

January 15, 1976

TO THE LENINIST TROTSKYIST FACTION COORDINATORS

Dear Comrades,

Enclosed are the following items:

1. A letter to the LTF Steering Committee from Mary-Alice Waters on the results of the poll of Steering Committee members on the document "Key Issues in the Portuguese Revolution."

2. A report by Stateman on the December 22-23, 1975, meeting of the United Secretariat.

3. Correspondence between the Socialist Workers Party, the Ligue Communiste Révolutionnaire, Lutte Ouvrière, and the Workers Socialist League concerning the establishment of an international commission to investigate the charges against Michel Varga by the OCI leadership, and the reported use of violence within the workers movement by the OCI. National Committee members have already received this correspondence as an attachment to Political Committee Minutes Number 15, January 9, 1976.

4. A letter from several members of the IMT to Joe Hansen in response to Healy's attacks on Joe.

Comradely,

John Benson

January 14, 1976

To the Steering Committee of the Leninist Trotskyist
Faction

Dear Comrades,

As of today, 29 of the 34 members of the faction steering committee (or seated replacements) who were present at the August meeting of the faction have responded to the November 28 poll concerning the line of the document "Key Issues in the Portuguese Revolution." All 29 concur that the general line of the document published in the October 20, 1975, issue of Intercontinental Press is the general line approved by the Leninist Trotskyist Faction steering committee.

The five comrades who have not responded are three comrades of the PST-Argentina, one comrade of the PST-Venezuela, and one comrade of the GCR-Italy.

The results of the poll therefore unambiguously reaffirm that the line of the "Key Issues in the Portuguese Revolution" is the line of the Leninist Trotskyist Faction.

Comradely,

Mary-Alice Waters

Report on December 22-23, 1975, Meeting of the
United Secretariat

by Stateman

1. The IMT (with the exception of Comrade Alan Jones) decided to reject the invitation made by the OCI for the United Secretariat to attend the OCI congress December 26-30. The stated reason was that the OCI "has repeatedly used violence towards members of other organizations of the labor movement." The leadership of the French LCR outlined several incidents along these lines. The IMT motion demanded that the OCI must first make a public self-criticism in relation to these incidents before "the invitation of the OCI could be taken into consideration and any answer could be given to it." Since the OCI congress was only a few days away, this amounted to a categorical rejection of the invitation.

LTF members of the United Secretariat supported the same position they put forward at the previous meeting, that the United Secretariat send a delegation to the OCI convention, and that "a major part of our intervention at the OCI congress should be to denounce OCI violence within the workers movement, and to explain that any repetition of such action will cut across further discussions with the USEC."

The IMT also decided to pass a motion that "the U.S. is opposed to the SWP accepting the invitation of the OCI to attend its convention."

2. The IMT decided to instruct the Canadian section, the LSA/LSO to "suspend the invitation" to the Quebec-based GSTQ, which is affiliated with the OCRFI, to attend the convention of the LSA/LSO scheduled for December 27-30. (See December 19 LTF steering committee mailing and attached letters.) The motion adopted by the IMT states that if "the Canadian section's leadership does not conform to this decision, the USEC will. . .submit to the next IEC the question of the Canadian section leadership's breach of discipline. . . ." Galois submitted a statement that read: "The letter from the Political Bureau of the LSA/LSO to the United Secretariat clearly shows that in inviting the GSTQ to attend the LSA/LSO convention, the LSA/LSO is acting within the normal scope of its political activity within Canada. The United Secretariat does not have authority to instruct the LSA/LSO to rescind the invitation or to label it a violation of discipline if the LSA/LSO does not. This is a tactical decision over which the LSA/LSO has authority."

3. The IMT also decided to go ahead with their decision to hold a meeting of the IEC in February in spite of the fact that a representative gathering of the IEC cannot be held on such short notice. After receiving the letter from the LTF Coordinating Committee (see December 19 mailing), the IMT decided not to call the February IEC meeting a "restricted" one, as they had in the motion passed at the previous meeting, but in fact it will be just that since there will be no fund drive to raise the necessary funds to assure a full gathering. No changes were made in the proposed agenda for the IEC.

