

INTERNATIONAL

BULLETIN

VOL. I

JULY, 1941

No. 6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Greetings to the Chilean Trotskyists...	Page 1
Discussion.....	Page 2
On the Question of the Slogan of Neu- trality.....	Page 4
A Letter to the Comrades in the Argen- tine.....	Page 5
In the Sections.....	Page 10

PRICE 5¢

GREETINGS TO THE CHILEAN TROTSKYISTS

To the Unification Congress of the P.O.I. and the P.O.R.

Dear Comrades,

It is with deep regret that we must inform you that in all likelihood there will be no representative of the International to present greetings to you in person and to participate in the work of your Congress. The much vaunted democracy of Yankee imperialism has proved to be not even broad enough to permit representatives of the International Executive Committee and of the Socialist Workers Party of the United States to leave the country in order to visit Chile. We are still trying to arrange for our representative to be at your Congress, but in case we are not certain that this will be possible, we take this means of transmitting to you our warmest sentiments of solidarity and our best wishes on your unification.*

Your unification Congress is a great success for the Fourth International. Two revolutionary groups, coming from different sectors of the labor movement, are uniting on the basis of our principles and our methods. The result holds promise of renewed progress in your own country and serves as a valuable example to many groups abroad.

As it closes definitely one chapter of the Trotskyist movement in Chile, your Congress opens up a new one. To understand clearly what the tasks of this new period are, to find the correct solutions for these tasks, therein lies the fundamental problem on the agenda of your Congress. These new tasks may be summed up in a single formula:

How to make the transition from a propaganda group to a party seriously rooted in the Chilean working class?

This problem is not simple. It is perhaps among the most difficult that a young revolutionary organization must resolve. It requires perseverance on the part of the entire organization and a will always directed towards achieving this goal.

The Fourth International brings to you the experience of the world labor movement of the past, systematized in the decisions of its congresses. You have before you the works of its great leader, Leon Trotsky, fallen at his post of combat. All this constitutes an inestimable treasure, for these are lessons for which the workers of the entire world have often paid for with their blood. As part of the Fourth International, you are rich in an immense experience, both positive and negative, of victories as well as defeats in the international labor movement. But the task of a revolutionary party -- and you are the party of the Chilean revolution -- is not to repeat abstract formulae, no matter how correct they may be. The problem which you must confront and solve is: how to make this revolutionary heritage bear fruit in your country, in Chile.

Chile, like the other Latin-American countries, is not an imperialist country, but a semi-colonial one. How to apply in the concrete conditions of your country (and of Latin-America as a whole) the general

*For an account of the successful Unification Congress of the Chilean Fourth Internationalists, see The Militant of June 25, Page 5.

principles of the proletarian revolution, that is the first question which you must answer as a Marxist party.

The social struggles in the colonial and semi-colonial types of countries already have a long tradition throughout the world. They also have their lessons. A great chapter in the fighting history of the Russian as well as the international Left Opposition was written in the course of the Chinese revolution of 1926-27. Experiences of all sorts have not been lacking even after that. These are pages of revolutionary history which the Chilean Marxists must study closely.

This theoretical examination of the motive forces of the future Chilean revolution and of the relationships between the various classes of your country can and should naturally be developed within the normal framework of your party life. We are sufficiently strong to discuss and decide in common the problems of the revolution.

Such a clarification of the problems should find its culmination in the working out of a program of action on the part of your organization. This is an indispensable weapon which must be forged with great care. You will have to probe the demands of the Chilean workers and peasants, of the oppressed and exploited masses in general, systematize these demands within a framework of more profound reforms, and finally inscribe these reforms within a general revolutionary perspective of social upheaval.

It is necessary to discuss seriously such a program from the top to the bottom of the organization for a given time, to clear up and concretize each of its points. With such a program adopted, with every member of the party armed with a firm conviction in its correctness, systematic campaigns based on the program will have to be undertaken among the Chilean masses. Needless to say, the International will give you all possible aid in this work.

We are certain that your Congress will devote a great deal of attention to the activity of your party in the trade unions. It is necessary to learn how to link up theoretical intransigence with a capacity to carry on the prosaic, day-to-day work in the mass organizations. The establishment of powerful bulwarks in the trade unions should be one of the most important points of your program: that is what it means to become the revolutionary party of the Chilean working class.

