

March 30, 1976

To Leninist Trotskyist Faction Coordinators

Dear Comrades,

Enclosed are the following items:

1. A March 7 letter from Joseph Hansen to the European Contributing Editors of Intercontinental Press and a March 16 reply from Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, and Ernest Mandel.

2. A March 12 letter from Joseph Hansen to the United Secretariat.

3. A March 1 letter from the Political Committee of the Liga Operaria of Brazil to the United Secretariat.

4. An application to join the Leninist Trotskyist Faction from eight members of the Costa Rican Organización Socialista de los Trabajadores (OST).

5. A March 11 letter from three members of the OST of Costa Rica to Hugo Moreno.

6. Copies of two letters from the Groupe Marxiste Revolutionnaire of Quebec, one to the Political Committee of the LSA/LSO of Canada, and one to the United Secretariat, together with a cover letter from Colleen Levis of the LSA/LSO.

7. An excerpt from the February 19 minutes of the Political Committee of the British International Marxist Group.

8. A February 11 letter from Michel Pablo to Ernest Mandel.

Comradely,

Caroline Lund

COPY

Intercontinental Press
New York
March 7, 1976

To the European Contributing
Editors of Intercontinental Press

Dear Comrades,

At the February 15 meeting of the United Secretariat, representatives of the International Majority Tendency maintained that the editor of Intercontinental Press had made a grave error in publishing Tony Thomas's report to the National Committee of the Socialist Workers party on the situation in Angola (in the January 26 issue). They contended that this initiated a public discussion on the interpretation of events in Angola that had not been previously agreed upon.

In a separate letter, I will take up that question; in this letter I will confine myself to the warning that was addressed to me. Comrade Mandel, one of the contributing editors, said that if I committed a similar offense "once or twice more," the three contributing editors in Europe would resign, with a joint letter declaring that Intercontinental Press is a publication of the Socialist Workers party.

In the subsequent discussion I asked twice whether such a letter had already been drawn up. No forthright answer was given on this; however, it was quite clear from the preciseness with which Comrade Mandel outlined the letter of resignation that the content had already been decided upon.

Since I have no way of knowing in advance what new "errors" of mine might cause the three contributing editors in Europe to decide to mail the threatened letter, I think it is necessary to take at least one anticipatory step. Resignations over an issue like the publication of a document dealing with Angola would be deplorable, in my opinion. However, I realize that the IMT leaders are not likely to pay much attention to my views on this. Nonetheless, I hope that the letter--if it is ever sent--will be adjusted to avoid a misrepresentation; that is, the assertion that Intercontinental Press is published by the Socialist Workers party.

The leaders and members of the SWP have been strong supporters of Intercontinental Press since its inception, viewing it as one of the main achievements of the reunification of the world Trotskyist movement in 1963. In fact their interest was decisive, in my opinion, in making it possible to build the circulation of Intercontinental Press to such a point as to make the magazine financially viable. But the SWP is not and never has been the publisher of Intercontinental Press.

In view of the circumstances, I think that it is now advisable to indicate in the masthead who the actual publishers are. As soon as the necessary details are taken care of, we will go ahead with this change.

While the change in the masthead may seem to be a minor matter so far as you are concerned, it is actually of some importance in the United States from a legal standpoint.

cc: PF, LM, EM

Comradely yours,
s/ Joseph Hansen
Editor

* * * *

Intercontinental Press
New York
March 12, 1976

United Secretariat

Dear Comrades,

A protest was lodged at the February 15 meeting of the United Secretariat over the publication in Intercontinental Press of Comrade Tony Thomas's report to the National Committee of the Socialist Workers party on the situation in Angola. It was argued that the editor of Intercontinental Press had made a "grave error" in doing this since it initiated a public discussion on the interpretation of events in Angola without previous agreement.

