

x: PC

September 19, 1976.

Dear Jack,

SEP 23 1976

The September 11-12 USEC meeting decided to include the following items in the English, French and Spanish IIDB at this stage:

- 1) and 2) Two articles submitted by the Japanese section, one on the Portuguese revolution, another one on the European document.
- 3) The July 1976 USEC resolution on regroupment.
- 4) The SWP PC reply to that resolution (for the time being without the appendixes. We wait with the printing till the October USEC meeting settles the matter of the appendixes one way or another).
- 5) The minority faction statement on the situation inside the FI without any appendixes not previously submitted to the USEC.
- 6) The minority faction statements on the Portuguese, Mexican and Italian elections campaigns, without any appendixes not previously submitted to the USEC.
- 7) The statements made by majority members of the USEC on the Portuguese and Mexican election campaigns attached to the minutes of the July 1976 USEC meeting *(Should be published in the same bulletin as 6)*
- 8) The exchange of letters between Lutte Ouvrière and USEC without any appendixes (i.e. the initial two letters of L.O.; the USEC answer; the second letter of L.O.; the second USEC answer).
- 9) Comrade A. Jones' reply to the SWP PC answer to the USEC regroupment resolution.
- 10) A statement of the September 1976 United Secretariat on factual inaccuracies contained in the SWP PC answer to the regroupment resolution. *This should be published in the same bulletin as (9)*

I believe you already have all these documents, except document 10 which is enclosed herewith (as is the copy of a letter we sent to the OCRFI, in application of the July 1976 resolution on regroupment). In case you don't have document 9, we asked cde A. Jones to send you another copy.

Concerning the appendixes to item 4: we want to rediscuss the whole procedure of such "appendixes", which gets more and more questionable. It was decided to refer matters to the October USEC, at which comrades of the SWP will be present. The same applies to the appendixes of your report, if submitted as such. Of course there is no objection against any submission of contributions of your faction as separate contributions.

As for the women liberation document which you submit, it concerns a resolution to be submitted to the vote of the World Congress. Therefore, it seems more regular to us to offer it first for consideration and vote to a normal leadership body of the movement, i.e. the next (or over-next) USEC meeting. We regret in any case that you have preferred giving factional status to that document. We thought that there had been a clear understanding, both in the Bureau with the minority faction representative, and between the women commission and cde Mary-Alice, that there would be a preliminary open discussion on this question between all comrades concerned, before submitting final drafts and certainly before handling them as faction or tendency documents. We do not believe that the question of women liberation should become an object of the faction fight. Nor do we exclude that we could accept Mary Alice's draft as basis for a common USEC document. So we think it wiser to have in any case a preliminary discussion at the next USEC meeting.

Finally, comrade Mario informed us at the September USEC meeting that the "bolshevik tendency" (the Moreno grouping) will submit its tendency platform before the end of the month. We decided to give

priority to the publication of that platform, as soon as it is submitted to the International leadership.

x x x x

For the October USEC meeting, the IMT will submit a lengthy self-criticism of the majority document adopted at the 9th world congress, for publication in the IIDB. It is already drafted.

The Bureau will submit to the USEC October discussion a first draft balance-sheet of the Vietnamese revolution, defining reunified Vietnam as a bureaucratically deformed workers state. As on the women liberation question, we think a preliminary discussion in the normal leadership bodies is indispensable before this document is submitted to the IIDB, either as a majority document or as a unanimous document (voted in its general line, i.e. leaving open the possibility of amendments).

We decided at the September USEC meeting to launch an international solidarity campaign with the South African freedom movement. We think this could be a central anti-imperialist campaign for the F.I. forces for a long time to come, as this struggle will in any case be a lengthy one. The political and administrative aspects of that campaign will be discussed at the October USEC meeting. Any proposals or suggestions you will be bringing with you on that subject will be most welcome.

Also on the October USEC meeting, the Bureau will submit a draft resolution on an international campaign for solidarity with the political prisoners in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, a draft of which will be sent to you well in advance, so that you could consider it before you come here.

We want likewise to raise with you the possibility of launching an appeal for a solidarity fund with FI or sympathizing political refugees and victims of political repression. We are more and more in trouble with helping an increasing number of Latin-American and Middle-East refugees. ~~There is also the Bengal case which remains embarrassing.~~ The USEC budget or sections funds' cannot cope with these increasing expenses anymore. We believe a broad financial appeal for individual donations, if necessary with an independent administration and address, would be the best solution. If you have any suggestions in that respect we would be glad to consider them during our meeting.

