

X:PC

OCT 1 1976

23 Albert Rd

London N.22

26 September 1976

Dear Jack,

Thank you for your two letters of 16 September and 18 September. They raise a large number of issues so I will try to go through them in some sort of order.

*

*

*

In relation to the campaign against Healy things are going relatively well. As Connie has probably told you we have provisional agreement from a number of groups for a big meeting. We have set a tentative date of 31 October or the first weekend in November. The decision between the two depends on availability of halls, speakers being free etc. If we get the right platform - I am pushing for one of Joe, Ernest, Pablo, Lambert, Thornett - there is no reason why we can't get a minimum of 1500, and probably more like 2000, at the meeting. There are a number of tricky obstacles still to be negotiated (what to do with all the little groups, the IS, Coates etc) but things so far are getting on quite nicely. We are discussing the final plan at the Political Committee this week and I will make sure you know the outcome.

*

*

*

On the FBI case I am enthusiastically in favour of internationalising the issue - and so are the cdes in the leadership I have discussed it with. I would suggest that Coates would be a very useful guy on this - he has a network of MPs, left bureaucrats in the unions etc. He is a real shit on many political questions (at the moment he is waging a campaign to prevent the IMG affiliating to the 'non-partisan' Institute for Workers Control), but on this he would almost certainly be very helpful. Would you like me to fix up a meeting or would you prefer to do it from your end? In any case you should send him all your stuff on the case if you don't already do so.

On the impact of the case incidentally I think it is quite clear that the European cdes underestimated the importance of the campaign - a fact I suspect is not unconnected with sectarianism towards the SWP (although I include the IMG

in this particular self-criticism*). I don't think the International has made
on, tenth of the use of the case it could have. In Europe the aspects of the thing
need to be widened of course, in particular evidently the concentration here has
to be on the CIA et al and not the FBI as regards direct involvement, but apart
from discussing the issue in Britain I think it should be put on the U.Sec agenda.
*As I believe in being correct in these things I don't mind writing that down
and signing it if you want!

*

*

*

On Malik's tour, this is best discussed when you are over here as Brian Grogan, who
is in charge of the anti-racist campaign work, is basically out of town for two
weeks on a tour and I haven't been able to discuss it with him. I know he is
in favour in principle however. The only point he raised was that at present
in Britain on the racist struggle, apart from the direct violence here, it is the
South African issue which dominates the scene and he was worried this might
affect the size of the meetings. This is best discussed out in concrete detail
however so I will just make sure the relevant cdes are available when you are here.

*

*

*

I was most interested in the correspondence with Lambert. Given that the meeting
is going to take place I think it is a very good fact to have an IMT cde present. As you
chose to quote me, however I would point out that in the document I wrote I made other
conditions about our meeting with Pablo than simply an LFP member being present. These
other conditions, such as sections agreeing - (I note his letter is headed OCI and not
OCRFI), only meeting once, what we discussed etc. Given that we as the International are to
have a meeting with him in October - I assume Ernest sent you a copy of the letter
decided at the last U.Sec - I'm not sure the meeting is a good thing in New York
even from the point of view that would exist if the U.Sec majority's policy on the
OCRFI had been correct from the beginning.

If we turn to the substance of the matter I am sure that people are going to protest
about the meeting - and I support some of their points. However I personally am in favour
of the SWP meeting Lambert as many times as possible - provided it is done through
the International. I want you to really find out what their political positions are. A
small taste of their method comes out in his letter. Do you really want to tie yourselves
internationally to a group whose leaders deal with political opponent groups

by talking of their leaders as the 'provocateur varga' - not to mention the previously 'suspected of working for the Bolivian police' Moscoso? I thought we were trying to stamp out that sort of shit with our campaign against Healy.

