation changes, when knowledge of working life and practical qualities are needed "*. And he proposes again that *"all the workers go to the CC" but (and we will put it in capital letters so you understand it once and for all) **"IT IS ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY FOR THE NEXT CONGRESS TO CHOOSE THE LARGEST POSSIBLE AMOUNT OF WORKERS TO THE LOCAL AND CENTRAL COMMITTEES"***. Did you understand, comrades? To all the positions of leadership, cells, local, Regional committees and also to the CC!

And this "workerist" of Trotsky insists: *"When choosing these new comrades there is an inevitable risk. If only a third of the new workers' members of the LOCAL and CENTRAL committees prove to be up to the job, the result is excellent. "And then he insists, as if writing for the current majority fraction of the PTS: **"There exists in all organizations a difficulty, that there are***

traditional members of the committee and also that secondary considerations of a factional and personal nature play a decisively large role in the making of candidate lists. The task is to break with the routine that is the beginning of bureaucratization, to convince the organization and especially its ruling stratum (which is more difficult) that it is necessary to systematically renew the composition of all the governing organs of the Party". (Our Bolds).

On December 8 of the same year, he insists again: *"Every real revolutionary who notices the mistakes of the partisan regime, must first say: we must bring ten new workers to the party."*

Well, comrades of the majority. We affirm, far from 35 trade union workers to the CC to save the apparatus, we need promoting the worker wing of the party and above all the working youth to all the leading positions. And we say with Trotsky: *less talking and more hearing!*

All the cells of the party that militate in the Ceprodh and in the Marxist Courses must, through these channels that the party has conquered, win over ten workers for each cell in the next six months. Because from these channels is where there are more possibilities to do so, and far from contradicting them, they will strengthen and improve their revolutionary character.

It is necessary to concentrate the forces of the top leaders of the CC, to strengthen deep and patient work in key sectors of the proletariat, for the next six months to build new revolutionary circles in key institutions.

It is necessary to convince -and we know that it is very difficult to do so- that we should advance in placing as leaders of cells, of zones, and also of the CC, a whole new layer of the working class and youth, to whom the semi - intellectuals of our party tell they are useless. And thus they educate them, acting as a true transmission belt of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology that workers are ignorant and backward, and that they cannot learn and move quickly, not only by means of courses and studying, but in the way of using the leading positions of our party as a school of revolutionary formation, of formation of true Tribunes of the people.

This is the true fusion between intellectuals and revolutionary workers at this moment in our party, when we must prepare ourselves to give new and greater leaps in our fusion with the workers movement, when reality gives us new possibilities, before new leaps in the international

and national situation.

And different from the "35 and 35", we want these workers to make a real school of theoretical and revolutionary training, that the most prominent among them were part of the Editorial Board of the Estrategia Internacional and the LVO. That the intellectuals have the patience to study with them to prepare in common the Marxist Courses, so that they even take an active part in them. Because comrades, if we get two or three workers capable of explaining capitalist exploitation and the core of revolutionary strategy and theory, polemicizing with the intellectuals of the bourgeois university together with our revolutionary intellectuals, in front of 200 or 300 students, we will be much more close to winning over and even expanding our work in the youth, and that the students we won were of better quality, a million times more revolutionary.

What a shame, Comrade Christian Castillo, speaking about an audience in front of new comrades and other old university students, self-criticizing for having been "the Taliban of the workers' movement in the university", without saying what we say here! It is a shame! We cannot even compare to the generation of the '70 who were proud of taking advanced workers to the University.

The exponents of the majority fraction speak

the language of the pressures of the center-left, and not of Trotskyism. That is why, in the last analysis, they are intellectual badges of a small apparatus of a small Marxist League, used today to muzzle the workers of the minority, and keep them in silence and depoliticization. Making them believe that this is not for them, that Marxism and the science of the liberation of the exploited is not for the exploited themselves.

That is why, from the TBI, we affirm, that the intellectual "badges" of the self-proclaiming parties are as depoliticizing and enemy of developing worker intelligentsia as the centrist apparatuses of the economicist parties, which use the trade union workers that they themselves educate, as union "badges" to hold their leading positions.

Neither trade union "badges" nor intellectual "badges"! For a revolutionary fusion between Marxist intellectuals and workers intelligence!

For professional revolutionary members, true conspirators to subvert the existing order of exploitation!

If the PTS doesn't detain its national-Trotskyist and self-proclaiming course and become proletarian, it will inevitably degenerate.

*** * ***

APPENDIX

The “crisis of subjectivity” of Albamonte and the rightist fraction of the ex-PTS

The ideological misery of the revisionist and opportunist left

“The objective prerequisites for the proletarian revolution have not only “ripened”; they have begun to get somewhat rotten. Without a socialist revolution, in the next historical period at that, a catastrophe threatens the whole culture of mankind. The turn is now to the proletariat, i.e., chiefly to its revolutionary vanguard. The historical crisis of mankind is reduced to the crisis of the revolutionary leadership.”

Leon Trotsky, Transitional Program

Introduction

International Strategy No. 10, published by the right wing fraction of the PTS, as they say, “marked a milestone”. But not for the supposed “theoretical-political” advances but for a brutal revision of the central thesis of the Trotskyist Transitional Program:

In issue 10 of IS they said: “... currently the worsening of the world crisis reveals an enormous contradiction between the putrefaction of imperialist capitalism (and with them the maturity of the objective conditions for the proletarian revolution) and the immaturity of the revolutionary subjectivity of the working class”. This concept was repeated throughout the entire magazine.

In issue 1 of the Bulletin of International Workers’ Information (BIOI) of the FPT (11/26/98), we demolished this conception of Emilio Albamonte and the rightist fraction from all angles, starting by opposing the central thesis of the Transitional Program, thesis that “The crisis of mankind is reduced to the crisis of its revolutionary leadership”. We showed them how, like all centrists, they

ended up blaming the masses instead of the treacherous leaderships, for the defeats suffered.

We showed that the disappearance of the crisis of leadership category led to Morenoist objectivism instead of to the Permanent Revolution; that when the struggle against the treacherous leaders disappeared, a pacifist conception of the revolution was left without obstacles for the masses; that fell into a social-democratic party conception to help these with propaganda to overcome the “crisis of subjectivity”, instead of the Leninist combat party, insurrectional, to defeat the treacherous leaderships and lead the masses to the seizure of power; and finally we showed that such a conception went hand in hand with self-proclamation, a false academic and theoretical “internationalism”, which concealed National-Trotskyism, and abandoned the struggle for the reconstruction of the Fourth International.

Albamonte and the right wing faction have not been able to answer a single one of these

devastating criticisms of their revisionist "thesis". There was the remotest possibility that they would have a minimum of revolutionary honesty and that they would recognize the mistake, that they would tell us ultimately last, what was written in IS No. 10 was no more than an outburst (with which the discussion would be closed in what to this point it refers).

But no. In a document entitled Draft resolution on balance and orientation of the internationalist policy of the PTS and the FT (IS) of December 18, 1998, presented to the congress that month, they insist again on the same, and even reacting as petty bourgeois obfuscated, they advance by formulating a "theoretical" thesis, a thesis that puts them at the end of the century **in the field of Menshevism against Bolshevism**, as vulgar reformers. Now they tell us that **"the crisis of subjectivity includes the crisis of leadership"**, that **"the overcoming of the 'crisis of subjectivity' includes the overcoming of the 'crisis of revolutionary leadership'"**.

As we shall see, that of Emilio Albamonte, is a nationalist-Trotskyist, Menshevik "theory" that serves on the one hand to justify the backwardness of the revolution by blaming the consciousness of the masses, in a tone consonant with those intellectuals who see of a very bad taste to attack the "left" parties, the reformist and counterrevolutionary leaders responsible for the defeats, with whom they peacefully agree and coexist all day. And on the other hand, it serves to accompany knowledgeably the LRCI in its capitulation to the governments of the bourgeois workers' parties in Europe, to its dissolution together with all the centrism in the imperialist democracies and its adaptation to the labor aristocracy and the bureaucracy union, which the rightist fraction repeats in the only place where it has a small worker's job (Astilleros Río Santiago).

We would not waste time answering this position or the inconsistencies of the university pond with which it is intended to sustain it now - a tangle in its own words to try to save, after we demolish its "leafy elaborations", the prestige of "organic intellectuals of the working class" - if it were not for the same as "in the madness there is a method", behind the inconsistencies of prestigious petty bourgeois there are conceptions that poison the conscience of hundreds of honest Trotskyist militants and advanced avant-garde elements. But such is the confusion that gets, that, covering our noses, we will face and fight it, returning to the ABC, struggling from Bolshevism against these "new" Menshevik elaborations of Albamonte y Co.

What do they say, now, in essence, Albamonte and the rightist fraction? They begin by asking themselves in this document (Our Bolds):

"The 'reformist recomposition of the workers' movement' (expressed in a supposed strengthening of the unions, increase of affiliations, and in the electoral triumphs of the social democratic parties in Europe, N of R.) that we have described above, does it mean an advance in the 'subjectivity of the proletariat' that in the editorial of IS No. 8 we said that it was **tending to 'zero'?**"

And then they tell us:

"... the 'crisis of revolutionary subjectivity of the proletariat' includes the 'crisis of revolutionary leadership' but it covers other aspects: the lack of new combat institutions (those that have emerged have been ephemeral now); the disappearance of the idea of the proletarian revolution in the bosom of the masses or at least large sectors of the vanguard, the nonexistence of "mass centrism" as ruptures of the great reformist apparatuses. For this reason, what strengthens the "subjectivity" are the experiences that imply milestones of class independence, of class consciousness "(Our bolds).

To answer:

"... the answer to the question we asked at the beginning of this thesis is: insofar as the 'recomposition' of the workers' movement is reformist', it does not mean an advance in revolutionary subjectivity".

And as a conclusion, they pontificate:

"... subjectivity is still extremely low today".

ALBAMONTE BREAKS WITH THE THEORY-PROGRAM OF THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION

The theory of the Permanent Revolution establishes the relationship between the **political subject**, the revolutionary party, and the **social subject**, the working class. The revisionism of the theory of the Permanent Revolution has manifested itself in two ways: an objectivist,

which reduces the party to a secondary role, maintaining as a rule that the mobilization of the masses, with any leadership, can reach the historical objectives of the class worker another subjectivist, who inverts the terms, rejecting any revolutionary process that does not lead the revolutionary party.

Albamonte's thesis, that "*the crisis of subjectivity includes the crisis of leadership*", and that "*the overcoming of the 'crisis of subjectivity' includes the overcoming of the 'crisis of revolutionary leadership'*" breaks with that theory because **it means the dissolution of the political subject in the social subject, of the party in the masses**, in the preparatory moments, and in the revolutionaries, as we shall see in the case of the Russian Revolution, to the dissolution of the party in the soviets.

The fraction of Albamonte has the "theory" that to the high "subjectivity" once reached by the masses, just needs to add the party, as an element in "last instance" for that subjectivity to be "true", when he writes:

"... what strengthens the 'subjectivity' are the experiences that involve milestones of class independence, of class consciousness.

Overcoming the 'crisis of subjectivity' includes overcoming the 'crisis of revolutionary leadership'.

This means that a real subjectivity of the proletariat will be one in which the proletariat counts on its front with a revolutionary party, and leads the poor masses of the city and the countryside behind it. If not, all the pulls of subjectivity that the proletariat conquers will end in deviation from the revolution (Nicaragua of '79, Portugal of '74, France of '68, etc.), in defeats (China of 1925-27, Indonesia of the '65, Chile of '73, etc.) or, under exceptional conditions, in brutally deformed revolutions (Yugoslavia and China in the postwar period, Cuba, Vietnam) "(Our Bolds).

This conception is Menshevik, because it means the following: that the masses, which have "low subjectivity" today, progressively evolve towards a higher one, towards "class independence in a broad sense", to which the party collaborates with propaganda, and in the end, when the masses conquer this "high subjectivity" they will converge with the party so that it leads them

to the seizure of power.

