14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014

December 11, 1976

No. 1

To the Leninist Trotskyist Faction Steering Committee

Dear Comrades,

First of all, it has been suggested that the communications to the Steering Committee be numbered so that comrades can know more easily whether they have missed any. So we will begin with this mailing as No. 1.

A series of very important and positive decisions were made at the October meeting of the United Secretariat. A full report on that meeting is in preparation, and will be published within a week or two in the form of an SWP Internal Information Bulletin. It will be sent to you airmail.

Meanwhile, enclosed in this mailing are the minutes of the September, October, and November United Secretariat meetings. Especially to be noted are: 1) the Jones motion concerning conditions for a democratic and authoritative world congress (page 3 of October minutes), 2) the motion on the OCRFI (page 2 of October minutes), and 3) the letter to the OCRFI passed by the November meeting (see page 11 of November minutes for French version).

Also enclosed is a copy of a letter to the United Secretariat from Jack Barnes, Joe Hansen, Barry Sheppard, and Mary-Alice Waters in response to the November decision by the United Secretariat majority to pull back from the agreed-upon course in relation to the OCRFI. This letter has three attachments, including an English translation of the United Secretariat majority's letter to the OCRFI passed at the November meeting.

Finally, it should be noted that the minutes included in this mailing were prepared by the United Secretariat Bureau. For the past period, the LTF has taken on itself to prepare and send to the Steering Committee minutes of the Secretariat meetings. This was necessary due to the breakdown of functioning of the international center, which included an inability to agree on accurate minutes. The decisions of the October meeting, however, if lived up to, cleared the way to resolving this problem. (This will be explained more fully in the report being prepared.) Thus we expect that in the future, United Secretariat minutes will be sent out by the Bureau to all IEC members in the normal way.

Comradely,
Caroline Lund

United Secretariat Minutes September 11-12, 1976

Present: Adair, Aubin, Claudio, Domingo, Duret, Frank, Frej, Fourier, Jones, Julio, Marcel, Otto, Roman, Verjat, Walter.

IEC: Stefan, Saul,

Invited: Roberto

Agenda:
1. South Africa
2. China after Mao
3. Political situation in Argentina and solidarity work
4. Colombia
5. Peru
6. SWP Convention
7. Spain
8. Regroupment
9. World Congress preparation
10. Bureau report
11. Miscellaneous

1. South Africa.

Walter: reports on particuliarities of present stage of South African freedom struggle: the influence of the defeats of Portuguese colonialism in Angola and Moçambique and of the extension of the struggle to Zimbabwe and Namibia, at the very borders of South Africa; the changes in the social composition of the black population of South Africa, with a majority non living in the townships and being in a process of proletarianisation; with the increasing international pressures upon the apartheid regime to make some token concessions to help the imperialist and the neo-colonialist governments in Africa to cover up their support to Vorster etc. All this means that , contrary to what happened after the Sharpeville massacre, this time the mass struggle will not subside rapidly but will continue for a long time, with inevitable ups and downs. On the other hand, both the economic importance of South Africa(gold and diamonds) and its strategic position are such that a surrender of the imperialist and white capitalist positions to the black liberation struggle inside South Africa is out of question in a foreseable future. And the abscence of a black bourgeoisie means that a neo-colonialist solution of the tape applied in the other African countries is unrealisable. Under these circumstances, a long drawn out struggle and a process of permanent revolution are to be foreseen. The F.I. should prepare for this, which will become one of the main if not the main focus of anti-imperialist agitation in the coming years, with great potentialitees of radicalization both in Britain, the USA, the rest of Africa, Western Europe and India.

Motion The Useo empowers the Bureau to present the next Usec meeting a plan for an international campaign of solidarity with the South African freedom fighters and for the coordination of the campaign of all the sections at Usec/Bureau level.

Carried unan.

2. China after Mao

Claudio reported on the perspectives for development in China after Mao's death

Motion to print an article in Inprecor along the lines of the report

Carried unan.

3. The Political situation an Argentina and solidarity work

Julio: reported on the political situation and our solidarity tasks

Motion 1. The Bureau sends letter to the sections on the solidarity work
2. The Bureau sends letter to some sections demanding what has been done and what can be done
3. To discuss at the next Usec meeting on how the solidarity work can be broadened by working with the Amnesty International etc

Carried unan.

4. Colombia

Roberto: reported on the demand of Bloque Socialista of affiliation to the Fourth International

Motion to elect a small commission which discusses with Roberto and other comrades for reporting to the next Usec, and that the Bureau writes a letter to the section and the other groups in Colombia for explaining in detail the discussion on this point of the agenda.

Carried unan.

Motion Julio: Taking account of the fact that various parties or groups in Colombia have decided to enter the Fourth INternational and considering that representatives of these groups will be in Europe for some time especially to discuss the question of the unity of these organizations which claim allegiance to the Fourth International, I propose that these representatives be invited as observers to the political discussions of the United Secretariat and all its discussions related to the subject of the Colombian unification during the time they are in Europe, provided the offivial section of the Fourth INternational states its agreement in writing.

Motion George: that the invitation only concerns discussions related to the unification problems

Vote: Motion George: For 4, Against 6, Abst. 4, Not.v. 0
Not Carried

Motion Julio: For 9, Against 0, Abst. 4, Not.v. 0
Carried

5. Peru

Frank: reported on the political and organizational situation in Peru

Motion: The United Secretariat considers that the division of forces claiming allegiance to the Fourth International constitutes a major obstacle to the effectiveness of our intervention in a difficult period for the Peruvian working class and peasents;
a) considers, on the basis of the information at its disposal, that the differences between the PST and FIR would not prevent a reunification;
b) calls upon the two organizations to establish contacts to initiate a political discussion whose outcome should be reunification;
c) considers that it is of common interest for the PSI(which has requested to join the International) to participate in the unification process in order that there be only one organization in the country linked to the Fourth International;
d) conceives of this unifiaction as part of a more general dynamic of reunification in all the countries in which the forces of the International are divided.

Carried unan.

6. SWP Convention

Jones: reported from the SWP Convention

Adair: complementary report

Motion Jones: The United Secretariat welcomes the correct decision of the C.C. of the LCR to reverse the position of the P.B. on attendance at the convention of the

SWP of individual members of the LCR

Vote: For 1, Against 4, Abst. 5, Not.v. 0
Not Carried

Motion Jones: The United Secretariat affirm that the statutes of the Fourth International makes membership of the International, and not of a particular national, section, the basic framework of membership and such a status inwolves the right of members, within the normal functioning of activity and organizational rules& leading bodies of the national organisation, to discuss with members of other sections, to attend congresses of other sections, to participate effectively in international tendencies , factions etc

Vote For 1, Against 9, Abst.1, Not.v. 0
Not Carried

Annexes 1. Resolution of the LCR CC
2. Declaration of vote
3. Declaration of vote

7. Spain

Saul: reported on the LCR and the LC congresses

Motion: The Bureau sends a letter to the LC and the LCR inviting them to the next Usec in order to permit reports from the two organization's congresses, to have a discussion about the unification problems and the political situation in the country

Carried unan.

8. Regroupment

Jones reported on the steps taken and to be taken in relation to groups who are coming closer to the Fourth International or are approaching the Fourth.

Motion: a The Bureau sends a letter to the LO proposing them a date for the agreed upon meeting
b. Somenne from the Usec then in Britain will together with the IMG go and have discussions with the ICL
c. To arrange a meeting with the OCRFI for informing them about the content of the Usec decission concerning relations with them.

. Carried unan.

Annex 4. Statement of Claudio

9. World Congress preparation

Walter reported on the IIDB: The following items are accepted for inclusion in the IIDB:

1. A resolution of the Japanese section on the Portuguese revolution.
2. A cpntribution of the Japanese section on the European perspectives document.
3. The July 1976 Usec resolution on regroupment
4. The answer of the SWP's PC to the July 1976 Usec statement on regroupment, for the time being without the appendixes
5. A September 1976 Usec statement on a factual inaccuracy contained in item (4) (see appendix 5)
6. Comrade Alan Jones' reply to item (4)
7. The international minority faction's statement on the present situation in the International, without any appendixes not previously communicated to the Usec.
8. The international minority faction's statement on electoral tactics in Portugal, Mexico and Italy, without any appendixes not previously communicated to the Usec.

9. The statements of majority members of the Usec on electoral tactics in Mexico and Portugal, contained in the July 1976 Usec minutes
10. The exchange of correspondance between Lutte Ouvrière and the Usec, without any appendixes not previously communicated to the Usec. This exchange is composed of the two initial L.O. letters, the Usec reply, the second L.O. letter, the second Usec reply.
11. The "bolshvik tendency"'s tendency platform, as soon as it arrives at the center.

Priority in,publication should be given to item (11), as soon as it as on hand. Items (4) and (5) should be published together; likewise items (8) and (9).

Motion to include in item (3) Claudio's statement on the passage of the resolution concerning RMOC
Carried unan.

Motion to postpone a discussion on the inclusion or not of all the appendixes to the item (4) till the October Usec and the presence of observers from the Swp.

Vote For 9, Against 2, Abst. 0, Not.v. 0
Carried

10. Bureau report

Walter report on
a. composition of the Bureau
Motion to include Jones as member of the Bureau
Carried unan.
b. GMR congress
Motion to send a delegate if the finacial problems is solved. Otherwise send a letter of greetings
Carried unan.

11. Miscellenous

a. Frej declares adherence to the declaration concernigg the electoral tactics in Portugal signed Claudio, Duret, Fourier, Georges, Jones, Rudi, Vergeat, Walter and included in the July Usec minutes.
b. Jones informes that the comrades excluded from the PRT Portugal claims to have send a letter to the Usec.