As for his political views, does the SWP really fancy a future with someone who is so incapable of a serious and balanced political position that they have to attempt to claim that Ernest openly proposes the liquidation of the International or that the LCR supports a Popular Front? You can be sure a person who is incapable of making an objective judgement on such an issue is going to have a warped position on a whole number of external political issues as well, for there is no iron wall between attitude to other groups and other political issues - which is why of course I agreed with you at Oberlin when you said that if the LCR took a sectarian stance on the Lambertists this must affect their other politics also.

If you can really get a discussion going he would have even more interesting things to discuss - why the OCI claims that the productive forces have not developed at all since 1938, why we should be neutral in wars between the Arab states and Israel, why the OCI retains the relations it does with the PLO, and why it evades letting people know Trotsky's real views on that group, etc. If I have not misjudged the SWP rather grotesquely I don't think he'll have much success in winning you over on those ones!

Perhaps in a real discussion through the International you can win over either him or some of the ranks of the OCRFI - although I am rather more optimistic about the latter than the former. I am very much in favour of a discussion with the OCRFI but I think it very important you don't have any illusions about their real political positions at present. Apart from the one issue of Popular Front's in Europe, and even there I don't think you have agreement with them on what practically to do (their vote on Mitterand, the slogan of SP government in Portugal etc), on every other major political issue your positions are not at all those of the Lambertists. A split in the International, and your attempting to create some sort of international current with them, would not only be a split which was not justified on a principled basis, but is one that would end in a disaster for the SWP as any such 'current' would blow up over any one

of a dozen issues. I know that you always say that but I get a strong impression that you don't really grasp it. So ^{that} you can see just what a disaster such a manouvre would be is one of the four chief reasons (together with hoping to win over some of the ranks of the OCRFI; exposing their manouvre if it is one; and the remote possibility that at least a section of their leadership has genuinely² changed their minds) why I favour discussions with the OCRFI. The more both the leadership and the ranks of the SWP find out about the politics of the OCRFI the ~~better~~ on this front.

Maybe I am wrong and the Lambertists aren't just manouevring, a discussion is the best way to find out, but I must say that the letter to you doesn't exactly change my mind on that. In any case however, whatever our differences on interpretation of their intentions, I am sure we can win the International for a discussion with them - if that's what you seriously want of course. Just don't have any illusions about them. Don't do anything unprincipled and crazy, whether it be a split or something short of that which forces one on us, which would be a disaster for the Fourth International but an even bigger one for the SWP.

Finally, no matter what you think about the internal regime of the LCR, don't have any illusions that once they had split up the International the OCI would give the SWP anything like the possibilities to win people to their political positions that the sections of the FI give.

All this may be obvious to you, I don't know, but it certainly isn't obvious to the ranks of the SWP and even maybe to the majority of its leadership. For them not to grasp it is extraordinarily dangerous.

*

*

*

On your proposal concerning a trip here: I think it would be a very good idea for you to come here prior to the meeting in Brussels as you propose. We can certainly go through all the initial items you raise. However I can't, for political and personal reasons, get to Brussels before the date the meeting starts. However, apart from a couple of unshiftable engagements, I have got plenty of time available in the days you mention. By far the best option of those you suggest is therefore that you come to London. We can certainly arrange all the meetings

you want.

I must say that I am slightly unclear from your letter however as to exactly what you want to discuss. I assume it is not just Malik's trip as you refer to these 'initial matters' in a way that refers to the discussion we had in Oberlin on which incidentally I think it is a great pity you didn't make any comments on the proposals I made. Here I am perfectly willing to have a discussion but I must make one proviso. I will be at the informal meeting in Brussels for the IMT and while anyone who compromises on principles is a scoundrel who will never build anything, it is also the case that it is necessary to observe certain guidelines and anyone who isn't prepared to make concessions on secondary questions is an irresponsible idiot. In the present circumstances it must be obvious that I can't discuss as the IMT and discuss details of what it has decided or discussed for the October meeting. However as a member of the United Secretariat and a leader of the IMG nobody can or will prevent me from discussing with anybody the general situation inside the International and the chief issues at stake. On that basis I am always willing and keen to discuss with cdes, and in particular those in the LTF, on the situation - as Barry can tell you from long experience at the U.Sec.. I think that The Militant in the old days of the Left Opposition used to carry a quotation from Lenin which said that anyone who didn't read both sides of the argument was an idiot who could be dismissed. That is my attitude to discussions with the LTF - I frequently don't agree with them but I want to hear what they have to say. Furthermore, as I, for evident geographical reasons, hear what the IMT has to say 98% of the time, I am always particularly glad to be able to have a discussion with the cdes of the SWP and the LTF. I would therefore be extremely happy to have a discussion with you, and I think it could be useful, provided it is within the framework I have indicated.