Because, let's stop at what they say:

"What strengthens the 'subjectivity' are the experiences that imply milestones of class independence, of class consciousness".

And the leaderships, what role do they play?

Saying the above without clarifying this question, is only a half truth, or a lie. Because it takes into account for the advancement of consciousness only the objective factor, the mobilization, and not the subjective one: the necessary defeat of the counterrevolutionary leaderships and the reconstruction of the Fourth International. As he himself manifested it, for Albamonte, in the "strengthening of subjectivity" the resolution of the leadership crisis plays a secondary, subordinate role.

They tell us that without a revolutionary party, the revolutions are defeated, deviated or degenerated. But it is nothing more than a hoax to hide their true Menshevik conception: the party is nothing more than an aggregate to the "subjectivity of the masses", fulfills the role of laying down the "pulls of subjectivity", because the real strategy is (see IS No. 10) fight for "class independence in a broad sense".

All centrists, whether sectarian or opportunistic, confuse the relationship between the objective (the mobilization of the masses, their actions and the organizations that are given for the struggle) and the subjective (the revolutionary party). The MAS of the '80s poisoned the mind of its militants saying that "the party was going to include the Soviets in its bosom", that they were going to be an appendix of the party. Today the PTS, like the other side of the same coin, holds very loose of body that the "high subjectivity", the radicalization processes, the actions in the streets, the pickets, the factory committees, etc., and in that case the workers' militias and the soviets dominate the revolutionary party.

Marxism, making use of the categories of Hegel, differentiates the class itself, the working class as it occurs in capitalist society, from the class for itself, aware of its revolutionary historical role, understood as the existence of a revolutionary party at the head of the masses. This theory that the "crisis of subjectivity includes the crisis of leadership" **means that the class itself includes the class for itself**, that is, liquid to the revolutionary leadership. Those who told us, at the beginning of the fractional struggle, that the

revolutionary party, which would have the right theory and program in the hands of the intellectuals, is not shaped by reality, **now they dissolve it completely in it**. The thesis of Albamonte is therefore a liquidationist thesis of the revolutionary party. That is why the category of "Leninist combat party, insurrectionist" has disappeared from its "party documents".

Just as the Mandelism during the 1968-1974 period was an example of impressionism in the face of the "high subjectivity" shown by the working class at that stage, raising the historical law that workers could come to know "critical social science", Albamonte and his right wing fraction, conversely, are impressed by the "low subjectivity", by the backwardness in consciousness that the defeats imposed by the counterrevolutionary leaderships and the loss of conquests produced. But both have the same method, that of seeing an evolving consciousness, by propaganda, from "zero" to "true" or historical.

They are astonished, and formulate, as a law for a whole historical period, that the permanent revolution or the lessons of a school of revolutionary strategy that drew the Third International, or the central thesis of the Transitional Program that "the crisis of humanity is reduced to the crisis of its revolutionary leadership" would no longer be valid. They tell us that these laws do not work anymore and they renounce to form cadres in them. The new law is that everything is now determined, for a historical period, by the "crisis of subjectivity", by the backwardness of the consciousness of the mass movement. Therefore, the only thing that can be done is a lot of propaganda of the program, hoping that another period like that of 1968-74 will fall from the sky and the revolutionary party will also.

FOR ALBAMONTE, THE MASSES HAVE EVERYTHING TO BLAME AND NOT TREACHEROUS LEADERSHIPS

We are then faced with the following discussion: what is the cause of the crisis of humanity, of the defeats and setbacks of the revolution? Is it the crisis of leadership, that is, the existence of counterrevolutionary leaders at the head of the workers and mass movement and the weakness of the revolutionary leadership, as Trotskyism says? Or is the cause the "crisis of subjectivity" of the masses, as Albamonte and the rightist fraction say, or as other centrists

of the POUM type have said due to the lack of "maturity"?

Against this thesis, Trotsky, in the Transitional Program argues:

*"The orientation of the masses is determined **above all** by the objective conditions of decaying capitalism, and **secondly** by the treacherous policy of the old workers' leadership".* In other words, the crisis of leadership, understood as the existence of counterrevolutionary leaderships, is so but so decisive that it is only one step lower than the objective conditions of decaying capitalism.

And add below:

"The **main obstacle** in the way of the transformation of the prerevolutionary state into a revolutionary state is the opportunist character of the proletarian leadership." (Our Bolds)

"*Mainly*", "*main obstacle*". Is it necessary that we insist with more evidence on what was the conception of Trotsky?

We are then faced with two opposing theses. A Trotskyist, Bolshevik; the other is that of Albamonte y co., which, as we shall see, contains a fully Menshevik, social-democratic conception of how the mass consciousness is forged.

For the majority fraction the "crisis of subjectivity" has its maximum expression since 1989. It opened with the abortion of the political revolution in the East and the beginning of the process of capitalist restoration, while, according to its conception, under the rule of Yalta the "subjectivity" was high, it was supposedly expressed in that the masses had the "idea" of the proletarian revolution, and in independent actions such as those of the period of great revolutionary workers and masses rise of '68 -'74. But, what Albamonte "forgets" is that the masses, even with very high "subjectivity", were dominated by the communist and social democratic parties (Chile, France, Portugal, etc.) that betrayed and defeated them.

It is because of the crisis of leadership that revolutionary efforts of such vast scope as those of the period of '68 -'74 were aborted. The final result of the process opened in '89, the very low "subjectivity" shown by the masses, to what is attributable but to these defeats provoked by the counterrevolutionary leaderships, that is, to the crisis of revolutionary leadership? And the cen-

trists, the "Yalta Trotskyism" that overtly capitulated to the counterrevolutionary apparatuses, which refused to build Trotskyist parties in the East, also have a lot to do, by their capitulations, in that "low subjectivity"!

On the basis of this true conception it is possible to understand why "subjectivity", understood as consciousness or "maturity", and therefore the orientation of the masses, on the one hand, and the leadership on the other, may be in complete contradiction, in a "180-degree angle", according to Trotsky. That is to say, that workers can demonstrate great "maturity" and "subjectivity", put up Soviet-type organisms, arm themselves, organize militias, make semi-insurrections, tear down bourgeois regimes, but they are betrayed by counterrevolutionary apparatuses, often because the defection of the revolutionary parties, as in Germany in 1923, or the betrayal of the centrists like those of the POUM in Spain in 1936-'39.

The "theoretical discovery" of Emilio Albamonte y Co. consists in the fact that there would be a category of Marxist analysis superior to that of crisis of leadership since it "includes" it: the "crisis of subjectivity". This would be a cocktail within which the leadership crisis would be part of the same level as the lack of "combat institutions", the "disappearance of the idea of revolution", the lack of centrist "ruptures" of the apparatuses.

But the reality is that the crisis of proletarian leadership ultimately **determines** "the lack of new institutions for combat" or its "ephemeral" character directly affects, with the defeats and demoralization that the counterrevolutionary leaders provoke, "the disappearance of the idea of revolution within the masses or at least in broad sectors of the vanguard." The great revolutionary rise of '68 -'74, although it fulfilled the conditions that Albamonte seeks, was aborted in France, Argentina, Portugal, Chile, etc., by the counterrevolutionary leaders in particular Stalinism. That is to say that "subjectivity" **ended up** being low **because** of the crisis of leadership, of the betrayals of counterrevolutionary apparatuses. How, then, can the leadership crisis, if it is a subordinate part, impose on itself the high "subjectivity" of that period? These are the inconsistencies in which it falls to adopt this new "thesis", which breaks with a law as simple of any structure as that "the whole subordinates the parties."

But for Albamonte, this is no longer valid. In '89, the fall of Stalinism would open a period where the lessons of the world proletariat, drawn

by the Third International and the Fourth International, which summarize 50 years of revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, would not be valid or apply now. In this turn to Menshevism, they erase the differences between Bolshevism and Menshevism with a stroke of the pen.

MENCHEVISM VS. BOLSHEVISM

Menshevism emerged as a current of Russian Marxism at the beginning of the century, opposed to Bolshevism led by Lenin, around the character of the Russian revolution and the role of the proletariat in it and the role of the revolutionary party of the working class. The Menshevism was based on the fact that Russia, since it was a backward country, had to go through a long stage of capitalist development until it reached the level of development of the most advanced countries such as Germany. They started from the fact that Russia was a country dominated by an autocracy representative of the landowning nobility, with a huge semi-feudal peasantry and a numerically weak proletariat, little or almost nothing organized, culturally and politically backward.

Therefore, according to the Mensheviks, one could not even speak of a socialist revolution for Russia, that this weak, backward, and uneducated proletariat would take power on such a poor material base. On the contrary, the task of leading the political struggle against Czarism and overthrowing it, establishing bourgeois democracy, corresponded to the liberal bourgeoisie grouped in the KDT (Constitutionalist Democrats) party, as well as to lead the entire subsequent stage of capitalist development, and the proletariat had a subordinate role.

Menshevism saw this process separated country by country, there was no world revolution for it as a strategy. It was deeply nationalistic and dependent on its own bourgeoisie to the point that in World War II supported the imperialist war and sent the workers of the various European countries to kill each other to defend "their homeland", that is, their own imperialist bourgeoisie.

For Menshevism, the role of the working class had to be limited to the economic struggle, to build unions, to strengthen itself as a class, numerically, organisationally and culturally, until, at a point of this development, it was able to over-

throw the bourgeoisie that then ruler and establish socialism. For the Mensheviks the socialist revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat was only possible in a capitalist advanced country like Germany, where the proletariat had forged a high consciousness in a school of syndicalism and parliamentarism.

Therefore, **the Menshevik thesis is that the backwardness of the working class is a central issue for revolutionary politics**: that in order to make the socialist revolution it has to advance in its backward consciousness throughout a historical period, strengthen itself in its unions and Therefore, the only possible program is to deepen bourgeois democracy.

For the Mensheviks, therefore, a party was needed whose task it was to carry out much propaganda to raise that ideology.

The **party** for the Mensheviks was, then, without clear limits, a loose party, composed of anyone who fulfilled the only condition of adhering to its program, with the militants dedicated to the immediate economic and trade union struggle, while the leaders reserved the task to create, maintain and strengthen the socialist ideology, and to explain and propagate the historical tasks of the proletariat. Thus the program was divided into a minimum, for the union struggle and for reformist conquests, and another maximum, for propaganda, to educate the uneducated masses, raise their conscience and prepare them in that way by the time they came to take power.

But this breadth in the party corresponded to an absolute ultimatumism towards the **mass organizations**: these were conceived as collaterals of the party, which, along with the development of the working class, should absorb the unions, the workers' clubs, etc.

The theses of **Bolshevism** - and when we speak of Bolshevism, we refer to Trotskyism, its continuator - are totally opposed to the Mensheviks.

Bolshevism (Trotskyism) starts from the fact that the objective conditions for the revolution, prepared by the crisis of the capitalist system, are not only mature but are already decomposed. That the alternative "socialism or barbarism" is more valid than ever. A generalized crash, as may be possible in the immediate future, would be nothing more than a foretaste of barbarism, that is to say, of the retreat of civilization as a result of the proletariat not giving a socialist exit. Rus-

sia and Southeast Asia, with the collapse of their economies, and Africa, a continent destroyed by imperialism, are an advance of the price that the masses have to pay for the backwardness of the socialist revolution.

But Bolshevism does not do this analysis country by country, does not consider that there are countries fit and unfit, mature and immature, for the revolution, and proletarians prepared and unprepared for their dictatorship. For Bolshevism as long as the capitalist economy is global, its crisis prepares the objective conditions for the revolution throughout the world. But not in the sense that it is done in unison, but there is a single revolution that combines different "national" revolutions in backward and advanced countries and, for decades, also the political revolution in the degenerated and deformed workers' states, which only it can be the defeat of imperialism on the entire planet.