We would urgently need for Inprecor an article on the latest developments in the class struggle in the USA: the rubber workers ~~and~~ long strike, the stirrings in some unions like the steel workers union, the Ford UAW strike etc. Could you have us sent such an article?

Finally, two points worry us: the de facto refusal of cde Hansen and the SWP leadership to apply the IEC resolution, as amended by the Mexican parity committee, as to the need to publish in the USA comrade Ricardo's reply to the one-sided and factional account of the split in the LS, which was published against our express advice in I.P.; the unilateral decision you seem to have taken to expand I.P. into a Spanish language version. Both ~~the~~ these unilateral decisions, which go a long way towards transforming the minority faction into a public faction with public faction organs, public discipline overriding F.I. discipline, and refusal of elementary democratic rights to opponents of the faction inside the F.I., we cannot accept under any circumstances. If maintained, they will lead to serious consequences, as we shall have to answer them in defence of the integrity of the F.I. We want to discuss these questions likewise with you in our October meeting. They will be raised in the October USEC meeting in any case.

x x x x

A serious matter has arisen in relation with the "O.S.T." of Costa-Rica, regarding accusations said to be advanced against its leading member of Nicaragua origin. You will have received the copy of a letter which the "O.S.T." sent us on that matter. We believe this to be sufficiently grave to be immediately transmitted to an ad hoc control commission, sitting in Mexico and Central-America (jury d'honneur). We

have suspended decision till we can consult with you in October, but beyond October this matter can not be allowed to rest.

X X X X

We think it useful to indicate to you some of the more general problems we want to raise with you during our October meeting. Our central concern is to defend the statutes of the International as they stand, without any change, without any "tightening of centralism", but with the full acceptance of their validity and loyal and real application as they are. We want to defend the democratic centralist structure of the FI as an organisation, within the limits of the present statute. For us, this is not a tactical or organisational question, but a basic programmatic issue. Any questioning of the binding nature of majority decisions of world congresses, IECs and USECs, within the limits of the statutes, means for us a liquidationist retreat from Trotsky's concept of the FI towards a London Bureau, IInd International type of gathering i.e. a basic turn towards centrism of the SAP and Kautsky variant.

The necessity of an international organisation with common discipline, instead of an international discussion club which only agrees by consensus, i.e. in case of unanimity, in our opinion unavoidably flows from the very nature of the imperialist ~~state~~ which, while it keeps the conquest of power initially a problem posed at the national level, implies a qualitatively higher degree of international integration of economics, politics, class struggle and state power than at previous epochs of capitalism. It is therefore an unavoidably corollary of the theory of permanent revolution. To abandon that organisational structure means to retreat towards "trotskyism" ("socialism") in one country". We are not ready to make the slightest concession to such a retreat, neither in formulation nor in practice. It is for us synonymous with a liquidation of trotskyism. For us no authoritative world congress can exist if its decisions are not recognized by and binding upon all sections and members, even if they disagree with them, as long as they are majority decisions within the limits of the present statutes. To establish rules for democratic pre-congress decisions, without simultaneously reaffirming the binding nature of congress decisions and the authority of the democratically elected leadership, would be completely meaningless for us, now that the binding nature of majority decisions has been openly challenged by you in the "closed" session of your Convention.

We believe this issue to be all the more burning to-day for two specific reasons, unrelated in and by themselves to your questioning of the principle.

In the first place, the growth of the movement now creates the concrete possibility of attracting wider centrist leftward moving forces in several countries to sections of the F.I. Centrist organisational and political pressure ~~will~~ upon our movement will, however, simultaneously grow. The question of the International, its nature and structure, will play a key-rôle in that context. Any concession we would make to you or to the Lambertists on the question of the nature and the structure of the International, would be used by forces conciliatory to centrism inside or at the periphery of our movement. Political concessions to centrism are bound to follow on the footsteps of the organisational concessions: the whole history of the international working class movement testifies to this. Regroupment can only operate in favor of revolutionary marxism, i.e. of building genuinely revolutionary parties, if tactical flexibility is combined with utmost firmness on basic principles, both political and organisational ones. To retreat on this to-day opens the road towards centrifugal disintegration tomorrow.

The developments of the last years have likewise confirmed that any concession made to the transformation of the F.I. into a loose federation of public factions could only unleash a dynamic of splits in national sections too. The corollary is that any continuation of the process of splits in an increasing number of countries could only lead to

have suspended decision till we can consult with you in October, but beyond October this matter can not be allowed to rest.

x x x x

We think it useful to indicate to you some of the more general problems we want to raise with you during our October meeting. Our central concern is to defend the statutes of the International as they stand, without any change, without any "tightening of centralism", but with the full acceptance of their validity and loyal and real application as they are. We want to defend the democratic centralist structure of the FI as an organisation, within the limits of the present statute. For us, this is not a tactical or organisational question, but a basic programmatic issue. Any questioning of the binding nature of majority decisions of world congresses, IECs and USECs, within the limits of the statutes, means for us a liquidationist retreat from Trotsky's concept of the FI towards a London Bureau, IInd International type of gathering i.e. a basic turn towards centrism of the SAP and Kautsky variant.