It appears to me, after checking the facts, that the charge lacks substance. Without going back further, the question of policy in relation to Angola was referred to in the article "For a Correct Political Course in Portugal" (IP, No. 36, October 13, 1975, p. 1383), which Gerry Foley, George Novack, and I submitted in reply to the article "In Defense of the Portuguese Revolution" (IP, No. 31, September 8, 1975, p. 1167) written by Comrades Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, and Ernest Mandel. The reference, of course, was made in conjunction with our position on the key issues of the Portuguese revolution and did not deal with the Angolan question per se. We merely pointed to the failure of the majority of the United Secretariat to initiate a campaign on the basis of immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Portuguese imperialist troops from Angola, analyzing this failure in conjunction with the policies they sponsored in Portugal.

Following this, the editor of Intercontinental Press received a communication from Comrade C. Gabriel, sent via the Bureau of the United Secretariat, asking that we publish an article he had written polemicizing with our reference to the failure of the majority to launch a campaign on withdrawal of Portuguese imperialist troops

from Angola. Comrade Gabriel's article, which injected a number of issues involving the Angolan struggle in contradistinction to the subject matter of the Portuguese revolution, was published in the December 8, 1975, issue of Intercontinental Press under the title "On the Question of Angola."

The accompanying letter from the Bureau of the United Secretariat, dated October 26, 1975, and signed by Comrade Duret, was as follows:

"Enclosed please find an article on Angola which was received by the Political Bureau of the U.Sec. The Bureau has decided to recommend to you that this article be published in Intercontinental Press under the suggested title 'On the Question of Angola.' A fraternal observer from the USA was present at the Bureau meeting at which this was decided.

"Please let us know in which issue the article will be appearing."

In addition to this, it should be noted that Comrades Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, and Ernest Mandel publicly referred to the differences they have with us over the struggle in Angola in the final section (pp. 1839-40) of their article "Revolution and Counterrevolution in Portugal" which was published in the December 22, 1975, issue of Intercontinental Press (No. 46).

From the above, it is quite clear that the decision to publicly discuss the differences over Angola as a separate subject was taken by the Bureau of the United Secretariat and that this decision was not in contradiction to the position taken by Comrades Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, and Ernest Mandel but in consonance with it. Evidently the members of the United Secretariat had forgotten these precedents when they took up the subject at the February 15 meeting.

In view of the above, it is obvious that the publication of Comrade Thomas's report did not represent a unilateral decision on my part to "initiate" a public discussion on the Angolan struggle. It came within the framework of the polemic already begun in the pages of Intercontinental Press. If blame is to be assigned for this, the first to be placed in the dock ought to be the members of the Bureau of the United Secretariat. As for myself, I think these comrades should be commended for starting a public discussion that can help to clarify the issues involved in the developing class struggle in Angola.

Comradely yours,
s/Joseph Hansen
Editor

March 16, 1976.

Dear Comrade Hansen,

We have received your letter of March 7, 1976. It is based upon a misapprehension. There exists no letter of resignation "already drafted" by Livio, Pierre and myself as contributing editors of I. P., nor have we decided to resign. Even less have we any intention of creating legal problems for the SWP by claiming that it is publishing I.P.

What we did try since a long time--and it seems in vain--was to explain to you that you place us in an increasingly intolerable position by accumulating accomplished facts, systematically refusing to consult us on any move which might provoke controversy, acting as if the contributing editors were non-existent and some secret editorial board was operating in their place, and generally tending to transform I. P. into a public faction organ, which is contrary to the purpose for which the magazine was founded, contrary to the rules and traditions of our movement, and contrary to the interests of the F. L. and I. P. itself.