4. The IMT decided not to publish three items submitted to the International Internal Discussion Bulletin. These items were an

article by IEC member Sakai for the Political Bureau of the Japanese section; an article by Comrade Wilcox, a member of "Tendency A" in the British IMG; and the LTF correspondence concerning the document on Portugal adopted by the LTF steering committee (most of which has already appeared in the discussion bulletin of the Argentine PST, and which was submitted to the bulletin by the LTF coordinating committee. Instead, the IMT referred these items to the bureau, to bring a report back into the next meeting of the United Secretariat.

The IMT spokesmen said that the LTF correspondence could not be printed, since the specific items were not before the meeting, and "personal" letters might be included as allegedly happened with the "last IIDB in English." They said that Sakai might not want his article printed -- this was in the face of a letter to the United Secretariat from the Japan RCL Political Bureau requesting the article be printed. Jones said that the Wilcox article had not been approved by the IMG Political Bureau; Ghulam said the article had been submitted to the IMG Political Bureau some months ago.

Galois made the following statement for the minutes: "The refusal to accept these three items for publication in the IIDB, coming after the last meeting's refusal to accept other material in the IIDB, is a grave error. It is a further step toward suppression of material that members of the Fourth International are entitled to read. Particularly flagrant is the refusal to accept the article by Comrade Sakai, entitled "On the International." Comrade Sakai's request is contained in a letter to the United Secretariat dated November 12, 1975; this letter has been in the possession of the US Bureau for at least four weeks; Comrade Sakai's request was made on behalf of the Political Bureau of the JRCL; and the request was made in the following unambiguous words: 'The Political Bureau of the Japanese section asks the United Secretariat to include the article in its internal international bulletin.'"

5. A division between IMT supporters in the IMG again came into the open around a discussion on a draft political resolution for the IMG prepared by Comrade Walter. It was to be adopted by the United Secretariat and then submitted to the upcoming convention of the IMG. The draft by Comrade Walter was supported by Jones, who is the leader of "Tendency B" in the IMG. Spokesmen for "Tendency A," including Ghulam, brought copies of their own draft resolution, and opposed the Walter draft. Adair, a member of the LTF in the IMG, stated his opposition to the entire procedure of the United Secretariat writing the political resolutions for the IMG, and said the LTF in Britain was submitting its own resolution but would submit it to the IMG. Walter's draft was adopted by the IMT at the end of the discussion.

6. Claudio reported that Comrade Dario, a member of the LTF leadership in Italy, has been expelled by the Central Committee for fostering split activities by other LTFers. No written charges were presented. Three other LTF members in Turin have been expelled for "inactivity," three in Rome have been suspended, and at least six in Naples have been suspended. The LTF is attempting to gather documentation on all these instances, but according to the information we now have, it appears that none of the comrades involved were informed that disciplinary action against them was pending.

Galois requested clarification on the status of two LTF members recently expelled from the French LCR. The leaders of the LCR present said they did not know the facts. It was agreed they would check the facts and report back.

Motions, Statements and Correspondence for the
Minutes of December 22-23, 1975 United Secretariat Meeting

1. On the OCI Convention

A. Motion adopted by French LCR central committee December 21, 1975

The question posed by the OCI's politico-organizational methods (which consist of using violence in its relations with members of other organizations, including the Spartacists, LIRQI, and the LCR) is a problem that supercedes any confrontation or debate dealing with fundamental political questions.

1. This problem ought to be the subject of a real political offensive against the OCI and its membership.

2. The United Secretariat, having received an invitation to the OCI's Congress, is asking the advice of the Central Committee of the French section of the Fourth International. The Central Committee proposes that the United Secretariat demand that the OCI leadership make a public self-criticism concerning the matters mentioned above and explicitly condemn all forms of violence within the workers movement. This is a precondition for considering the invitation. In the event that this single precondition is met, we are in favor of the United Secretariat discussing a delegation and deciding on its participation in the Congress with the same procedure as with any other organization inviting us under comparable conditions.

3. It is essential to establish accurately a detailed dossier of the various incidents in question (from the attack on the FSI demonstration up to recent events), and to bring it to the attention of the International and of the French organizations concerned.

Motion adopted unanimously except
for 5 abstentions and 1 not voting.