Thus, as Trotsky explains, a backward country can reach the dictatorship of the proletariat earlier than an advanced one, but later this one to socialism. The latter depending on the march of the world revolution, as the seizure of power in Germany by the proletariat was the exit for the revolution in backward Russia. With this conception, under the Bolshevik leadership, the Russian working class was the most internationalist in history, because it understood that its fate was linked to that of the European revolution.

For Bolshevism, in the epoch of decadence of capitalism, there were no national programs, country by country, but an international program that only had to adapt to national peculiarities. Bolshevism saw Russia as only the weakest link in the imperialist chain, but it did not make any exclusivism. The triumph in Russia was tactical in function of the revolution in Europe. **The Bolsheviks agreed to hand over Russia in exchange for seizing power in Germany, a capitalist advanced country!**

During the World War I, Lenin and the Bolsheviks grouped the internationalists who faced the debacle of the Second International whose parties aligned themselves with the respective imperialist national bourgeoisies. Lenin synthesized his policy in revolutionary defeatism, which stated that the best thing for the proletariat was the defeat of his own country. And that is why he called on the workers in arms to turn the rifle against the enemy at home and to transform the imperialist war into a revolutionary civil war against the bourgeoisie itself (which

constituted a program and a policy of agreement in everything with the theory of the Permanent Revolution). **Bolshevism embodied this whole conception in the foundation of the Third International, the world party of the revolution. They were strategists of the international revolution.**

For the **Bolshevism**, unlike the Mensheviks, in **the epoch of decadence of capitalism, of wars, crises and revolutions, the conscience, the lack of preparation of the masses, the ideology of these, are not an obstacle that to be overcome need of a whole historical period.** Bolshevism is against any rule that is wanted to impose on the proletariat on the grounds that it is not "prepared"; it rejects in principle any argument based on the "backwardness" of the masses, on their lack of preparation, on their "crisis of subjectivity", on their lack of culture. The conscience can advance quickly to the heat of the revolutionary mobilization, and even set milestones of revolutionary program, but fundamentally advances if the revolutionary party is at the forefront of the struggle against the bourgeoisie and imperialism, and against the bureaucracy and treacherous leaders, against the institutions that corrupt the consciousness of the proletariat by diluting, disorganizing and defeating all the efforts that the masses make.

That is why Bolshevism rejects the division between the minimum and maximum program of the Mensheviks, and raises a **Transitional Program** of transition to mobilize the masses, so that they, by their own experience, reach consciousness, to the conviction that there is no other way out than to take power.

And while it raises that program, a Bolshevik **party** is opposed by the vertex to the Menshevik. It is not broad, but is based on a rigorous selection and devotion to its objectives; it is not preparing to "deepen democracy" by a long period of legal existence and parliamentary and union struggle, but to organize the insurrection. That is why Lenin argued: "Give me 100 professional militants and I will move Russia from its foundations!"

Meanwhile, in relation to **mass organizations**, Bolshevism is also the opposite of Menshevism: it conceives those as broad as possible and struggles to extend them. Because the broader these are, the more possibilities the revolutionary party has of exposing the traitors and capitulators against the vanguard. Bolshevism is the opposite of ultimatumism in front of the masses: it proposes to direct them based on the fact that they, by their own experience, un-

derstand that the revolutionary program is the most appropriate.

What was the proof of the facts? The very process of the Russian Revolution meant a defeat in the whole line of Menshevism. The backward Russian masses led the first attempt to overthrow Czarism in 1905, a revolution that began with a mobilization led by a priest, the "Pope" Gapon, who had the goal of asking the "little father Czar" mercifully (that was indeed "Crisis of subjectivity"!)). But in a few weeks this revolution carried out by this weak and backward proletariat, in a sea of even more backward peasant masses, entered history because it set up the soviets: in the short span of weeks, passed from Gapon and the icons of the orthodox church to the Soviet of Petrograd leaded by Trotsky, while the liberal bourgeoisie agreed with Czarism and autocracy the lukewarm democratic reforms that would allow it to appear before the masses and convince them that they had triumphed. The revolution of 1905 did not triumph, but the Bolshevik party and the conscious workers made an experience that would be of unparalleled value in 1917, when that same proletariat led by the Bolshevik party took power, giving the final shot to the autocracy, to the bourgeoisie and together with it to Menshevism.

However, despite the resounding defeat that this conception suffered, as early as 1917, Menshevism is still alive today, but transformed into counterrevolutionary theory and politics by Stalinism, which kept it alive throughout the century. With the defeats that it caused in the decades of '20 and '30 (China, England, Germany, France, Spain), with the first degeneration and after destruction of the Third International and with the pseudosocialism of "socialism in one single country", Stalinism caused a huge leap backwards in the consciousness of the world proletariat, and in particular in that of the USSR, the most internationalist in history led by the Bolshevik party. Thus, to this day, the internationalist consciousness of the world working class that came from the First International of Marx and Engels and that continued in the Second before the passage to the bourgeois imperialist camp of its leadership, has been cut to this day.

The Popular Front policy of Stalinism, of class conciliation, consisted and consists precisely in telling the masses that are not yet capable, that they do not have the necessary strength or conscience, and that is why they must trust in the "democratic bourgeoisie", almost always in the shadow of it, or even more, if necessary, in the "nationalist" or "democratic"

military. Taking this conception from the Mensheviks, Stalinism, which is the "continuity" of Menshevism, led to the defeat of any revolution close to it, from the China of '27, through Spain and France in the '30s in Europe, and in all the colonial and semicolonial countries, as is the case of Chile in 1971-73.

THE CENTRISTS AND MENSHEVISM

The Menshevik conception, as counterrevolutionary, has penetrated deep into centrism, which only oscillates between revolution and counterrevolution. And the centrism of today, the "post-1989 Trotskyism" is a true reflection of this.

- Centrism is deeply nationalistic. Although it proclaims its "internationalism", the "reconstruction of the Fourth International", etc., as the PTS, or calls for his "refoundation" as the PO, his goal is to build national sects, from big but dumb parties as the MAS of the '80 to small charlatans groups like the PTS, sects fully adapted to the bourgeois regimes, coated, as in the case of the rightist fraction of the PTS, of pompous names as "centers of deep theoretical elaboration". The "reconstruction of the Fourth International" is only a cover for its multiple capitulations nationwide. Their agreements to form "joint committees", "trends", "mergers" of international character, are nothing more than agreements without principles, where each participant does not get into the capitulations of the other, to get "plate" of internationalists.

- The centrism rejects in the facts, although it proclaims it in word, the Bolshevik thesis that the conditions are more than ripe for the socialist revolution. It denies that the backwardness of the proletarian revolution, the crisis of humanity, as the Transitional Program maintains, *"is reduced to the crisis of its revolutionary leadership"*. They deny that the main obstacle is the counterrevolutionary leaderships. They argue, on the contrary, that the central problem is the backwardness of the masses, their conscience.

There is a centrist variant that holds that capitalism has regained new strength; that we are facing a "new phase" of capitalist development, in a new reformist era (as affirmed by a current of centrism to which the MAS belongs). In this way, they also maintain that the proletariat has to go

through a long school of syndicalism and parliamentarism, of "refoundation".

But with which we are discussing at this moment is with the first of the two variants, which tells us about ten years of "subjectivity tending to zero", and that before this adopts the program of currents such as the LRCI, not already adapted but, like all European centrism, dissolved in the imperialist democracy. That program of centrism is a version of the Menshevik **program**:

- "Strengthen" the unions like the German proletariat ([see article to understand what this "strengthening" is really like!](#))

- "Deepening", "expanding" democracy, that is, the "democracy" of the imperialist butchers, expressed in the support of the whole centrism as a bloc to the European "Parliament", in its renunciation of the struggle for the Socialist States of Europe and in its defense of "democratic Europe"; and even, as in the case of the LRCI, in the struggle for a "European Constituent Assembly";

- According to the latter, they propose to the proletariat not the struggle for the unity of the working class to confront the imperialist employers, but they set a goal that is only "democratic": they say to the "organized" workers, dominated by the cream of the working aristocracy, which have to be "in solidarity with the immigrants", combat "racism" and organize the unorganized.

- They hold as the only possible policy mobilization within the framework of bourgeois democracy: they are the champions of putting "thousands on the streets" and "surrounding parliaments", for any objective: for imperialist justice to judge Pinochet, to stop the attack on Iraq, etc.

- The struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat remains, for the centrists, as for the Mensheviks, postponed for a distant future. How are we going to pose it to workers so backward, with "subjectivity tending to zero" or "very low"! They seem to tell us.

- The only way forward, then, that the workers' movement has according to centrism, is, as for Menshevism, a long school of syndicalism and parliamentarism, of "strengthening" their organizations, of "reformist recomposition" and of electoral triumphs (yes, like those of Blair and Jospin!), after which it will be the turn of more political struggles. In fact, this is an absolute capitulation to the union bureaucracy, the labor aristocracy and imperialist democracy.

- For centrism, the **task** is the same as for Menshevism: to develop and include in the proletariat the socialist ideology, the "idea of the proletarian revolution", as Albamonte says. For centrism, the proletariat needs "ideologues"! They look like Martov, Vera Sasulich, Axelrod, etc., the Russian "legal Marxists"! They are the greatest advocates of the division between "manual labor and intellectual work" inside the party! The politics, the "theory", the "dialectic" is for the intellectuals who from the outside give them to those "backward" and "uneducated" workers with whom they "merge"!

- As far as the question of the party, they are also a copy of the Mensheviks: in centrism it is forbidden to speak of Leninist party theory, or that "it is a secondary issue", according to Albamonte in his alleged "answers" to the TBI, today FPT. The first feature of centrism is that it stops talking in its insurrectionist party documents. In different gradations, this seems "Jacobin", an "exaggeration", or in the best of cases it is not worth going around repeating a lot and educating the cadres in this concept.

- Regarding **mass organizations**, centrism, like Menshevism, sees them as collaterals of the party. For the history will be the affirmation of the MAS of the '80 that in the "lighthouse of the world", Argentina, there were going to be soviets, which were superfluous because the party was going to contain them organizing all the masses in its bosom.

But these were delusions of a party, although "dumb", great. For small sects like the PTS the ultimatumism is low flight: it is limited to promoting a "broad" human rights organization such as Ceprodh, from which everyone who does not agree with the PTS is expelled!

THE "MATURITY" OF THE MASSES FOR TROTSKY AGAINST THE MENSHEVISM OF EMILIO ALBAMONTE

If we have stopped to explain, schematically, the central features of Menshevism and Bolshevism, it is because **centrism holds the same conception as Menshevism about the consciousness of the masses or "subjectivity," as Albamonte prefers.**

The same who raise the thesis that leads to argue that the lessons of revolutions such as the Spanish no longer apply, have the nerve to bring nothing less than the example of Spain to support their conception of "subjectivity", conscience or "maturity" of the masses. But in their hands, armed with such "theory", historical analogies turn against them. In their eagerness to sanction their thesis as fair, they come to falsify Trotsky when they say:

"... Trotsky speaks of the 'maturity' or 'immaturity' of the proletariat in the face of mature objective conditions for the proletarian revolution. To take some examples, in 'Class, Party and Leadership' it puts the proletariat, betrayed by its Stalinist-socialist-anarchist-centrist leadership in the Civil War, as an example of 'maturity', and in 'The political backwardness of the American workers' (May 19, 1938) shows the immaturity of the American proletariat."

A conception opposed to that of Trotsky, for whom:

"The victory of October is a valuable testimony of the 'maturity' of the proletariat. But this maturity is **relative**. A few years later, that same proletariat allowed the revolution to be strangled by a bureaucracy from its own ranks. **Victory is by no means the seasoned fruit of the 'maturity' of the proletariat. Victory is a strategic task. It is necessary to take advantage of the favorable conditions offered by a revolutionary crisis to mobilize the masses, taking as a starting point the level of their 'maturity', it is necessary to push them forward,** make them understand that the enemy is in no way omnipotent; he is torn by his contradictions, that panic reigns behind his imposing facade. **If the Bolshevik party had failed in this task, it would not have been possible even to speak of the triumph of the proletarian revolution.** The Soviets would have been crushed by the counterrevolution and the tiny wise men of all countries would have written articles and books stating that only unfounded visionaries could dream in Russia with the dictatorship of the proletariat, this being how small it is numerically and so immature" (Class, Party and Leadership).

