

Xs: Jm, Jdk, (over)

REPORT OF THE AD HOC FACT-FINDING COMMISSION ESTABLISHED BY THE  
UNITED SECRETARIAT TO EXAMINE DISCIPLINARY MEASURES  
TAKEN BY THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST GROUP,  
LEBANESE SECTION OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

March 1978

In December 1976, the Revolutionary Communist Group (RCG), Lebanese section of the Fourth International held its second congress and decided unanimously to take disciplinary measures against two comrades, Selim and Magida, who left Lebanon in March 1976 on leave of absence and had not returned.

On hearing this decision when Comrade Jaber went to Europe in December 1976, comrades Selim and Magida sent a letter to the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, appealing the measures taken against them by the Lebanese section, making counter charges against the functioning of the section and its central leader comrade Jaber, and demanding that an international control commission take up these questions.

At its meeting of April 30, May 1-2, 1977, the United Secretariat passed the following resolution: "To establish an ad-hoc fact finding commission of 2 - 3 comrades and refer its composition to the bureau."

On May 10, 1977, the United Secretariat Bureau designated Otto and Susan Williams as constituting this ad-hoc fact finding commission (FFC).

Because of previous commitments of the commission members and of comrades Selim and Magida it was not possible to take up the work of the FFC during the summer months. Comrade Otto found it necessary to resign from the FFC in September 1977 and at the October 29-31 meeting of the United Secretariat he was replaced by Comrade David.

The FFC met in Paris on November 1 and 2. It interviewed Comrade Rothschild of the International Arab Commission (IAC) and comrades Jaber, Selim, and Magida. On December 10 the FFC interviewed Comrade Roman of the United Secretariat Bureau, Comrade Ben of the IAC, and Comrade Magida. To save expense it was agreed that Comrade Williams would interview Comrade Jafar of the IAC in London, and make a trip to Lebanon. Comrade Williams spent one week in Beirut from the middle of December 1976 where she met members and candidate members of the RCG and attended meetings of the central committee and of the cells. She also interviewed individually the members of the central committee and three former members of the RCG, Comrade Paul who resigned during the summer of 1977, Comrade Adnan who left at the beginning of 1976, and Comrade Nadira who left in 1975. Comrade Williams also met briefly with an organized worker sympathizer of the RCG in Beirut. Finally, Comrade Williams had a brief interview with Comrade Duret of the United Secretariat Bureau on January 30, 1978.

A written statement was given to the FFC by Comrade Rothschild. Another statement, written jointly by Comrades Selim and Magida, was also given to the FFC. Comrade Magida gave the FFC a copy of a letter from Comrade Adnan to the United Secretariat which was dated Chicago, December 1976. Other written material which the FFC referred to are letters addressed to the United Secretariat from members of the IAC, the reorganization proposals for the IAC, and minutes of the IAC.

The FFC met in Brussels on January 31 and February 1, 1978, to consider all the facts and information which had been submitted to it and to draw its conclusions. The FFC received full cooperation in its work from comrades Selim and Magida, all the comrades in Beirut, comrades of the IAC, and comrades in the International center.

The scope of the work of the FFC went beyond ascertaining whether the statutory requirements had been met by the section in making its decision in December 1976 and by comrades Selim and Magida in making counter-charges contained in their letter of December 26, 1976. We looked into the reasons why the section took the decisions it did -- some six months or more after the expiry of the leave of absence of comrades Selim and Magida. We noted the changed position of the newly elected central committee of the Lebanese section regarding this decision at its meeting in January 1977 when Comrade Jaber made a report on his trip to Europe.

We looked at the reasons why comrades Selim and Magida remained in Europe after the leave of absence for each had expired. We noted the political activity they carried out in Europe under the direction of the IAC of which they became members. We examined the role of the IAC, and in particular the reorganized IAC which in its tasks, composition, and functioning directly related to the work of the fact finding commission. In examining the functioning of the Lebanese section and its central leader, Comrade Jaber, we considered the role of the International leadership and the degree to which it had been able to meet its responsibility to help a new section develop correct norms of functioning.

It is in this overall framework that we considered facts and related factors to arrive at our conclusions. It is not possible in this report to take up every single relevant point, brought to our attention in the written and verbal submissions. Our aim is to give a brief objective outline of some key issues which will enable comrades to understand the developments which led to the setting up of the FFC. The conclusions we draw and the recommendations we make are based on the need to find satisfactory solutions to the questions which made it necessary to have a commission and to try to avoid similar problems occurring in the future.

#### The Base of Comrade Selim

After the civil war broke in April 1975 the organizational framework of the Lebanese section, which was based on areas of work, disintegrated and the section reorganized itself on a geographical basis. It divided its forces into two cells -- one in Nabaa and the other in Shiyah, two popular districts of Beirut. The CC did not act as a leadership body throughout the war and each cell made its own initiatives and experiences. Comrade Selim, who was a member of the central committee, was the recognized leader of the Nabaa cell. He made periodic visits from one to one-and-a-half months to Shiyah to discuss with the central committee (CC) members there and exchange information.

After the ceasefire in January 1976 the Nabaa cell unanimously agreed to ask for a written balance sheet of the experiences of the two cells during the war. The Shiyah cell did not agree to this but instead sent Comrade Ziad, also a CC member, to Nabaa to give an oral report on the work of the comrades in Shiyah. It also asked Comrade Selim to go to Shiyah and give the comrades there an oral report of the work in Nabaa.