==========

Annexes

Appendix 1: Declaration of vote by Fourier

I am voting against resolution no 2 of Comrade Jones because a) in my view there is an error in the formulation on membership in the International: accrding th to the statutes, one is member of the International by virtue of being organized in a section of the International, and not individually; b) while I do not object to personal trips to one or another country, or to personal conversations, I do not believe that anything and averything can be permitted in this domain, The question will have to be examined at some length in the discussion for the next World Congress on the structure and functioning of the International.

Appendix 2: Declaration of vote by Walter

I abstain on Cde A. Jones' motion, although I substantially agree with its contents. I believe however it is wrong to single out one section for having made mistakes on the matters considered, while not saying anything about similar incidents which occured e.g. in the SWP and the Spanish LC. Given the present factional climate which unfortunately exists inside the world movement, it is all the more necessary to defend, in an intransigient way, universal organisational principles, both regarding the rights of members and the rights of elected leaderships, without discrimination nor exceptions, so as to clearly stress thatt all members of the F.I. or organizations in political solidarity with the F.I. have equal rights, and all sections and sympathizing sections, regardless of their srtenght or the factional alignment of their leaderships, are treated as equals.

Appendix 4: Statement by Claudio

In regard to the characterizations of the SWP attributed to RMOC in the resolution on regroupment adopted by the United Secretariat at its meeting of July, as a member of the United Secretariat present at the founding conference of the RMOC, I would like to point out that the conference did not characterize the SWP as reformist or centrist. Morecver, suwh a characterization would have been in contradiction with the decision made by the conference to ask the SWP leadership to admit the RMOC comrades into the party on the basis of their commitment to respect the party's discipline.

September 12, 1976

Appendix 5: Statement of the United Secretariat of September 12, 1976

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

1. At no time did the leadership of any European section engage in any discussion with the international grouping called Revolutionary Marxist Tendency, nor invite it to any of its gathering, prior to a consultation with the leadership of the Fourth International.
2. According to what they explicitly declare, at no time did the leaders of the International Majority Tendency engage in any discussions with the international Revolutionary Marxist Tendency.
3. When the IRMT approached the leadership of the LCR, the French section of the F.I., for a common discussion, the leadership of the LCR immediately and correctly referred this question to the Usec.
4. The Usec discussed this question at its January 1976 meeting and decided to propose to the IRMT a discussion between a Usec delegation and the IRMT. This

was an unanimous decision of the Usec. In the Usec delegation elected, a representative of the minority faction was included (see appendix 6)
5. The meeting took place in Brussels, on January 26. The SWP observer, cde Horowitz was present at that meeting from the beginning to the end.
6. The letter of Michel Pablo to Ernest Mandel refers to that meeting, as is obvious both of the contents of the letters which corresponds exactly to what Pablo said at the above-mentioned meeting, as from the date.
7. The absence of any mention of these two facts in the SWP's PC Statement, in spite of the perfect knowledge of them by the SWP observer, member of the PC, is a flagrant misrepresentation by omission.
8. The February 1976 Usec heard a brief report on that meeting which did not contain any proposals or suggestions of follow-up, and therefore was not included in th the minutes. But many minority faction Usec members and several SWP observers were present at that meeting and heard that report, a fact equally not mentioned in the SWP PC Statemnet.
9. The copy of the letter by Michel Pablo to Ernest Mandel was put into the Usec correspondance file and a copy of it was handed to the minority Usec members and SWP observer of the Usec.
10. When Pablo contacted the IMG, via the New Left Review, and proposed a meeting the IMG leadership pursued the policy which it always follows in these matters. It arranged an informal gathering, heard Pablo explain his political positions, aksed some questions regarding appreciations he made of some historical events; it discussed no matters of internal discussion in the International. Because it w was aware of the possibility of a manouver by the IRMT, it ensured that a member of the international minority faction was present at this gathering. It immediately contacted the Usec to inform them of the meeting and Pablo's proposals, and asked for a Usec decision on what to do (see appendix 7). It naturally will have no discussion with Pablo, or even agree to a further meeting, without prior approval by the Usec.

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

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

September 12, 1976 The United Secretariat of the F.I.

Appendix 6: Extract of the minutes of the United Secretariat meeting of January 24-25, 1976

p.3. point 7 Miscellenous, subsection c):
"c. Meeting with MRT
Walter informs about meeting between Usec and representatives of the MRT (Pablo grouping) asked for by the MRT.
Motion to send a delegation composed of Galois, Walter, Roman, Duret(Mari invited to participate in delegation, stated he was unable to do so)
Carried unan."

Appendix 7: Letter of Alan Jones to the United Secretariat

(without date) 97 Caledonian Road
London N 1.

To the United Secretariat,
Dear comrades,
This is to inform you of events concerning Pablo in Britain. Pablo was in

Britain last week and contacted members of the IMG- first through the New Left Review and then by arranging an informal meeting with comrades from the IMG leadership. As is the normal practice with the IMG when a person from another organization within the workers movement asks forameeting, we agreed subject to the fact that we will not discuss internal affairs of the F.I. or political differences within the International, nob will we have a meeting with an organization which is carrying out a policy of violent attacks on other sections and where we are aware that the section would not like us to have a meeting with this organization.

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

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

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

Fraternally,
(signed) Alan Jones

Appendix 1

Résolution du CC de la LCR d'août 1976

La section française de la IVème Internationale a décidé de ne pas être présente au congrès du SWP, non pas en raison des divergences politiques avec la direction du SWP (FLT), mais en raison du sens politique que prenait ce congrès par rapport à l'Internationale. En effet, le SWP a invité des organisations sans demander l'avis, ni consulter les sections des pays correspondants : pour la France, LO et le CORQI, en violation flagrante d'une décision antérieure du SU, elle-même consécutive aux contacts antérieurs pris par le SWP avec les lambertistes. Plus grave, pour la première fois, le SWP a invité en tant que tel le CORQI appendice international des lambertistes. Faut-il rappeler que les lambertistes et le CORQI estiment que la QI a été "détruite" par les dirigeants actuels du SU, que les organisations de la QI ne méritent ni le nom de trotskystes, ni celui de révolutionnaires, qu'il s'agit seulement de flancs-gardes du stalinisme et qu'en conséquence, la seule politique du CORQI se limite à la volonté publiquement affirmée d'œuvrer à la rupture de la QI. L'invitation en tant que telle du CORQI, sans même demander l'accord du SU, constitue donc une prime fractionnelle à la manœuvre lambertiste. C'est d'autant plus clair que, comme le remarque la résolution du SU votée les 3 et 4 juillet, les invitations constituent "un acte politique puisqu'elles excluent les spartakistes, les Healistes et d'autres qui attaquent politiquement le SWP... Le SU remarque que par cet acte politique, le SWP a choisi de ne pas inviter une organisation telle que RMOC qui attaque politiquement le SWP, mais a choisi d'inviter des forces telles que le CORQI qui attaquent la majorité des sections de l'Internationale comme contre-révolutionnaires..." Autrement dit, le caractère politiquement sélectif des invitations est évident. Il s'agit d'une volonté réaffirmée d'agir pratiquement en fraction ouverte, s'ajoutant au refus de contribuer aux ressources du centre, à la non-diffusion de fait d'Inprecor (organe officiel du SU) aux USA, à une politique unitaire avec différentes organisations en "violant les droits des sections nationales pour décider de leur tactique, ainsi que les droits des instances de directions nationales" (résolution du SU du 3/7/76), à l'envoi en France d'un permanent contrôlé ni par le SU, ni par la section française à ce jour...

Face à cette politique fractionnelle, nous devons à la fois développer le débat d'idées et lutter contre toute manœuvre fractionnelle dans la QI. La condition d'ailleurs pour que le débat politique puisse se développer est que tous les militants et sections construisent l'Internationale.

C'est pourquoi le BP avait décidé que la section française ne serait pas présente au congrès du SWP. Il ne s'agit pas là d'un mesure générale, mais d'une décision conjoncturelle qui ne visait que le congrès du SWP, considéré en tant qu'acte politique nuisible à l'Internationale. Le BP a, bien entendu, laissé, et laisse libres, tous les camarades d'aller aux USA, d'y rencontrer les militants et les dirigeants du SWP, de participer à des réunions avec eux, etc... (tout en demandant à être informé préalablement).

C'est sur la base de ces considérants que le CC ratifie la décision du BP de ne pas envoyer de délégation de la SFQI au congrès du SWP, mais considère qu'il était possible aux militants dela LCR, présents aux USA, d'assister à titre d'observateurs individuels à ce congrès.

Minutes of the United Secretariat meeting 16-17 October 1976.

Present: Adair, Aubin, Atwood, Brewster, Capa, Claudio, Crandell, Domingo, Duret, Fourier, Frej, Galois, George, Johnson, Jones, Julio, Karl, Martinez, Marcel, Otto, Pepe, Roman, Rudi, Therese, Verjat, Walter, Celso.

IEC: [illegible]y, Christina, Raul, Peter, Peterson, Stefan, Manuel, Stateman, Williams.

Invited: Sanchez, Lillen,

Agenda: 1. Argentina
2. China
3. Costa Rica
4. Spain
5. South Africa
6. Thailand
7. Solidarity work with political prisoners in Eastern Europe
8. Mexico/Colombia
9. Bureua report
10. World Congress Preparation

==========

1. Argentina

Capa reported on the political and organisational situation in Argentina

2. China

Claudio reported on first conclusions concerning the events in China

3. Costa Rica

Motion An ad hoc commission of George, Atwood and Julio investigates an organisational problem and reports to the next Usec meeting.

Carried unan.