That is why Trotsky, for whom the "main" was the action of the leaderships, **categorically** says in "Class, party and leadership", against the centrists who spoke as Mensheviks, against those who claimed to blame the defeat in Spain on the masses for its backwardness, "low subjectivity" or immaturity, and not counterrevolutionary leaderships, that:

"The 'immaturity' of the proletariat, the 'lack of independence' of the peasantry, are not decisive or basic factors in historical events. Below the consciousness of the classes are the classes themselves, their numerical strength, their role in economic life. Below the classes is a specific system of production that in turn is determined by the level of development of the productive forces. **Why not say that the defeat of the Spanish proletariat was determined by the low level of technology?"** (Our Bolds).

That is, the reality is the other way around: if it can be called "crisis of the proletarian subjectivity", **it is determined by the crisis of revolutionary leadership.** For Trotsky, the category of "crisis of revolutionary leadership" was so globalizing, so decisive, that is why he opens the Transitional Program starting by saying:

"The world political situation **as a whole** is **mainly** characterized by the historical crisis of the leadership of the proletariat" (Our Bolds). The opposite of what Albamonte maintains.

We repeat with Trotsky: **the "subjectivity", the "immaturity" of the masses, is not a decisive or basic factor. The "main obstacle" is the counterrevolutionary leadership, the revolutionary leadership crisis of the proletariat.**

"THE POLITICAL BACKWARDNESS OF THE AMERICAN WORKERS" AND THE MISERY OF THE NATIONAL-TROTSKYIST THOUGHT OF EMILIO ALBAMONTE

We are facing a deeply nationalist vision of mass consciousness, not internationalist as that of Bolshevism. They are talking about a country-by-country awareness; that workers have a "national" consciousness in the sense that it is determined only nationally. The reality

is that the consciousness of the masses is formed by multiple determinations, one of which are the marches and counter-marches of the world revolution. We cannot speak of a Spanish "maturity" and of a North American "immaturity", compartmentalized, without relation between them, because for a Marxist - and for this one must be a Marxist and not a petty-bourgeois nationalist bungler - there is a world working class with national particularities. Therefore, **the backwardness of the American workers was also a product of the defeat of the European revolution,** of the triumph of fascism in Germany, of the defeat in France and in Spain. If it had triumphed in Spain, the consciousness of the American workers would have changed radically!

The backwardness of the American workers in the 1930s, then, was not, nor is it today, a "national peculiarity" alone. It was the direct son of the betrayal of Stalinism that destroyed the Third International and the defeats that it provoked in Europe.

Speaking of the "backwardness" of the American working class and not mentioning the deep socialist and internationalist tradition of its vanguard, is a falsification. At the impulse of the Russian Revolution of 1917, the North American workers' vanguard was part from the beginning of the foundation of the Third International, with the Communist Party emerged as the left wing of the Socialist Party and connecting with the heroic tradition of the IWW (Internationalist Workers of the World), which according to JP Cannon (the founder of American Trotskyism) *"was a very large militant labor movement. It entered the war unquestionably as the organization that united the majority of the militant proletariat."* ("History of North American Trotskyism")

Thus arose a powerful Communist Party that later dragged the bureaucratic degeneration of the Third International, with the help of the right wing of the Soviet bureaucracy, Bukharinism, which divided it (current known as Lovestonism by its leader Lovestone). This is what J. P. Cannon says: "... in the following years we find ourselves with the degeneration of the Comintern, the beginning of Stalinization. The leadership of the Comintern was directed to our party, as to any other, not with the intention of clarifying problems, but to keep the issue red hot. They wanted to get rid of all the independent people, the fighters, the stubborn people, so that they could create, from that moment, a docile Stalinist party". ("History of North American Trotskyism")

Only because of the betrayals of Stalinism

in the 20s and 30s, one can understand why the Democratic Party, a political wing of US imperialism, could penetrate into the workers' vanguard, doing so precisely with a program of "democratization" of trade unions against the bureaucratic control imposed by the CP. Such weight of the imperialist bourgeoisie in the vanguard of the workers' movement cannot be understood without starting from the defeat suffered by the proletariat of Germany, France, Spain, if it is not part of the impact of the Hitler-Stalin pact, and of the demoralization that caused, that is, the influence of international events.

In the same way, in the '70s, the triumph of the Vietnamese revolution did not mean an advance of the consciousness of the American working class, **because of the Stalinist leadership**. Not a single American worker became a revolutionary despite the fact that it was the US masses that paralyzed the US war machine from the inside, to the point that they contributed to the first military defeat of their country. It is that, despite the heroic triumph of the Vietnamese people, that aberration known as "socialism" that were the degenerated and deformed workers' states could not attract even a single American worker.

But this can hardly be understood if the "national" working classes are seen as separate things, regardless of the betrayals of the world apparatuses, of the crisis of leadership and of world politics.

On the other hand, with the "theory" of the rightist fraction, it is intended that there are different degrees of maturity, such as "Spanish" and "North American", on an absolute and **nationally separate** scale. Workers prepared and not prepared, country by country. **They are classic Mensheviks!**

With this conception one goes of head to the national exclusivism, the same method with which the stalinist bureaucracy explained nothing less than the "socialism" in a single isolated country, that is to say in Russia: by the particularities of that country, among them the conscience advanced of its proletariat against the backwardness of the world proletariat that the revolution had not been able to make.

We have already seen that his theory fails when it is tried to apply it to a revolutionary situation like the Spanish one. But Albamonte and the rightist faction bring in their defense the article by Trotsky on "The political backwardness of

the American workers", as supposed proof that Trotsky, in preparatory, non-revolutionary situations, thought like them, that is, like a Menshevik. But in that article there is not a shred of what Albamonte means by "crisis of subjectivity." On the contrary, this article **is a controversy with those who maintained that the Transitional Program was very advanced for the American workers, and against those who, like Albamonte, saw that backward consciousness as an obstacle**. And so it says:

"The class consciousness of the proletariat is backward, but the consciousness is not the same material as the factories, the mines, the railroads, but it is more variable, and under the blows of the objective crisis, of the millions of unemployed, **it can change quickly.**"

We have already seen that for Trotsky the backwardness of conscience is not a "decisive" factor in revolutionary situations, as in Spain. But neither was it in preparatory situations, like in the US. For Trotsky, the backwardness of the American workers was only a fact of reality, that far from seeing it as an obstacle, it only led him to the conclusion that the way in which the program was exposed should be adapted, appealing to pedagogical forms:

"The program must express the objective tasks of the working class before the backwardness of the workers. It must reflect society as it is, and not the backwardness of the working class. It is an instrument to overcome and defeat the backwardness. That is why we must express in our program all the acuteness of the social crisis of capitalist society, including in the first line the United States. We cannot postpone or modify objective conditions that do not depend on us. We cannot guarantee that the masses will resolve the crisis, but we must express the situation as it is, and that is the task of the program.

Another question is how to present this program to the workers. **Presenting the current situation to the workers is, above all, a pedagogical task and a question of terminology. Politics must adapt to the productive forces, that is, to the high devel-**

opment of the productive forces, to the paralysis of them by the capitalist forms of property, to the growing unemployment that becomes increasingly profound "(Our Bolds)

And before the argument that the workers would not understand the program, he says:

"Possibly. But this only means that the workers will be crushed, since the crisis cannot be solved by any other means than the socialist revolution."

And he holds:

"At present, the American proletariat also has certain advantages because of its political backwardness. It seems a bit paradoxical but, nevertheless, it is absolutely true. The European workers have had a long past of social democratic and communist tradition, and these traditions are a conservative force... The American workers have the advantage that the vast majority are not politically organized, and only now they begin to organize in the unions" Observe: they did not have "new combat organizations!" And even less "the idea of the proletarian revolution!" Its "subjectivity" was very low! However, that did not prevent Trotsky, instead of the weeping conclusions about "subjectivity tending to zero", to extract from that: "This provides the revolutionary party with the possibility of mobilizing them under the blows of the crisis".

And the whole article is dedicated to explaining how, even before the processes of radicalization, in the preparatory moments, even before the leaps forward in the consciousness of the masses, the party could be built and merged with the workers' vanguard without the conscience backwardness being an obstacle. That is why it proposes to organize a large-scale campaign in the unions, to win them around slogans such as the mobile scale of working hours and even the formation of self-defense pickets against the fascist response to the advance of this campaign, to further advance the action of the party. This was what Trotsky said about the proletariat and about the situation that Albamonte sets as an example of "crisis of subjectivity" or of "low subjectivity"!

J. P. Cannon says: "the revolutionary workers of the new generation were repelled by Stalinism. In the course of future development (after the betrayal in Germany in 1933. N. of R.), under the terrible pressure of international events, and particularly the rise of fascism in Germany, the social democratic parties began to deploy leftist and centrist tendencies of all kinds". ("History of American Trotskyism"). The end of the bad days for American Trotskyism had arrived.

With his theory, **Albamonte cannot explain, for example, major landmarks of the North American working class led by the SWP Trotskyists as was the great Minneapolis strike in the 1930s.** Nor can explain the great experience of the SWP, under the leadership of Trotsky, in the unions with the front with the "progressive" "Rooseveltians" against the Stalinists and the subsequent turn demanding them to raise their own presidential candidate worker; the "entrism" to the Socialist Party; the fusion with Muste's party. Product of all these great experiences of intervention in that labor movement so "backward", and building a Bolshevik party, the SWP became a great vanguard party in the US, in a power.

The elements of the "subjectivity" of Emilio Albamonte are a fantastic requirement; they ask for such a perfect degree of maturity or "subjectivity" that they make this conception become the most defeatist thing there is, because it transforms the construction of the party into the labor movement into an impossible one. And they want us to believe, by misrepresenting the quotations, that Trotsky did not see it possible for the revolutionaries to merge with the vanguard, that they would take giant steps in their construction in the workers' movement and that even, "under the blows of the crisis", lead them and mobilize them, as in the USA, for the backwardness of the working class!

Albamonte, on the other hand, extracts the opposite conclusion to Trotsky: that in preparatory situations, due to the backwardness of the workers, propaganda can only be done, because as long as the "crisis of subjectivity" prevails, it is for the future to be built in the workers' movement, and meanwhile we have to build ourselves in the petty-bourgeois youth. Typical reasoning of a charlatan petty bourgeois group, formed in the University of Buenos Aires, that looks at the working class with disdain and wants to explain "theoretically" its impotence even to approach it.

CONSCIOUSNESS ACCORDING TO MARXISM

What is behind all this "theory"? If what they mean is that the consciousness of the masses is backward, they are only rediscovering gunpowder, repeating something elementary: while the bourgeoisie is the ruling class, the dominant consciousness in the masses is therefore bourgeois, just as the dominant consciousness under feudalism would be feudal. The backwardness of the conscience should not surprise anyone, because *"the conscience is in general backward, outdated in relation to economic development"*. (Trotsky, "The backwardness of the American workers")

But the consciousness of the workers and the mass movement is not an "ideological" problem. It is expressed, materialized, in institutions dominated by the bureaucracy of the labor, trade union and political movement, supported by the labor aristocracy, in millions of workers whose privileges with respect to the great masses are preserved so that they serve as a social base for that bureaucracy. Such awareness is due to nothing more and nothing less than the existence of imperialism, which buys that sector of the proletariat and maintains an army of bureaucrats as jailers and police of the labor movement. Of course, for Lenin, this conscience determined by capitalism was the great "enemy" of the revolutionaries.