A few weeks later at a full meeting of the CC, Comrade Selim asked to resign from the CC and to take a leave of absence for personal reasons, stating that given the demoralizing conditions in Nabaa and his own fatigue, it was not possible for him to continue his political work there. The CC refused to accept his resignation and after discussion agreed that Selim should take 15 days leave. In the discussion comrades state that it became clear that Comrade Selim was thinking of giving up

political work and leaving the section. He left on his leave of absence with the understanding that the comrades on the CC hoped that he would return, but if he did not do so it would mean that he had decided to leave the section. Comrade Jaber advised Comrade Selim who was planning to go to Tunisia to go to Paris instead, where he would be able to have some political contact with the forces of the Fourth International. Comrade Selim went to Tunisia toward the end of March and arrived in Paris in April 1976.

During the summer of 1976 Comrade Selim took up political activity in Europe under the direction of the IAC. Comrade Paul, who was still a member of the RCG at that time, made a trip to Paris in June 1976 and talked with Comrade Selim there. Comrade Paul, in his oral submission to the FFC in Beirut in December 1977, stated that at the time of his discussion with Comrade Selim in Paris Comrade Selim did not consider himself still to be a member of the Lebanese section, and did not intend to return to Beirut. He was aware of his contradictory situation vis-à-vis the Fourth International and raised with Comrade Paul the question of his joining the LCR in France. (The FFC points out that it has not had an opportunity to verify Comrade Paul's statement with Comrade Selim. But Comrade Selim's oral submission indicates that he might disagree with it, though he is ambiguous on this point.)

Comrade Selim did not take any steps to join the LCR and continued political activity for the IAC. Later, he supported the analysis made by the IAC of the Lebanese situation and the conclusions it drew for the work of our comrades there. He was not present at the September 1976 meeting of the IAC which adopted the reorganization plans and the resolution which was considered necessary for the implementation of these plans. He attended the October and November meetings of the reorganized IAC, accepting assignments, one of which was to work with Comrade Gérard to produce a detailed outline of a text to be the basis of drafting a new resolution on the Arab East for the next World Congress. At the November meeting of the IAC Comrade Selim was formally proposed as a member of the IAC.

From the time Comrade Selim left Lebanon in March 1976 he did not write or communicate directly with the Lebanese section. When he did not return and did not get in touch with them the comrades in Lebanon concluded that he had left the section. The comrades were disappointed but there was no question of taking any disciplinary action against him. This did not arise until they heard in October 1976 that Comrade Selim was a member of the IAC and that the IAC had been reconstituted on the basis of an analysis different from that held by the comrades in Lebanon. The comrades in Lebanon then decided that it was necessary to clarify Comrade Selim's relationship to the section and the International.

#### The case of Comrade Magida

Comrade Magida was also a member of the CC. During the war she was not allocated to either of the cells because of the nature of the work she was doing. She acted as a liaison between them when possible and helped in any way she could. During the war she received serious injuries which necessitated going to Europe to get specialist treatment. She left Lebanon in March 1976 on a leave of absence to get this treatment which she expected would take one-and-a-half months. In her mind, and as far as the leadership was concerned, Comrade Magida would then return to Lebanon. The treatment took longer than originally expected but in the summer of 1976 it was still her intention to return to Lebanon after completing her treatment. Later she became convinced to stay in Europe, first by members of the IAC who considered her plans to return to Leba-

non during the peak of the war in August 1976 to be very dangerous, and later because she became convinced of the analysis of the IAC on the Lebanese situation and its conclusions for the work of our comrades there.

It is not clear when Comrade Magida was made a member of the IAC, nor by whom, but in the report on the September 1976 meeting of the Arab Commission she voted for the reorganization plans and for the following motion:

"Considering:

- a) That information we have received indicates that the current objective situation in Lebanon makes it extremely difficult to carry out effective political work;
- b) That the Arab Commission has elaborated a plan for the reorganization of the Arab work of the International which requires the presence of comrades Majida and Selim, the Arab commission believes that comrades Majida and Selim can be more effective in building the FI if they remain in Europe during the coming period, so long as considerations a and b continue to hold. The Arab Commission therefore requests that the United Secretariat assign these comrades to remain in Europe and help implement the project of the commission and to communicate this decision to the comrades in Lebanon."

From the time Comrade Magida left Beirut in March 1976 she did not write or get in touch with the section to inform them of the reasons why she was remaining in Europe and to tell them of the work she was doing under the direction of the IAC. Comrade Magida informed the committee, however, that she had tried unsuccessfully in the late summer to telephone Comrade Jaber.

The section heard indirectly that she had undertaken a speaking tour in Japan during the summer of 1976 and that she was carrying out political work for the IAC. They were surprised that she did not write to them but did not think that this meant she would not be returning to Lebanon. Early in October 1976, Comrade Jaber made a telex contact with Rouge and Comrade Ben telephoned him. This was the first direct contact with the section for around two months. Comrade Jaber was informed over the telephone of the analysis of the IAC on the situation in Lebanon, the conclusions drawn for our work there and of the reorganization plans for the IAC which had been adopted. He was also informed that comrades Selim and Magida were in agreement with the reorganization plans and and members of the IAC. At the same time he learned that the United Secretariat Bureau had approved the reorganization plans and decisions of the IAC. Comrade Jaber made it clear that he was opposed to the analysis made by the IAC, and of its reorganization plans and its new composition.