4. Spain

Raul reported on the last congress of LC and its political evaluation of the present situation in Spain.
Manuel rpported on the same thing on behalf of LCR

5. Southern Africa

Peterson report on the political development in the aera and the tasks of solidarity

Motion The Bureua sends a ciscular letter to the sections concerning initial steps in the solidarity work and a statement along the lines of the report.

Carried unan.

6. Thailand

Roman presented statemant for the United Secretariat

Motion to adopt the general line of the presented statement and to be edited by the Bureau.

Carried unan.

7. Solidarity work with political prisoners in Eastern Europe

Stefan reported on how to carry out the solidarity work

Motion That the Bureau sends a circular letter to the sections on the solidarity tasks with the polish workers jailed by the regime, and that the presented resolu-

tion will be edited and adopted at the next meeting.

Carried unan.

8. Mexico/Colombia.

Domingo reported on the organisational problems in Mexico and Colombia

9. Bureua report.

Walter: reported on:

a) the composition of the Bureau

Motion to elect Atwood, Galois and one representatives from the "Bolsjevik tendancy" to the Bureau

Carried(with one abstention)

b) meetings with the OCRFI and LO

1) OCRFI

Motion to adopt the following resolution to be presented to the OCRFI at the meeting(except the last paragraph which is internal):

"We propose that the United Secretariat of the Fourth International and the Organising Committee for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International make parallel statements to be printed in Rouge, Informationes Ouvrieres and other publications of the Fourth International and the OCRFI.

1. That the goal of the discussions is to strengthen the force of the Fourth International as a single international organisation based on the program of Trotskyism, including adherence to democratic centralism.

2. That the United Secretariat and the Ligue Communiste Revolutionnaire while holding deep differences with some of the positions of the OCRFI and the Organisation Communiste Internationaliste sonsider them to be revolutionary organisations.

3. That the OCRFI and the OCI similarily affirm that they consider the Fourth International and its French section the LCR to.be revolutionary organisations altough they hold deep differences with some of their positions.

In wiew of the agreement on these points, the United Secretariat will open an organised discussion with the OCRFI on the basis of a mutually agreed on agenda.

(internal part): If the OCRFI rejects making any statement along the proposed lines the United Secretariat and the participants supporting it at the meeting agree that an organised political discussion will not be entered into at this time."

Carried unan.

Motion to send the following delegation to the meeting: Aubin, Duret, Otto, Walter, Jones., Julio, Pepe, Galois, Crandell, Celso + one observer from the LCR leadership.

Carried unan.

2) LO

Motion to send the following delegation to the meeting: Aubin, Duret, Otto, 2 comrades from the international minority tendency and 1 comrade from the "Bolsjevik tendency".

Carried unan.

c) Letter from ex-LCI comrade

Motion to take up the question at the next meeting

Carried unan.

d) Letter from ex- GCR comrade

Motion to refer the question to the Bureau

Carried unan.

e) Letter from India
Question refered to the Bureau

f). Trip to Greece

Claudio reported on his trip to Greece

Motion The Bureau sends an answer to the letter of FCR

Carried (with one abstention)

g) IIDB

Motion to publish in IIDB all the material presented to the Usec prior to or at this meeting and still pending for publication

Carried (with two abstentions)

10. World COngress preparation

Jones report on the proposals

Motion To assure a democratic and authoriative world congress, the following additions to the resolution of the February, 1976, IEC and the July 3-4 United Secretariat are agreed upon.

1. The United Secretariat takes responsability for translating and publishing pre-world-congress documents in French and English. It also assumes responsability for translating these documnets into Spanish, but leaves responsability for publishing and circulating them to the Spanish-speaking sections. In addition, the United Secretariat assumes responsability for keeping in print bulletins that are relevant to the current discussion.
2. Line resolutions are to be translated, published and mailed to the sections by four months before the date set for the world congress.
3. The deadline for submission of line resolutions to the United Secretariat is set at six months before the date set for the world congress.
4. The deadline for submission of other contributions to the United Secretariat is four months before the date set for the world congress.
5. Translation, publication and mailing of such documents to the sections is to be completed within two months of receipt of the documents.
6. Publication of documents received after the deadlines set above cannot be guaranteed.
7. If the deadlines for handling bulletins set above are not adhered to. the world congress is to be postponed until least three months after these conditions are met.
8. The Parity Committee will make recomendations to the United Secretariat concerning public discussions
9. The United Secretariat will poll the International Executive Committee for its approval on the date of the world congress.
10. All sections, except those working under extremely repressive conditions, will hold congresses to elect their delegates to the world congress after discussion and vote on the line documents.
11. We agree that adherence to the above conditions will assure a democratic and authoritative world congress, as defined by the statutes. This involves the duty of sections and sympathising organizations to apply world congress decisions as specified by the statutes. We agree not to propose any changes in the statutes at the world congress, but to continue to abide by the statutes adopted at the last world congress.

Carried unan.

Adair, Atwood, Aubin, Capa, Celso, Claudio, Crandell, Duret, Domingo, Fourier, Frey, Galois, Georges, Johnson, Jones, Julio, Karl, Martinez, Otto, Pepe, Roman, Thereze, Walter, Werner, Carmen, Peterson, Raul, Peter, Stateman, Peterson, Stephan, Williams.

PS. Addition to point 9 b):

Walter reported that Celso had given an oral report to the Bureau on a discussion with members of the OCRFI and that no written report would be necessary.

APPENDIX ONE

We were astonished to see in the September 11-12, 1976 United Secretariat minutes, a statement in the name of the United Secretariat, concerning relations between the Fourth International and the IRMT (see appendix number 5, "Statement of the United Secretariat of Septmber 12th 1976").

The text of this statement was not submitted to the September United Secretariat meeting. Its contents were not discussed. Nor was it presented to the meeting for a vote. Furthermore, having read the statement, we disagree with it.

It is completely irregular and undemocratic for a statement to be made in the name of the United Secretariat in this way. Such a procedure has no precedence in our movement. If some members of the United Secretariat wish to make a statement of this kind and attach it to the United Secretariat minutes, then that is their right. But it must be submitted in their own names and not in the name of the United Secretariat as a whole. Alternatively, a text must be prepared for discussion and vote at a meeting of the United Secretariat.

We therefore dissociate ourselves from this statement both from the point of view of procedure and content.

Adair, Marcel, Martinez
October 16th, 1976

APPENDIX TWO

The actual facts

A Reply to the Majority of the United Secretariat

The September 12, 1976 "statement of the United Secretariat" professes to rectify alleged missatements made by the SWP Political Committee on certain facts. Eight points are to be noted about this "rectification".

1. The statement is signed in the name of the United Secretariat. No indication is given that differences of opinion over this statement may exist within the United Secretariat. Thus members of the Fourth International who read the statement are left with the impression that it represents the position of the United Secretariat as a whole. In fact, the statement does not reflect the views of all members of the United Secretariat. Comrades Adair, Marcel, and Martinez, who were present at the September 11-12, 1976 meeting, say that they disagree with the statement. (See their statement of October 16, 1976) Furthermore, although the "statement of the United Secretariat" is dated September 12, 1976, it was never put to a vote at the United Secretariat meeting of September 11-12. Thus it is not known which members of the United Secretariat take responsibility for the September 12, 1976 statement accusing the SWP Political Committee of misrepresentation.

The proposal to issue this statement was made by the IMT leaders who hold a majority in the United Secretariat. It may therefore be assumed that the statement represents the opinion of the majority of United Secretariat members present at the September 11-12, 1976 meeting.

2. Point No. 2 of the statement of the majority of the United Secretariat asserts: "According to what they explicitly declare, at no time did the leadership of the International Majority Tendency engage in any discussion with the International Revolutionary Marxist Tendency."

Since the leadership of the IMT has made no declaration on this point previously that we know of, this is then their first explicit declaration. Thus the majority of the United Secretariat is speaking, it is clear, as the leadership of the IMT and in its behalf. The medium chosen to issue this IMT statement is a statement in the name of the United Secretariat.

It is to be noted that nothing is included in the above sentence about the actions of individual IMT leaders, or of the leaderships of sections where the IMT holds a majority.

3. At the United Secretariat meeting of April 19-20, 1975, Comrade Walter reported on a discussion he had had with comrade Heredia of the Fraccion Bolshevique (which was recognised as a sympathising organisation in Argentina by the last world congress). Comrade Heredia had been present as an invited observer at a recently concluded international conference of the IRMT.

Comrade Walter reported that Comrade Heredia had taken this initiative on his own, and had not informed the United Secretariat in advance. IMT leaders also disclaimed prior knowledge of Comrade Heredia's action. At the April meeting of the United Secretariat no accusations of violating democratic centralism were raised against Comrade Heredia. Comrade Herdeia is not formally a member of the IMT, but has attended IMT caucus meetings. At the World Congress he did not speak as a member of the IMT, but he voted (with criticisms) for all the line documents of the IMT, the IMT political resolution and the resolutions on Europe, Bolivia, Argentina and Armed Struggle. (See the statement by Heredia attached to the minutes of the World Congress, IIDB, vol. XI, no. 5, p. 20.)

4. Point No. 1. of the September 12, 1976, statement of the leadership of the IMT asserts: "At no time did the leadership of any European section engage in any discussion with the international grouping called Revolutionary Marxist Tendency nor invite it to any of its gatherings, prior to a consultation with the leadership of the Fourth International."

However, point No. 10 states that the leadership of the IMG, British section, DID engage in a discussion with Michel Pablo, the leader of the International REvolutionary Marxist Tendency. This discussion was held prior to consultation with the leadership of the Fourth International. The United Secretariat was informed AFTER the discussion was held. The sequence of events is absolutely clear in the letter sent by Comrade Alan Jones of the IMG to the United Secretariat.

