

SEP 27 1977

(PAGE 1)

XS: PC

Brussels

September 23, 1977

Dear Gus et al,

Following are some points resulting from the United Secretariat meeting and the subsequent bureau meeting.

Amador, Discussions on this point before and during the meeting indicate that we do not yet have agreement on this point. However, it was agreed to postpone consideration of it so that the United Secretariat members can read all the material from Costa Rica, which wasn't available at the meeting. The point will be taken up at the next meeting and a decision on him made at that time. We have agreed to continue discussions on this point informally and in the bureau between now and the next meeting.

Livio<sup>y</sup> was opposed to postponing the point on the grounds that the Amador interview in IP had to be answered, as well as the assertion in Jack's report to the LTF meeting that Amador was a member of the FI. Enrique, a member of the Socialist Bloc of Colombia and a representative of the Bolshevik Tendency also opposed postponement.

IIDB, There was a good deal of heat expressed over the fact that we had published the reports on the dissolution of the LTF without prior approval from the United Secretariat. However, a motion to approve this material was carried, with some of the French comrades abstaining. A motion was also passed that the IIDB with the INT declaration and our answer could be sent out as IIDB No. 7, with Pierre Frank against and Enrique abstaining. A motion to print the documents of the LTF minority (Nemo and Melan had submitted them) was passed, with 3 abstentions, Pierre Frank, Robs and Sador. Nemo had also submitted his document on Europe, but in accordance with our prior agreement on ~~past~~ procedure, this was referred back to the French central committee. It was also agreed to approve an article by the Dutch comrades as well as one from Vinnie from Germany. Joanna will send you a letter concerning these decisions as well as the material.

OCRFI, We failed to get agreement to approach the discussion with the OCRFI in a new way. The ~~majority~~ majority wished to go ahead and submit the document drawn up by Livio, providing we can come to agreement on editing it. If we do not come to such agreement, it goes back into the United Secretariat.

Duret, however, expressed the view that after this initial document is submitted, we should allow individual signed contributions as the discussion unfolds.

Bolshevik Tendency, A statement on Panama along the lines of the LSR-SWP statement was drawn up and passed unanimously, with the exception of Enrique who abstained. A motion was passed to the effect that those who have been publicly attacked in the press controlled by the Bolshevik Tendency can publicly answer in the manner they see fit.

Spain, there was a political discussion on Spain. Caroline is writing a separate letter going over this.

Future meetings: The next meeting will be October 29-31, to be followed by the IMT meeting. The IMT coordinating committee met and decided to recommend dissolution of the IMT and to invite non-IMT members of the United Secretariat to attend (motions sent under separate cover). The meetings after that will be: December 17-19 and January 28-30.

IP-Inprecor: Inprecor is supposed to send IP completely finished manuscripts as well as a copy as soon as it is printed, together with their suggestions as to which articles they think are most important. They would like to receive a copy of the list of articles being discussed in the IP staff meeting so they have some idea of what is coming up in IP. They didn't want to publish Joe's review of the book on Latin America, on the grounds that it was too theoretical. They will print Jack's report to the convention taken from the Militant.

French IIDS. Under the point concerning the IIDS that contained the materials relating to dissolution of the LTF, the old point about there being too much discussion material came up. It turns out that the French are once again about 17 items behind schedule in the French IIDS. In the bureau meeting, it was raised again. They made a proposal or request concerning this backlog. They want to know if they get the material translated and set, and send New York camera-ready copy, would we be willing to print these French bulletins on newsprint. In short, the LCR won't do it. I told them I would transmit their request. My own opinion is that we should do it, but that is up to you.

Vietnam resolution. B Duret says there is a translation error in the resolution on Vietnam by him, Rousset, et al. We thought that Jon had done that translation. It appears that Jon may have used an initial draft. Rousset is supposed to send a correction.

Agenda for next United Secretariat : 1) North America -- political discussion on both the U.S. and Canada; 2) France -- political discussion; 3) Portugal -- political discussion, situation of section; 4) Latin America -- reports. Moreno is supposed to be present; 5) Report on anti-nuclear meeting -- meeting of representatives of European and other sections Oct. 22; 6) Amador; 7) misc.

Discussion on documents. They seem determined that a European document is needed. Duret and Aubin have drawn up an initial draft for purposes of discussion. Gus has the first part of this draft, and they will give us the second part next week. Concerning our points on the imperialist countries, Ernest thinks that either we can have another document on this or include it in a political resolution that will not be conjunctural but more basic (something like Dynamics). He is going to draw up an outline of what he thinks such a document would include and have it ready for informal discussion before the next United Secretariat meeting.