Your party is also confronted with the task of creating a leadership. A propaganda group can tolerate many things which a party cannot permit. It is necessary to be thoroughly exacting with regard to the leadership, to check the attitude of each of the leaders towards the daily problems of party life as well as in the decisive moments of the struggle of your party. On the other hand, the leadership must demand of all the members strictest discipline in action. Those who hesitate must be left by the wayside! It is better to have a good sympathizer than a bad party member.

In the name of the thousands of fighters who, in the entire world, struggle under the most difficult conditions for the liberation of the oppressed, the Executive Committee of the Fourth International salutes in you the pioneers of the emancipation of the Chilean masses. Go forward, with courage, boldness and perseverance, and your victory is assured!

Long live the strong and unified Chilean Section of the Fourth International!

Long live the world revolution!

International Executive Committee
World Party of the Socialist
Revolution (IV. Int.)

June, 1941.

DISCUSSION

Among the partisans of the Fourth International in the Argentine a serious discussion is at present in progress with respect to two major questions which are in themselves interrelated.

1- The question of the attitude to be taken by the revolutionists in a semi-colonial country such as the Argentine towards the raging imperialist war, and the slogans to be employed in such cases; and

2- The question of the national problem as a whole in such countries, and the revolutionary solution of it.

On the first question, some Argentine comrades have raised the slogan of "neutrality", while others, opposing them, have confined themselves to a much too abstract agitation on the war question.

The first of the documents which follow is a statement by the International Executive Committee giving its views on the use of the "neutrality" slogan.

The second is a critical article by Comrade Marc Loris, a member of the I.E.C., who takes up some of the literature on these subjects published by various Argentine comrades subjecting it to an analysis in the light of the fundamental theses adopted by our International movement in the past. Comrade Loris' article is meant only as the first contribution in a period of discussion on these questions, in the course of which we hope to bring contributions from comrades holding opposing or similar views in the Argentine, in other Latin-American countries, as well as in the International in general.

The importance of the questions and the constantly new conditions under which they are being posed makes necessary a thorough-going discussion before any decision is arrived at. The I.E.C. proposes to conduct this discussion freely and as widely as possible, in the traditional spirit of democratic centralism.

ARGENTINE

ON THE QUESTION OF THE SLOGAN OF NEUTRALITY.

1. The idea of neutrality is essentially an idea which the bourgeoisie of small countries, crushed between competing imperialists, vainly attempt to achieve. In almost every small country in the world, as well as in semi-colonial countries, the bourgeoisie is divided into three sections with reference to the question of its participation in the imperialist war: one - a section of the bourgeoisie favoring American-English imperialism; two - a section favoring German imperialism; three - a section desiring to be neutral in the struggle between these two imperialist contenders. It is only under very special circumstances that the bourgeoisie of a small country and of a semi-colonial country can actually be neutral. In general, it is sucked into the maelstrom on the side of one or the other of the imperialist powers.

For the proletariat or any section of the proletariat to support the idea of neutrality and to issue it as a slogan would succeed only in tying itself up with that section of the bourgeoisie hoping and praying that the war would leave it alone. In spite of every attempt that is made to give the idea of neutrality some content which would distinguish its use by the proletariat from its use by any section of the bourgeoisie, it would inevitably lead to a blunting of distinction between the revolutionary proletarian party and that section of the bourgeoisie advocating neutrality. It certainly would not distinguish the attitude of the revolutionary proletariat from the attitude of that section of the bourgeoisie.

2. The concept of neutrality tends to become a purely legalistic one. The idea is fostered that a neutral nation can be impartial in a struggle between two imperialist powers. By impartial it is meant that whatever it permits one power it will also permit the other power. It completely lacks a spirit of struggle against both imperialist camps. In its apparent attitude of indifference to the victory of either of the camps, there cannot be detected the proletarian attitude that both camps are in reality one and the same and must be destroyed.

