

## SOME FACTS ABOUT THE I.S. EC AND THE P.R.P.

### 1. PRP and FUR OFFICIALLY SUPPORTED A CAPITALIST GOVERNMENT

Painful but true. With approval of the PRP, the FUR, in its founding document, gave political support to the Goncalves gov't and its program. This is the same Goncalves whom the PRP had attacked for imposing an austerity program on Portuguese workers. With the collaboration of the CP, Goncalves broke strikes. None of us doubt that the Goncalves gov't was a capitalist gov't. But here is the evidence for FUR political support of the Goncalves gov't's "new" program (from the text of FUR founding document): The assembled parties "approve the following points: . . . (3) The document entitled 'Lines of Programmatic Action and Tasks of Transition' (the CP-Goncalves thesis -- SZ) constitutes the basic guide document for the activity of the gov't so long as the necessary conditions have not been met for the formation of a gov't of revolutionary unity."

When asked about this, the PRP said: (1) Goncalves is to the left of the CP. (2) "We did not want to see the gov't toppled from the right". Correct. No revolutionary wanted to see that happen. But it did not follow that the PRP had to agree to support the gov't's program. It could have done as Lenin did in a similar situation in 1917. When Gen. Kornilov tried to overthrow the Menshevik gov't of Kerensky, Lenin urged fighting Kornilov. But at no time did he cease his political attacks on Kerensky, much less give him any political support. A similar policy by the PRP would have permitted it to work with the CP ranks and at the same time clearly oppose the CP politically.

It should be added, however, that the same FUR document also endorsed the COPCON document as "providing the basis for the elaboration of a revolutionary political program". That is, the CP gained PRP support for the Goncalves program "today" in exchange for a CP "promise" to work for a revolutionary program later. (Two days later, the CP quit the FUR in expectation of a new bloc with the SP.)

### 2. PRP "ROLE" in Construction Workers Successful November '75 Strike

The Oct. issue of the I.S. Internal Bulletin includes an article by BZ containing large extracts from a report by Joan M. on the giant mobilization of 100,000 construction workers which surrounded the parliament and imprisoned the gov't until it won its economic demands. Joan reveals an astounding (to us, and to her) total abstention and immobilization of the PRP in that strike (2 weeks before the right wing coup). Does the EC question these facts too? Why the silence? Why didn't the EC put out this information internally? Why were we told instead that the PRP had played a leading role in the event? But most of all, why didn't the PRP play a role? Has it anything to do with their strategy of agitation for armed insurrection at that time?

### 3. THE PRP PRESS (?)

The one criticism which the EC allows itself to make is that the PRP did not sufficiently emphasize its newspaper, Revolucao. Then how come the EC has not commented, or told the membership about the latest PRP retreat on this question? While the PRP's own newspaper remains a weekly, and not always that either, the PRP has assumed responsibility for a daily newspaper, Pagina Um, of the 'non-party revolutionary left' (a paper which is now in danger of folding). (A year ago, several individuals in the U.S. proposed to raise money for a daily PRP newspaper; it was turned down). The focus on Pagina Um in preference to the PRP's own Revolucao, shows clearly that the PRP de-emphasis on its party press is no accident, and that, it, in fact, stems from the PRP's lack of a real party-building strategy.

→ 15-60 made similar offer of £10,000 -- rejected