5. Point No. 3 asserts: "When the IRMT approached the leadership of the LCR, the French section of the F.I., for a common discussion, the leadership of the LCR immediately and correctly referred this question to the Usec." Point No. 4 asserts that "The Usec discused this question at its January 1976 meeting and decided to propose to the IRMT a discussion between a Usec delegation and the IRMT..."

The fact is that this question was first discussed at the United Secretariat meeting of December 22-23, 1975. At this meeting, Comrade Marlene of the French LCR reported that a delegation of the LCR leadership had held a discussion with a delegation of the IRMT. No representatives of the LTF were invited to attend or observe this discussion with the IRMT.

Comrade Marlene said that the IRMT delegation included representatives from several countries, but that the discussion concerned only French matters. The United Secretariat had not been consulted prior to the meeting. Nor had the leaderships of the sections or sympathising groups from the countries represented in the IRMT delegation.

During the discussion the IRMT delegation requested a meeting with representatives of the United Secretariat. The United Secretariat agreed at its December 22-23 meeting to the proposal of the IRMT, stipulating that the United Secretariat delegation should include representatives of both the IMT and the LTF. The January 24-25, 1976 meeting of the United Secretariat merely established the exact composition of the United Secretariat delegation.

6. Regarding points 5, 6, 8 and 9. The meeting between a delegation of the IRMT did take place on January 26, 1976. An SWP observer was present. The letter from Pablo to Ernest Mandel refers to this meeting. In Febuary, 1976, the United Secretariat was informed that the meeting had been held.

While it is true that this report "did not contain any proposals or suggestions of followup," this was not the reason for not including it in the minutes, as is asserted in point No.8. All reports at United Secretariat meetings, including those that contain no proposals or suggestions for followup, are noted in the minutes. In this case, the "report" given to the United Secretariat was merely an announcement that a written report would be drawn up and made available, as had been decided upon by the Bureau. Frequently such announcements are not noted in the minutes.

7. Though promised, no written report was ever submitted to the United Secretariat. It was in light of this that the Political Committee of the SWP expressed its concern. The concern was not over the conference with leaders of the IRMT but over the absence of a report. "We do not know how far things have gone, since no written report of this move has been submitted to the United Secretariat..." "We do not know what reply was made to this (Pablo's) letter, or what conferences have been held since."

By protesting very loudly that the SWP knew about the January 26

meeting, since an SWP observer was present, the United Secretariat majority sidesteps the point that was raised: How far have things gone? Why has there been no written report?

8. The statement of the SWP Political Committee contained a quotation from a document written by comrade Matti, a member of the LCR Political Bureau, in which he voiced his opinion of the objectives of the Pablo grouping as follows: "Their plan vis à vis us is clear: they want to BUILD THE PARTY with a section of the LCR and a section of the PSU, that is, explicitly with what they believe to be the former tendencies 2 and 3 against tendencies 1 and 4 (tendencies in the LCR), and at the international level they want to discuss with the IMT to the exclusion of the LTF and the SWP. Therefore their attitude is factional and their goal is to divide us..."

Was Comrade Matti alone in this opinion? Or was his view shared by other leaders of the LCR? The possibility that this was an accurate assessment of Pablo's objectives was cause for additional concern.

An appendix to the SWP Political Committee statement included a statement by Comrade Matti replying to the decision of the LCR Political Bureua forbidding members of the LCR from attending the SWP convention. In this statement Comrade Matti commented on the policy of the leadership of the LCR: "Thus, the French section has recently had a consistent policy of exchanges with an number of centrist groups from other countries without its being subjected to accusations of 'factionalism.' The French PB (Political Bureau) has even met representatives of the IRMT."

Comrade Matti, a member of the LCR Political Bureuu, is in a position to know the facts about the actions of the Political Bureau. It can be left to the ranks to judge who was misrepresented the facts. The question remains: How far have things gone?

October 17, 1976

Atwood
Celso

Galois

Johnson

Pepe

Stateman

Therese.

MINUTES OF UNITED SECRETARIAT MEETING
NOVEMBER 13-14, 1976

PRESENT: Adair, Aubin, Claudio, Domingo, Duret, Fourier, Frej, Galois, Georges, Johnson, Jones, Otto, Roman, Rudi, Walter, Werner

IEC PRESENT: Carmen, Petersen

GUESTS: Fernando

AGENDA:
1. Draft Resolution on Indochinese Revolution
2. Political Situation in Britain
3. Split in the Scottish Labour Party
4. World Congress Preparations
5. China
6. Poland
7. Zimbabwe
8. South Africa Solidarity
9. Policy Statement on East European Defense Work
10. Lutte Ouvrière
11. OCRFI
12. Bureau Report
13. Miscellaneous
14. Colombia

CHAIR: Johnson

1. Draft Resolution on the Indochinese Revolution

Roman reported on the draft resolution submitted to the pre-world-congress discussion bzy Aubin, Duret, Roman, and Walter.

Discussion.

MOTION: To approve the general line of the resolution for submission to the pre-world-congress discussion.

For: 13 (Aubin, Claudio, Domingo, Duret, Fourier, Frej, Georges, Jones, Otto, Roman, Rudi, Walter, Werner).

Against: 1 (Adair)

Consultative vote: Against: 2 (Galois, Johnson) CARRIED

2. Political Situation in Britain.

Jones reported.

Discussion.

3. Split in the Scottish Labour Party

Jones reported.

Discussion.

4. World Congress Preparations.

Galois reported on items for inclusion in the IIDB.

MOTION: to accept the following items for inclusion in the IIDB:

1) "Europe versus America and the Crisis of European Stalinism" report by Jack Barnes to May 1976 SWP National Committee meeting.

2) "The Portuguese, Mexican, and Italian Elections," report by Barry Sheppard to the August 1976 SWP National Convention, plus two appendices a) the July 19, 1976, letter from the United Secretariat to Ricardo Hernandez and b) the common electoral platform of the Mexican CP, MOS and LS.

3) Resolution on Angola adopted by the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction in August 1976.

For: 2 (Adair, Jones)

Abstaining: 10 (Aubin, Claudio, Duret, Domingo, Fourier, Frej, Georges, Roman, Walter, Werner)

CARRIED!

Consultative Votes: For: 2 (Galois, Johnson)

Statement by those who abstained on this motion: We abstain on this question not because we want to exclude any material submitted to the IIDB, but because we continue to believe that the procedure of including whole articles, letters, resolutions, etc. not in and of themselves, but as appendices to other material, and sometimes without previous agreement from their authors, is inadvisable and leads to obvious abuses.

Galois initiated a discussion concerning the status of the tendency whose formation was announced at the February 1976 meeting of the IEC by comrade Capa.

Discussion.

5. China.

Claudio introduced a draft statement on the current crisis in the Chinese leadership for publication in the press of the International. (The statement was included in the November 18, 1976, mailing from the Bureau to all sections and sympathizing organizations.)

Discussion.

MOTION: To separate out the question of the scope of workers democracy from the resolution as a whole and to organize a discussion on this question at the next meeting of the United Secretariat.

For: 10 (Adair, Claudio, Domingo, Fourier, Georges, Jones, Roman, Rudi, Walter, Werner.)

Against: 3 (Aubin, Duret, Frej.)

CARRIED!

Consultative Votes: For: 2 (Galois, Johnson)

MOTION: To adopt the general line of the statement.

For: 9 (Claudio, Domingo, Fourier, Georges, Jones, Roman, Rudi, Walter, Werner.)

Against: 1 (Adair)

Abstaining: 2 (Aubin, Duret)

CARRIED.

Consultative Votes: Against: 2 (Galois, Johnson)

6. Poland

Georges reported on the development of opposition to the Gierek regime especially within the working class and the significance of the public support the victimized strikers have received in Poland itself.

Discussion.

7. Zimbabwe

Petersen introduced a statement for publication in the press of the International on Zimbabwe. (The statement was included in the November 18, 1976, mailing.)

Discussion.

MOTION: To adopt the general line of the statement.

CARRIED.

8. Southern Africa Solidarity Work.

Petersen reported on the progress of the work and upcoming activities. (A calendar of events was included in the November 18, 1976, mailing.)

Discussion.

9. Policy Statement on East European Defense Work.

Galois introduced the draft statement. (The statement was included in the November 18, 1976, mailing.)

Discussion.

MOTION: To adopt the general line of the statement.

CARRIED.

10. Lutte Ouvrière

Walter introduced a proposed letter to Lutte Ouvrière as a result of the October 22, 1976, meeting between delegations of the Lutte Ouvrière international current and the United Secretariat.

Johnson introduced an alternative letter.

(See Attachment A for text of both letters.)

Discussion.

For letter introduced by Walter: 12 (Aubin, Claudio, Domingo, Duret, Fourier, Frej, Georges, Jones, Roman, Rudi, Walter, Werner.)

For letter introduced by Johnson: 1 (Adair)

Consultative Votes: For letter introduced by Johnson: 2 (Galois, Johnson)

11. OCRFI

Duret introduced a proposed letter to the OCRFI as a result of the meeting of October 19, 1976, between delegations of the OCRFI and the United

Secretariat and the statement the OCRFI proposed publishing after this meeting.

Jones introduced an alternative motion.

(See attachment B for the proposed OCRFI statement and the proposed letter and motion.)

Discussion.

For letter proposed by Duret: 11 (Aubin, Claudio, Domingo, Duret, Fourier, Frej, Georges, Roman, Rudi, Walter, Werner.)

For motion proposed by Jones: 2 (Adair, Jones)

Consultative votes: For motion by Jones: 2 (Galois, Johnson)

Statement by Jones: (See attachment B.)

12. Bureau Report.

a. Adair reported on a January 14, 1976, meeting planned for London to defend Joe Hansen and George Novack against the slander campaign by Healy. Ernest Mandel will speak. In addition, speakers have been invited from the SWP, the OCRFI, the IRMT, and other tendencies.

b. Duret reported on the coming congress of the Portuguese PRT, an appeal by members expelled from the PRT, and an appeal by members expelled from the LCI.