B. Motion by Fourier:

The United Secretariat of the F.I. has been informed by the leadership of the SWP that, in an exchange of letters which it has had with the leadership of the OCI, the OCI has invited the USEC to attend its next national congress. The USEC has asked the LCR, French section of the F.I., to give its advise on this question.

The Central Committee of the LCR has submitted a report indicating that the OCI has repeatedly used violence towards militants of other organisations of the labor movement, among them "Spartacists," members of the "LIRQI" as well as against members of the LCR who tried to intervene in order to stop such methods. Hence, the CC of the LCR has proposed to the USEC to demand from the leadership of the OCI that it should make a public self-criticism in relation with the affairs mentioned in the above-named report, and that it should condemn explicitly every form of violence inside the labor movement, this being a precondition before the invitation of the OCI could be taken into consideration and any answer could be given to it.

The USEC recalls that the Fourth International has always vigorously condemned the use of methods of violence inside the labor movement, methods used since a long time by the reformists against the

revolutionists, and later developed on a monstrous scale by the stalinists. The USEC decides to adopt the proposal of the Central Committee of the LCR, and empowers its Bureau to transmit the present resolution to the OCI.

C. Motion by Stateman:

In view of the evidence presented to the United Secretariat that the OCI employs violence within the workers movement, the USEC decides:

1.) To send a USEC delegation to the OCI congress;

2.) That a major part of our intervention at the OCI congress should be to denounce OCI violence within the workers' movement, and to explain that any repetition of such action will cut across further discussions with the USEC.

D. Statement by Jones:

I am convinced that supporters of the LTF are acting towards the OCRFI in a way which is provocative, incorrect and which leads to a sharp increase of tensions inside the international -- the invitation of the OCRFI to the SWP convention and the invitation to the LSA/LSO convention being the most obvious case. Cdes of the USec majority correctly believe that such actions tend to increase tendencies towards a split in the International. However such dangers cannot be combatted by the USec majority itself adopting positions which are not correct. To take the main points raised:

(a) The use of violence and slander; naturally cessation of this is a precondition for political discussion of the type proposed. However it seems obvious that the best way to get this is to go to the OCI convention to make this point absolutely clear to them there.

(b) Splitting manouvres; I am sure that the Lambertist leaders are attempting to split the International. However (1) even an approach to Pabloites must create big contradictions for the Lambertists which we should seek to exacerbate (2) We cannot act on the basis of our interpretations of their intentions but only on basis of their objective actions. By not discussing with them you help convince them of our weakness and inability to discuss.

In my opinion the approach of the USec majority indicates a subjectivist reaction which cannot be justified.

Despite this however it is the duty of all those who disagree with the position of the USec on this to fight for a change in this line within the International. I am therefore naturally totally opposed to any act by the LTF or the SWP which goes against decisions of the USec or which represents a unilateral approach to the OCRFI. I therefore voted for the resolution on Canada and against the SWP attending the OCI convention.

E. Germain letter to the OCI:

[translation]

United Secretariat of the
Fourth International
December 23, 1975

To the Central Committee of the OCI

Comrades,

At its December 22-23, 1975, meeting the United Secretariat of the Fourth International decided to send you the following resolution, adopted at that meeting:

"The United Secretariat of the Fourth International has been informed by the Socialist Workers Party leadership that in an exchange of letters with the OCI leadership the latter invited the United Secretariat to attend its next congress. The United Secretariat asked the LCR, its French section, for its opinion on this matter.

"The Central Committee of the LCR provided a report indicating that the OCI has repeatedly used violence against militants from other organizations within the workers movement such as the Spartacists and LIRQI, as well as against LCR militants who were intervening to put a stop to such methods. As a result, the LCR Central Committee proposed that the United Secretariat demand that the OCI leadership make a public self-criticism concerning the matters mentioned in its report, and that it explicitly condemn all forms of violence within the workers movement. This would constitute a precondition for taking the OCI request into consideration and for deciding how to deal with it.

"The United Secretariat recalls that the Fourth International has always vigorously condemned the use of violent methods within the workers movement, methods used by the reformists against revolutionaries for a long time and expanded on a monstrous scale by the Stalinists. The United Secretariat decides to adopt the proposal of the LCR Central Committee and instructs its Bureau to communicate the present resolution to the OCI."