We just remind you (among other items) about the following decisions you never cared to consult us about beforehand, although certainly no "pressure" arising from the weekly publication of I. P. could have prevented such a consultation:

1. The decision to include Spanish language material in I. P. and Spanish language comrades on I. P. staff itself;
2. The decision to invite comrades exclusively selected from the international minority faction of different countries to work temporarily on I. P. staff;
3. The refusal to implement the USEC advise to put comrades sympathetic to the views of the leadership of the F. L. on I. P. staff (we have proposed a concrete candidate at a recent meeting);
4. The decision to publish, during the decisive months of the revolutionary process in Portugal and Angola in 1975, a long series of articles on these countries written on a line contrary to that of the leadership bodies of the F. L. and to present these articles not as minority contributions to an ongoing discussion but as "line" articles, which compelled us to public polemics in order to eliminate the wrong impression created by these publications as to what the line of the F. L. on Portugal and Angola really was;
5. The decision to publish a highly factional article on the split in the Mexican L. S., publication of which, in our opinion, does a serious disservice to the F. L. and tends to discredit our movement;
6. The decision to devote large space of I. P. to polemics with sectarian groupings, with a typical internal bulletin contents.

In view of this drift we warned you that, if you would continue to act in such an uncomradely and biased way, we would have no choice but to dissociate ourselves publicly from I. P., because we could not bear the responsi-

bility, which we consider detrimental to the F. I.

Instead of rectifying your factional course, or showing any willingness to return to a more principled way of operating, you now announce in your March 7 letter a new accomplished fact: "to go ahead with a change of masthead," without even suggesting that we could be consulted about the proposed formula, leaving us to learn it when it appears in print in I. P.

We again request you to change this irresponsible course and to return to the normal habit of elementary collective consultation and decision-making between editors of a magazine, before important moves are made

for which no "pressure of time" can justify this systematic refusal of prior consultation.

We have no wish nor intention to provoke a public break with I. P., a publication which could have been used, and should have been used, as a means to consolidate the unity of the movement, in spite of the existing political differences, and act as a means to provoke additional frictions and divisions. But if your policy of accomplished facts and deliberate provocations is escalated, you will finally bear the responsibility for our escalated reaction, one form of which could be us dissociating ourselves from a magazine which would no more serve the interests of the F. I.

Fraternally yours,

Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, Ernest Mandel

TRANSLATION

Sao Paulo, March 1, 1976

To the United Secretariat of the Fourth International

Comrades,

The Political Committee of the Liga Operaria (Brazil) has the responsibility to clarify for all member parties of the Fourth International and the United Secretariat the following:

1. that it does not endorse the document sent to the International Executive Committee in February of this year and signed by seven member parties among whom was included the Liga Operaria. This document reports the separation of these parties from the Leninist Trotskyist Faction and calls for the formation of a new Faction.
2. that the document referred to above was actually signed by one of our comrades who was in Argentina and is a member of our Political Committee. He signed the document in a purely personal capacity.
3. that this document does not express the position of the Liga Operaria regarding the manner in which to overcome the differences that exist today inside the LTF on the Portuguese situation and the tasks of the Fourth International and the LTF itself.
4. Our position is that the break with the LTF and the call for a new faction should only be made if it becomes clear that there is no possibility to arrive at a common position on Portugal. In our view it is necessary to seek such an agreement by means of a meeting that should take place as soon as possible of all the parties, organizations, groups or individuals that compose the LTF, a meeting where all positions would be openly and fully discussed with the objective of resolving the differences and strengthening the LTF.
5. that given the latest events (the appearance of new differences between the Argentine PST and the SWP, the break with the LTF by six parties, the call for a new faction) the Liga Operaria Political Committee decided to organize a full discussion in the entire organization of the main document relating to the Portuguese revolution presented by the Fourth International, including the document sent to the IEC by the six parties that have left the LTF, and that this discussion will take place prior to our National Congress which will decide which road to take regarding its remaining in the LTF or not.
6. In addition the Liga Operaria considers it necessary to express its concern about the recent splits that have occurred in member parties of the Fourth International, considering that these splits do not contribute to the task of constructing Trotskyist parties in all countries of the world, nor to the strengthening of the Fourth International. It also insists on the importance of the unity of the Fourth International in order to carry out the tasks the Portuguese revolution presents to us.

For the victory of the Portuguese Revolution!
For the Unity of the Fourth International!