Several days later, at the meeting of the IAC of October 9-10, Comrade Ben reported on his telephone conversation with Comrade Jaber and on the analysis which the comrades in Lebanon had of the situation there. The IAC decided that Comrade Duret, a member of the United Secretariat Bureau, should get in touch with the comrades in Lebanon in order to discuss the reorganization plan of the IAC, the status of comrades Selim and Magida, and the future work of the group in Lebanon. This meeting, which was the first meeting of the IAC after the adoption of the reorganization plans, continued working on the basis of these plans which were, in their opinion, dependent for success on comrades Selim and Magida remaining in Europe. At the November meeting of the IAC comrades Selim and Magida were among those proposed for membership on the reconstituted IAC.

The Positions of the RCG Leadership in Relation to Comrades Selim and Magida

Meanwhile the remaining members of the CC of the RCG in Beirut met and took some decisions in relation to the status of comrades Selim and Magida and relations between the International and the section during the civil war. The Lebanese comrades felt strongly that the International center had failed in its obligation toward them during the civil war. It had not given them the political and material help which a small group, isolated as it was, could have expected from it during the war situation. They were faced with immense political and financial problems and they needed the help of the International leadership in discussing them out. Above all they needed to know that the forces of the Fourth International as a whole were in solidarity with their struggle, carrying out solidarity actions and giving maximum publicity to it in the press of the sections. The comrades maintain that they did not get such help. No one from the International leadership visited them nor offered to do so throughout the war period. A meeting could have been held in Cyprus, they claim, if the situation was too difficult to go to Beirut.

Throughout the whole war the comrades claim that people were entering and leaving Lebanon and they could have been contacted. It was easier to make contact with Beirut from France or London than the other way around. Given the lack of concern, as the RCG comrades saw it, for the situation, they considered the decisions of the reorganization of the IAC and its consequences for the work of the comrades in Lebanon to be a provocation. It was in this context that the remaining CC members decided at a meeting in October "to suspend Comrade Magida and call to the attention of the International that Selim had deserted the section and thus the International, and that he and Magida could not be integrated in any of its bodies without the approval of their section, according to the statutes of the Fourth International. A resolution of four points was adopted, one of which was a notification of the status of Selim and Magida and considered as a protest against their presence in the recently and undemocratically formed Arab commission."

The four point resolution was as follows:

"To consider former RCG members presently out of the country to be out of the RCG and thus out of the International.

To ask for the dissolution of the central Arab commission.

To ask for the discharging of Comrade Vergeat from the responsibility for Arab work.

To ask the center of the Fourth International for a self-criticism about its attitude towards the Lebanese situation."

These points were read to Comrade Ben on the telephone. Later Comrade Jaber was asked to make a trip to Europe, to discuss these points and other matters. He agreed and went to Europe in late December 1976. Before this happened the RCG held an extraordinary congress in Beirut in December 1976. This dealt with two items: 1) a report on the political situation and 2) organizational report. Both of these reports were presented orally to the congress. The report on the political situation was seen as an introductory report which would be finalized in a written form for a conference to be held in 1977. The comrades claim that this extraordinary congress was necessary in order to elect a new central committee so that the section would have a more representative leadership to reorient the section following the demoralization of the aftermath of the civil war. Contained in the organizational report was an item of the cases of Selim and Magida and the congress voted unanimously to support the positions of the CC which have been outlined above.

Comrade Jaber went to Europe in late December and first attended a meeting of the IMT bureau. This meeting discussed the meaning of the four-point resolution which the RCG congress had passed. As far as Selim was concerned the resolution meant that he was not a member of the section and therefore outside of the Fourth International. As far as Magida was concerned her membership was "frozen," (Comrade Rothschild, who was invited to the meeting for this item, explained to the FFC that the report was given in French and the word "geler" was used.) In clarifying this it became clear that Magida was not considered expelled, but suspended, and could therefore not be a member of the IAC, although she could be a sympathizer of the ICR.

The IMT bureau meeting further discussed the reasons for the action against Comrade Magida, but when it began to discuss the cases of the two comrades to see if some solution could be found Comrade Rothschild intervened to make two statements:

- 1) that the IMT bureau had no authority to discuss the matter and
- 2) that he would report the comments of Comrade Jaber to comrades Selim and Magida and that he fully expected them to appeal the decision of the RCG to the International Control Commission.

There was no further discussion on this point, but Comrade Jaber then reported on the other points of the four point resolution adopted by the congress of the RCG.

Later Comrade Jaber made a report to the United Secretariat giving his analysis of the civil war and the current situation. At a separate session he reported on the decisions of the RCG concerning comrades Selim and Magida. The meeting was informed by Comrade Rothschild, who was invited for this point, that he had spoken to the two comrades on the telephone and they intended to appeal the RCG congress decisions and make counter charges.

Subsequently Comrade Jaber met with the United Secretariat Bureau and there was an attempt to reach a solution that would avoid the expense and rancor of a control commission. An attempt was made informally to reach a solution which could be taken back to be considered by the comrades in Beirut. Comrade Magida insisted that her case and that of Comrade Selim were the same and would not consider a solution that did not recognize this and treat both cases alike.

Comrade Jaber returned to Beirut in January 1977 and called the first meeting of the newly elected CC at which he reported on his trip to Europe and the cases of Magida and Selim were discussed again. The minutes of the CC contain the following paragraphs and were distributed to the RCG membership:

"7. The relations with the International were discussed. Concerning the four point resolution of the extraordinary second congress:

A. The United Secretariat took note officially and unanimously of the fact that Selim and Magida are out of the RCG and that it was thus impossible to designate them in any of the bodies of the International in application of the statutes in force. In this respect, the CC examined again the status of Selim and Magida and adopted by a majority vote the following resolution:

- 1) The CC confirms the decision of the second convention of the RCG to consider that Selim, who abandoned his militant tasks, thus put himself out of the RCG and out of the International. His organizational status in Europe should not in any case and until further notice go beyond the status of sympathizer.