The necessity of an international organisation with common discipline, instead of an international discussion club which only agrees by consensus, i.e. in case of unanimity, in our opinion unavoidably flows from the very nature of the imperialist ~~struggle~~ which, while it keeps the conquest of power initially a problem posed at the national level, implies a qualitatively higher degree of international integration of economics, politics, class struggle and state power than at previous epochs of capitalism. It is therefore an unavoidably corollary of the theory of permanent revolution. To abandon that organisational structure means to retreat towards "trotskyism" ("socialism") in one country". We are not ready to make the slightest concession to such a retreat, neither in formulation nor in practice. It is for us synonymous with a liquidation of trotskyism. For us no authoritative world congress can exist if its decisions are not recognized by and binding upon all sections and members, even if they disagree with them, as long as they are majority decisions within the limits of the present statutes. To establish rules for democratic pre-congress decisions, without simultaneously reaffirming the binding nature of congress decisions and the authority of the democratically elected leadership, would be completely meaningless for us, now that the binding nature of majority decisions has been openly challenged by you in the "closed" session of your Conventi

We believe this issue to be all the more burning to-day for two specific reasons, unrelated in and by themselves to your questioning of the principle.

In the first place, the growth of the movement now creates the concrete possibility of attracting wider centrist leftward moving forces in several countries to sections of the F.I. Centrist organisational and political pressure ~~which~~ upon our movement will, however, simultaneously grow. The question of the International, its nature and structure, will play a key-rôle in that context. Any concession we would make to you or to the Lambertists on the question of the nature and the structure of the International, would be used by forces conciliatory to centrism inside or at the periphery of our movement. Political concessions to centrism are bound to follow on the footsteps of the organisational concessions: the whole history of the international working class movement testifies to this. Regroupment can only operate in favor of revolutionary marxism, i.e. of building genuinely revolutionary parties, if tactical flexibility is combined with utmost firmness on basic principles, both political and organisational ones. To retreat on this to-day opens the road towards centrifugal disintegration tomorrow.

The developments of the last years have likewise confirmed that an concession made to the transformation of the F.I. into a loose federation of public factions could only unleash a dynamic of splits in national sections too. The corollary is that any continuation of the process of splits in an increasing number of countries could only lead to

Secrétariat Unifié de la
Quatrième Internationale.

18 septembre 1976.

Au "Comité d'Organisation pour la Reconstruction de la
Quatrième Internationale",
François DeMassot,
c/o Informations Ouvrières,
87 Faubourg St. Denis,
75010 Paris.

Camarades,

Le Secrétariat Unifié de la IVe Internationale a discuté de ses rapports avec des organisations trotskystes, ou s'appelant trotskystes, qui se trouvent à l'extérieur de la IVe Internationale. Il a voté à ce propos une résolution qui contient un passage concernant votre organisation, ceci dans le contexte de votre proposition adressée au Secrétariat Unifié d'entamer une discussion pour laquelle vous ne soumettez aucun ordre du jour établi à l'avance.

Il serait opportun d'avoir une rencontre entre les représentants de nos deux organisations en vue d'examiner divers aspects de pareille discussion éventuelle. Vu la nécessité de voir participer à cette réunion des camarades qui résident dans différents pays fort distants les uns des autres, nous préférierions fixer la date de cette réunion aux alentours du 19 octobre 1976. Prière de nous communiquer aussi vite que possible si cette date peut vous convenir.

Salutations communistes internationalistes,

Pour le Secrétariat Unifié de la Quatrième Internationale

Ernest Mandel.

STATEMENT OF THE UNITED SECRETARIAT OF SEPTEMBER 12, 1976

The "Statement of the Political Committee of the SWP on the objections raised to inviting the OCNEI to ~~xxx~~ observe the 1976 convention contains in point I references to "conversations" allegedly conducted in Paris, Brussels and London, by "leaders of the LCR and of the International Majority Tendency" with the international grouping called International Revolutionary Marxist Tendency (the Pablo grouping). The passage of the statement contains misrepresentations of facts which have to be immediately rectified.