Barry

OCT 4 1977

XS: PC

Brussels  
Sept. 23, 1977

New York

Dear Gus et al,

This is an addition to Barry's letter on the Sept. 15-16 United Secretariat, concerning the point on Spain. As you know, it had been projected that the United Secretariat was going to adopt a document on Spain, the first draft of which would be drawn up by the Spanish comrades. Comrade Jaime came to the meeting with the draft of a document, but it was projected as the first draft of a document of the LCR leadership, to open the discussion for their congress which will take place in December. It was clear from Jaime's report that the LCR comrades will be writing the document and, although they are very appreciative of discussion and ideas from the United Secretariat, they have no proposal at this point for a separate United Secretariat document on Spain before their congress. No one at the meeting raised any counterproposal to proceed with a separate document.

The first part of the document is seen as a continuation and deepening of the balance sheet that the LCR comrades have drawn on some of the "leftist errors" of the past few years. I won't go over the list of points Jaime mentioned, since they go along the general lines of that Swiss report we received last summer. One new thing was that he said they thought they had underestimated the influence of the CP over the masses and also the importance of demands on the political level. That even though the workers had managed to outflank the CP on numerous occasions, these successes were not expressed in any permanent alternative pole to the CP; the vanguard had not been able to pose any alternative course to that of the CP on the political level.

One important aspect of their pre-congress discussion will be on the national question. Specifically, they are discussing their approach to the demand for independence, which has been ~~now~~ raised more and more insistently in recent mass demonstrations. And secondly, their response on the question of the "autonomy statutes" ~~α~~ that are being proposed or discussed for Catalonia and other nationalities. Jaime said even our own comrades have been surprised at the rapidity of the rise of mass sentiment for independence in Baskadi in the past couple of months. \*of Baskadi

He said the question of the republic has become an even bigger issue these days inside the CP and SP because of the discussion over the drafting of a constitution. ~~When~~ We raised some questions on the republic slogan, for example, on the difficulty of using a slogan that from our point of view refers only to the form of government and not its class content, when the majority of people would tend to automatically associate the form of a republic with a bourgeois class content. Jaime answered that in Spain today it is impossible to avoid the debate over the form of the government by itself because of this debate over the constitution, where the question is whether the first line will read: "Spain is a monarchy...." or that it is a republic.

This relates to a broader problem that the comrades seem to be having. Their thinking goes in the direction of trying to make proposals for the actual content of the constitution that is presently being discussed in the Cortes.

Along the same lines, Jaime noted that there is a big crisis of all the bourgeois institutions today in Spain--the police, courts, army, city government, etc. There is a general decline of authority, expressed inside families and in schools, and in the rising up of all types of new social movements. But, he said, with the demagogy of the new government and lessening of repression, these institutions have gained new legitimacy with their "democratic" reformed image. So, he said, one of the areas where the LCR comrades would like the opinions of the international leadership is on the general question of the attitude of revolutionists to institutions of the bourgeois state in such a situation. That is, he said, what kinds of demands can we raise in response to the various proposals of the reformists to "democratize" the army, the police, the justice system, etc. It's not enough to just reject bourgeois democracy, he said, we have to propose how to control those institutions.

We will obviously have more discussion on these questions in the future. From Jaime's report, it appeared that there is some confusion in the LCR on these questions.

The other two areas on which Jaime said the Spanish comrades would like the opinions of other comrades were: 1) on the national question, how to approach the phenomenon of "pre-nations," or nationalities in formation, and the regional question; and 2) on practical application of governmental slogans. The LCR has adopted the call for a CP-SP government, but they are trying to figure out how best to use it in concrete situations.

\* \* \*

A couple small things. First, remember the statement from Marcelo to the LTF? I had written him that we would translate it and make it available to the steering committee, but I totally forgot to do it. Is there any other way we can make it known now? Somebody should at least read it carefully and see.

Also, I notice that ~~Julio~~ Julio in Argentina has ~~not~~ still not been receiving IP, etc. He obviously does not get our letters either, because I had written to him specifically about the problem of the address. I suggest you ask Marcelo to notify them that the address is no good, or send a whole letter to them through Marcelo.

Lastly, Jacqueline wants an article on the women's movement in the USA for a booklet on the women's movement in various countries that will be published in French. I think it will definitely be published. We can pretty much write anything we want. Could you show this letter, and the minutes of the women's commission several months ago where the project of this series of booklets is described, to Willie Mae, Cindy, and M.A. and ask if they have any ideas for the article and whether someone there could write it. If I had to write it, the only thing I can think of is to kind of make a synthesis of the Cindy-M.A. series in the Militant.