2) The CC decides to annul the decision of suspension concerning Comrade Magida and to consider favorably any demand of transfer she would present. This decision is based on considerations relating exclusively to the personal status (physical and moral) of the comrade. It is in any case neither an approval of the political justification that she gives for her presence in Europe nor a justification of her behavior in Europe during the last months. On the contrary, the CC considers Comrade Magida to be responsible for acting against the political line of the RCG and without contacting it, particularly by her voluntary decision to remain in Europe against the will of the RCG and by transmitting her own opinion on strictly internal matters to people out of the RCG and out of the International. The CC notes at the same time that Selim and Magida have communicated internal organizational details concerning the RCG which are hidden even to a part of its membership (such as the number of members of the CC). This practice is very dangerous given the precedents Selim and Magida in divulging internal matters; it is an evident infraction of organizational secrecy. The Bureau of the United Secretariat should prevent it."

Members of the CC gave evidence to the FFC that contacts of the RCG and friends of Comrade Selim had returned from France telling them that comrades Selim and Magida had asked them to stay in France, suggesting that they could get work for them at Rouge. At the same time they made attacks on the section, being derisive about the size and activities of the RCG, claiming that it was under the bureaucratic control of Comrade Jaber. They knew of the setting up of the FFC and had other internal information which as non-members of the RCG they should not have had. The FFC did not check on this evidence. Nor did it check on the evidence submitted to it by comrades Selim and Magida that personal attacks had been made against them to non-members of the RCG. The members of the CC of the RCG, including Comrade Paul, who has left the RCG in the past months, maintained that personal attacks were not made by them against comrades Selim and Magida. When the comrades did not return and political activists of the left asked about them, it became necessary for members of the RCG to state that Selim had left his political tasks in Lebanon and that Magida had decided to remain in Europe and they disagreed with both of these decisions.

#### Conclusions of the Fact Finding Commission

The FFC notes that as from January 1977 had Comrade Magida written to the Lebanese section asking for a transfer to another section of the Fourth International, a letter of transfer would have been sent to the appropriate body. She has not done so. As she stated to the FFC, she is of the opinion that her case and that of Comrade Selim are the same and should not be considered separately.

The FFC points out that the reasons for their leave of absence were different and the basis on which they left Beirut were different. To the knowledge of the FFC Comrade Selim has never considered returning to Beirut to take up political activity again there. In not returning from his leave of absence or clarifying his position with the RCG, he did in fact relinquish his membership in the RCG. Comrade Magida, on the other hand, did intend to return to take up political activity again in the Lebanese section on completion of her medical treatment, until she became convinced by September 1976 of the reorganization proposals of the IAC.

The FFC considers that it was incorrect for comrades Selim and Magida to become members of the IAC without first clarifying their membership positions with the RCG and applying to join or be transferred to the LCR in France had this become necessary. It is clear that comrades cannot have the rights of membership in the Fourth International without being integrated into a section of the Fourth International. In the case of Comrade Magida, the Lebanese section will give her a letter of transfer if she does not wish to return to Lebanon.

The FFC considers that Comrade Selim should be given an opportunity to rectify his error in relinquishing his membership. He could have done this when he decided it was possible for him to take up political activity again by applying to join the French LCR, but up until now he has failed to do this.

The FFC recommends that Comrade Magida should be integrated into a section of the Fourth International as a member in good standing and that her political activity should become the responsibility of whichever section she joins.

The FCC recommends that Comrade Selim's application for integration into a section of the Fourth International be considered favorably by the section, but stipulates that his status will depend on the normal procedures prevailing for application for membership in whichever section he applies to join.

The FFC considers that it would be better if they could be reintegrated into the Lebanese section since they are comrades with some experience and our forces in Lebanon are very small. However, the FFC recognizes that the deterioration of relationships between the two comrades and the section does not make this a realistic proposition right now. It considers that the International leadership together with the Lebanese section and the two comrades concerned should work toward reaching an improvement in the relationships so that it could be possible for comrades Selim and Magida to be reintegrated into the RCG at a later date if they decide to return to Lebanon.

The FFC points out that it may have been possible to have avoided much of the deterioration in the relationships between the two comrades and the RCG if members of the IAC and the United Secretariat Bureau who were aware of the situation of comrades Selim and Magida had advised them correctly to get their situation clarified with the RCG and seek its collaboration with them in their political activities. The FFC also considers that relations may not have deteriorated to the extent that they have had the maximum effort been made to discuss with the RCG before adopting reorganization plans which so directly affected it. It does not surprise the FFC that the RCG finds it difficult to accept that the reorganization plans really were considered to be only provisional -- until contact was made with it. Leaving aside whether the IAC or the United Secretariat Bureau had done everything possible to establish contact with the comrades in Lebanon before the reorganization plans were adopted, contact had been established before the first meeting of the reorganized IAC in October 1976. The minutes of this meeting held on October 9-10 show that it was not seen as a priority before taking any steps to implement the reorganization proposals to invite Comrade Jaber to Europe to discuss these proposals and to consider the opinions of the RCG. Formally the proviso to do so was written into the reorganization plans, but events rather give support to the view of the RCG that the IAC did not act in good faith towards it. There are some other points which the FFC wishes to draw attention to concerning the IAC and its reorganization plans and this will be done at the end of the report.