Internationalist Communist
greetings,
For the United Secretariat Bureau,

E. Germain.

2. On the LSA/LSO Convention

A. Motion by Walter:

The USEC instructs the Bureau to write in its name to the Canadian section along the following lines:

1. We note that the Canadian section states that it invited the Quebecois section of the "OCRFI" to its national convention without having previously received the October 1975 USEC minutes and without having been informed of the contents of the two motions on the relations between the F.I. and the "OCRFI."

2. We cannot accept the argument that this invitation is a purely national tactical matter for the Canadian section alone to decide. We are faced with an international offensive of the "OCRFI," with the avowed and openly expressed goal of splitting the F.I. The Quebecois grouping, member of the "OCRFI," has not dissociated itself from this goal, nor has it clearly condemned the use of physical violence inside the working class movement, systematically practised by the OCI, the main component of the "OCRFI." Any attempt at regroupment in Canada -- as different from punctual united front operations with the "OCRFI" Quebecois grouping, without a previous clarification of these questions, without a clear break of that grouping with the "OCRFI," and without serious guarantees against dual international membership, would be in contradiction with the organisational and political principles of the Fourth International, as defined by the statutes.

3. We therefore request the Canadian section to suspend the invitation of the Quebecois "OCRFI" grouping to its national convention, pending clarification of the above-named issues. If the Canadian section's leadership does not conform to this decision, the USEC will have no choice but to

(a) Request a delegation of the RMG/GMR, to defend before that convention the USEC's positions on the questions raised in paragraph 2 of this motion.

(b) Submit to the next IEC the question of the Canadian section leadership's breach of discipline in relation with the October 1975 USEC resolutions on the relations between the FI and the "OCRFI" as well as its national groupings.

4. This motion does not imply in any way a rejection of the possibility of moves, neither by the F.I. nor by its national sections, towards the "OCRFI" or its national groupings. But it does imply that in order to be productive from the point of view of building and strengthening the F.I., such moves should be made after previous consultation and in common action of the whole F.I., and not as factional maneuvers and by unilateral decisions of separate parts of the movement.

B. Statement by Galois:

The letter from the Political Bureau of the LSA/LSO to the United Secretariat clearly shows that in inviting the GSTQ to attend the LSA/LSO convention, the LSA/LSO is acting within the normal scope of its political activity within Canada. The United Secretariat does not have the authority to instruct the LSA/LSO to rescind the invitation or to label it a violation of discipline if the LSA/LSO does not. This is a tactical decision over which the LSA/LSO has authority.

C. Letter from Walter to the leadership of the LSA/LSO:

December 23, 1975

To the leadership of the LSA/LSO, Canadian section of the F.I.

Dear Comrades,

We have received and discussed your answer to the letter of the USEC/Bureau of Dec. 12 relative to the invitation of the Quebecois grouping adhering to the "OCRFI" to your national convention.

We note your statement that your invitation of that grouping occurred before you had received the October 1975 USEC minutes, and without your having been informed, prior to the reception of these minutes, about the contents of the two motions voted during the October 1975 USEC meeting on the relations between the F.I. and the "OCRFI." We accept your statement.

However, we cannot accept your argument that even now, after having received the text of the motions voted at the October 1975 USEC meeting, the question of the invitation of the Quebecois grouping adhering to the "OCRFI" is a purely national tactical matter for the Canadian section alone to decide.

We are faced with an international offensive of the "OCRFI" which, under the guise of a unity maneuver, pursues the avowed and openly expressed goal of splitting the F.I. The Quebecois grouping which is a member of the "OCRFI" has, to our knowledge, never dissociated itself from this goal, nor has it clearly condemned the use of physical violence and slander against political opponents inside the working class movement, systematically practised by the OCI, the main component of the "OCRFI."

Furthermore, any attempt at "regroupment" in Quebec or in Canada -- as different from punctual united front agreements which any national section is of course free to conclude with any working class organisation -- with the Quebecois formation adhering to the "OCRFI" without a previous clarification of these questions, without a clear break of that grouping with the "OCRFI", and without serious guarantees against double membership, would be in contradiction with the organisational and political principles of the F.I. as defined by the statutes.