It goes without saying, of course, that the forces of the Fourth International can never be neutral in a struggle between a colonial people or a semi-colonial people against an imperialist power. We understand very well that those comrades who use the slogan of neutrality do not mean that they would be neutral in such a case. And we also understand that they are opposed to both rival imperialist powers. But we insist that the slogan does not in any way indicate the necessity of a struggle against all imperialist robbers. Neutrality is not the word which we can accept, nor is the idea of neutrality the idea that we can accept for the proletariat. The slogan of neutrality is at best conducive to a passive role which does not further the struggle against imperialism. A slogan of such a nature, therefore, is not a slogan that the Fourth International can accept.

3. The revolutionary parties of the South American countries, the sections of the Fourth International of the South American countries, must utilize such slogans which will mobilize the workers and peasants of those countries against all imperialisms.

Our slogans at any given time must be such as to point out the main danger for the small nation of a colonial or semi-colonial nature. While attacking not by neutrality, but by an active anti-imperialist struggle, imperialism in general, it must point to the main imperialist danger of the moment. In this case Yankee imperialism is lining up all of Latin-America for its own ends. We must attack American imperialism above all. The proletariat must sharply distinguish itself from its own bourgeoisie which plays the game of neutrality only to give itself room to bargain for more of the spoils of imperialist exploitation, or, which sells itself outright for a price to one of the powers. Today it is American imperialism that is being aided by the Latin-American bourgeoisie. This aid under the guise of defense of democracy against fascism, must be exposed and attacked by our forces. It must be made clear that only by the alliance of the Latin-American masses with the American proletariat can both the native bourgeoisie and the American imperialists be defeated in their common machinations to keep the Latin-American peoples in subjection.

As substitutes for the slogan of neutrality we suggest:

"Down with Imperialist War"

"Down with Yankee Imperialism"

"Against all Imperialist Exploiters"

"For a United Socialist Latin-America"

May, 1941

I.E.C.

A LETTER TO THE COMRADES IN THE ARGENTINE

Dear Comrades,

The international leadership is attentively following the discussion now taking place among you. This discussion of the revolutionary problems of your country is extremely important for the future of our movement, not only in the Argentine but in the whole of Latin-America. In the last analysis it is of interest to all colonial and semi-colonial countries, that is to three-quarters of our planet. The International will be unable to make a useful intervention until the time when more detailed documents are presented by both groups. Thus, though the author of this letter is a member of the International Executive Committee, the following lines have a personal character and only the author is, of course, responsible for them.

I have just finished reading two pamphlets: "The Argentine and the World War" (La Argentina frente a la guerra mundial), published by the Revolutionary Workers' Group (Grupo Obrero Revolucionario), and "The Fourth International and the Struggle Against Imperialism" (la IV Internacional y la lucha contra el imperialismo), by Comrade Jorge Lagos. The two documents are quite different. One of them is a collection of articles published over a period of six months, and the other is a draft thesis. You may be certain that when reading them I

never lost sight of this difference in nature. However, the two documents outline political perspectives, propose slogans and so are both justifiably subject to criticism.

I shall begin with the central question, concerning national emancipation. In the pamphlet of the G.O.R., national emancipation appears as a slogan abstracted from any concrete reality and consequently empty. The tone of the entire pamphlet is indicated by the following lines: "The Argentine, like all colonial and semi-colonial countries must not go into a struggle at the side of and in the service of its conquerors, but must become a free country. This is the question." (La Argentina, como todos los paises coloniales y semicoloniales, no debe ir a luchar al lado y al servicio de sus dominadores, sino llegar a ser un pais libre. De eso es lo que se trata.) But what does a "free country" mean? The author of the pamphlet attempts to explain it in the following lines: "Let us agitate on behalf of the Argentine itself, so that our people can take control of all the foreign industrial enterprises, great public utility companies, agricultural societies and banks which are now dominating us and sucking us dry." (Hagamos agitacion en favor de la propia Argentina, para que pasen a poder de nuestro pueblo todas las grandes companias de servicios publicos, empresas industriales, sociedades agricolas y bancos extranjeros que actualmente nos esquilman y dominan.) I am assuming that the adjective "foreign" refers to all the nouns following it -- public utilities, industrial enterprises, agricultural societies and banks. And the national bourgeoisie? What is meant by the formula "our people can take control"? This is part of the considerably out-of-date and worn-out arsenal of all the petty-bourgeois demagogues. Does the author imagine that the proletarian revolution can be recognized beneath this catch-penny phraseology? The pamphlet also speaks of the Argentinian economy which is "distorted" by imperialist oppression. Would it be a question of "restoring" Argentinian economy, of making it "normal"? Within the framework of imperialist capitalism is it possible to hope for it to follow a harmonious course of development? Even in his own time Marx ridiculed those petty-bourgeois dreamers like Sismondi who wished to eliminate the "bad parts" of capitalism. Today it is even less possible to correct the "excesses" of imperialism. The author of the G.O.R. pamphlet never explicitly expresses such a perspective, but all his formulas inevitably suggest it to the reader. And this is, in the full sense of the word, a reformist perspective.