Before proceeding to take up the counter charges made by comrades Selim and Magida against the RCG and Comrade Jaber, the FFC has some points to make concerning the statutory requirements which have to be observed when charges are made. It is a basic norm of the Trotskyist movement that the accused must be presented with the charges in advance and have the right to present their defense and, except where geographically impossible, to confront their accusers in the body having jurisdiction in the case (cf. point 43 of the statutes of the Fourth International). The FFC notes that the Lebanese section did not meet these basic statutory requirements in taking disciplinary measures against the comrades. It also notes that comrades Selim and Magida, in appealing the disciplinary measures taken against them and making counter charges against the functioning of the section and Comrade Jaber, did not observe them either. The specific charges relating to the assertions made in their letter to the United Secretariat dated December 1976 were not outlined in this letter nor sent to the section. It was not until the FFC began its work that these specific charges were presented by comrades Selim and Magida in their joint statement to the FFC in November 1977.

To the knowledge of the FFC it was not geographically impossible for comrades Selim and Magida to have attended the extraordinary congress of the RCG in December. Whether they would have attended is irrelevant and it is not possible to ascertain this since they were not given the opportunity to do so. Their complaint on this point is legitimate. Likewise we think it is legitimate for the comrades in Lebanon to hold the opinion that the counter charges should have been made known to them and that they should have had the opportunity to be confronted by comrades Selim and Magida to discuss before the membership the allegations they made against the section.

It is always necessary to proceed correctly and to show good faith when charges and counter charges are made. The FFC considers that the content of the CC resolution of the RCG of January 1977 was prejudicial against comrades Selim and Magida. Since they had not been given the opportunity to defend themselves before the RCG the circulating of the resolution to the membership can harm the development of future comradely collaboration between comrades Selim and Magida and the present members of the RCG.

#### Counter Charges Made by Comrades Selim and Magida Against the RCG and its Central Leader, Comrade Jaber

Comrades Selim and Magida claim that expulsion is a widespread practice in the RCG and that five members at the time of its founding conference in 1974 have since been expelled. They include in the five the case of comrades Selim and Magida and three comrades whom they alleged were expelled for factional activity against the RCG. We have already taken up the cases of comrades Selim and Magida and the facts show that they were not expelled from the RCG. The facts also show that three comrades were engaged in factional activity against the group, and two of the comrades were expelled. On their own admission to the control commission which was set up, they were organizing a secret faction within the RCG and trying to recruit to it members and contacts of the RCG. The third comrade, Nadira, who gave an interview to the FFC in Beirut, was not expelled. She recognized the error she had made in helping to organize the secret faction and insisted that she remain a member of the RCG. She was removed from the CC and participated in the student cell as a candidate member from 1974-75. She left the RCG because she considered the group had failed to work out a program and orientation to students. She has remained politically active, working with various Palestinian organizations during the war,

but is not a member of any organization. Ideologically she remains a Trotskyist and sees the need for a Trotskyist organization that has a program and an orientation to win support from all sectors of the masses, including teachers, students, etc. At the same time she does not yet have confidence in the RCG to do this.

On the case of the disciplinary actions taken against the members of the RCG on the question of a secret faction, the FFC was informed by comrades Selim, Magida, Jaber, and Nadira that Comrade Sami, a member of the informal body known as The Arab Leadership (set up at the time of the Tenth World Congress) was involved in the setting up of the secret faction. Along with other Iraqi comrades he advised some Lebanese comrades to organize a secret faction as a means of changing the relationship of forces inside the group. At the time of the first congress of the RCG, prior to the Tenth World Congress, where a report was made to the International to recognize the RCG as the Lebanese section, the secret faction was discovered.

It was not possible for the FFC to meet with Comrade Sami to verify his role in the secret faction, but something needs to be said about the fact that although there was a control commission to take up the charges of secret factionalism against the three members of the RCG, no investigation was made by the RCG leadership or by any other body of the alleged role of the Iraqi comrades in relation to the secret faction. In the opinion of the FFC this was incorrect. In the circumstances it suggests that it is permissible to have one code of conduct for some comrades in the Fourth International and another for others. Comrades can wrongly draw the conclusion that there are privileges for some comrades giving them protection against possible disciplinary action being taken against them. The fact that the Iraqi comrades were looked to for being experienced comrades of the International is all the more reason why the allegations that they had advised RCG comrades to organize a secret faction should have been looked into by an appropriate body. Not to have done so is a miseducation of comrades regarding the norms of functioning of a Leninist organization and harmful to international relations.

Comrades Selim and Magida allege that student comrades were expelled from the RCG for refusing to take up the specific university courses demanded of them by the RCG leadership. The current leadership of the RCG denies that student comrades have been expelled for these reasons. RCG leaders explained to the FFC the particular problems they face in combatting the strong pressures on students to leave Lebanon and go away to study, or to take up courses at one of the universities in Beirut which makes heavy demands on students' time. Their general policy is to discourage comrades and contacts from leaving Lebanon and encourage them to attend the university which the RCG considers offers the greatest potential for political activity. This policy would be taken into account when considering whether a student sympathizer should become a candidate member or a full member. A case was cited to the FFC by CC members of a candidate member who was reduced to sympathizing status because he was not willing to accept the recommendation of the student cell regarding his choice of course or university.