Comradely,

*Caroline*

Caroline

(PAGE 5)

I forgot one thing. There is no letter from Ernest to Viejo Topo.  
~~He wrote a letter to the LCR Political Bureau, asking them to transmit his~~  
~~article to Viejo Topo for publication, since the previous interview~~  
~~did not accurately reflect his views. I believe I sent you a copy of~~  
~~this letter a couple of weeks ago in with a lot of other copies of stuff~~  
~~from the bureau mail folder.~~

He wrote a letter to the LCR Political Bureau, asking them to transmit his  
article to Viejo Topo for publication, since ~~the~~ the previous interview  
did not accurately reflect his views. I believe I sent you a copy of  
this letter a couple of weeks ago in with a lot of other copies of stuff  
from the bureau mail folder.

OCT 4 1977

(PAGE 6)

XS: PC

September 28, 1977

Dear Gus,

Just a point to clarify the question of the French IIDS. Thinking it over, the proposal that we print them if we can get camera-ready copy doesn't solve anything. The bottleneck isn't the printing, which can be done in Paris just as easily. The problem is that the LCR disagrees politically with the importance of the bulletin and of the discussion. It is this question we have to have clarified. We might end up agreeing to help in some way, including printing them, but we shouldn't start from there. We will raise these points at the bureau today.

Barry

October 1, 1977

Dear Gus,

A telephone call from J-P indicated that there was a fight at the congress of the Colombian PST over Ricardo. The fight began over whether to admit him to the congress, with Moreno opposed. J-P reported that the fight expanded to include charges that the Moreno leadership manipulated the PST and its finances, etc. As a result, Moreno is supposedly coming over here to live.

No political differences were reported. J-P thinks politically the PST is doing good. Just before the congress they had a public meeting of 3,000, he reports.

\* \* \*

The Secretariat received the same invitation to attend the GSTQ convention as the SWP did. The bureau wants to know if you or another observer of the Secretariat from New York can go representing the Secretariat.

\* \* \*

I think Rodrige should send a copy of Alfonse's letter directly to the Secretariat and another copy to me. If you have copies you could do this.

\* \* \*

The translation of Gus' reply to Moreno done by Manifiesto Obrero might be desired by other groups. I suggest that we send other Spanish-speaking groups a copy.

\* \* \*

Bruce Landau sent copies of some letter to the Secretariat at the old address. He should use the new address in the future. I assume these letters are coordinated with you.

\*\*\*

I noted that in reply to a number of comrades requesting discussion bulletins, we have written them giving them the list and implying that they would have to pay for any they ordered. I want to raise whether we should not send a representative sample of the most important bulletins free right away at least to comrades in colonial countries, as well as the list for any others they might want to order.

\* \* \*

We had a preliminary discussion concerning Inprecor and IP. Ernest's position remains the necessity to put out a single, identical magazine of the United Secretariat in as many languages as possible. He is willing to "compromise" with IP. His "compromise" is as follows: 1) A new name; 2) IP prints all material from the French magazine; 3) IP produces its own material in addition edited by IP; 4) IP should check with the bureau before printing items IP thinks might be controversial although this isn't a condition; 5) Material in the French magazine would include items first produced by the IP staff.

Concerning the French and Spanish magazines, and others if they

(PAGE 8)

can be done, Ernest's position is that these must be edited by the bureau. However, the work of translation, setting, proofreading, printing and distribution will be done by the French and Spanish sections, who will also be responsible for the finances.

I proposed that the bureau do no editing at all, but that the bureau and Secretariat, as a result of political discussions, put out statements, ask individuals to write articles, etc, on the important political questions as they arise, and that these be sent to IP, the French magazine, the Spanish magazine. These magazines would be edited by people appointed by the sections or sympathizing groups, would not be identical but reflect the different needs of these magazines and would not have to have the same name.

Duret and Aubin tended to agree with my proposal on the grounds that for the center to function properly, it should get rid of not only all the technical and financial burden but also the editing task. Ernest accused them of "changing their position." This will again be taken up at the next bureau I will attend in two weeks, because they want to talk to the French about whatever proposal is agreed to. IP will be discussed when we have a larger delegation here for the next Secretariat and dissolution of IMT meetings.

While tending to agree with my proposal, Duret and Aubin have not yet decided whether they are going to fight for it, and at present still are for changing IP's name.

Bary



(PAGE 9)

New York  
October 1, 1977

Brussels

Dear Barry and Caroline,

Enclosed is a copy of Livio's draft on Stalinism, with some self-explanatory editorial remarks by Joe and myself written in.

Another careful reading of the document confirms our original opinion that it would be unwise to submit it to the discussion with the OCRFI. I'll take up a few points here.