The quotation I have given above begins with the words: "Let us agitate on behalf of the Argentine itself, so that our people can take control...etc..." I shall ignore the chauvinist character of the expression. What is meant by the formula "Let us agitate..."? This formula, - and this is the essential defect of the pamphlet - faces two ways. "Agitation" may mean the exercise of pressure, which is a purely reformist solution. Or again it may be revolution, and necessarily a proletarian revolution. But in that case why not say so clearly? Would we be deceiving the national bourgeoisie, or our petty-bourgeois allies? Alas, all past experience shows that such methods deceive no one but the proletariat. Towards the end of the pamphlet the following phrase is found: "...achieve national emancipation by way of the expropriation without indemnification and the nationalization of the banks, business enterprises, etc..." (lograr la liberacion

nacional a traves de la expropiacion sin indemnizacion y nacionalizacion de los bancos, empresas, etc...) Here all the real relationships are turned upside-down. The last part of the phrase refers to the proletarian revolution (once again, why not call it by its name?), and this proletarian revolution is presented as the instrument, the means of national emancipation! Many years ago Lenin once wrote: "We must subordinate the demand for national self-determination to the interests of the proletarian struggle. It is precisely in this that the difference is found between our manner of posing the national question and the bourgeois-democratic manner." Here are a few lines that must be seriously reflected on! All petty-bourgeois movements (Pilsudsky, Masaryk, etc.: they are innumerable) seek, or did seek, to subordinate the class struggle to the national movement. Lenin wants to utilize the national oppression as an auxiliary instrument of the proletarian revolution. We must choose between Masaryk's ways and Lenin's way! The author of the G.O.R. pamphlet, alas, is embarking on the former rather than on the latter. For him national emancipation becomes an omnipresent and omnipotent entity which subordinates everything to itself, including the proletarian revolution. A small detail is rather significant: throughout the thirty-nine pages of the pamphlet I did not once encounter the words "socialism" or "socialist" (except for names of parties). No -- all this is far away, very far away from Marxism.

As to the means of action of the working-class the pamphlet says only a few words which, unfortunately, reveal the greatest confusion. According to the pamphlet the proletariat must "demand the formation of a United Proletarian Front" (exigir la formacion de un Frente Unico Proletario). Between whom and whom? A united front is a temporary agreement between two or more parties, to attain certain specific objectives. Which are these parties? What are the objectives? Nothing is known about it. In reality the brochure presents the united front (once again: between whom and whom?) as a substitute for the revolutionary party.

Not only in the national question, but even on all the problems it touches the pamphlet of the G.O.R. skirts reformism incessantly. I shall take a last example. The pamphlet states: "The government has sent to the congress a draft of a neutrality law with the object of controlling the activities of the "fifth column." There would be nothing to object to if this law really did have such an object for its purpose and if...etc..." (El gobierno ha enviado al congreso un proyecto de ley de neutralidad con el fin de controlar las actividades de la "quinta columna." Nada tendria que objetarse se esa ley tuviera por fin realmente tal proposito y si...etc...) No - there is no revolutionary language here. The bourgeois state can never "really have such an object" and we do not require it to have, because we know its class nature too well. To put a stop to the fascist rabble we have our own weapons, the workers' militia, and the arming of the proletariat.