The FFC recognizes the problem that the RCG has in combatting the particular pressures on students in Lebanon. However, it points out that membership in the Fourth International is voluntary. The degree of commitment and activity of each member is dependent in the main on the political understanding of each comrade and the degree to which the leadership and organization as a whole is able to instill confidence in its program and activities to inspire comrades to make

the utmost self-sacrifices in pursuit of its aims. Young comrades do not join the organization with this kind of commitment, but membership in the Leninist organization helps them to attain it. There are many cases throughout the International where student comrades have decided to give up their studies, throwing away their opportunities to gain degrees, or upon completion of their courses have put their career qualifications aside in order to work full time in some aspect of the work of building the revolutionary party. After discussing out with comrades the most useful course of action to take in relation to education courses or where to work, etc., it must be left to the comrade concerned to make the decision. Any change considered necessary to be made in the status of a comrade should be on the basis of the actual inability of any comrade to meet the requirements of membership, candidate membership, or sympathizer status, and not on some situation that might arise some time in the future.

A further charge is made by comrades Selim and Magida that comrades who decide to leave the RCG are considered by the RCG as expelled from the Fourth International and therefore unable to become members of another section. To the knowledge of the FFC there is no concrete evidence of this. No evidence was given that either of the two comrades cited, comrades Adnan and Usama, have ever applied to join the French LCR or any other section. In the case of Comrade Adnan, after he left Lebanon he spent a short time in France and in the United States in search of work and then returned to Lebanon where he is presently living and working. To avoid any confusion on this question the FFC considers it relevant to state that comrades who decide to leave the RCG put themselves outside of the Fourth International. This does not mean that comrades who leave the RCG and later go and live in another country cannot become members of another section of the Fourth International. Providing they meet the requirements of membership of that particular section, there is no constitutional reason why they cannot do so. (This does not suggest that it would be correct to advocate that comrades should leave a section and then rejoin the Fourth International by taking up membership in another section. In considering such an application a section would want to take the previous political development of a comrade into account. This means it should seek the advice of the section of which the comrade had been a member.) But this is different from being transferred from one section to another and which applies to members in good standing who leave a section with the approval of its national leadership to go and live in another country for a period generally longer than six months.

Comrades Selim and Magida make some other charges relating to the internal functioning of the RCG and the conduct of its central leader, Comrade Jaber. Specifically they charge that Comrade Jaber exercises a strong "intellectual repression" over comrades who do not agree with his positions. They allege that the lack of internal discussion and internal discussion bulletins prevents comrades from making a political development and that when disagreements arise Comrade Jaber uses non-political methods -- like accusing comrades of not being Marxist and of being politically ignorant, etc., and in this way gets his position adopted. The FFC is not taking up each criticism or every example of the alleged incorrect functioning of the RCG and Comrade Jaber made by comrades Selim and Magida and other former members of the RCG. Nor does it take up the specific criticisms made to it of aspects of the functioning of comrades Selim and Magida and others who are no longer members of the RCG that the FFC heard in the course of the work of the FFC. In many cases differing versions of the same incidents were given to the FFC and it is not able to judge

which version is correct. What the FFC considers to be important is to bring to the attention of the RCG aspects of its functioning which the FFC considers to have been incorrect, noting some changes which have taken place in the past months and explaining the necessity of ensuring that their organizational practices are based on Leninist principles of organization and how otherwise they will not be able to grow quantitatively or qualitatively.

In adopting this approach we take into account that the RCG is a relatively new section of the Fourth International. It was given the status of a section at the 1974 World Congress. The size and social composition of its forces now are not qualitatively different from what they were at the time of its founding congress in 1974. The role of the leadership and a healthy internal life are key questions in the building of a revolutionary organization whatever its size. It takes time and experience to build a collective leadership with the authority to guide and centralize all the activities of the party. But from the very beginning it is necessary to have correct norms of functioning; otherwise it will not be possible to develop the program, work out the correct orientation, and set realistic tasks which will enable a small group to increase its forces.

The fundamental organizational principle on which the Leninist organization is based is that of democratic centralism. This is not some abstract formula but constitutes an interrelated process of democracy in deciding party policy and centralized action in carrying it out. Democracy is basically a method of reaching a decision. It requires that first all viewpoints should be heard in debating a question, then a vote is taken and then the decision of the majority is carried out. Centralism is basically a method of exercising the right of the majority to see that its decision is carried out. The important concept is that for centralism to be effective every member has to have the opportunity to be involved in the process of a democratic discussion and decision-making. It is the leadership's responsibility to ensure that the necessary conditions for this exist within the organization. Three important requirements have to be met. The members must have access to all the relevant information concerning the issues to be discussed, adequate time to consider them, and an atmosphere must prevail that makes it possible for the issues to be debated out in a democratic manner. The internal information bulletin and the internal discussion bulletin are the usual vehicles for distributing written contributions from the leadership and rank-and-file members. The internal discussion bulletin is part of the essential preparation for a democratic national congress, which decides on the basis of its political analysis the major tasks of the section for the period ahead. An important part of this discussion usually involves drawing a balance sheet of the work of the organization in the previous period. In this way the work can be assessed, mistakes can be corrected, political differences can be resolved, and policies adopted can be carried out in a centralized manner. The task of the central committee elected at the national conference is to guide the membership and centralize its activities in the carrying out of the policies adopted and it is accountable to the whole organization.

The FFC states that this is not the way the RCG has been functioning. We are of the opinion that the inability of the leadership to organize adequate democratic discussion within the organization is the source of much of the frustration which some members have felt over the past years. It is an important contributory factor for some comrades' leaving the RCG. Dissatisfaction with the orientation of the group and with not being able to see the possibility of getting the kind of internal discussion that would make it possible for changes

to be made was a factor in the cases of the three former members of the RCG whom the FFC interviewed in Beirut. Comrade Nadira, who left in 1975, Comrade Adnan who left in early 1976, and Comrade Paul who left in mid-summer 1977. It is necessary to state here that Comrade Paul, in making this point, did not give it as his central reason for leaving. He had some personal reasons for leaving also, but his inability to see the possibilities for making changes in the orientation and functioning of the group which he considered necessary for any significant growth of the RCG was one of the factors which influenced him in making his decision to leave.