First of all, a serious question can be raised about the character of the document. Our original proposal was not to try to write a separate document at all, but to submit to the discussion with the OCRFI both Jack's article on "Europe vs. America" and Ernest's article on "Three Facets of Eurocommunism," with the understanding that despite differences on some points between the two articles, they shared a common view on the most important questions. This proposal was rejected, and the United Secretariat decided instead to draft a short document on "Eurocommunism" that would incorporate points from the two articles above. Although this was not the best decision, it was at least a serious proposal, since the question of "Eurocommunism" is timely and important, and it was reasonable to think that a short but adequate document on "Eurocommunism" could be written quickly, and that we might be able to reach broad agreement on its main lines.

Now what we are faced with is a set of draft theses that ostensibly summarize more than 50 years of experience with Stalinism on a world scale. It would be quite an achievement, indeed, if this hastily written draft measured up to its objective. Of course, it does not, and the draft is wide open to attack for its weaknesses, even on points where there might be agreement--not only among the comrades of the United Secretariat, but also with the OCRFI.

Even more serious is a built-in problem with this draft: by its very nature, a document of such scope cannot avoid dealing with questions such as the nature of the Chinese, Vietnamese and Yugoslav Communist parties, or the question of political revolution in Vietnam. But there is not agreement on these questions, and so there cannot be a common document on 50 years of world Stalinism.

Now, to go through a few of the other problems with the draft.

There is an underlying thread of difference over what Stalinism is. Stalinism is explicitly defined in the draft as an ideology. It is implicitly treated in the draft as the ideology promulgated by Moscow

(PAGE 10)

in the period when Stalin lived. The inference can naturally be drawn from these narrowly restrictive definitions that the Communist parties or individuals who defend the rule of privileged bureaucratic castes in the workers states, but who defend such rule with ideological and political conceptions other than the precise ones employed during Stalin's life, are breaking with Stalinism.

Thus, in the draft, the West European Communist parties are never called Stalinist. Nor are they called Social Democratic. What are they then? The draft labels them "neoreformist." But what does this mean? Does it mean, as the literal reader might infer, that they are new variants of an already existing category of reformism (Social Democratic or Stalinist)? Or is this some sort of shorthand for a new socio-political category that the authors are reluctant to explain explicitly?

A similar problem comes up in the implicit distinction made in the draft between Stalinism and Maoism; Maoism is never dealt with as a variety of Stalinism. Similarly, in the statement in point 7-b that "the Tito tendency, the first to submit the classical methods and conceptions of Stalinism to an overall critique, raises the problem of self-management and the decline of the state as fundamental answers for the process of bureaucratization...." Now, there are well-known differences between us in analyzing the nature of the Chinese and Yugoslav CPs during the course of the Yugoslav and Chinese revolutions. But today there is supposed to be agreement on the existence of bureaucratic castes in China and Yugoslavia. Are these castes something other than Stalinist? Do the Titoist "self-management" schemes fall outside the framework of Stalinism?

Another problem with the draft is its overly schematic and flawed treatment of certain questions. Take sections 4-7, for example, in which the history of world Stalinism is divided into three phases. No account is taken of the rather important dividing line that 1933 represented in the Third International. Other periods in the history of Stalinism could just as easily be added, such as that of Great Russian chauvinism in World War II.

The general problem is that such schematic division is not the best way to deal with changes that have occurred in Stalinism at different tempos. There was a period in world Stalinism characterized by the worst excesses of police dictatorship and cultism in the Soviet Union. This period coincided roughly with Stalin's lifetime. (In China, the pattern was different.) The early 1950s saw no change in this aspect of Moscow Stalinism. So, as far as this is concerned, phases "a" and "b" in the draft are really one phase.

There was also a period in world Stalinism characterized by Moscow's monolithic domination over world Stalinism. The first important crack in the monolith occurred in 1948, with the Tito-Stalin break. Others came later. So, the time period and tempo of the monolithism phase is different from that when Stalin was alive.

(PAGE 11)

Furthermore, the draft's assertion that Stalinism had passed its peak after World War II is wrong. On the contrary, the strength of world Stalinism as a united, cohesive world movement was never greater than in the immediate postwar period. True, the objective potential was now much stronger for undermining this strength, but it took a while for this potential to express itself. Here, too, the effort to pigeonhole everything into neat phases encourages errors of oversimplification.

The categories of point 7 in the draft likewise raise a few questions. Do the Rumanian and North Korean bureaucracies really have enough in common to form a category of their own? Why not also include Albania? On the other hand, if these three don't fit in the same category, wouldn't the same logic apply to the other categories? Take Khrushchhev, for example. Given Khrushchhev's policy towards Gomulka and Nagy in 1956, how can it be explained that the draft puts all three of them in the same category?