Discussion.

Agreed that the delegation to the PRT congress be composed of Atwood, Duret, and Julio and 1) that it be mandated to help further the process of fusion between the PRT and the LCI and 2) that Duret be mandated to present the position adopted by the United Secretariat on Europe and Portugal.

Agreed that while the United Secretariat does not take a position on the expulsions from the PRT at this time, the delegation be mandated to uphold correct organization norms if this matter arises at the congress.

Agreed to write the comrades expelled from the LCI recommending that they should direct their appeal to the coming LCI congress, the highest body of the LCI, in conformity with normal procedure, and to request that the LCI provide all information they have on the expulsions to the United Secretariat.

c. Walter reported on a letter from Comrade Ricardo of Mexico concerning the activities of members of the PST of Argentina in Mexico and on the status of an article by Comrade Ricardo concerning the December 1975 split in the Liga Socialista.

Discussion.

MOTION: a) To write to Comrades Moreno and Orestes concerning the letter and to request the documents referred to in the letter; b) to empower the Bureau to draft a motion on proper tendency and

faction functioning, including travel and living in other countries.

CARRIED.

MOTION: To write to Comrade Ricardo to request the edited version of his article on the split in the Liga Socialista so that it can be published.

CARRIED.

d. Johnson reported on the functioning of the Bureau and correspondence handled.

e. Johnson reported on the December and January dates for the meeting of the United Secretariat.

f. Aubin reported on the coming congress of the Antilles GRS.

MOTION: That Domingo be the United Secretariat representative at the congress.

CARRIED.

13. Miscellaneous

a. MOTION by Claudio: That the commission on Costa Rica be asked to prepare its report for the next meeting of the United Secretariat.

CARRIED.

b. MOTION by Duret: "The United Secretariat has been informed that a group known as the Bolshevik Tendency has held at least two international meetings to discuss adoption of a political platform and has made decisions on organizational structure. The United Secretariat has not yet received copies of the political platform or organizational decisions of this group. The United Secretariat decides to discuss this question at the December 1976 United Secretariat meeting.

"The United Secretariat Bureau is instructed to send a letter to comrades Capa and Julio, informing them of this decision and requesting one of them to be present at the December United Secretariat meeting."

CARRIED.

c. MOTION by Walter: "The United Secretariat strongly objects to the IEC Minority Faction's having submitted their resolution on Angola for publication in Intercontinental Press. This resolution was published in the issue of IP dated October 11, 1976, under a heading 'Draft resolutions' and with the following introduction:

"'The following resolution has been submitted by the Leninist-Trotskyist faction for discussion by the ranks of the Fourth International in preparation for the next congress of the worldwide Trotskyist organization. A resolution presenting the International Majority Tendency on the situation in Angola was published in the April 12, 1976, issue of Intercontinental Press.'

"The United Secretariat states that the public appearance of this document in IP is a violation of the right and responsibility of

the leading bodies of the FI to organize the pre-world-congress discussion and internal debate in general as they are mandated by the statutes. This resolution was not presented to the United Secretariat for inclusion into the international internal discussion bulletin, but instead was made known to the leadership and ranks of the FI through its unprecedented public appearance in IP. This action jeopardizes our ability to carry out a democratic internal debate, organized by the leading bodies in order to safeguard that democracy. Any public discussion which may be appropriate must be under the control of the United Secretariat.

"The United Secretariat objects to the formulation 'A resolution presenting the IMT on the situation in Angola was published in the April 12, 1976, issue of IP.' This resolution, passed at the February 1976 meeting of the International Executive Committee, is not a presentation of the positions of the IMT, but is the expression of the Fourth International's political position on Angola as determined by a majority vote of its highest body between world congresses. This formulation denies the right of leading bodies to speak for the FI as a whole, and reduces their function to that of a platform for tendencies and factions to express their points of view.

"The United Secretariat requests that the IEC Minority Faction respect the normal democratic centralist procedures for the organization of the pre-world-congress debate. The inauguration of the rubrique 'Draft Resolutions' in IP points up the need for full clarity on these norms, in particular the fact that only the leading bodies of the FI can authorize the external publication of draft resolutions submitted to the internal discussion if they deem this necessary and constructive.

"The United Secretariat decides to request that the editor of IP should print a correction of its introduction to this document centered on the following point: that the IEC resolution on Angola published in the April 12, 1976, Intercontinental Press was not a resolution reflecting the views simply of the International Majority Tendency, but was a statement by the Fourth International as determined by majority vote of its leading body."

Discussion.

For: 8 (Aubin, Claudio, Domingo, Duret, Jones, Frej, Walter, Werner.)

Against: 1 (Adair) CARRIED.

Consultative Vote: Against: 2 (Galois, Johnson)

d. Aubin reports on a French LCR Central Committee motion. (See attachment C.)

MOTION by Aubin: "The United Secretariat approves the request made by the French LCR Central Committee and strongly recommends to the SWP Political Committee to reply to the request. The United Secretariat further recommends to the SWP to comply with the recommendations made in the motion 'Relations with Trotskyist Organizations or Groups Claiming to Be Trotskyist, which are Outside the Fourth International" adopted at the July 3-4, 1976, meeting of

the United Secretariat."

For: 8 (Aubin, Claudio, Duret, Domingo, Frej, Jones, Walter, Werner.)

Against: 1 (Adair)

CARRIED.

Consultative Vote: Against: 2 (Galois, Johnson)

e. Adair reported on the coming Irish MSR congress and the Murray defense campaign.

MOTION: To empower the Bureau to organize a delegation to the MSR congress.

CARRIED.

Discussion.

Agreed that the Bureau should prepare a report on the Murray defense campaign and encourage the sections and sympathizing organizations to publicize the defense and to organize protests where possible.

f. Walter reported that the United Secretariat has received a letter in reply to its letter to Iranian comrades living in Europe.

Discussion.

Agreed to send a copy of the letter to the Sattar League and ask for their comments on the letter.

g. Agreed to attach to these minutes a statement by members of the United Secretariat who support the IMT concerning the January 26, 1976, meeting with the IRMT. (See attachment D.)

14. Colombia.

Walter reported on a trip to Colombia by Walter and Domingo.

MOTION: That comrades Walter and Domingo, in consultation with the International Executive Committee members resident in Colombia, will represent the United Secretariat in discussions with the organizations in Colombia that state adherence to the FI. The purpose of these discussions will be to help facilitate the process of unification currently under way among Espartaco, Liga Obrero Comunista, and Comando Camillistas. In addition the purpose will be to extend the process of unification to include the Socialist Bloc and the other organizations in Colombia that support the Fourth International.

CARRIED.

Meeting Adjourned.

ATTACHMENT A
Two Letters Proposed to Send to Lutte Ouvrière

1. Letter introduced by Walter - Carried.

Bruxelles
Le 14 novembre 1976

Sécrétariat unifié de la IVe Internationale â Lutte Ouvrière

Chers camarades,

Le Secrétariat unifié a examiné dans sa session des 13 et 14 novembre 1976 les résultats de la rencontre du 22 octobre de nos délégations respectives. Il a également pris note du rapport de son observateur à la réunion internationale que vous aviez convoquée.

Il constate :
a) que nos points de vue concernant l'utilité de joindre à toute proposition de discussion durable entre diverses organisations révolutionnaires un cadre d'action contraignant, semble être plus proche que préalablement supposé;
b) que la participation ainsi que le déroulement de la réunion internationale du 31.10.76 confirme le caractère peu réaliste, du moins à l'étape présente, d'un effort de rassembler, ne fût-ce qu'à des fins de discussion, tous les groupes se réclamant du trotskysme, ainsi que la pauvreté de ce genre de discussion à laquelle toute une série de sectes semblent accorder la priorité.

Dès lors, le SU estime qu'il est utile de faire avancer dans l'immediat les efforts bilatéraux entre votre courant et le notre, afin de sonder de manière pratique la possibilité de combiner une discussion avec des expériences d'action commune. Les résultats de ces expériences devront démontrer si un processus de fusion entre nos deux courants est possible à moyen terme.

Dans ce but, le SU fait les propositions suivantes, dans le domaine français en accord avec les directions de la LCR:

1 - que LO et la LCR entament immédiatement des discussions en vue de la publication commune d'un supplément de quatre pages hebdomadaires à "Rouge" et à "Lutte Ouvrière".

2 - que des discussions s'engagent en vue d'une campagne électorale commune en 1977, et notamment de la publication en commun d'un materiel de propagande et d'agitation pour les élections municipales de 1977.

3 - sur l'organisation avant la fin de l'été 1977, d'une conférence ouvrières commune LO/LCR en France.

4 - Que le SU et votre courant international établissent immédiatement une commission paritaire pour la discussion de la plateforme et des modalités pratiques d'une campagne de solidarité avec les masses laborieuses de coleur en Afrique du Sud, campagne qui sera sans doute de longue haleine vu l'importance de l'Afrique du Sud pour l'impérialisme et la durée probable de la lutte de libération dans ce pays. Un des buts prioritaires de cette campagne devrait être l'aide à apporter à la reconstitution d'une organisation trotskyste en Afrique du Sud même.

5 - Examiner la possibilité d'un effort similaire d'appui à la révolution espagnole qui monte.

6 - La discussion et éventuellement l'élaboration en commun, soit, à défaut de cela l'élaboration par votre courant, de plusiers articles à paraître dans un numéro sur 4 d'"Inprecor".

Nous attendons donc votre réponse à ces propositions ainsi que d'eventuelles contre-propositions ou propositions additives de votre part. Nous sommes évidemment prêts à vous rencontrer dans les plus brefs délais pour en discuter.