The consciousness of the proletariat is not a free expression of its experience and its learning and its place in the economy, but it is molded, deformed and oppressed by the domination exercised over it by the bureaucracy as a transmission belt of imperialism. Therefore, although consciousness can be very backward, it can never be "zero", unless it is considered that fascism in its deepest tendencies has triumphed and has reduced the proletariat to a formless mass without "subjectivity", not even bourgeois. A pure absurdity. As also is the pretension of a "high subjectivity" achieved by the masses in years of learning and education, evolutionarily, social-democratic, Menshevik conception from beginning to end.

Of course, the defeats weigh on the consciousness of the masses and mold them. But Trotsky maintains, as we have already mentioned, that "the class consciousness of the proletariat is backward, but the consciousness is not of the same material as the factories, the mines, the railroads, **but is more variable and, under the**

blows of the crisis. objective, of the millions of unemployed, can change quickly". ("The backwardness of the American workers", Our bolds).

The end of the decade of the 30s was a period of intense defeats of the proletariat world-wide. The working class had been taken to the butchery of another world war; Fascism prevailed throughout Europe. However, the Fourth International said in the "Manifesto on the Imperialist War and the World Proletarian Revolution":

"It is true that in the last twenty years the proletariat suffered one defeat after another, each more serious than the previous one, was disillusioned with the old parties and the war undoubtedly found him depressed. However, we should not overestimate the stability or duration of these moods. The events produced them; they will dissipate them."

The consciousness advances and retreats before the blows of the crisis. It crystallizes in institutions and in conquests of the masses. The backward consciousness, the "crisis of subjectivity" that has so much impact on Albamonte, has material bases: it is nothing more than the expression of the loss of conquests, even though the triumph of the restoration is not resolved, of the former deformed and degenerates workers' states, of the imperialist unification of Germany, of the defeat of the Chinese masses in Tiananmen. The retreat of the anti-imperialist consciousness of the Argentine working class cannot be understood if it is not as an expression of the defeat in the Malvinas war at the hands of imperialism.

The consciousness of the masses is the result of multiple determinations, based on the law of uneven and combined development. But someone armed not with Marxism but with pragmatism and common sense, cannot understand this and falls into the objectivism of seeing the development of consciousness as something linear, evolutionary, from "low" to "high" until you reach to the "real".

But in moments of ascent, the consciousness advances by leaps from the actions and the combats that the masses give. In revolutionary situations, the masses can learn in days and hours what in times of peace they do not learn in years. In acute moments they overthrow hated regimes, they start revolutions, they manage to set up Soviet-type organisms, etc.

As we have been arguing, the outcome of the 1989 events is contradictory; it is not yet solved. The masses have had, in this last period of ten

years, moments of very high "subjectivity", as in the broad armed uprising of Albania, currently in the civil war in Kosovo, with the pickets in the streets of Cutral Có and Jujuy in Argentina, paralyzing Ecuador with an indefinite general strike - strike that they are now trying to repeat again-, with the pickets that paralyzed France in '95, in the Indonesian revolution, etc. What they lacked was not "subjectivity" but a well-tempered revolutionary party, with trained cadres, that could act in those moments. And what was left over were the tons of cold water that the counterrevolutionary leaderships, the recycled Stalinism, the social democracy, the church, the petty-bourgeois nationalist leaders, etc., and the impotent and capitulatory centrism that claims to be "Trotskyist", poured out on the masses insurrected to deflect them, expropriate their triumphs and defeat them.

But Emilio Albamonte takes sides far from this Marxist conception. Not only does he begin by repeating the dissent of IS No. 8 of a *"proletarian subjectivity... tending to zero"* (of which we become jointly responsible since we integrated the PTS at that time), but he reaffirms it: today the consciousness remains *"extremely low"*.

The basis of such a breakdown is the adaptation to the left petty-bourgeois media lamenting: "how late: in Russia they were throwing the statues of Lenin, in Cutral Có and Jujuy they ended up settling for a few pesos, in Indonesia there is great confidence in the oppositional party 'democratic', etc., etc.!... The bourgeois ideology reigns!". The immersion in the middle class and academic intellectual means leads them to elaborate a "theory" very much in tune with these media, for whom the socialist revolution is an unattainable goal because they do not find the guarantee of a perfect "maturity" of the masses. As Albamonte would say, the guarantee of a "high subjectivity".

THE MENSHEVIK "THEORY" OF THE "ADVANTAGE" OF EMILIO ALBAMONTE: RIGHTIST MORENOISM

All this "theory" of Albamonte on "subjectivity" low or "zero", goes together with the analysis that with the fall of Stalinism, mediations have a "structural" weakness. It is the theory of the "advantage" of the masses, which leads him to see imperialism as a "paper tiger". They say:

"... the counterrevolutionary workers' bureaucracies and the petty-bourgeois leaderships are structurally weakened... imperialism does not even have a power that tends to replace the clearly dominant role of US imperialism on the planetary scale during the Yalta Pax Americana, nor does it have solid counterrevolutionary apparatuses within the labor movement, as was Stalinism in that period. This is the advantage that the proletariat has to **revert** all the cons that it suffers today... To the extent that the revolution (and therefore the counterrevolution) begin to be central factors in the world situation (which does not happen today) this advantage will show its effects in all its magnitude".

In other words: the proletariat has a "advantage" that will only be deployed when revolution and counterrevolution "are central to the world situation (which does not happen today)"; "Advantage" which is that the crisis of leadership is secondary because when falling Stalinism such a crisis has been overcome for the most part.

The method of Albamonte is strange to Marxism, because it is based, like all the revisionists and centrists, on taking a certain element of reality, the fall of Stalinism and the advantage that it means for the masses, but absolutizing and sublimating it, transforming it into a determinant, instead of relying on Marxism and the law of uneven and combined development, on the multiple determinations of hierarchical elements. And the hierarchy is that the fall of Stalinism did not solve, nor could it solve, on its own, the crisis of revolutionary leadership.

Because, explain this contradiction, please: if that "advantage" has existed since '89, for ten years, why is the revolution and the counterrevolution not "central" today? Why this "advantage" will serve in the future to "reverse" the defeats and has not served to prevent them in these ten years in which there has been, according to the words of Albamonte, a "huge setback in its conquests (process of capitalist restoration in Russia, China, Eastern Europe, Cuba, Vietnam, etc., very high unemployment and precarious working conditions, etc.)"? Why this "advantage" has not acted to prevent it? **Albamonte tries to get rid of such a trap in which his own incoherencies have put him asking for tools to Menshevism: the cause is the "crisis of subjectivity", the immaturity of the masses and not the counterrev-**

olutionary leaderships. Repeat the old story that the masses are not fit; that are immature.

The scheme that is presented to us, then, is the following: the process until the beginning of the revolution would be difficult, tortuous, because of the backwardness of the conscience, but once the revolution started, everything would be made easy by the fall of the Stalinist apparatus, when "this advantage will show its effects in all its magnitude". It seems that the counterrevolutionary leaderships have stopped acting, that is, **the crisis of revolutionary leadership disappeared.**

But let's apply this "advantage" scheme to Indonesia, where February Revolution has been open for more than six months, without the regime ending up falling. There the revolution began as soon as the economic crisis broke out, without any delay. However, now, when the revolution is developing, the "effects" of the "advantage" are nowhere to be seen "in all their magnitude". On the contrary, the brutal leadership crisis is the reason why it is costing the Indonesian masses enormous sacrifices to overcome the resistance of the exploiters. It is costing horrors to achieve unity between the proletariat and the countryside and to face the influence of Islamism among the masses is a cyclopean task. Therefore, because of the crisis of leadership, the revolution is threatened to retreat. What "advantage" are they telling us about?

We are facing an anti-Marxist "theory" that is not part of the class struggle. Because the Marxist analysis begins because the real advantage, **the true strength of the masses is that since 1989 they have not stopped fighting, first with a fierce defensive struggle,** including outbursts and spontaneous revolts (Caracazo, Los Angeles, Santiagoñazo, Intifada, etc.), and then, since 1995, with an attempt at a workers' counter-offensive in several European countries and in South America with major general political strikes. This is what has impeded decisive triumphs on the part of imperialism.

But imperialism also has an advantage: **the crisis of leadership that, against what Albamonte thinks, has worsened since '89.** In this crisis, the capitulations of centrism; the debacle of "post-89 Trotskyism" have a lot to do with it. This crisis is the explanation of why, despite the enormous efforts of the workers' movement and the masses, the revolution and the counterrevolution are not "central factors" in the world situation. While Albamonte and the intellectuals tell us: "but look at what more backward consciousness,

how ephemeral are their combat institutions, if they do not even have the idea of the proletarian revolution!", We are with Trotsky when he says that "the **main obstacle** is the path of the transformation of the prerevolutionary state into a revolutionary state is the opportunist character of the proletarian leadership" and that "the orientation of the masses is determined **above all** by the objective conditions of decomposing capitalism, and **secondly** by the treacherous policy of the old workers' leadership". It is these leaderships that have dissolved, disorganized, become "ephemeral", with the most ferocious violence and blackmail, the "new combat institutions" such as the pickets of the French workers, those of the North American workers, those of Cutral C   and Jujuy in Argentina! Only intellectuals who know nothing about the workers' movement, who never saw it closely, can so pedantically demand more from the masses and demand so little from themselves!

This crisis of revolutionary leadership is expressed in the creation and recreation of new and old mediations such as social democracy, recycled Stalinism in Europe, nationalist petty-bourgeois leaders in the East, Zapatismo, guerrilla in Colombia, Maoism in Latin America, etc., and the new capitulation of centrism that is dressed in "Trotskyism". Although the fall of Stalinism was a hard blow "by the left", this cannot be absolutized until transforming it into an autonomous historical factor, because the fact that they are not based like the old Stalinism in the workers' state, does not mean that these mediations with the collaboration of the capitulations of centrism, are not able to collaborate with imperialism, diverting, betraying and disorganizing everything that the masses do. The demands to sanction a "high subjectivity" on the part of Emilio Albamonte are completely fantastic, because greater heroism and willingness to fight cannot be expected than what we saw in the rebellious masses in Albania, in Ecuador, in France, in the strikes of Argentina, in Cutral C   and Jujuy, in Indonesia today.

The "theory" of the "advantage" of Albamonte **leads to a spontaneous and easy conception of the revolution,** objectivist, easily. Applied to Indonesia, or to any other open revolutionary process, it means that there will be no counter-revolution action, that there will be no Popular Front or "Korniloveadas" (attempts to counter-revolutionary coups), because the mediations are "structurally weak"; that taken the power in a country, this one is not exposed to the direct aggression of imperialism because by "advantage" this one is not going to be able to act.

So, **what they are telling us is that the international revolution will be easy**, with the imperialist bourgeoisie reduced to a citadel surrounded by the masses of the world. If this is so, then why the Fourth International? Why the algebra of the world revolution? It turns out to be a deep national-Trotskyism.

Emilio Albamonte and the rightist fraction express a variant of the objectivist, Morenoist conception of the revolution. For Moreno, the mere weight of objective conditions, the crisis of the capitalist system and the mobilization of the masses automatically guaranteed the revolution, for which the role of the party was to find "the slogan that mobilizes." For Albamonte, on the other hand, the automatic engine is the development of "subjectivity", which, although "low" for now, has no fences in sight due to the fall of Stalinism, with which the role of the party is no longer to provide "The slogan that mobilizes" but the "program that educates".

For Moreno the party was not necessary at the national level, because the masses took power with any leadership. But as these left them locked in the borders of the country - like Castro - the Fourth International was necessary to guarantee that these revolutions would spread and have an end to the international revolution. **But Albamonte's scheme is more right than Moreno's**, because in its difficult scheme for now, because of the low subjectivity, but easy after the fall of Stalinism, the **international revolution does not enter**. It is a theory for a national revolution, isolated, because no one in their right mind, unless it is a rotten Menshevik, can say that the revolution has a strategic "advantage", while there is imperialism that will do everything possible to burst it, armies will arm, it will invade, it will pay "cons", etc. It is the same exclusivist conception of petty-bourgeois leaderships as Sandinism, which believed that with imperialism it was possible to negotiate and that it was not going to attack them.