Liga Operaria (Political Committee)

TRANSLATION

To the International Steering Committee of the LTF

Dear Comrades,

After having intensely and attentively read, studied and discussed all the documents in our possession regarding the differences in the Fourth International since 1968, the undersigned members of the OST [Organización Socialista de los Trabajadores] of Costa Rica (which has already applied to become a sympathizing group of the International), whereas we have fulfilled all of the prerequisites to be considered members of the Fourth International, ask that we be accepted as members of the LTF on the basis of the following points:

1. We subscribe to all the points of the Platform of the Leninist-Trotskyist Tendency that was issued March 4, 1973.

2. We subscribe to every one of the 10 points of the platform of the LTF issued August 17, 1973 (especially the eighth point for a change in the leadership of the Fourth International, which continues to be more valid than ever).

3. We entirely subscribe to the political positions expressed in the document entitled "Key Problems of the Portuguese Revolution," which was issued in August 1975 after a discussion in the LTF.

In addition to the above points, we want to point out that our position on the question of Angola, to our knowledge not yet debated in the LTF, is, in its general lines, the same as that of the T. Thomas article, "Angola: Behind the Civil War." At the same time, within the general context of our association with the LTF we want to stress our repudiation of the way in which the TM of the Mexican IS carried out its convention as well as to condemn all the actions against the rights of the minorities and democratic centralism committed by the TM in Mexico. Similarly we condemn and want to completely disassociate ourselves politically from the signing of an electoral platform with Stalinism in the way it was carried out by the TM of the Mexican IS.

In our request to join the LTF we would like to express our position on the necessity of the LTF opening a serious political debate, which would broadly analyze and characterize the political positions taken by the Argentine PST. In view of the fact that, except for the material regarding the problem in Mexico, nothing has been written or published internally, there is a danger of the question becoming a whisper campaign that would deform and sidetrack the necessary political debate.

Finally, and in anticipation of our membership being approved, we are naming a committee responsible for defending the positions of the LTF and establishing direct contact with you. We don't know if, for administrative reasons, the real names of the comrades should be given. Until we hear differently, we prefer to use pseudonyms.

The provisional committee of the LTF is made up of all the signers of this letter. We preferred that other members of the organization who also wanted to sign do this at a later date, with a greater understanding of the questions, which we feel they have not studied sufficiently, especially the positions of the IMT.

Signed: Sara, Virginia, Rodrigo, Laura,
Patricia, Andrés, Ernesto, Carlos
Garabito.

Please acknowledge the receipt of this letter as soon as possible.

TRANSLATION

March 11, 1976

Comrade Hugo,

We extend our warm revolutionary greetings to you and your party, our solidarity with the class struggle which you are faced with, and we hope for the greatest success for the Argentine working class and the PST.

As you know, our small organization first came into serious contact with the LTF at the Ohio convention in August 1975. After that convention, Comrade Tuny visited us. He told us:

1. That differences existed between the PST and SWP around the methodology of building the party and the very conception of the revolutionary party.

2. That these differences were known to the SWP and PST.

3. That during our stay in Ohio, neither the PST nor the SWP wanted to talk with us about this matter because we had just arrived and they did not want us to have a bad impression.

4. That these differences consisted of:

a. That the PST had a conception of party building based on intervening in the class struggle, and that the SWP had a merely propagandistic conception.

b. That regarding the LTF, the PST thought that it had to have an organized and democratic leadership that was proportionally based on the numerical size of each organization, and that the SWP did not think so, and that at each meeting more members of the SWP attended than of any other group, giving the SWP the votes, although this did not in any way reflect the SWP's relative numerical weight in the LTF.

c. That the PST had as a norm sent their cadres to each country where the class struggle is particularly sharp while the SWP, in spite of immense economic resources, was incapable of the least assistance of any kind.

As was to be expected, our first response was to ask for clarification from the SWP. Comrade Caroline Lund responded, for the SWP. According to the SWP's response:

1. To the knowledge of the SWP, at that point no clearly stated differences existed between the PST and SWP over either party building or the functioning of the faction.