Fraternelles salutations communistes,
Secrétariat unifié de la IVe Internationale

2. Letter introduced by Johnson - Defeated

November 14. 1976

TO: Lutte Ouvrière

FROM: The United Secretariat of the Fourth International

Dear Comrades,

At its November 13-14, 1976, session, the United Secretariat discussed the results of the October 22 meeting between our respective delegations. We also took note of the report of our observer at the international meeting that you had called.

The United Secretariat:

a) agrees on the usefulness of linking the proposals for discussions between us to a framework of common action;

b) thinks that it is unrealistic and unproductive to try to gather together all groups claiming to be Trotskyist, even if it is only for discussions.

The United Secretariat considers it useful to move forward right now with bilateral efforts between your current and ours in order to probe in a practical manner the possibility of combining a discussion with experiences in common action. The results of these experiences ought to show if a fusion process between our two currents is possible.

With this goal the United Secretariat makes the following proposals:

1) that the United Secretariat and your international current immediately establish a parity commission to discuss the platform and practical modalities of a campaign of solidarity with the Black masses of South Africa, a campaign that will undoubtedly be a long one given the importance of South Africa for imperialism and the probable duration of the liberation struggle in this country. One of the priority goals of this campaign must be to help bring about the reconstitution of a Trotskyist organization in South Africa itself.

2) to examine the possibility of a similar effort of support to the Spanish revolution, which is advancing.

3) the discussion and possibly the common elaboration, or failing that, the elaboration by your current of several articles to submit for publication in one ouf of every four issues of INPRECOR and INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS.

4) We invite you to contribute articles for internal discussion within the memberships of our respective organizations on the topics under discussion for the upcoming world congress of the Fourth International. If you are agreeable, we will work out the modalities for organizing suhh a discussion with you.

In addition, the United Secretariat supports the following proposals that the leadership of the French LCR has informed us that it is making:

1) LO and the LCR immediately enter into discussions with the view to the common publication of a 4-page weekly supplement in both Rouge and Lutte Ouvrière.
2) that discussions begin with a view to a common election campaign in 1977, and particularly of the publication in common of propaganda and agitational material for the 1977 municipal elections.
3) that a common workers conference of the LCR-LO be organized in France before the end of summer 1977.

We await your response to these proposals as well as possible additional proposals from you. We are obviously ready to meet with you as soon as possible to discuss these proposals.

Fraternal communist greetings,
The United Secretariat of the Fourth International

ATTACHMENT B
Letters, Motions, and Statements Concerning the OCRFI

1. Statement of the OCRFI

The delegation of the International Bureau, mandated by the Organizing Committee for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International, after a discussion with the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, considered the following resolution adopted by the United Secretariat:

> We propose that the United Secretariat of the Fourth International and the Organizing Committee for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International make parallel statements to be printed in Rouge, Informations Ouvrières, and other publications of the Fourth International and the OCRFI.
>
> 1 - That the goal of the discussions is to strengthen the force of the Fourth International as a single international organization based on the program of Trotskyism, including adherence to democratic centralism.
>
> 2 - That the United Secretariat and the Ligue Communiste Révolutionnaire while holding deep differences with some of the positions of the OCRFI and the Organisation Communiste Internationaliste consider them to be revolutionary organizations.

3 - That the OCRFI and the OCI similarly affirm that they consider the Fourth International and its French section the LCR to be revolutionary organizations although they hold deep differences with some of their positions.

In view of the agreement of these points, the United Secretariat will open an organized discussion with the OCRFI on the basis of a mutually agreed on agenda.

The OCRFI renews its proposal to open a discussion between the two international organizations, without any conditions or preliminary requisites, the objective being to reconstruct a united Fourth International on the basis of its founding program, in order to try to overcome the differences that were at the origin of a split that lasted for almost a quarter of a century.

That the goal of the discussions is to strengthen the force of the Fourth International as a single international organization based on the program of Trotskyism, including adherence to democratic centralism.

The delegation of the Organizing Committee holds that ties with the Fourth International and affirmation of the validity of its program characterize an organization as revolutionary.

Both the United Secretariat and its sections, and the Organizing Committee and its organizations affirm the necessity for the Fourth International and the validityof its program. This characterizes both of them as revolutionary organizations.

2. Letter introduced by Duret - Carried.

Bruxelles
13 14 novembre 1976

Secrétariat unifié de la Quatrième Internationale au "Comité d'organisation pour la reconstruction de la IVème Internationale"

Camarades,

Le Secrétariat unifié a reçu, attachée à la lettre du 27 octobre 1976, la déclaration du "Bureau international du Comité d'organisation pour la reconstruction de la IVème Internationale".

Le SU considère que la déclaration du Bureau international ne répond pas effectivement à la demande formulée dans le point 3 de sa résolution du 17 octobre 76 ("que le CORQI et l'OCI affirment similairement que la IVème Internationale et sa section française, la LCR, sont des organisations révolutionnaires bien qu'elles aient de profondes divergences avec certaines positions de ces organisations"). Ceci est illustré par les faits suivants. Les multiples caractérisations de la Quatrième Internationale, de sonSU et de ses sections effectuées par le CORQI et ses organisations avec les conséquences pratiques qui en découlent, sont jusqu'à présent l'obstacle majeur à toute discussion. Or, après la réunion entre une délégation du SU de la IVème Internationale et une délégation du CORQI, après la déclaration faite lors de cette réunion, une caractérisation de même nature, s'inscrivant dans la continuité des

caractérisations précédentes, paraît dans vos publications officielles. Le dernier paragraphe de votre déclaration d'octobre 76 clarifie donc pas la situation. En effet, dans un texte -- daté d'octobre 1976 -- vous affirmez :

> "Crise de la IVème Internationale? Nous considérons que la IVème Internationale a subi en 1950-1953 une crise destructrice qui s'est d'abord marquée par l'exclusion arbitraire de la majorité de la section française puis en 1953 par une scission traversant la IVème Internationale à l'échelle mondiale et par la formation du Comité international rassemblant notamment le SWP, les sections anglaise, française, suisse, chinoise.
>
> "Le contenu destructeur de cette crise était donné par le fait qu'elle était provoquée par l'offensive contre les principes et le programme de la IVème Internationale d'un courant révisionniste formé au centre même de l'Internationale, dans sa direction.
>
> "Nous considérons que cette crise n'a pas été surmontée, qu'elle ne peut l'être que par l'élimination de la IVème Internationale de positions revisionnistes contraires aux principes et au programme de la IVème Internationale. Ce n'est pas sur des aménagements diplomatiques ni par des procédures administratives que ce but peut être atteint, mais par le bilan de l'histoire de la IVème Internationale et de sa crise, en relation avec les problèmes surgis du développement même de la lutte des classes.
>
> "Si nous estimons que la crise de la IVème Internationale a un caractère destructeur, c'est avant tout parce que les coups que le révisionnisme a portés à l'organisation internationale fondée par Léon Trotsky ont abouti à sa destruction comme organisation mondialement centralisée sur la base du programme de transition."
>
> (Avertissement à "Correspondance internationale" bulletin international de l'OCI octobre 1976. Souligné par nous.)

Cette ambiguité ne peut que contribuer à donner l'impression à l'opinion ouvrière et aux militants révolutionnaires que votre déclaration s'inscrit dans le cadre d'une opération sans principe.

En effet, le dernier paragraphe de votre déclaration n'implique aucune clarification explicite par rapport au type d'affirmations citée ci-dessus. Par conséquent, non seulement elles contredisent mais encore elles enlèvent toute valeur à votre affirmation (qui reprend le point 1 de la résolution du SU) comme quoi "le but des discussions est de renforcer la IVème Internationale comme organisation internationale unique, basée sur le programme du trotskysme, ce qui inclut l'acceptation du centralisme démocratique".

Une prise de position nette sur ce point reste donc un préalable à toute discussion entre nos organisations, au même titre que la caractérisation par le CORQI de la IVème Internationale dans son entier comme une organisation révolutionnaire.

A notre avis, une discussion ayant pour but "de renforcer la IVème Internationale comme organisation unique, basée sur le programme du trotskysme, ce qui inclut l'acceptation du centralisme démocratique", suppose non seulement un accord programmatique et l'acceptation du centralisme démocratique, mais aussi la possibilité d'une unité d'action dans la lutte de classe courante entre toutes les sections et organisations sympathisantes de la IVème Internationale, et les organisations adhérant au CORQI.

En ce sens, une clarification de votre part, particulièrement sur le point 3 de la résolution du SU, est seule susceptible de créer les préconditions pour ouvrir un débat permettant de tester la possibilité de concrétiser ces trois critères. Il est dès lors nécessaire que "le Bureau international du CORQI" réponde sans équivoque aux trois points de la déclaration du SU.

Enfin, le SU estime parfaitement justifiée la prise de position publique du BP et du CC de la Ligue communiste révolutionnaire (section française de la IVème Internationale) face aux agressions commises par des militants de l'OCI à l'encontre de membres de la LOR et de membres de la LCR à Amiens, le 20 octobre 1976.

Salutations révolutionnaires,
Le Secrétariat unifié de la IVème Internationale

3. Resolution by Jones - Defeated.

The United Secretariat considers that the OCRFI statement meets the conditions for opening of a discussion, as decided upon at the October 16-17, 1976, United Secretariat meeting. The United Secretariat therefore decides to issue a public statement to be published parallel with the statement of the OCRFI. The text of the United Secretariat statement will be that of the resolution adopted at the October 16-17, 1976, meeting, edited for public use.