We therefore request you to suspend your invitation of the Quebecois grouping adhering to the "OCRFI" to your national convention, pending clarification of the above-named issues. If you would not conform yourself to this decision, the USEC would have no choice but to:

(a) request that a delegation of the GMR/RMG defends before your national convention the positions of the Fourth International leadership developed in the third, fourth and fifth paragraphs of this letter, and strongly condemns the violation of discipline involved in that invitation, which could only be considered as a questioning of the organisational structure of the F.I. as defined by the statutes;

(b) submit to the incoming I.E.C. the question of the Canadian section's leadership's breach of discipline.

We hope that you will conform yourself to our decision, even if you don't agree with it, and that you will avoid a further sharpening of the conflict arising out of the question of how to handle our relations with the "OCRFI."

We do not reject in any way the possibility or advisability of moves made by either the FI or by national sections towards the "OCRFI" or its national groupings to probe the possibility for discussion, collaboration or even regroupment with some or many of these forces. But such moves, in order to be productive from the point of view of building the FI and its national sections, should be made after previous consultation of the USEC, in common agreement of all the forces of the F.I., and not as factional maneuvers or unilateral decisions by any separate section or part of our world movement.

Fraternally yours,

For the United Secretariat
of the F.I.,

Walter

3. On the International Internal Discussion Bulletin (IIDB)

A. Statement by Galois:

The refusal to accept these three items for publication in the IIDB, coming after the last meeting's refusal to accept other material in the IIDB, is a grave error. It is a further step towards suppression of material that members of the Fourth International are entitled to read. Particularly flagrant is the refusal to accept the article by Comrade Sakai, entitled "On the International." Comrade Sakai's request is contained in a letter to the United Secretariat dated November 12, 1975; this letter has been in the possession of the US Bureau for at least four weeks; Comrade Sakai's request was made on behalf of the Political Bureau of the JRCL; and the request was made in the following unambiguous words: "The Political Bureau of the Japanese section asks the United Secretariat to include the article in its internal international bulletin."

B. Statement by Aubin, Duret, Fourier, Georges, Marline, Roman and Walter:

The Galois statement is scandalous on five accounts:

a) To present the postponement of a decision on the timing, planning and exact contents of the IIB as an attempt to "suppress" discussion material is a travesty of facts. The International never "suppressed" any material. The 150 articles preparatory to the 10th world congress bear testimony to this.

b) To question the right of the international leadership to organize the international discussion is a further step towards the minority's questioning the democratic centralist structure of the F.I. as an organisation. We are not yet in a pre-world congress discussion period. Neither on the question of the International, nor on the question of the European Perspectives Document, has the discussion been continued since the world congress in a written form. The USEC has the right to decide by what documents the discussion on these questions should be reopened.

c) The submission of a vague "exchange of correspondence" between comrades Hansen and Moreno for inclusion in the IIB, without precise specification of all the material included, and without the USEC knowing whether all the authors of that material agree with the inclusion of it in the IIB, is unacceptable after the occurrence with the last IIB in English, in which private letters were included which had never been submitted to the USEC, inclusion which took place without consultation and against the wishes of the authors of some of these letters. The least we can demand, under these circumstances, is that we should have an exact list of material submitted to us, also with an exact specification of the length of each item.

d) It is rather cynical to accuse the International, the most democratic organisation in the world with the freest tendency debates, of "suppression of discussion material" when the accusation comes from a comrade who has covered up the undemocratic expulsion of nearly a whole ideological tendency from a trotskyist organisation, quite an "efficient" way to suppress any serious discussion on disputed international questions for several years in that organisation.

e) Even more cynical is comrade Galois' heavy insistence on the delay between the arrival of comrade Sakai's letter at the Bureau and the submission of his discussion material to the USEC. Under the circumstances of the faction fight inside the International, such submissions have always occurred after consultation with the minority comrades on the Bureau. But outside of USEC meetings, such consultation has become nearly impossible, because the comrades of the minority hardly ever show up at the Bureau or the Bureau's office anymore. Before this USEC meeting, all of them stayed away simultaneously for three weeks, subordinating the normal functioning of the Bureau and the USEC to their own faction priorities, convenience and decisions.