2. That they had not characterized the PST as "activist," nor, to their knowledge, had the PST openly characterized the SWP as "propagandistic."

3. That the SWP considered that if such differences existed, that they should be brought to light in political documents and not in the whispers and "gossip" of Comrade Tuny.

4. That the SWP considered that such a discussion would be more fruitful if the leadership of the PST decided to carry it out openly and clearly.

At that point, it became clear to us that something was amiss in the LTF. Was it that the SWP did not want to tell us the truth??? Was the leadership of the PST maneuvering in order to discredit the SWP in a dishonest and back-handed way??? Were these merely the personal positions of Comrade Tuny or did they represent the line of the PST's leadership and follow the instructions emanating from it???

In face of this dilemma, we decided to continue observing the development of events and to maintain our motion toward the LTF on the basis of our political agreement with positions expressed clearly in public documents.

During the weeks prior to the arrival of Comrade Tuny, we learned of the differences between the PST and the leadership of the GMI of Colombia. To the extent that these differences were expressed to us by Comrade Otto in personal letters to a comrade of our organization, it seemed to us that Comrade Otto took a position that was hardly correct. According to him, he was afraid of foreign comrades of a high political level and solid training coming to Colombia and exercising a leadership role in practice. We thought (and still think) that foreign comrades can enormously help the development of an embryonic organization and that the question of playing a leadership role ought to be resolved through the election by the organization of its leading members and not in the fact of having a greater political level or coming from a larger party. When Tuny arrived, things appeared in a different light. Tuny explained to us that the intentions of the PST were to fuse the GMI with the Bloque Socialista for which, if necessary, they would remove the existing leadership of the GMI. Immediately we expressed our strongest condemnation of this type of position to Comrade Tuny. In a public debate we could observe that in front of a leading member of the IMT Comrade Tuny did not defend the positions of the LTF on Portugal and back-handedly expressed some criticisms of the SWP.

Such actions by Comrade Tuny seemed to us to be in violation of the discipline of the faction, but we did not attribute this to the leadership of the PST, but rather to Comrade Tuny's low political level. Nevertheless, it was still clear that something was wrong, because it seemed doubtful that Comrade Tuny would venture to take such positions openly without the expressed or tacit authorization of the PST. During the same visit Comrade Tuny told us a strange story according to which Comrade Warshell of the SWP had been won to the positions of the PST by an Argentine comrade and that the SWP had subjected him thereafter to political ostracism.

Two months later we attended the convention of the Liga Socialista in Mexico. As soon as we arrived in Mexico, and before having any conversation of any kind with the members of either tendency, we read the tendency documents, and from the way the dispute was presented in the documents, we felt completely in agreement with the TBL. Although neither of the two positions satisfied us completely, it was clear to us that:

1. The positions of the TBL were principled and were based on building the party on the basis of a class-struggle program.

2. The positions of the TM threw on the scrap heap the program, rank-and-file control over the leadership, and democratic centralism.

In this situation, it would be hard to have any other position.

As the congress went on, we were able to note that behind the expressed political positions there were other important facts:

1. That the PST openly defended the positions of the TM, speaking to us in favor of the TM.

2. That the SWP did not try to influence our position in any way.

3. That the leadership of the FBL had committed a grave political error before the congress and that this error had been used by the TM to win support from the delegates, diverting the political debate.

4. That all the resolutions of the congress would clearly lead to a situation in which the incoming leadership would be provided with a docile rank-and-file with which it could carry out any kind of maneuver without the rank-and-file of the organization being able to exercise any control. At the same time, the incoming leadership was provided with an organizational structure that would allow it to purge the less docile elements of the FBL.

5. That, regardless of the error committed by the leadership of the FBL, the TM did not have any right at all to prevent the minority from placing whomsoever the FBL chose on the leading bodies of the LS. The TM's veto of the FBL's being represented on leadership bodies by the political leadership it freely chose was a brutal act of disrespect for the rights of the minority.