The United Secretariat will discuss at its December 1976 meeting the forms and modalities for this discussion that will be proposed to the OCRFI. The United Secretariat will alsomake proposals for joint actions with the OCRFI, with the objective of linking the progress of the discussions to progress of common activity. The United Secretariat will also decide the organizational framework under which the Fourth International will function in the discussion with the OCRFI.

In light of developments since the October discussion a further meeting should be held with the OCRFI to clarify

i. the significance of the statements in Correspondance internationale of October 1976 and the nature of polemics between the two organisations;

ii. the issue of violence in the workers movement;

iii. proposals for joint work.

4. Statement by Jones

Given the unanimous resolution at the last United Secretariat meeting on a coherent and correct position on relations with the OCRFI it was important if possible to continue unanimous approach

at this meeting. In particular, it was important to have an agreement with the French comrades on tactics on how to continue the line adopted at the last USec; this is for the evident reason that relations between the LCR and the OCI are a dominant element in relations between the United Secretariat and the OCRFI. However, at this Secretariat a position was taken which on a number of crucial points is impossible to support and is in contradiction to that taken at the last meeting.

1. The USec letter demands an admission from the OCRFI that they have changed their position ("une caracterisation de même nature, s'inscrivant dans la continuité des caracterisations precedentes"). This is not a permissable method either in relation to where such demands for self-criticism have their historical origin or even from the point of view of elementary social and political psychology. We can and must demand absolute clarity and lack of ambiguity on present positions of the OCRFI, but we cannot demand an explanation of whether they have changed and self-critized previous positions.

2. In my opinion, and based on a study of available material, it is absolutely clear that violence by the OCI took place at Amiens -- the only question is whether this was organized by its leadership or brought about by individual leaders or rank-and-file elements. The fact that the OCI leadership covered up this situation with pathetic statements and denials is both extremely serious in itself and revealing on the methods of this leadership. This issue, and the position of the OCI on the LOR (Vargaites) must be dealt with at a meeting with the OCRFI as soon as this can be organized -- the very first meeting of any discussion. However, this strong personal opinion is something quite different from the United Secretariat as a body taking a position that acts of violence by the OCI members have occurred. For such a serious accusation to be made, one which if substantiated and not clarified by an unambiguous position of the OCRFI, must lead to the rapid break of any discussions with them, clear and unambiguous evidence accepted as authoritative by militants outside our ranks must be brought forward. Such evidence is clearly accumulating in the dossier presented to this United Secretariat. However, the Secretariat has not had a serious discussion on the issue and it is irresponsible and lowering the authority of the Secretariat in such circumstances to send declarations such as the last paragraph of the letter.

3. The draft letter asserts that the declaration of the OCRFI is not clear on whether it regards the International as revolutionary. There is no doubt that the declaration of the OCRFI is weak, above all that virtually no practical consequences of such a recognition are drawn. I stated at the time of the October 19 meeting with the OCRFI that a clearer and stronger statement should have been asked for. However, at that time other comrades did not agree with this. Taking the OCRFI statement as it is, however, the declaration does satisfy the correct conditions laid down by the United Secretariat. Naturally, the reasons the OCRFI gives for considering the United Secretariat revolutionary are not the ones we would give. The declaration does not make it clear that the practical conclusions which we would demand of a recognition of an organization as revolutionary

will be met. But it does satisfy the condition the Secretariat laid down for initiating a discussion, which is of course something quite different from a satisfactory conclusion of the discussion.

It is true that since the October meeting statements have been made, notably in Correspondance International of October 1976, that at least arguably call into question the meaning of the OCRFI declaration. It is correct to demand unambiguity and clarification of these statements. However, this should be taken up in the meetings with the OCRFI which would be necessary for determining a discussion.

The correct procedure is to publish the two declarations, which read by any militant would clearly mean what they say and not any "secret" meaning given to them by any party, and to proceed rapidly to discuss the points indicated above and in the resolution voted for by 2 United Secretariat members and which it was indicated was supported by two observers.

If it could have been possible to arrive at a compromise to clarify matters further and satisfy comrades, for example by having a further meeting with the OCRFI, this would have been correct to preserve a unanimous approach, although it would have been tactically bad in actual relations with the OCRFI. However, as discussion revealed it was not possible to have compromise even on this minimal proposal it is important that clarity of positions is revealed. For that reason not a compromise resolution but a slightly amended version of the original one I drafted was submitted to the vote.

It goes without saying that although the USec resolution is incorrect it must be carried out and no action taken outside the framework laid down by the United Secretariat is permissible under democratic centralism. However, in light of the decision taken at this United Secretariat it will be necessary for those forces in the International in disagreement with the line adopted at the Secretariat, and in agreement with the general alternative resolution, to meet to discuss how to undertake a struggle to gain a correct decision.

ATTACHMENT C
MOTION DU CC DE LA LCR/SFQI SUR LES CONTACTS SWP/OCI

Le CC de la LCR proteste contre le fait qu'une délégation du BP du SWP de passage à Paris ait jugé bon de passer au local de l'OCI et d'y discuter avec des dirigeants de cette organisation de l'affaire d'Amiens avant même de rencontrer la direction de la LCR, sans même la prévenir ni lui demander son avis sur l'opportunité d'une telle rencontre, tout ceci contrairement aux résolutions votées par le SU (voir "Documentations internationale No 6 - Novembre 76). Il mandate le BP pour exiger de la direction du SWP des explications sur une telle attitude.

ATTACHMENT D

STATEMENT BY AUBIN, DOMINGO, DURET, FOURIER, GEORGES, JONES, LIVIO, FREJ, OTTO, ROMAN, RUDI, VERGEAT, WALTER

The PC of the SWP started by a slanderous insinuation that the IMT members of the USec had had some secret negotiations with the international Pablo grouping (IRMT). When it was disclosed that the only international meeting which they had had with that grouping had been previously announced and authorized by the USec, and had been held in the presence of an SWP observer, they now retreat to the equally unfounded and slanderous insinuation that "because there was no written report on that meeting" they are ignorant of how far things have gone.

The truth of the matter is that NOTHING has gone on since that meeting, and that no follow ups took place. To ask for "proof" that nothing has happened is a classical smear tactic: "did you or didn't you stop beating your wife?"

C

COPY COPY COPY

New York, N.Y.
December 8, 1976

To the United Secretariat

Dear Comrades,

As observers at the United Secretariat meeting of October 16-17, 1976, we shared the sense of accomplishment felt by everyone there over the unanimous vote for resolutions opening the door to a united center, organizing a democratic and authoritative world congress, and clearing the way for a discussion with the Organizing Committee for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International. We felt equal satisfaction when the OCRFI on October 19 accepted the conditions laid down in the latter resolution.

Consequently, the letter to the OCRFI dated November 14, which was approved by a majority of the United Secretariat, has aroused grave concern among us. It goes against the unanimous decision of the October 17 United Secretariat meeting.

Before taking up the questions it raises, we think the letter itself calls for clarification; it is written in such an obscure way that it is difficult to determine its purpose and what it is talking about.

The context is the sustained effort of the OCRFI to open up friendly relations and a political discussion with the United Secretariat of the Fourth International despite repeated rebuffs. The OCRFI's effort led, after various ups and downs, to a meeting of representatives of the two organizations on October 19. At this meeting the United Secretariat delegation presented the resolution adopted unanimously by the United Secretariat two days previously. The text is as follows:

"We propose that the United Secretariat of the Fourth International and the Organising Committee for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International make parallel statements to be printed in Rouge, Informations Ouvrières and other publications of the Fourth International and the OCRFI.

"1. That the goal of the discussions is to strengthen the force of the Fourth International as a single international organisation based on the program of Trotskyism, including adherence to democratic centralism.

"2. That the United Secretariat and the Ligue Communiste Révolutionnaire while holding deep differences with some of the positions of the OCRFI and the Organisation Communiste Internationaliste consider them to be revolutionary organisations.

"3. That the OCRFI and the OCI similarly affirm that they consider the Fourth International and its French section, the LCR, to be revolutionary organisations although they hold deep differences with some of their positions.

"In view of the agreement on these points, the United Secretariat will open an organized discussion with the OCRFI on the basis of a mutually agreed on agenda."

After some discussion on various matters, including the meaning of the three points, the delegation of the OCRFI accepted the resolution of the United Secretariat. In its statement, which it drew up in a caucus during the meeting, the OCRFI delegation first repeated the text of the resolution and then specified acceptance of it in the following terms:

"The OCRFI renews its proposal to open a discussion between the two international organizations, without any conditions or preliminary requisites, the objective being to reconstruct a united Fourth International on the basis of its founding program; in order to try to overcome the differences that were at the origin of a split that lasted for almost a quarter of a century.

"That the goal of the discussions is to strengthen the force of the Fourth International as a single international organization based on the program of Trotskyism, including adherence to democratic centralism.

"The delegation of the Organizing Committee holds that ties with the Fourth International and affirmation of the validity of its program characterize an organization as revolutionary.

"Both the United Secretariat and its sections, and the Organizing Committee and its organizations affirm the necessity for the Fourth International and the validity of its program. This characterizes both of them as revolutionary organizations."

The two delegations expressed their pleasure at having finally succeeded in overcoming the obstacles to a fraternal relationship that would make possible a mutually profitable discussion.

Proceeding in accordance with the agreement reached October 19, the OCRFI drew up an English translation of their statement for publication in its press internationally. Again in accordance with the agreement, the OCRFI submitted the draft with its English translation to the United Secretariat for approval. An accompanying letter was dated October 27, 1976.