The Albamonte thesis of the "advantage" leads to a caricature of revolution, without enemies in sight, without counter-revolution, without invasion of imperialism and without the need for the Fourth International.

FOR ALBAMONTE, THE MASSES ARE TO BLAME EVEN FOR THE CRISIS OF THE MARXISTS

So much is the impact of the "crisis of subjectivity" on their heads, that in another preparatory document of a future congress on April 2, 3, and 4, 1999, they **open** this saying clearly:

"It is essential to understand that it is impossible to make revolutionary politics today (ie build a league like the PTS) without assuming the crisis of subjectivity of the proletariat and its conscious expression, revolutionary Marxism.

Who means to ignore that all groups claiming Marxism, even the most recalcitrant centrists, formulate their theories and their policies and 'educate' their cadres in a situation where bourgeois ideology reigns indisputably over society, does not understand how much against the current is to make revolutionary Marxist politics today. "

Leaving aside the "brilliant discovery" that "*bourgeois ideology reigns*" (and how could it be otherwise in bourgeois society?), they say:

"It is not just that in our country there are no newspapers or regular publications claiming Marxism (?). The most elementary books of the Marxist classics have disappeared in recent years. You cannot find (what would have been unimaginable in the '70s and even in the '80s) the works of Lenin (except in some bookstore of the CP) or of Trotsky (except isolated texts in bookstores selling used books)".

But what will this have to do with the "subjectivity" of the masses? Are they educated by reading the classics of Marxism? The deviation of the mass wave of '95 in France, Argentina, etc., was due to the fact that the masses do not visit the bookstores of used books? As if everything were reduced to an editorial policy that took Lenin and Trotsky out of a supposed oblivion! But for Albamonte y Co., It is, because the first task proposed in this document is to allocate "*all the human and financial resources that are possible and necessary and... make every effort to disseminate the work of the masters of revolutionary Marxism as widely as possible*".

And then they say:

"In the Congress on international politics, we

proposed that the 'misery of the subjectivity of the proletariat' corresponded to a 'misery of strategic thinking' in the Trotskyist movement."

This is already very serious! The masses are not only to blame for the backwardness of the revolution but also ... for the betrayals of centrism! **They tell them: breathe in peace, centrists of the world, participate together with the imperialist bourgeoisie of the "united and democratic Europe", capitulate to the bureaucracy and the social democratic parties in power, support Milosevic against the Kosovar masses, that in Buenos Aires they have found a justification for your betrayals! The fault lies in the "low subjectivity of the masses" and not your capitulations to the counterrevolutionary apparatuses!**

And what hides this "theory" -justification, is that since '89 there have been great opportunities for Trotskyism to build strong revolutionary parties, which centrism betrayed, as in France, shaken by strikes in '95, in Argentina, crossed by the general strikes in '96 and by the uprisings of the unemployed of Cutral Có and Jujuy, in Bolivia, with its general strike betrayed by the COB with the collaboration of the centrists of Loraist POR. That is the true cause of the crisis of the *"strategic thinking of the Trotskyist movement!"*

On this basis it would be impossible to explain the founding of the Fourth International in 1938, one of the highest points of Marxist "strategic thinking", at a time when there was a profound "crisis of subjectivity" resulting from the defeats that Stalinism had caused in Germany, Spain and France. Fascism prevailed and war was prepared. From what crisis of the "strategic thinking" of Marxism do they speak to us?

And in 1914, when the "crisis of subjectivity" was terrible, because the workers were carried by the social democracy to kill each other in the war it was the moment of greater strategic clarity of Lenin, who raised the policy of turning the imperialist war into war against the bourgeoisie itself and preached revolutionary defeatism.

Will they start to tell us, perhaps, at any moment, like many centrists, that Trotsky was wrong to found the Fourth International in the midst of a situation of such acute crisis of "subjectivity", and that he should have devoted himself to mounting a great editorial to make known his works and those of Lenin? Some of that they already said when from LVO, in a new history of American Trotskyism, they put Trotsky as a professor of dialectics and Marxist theory.

"IDEOLOGICAL REVERSION"?

This Menshevik conception of the consciousness of the mass movement is so marked that when analyzing the international situation, in the same document with which we are arguing, the first element, according to what we have been discussing, is... the ideology of the masses!

Among the different elements that characterize the world situation, the first one would be:

"A) The 'ideological reversion' produced by the huge leaps of the economic crisis in '97 and '98 that liquidated bourgeois triumphalism and showed the masses the fallacy of 'capitalist prosperity' in the world ..."

Marxism analyzes reality with categories such as the economic base, the class struggle, the situation of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, their leaderships, the relationship of forces. But these gentlemen have inaugurated a new method: they start with ideology, and not only for ideology, but for its "reversal", perhaps to give good news meanwhile mourn the "crisis of subjectivity"! Their ability to penetrate and understand reality is such that they can listen, from Buenos Aires and still without any "correspondent", to the state and dynamics of the ideology of the masses of the world! With the same **Fukuyama method, but the other way around, they seem to tell us: Hallelujah, "history has begun again"!**

We are facing the fantastic idea that the "ideology" of the masses is not shaped by the action of the counterrevolutionary apparatuses, and their experience of struggle, their triumphs and their defeats, but because they can understand, reading the newspapers and seeing through the television the "fall of the markets" and the value of the Dow Jones, the character of the economic crisis and the lie of "capitalist prosperity". We are facing a social-democratic conception from beginning to end, which starts from the "culture" of the masses, which is acquired through learning, evolutionarily.

The intellectual considers with relief and augury that the masses disbelieve of neoliberalism and Thatcher. But it is that this change, the hatred of those millions of workers, is expressed in the vote Blair, Jospin, Schroeder. This is presented to us with a mass counter-offensive expropriated by the counterrevolutionary leaderships. But in the

scheme of Emilio Albamonte that does not matter because the mediations are very "structurally weak"; they have ceased to be an obstacle; we have "advantage" for a while.

But can you tell us how this "*ideological reversal*" takes place in Russia, where the "*fallacy of capitalist prosperity*" is emphatically manifested, but where, with the economic explosion and the inflationary blow, the mass movement has become depressed and with its forces gripped? Perhaps in Europe, where the mass offensive and the great wave of general strikes of '95 was diverted and strangled by the reformist leadership and the union bureaucracy, and that now, even with the endorsement of the "Trotskyists" are going to put the masses in the "multinational" parliamentary elections in support of European unity around the most rapacious monopolies? Perhaps in Argentina where the bureaucracy and the bosses put the struggles of '96 and '97 in the electoral detour?

BAD MEMORY

We are then faced with a social-democratic, Menshevik conception that defines the working class in terms of its consciousness. The Second International, while betraying every day, only saw collaborate with propaganda, like Albamonte, to advance the consciousness of the working class, which, at one point, would allow the transition to socialism. The Second International would have said to know the "theory" of Albamonte: "with much subjectivity we come to power." But the masses do not express themselves with their consciousness in a pure state, but through **parties**, revolutionaries, counterrevolutionaries and centrists, with different strategies.

For that reason, in 1993 the PTS said correctly in "Controversy with the IWL and the theoretical legacy of Nahuel Moreno" (International Strategy No 3):

"From this interpretation of the backwardness in consciousness an anti-Leninist conception emerges: for the IWL the struggle for a revolutionary class consciousness is not a struggle against the apparatuses, but an ideological struggle, through propaganda by the socialism. We would not be Trotskyists, nor would we be doing this controversy, if we denied the political theo-

retical struggle and the need for propaganda to organize conscious workers in our ranks, but this is an indispensable component in the Trotskyist movement only if it is put in place for the struggle against counterrevolutionary apparatuses in the workers' movement. In other words, to put into practice 'the maximum expression of the class struggle: the political struggle between parties', according to Lenin. "

But how current these lines are! How clear Albamonte y Co. when they wanted to break with the centrism of the MAS and the IWL, which contrasts with their current revisions!

BY THE HAND OF THE LRCI, EVERYTHING ENDS IN A CAPITULATION TO THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE BOURGEOIS-WORKERS' PARTIES IN EUROPE

All the somersaults about "*zero subjectivity*", "*very low*", "*true*", is to end by saying, however, that:

"... only an inveterate sectarian can refuse to see that by putting the European proletariat to its reformist leaderships in power, the possibility of possible confrontations between the workers' movement and its leadership, essential for the emergence of truly radical political processes, opens up. revolutionaries. "

We are facing the thesis that has been raised by all, absolutely all the centrists, in one way or another, to capitulate to the governments of the bourgeois-workers' parties and the popular front, from Andrés Nin and the POUM in Spain of the '30, passing through Lambert and the OCI in France of the '80 before the government of Mitterrand, and ending with the LRCI before the government of Blair. According to this thesis, the masses in their rise to the left take their reformist leaderships to the power, and then when they make the experience with them in power, they move more towards the left and towards the revolution. The stage of the workers' governments of the bourgeois workers' parties and popular front, an expression of the "strengthening of the workers' movement", as the LRCI says, and a sample of the "reformist recomposition" according to the rightist fraction of the PTS, would allow the advance of consciousness; it would be a prelude to

the revolution.

Let us compare this conception with the revolutionary Marxist vision, and exactly opposite to that of the rightist fraction, which we wrote in the Bulletin of International Workers' Information No. 1:

"... the rise of workers in Europe was diverted and channeled electorally with the triumph of the workers-bourgeois parties that reached of the government as Labor in England, the SP and the CP in France and more recently in Germany with the triumph of Schroeder, and the same in most Western European countries. These governments of the reformist parties are playing the role, using the illusions of the masses in them, to disorganize and curb the tendencies to the revolutionary struggle that the European labor movement began to show in '95. If this process deepened, if the wave that began in '95 was not diverted by the action of treacherous leaderships, the prospect of a proletarian boom that accelerated the trend of more direct confrontation between revolution and counterrevolution was opened, a view that governments of the reformist parties avoided preventively. They are social-imperialist governments... that by relying on the labor aristocracy they play a preventive role, of preventing the proletarian revolution from opening up."

The opportunist never sees the actions of the counterrevolutionary leaderships, or minimizes them, because he is willing to capitulate. Then see only an advance of the masses to the left, not to mention that on the way the workers meet the counter-revolutionary and centrist parties that at every step disorganize, divert and help to defeat the masses. The Marxist thesis, as we say in the Bulletin of International Workers' Information No. 1, maintains the opposite:

"These governments do not express any strengthening of the working class, but quite the opposite, because in reality they have been the main instrument to strangle the counter-offensive opened in '95 with the 22-day strike in France. In case the economic crisis raises it, they will only prepare the stage for more Bonapartist and even fascist variants" ("New world events, new revolutionary lessons", BIOI No.1, our bolds). Speaking clearly: the governments of the SP and the CP in France, of Labor in England, of Schroeder in Germany, etc., are the bourgeois imperialist response to the mass counteroffensive, never the distorted expression of this rise, as the opportunists maintain.

And much less can they be the expression of a "reformist recomposition of the workers' movement". This assertion is a classic capitulation of Kautskyist renegades, which forces us to return to the ABC of Marxism, since it is a break with the Marxist theory of the State, so well explained by Lenin in *The State and the Revolution*, according to which the state and the institutions that compose it have a class character. Under capitalism they are bourgeois. Albamonte y Co. they are telling us that the working class is "recomposed" with a bourgeois institution of the imperialist boss state, as important as the government, or that such imperialist governments express that "recomposition". The governments of the bourgeois-workers' parties cannot express anything of the proletariat, because they are imperialists from end to end, they are managers of the imperialist bosses. If you like, we are facing a "reformist recomposition" of the European imperialist employers!