*

*

*

To indicate how I do see things from a U.Sec and IMG point of view, as opposed to a specifically IMT one, I think it is worth just briefly describing how I think at least some of the cdes in Britain see things. The most important to stress is that I think every cde on the leadership, except perhaps for a couple of factional idiots, is quite clear that there is going to be no such thing as any IMT 'discipline' on what comes out of the October U.Sec - nor any chance that

the IMG will not make its views known. This is not merely for general reasons of principle but because on at least three concrete and important issues now - relations with the OCRFI, the motive behind the removal of the OCRFI correspondence from the IIDB, and the position taken on the LCR PB decision on the SWP convention - every one I have spoken to is convinced that the U. Sec took a wrong position. One thing we have learned about in the IMG, frequently the hard way, is about tendency and faction fights. The easiest thing in the world in the last five years would have been to split the IMG or completely erode the authority of its leadership. If we had taken the types of decisions the U. Sec has on some of these questions we could have accomplished it easily. The IMG leadership genuinely supports the IMT politically but I don't think it trusts the U. Secs organisational judgement on a whole number of things. I hope very much that what comes out of the October U. Sec is correct but if it isn't the IMG will take its own position on it - and that particularly applies on issues such as relations with the OCRFI, translations of bulletins etc. In the IMG we don't suppress anyone's views or democracy and we still win a majority and I am deeply suspicious of anyone who flunks on this question - it suggests to me that they don't have confidence in their ideas or don't understand the reason why they support particular positions and therefore feel they can't defend them. We intend to build a powerful organisation in Britain and you can't do that with a membership which only supports a line because it has never heard any other case put before it.

*

*

*

If we turn to what the IMG will support I think it depends entirely what position is taken on the principled position on international democratic centralism. Please do not make any mistake about it but for us, and I think for the IMT, this is a split issue. As I said at the convention we can have disagreements over what powers international leading bodies should have, and certainly no-one is going to do something so idiotic as to split over whether the OCRFI attends the SWP convention, (although you pay a price in the way that the membership of the sections see you when you break U. Sec decisions on such questions), but the principled question of international democratic centralism is something quite different. It is a programmatic position. Once someone stands up, if they were to, and says not 'international leading bodies should have X and Y right to take decisions but not Z right' but instead 'there is no democratic

centralism internationally. Nothing is binding' then that is just as much a violation of principles as if someone were to come forward and propose we were to alter our position on the class nature of the Soviet union, the role of the bourgeoisie in colonial countries etc. I don't like to be pompous in letters but on such an issue I can't help but quote what our Marxist teachers had to say unanimously on this issue

Rosa Luxemburg:

"The center of gravity of the organisation of the proletariat as a class is the International. The International decides in time of peace the tactics to be adopted by the national sections on the questions of militarism, colonial policy, commercial policy, the celebration of May Day, and finally, the collective tactic to be applied in time of war.