C. Letters from Wilcox and Sakai:

London

Nov 26th 1975

Dear Comrade:

I enclose a copy of a discussion document contributed to the IIBD.

Fraternally,
s/ James Wilcox

* * *
Tokyo, November 12, 1975.

To the United Secretariat of the Fourth International

Dear Comrades,

I enclose a copy of my article, On the International, which has been written for international circulation in the International based on the draft document on the International for the 8th national congress of the Japanese section.

The political bureau of the Japanese section asks the United Secretariat to include the article in its internal international bulletin.

Fraternally yours, s/Sakai
for the political bureau JRCL/JCFI

TRANSLATION

TRANSLATION

Paris, November 17, 1975

Dear comrades,

After a year of joint meetings about the advisability of complying with LIRQI's request to create a commission of inquiry into the accusations made against its leaders by the OCI, we believe that in view of the impasse the discussions have reached it is advisable to jointly work out some proposals that are on the one hand final, and on the other hand clear and plain.

We therefore state our position:

1. Lutte Ouvrière is ready to participate in such a commission.
2. Lutte Ouvrière will not sign the statement proposed by LIRQI, attached to the present letter, which includes approval of LIRQI's proposal before the commission even meets, thus making it pointless to constitute such a commission.

We do not particularly limit ourselves to the statement we proposed in order to facilitate the discussion, and we are prepared to sign a statement that may not embody such positions.

Enclosed for your information is the statement we suggested.

3. In our opinion, LIRQI cannot be both judge and party to the dispute at the same time, and it would be better that its representatives not be members of the commission.

In the worst case, if no points of agreement can be reached for a common statement, in our opinion each organization could announce the terms it thinks would be best for forming the commission.

If the LCR believes that LIRQI's presence would not be detrimental, we will accept the constitution of such a commission without going back on our own position.

Having said this, to make our position clear, we believe that the discussions among our various groups are now pointless and we await written proposals whether they be from LIRQI or from another of the groups involved.

Our own proposal is that, given the present state of the matter, the LCR, the Spartacist League, the Workers Socialist League and Lutte Ouvrière constitute this commission immediately and invite LIRQI and the OCI to present evidence to them.

Fraternally,
Lutte Ouvrière

sent to LIRQI
LCR
Spartacist League
WSL

STATEMENT PROPOSED BY LIRQI

The undersigned organizations, militants and individuals of the French and international workers and democratic movement met October 30, 1975, in response to an appeal from the Ligue Internationale de Reconstruction de la IVeme Internationale (International League for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International) and from Comrade Balazs Nagy, also known as Michel Varga, a member of the International League.

They have decided to form a Workers Commission of Inquiry for the purpose of taking a position on

a. the campaign of unproved accusations launched by the leadership of the Organisation Communiste Internationaliste, according to which Comrade Balazs Nagy, a former leader of the Hungarian revolution of 1956 and the former secretary of the Petöfi Club, is an agent provocateur of the CIA and of the KGB.

b. the extension of these accusations to the International League as such, going so far as repeated physical attacks against militants of the OCI-International League Faction, especially at the time of the united demonstrations against Franco and of the diffusion before the meeting for the freedom of Soviet mathematician Leonid Plyushch, and to make its conclusions public in order to put a stop to methods contrary to workers democracy.

The basis for constituting the Commission of Inquiry is that there should be no question in the workers democratic movement of hurling accusations of such a grave nature against a revolutionary militant or an organization without proof. The Commission of Inquiry is being set up because the OCI, contrary to its claims, in the various articles and brochures published under its leadership up until now, has not only provided no proof, but even worse it has launched a campaign of physical assaults. Because these accusations and attacks are carried out without proof, assuming that it is up to the accuser to furnish proof, they constitute slanders and provocations.

That is the point of departure for the work of this Commission of Inquiry. Its first action will be to summon the OCI leadership, which claims to have proof, to appear before the Commission to restore Balazs Nagy's archives and to bring forward all the documents in their possession.