In addition to the above, the draft fails to deal adequately--even if briefly--with the experience of the various antibureaucratic developments in Eastern Europe in the post-World-War-II period. There are a great many lessons from this experience that we can incorporate into our program for the political revolution, and this absence is certainly glaring in a document of such ostensible scope. Another striking thing is the absence of even a brief assessment of the impact of the Cuban revolution on world Stalinism.

Finally, the draft's analysis of "Eurocommunism" is very abbreviated. The "Three Facets..." article by Ernest is much more useful. So is the Michaloux-Udry article. The draft's analysis of "Eurocommunism" makes some errors that these articles do not. And, beyond the question of analysis, the draft does not adequately discuss the big openings that Trotskyists have around the "Eurocommunism" issue. And, to think, this should have been the central focus of the document we expected!

To conclude, it is hard to see how this draft could be fixed up to be acceptable--even if there is agreement on some points. In addition, there is a time problem. If the document gets put off once again, it will mean another delay in the opening of the discussion with the OCRFI. This cannot be justified.

There is one additional factor that has to be considered. The original assumption in the United Secretariat was that basic agreement might be possible on the basis of the articles by Jack and Ernest. The Bolshevik Tendency comrades did not express an opinion on this point. But now Revista de America has published an article by Greco attacking both of the above articles. So, the desire expressed by some of the comrades in the United Secretariat to begin the discussion with a common document is clearly unattainable, even if the character of the document were to be changed in accordance with the original decision to write a document on "Eurocommunism." The whole idea is vitiated on that basis alone.

(PAGE 12)

So, in light of all these considerations, maybe the comrades there will be open to reconsidering our original proposal. We have something to say to the OCRFI on "Eurocommunism." It is an important, current issue in politics. Better two useful, individually-signed articles than one weak set of theses that will be open to attack on all sorts of points--big and small--in which the timely "Eurocommunism" issue gets submerged.

Comradely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Gus Horowitz".

Gus Horowitz  
SWP National Office

(French LCR)

Motion passed unanimously [with three abstentions, according to Robs] by the members of the IMT at the time of the Central Committee meeting of the LCR (SFQI), Aug. 26-30, 1977

The Central committee of the LCR has been informed of the motivations for the dissolution of the LTF and the way it was carried out, by Sylvain's report.

1. This dissolution does not do away with the differences which continue to be expressed up to the present. The comrades of the LTF reacted positively to the balance sheet of the IMT on Latin America, which continued and deepened the self-criticism which was begun at the time of the 10th World Congress. They themselves think that a rapprochement is possible on the national question, on the women's movement, on Eurocommunism and on the understanding of the mass vanguard the way the question is approached in the latest platform of the IMT (Documentation Internationale, number 11). We will have to measure the extent and the limits of these convergences on the basis of documents that will be written. Moreover the comrades still have a series of differences on Europe, Vietnam, and China, for example.

For our part, we have spelled out in the platform of the IMT ~~our~~<sup>our</sup> differences with the positions defended by the LTF on Vietnam, Angola, and above all Portugal. There doesn't yet exist any document which would enable us ~~to~~<sup>to</sup> know the balance sheet the comrades would draw today on their analyses of Latin America since 1969 and on their intervention on that continent through the BLT (to which the leaderships of the PST and PRT-U belong) between 1973 and 1977.

The goal of the pre-congress debate for the 11th World Congress will be to examine the positions, spell out the arguments, and overcome divergences wherever possible.

2- Nevertheless, the dissolution of the LTF helps to create a new situation in the International, to reinforce its unity, to aid in its intervention, and to improve the openness and the clarity of the discussion.

So far as we are concerned, we have been in favor of the dissolution of all tendencies and factions--IMT included--since the 10th World Congress, and that's for sure. We have maintained that since the moment when the LTF was set up in the form of a faction we have been in a situation of open crisis in the International. During this time we have always tried to maintain the tendency character of the IMT. We are determined to respect the sovereignty of the recommendations of the International and of its sections, in order to preserve its unity.

Taking note then of the positive situation for the construction of the Fourth International created by the dissolution of the LTS and by the fusions which have been accomplished (Canada) or are under-way, the IMT in France:

instructs

a. ~~instructs~~ its representatives to the leading committee to support the immediate dissolution of the IMT;

b. asks that this positive development be translated on the organizational level onto a regularization of the institutions, press and finances of the International;

c. will meet with the leading committee to discuss a balance sheet on the evolution of the positions and the functioning of the IMT.