The FFC notes that the CC failed to act as a central leadership body in the period of the civil war. Each cell developed its own initiatives and operated quite independently from each other. The comrades state that the conditions of war made it impossible except in periods of truce for the cells to come together. But the majority of CC members were able to continue meeting every month or so. Information was exchanged at these meetings but no line of action was developed for the organization as a whole and no assessment made of the experiences of each cell. As already explained earlier in the report, in the truce at the beginning of 1976 a request was made from one of the cells for each cell to write up a balance sheet of its experiences for discussion. The FFC notes that this request was refused basically because two members of the CC could not see what useful purpose could be achieved by it. The FFC is of the opinion that a written balance sheet and discussion on the different experiences of the cells in the first period of the war could have helped the comrades in the RCG to collectively assess their experiences; correct any errors they had made, and work out a unified course of action for the next period. Whatever the outcome of such a discussion it would have been the correct way to proceed and the only way to overcome the demoralization that many comrades were beginning to experience.

Instead, some comrades who saw no way of getting a discussion and making any necessary changes became more frustrated. In the cases of comrades Selim and Adnan this was a factor in their decision to leave the section.

The FFC also notes that after the war an extraordinary conference of the RCG was held in December 1976. An oral report was given on the political situation and on some organizational questions and a new CC was elected. This congress was seen as preparatory to another which was to be adequately prepared and held in 1977. This has not yet taken place, although the CC comrades informed the FFC that preparation for the next congress is now underway. The FFC notes that an internal bulletin has been opened for contributions on organizational questions and copies of it were given to the FFC.

The internal discussion bulletin has an important role in the democratic functioning of a Leninist type party but the bulletin in and of itself does not meet all the requirements of a democratic discussion. It is not possible to have a democratic discussion and make democratic decisions if the atmosphere is not one in which comrades can freely speak their minds. It is the leadership's responsibility to set an example in making sure that the tone of all discussions is comradely, education in approach, and free from any form of intimidation. Only in such an atmosphere can the issues be debated in a serious manner. This is part of the process of helping comrades to develop into self-acting and critically minded cadres. It is impermissible to condone or excuse any comrade who introduces a political method of any kind into our movement. Even more so is it impermissible to excuse a leader who shouts at comrades or accuses them of

political ignorance, on the grounds that he has a nervous temperament and is under many pressures. This may be the case, but it is no excuse for allowing the use of apolitical methods which are alien to the Trotskyist movement. Whether it is the intention or not to get support by intimidation instead of through political reasoning is irrelevant. In practice it means just that. At all times it is the responsibility of the leadership to see that the correct atmosphere prevails in all bodies of the organization so that discussions can take place in a democratic manner. On the basis of the evidence given to it the FFC has to state that the leadership of the RCG has made errors in this respect. We also note that not one comrade of the former CC or the newly elected CC considers such practices to be correct. Comrades Selim and Magida in their statement recognize that as part of the former leadership they take a share of the responsibility for some of the errors in the functioning of the RCG over the past years. The position of the current leadership is that it does not intend to repeat mistakes made in this connection in the past. A conscious effort is being made to organize a better division of labor within the leadership to enable it to function better and raise the political level of the organization as a whole.

The FFC records that the three former members of the RCG who gave interviews to the FFC in Beirut continue to be Trotskyists ideologically. The FFC is of the opinion that the RCG leadership should have a perspective of winning them back to the section.

Comrades Selim and Magida claim that the RCG is not an organization in the real sense of the term -- in that its functioning has nothing in common with the functioning of a Leninist organization and it is numerically small. The FFC has drawn attention to some aspects of the functioning of the RCG which if not corrected will prevent it from developing into a Leninist combat party. It is a fact that its forces are small and that there has been no real growth since it became the section at the 1974 World Congress.

However, the FFC has no evidence before it that the functioning of the RCG in the period since it became the section is qualitatively different from 1974 when it was given the status of the section. The FFC does not have before it the criteria on which the decision for the RCG to become a section was based. What the FFC thinks is pertinent is to what degree has the International leadership over the past four years been able to help the RCG to function correctly and develop the correct political orientation to enable it to grow. To the knowledge of the FFC no member or members of the IEC, apart from the comrades in charge of Arab work in general, were given the specific task of following the work of this new section and the responsibility to help it function correctly.

The FFC recognizes that the past four years were intense years in the factional struggle in the Fourth International. The International leadership and center were weakened in that there was no real collaboration at the International leadership level to make it possible to organize a satisfactory division of labor and there was a lack of material resources at the International center. This new and small section, which was geographically isolated in an important political area where there is no tradition of Trotskyism, had immense objective and subjective difficulties to overcome. Many of the problems it had to face are those of any similar small group -- the need to develop a leadership and work out the necessary division of labor to attend to the education of its forces; the writing, production, and selling of its publications; and the working out of its political line for intervention in the class struggle. The RCG faced additional problems arising out of the civil war situation which existed for

approximately eighteen months (including the short truce periods). New forms of political activity and organization were necessary and comrades had to face severe financial problems, food shortages, and dangerous physical war conditions.