On the question of national emancipation and the relationships between imperialism and the national bourgeoisie Jorge Lagos' draft thesis says many correct things which complete and quite often correct the G.O.R. pamphlet. But - but too much of the best may be bad. Comrade Lagos falls into a series of errors which may be classified under the general heading of sectarianism.

Thus, he states: "We Trotskyites have always denied the existence of feudalism or of feudal survivals in the Argentine countryside." (*Los Trotskistas hemos negado siempre la existencia de feudalism o de supervivencias feudales en el campo argentino.*) No, Comrade Lagos, this isn't correct. The Trotskyites may have denied that, but in that case they were wrong and it is not an action that makes them deserve the name of Trotskyites. Even in the great capitalist countries there is no lack of feudal survivals. The revolution in England will have to smash the monarchy. This doesn't mean that a bourgeois revolution is on the order of the day in England. It simply means that even in the most "advanced" great imperialist countries the bourgeoisie is incapable of realizing its own democracy. There is no lack of feudal survivals in the countryside even in the most basically capitalist country, the United States. Without ever having been in the Argentine I am certain that your statement is incorrect, Comrade Lagos. Of course, the law of the transformation of quantity into quality retains its full value here. It is not a question of replacing the proletarian revolution with the bourgeois revolution. But it is up to the proletarian revolution to solve bourgeois-democratic tasks which the most advanced bourgeoisie has been unable and is unable to solve. This is an extremely important point for our propaganda and our agitation.

The same sectarian tendency is shown on the question of war. Comrade Lagos writes: "War between one of our countries (by this he means the countries of Latin America) and one of the imperialist sectors would be an imperialist war." (*La guerra entre un o de nuestros paises y uno de los sectores imperialistas sera una guerra imperialista.*) This formula is theoretically false and politically dangerous. If the United States enters into a war against Germany tomorrow and forces the Latin American countries to follow it, the proletariat will of course be unable to support such a war, because the principle enemy at present, of the Latin American countries is not Hitler, but Roosevelt. But other wars are possible between a country of colonial type and an imperialist country, wars of anti-imperialist defense. History is full of them. At present China is struggling against Japan. The proletariat cannot remain indifferent in the face of such wars. Of course, the fact that the proletariat supports an oppressed country in its struggle against an imperialist power by no means indicates that the revolutionary party identifies its program with that of its national bourgeoisie. But this question has been clarified a number of times in the theoretical documents of the Fourth International. Comrade Lagos also mentions a war between two colonial countries. It is impossible to give a general reply. Both countries may very well be agents of two different imperialist bandits (the war between Bolivia and Paraguay) and in this case everything must be done in order to transform the war into a common struggle against imperialism. But it is also very possible that one of the colonial countries may be a direct agent of one imperialism against a colonial country struggling for its independence. In this way, for example, Japan might make use of Thailand against China. In such cases it is necessary on each occasion to make a serious analysis of the concrete conditions. But it is impossible for the proletariat simply to turn its back on all wars by placing them in one bag with the trademark "imperialist war."

Comrade Lagos' pamphlet also forgets the question of the revolutionary party in the Argentine. However correct political theses may be, if they are without an examination of the problems of party formation, they are like an unloaded gun. You may be able to handle the gun and aim very well, but you will never capture the game.

I cannot end this letter without a few remarks on the tone of your polemics, Argentinian comrades. In general we scarcely have the habit of complaining of the bitterness of controversies and we leave it to the centrists to mourn over too lively a tone in disputes. But in your case the question is not of calming down but of purifying. You're in the midst of discussing theoretical questions of the greatest importance for your future. It would be futile to think yourselves able to solve the problems in dispute by personal accusations that you can hardly justify to an outside observer, if indeed they are ever justifiable.

The decline of the old capitalist Europe and the imperialist explosion of the United States constitutes for the countries of Latin-America the breaking down of their political and economic equilibrium, that is to say, revolutionary crises are ripening for these countries. They must seriously be prepared for. Your discussion on the character of your future revolution and on your tasks must be one step in this direction, and this letter has no other object than to seek together with you, and with the entire International, for the path which must lead you to victory.

Revolutionary greetings,

Marc Loris

May 20, 1941.