6. That the transformations carried out in the internal structure of the LS and the way in which the incoming leadership acted showed that the LS emerged from the convention a different organization than it had been before, that it had broken with the positions of revolutionary Marxism on the construction of the party, and that the presence of the FBL within the party as an internal faction subject to

the discipline of the party was untenable.

For all these reasons we solidarize ourselves with the line carried out after the convention by the FBL, which is not to say that we approve of each and every one of their actions. Please excuse this lengthy recital of events, but we consider it necessary to make our positions clear.

During the convention, the attitude of members of the leadership of the PST was to stimulate, incite, lead, and counsel each one of the reprehensible acts carried out by the TM. The problem presented to us is the following: If on one hand we condemn the line and methods employed by the TM in Mexico, we cannot say that the political line of the PST and its differences with the other parties of the LTF are faithfully expressed in the political positions of the TM, (or can we?) What is the PST's famous party-building line? DOES IT EXIST? Why then has it not been expressed in politically clear documents? How is it that one of the most brilliant leaders of the international, such as you, has still not expressed them clearly after all this time? What meaning does the PST's membership in the LTF have? Are you or were you searching for an unprincipled bloc in the face of the IMT? Are you now setting out to form a bloc with the IMT? Based on what positions?

Nevertheless, in the midst of all these unclear things, something clear already exists that we must take a position on. It is really "immoral" (to use the terminology, it seems, of the PST) to raise international differences through personal positions taken by PST members without any political foundation, without a single document on which one could make a judgment, without raising debates in question on a leadership level, etc. These things have nothing to do with revolutionary morality--a political leadership that will not take responsibility for the line taken by its militants in fraternal parties, under the pretext of their not being leadership cadres, when these same militants are found to be carrying out a consistent line and strategy, probably provided by their leadership, from Portugal to Mexico, from Italy to Greece, from Spain to Colombia and England, etc. (We would say: it is incorrect. But it seems that for you correct and incorrect are called "moral" and "immoral.")

It is evident that all these circumstances force us to raise serious questions about the confidence we can have in the PST leadership. But we have every aim of regaining complete political confidence in you. We know how much interest you can have in gaining our political confidence--a small, newly-formed group. Nevertheless, regardless of the interest you might have, it is our duty to demand, with our small voice, political positions that we consider to be correct. For this there is only one road. It is clear that differences exist. LET'S NOT HIDE THEM! LET'S NOT COVER THEM UP! Let's not leave them to negotiations in the corridors at the international meetings! Let's not raise them in a back-handed or surreptitious way THAT

WOULD LEND ITSELF TO MANEUVERS AND MISUNDER-
STANDING OF POLITICAL POSITIONS!

Comrade Hugo, we are asking you to express in a revolutionary fashion, in documents, a complete analysis of the differences in the way you characterize the other sectors of the Fourth International and their respective political lines for party-building; criticize them until you draw blood and express the political alternative that you offer to the world proletariat.

In such a polemic, if the decision is made to start it, we pledge to state our views based on what we consider to be a correct political line. None of what you have said or done before would prevent us from supporting you if your stated positions were the most politically well-founded ones. We have learned much from you during the past months, above all, unfortunately, we have learned some positions that a revolutionary party should not take and methods that it should not employ in developing differences. We have the firm hope of receiving more positive lessons from you in the future.

To be where the class struggle is sharpest? To build organizations, send militants, to give political and monetary help to the class struggle in key countries? BRAVO COMRADES! Nothing is more Leninist, nothing is more Trotskyist, nothing is more revolutionary!

But precisely doing this commits the party that upholds such a line to adopt the clearest, most open, most politically honest political positions.

We hope that this letter serves the purpose for which it is intended and that you don't condemn us or break contact with us because of it. We need your open, frank, hard

criticisms in the way that only Bolsheviks can make them. We promise not to be diplomatic with you.

Attached to this letter is an internal document from our organization, which, if you take the time to read it, you will see offers you some good material to criticize and tear apart as Bolsheviks.