Since the Commission of Inquiry is a united organ struggling for respect for workers democracy, and not a political bloc, it is open to all organizations and militants of the international workers movement, including of course militants of the OCI, and all democratic individuals on the basis it was established for. We call on them to take active part in its work which, along with its results, will be made public before the workers movement.

TRANSLATION

STATEMENT PROPOSED BY LUTTE OUVRIERE

For some time, the Organisation Communiste Internationaliste has put forward a number of accusations, asserting that Balasz Nagy, also known as Michel Varga, is an agent provocateur of the CIA and the KGB, and extending these accusations to the organization Michel Varga belongs to, the Ligue Internationale de Reconstruction de la Quatrième Internationale.

We consider such an accusation against a militant or an organization to be sufficiently grave to require the entire revolutionary movement to determine whether it is justified or not. For that reason we have decided to form a Commission of Inquiry for the purpose of inviting the OCI leadership to present us with all the proofs they claim to possess, and of asking that all those who may be able to provide evidence for a decision in this matter come and testify.

By means of a scrupulous verification of facts and documents, a verification it will make public, the Commission undertakes to prevent the establishment of a climate of accusations and mutual suspicions foreign to the revolutionary movement. In order for this verification to be accomplished with the greatest possible authority, the Commission invites all organizations claiming adherence to the revolutionary workers movement to take active part in its work.

COPY

December 20, 1975

Lutte Ouvriere
[address in original]

Dear Comrades,

We received your letter of November 17, 1975, concerning the organization of a commission of inquiry to look into the accusations made by the leadership of the OCI against Michel Varga and the counteraccusation made by the LIRQI against the leadership of the OCI.

Without going into the history of the attempts to organize such a commission, we would like to inform you that the SWP is ready to take part in any legitimate commission established for this purpose.

It goes without saying that neither the accused nor the accusers can participate in this commission in the capacity of judging the facts presented, but we hope that both the OCI and LIRQI leaderships will cooperate in the fullest to provide the commission with all relevant documentation and information.

In our opinion this is the only responsible way to deal with the question and eliminate the potentially serious consequences stemming from it.

Please keep us informed about steps taken to set up the commission.

Comradely,

/s/

Barry Sheppard
For the SWP Political
Committee

cc: USFI
LCR
WSL
OCI
LIRQI

COPY

COPY

14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014
January 9, 1976

Ligue Communiste Révolutionnaire
Workers Socialist League
Lutte Ouvrière

Dear Comrades,

The plenum of our National Committee, meeting on January 4, decided to cooperate in the commission of inquiry into the accusations made by the leadership of the OCI against Michel Varga and the counteraccusations made by the LIRQI against the leadership of the OCI.

We have asked John Benson, Gus Horowitz and Ed Shaw to be our representatives on this commission and to do everything possible to gather, in a preliminary way, documentary material and various opinions on these matters. They will get in touch with you in the near future to discuss the organization of the commission and the exchange of information that should be available to all the members of the commission of inquiry.

We've also asked the other members of our leadership to aid the commission in any way possible when they are in Europe.

Please keep us informed as to the results of any preliminary findings.

Best comradely regards,

/s/

Barry Sheppard, for the
Political Committee
Socialist Workers Party

cc: USFI
OCI
LIRQI

COPY

COPY

December 26, 1975

Dear Joe,

We want to express our indignation with the scandalous slanders which the Healy-inspired press has been spreading against yourself and the Socialist Workers Party, in relation with the assassination of comrade Trotsky and a so-called "security problem" of the Fourth International.

To be attacked by paranoid sectarians has been the fate of many revolutionists throughout the history of the international labor movement, starting with Marx himself. We are sure you will take it with the same stoism [sic] as marxists always have.

We are in full solidarity with you against the vile slanderers. At the same time we believe this incident confirms the correctness of the firm determination we have shown to radically eliminate the twin poisons of slanders and the use of physical violence from the labor movement. This purpose can be furthered, among other things, by putting all groups which use such methods under quarantine for any form of privileged discussions or relationships, as long as they do not stop the rot, once and for all.

You can publish this letter in Intercontinental Press, if you consider it useful.

Fraternally yours,
s/Ernest

Alain, Charles, Charles-André,
Ernest, John, Livio, Pierre,
Tariq, Vergeat