IN THE SECTIONS

From time to time, we intend to bring in this space reports of activities of various sections of the Fourth International. It must be remembered that in view of conditions brought about by the present World War, communications are very tenuous and take considerable time in reaching us wherever they are established. In many cases, direct contact is impossible and reports received are made only by second-hand. However, we consider it important for the information of the comrades, to present such material, even if it is incomplete, in line with internationalist spirit of the organization. •

LATIN AMERICA

Due to the presence in Latin America of a comrade who has in the past collaborated with the International Executive Committee, we have been fortunate in getting a series of detailed reports on the life, composition, and activities of the Fourth Internationalists in the South American countries. The first of these, dealing with the Argentine, was made on the basis of information furnished by responsible comrades of the Liga Obrera Socialista and the Liga Obrera Revolucionaria, the two groups affiliated with the International in that country.

LIGA OBRERA SOCIALISTA

Strength: The Central Committee made careful distinction between sympathizers and regularly active dues-paying members. Of the latter they claim groups in the Federal Capital, La Plata, Cordoba, Rosario, Santa Fe, and others scattered. They claim many sympathizers close enough to help sell their newspaper, contribute for various party causes, etc. They say there are hundreds of vague sympathizers, but decline to consider them as such unless they show more than mere emotional or intellectual sympathy. Regarding these figures, they stress that the movement in Argentina, like the development of Argentina itself, is held up by a tendency of provincial groups to consider themselves semi-autonomous, and that they keep an extraordinary effort to overcome this tendency toward "federalization" in favor of strict centralization, drawing provincial comrades into the central work.

Social Composition: The L.O.S. claims about 70 percent of its membership is working class, the rest being students, intellectuals, and indeterminate elements. Principal trade union influence in La Plata, among the "frigorifico" workers. Admit that Quebracho group (L.O.R.) has great advantage in adherence of Fossa and a Mendoza trade union leader, but contend that he has no working class rank and file.

Leadership: The L.O.S. has just passed through a series of convulsions in its leadership, the Central Committee having been twice changed in recent months. One convulsion was political: Milesi, as you already know, in preparing a resolution in a trade union, condemned Soviet aggression equally with Nazi aggression, bracketing the two. Instead of a severe censure, with warning of expulsion on the next occasion (there were, I believe, extenuating circumstances)

the Central Committee expelled Milesi from both the Central Committee and the League. (Milesi has full Shachtmanite position, cooperated closely with Lebrun on his visit, though to little practical effect). With Milesi there resigned the few anti-defensists of the L.O.S., leaving the League unanimously defensist.

The present leadership is very activist, relatively efficient.

Political Position and Political Differences with the L.O.R.:
Full Fourth Internationalist position, including uncompromising defense of the U.S.S.R. Difference with the L.O.R. limited to question of "Neutrality" and "National Liberation" as slogans in South American semi-colonial countries. For the formal development on their position on these points you already have copies of their internal discussion bulletins, and direct reports. (If I may inject a personal judgment here, the difference is not that of principle but of application. Quebracho's use of the unexplained and unimplemented slogan of "Neutrality" was incorrect; and the arrival of the declaration on the subject by the I.E.C. was timely and will be, I hope, effective.)

On the other hand, the total rejection of "Neutrality" by the L.O.S., not only as a slogan but even as a talking-point, impresses your observer as containing much sectarianism and ultra-leftism.

There is absolutely no doubt in my mind, from personal observation here, that the desire for neutrality on the part of the Argentine proletariat, rural workers, and large sectors of the petty-bourgeoisie, is passionate and profound. It seems to be that, instead of treating the subject with a sweeping gesture of almost contemptuous dismissal, as the L.O.S. tends to do, that popular feeling could be used as a starting point in an effective explanation to the Argentine industrial and livestock workers of: (a) why the national bourgeoisie cannot by its nature be permanently neutral and keep Argentina out of the imperialist war; (b) why a passive attitude of mere neutrality on the workers' part, involving as it does reliance on the national bourgeoisie, is not only ineffective, but against their own interests and those of workers in the belligerent countries--that their natural desire not to be dragged into the imperialist blood bath can best be expressed and served by taking an active position against both imperialist camps, etc., etc.--you can imagine the other points.