The obligation to carry out the decisions of the International takes precedence over all else. National sections which do not conform with this place themselves outside the International." (Theses on the Tasks of International Social Democracy in The Junius Pamphlet)

Lenin:

"All the decisions of the congresses of the Communist International, as well as the decisions of its Executive Committee, are binding on all parties belonging to the Communist International. The Communist International, working in conditions of acute civil war, must be far more centralised in its structure than was the Second International. Consideration must of course be given by the Communist International and its Executive Committee in all their activities to the varying conditions in which the individual parties have to fight and work, and they must take decisions of general validity only when such decisions are possible." (Thesis 16 of the Terms of Admission into the Communist International)

1938 statutes of the Fourth International - prepared for the congress when Trotsky was still alive of course

"The internal structure of the International, on the local, national, and world scales, is determined by the principles and practice of

democratic centralism.

The sections are required to observe the decisions and resolutions of the International Conference, and, in its absence, of the International Executive Committee, represented during the intervals between its meetings by the International Secretariat - while nevertheless retaining the right of appeal before the next higher bodies until the next International Conference." (Point 4)

These positions, which are from among the most authoritative documents of the Marxist movement on political and organisational questions, are quite unequivocal. While each places particular limits on what rights the International and its leading bodies should have - Luxemburg by explicit definition of areas, Lenin through a general warning injunction, and Trotsky through his practice - nevertheless there is not the slightest doubt that all these positions stand for the binding character of decisions of International leading bodies - although of course they might well have had differences on exactly what subjects binding decisions could be taken on etc.

The reason for the organisational position taken by Luxemburg, Lenin and Trotsky is of course obvious - while programme is fundamental, an organisation can only be built around that programme by definite organisational statutes, norms and methods (a good Cannonist principle). An 'International' not founded on this basis would disintegrate. A breakdown of the democratic centralist character of the Fourth International would in a few years, and above all in the types of powerful class struggles which are developing, lead to the destruction and liquidation of the majority of the cadres of the Fourth International. In that sense, if the SWP did come out against the real principle of international democratic centralism, the situation revolutionaries in the International would be faced with would be a 1953 in reverse - in 1953 the SWP felt that with Pablo's undermining of the democracy of the International it was necessary to make a split to save the cadres from liquidation while in the present case, faced with the SWP's threat to the existence of the International, it would also be necessary to take the appropriate steps to save the cadres (I of course don't say that the SWP was correct in the concrete case of 1953, but I agree that if there really was a threat to break up the accumulated forces of the International then a split is preferable to allowing such a project to go through).

*

*

*

So that there is no misunderstanding of what is meant by international democratic centralism however I will just spell out what I see as the main points.

The question of international democratic centralism, and the respective powers of national sections and international leading bodies, is based on the dialectical inter-relation of two elements of Trotskyism - firstly that the political development even in an individual country is composed of the elements of the world process and secondly, however, that each country is a specific and unique form of combination of these elements. As Trotsky put it "the national peculiarities represent an original combination of the basic features of the world process. This originality can be of decisive significance for revolutionary strategy over a span of many years." (Preface to Permanent Revolution). The organisational correlate of this is, simultaneously, the existence of an international organisation based on democratic centralism and based on the domination of the world process over each individual country (as Trotsky put it "only an international organisation can be the bearer of an international ideology") and at the same time the right of the national sections to determine national tactics - only an organisation implanted in the 'original combination', as both theoretical consideration and practical experience shows, is in a position to determine the specificity of the situation in which national tactics must be based.

The exact relation between this international process and national tactics of course differs in differing conditions. In certain extreme situations it may even be correct and necessary to sacrifice national sections to the interests of the international development - Lenin was quite clear that in the event of the start of the German Revolution the Russian state would have to intervene in its support whatever the consequences for Russia itself. If we were in such extreme conditions, if for example one of our sections had taken power in a country and we were waging a campaign against an imperialist armed intervention, then an ultra-centralised, even semi-military, international discipline would be necessary. Every question of national tactics would be completely subordinate to this gigantic fact of the international class struggle. At the other extreme however, where what is involved is a question which is a life and death one for the national party but not the dominant element of the international process, the international has no right to determine even the most basic issue of national tactics -

I note for example that Lenin and Trotsky both severely attacked the line of the Italian Party under Bordigha confronted with the rise of fascism, and Lenin openly declared his support for the policy of Gramsci, but the Third International never once ordered the Italian Party to change its line even although its failure to make such an alteration was literal physical suicide for most of the party. Finally of course in most situations the International leading bodies are best advised to tell anyone to do ^{anything} as little as possible and sit to elaborate general texts, offer advice, regulate relations between sections where there are disputes etc.