Here in Costa Rica we are distributing Revista de America and have set plans to expand its circulation. We want to continue doing so because we think it is the best revolutionary Marxist magazine in Spanish, with the broadest information and analysis of Latin America. Nevertheless, its distribution for us is a political task, not a commercial one, and this is the way it should be. Lately we have noticed some articles in Revista de America that do not coincide with our own political positions. Concretely we are referring to your analysis of Spain, Angola, and Portugal. We believe therefore, that it is our most elementary democratic right to use explanatory inserts inside the copies of Revista de America clarifying our own positions. You will receive copies of them. We suppose there is nothing wrong with this inasmuch as your positions will be available at any rate to those who get the magazine.

We very much appreciate the invitation extended to us by the PST to attend your cadre school. As we explained to Comrade Exposito our finances made it impossible for us to attend.

In view of the needs that our external work has placed before us, and after many debates, and while still remaining dissatisfied with the results, we have decided to adopt Organizacion Socialista de los Trabajadores (OST) as our political name. Awaiting your reply, we send you revolutionary greetings,

s/ Sara Rodrigo Virginia

cc: LTF, SWP, LS(FBL), GMI, Hugo Blanco, LC

COPY

COPY

Montréal
March 11, 1976

SWP National Office
New York

Dear comrades:

Enclosed are copies of two letters received by us recently from the GMR. The letter dated March 2, sent to the USec was not received until yesterday (March 10). We have also heard several rumors about internal debates and tendencies within the GMR which may explain the references in the letter by François Cyr.

Comradely,
s/Colleen Levis

* * *

COPY
(we received a poorly reproduced photocopy)

COPY

Montreal, 2/3/76

FROM GMR Political Bureau

TO: United Secretariat of the Fourth International

Comrades,

We hereby bring to your attention still another deviation from the decisions of the USFI by the comrades of the official section of the FI in Canada and in Quebec, the LSA-LSO. Contrary to the letter and the spirit of the USFI resolutions of October 1975 and especially of December 22 and 23, 1975, a delegation from the LSO last weekend attended the congress of the Groupe Socialiste des Travailleurs du Québec [Quebec Socialist Workers Group], which is affiliated with the so-called Comité d'organisation pour la reconstruction de la Quatrième Internationale (Organizing Committee for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International).

You understand that, in addition to dealing a blow to the discipline and democratic centralism of the Fourth International, this gesture, following up the LSA-LSO's decision to invite a large delegation from the GSTQ to its own convention during the holidays, makes the privileged relationship between the LSA-LSO and the GMR, sympathizing organization of the Fourth International, increasingly difficult. Therefore we ask that you take the steps that are called for.

s/Khaldoun
for the GMR Political Bureau

cc: RMG (Canada), LSA-LSO

COPY

* * *

COPY

March 1

LSA Political Committee
Montreal

Dear Comrades,

In a short time the Groupe Marxiste Revolutionnaire will hold a Political Pre-conference. Given the provisional character of the decisions we shall make there, because of the nature of the discussions we are presently conducting, the Political Bureau of our organization has decided:

- a) to invite no contacts and very few sympathizers;
- b) to invite no delegations of observers from other organizations, except our comrades of the RMG leadership.

Very probably we will hold our First National Political Conference during May or June. When the date is definitely set, we will send you an invitation.

We are certain, comrades, that you will not interpret this decision as a sectarian action on our part.

Please transmit this decision to the SWP.

Militant greetings,

s/François Cyr
for the GMR Political Bureau

COPY

COPY

Excerpt from IMG Political Committee minutes, Feb. 19, 1976

10) Letter to the USEC:

Jones resolution: "That the following letter be sent to the USEC" carried 6-0-2.

Text of letter:

"We have received the minutes of the November meeting of the United Secretariat. We noted the resolution passed regarding the distribution of the IIDB containing the correspondence concerning the attendance of the OCRFI at the SWP convention.