- 1° At no time did the leadership of any European section engage in a discussion with the international grouping called Revolutionary Marxist Tendency nor invite it to any of its gathering, prior to a consultation with the leadership of the Fourth International.
- 2° According to what they explicitly declare, at no time did the lead of the International Majority Tendency engage in any discussions with the international Revolutionary Marxist Tendency.
- 3° When the IRMT approached the leadership of the LCR, the French section of the F.I., for a common discussion, the leadership of the I immediately and correctly referred this question to the USEC.
- 4° The USEC discussed this question at its January 1976 meeting and decided to propose to the IRMT a discussion between a USEC delegation and the IRMT. This was a unanimous decision of the USEC. In the USEC delegation elected, a representative of the minority was faction (see appendix A). *(code Gus Horowitz)*
- 5° The meeting took place in Brussels, on January 26. ~~the~~ SWP observer was present at that meeting from the beginning till the end.
- 6° The letter of Michel Pablo to Ernest Mandel refers to that meeting as is obvious both of the contents of the letters which correspond exactly to what Pablo said at the above-mentioned meeting, as from the date.
- 7° The absence of any mention of these two facts in the SWP's PC Statement, in spite of the perfect knowledge of them by the SWP observer member of the PC, is a flagrant misrepresentation by omission.
- 8° The February 1976 USEC heard a brief report on that meeting which did not contain any proposal or any suggestion of follow-up, and therefore was not included in the minutes. But many minority faction USEC members and several SWP observers were present at that meeting and heard that report, a fact equally not mentioned in the SWP PC statement.
- 9° The copy of the letter by Michel Pablo to Ernest Mandel was put in the USEC correspondence file and a copy of it was handed to the minority USEC members and SWP observer of the USEC.
- 10° When Pablo contacted the IMG, via the New Left Review, and proposed a meeting, the IMG leadership pursued the policy which it always follows in these matters. It arranged an informal gathering, heard Pablo explain his political positions, asked some questions regarding appreciations he made of some historical events; it discussed no matters of internal discussion of the International. Because it was aware of the possibility of a maneuver by the IRMT, it ensured that a member of the international minority faction was present at this gathering. It immediately contacted the USEC to inform the of the meeting and Pablo's proposals, and asked for a USEC decision on what to do (see appendix B). It naturally will have no discussion with Pablo, or even agree to a further meeting, without prior approval by the USEC.

As appears clearly from these facts, the United Secretariat has followed exactly the same procedure in relation with the IRMT as the one it has consistently defended on questions of relations with the OORFI.

Given the gravity of the omission contained in the SWP PC statement, which could lead to serious misinformation of the membership of the SWP, we request that this statement be included in the Internal Bulletin of the SWP.

September 12, 1976

The United Secretariat of the P.I.

Appendix A

Extract of the minutes of the United Secretariat meeting of January 24-25, 1976

p.3, point 7 Miscellaneous, subsection c):

"c Meeting with MRT

Walter informs about meeting between USEC and representatives of the MRT (Pablo grouping) asked for by the MRT.

Motion to send a delegation composed of Galois, Walter, Roman, Dur (Mario invited to participate in delegation, stated he was unable to do so).

Carried unanimously."

Appendix B

Letter of Alan Jones to the United Secretariat

(without date)

97 Caledonian Rd
London N 1

To the United Secretariat,

Dear Comrades,

This is to inform you of events concerning Pablo in Britain. Pablo was in Britain last week and contacted members of the IMG - first through the New Left Review and then by arranging an informal meeting with comrades from the IMG leadership. As is the normal practice with the IMG when a person from another organisation within the workers movement asks for a meeting, we agreed subject to the fact that we will not discuss internal affairs of the F.I. or political differences within the International, nor will we have a meeting with an organisation which is carrying out a policy of violent attacks on other sections and where we are aware that the section would not like us to have a meeting with this organisation.

At the meeting with Pablo, comrades simply asked him a number of questions regarding his present and past political positions. The main points he made were that differences with the International were in his opinion narrowing and that the French LCR should unify with the PSU. Within this framework, he expressed a number of differences concerning Portugal. As this involved differences within the International, we made no statement, other than referring him to published positions, but simply asked questions. We stated that if he considered differences were narrowing, then he should contact the International.

In order both to avoid misunderstanding within the International and any false conclusions on Pablo's part, we ensured that at this meeting members of both the IMT and the LTF were present.

Pablo indicated that he would be returning to Britain in the autumn and would like some further discussion - a point repeated by the member of his small British organisation who attended. I think the United Secretariat should decide whether we should have any further such meeting, or whether relations with the Pablo grouping should be handled simply at an International level, and what general attitude we should take to this current internationally and nationally.

Fraternally,

(signed) Alan Jones.