Between the two fundamental 'limits', i.e. the principled questions ^{of international democratic centralism and the right of sections to determine national tactics} involved, no timeless and ahistorical answer can be given to the functioning of an International on all questions. However the general guidelines seem to me roughly to be the following

- i. The International has the right to decide, and have as binding, the launching of international campaigns on decisive aspects of the world class struggle.
- ii. Every section has the duty to make known the views of the International on the class struggle even where it disagrees with it i.e. each section has the right and duty to express itself in its own press on all aspects of the national and international class struggle but it has the duty both to distribute international organs of the Fourth International and to make known in its own press what are the views of the International. (ICP and Militant are involved here).
- iii. Only the International can regulate relations with international political organisations - such relations affect many sections and therefore the right to determine them cannot be regulated by one particular section.
- iv. The International has the right to regulate both its own right to be heard and the organisation of international discussion i.e. it has the right to take binding decisions on the organisation of international discussion, to instruct sections to make known the views of the International to their members if this is being obstructed, to instruct national sections to make known the views of international tendencies in disagreement with a national section if this is being prevented etc. (Question violated in practice on certain questions by the U. Sec Majority).
- v. The International has the right to regulate international democracy i.e. that no-one can be excluded from the International for supporting a line which is not in agreement with a national section (e.g. if someone is thrown out of a

section for supporting an international tendency the International can recognise that these people are not outside the Fourth International; if the LCR refuses to discuss with the main component of the OCFI this cannot be taken as a veto on discussion with them).

There are of course other questions involved in international democratic centralism but these seem to me the chief ones for the present.

Considering the present organisational disputes therefore I find myself rather strongly in disagreement with the SWP on certain questions (the use of ICP, relations with the OCFI of a unilateral character etc) but I also consider that these questions of centralism can only be really posed when the U. Sec majority comes forward as a real defender of democracy - democracy being the precondition for centralism. At present the U. Sec Majority does not do this which is why I can agree to joint action with the SWP/LTF on these issues such as bulletins, the OCFI etc. However, just so there is no misunderstanding, once these issues of democracy are resolved then I think it necessary to have a real fight for centralism.

None of the points I have raised cut across the right of national sections to determine national tactics - on the contrary I consider this just as integrally to be defended as international democratic centralism. However the points I have made do involve the international being able to take binding decisions in some areas on the national sections. It is on that latter point that a disagreement in principle may exist. If so of course all particular questions such as the OCFI pale into insignificance.

*

*

*

At present however we don't know if we have a difference in principle. We know there are particular actions of the SWP over which there is disagreement; there are some statements of yours in the deposition to the court, and there is some very wild talk from some ITF members (I mentioned in Oberlin the discussion I had with Art Young). However as regards general statements there are only Cannon's famous speeches, with which I am well acquainted but which don't resolve the specific points under discussion, and the particular actions of the SWP - in addition of course to the question of no binding decisions on national tactics which no-one disagrees with.

As regards the actions of the ITF it is quite clear that they take positions which are not in line with the view that nothing is binding. For example if nothing is binding on anybody anyway why on earth is it worth taking all the trouble to get a correct U. Sec position on the World Congress? Do you seriously maintain that a section is not bound by a U. Sec or IEC resolution to, for example, launch activity as part of an international campaign in defence of the black masses of South Africa or to save Hugo Blanco's life? Why can't the SWP discuss anything it wants with Lambert, instead of referring in your letter to him to matters coming 'within the framework established by the United Secretariat', if no one is bound by those decisions of the U. Sec anyway? If nobody is bound by anything decided internationally, how on earth can the IMG even do such a trivial thing as supply you with its internal bulletins - after all you might suddenly decide to give them to our political opponents?