The new slogan now being adopted by the L.O.S.--"Not a kilo of meat, not a grain of wheat, for the imperialist powers!"--seems to my judgment a very poor one. Its ultimate implication--the development of an internal South American market--may be sound enough; but as a slogan right now, when Argentina is in a terrible crisis precisely on account of the loss of an export market for livestock and cereals, a fact constantly in the forefront of every industrial and livestock worker's thought, it seems to be overadvanced, and calculated to antagonize not only the backward strata of workers but even the advanced sector. I also wonder what the effect of such a slogan would be, if reported to them, on the hungry workers of England and France.

Similarly with the question of "national liberation." Quebracho seems to apply it mechanically; the L.O.S. seems to reject it so thoroughly as to lose the benefit of agitation about it.

Upon its differences with the L.O.R. on these two points, the L.O.S. was inflexible. Each group should submit to the I.E.C. a formal thesis stating its theoretical position, without any personalities or old rancors, and see whether on that basis the I.E.C. would not be able to reach a decision and give guidance.

Possibilities of Fusion: The L.O.S. claims to deplore the continued existence of two groups in Argentine, to understand the disadvantages thereof, and to admire the Chilean fusion. But they claim two things absolutely preclude fusion at the present time: the political differences described above; and the personality of Quebracho. They paint him as distasteful, disloyal, undisciplined. They do not make his exclusion from a unified group a condition of unification.

Newspaper: Inicial, with the June 1 issue, proposes to change from a monthly to a fortnightly. The L.O.S. claims finances are plodged, and appearance will be regular. Present circulation, 3,000. Distribution seems somewhat confused, hence I cannot guarantee how many actually get into readers' hands.

Trade Union Work: Believe the L.O.S. recognizes its supreme importance, and tries to carry it out; but my own impression, on first description, is that outside of La Plata, it is very spotty indeed. La Plata, however, is very healthy.

LIGA OBRERA REVOLUCIONARIA

(If this section is shorter, it is not because I attribute less importance to the L.O.R., but because many of the relations between the L.O.S. and it have been treated under the former.)

Strength: The L.O.R. claims groups in Buenos Aires, Mendoza, Santiago del Estero, San Fernando, and Chaco. In addition, Quebracho claims that the La Plata group, dissatisfied with the L.O.S., has become autonomous, and formed a "united front" with the L.O.R. "Hundreds of sympathizers."

Expects future growth to be very rapid indeed.

Social Composition: Claims practically all are working class elements, and furthermore that they are mostly officers in their respective trade unions. Those present each explained his union: principal ones seemed to be construction, typographers, and woodworkers. Several added that it was Fossa's return from Mexico which first posed problem of Fourth International in Argentina in a practical way, turned movement toward the masses; prior to that time had been "safe revolutionaries."

Political Position, and Political Differences with the L.O.S.: Full Fourth International, including unconditional defense of the U.S.S.R. Like the liberation is too profound to permit unification:

"it would be a bloc." Furthermore, several claimed, it would be absurd, in the present correlation of forces, for a vital growing group to fuse with a grouplet in full disintegration; much better, by continued activity side-by-side with that disintegration, to attract the healthy elements of the L.O.S. into the L.O.R.

On the question of clarifying matters in the I.E.C. by submitting a formal thesis on the questions of neutrality and national liberation, there was considerable difference of opinion as to the advisability of such a step, though nobody could produce any very good reason against it. Asked purely unofficially which of three courses they would prefer (1) continuing the situation as it now is, (2) opening negotiations to discuss the possible basis for unification, or (3) asking the I.E.C. for recognition of one or the other group on the basis of the formal presentation of political positions by means of theses--they were in considerable majority for continuing as they were; but, while opposed to any discussion with the L.O.S., many saw no objection to the submission of a thesis to the I.E.C. anyway.

Possibilities of Fusion: Treated above.

Newspaper: Under its new name, Lucha Obrera, has claimed press-run of 5,000, often increased to 7,000 and 10,000 on special occasions. Monthly.

COMMENTS

This is a purely preliminary first report. You will readily observe, by a confrontation of the statements of the two groups, that they are at variance on almost every point, especially membership and activity. It will be necessary to check a few of these points.

#