We would understand, although reality shows that this is not the case, if we were told that the "reformist recomposition" is expressed in the unions and in their strengthening, but never in an institution of the bourgeois state, the domination organ of the capitalist class. the proletariat

We are facing an opportunist characterization of the governments of the bourgeois-workers' parties (Lambertism) that would be the prelude to "truly revolutionary political radicalization processes", and a clear path towards revolution without "disheveled jopo". The same vision of the MST, of imperialism as "paper tiger" (morenoism). The fraction of Albamonte has not invented anything new. Its alleged "political theoretical strength" is nothing more than to repeat Menshevik theses on the consciousness of the masses, in addition to borrowing ideas from the worst of the arsenal of "Yalta Trotskyism".

TAKE OFF THE MASK OF TROTSKYISTS!

The rightist fraction, when trying to cover its Menshevism with a "Trotskyist" disguise, does nothing more than ask for the clothes borrowed from Morenoism: it ends up in the same conception of it that "crisis of leadership" means only the inexistence of revolutionary leadership, **and not that it is expressed in the counterrevolutionary character of the old leadership; in which treacherous leaderships are found in front of the masses. Thus, the concept of "crisis of revolutionary leadership", a concrete category that speaks of leaderships, apparatuses and concrete parties, and that for Trotsky is the "main**

factor" to characterize "the world situation as a whole", is taken as a made more, at the same level as the backwardness of the consciousness of the masses, than its low "subjectivity", and is transformed into an empty, abstract, metaphysical category. Therefore, the overcoming of the crisis of leadership see it as another element of the advancement of the consciousness of the masses; "Included" as one more element in its "subjectivity"; as a vacuum that only remains to be filled, **and not that this crisis manifests itself as the "main obstacle", the counterrevolutionary leaderships and apparatuses.**

Therefore, nothing new has been "discovered". We are facing a regression of Albamonte y Co. that leads directly ... to the MAS and the IWL Moreno. Against them, the PTS said in "Controversy with the IWL and the theoretical legacy of Nahuel Moreno" (Estrategia Internacional No. 3) in 1993:

"What does revolutionary leadership crisis mean? First of all, it does not mean 'steering vacuum' as it was held for a long time in the IWL. Crisis of revolutionary leadership in the imperialist epoch, on the contrary, means for us, the capacity that imperialism has to co-opt, buy, corrupt and use as a transmission belt of its policy the leaderships of the workers' movement and the masses. That is to say, this means not a lack or emptiness of leadership, but **the conformation of counterrevolutionary apparatuses** of the bureaucracy and the working aristocracy within the proletariat, from unions and parties to workers' states led by counterrevolutionaries."

And later it holds:

"As shown by the role of Stalinism in the case of the Spanish revolution, it follows that the struggle for a revolutionary class consciousness means the political and physical struggle to the death against the counterrevolutionary apparatuses of the workers' movement.

On the contrary, the position of the IWL, semi-idealist, leads from head to the complete capitulation to the counterrevolutionary apparatuses. To begin with, where does the monumental backwardness come from at the level of consciousness of the Russian masses and the East, but from the existence of the Stalinist apparatus that oppressed and repressed them, creating a consciousness hostile to socialism? On the other hand, let's call things by their name: the negative definition of backwardness in consciousness is, by positive, procapitalist consciousness. And this, where does

it come from, but from counterrevolutionary apparatuses such as social democracy, petty-bourgeois currents and mainly the bureaucracy itself, which, with Gorbachev from the state apparatus, poisoned the conscience of the masses by sowing them with illusions in capitalist reforms?"

This conception that Albamonte defended in 1993 against Morenoism (and to which we should add, as conformers of conscience, the loss of conquests such as German reunification on capitalist bases and the progress of the process of restoration in the East, because of the betrayal of the leadership), and with which today it breaks open sails, is in full agreement with what the FPT wrote in the Bulletin of International Workers' Information No. 1:

"From the FPT we continue to maintain that the key to our time, at the doors of the 21st century, continues to be the crisis of revolutionary leadership, as proclaimed by the Transitional Program. The 'crisis of proletarian subjectivity' at a given moment, contrary to what the rightist fraction says, is only the by-product of that crisis of leadership, that is to say of the defeats (both recent and historically accumulated) that the counterrevolutionary leaderships forces imposed on the masses, and the betrayals of centrism that adapted to those leaderships. The key to the "continuity" of revolutionary Marxism is given by the struggle to resolve the crisis of leadership, that is, to rebuild the Fourth International, and not, as the rightist faction says, by the struggle for 'class independence in a broad sense'". ("The centrist refoundation of the PTS", BIOI No. 1)

Emilio Albamonte and his faction leave no stone unturned in the central thesis of the Transitional Program, the foundation of the Fourth International and the school of revolutionary strategy that was the Third International under Lenin and Trotsky. But they do it shamefully, without saying that they are putting the centrist and poumist poison and therefore Menshevik poison. At least, renegades of Trotskyism, like Nora Ciapponi, break with it and do not hide it. They become poumists and they clearly say that Trotsky was wrong. "Long live the POUM!" They proclaim. But the leaders of our "theoretical center" do not have as much courage as Nora Ciapponi. They are the kind of politically cowardly centrist, who hides behind the banners of Trotskyism to do his outrages. That is why we cannot help but say: Out of Trotskyism, the hands of the renegades! Take off your mask! Go to the smelly pot of the poumist centrism!

NOTES

Note No. 1:

Proposal of the CC to the Extraordinary Congress

* We have noted the plenary session of the Central Committee that the agreements and differences that began in this party leadership body around part III of the document on party (balance and regime of our organization) have not yet been sufficiently addressed or developed with minutes, documents, etc., so that can be pronounced and intervened with positions of the party as a whole.

* That this is a discussion that the party must face with all passion and seriousness as it is about what kind of organization we should have to merge with the possible vanguard sectors that arise in the heat of the class struggle on the way to construction of a new internationalist revolutionary workers party in Argentina.

* That the PTS, despite its advances in the political delimitation with centrism and reformism and towards a consequently internationalist policy, has not yet fully developed a necessary discussion about the party regime, a discussion that

should crystallize in a party statute that raises the role and The articulation of the leadership, the cadres, the cells, aspirants and eventual groups that advance toward revolutionary positions.

The CC proposes to Congress to vote on the following resolutions:

1) To postpone the discussion of part III of the document about Party to deepen in the whole Party through discussion with documents of the leadership, bulletins, minutes, etc.

2) To constitute a intermediate quarter call to a new meeting of the Extraordinary Congress in the coming months to address said discussion and vote the party statutes.

3) Being this a new discussion that is only in its infancy, the session of this Extraordinary Congress after the fourth interim will be done with a new election of delegates in the cells of the Party.

HR - S. - F. - P. (They sign as part of the CC)

Note No. 2:

Resolution of the CC of August 16, 1998

Based on the resolution of the Extraordinary

Congress of August 8 and 9 on the discussion of Part II of the Document for the Extraordinary Congress (party regime) and on party statutes, the CC resolves:

1) To organize, as mandated by the Congress, a new Pre-Congress period that will culminate in a new session of the Extraordinary Congress on a date to be defined according to the development of the debate.

2) To constitute an Organizing Committee for the debate of such pre Congress that will be in charge of editing all documents or minutes related to the issues in question, be they organisms, tendencies or leaders, cadres or militants individually.

3) To inform the Party that comrades HR and P have declared on August 7 their intention to become a Tendency (for now of the CC) on the subject in question.

4) The whole of the CC, including the comrades HR and P, estimates that the documents may be prepared and edited for the whole party in a period of approximately 30 days, and reaffirms that it is a discussion among revolutionary Trotskyist comrades.

Comrades HR and R, agreeing in the general spirit of this resolution, requested 48 hours to make contributions that enrich it.

Note No. 3:

Extract from: Proposals of the CC tendency to democratically redirect the discussion in the party (8/26/98)

(...) These essential democratic measures that we propose to incorporate to what you propose are:

A) No comrade of base, cadre or leader can be separated from its team or organism, nor be intimidated in any way by the majority, especially considering that we are in a pre-congress period, and knowing that our tendency is a tiny one, a minority of the CC, and the comrades who decides to adhere to our platform will also be a minority at least initially, after the irresponsible and confusionist fractionation that you have made.

B) All acts, documents and minutes that are made in the Party must be given immediately to the minority, in the same way that it is our obligation to give you all the minutes and resolutions of

this tendency.

C) Given the experience of Circular N ° 3, we request, and as is tradition in the revolutionary movement when the minority requests it, to be a majority in that Committee organizing the debate, that is, if there are methodological problems urging the discussion, we break the deadlock.

D) Once we will present our tendency's platform, this should be printed next to the materials that we attach, in a special bulletin exclusively for the trend, immediately, as you did with Circular No. 3.

E) Once our platform comes to the whole Party, we will present documents to support the programmatic points that we developed in it. Once these documents are coming out we will ask to go down and discuss them in the party teams, in a calm and reflective way, as was our tradition when we as the TBI raised it to the MAS leadership. We hope you, as this is a common heritage, will accept immediately.

On the formal democracy proposals that you presented to us:

A) We request an office with a computer. We propose that it is at the Leon Trotsky Center, where Trotsky's writings and the Party's library are located, where we operate.

B) We accept an eventual income because we need a full-time comrade to help us to type our documents, as well as perform study and research tasks. The proposal is comrade S. Novak.

C) On travel meetings attendance, we will define it to the extent that, together with the platform, the different documents that support and develop it will come out, and we propose to organize them in common as part of the Organizing Committee of the debate composed of majority and minority of the CC, as we propose above.

About our obligations:

A) Any member of the party that declares to belong to our tendency once the platform has come out, must participate in any organism of the party to which it belongs and loyally promote all activities voted by a majority for the party and the teams, always understanding by the majority that, if we become a minority, the adherents

of our tendency will have other activities such as fighting for our ideas in the party, and to be able to convince the majority.

B) Once our tendency is established, we will propose that the most representative comrades of the same, in the amount that you consider, join the CC.

C) On our part, the current members of the tendency and the CC, Pico and H, we propose to place ourselves in the daily tasks of the party, in the following location: Pico: in San Martín and in the Organizing Committee of the Worker's Plenary voted in our Congress. HR: in international, next to comrade EA to prepare in common the new number of International Strategy that will develop the situation of the international proletariat and develop part II of the Argentine labor movement, incorporating the elaborations that HR has been making on the situation of the working class and the industrial proletariat from 1975 to 1998, from Yalta to 1989. We propose, from that location, HR to join the negotiating committee of the Liaison Committee (We clarify that on Sunday 23/8 there was a meeting of the Exploratory Committee with the POR, and HR was not invited (although we have clarify comrades and L last week, and then by letter, that this was our proposal).

D) It is our obligation, once the platform is issued to the whole party (while we appeal to the "inalienable right to become a tendency") immediately announce to the party's address the name of all the members of our organization that adhere. As they do so, as well as conducting plenary sessions informing the leadership of the party, so that this, if desired, can participate.

We believe that we must make a common effort to redirect the established political struggle, because we believe in encouragement, we at least, the need to educate the party in a discussion among revolutionary Trotskyists, and to give an example to the centrists of how to channel a tendential struggle in our organization, with methods totally different from the ones they use.

Note N° 4:

To the comrades of the CC majority and to all party members:

On Thursday, 8/27 at night, an urgent Congress was called to democratically re-organize the discussion in the party, summoned by the majority of the CC with just two days in advance.

Against this we state:

A) That such congress was summoned without discussing or consulting with the CC minority, especially when we had delivered a letter on 8/26, entitled "Proposal of the CC tendency to democratically redirect the discussion in the party". The majority first refused to receive it (not signing having received it, but keeping a copy), and then, without informing us, they published it for the whole party.

B) That the same day the Central Committee was in a meeting calling this urgent Congress. We were denied that this was being done, and then in the appeal the majority informs, the meeting they first denied existed and it was the "continuity" of the CC meeting on Sunday 8/23.