Until some of the recent short, and not very clear, statements made by the SWP, in which confusion seems to me exist in formulation anyway, I had never read anything which suggested that the SWP considered nothing binding. The International to have no right to determine national tactics is absolutely integral to international democratic centralism for theoretical reasons, but to take a step beyond that to nothing being binding is a violation of real principles of the communist movement. A serious discussion of what, if anything, you mean by international democratic centralism is absolutely crucial to determine whether there is disagreement in principle on this issue. If there is such a real disagreement in principle then obviously it takes priority over all other issues - it is a life and death question to save the International. This question is certainly one of the most urgent I would

like to discuss with the SWP. In particular how it sees the positions of Luxemburg, Lenin, and Trotsky outlined.

*

*

*

If we look at this issue of democratic centralism from another angle however we also have to note the situation of the IM. It may be the case that the SWP challenges the principled basis of international democratic centralism - that remains to be proven. What is proven already however is that the U. Sec Majority in certain of its actions already has acted in practice against international democratic centralism. If there is no translation of documents, if there is no circulation of documents, if there is no right to attend conventions, if there is a discriminatory attitude to political discussions with outside forces then in fact there is an undermining of democracy. And without democracy there can be no centralism. I am very strongly for centralism on those issues where it is correct - which is not national tactics but international campaigns; duty to circulate the press of the International; duty to make known the positions of the International even where the section disagrees with it; right of the International to attempt to persuade, ^{not} order; sections to take a particular line; relations with international ^{organisations} ~~issues~~; issues not of tactics but of principle etc. However an absolute precondition for such centralism is democracy. That is why I am perfectly prepared to co-operate, provided there is no principled obstacle, on the issues I outlined in my original draft.

In relation to this I have been able, since I sent my letter of 6 September, to have a lot more discussion with cdes as they got back off their vacations. In particular I have had several discussions with Brian Grogan and Tariq. Although we need some further discussions on particular points I am very pleased that agreement appears to exist on at least certain points - most importantly various of the ^{ex-}Tendency A cdes have, on reconsideration, changed their position on the issue of discussions with the Lambertists. On such issues as translation of documents, the position of the IC, etc there was agreement anyway. I think that, provided there was no disagreement with the SWP on principled questions, the general position of the IMG leadership would be along the lines we started discussing in Oberlin. What this evidently raises is the exact practical course of action.

On this I think there are two possibilities. If the October U. Sec passes a correct position then I think the IMG leadership will endorse it and make it their own platform.

i.e. making it clear, in a statement in the International, that as far as we are concerned there will be no authoritative and democratic world congress, and therefore no world congress, unless this/ agreement is carried out to the letter.
(i.e. the U.Sec resolution)

In the event that the U.Sec does not take a correct position, but that we agree along the lines we discussed at Oberlin, and no difference of principle exists on the question of international democratic centralism, then I personally would favour exactly what you suggested in the Convention - a clear and public, within the International, bloc to fight on certain key organisational questions. I think the comrades in the IMG would want to discuss this of course - the Russian proverb 'measure your cloth seven times before you cut it' is very apposite on such questions - but I think the IMG leadership is by now well educated on organisation questions of principle. If they became convinced that real issues of principle were involved on democracy, which in my opinion they are, then I think the correct actions would be taken.

* * *

What impact would the IMG taking such a position have? I think it would have some at least. The IMG, while not by any means the biggest section in the International, is not minute. It has a certain strategic geo-political position in the debates in the International. It has a lot of contacts in the European sections. It is a solidly INT sections (92% at the last vote) which carries some weight. I think such a bloc would have a bigger effect certainly than the LTF/SWP by itself or by merely parallel positions IMG-SWP.