"As the resolutions on these questions have been passed by the USEC we have of course carried it out. We however wish to protest in the strongest possible terms against the motivation contained in this resolution which introduces a new and unacceptable principle into organisational relations in the International. We refer to the statements which call for the deletion of the correspondence from this bulletin "in order to teach the international minority a lesson." This is quite unacceptable. All decisions regarding organisation, or other questions in the International, must be decided by the objective criteria of the statutes, the interests of the working class, etc. They cannot be introduced to "teach a lesson" to anyone, least of all a minority in the International. If the deletion of this material had been decided on because its inclusion had not been authorised, it would be possible to have a serious discussion on the merits or otherwise of this decision. The present motivation, however, attempts to introduce a principle which is completely unacceptable and, which, if seriously defended, would cast into question the democratic norms and functioning of the International.

"We call upon the USEC to withdraw the resolution on this question and to redecide the question of the circulation of this material on a correct organisational basis.

"As we consider this question an individual error, and not a sign of a deeply wrong policy by the International leadership, we have every confidence that this decision will be reversed and wish to take the matter no further. In the unlikely event that this is not done, however, we request that this letter, together with the resolution referred to, be placed in the IIDB."

TRANSLATION

"Sous la Drapeau du Socialisme"
Revue de la Tendence Marxiste
Revolutionnaire Internationale
Paris, February 11, 1976

Dear Comrade Ernest,

We are confirming in writing for your convenience the main points we discussed in Brussels.

Proceeding from our evaluation of the present conjuncture in Europe, we stressed the need to build united revolutionary Marxist organizations in time that have a serious mass base and are armed with a transitional program that is correct also in relation to the traditional Socialist and Communist mass organizations. This task is particularly urgent in countries such as Portugal, Spain, Italy, France and Greece. We stressed our assessment--which we believe you share--of the European situation, where for the first time in a long while, real possibilities are shaping up for revolutionary openings that could lead to the victory of the socialist revolution. We mentioned the case of France, where there is presently the PSU on one hand and on the other the LCR, which approached the PSU with a request to open discussions with a view to eventual unification, a perspective we support.

However, we see this eventual unification in the framework of a new organization that would not at the outset be part of any international formation, but would admit tendencies supporting the idea of joining one or another international organization at the proper time. This point, it seems to us, is essential to really clearing the way for both discussions about unification, and unification itself. Looking at it realistically, we cannot in the short run succeed in building an organization that would be revolutionary Marxist in its entire program. Rather, what is possible are organizations rapidly evolving toward such a program, especially in the context of an objective situation favorable to such an evolution.

We believe that the conditions of long-term crisis of European capitalism in particular favor such a perspective. Therefore, we insisted that questions of principle

of an organizational character that would obstruct the discussion and unification should not be raised, if our common goal remains creating in time substantial united organizations of the type to which we refer.

If we take the revolutionary perspectives in Europe seriously as well as the Portuguese experience, which was disastrous from the point of view of the state of preparation of the revolutionary left, we must lose no time in seizing the opportunities for such a regroupment in various European countries, beginning with France.

We also stressed our more general interest in the development of the Fourth International, from which we were so rashly expelled in 1965, and on the way the crisis within its ranks is evolving.

We emphasized that on important questions of assessing situations and of tactics, we feel ourselves to be closer to the tendency known as "European" but that we have no intention whatsoever of exploiting your internal differences, hoping rather that the Fourth International as a whole will come to correct positions. We repeat: our approach at this stage is conditioned by the urgency of the objective situation in Europe.

We have also stated that we are prepared as an international tendency--over and above more exhaustive and deepgoing discussions about forming revolutionary Marxist tendencies with a serious mass base everywhere--to consider all forms of practical collaboration among forces that are converging ideologically, without raising any prior conditions of "principle."

We hope that the contact begun at Brussels will be continued, even if for the time being it is only at the level of joint practical work as in the campaign we are conducting through the Russell Foundation Committee for the freedom of Portuguese prisoners, support to Angola and Mozambique, etc. . . .

With fraternal greetings,
Michel Pablo