The United Secretariat majority followed a different course. Instead of moving ahead on the basis of the agreement it had demanded the OCRFI accept, the United Secretariat majority switched its course 180 degrees. By way of justification, the United Secretariat majority contends in its November 14 letter that something new and unexpected happened, putting everything in question. The charge is formulated as follows:

"The manifold characterizations of the Fourth International, its United Secretariat, and its sections by the OCRFI and its organizations, together with the practical consequences that flow from these characterizations, have up till now been the major obstacle to any discussion. However, after the meeting between a delegation from the US of the Fourth International and a delegation from the OCRFI, after the statement made at the time of this meeting, the same sort of characterization, in a line of continuity with previous characterizations, has appeared in your official publications. The concluding paragraph of your October 1976 statement, therefore, has not cleared up the situation." (Emphasis in original.)

As can be seen, the letter charges that the OCRFI issued a new statement "in your official publications" after the October 19 meeting in which representatives of the two organizations reached the agreement indicated above. The implication is that if the statement had been issued before the October 19 meeting there would have been no cause for complaint.

As proof of the charge, several paragraphs are cited from the preface to the October issue (No. 1 of a new series) of the international information bulletin, La Correspondance Internationale, published by the Organisation Communiste Internationaliste, which adheres to the OCRFI.

The sentences in question express the view that in 1950-53, the Fourth International underwent a "destructive crisis," that this crisis has not yet been overcome, and that it "can only be overcome by the elimination from the Fourth International of revisionist positions contrary to the principles and program of the Fourth International." Without indicating the omission of three intervening paragraphs, the letter cites another sentence in the same vein in which the authors of the preface state that in their opinion the "destructive character" of the crisis in the Fourth International "resulted in its destruction as a centralized worldwide organization based on the Transitional Program."

The November 14 letter draws the following conclusion:

"The US considers that the statement by the International Bureau [of the OCRFI on the three points] does not really meet the demand formulated in Point 3 of its resolution of October 17, 1976 (i.e., 'that both the OCRFI and the OCI state that the Fourth International and its French section, the LCR, are revolutionary organizations, even though they may have deep differences with some of the positions held by the latter organizations')." (Emphasis in original.)

Furthermore, according to the letter, the OCRFI's statement as a whole is put in question: "Such ambiguity cannot but help give working-class opinion and revolutionary militants the impression that your declaration was made in the framework of an unprincipled operation."

The letter goes on: "...only a clarification from you as regards Point 3 of the US resolution in particular can clear the way for opening up a debate enabling us to see if these three criteria can be met."

The letter also appears to demand that the OCRFI say something about points one and two, although this is not at all clear: "As of now, the 'International Bureau of the OCRFI' must give an unambiguous answer to the three points of the US declaration."

* * *

On the substantive questions the November 14 letter does not stand on firm ground.

1. The allegation that the preface to the new OCI bulletin was written after the October 19 meeting is particularly weak. No attempt appears to have been made to verify the facts. The IMT members of the United Secretariat, who drew up the letter, do not appear to have even asked the OCRFI about the date.

2. It can easily be shown that the bulletin containing the preface was printed before the October 19 meeting. For instance, a copy was received in New York on October 16.

3. Long before the October 19 meeting, the United Secretariat had taken note of the views of the leaders of the OCRFI on the nature and consequences of the 1950-53 crisis in the Fourth International as well as their views on the 1963 reunification.

These opinions were considered to be no barrier to opening a discussion with the OCRFI centered on current political issues. In fact there was general acknowledgment that precisely these opinions of the OCRFI leadership would have to be included among the topics to be discussed. No demand was made on the OCRFI to give up its view in advance of a discussion. What was demanded of the OCRFI was acceptance of the three requisites that were codified in the resolution presented by the representatives of the United Secretariat at the October 19 meeting. The OCRFI accepted the three requisites. The United Secretariat delegation voiced its satisfaction. That should have closed the long chapter marked by the dragging of feet and placed everything on a more auspicious basis.

* * *

The November 14 letter sent to the OCRFI places the United Secretariat in an untenable position.

First, it is ridiculous to demand that the OCRFI reaffirm acceptance of the three points they already accepted on October 19.

If the leaders of the OCRFI take the oath a second time, what then? Will this satisfy the majority of the United Secretariat? Or will the majority demand that the OCRFI raise their right hand and solemnly swear a third and a fourth time?

Second, the majority of the United Secretariat has suddenly decided that the OCRFI's views on the "revisionism" to be found in the Fourth International contradict the OCRFI's acknowledgment that the Fourth International is a revolutionary organization.

It is the majority of the United Secretariat who are illogical. The discussion is called for because there are differences. The premise accepted by the OCRFI is that both sides should be open to persuasion. If there were no differences there would be no grounds for discussion, or trying to convince each other.

If the majority of the United Secretariat were to apply their new position logically, it would have truly drastic repercussions within the Fourth International. For instance, we have not changed our views on the destructive role played by Pablo. Others are of the same opinion, including members of the International Majority Tendency (Comrade Lequenne, for example). About half of the international holds that the famous turn at the Ninth World Congress marked a departure from Trotskyism. Leading comrades hold that the resolution on armed struggle, passed by a majority at the 1974 congress, revises the tenets of Trotskyism.

Does the majority faction propose to refuse to discuss with these comrades unless they first give up their views? Will they demand an oath to that effect? Would the majority faction demand that they repeat the oath because of the suspicion that they had their fingers crossed and thus were not really unambiguous? We trust that the demands of logic will not carry the majority faction that far.

Third, the letter deals a political blow to the Fourth International. The letter testifies to indefensible capriciousness in the conduct of negotiations. It likewise demonstrates that the United Secretariat, for whatever reason, stands in fear of opening a discussion with the OCRFI.

Fourth, the letter is evidence of the growth of sectarianism in the leading body of the Fourth International. While proclaiming a policy of seeking to unite the mighty proletarian forces required to advance the world revolution to success, the IMT demonstrates in practice that it is not even capable of welcoming the overtures of a Trotskyist current that wishes to strengthen the Fourth International. It rejects the positive course adopted by the OCRFI of seeking to overcome the years of bitter partisan polemics through a discussion that will demarcate the differences and probe the possibility of resolving them.

The least that can be said of this sorry performance is that the majority leadership of the Fourth International has in this instance shown political incompetence.

* * *

Why was such a letter written? In our opinion, the IMT has been divided on how to respond to the overtures of the OCRFI. One current, seeing the obvious advantages to be gained from accepting the positive moves of the OCRFI at face value, favored opening a dialogue and seeking to act in common in the class struggle wherever possible.

Another current, unfortunately in the majority, took a sectarian stance. It was determined to block any rapprochement. However, its leaders did not act forthrightly. In the United Secretariat they approved a course of responding positively to the advances made by the OCRFI. At the same time they adopted an extremely hostile attitude toward the OCRFI. This went so far as condemning friendly gestures to the OCRFI such as extending invitations to send observers to conventions.

In addition the majority of the IMT sought to provoke the OCRFI into moves that would blow up the efforts at rapprochement.

Another tack was to lay down conditions they felt certain the OCRFI would refuse to meet. Thus they counted on the OCRFI rejecting one or all of the demands in the resolution passed at the October 16-17 meeting of the United Secretariat. When the OCRFI, much to their surprise, accepted the demands, the majority of the IMT found themselves trapped by their own maneuver.

Instead of recognizing the damage to the Fourth International already inflicted by their unprincipled maneuvers and sectarian attitude toward the OCRFI and deciding that it would now be better to act in accordance with the positive approach approved by the United Secretariat, the majority of the IMT decided to push for an end to the attempt to establish friendly relations. This is the meaning of the November 14 letter. It is worse than previous moves because it comes <u>after</u> a meeting with the OCRFI in which agreement was reached.

The rationale for this course is the diehard factionalism of the IMT. The key leaders are afraid that the OCRFI might continue along the course it has begun until a fusion of forces would be feasible. If that were to occur, the IMT visualizes a bloc being formed by the Leninist Trotskyist Faction and the OCRFI. From their corner, such an outcome must be nipped in the bud at any cost!

The reality is that the LTF scorns a narrow factional outlook. From the beginning, the LTF has adhered to the principle that the

interests of the Fourth International stand above those of any faction. To build and to strengthen the Fourth International by bringing and keeping together all the forces standing on the program laid down by the founding congress, including democratic centralism, is a task that should be carried out without regard to narrowly conceived factional interests.

In this respect, it remains to be seen how the OCRFI will evolve. The organization is not monolithic. A current may exist that opposes rapprochement, particularly with the Ligue Communiste Révolutionnaire. It is certain, however, that a positive outcome hinges at this point on opening a fraternal discussion with the OCRFI and doing everything possible to foster and advance comradely relations with them.

In line with this, we would propose the following immediate steps:

1. To reconsider the November 14 letter. It was a blunder to approve it.

2. To resume the favorable attitude taken by the delegation of the United Secretariat toward the OCRFI's acceptance of the conditions laid down in the October 17 United Secretariat resolution on this question.

3. To open regular meetings with representatives of the OCRFI to remove possible misunderstandings that may have arisen recently or that may arise again in working to improve relations.

4. To publish in the International Internal Discussion Bulletin the preface to the first issue of La Correspondance Internationale so as to make it available to the membership of the Fourth International.

5. To likewise publish in the International Internal Discussion Bulletin the text of the statement that the OCRFI proposed to publish in line with the agreement reached at the October 19 meeting.

6. To move ahead with the discussion with the OCRFI projected in the agreement reached October 19.

7. To nominate an official United Secretariat delegation to observe the December international conference of the OCRFI. The

OCRFI has invited observers of the United Secretariat to take the floor there and say whatever they wish. This would constitute an excellent opportunity, it would seem, to present the viewpoint of the United Secretariat directly to members of the OCRFI from many countries.

Comradely yours,

Jack Barnes

Jack Barnes

Joseph Hansen

Joseph Hansen

Barry Sheppard

Barry Sheppard

Mary-Alice Waters

Mary-Alice Waters

encs.