I must say quite frankly that I would only favour such a solution in extremis. I would much prefer to persuade the U.Sec majority onto a right course. But the IMG/ is totally committed to opposition to any split in the International which is not justified by principle - one thing we have really done is smash the split men! If the SWP came out against international democratic centralism that would inevitably lead to a split for principled reasons. But the practical course which the U.Sec majority has taken on certain questions would provoke an unprincipled split as it is impossible to hold together even a national organisation, let alone an international one, on the basis of some of the types of decisions they have taken. To prevent such an unprincipled provoking of a split I think the IMG would be prepared to make a real fight against the U.Sec Majority - a fight which at this stage of the game isn't just passing a few resolutions. But, for all the reasons I went into at Oberlin,

it is not a fight I would undertake lightly or eagerly and will certainly not be maneuvered into it to serve any supposed factional interest of the SWP or LTF - which is what I meant by my remark about refusing to be a left cover for the SWP. I am only prepared to make such a fight if it is for the interests of the International which go right above tendencies or factions - it is just the case that I do consider the issues we discussed ^{are} such questions.

*

*

*

Briefly on the Cannon article. It is extremely interesting - absolutely excellent on principles on how to deal with unification approaches but not so clear on the 'faction and party' question. On the latter I think by far the best statement of his, and in fact the best single thing I know on the issue, is Cannon's letter to the SWP Political Committee of 22 May 1961 which you must know. I think that Cannon must have done some important rethinking on this issue as the position in that 1961 letter is much more rounded and correct than the statement on the same issue in the famous 'Factional Struggle and Party Leadership' (See Speeches to the Party p186). The statement of 1961 is so good in fact that, together with Trotsky's statement of the issues involved which can be found in his Writings 1932-33 p54, I think Cannon's words could be put verbatim into the statutes of the International. As, outside of Trotsky, I think there is more to be learnt from Cannon than from anyone else in our movement on how to build a Party (which is a truism to you but which I can assure you is very far from being the 'conventional wisdom' outside the United States), I am always extremely pleased to discuss his views. I hope we can go through the discussion on the article at some point.

*

*

*

Finally I am sorry this has been an extremely long letter. One conclusion I have drawn from five years faction fighting in the IMG however, and before that in the rather rougher school of the IS, is that the only practical politics is principled politics. Everyone I have ever met in that time who tried a manoeuvre finally saw it blow up in his face. I believe now in principled politics because I like winning. I wanted therefore to take a little time to put down exactly what I think. You (i.e. SWP) may be maneuvering like the clappers for all I know, although I hope not, but if you are I just know it will blow up at some point.

In the IMG we intend to build a powerful section in a powerful International so I don't think we'll manoeuvre. I hope you don't intend so either because if you really care, in a famous word, to collaborate, then I am sure we can get things done which both the IMG and the SWP eds have an interest in - and in any case whenever I manage to collaborate with the SWP eds I always learn something!

* * *

The only point I would add on practical issues to the outline I sent is I would like to hear your views on ICP/Inprecor.

* * *

Taken together with the outline I sent, with the above addition, this letter represents more or less my current thinking on the situation in the International. I hope, if you consider it profitable, we can continue the discussion we started at Oberlin. After a rather dreadful start I had the feeling that that meeting looked as if it might get somewhere. You must understand, as I pointed out, that I can't discuss before the U.Sec IMF matters, but even outside those limits I think it is possible to have a fruitful discussion. I personally would be very happy to go through the points raised.

Let me know as much as possible in advance whether you intend to come so that I can fix up my schedule - I need some prior warning because of organising engagements which can be moved but which become progressively harder to do so the less time I have to do it,

fraternally

Alan

P.S. On re-reading this letter the text is scarcely the best organised in the world. However I am on page 43 of my Herby text - I am doing a real history of his current's rise and fall - and I don't have time to rewrite this. Because of the time factor on the post therefore I have sent it as it is.

Just in case you should phone please remember with Barry what I told him about times i.e. I can be contacted at home in the evening but not after 10p.m. our time.