C) That if it was an recess, and if the meeting on Wednesday 8/26 was the continuity of Sunday 8/23, they did not publish the letter that we send them on 8/21, where we explained why that Central Committee was cited without documents, no agenda, etc. Question then corroborated by the issuance of the shameful circular N°3 organized by the majority fraction of the CC. This demonstrates that Circular N°3 and the extraordinary one that they have published, are imbued with the fractionalist method of leaving us totally out of the decisions of the CC, in what concerns the tendential discussion in the party.

D) This urgent call you make, like the two circulars that you have published fractionally, corroborate and reaffirm our characterization that you are a majority organized as a fraction before the documents and platforms are downloaded in the pre-congress period that is open in the party. And where it is well obvious and explicit is when you state: "fractionalism has been promoted by comrades, especially for the obvious fact that they just now say they are going to present a definitive platform of tendency (which we have requested since August, 7)." This is an absolute ignorance on behalf of the majority of the CC of the resolution of the last extraordinary Congress! For in their resolutions is written that in 30 days will the positions on item III of the document that the Congress could not discuss, and this is a resolution of the extraordinary Congress of our party. In a previous point you argued that there were differences, positions and semi positions about chapter III on the party regime, a position that was later ratified by the agreement that we signed on 8/16, where again, following the resolutions of the congress, we all reaffirmed that we would take 30 days to prepare written positions about the points the Congress could not address.

E) You argue, in the call to the "Urgent Congress", that you abstain and call the base of the party to guarantee a democratic debate, gathered in a "Congress". For this Congress, and the meetings that are being held, you make a proposal to conform a Commission of 10 comrades of the party of high tradition and great militant quality, to which one comrades for the majority of the CC and two for the minority. We already advance 12 points that are proposed to democratically channel the discussion in the party. You call to a Congress with a proposal as the party leadership, when we had proposed 12 points to redirect the debate democratically.

F) It would be a democratic congress if we had met to be able to go down the teams and plenaries to discuss our 12 points of proposals and could be discussed and voted by the majority and by the minority of the party together with the election of delegates, where your proposal would have been also discussed. Democratic possibility we did not have, because your unilateral proposal to call to a Congress two days in advance. We affirm that this is a method where the minority did not have the possibility of electing delegates based on your proposals and going down the party for such purposes. We consider it is a method at odds with the most elementary norms of democratic centralism, and that demonstrates, together with the embarrassing Circular N° 3, the no less embarrassing Extraordinary Circular, the call for an urgent Congress between roosters and midnight, when we are going through very serious problem of the party regime and the serious movementist character you are leading the party.

G) The fact we believe that you are acting as a real fraction, is not a cause you as the majority of CC, majority of the party's leadership, point out a written position before the whole party on the proposals we make about how to redirect the debate, and you omit it in your urgent call to Congress.

H) In this circular, you state that *"in these conditions, the comrades who constitute the majority of the CC consider that we cannot be the ones who decide how to organize in a principled way the ongoing debate in the party."* And all this because the minority, characterizes that they are acting with fractionalist methods as a majority of the CC. We do not understand why you as the party leadership, faced with a tendency that is a tiny minority of the CC, cannot fix a position on the 12 points that we present to you to organize the debate, and tell it to the whole party, that would be much more economical for the party and would

transform this congress that they have convened in a truly democratic congress. In the previous Congress you gave your opinion that you would be "mute" if the delegates decided to discuss point III, and they remain mute in the face of our proposals on how to redirect the discussion. After the Congress you call for plenaries without a written balance of it on behalf of the leadership. And to all this, you call it "to cast light, light and more light", when more than 16 days ago they have not written a single word, although you have spoken a lot. The light in the party enters when the leaders raise positions in writing that could be discussed by all the cells. We, together with Trotsky, say: *"Leninism fights with fists and teeth, but war is impossible without cunning, without subterfuge and without deception. Cunning in a victorious battle is a constituent element of Leninist politics. But at the same time, Leninism is the supreme revolutionary honesty with respect to the party and the working class. It does not use fiction, self-proclamation or false greatness."*

I) Comrades, the POR is not a tenure of the PTS, but another party. However, as they leaved they did not feel inhibited to sign an act of conformation of a Joint Committee to organize the discussion, setting a position as a majority of the CC. We do not understand why if we are a tendency of the same party, you cannot set a position as the majority of the CC about our proposals, and say if you are for or against them, and even take that position to a Congress.

J) We affirm that not establishing a written position as the leadership before our proposals or presenting them to the party before the Congress, it will turn it into a Congress without a program, at least on behalf of the majority of the leadership. So, what they are doing is not "throw light," but call to a Plenary Congress with audience so that "the base decides". The proposal you make of a "high quality" and "tradition" commission, to guarantee the debate, has one small problem: when the urgent Congress is dissolved, you will continue being the majority leadership of the party. And we still do not see what your passport, your program, for a democratic discussion in the party, you do not take it to the Congress that you have summoned. Unless you say, as party leaders, that they will abide "what the base decides".

K) We clarify that your policy to channel the debate is tinged not only with a high degree of movementism and democratism at odds with democratic centralism, but also adorned with a few drops of Morenoist liturgy, with which we disagree, when you propose a commission integrated by high tradition and militant quality com-

rades. We do not need a Control Commission, but a political committee that organizes the debate. How to define the militant tradition and quality, without taking into account the definition in front of the political positions that are just beginning to be expressed in our party and that will develop more each day? Are those 10 comrades going to commit themselves before the Congress not to raise their position before the political debate that is established, to be blind, deaf and dumb, and to remain neutral in front of the whole debate? Because until they convince us otherwise, for us, in this concrete crisis, in this concrete debate that is open, having a great tradition is to sustain our political positions in this struggle. You propose an arbitration. But we do not ask or accept arbitrators, but leave us the 30 days that we committed to write our documents (and the majority theirs, because we expect them to fulfill their commitment before Congress to write). And that the leadership and the Congress of 8/30 vote for yes or not the democratic guarantees that we ask, in order to present our platform and discuss it throughout the party, or to make other proposals.

L) That is to say, comrades, we think that your proposal and the realization of this Plenary Congress is demagogic and non-Leninist. The most serious thing is that they continue to appeal to tradition (!), When you compare this urgent Congress summoned by you and the post-congress plenaries to the situation *"when the PTS faced this serious crises in the party of which one of the most important and foundational of the current PTS, it was the 3rd Conference of 1989 (after the sector rupture led by Leon Pérez and the sector of the comrades that returned to the MAS, and shortly before the breakup of the group headed by Garmendia)"* ... We read this and we could not believe it. The Conference of 89 was after that ruptures that caused serious crises in the party where some valuable and important leaders went with whom together we had broken the MAS. Comrades, are you saying to the Party that we have already broken up with him, and that is why you have to hold a conference and plenary sessions like in 1989? What a bastard way to use tradition! We apologize for the term, but we are a trend and we are going to give the fight in all the pre-Congress to convince of our positions. This method that you are using has nothing to do with the PTS tradition. In '89, we delimited ourselves with currents that went back to the MAS when it was going up with United Left, or with Leonperism, which was a totally ultra-leftist tactical and not revolutionary Trotskyist current. Comrades: How are you going to state that you are moving according to the traditions of the Conference of

89 and say below, so easily and if nothing happened *"you agree with comrades HR and P. that we have the need to educate the Party in a discussion between revolutionary Trotskyists and to give an example to the centrists of how to channel to tendential struggle in our organization, with methods totally different from those they use"*? And then you compare us with Leon Pérez and Bobby! Tell the truth: Do you think you are discussing with Bobby and Leon Perez, or with comrades of a CC tendency who are principled Trotskyists? This is an irresponsible eclecticism that expresses a majority leadership that has lost its way and that the only thing that seeks dramatic effects to split the party and create with double messages a state of division in the cadres and the base of the party, with the objective to remain a circumstantial majority before the real debate begins. Comrades of the majority, acknowledgement from the parties make discoveries non-essential. This is the way in which you have flooded most of the base and cadres of the party with prejudices. And since we are materialists, we know that prejudices are transformed into a material force, that is, a fractional organization against the issues before their documents appear. That explains why they move with assemblies methods that our little league used only after heartbreaking ruptures when we were a public fraction of the MAS. That is why we consider your resolution not only demagogic but extemporaneous.

For all this as a tendency of the CC we solve:

1) To present our unwavering resignation to the CC because you have not recognized the resolution of the Congress of August 8 and 9 that opened a pre congress period of three months and gave thirty days to all members of the leadership to present their documents you had the documents. Because you have broken the agreement reached on August 16 in the CC, where we, as a CC tendency, assumed the commitment to write those documents in 30 days, apart from that the constitution of an Organizing Committee for the debate. We ask the CC for a proposal on which party bodies should we join, for which we reiterate the proposal in that sense made in the letter of 26/6/98.

2) To present our tendency statement as soon as possible, to the CC and the whole party, based on the fact that the differences that began in the party regime have been extended to other political problems in the course of the debate.

3) On the basis of the proportion of comrades who adhere to our platform in the party, we integrate as a tendency to the CC

4) Continuing requesting a democratic method to channel the debate as it appears in the points of the letter to the CC of August 26, to the leadership and the plenary summoned by the majority of the CC for the 8/30.

5) We request the immediate publication of this note to the whole party.

08/30/98

P. y HR

Note N° 5:

Extract from Declaration of the TBI of the PTS on the resolution voted by the plenary-congress on 8/30/98

(...) For all this, we resolve:

a) To state that we do not agree with the VIEWS and CONSIDERATIONS of the resolution voted in the Plenary-Congress of 8/30/98.

b) That on our part we continue considering ourselves as a tendency, TBI of the PTS, and we will continue struggling to convince the majority of the leadership and the party that this discussion was made in common organizations, without separating the base, even on the basis that for now you represent the great majority of the party.

c) We reaffirm that for us the discussion has begun with Chapter 5 of our platform that we are advancing. That said platform, as a draft, is being discussed by the members of the tendency, and that when its discussion ends and it is voted on by the members of the TBI, it will be presented to the party as a whole.

d) We accept, although we do not agree, considering that the majority of the party and the leadership so demand and have voted, the conditions established in the resolution of 8/30 for the discussion with our Tendency, and agree with you on all the practical mechanisms for this purpose. Clarifying that on our part will continue to call us the Bolshevik Internationalist Tendency of the PTS, and that all of the measures you have proposed to channel the discussion will be progressively developed as we present our constitutive political documents and platform.

Expecting that, despite such different points

of view and characterizations of the political struggle established within our party, we can make the maximum efforts to carry out a truly democratic debate, we remain at your disposal and we will participate with a delegation in the agreed meet of Wednesday 9/2 at 6:00 pm

On behalf of the TBI of the PTS,

Tucán - Pico - Pablo Cortina - Carlos - Hugo Ramírez

9/2/98

P.D: On Wednesday 9/2, we gave this note to the comrades F. and L. who requested that we deliver it signed in handwriting. We inform you that the comrades P. and HR sign in handwriting assuming responsibility for the TBI. We clarified that we were surprised yesterday because, before our platform and our documents were written, and we hope also yours, you have issued a Circular with the Resolution of the Plenary Congress of 8/30, which says that

"it is important to discuss this Circular with our supporters since the colleagues of the TBI of the PTS are doing it from their point of view." Thus, you are already proposing splitting the periphery, that is, acting as a public majority fraction when we have not finished nor publishing the platform of our tendency and even before the differences can be expressed in the newspaper. We confirm this fact, and we believe that it is nothing more than a continuity of the fractioning you carried out inside the Party during the last 30 days. We want to know what are the materials that you bring closer to the periphery (Internal Circular N° 3 with the minutes of P. and the response of EA, Chapter 5 of our platform we advanced, the basis of vote of EA, MR and JSM, the verbatim record of the intervention of HR in the Plenary Congress of 8/30 etc., etc.?). Would not it seem more convenient, once our platform and documents were ready, as well as yours, to organize the debate even with the periphery, from the newspaper, in the framework of the pre-congress in which we believe we are?

We request that you publish this note with this clarification and distributed by the same means as the Resolution of the Congress-Plenary of 8/30.

*editorial
socialista*

Rudolph
Klement