The RCG as well as two experienced former members, comrades Adnan and Paul, consider that the International center did not give them the help which they could have expected. The section has expressed its criticisms to the International leadership. It remains loyal to the Fourth International, defending it against strong political opponents. It is anxious to have the collaborative help of the International leadership in the political and organizational tasks it faces in order to build a strong section in Lebanon.

A report has been made by Comrade Williams to the United Secretariat Bureau giving information regarding the current size, internal functioning, and political activities of the RCG at the time of her visit in December 1977, and there is no need to repeat it again in this report. The unanimous view of the current CC of the RCG, of which two thirds of its members are on the ICC for the first time, is that they are anxious that after the work of the FFC is concluded a fresh start be made in the relations between the International center and the section. The FFC is of the opinion that it could be helpful if one or two comrades from the IEC who have party building experience could be assigned to more closely follow the work of the Lebanese section and through collaboration help the section to grapple with some of its specific problems.

#### Leadership of Arab Work.

Before the IAC was first established after the IEC meeting in February 1976, work in the Arab region was coordinated through an informal body consisting of comrades Vergeat, Mikado, Jaber, and Sami. Comrades Selim and Magida claim that Comrade Jaber monopolized and insisted on directing nearly all the Arab work alone. This resulted in a serious error being made which had severe consequences for our Egyptian and Iraqi comrades.

The FFC has not been able to meet with the comrades of this Arab leadership body and discuss how it functioned. If it were the case that Comrade Jaber directed this work nearly alone, the responsibility for such a situation would seem to rest on all the comrades who made up this informal body and on the International body to which it was responsible.

On the specific issue of an error of judgment which was made in that a police agent was treated in all good faith as a comrade, Comrade Jaber recognizes that he made an error in this respect. Comrade Jaber informed the FFC that the error was not his alone since Comrade Sami had introduced the police agent to him and organized the agent's visit to Beirut in 1975. The FFC has not been able to discuss this and related issues with Comrade Sami.

Errors of judgment have been made in the past and will be made from time to time in the future. The important thing is not to think that errors won't be made but to seek to function in a way that helps to eliminate as many errors as possible. This means that our aim is to act collectively. This requires that all the information must be given to those who are required to make decisions in particular areas of work and to carry out these decisions. This is the way we arrive at collective decisions and action and help to avoid making errors. But errors made in this way are not placed on the shoulders of an individual, but are the collective responsibility of the unit as a whole. It is not correct in the opinion of the FFC to ask individual

comrades to be involved in activity of a dangerous character if they have not been informed of the nature of the work, understand it and then agree to carry it out. Given the reservations and opposition which some members of the CC of the Lebanese section had to the visit to Beirut of the person who was later confirmed to be a police agent, it was incorrect for Comrade Jaber to go ahead with it.

Before ending its report the FFC thinks it pertinent to raise some questions in relation to the reorganization plans of the IAC which it considers the United Secretariat should examine.

### The International Arab Commission and Its Reorganization Proposals

The first IAC was set up following discussions held at the time of the IEC meeting in February 1976. It had two major functions: to coordinate and centralize the efforts to establish revolutionary Marxist nuclei in the Maghreb countries; to serve as a transmission belt between existing nuclei in the Arab East and the International as a whole, which entailed writing articles for Inprecor, overseeing the activity of the Arab commissions in various sections in Europe and coordinating that activity as far as possible, and distributing written material prepared by the groups in the region, etc. By July 1976 the functioning of the IAC was impaired because problems of the French LCR Arab commission were taken into the IAC. In August 1976 members of the IAC in Europe discussed the reorganization of its work and Comrade Rothschild was asked by them to draft proposals for reorganization. At its meeting in September the IAC considered these proposals and adopted a reorganization plan which is outlined in the Proposal for Reorganization of the IAC. These proposals were based on a number of changes in the objective situation which were outlined by the IAC as:

1. The commission has been unable to carry out the task of centralizing and coordinating the work of establishing nuclei in the Maghreb. The basic reason for this has been twofold: lack of clarity on the relationship between the responsibilities of the International commission and those of the French commission; organizational and political differences within the French commission, which have since resulted in the dissolution of that body.
2. The events in Lebanon have qualitatively altered the situation of the revolutionary Marxist nucleus there. As far as international work is concerned, the most obvious sense in which this is true is that contact between the group and the center has been virtually cut off. In addition, whatever the current conditions of the comrades there and whatever the medium-term evolution of the civil war, Lebanon will no longer be able to serve as a center for the organization of our work in the region, at least for a period of time, because of the impossibility of travel back and forth and because of the lack of functioning of communications systems.
3. A number of leading comrades from groups in the region are now in Europe on a more or less extended basis. Consequently, the available resources for conducting Arab work in Europe have expanded.
4. For many months now it has been impossible for the comrades in Lebanon to publish Munadil, which had served as the central political voice of Arab revolutionary Marxists. In fact, one of the tasks of the commission had been precisely to distribute it as widely as possible. It is unlikely that publication



and distribution of Munadil will be able to begin again soon. In effect, this means that the Fourth International currently has no regular journal in Arabic.

5. Also as a result of the civil war in Lebanon, the composition of the Arab milieu has changed. Historically, Arabs recruited politically to the FI in Europe have either remained in Europe permanently or have been unwilling or unable to continue political activity on returning to their countries. Now, however, there are significant numbers of Arabs who have left Lebanon out of necessity and do not intend to remain in Europe permanently or to become assimilated into European life. At the same time, they are seeking both explanations for what has happened and political alternatives. This offers the FI a field of activity that may well prove fruitful."

To meet this new objective and subjective situation as outlined by the IAC it proposed that the tasks and composition of the IAC should be changed. In general, the IAC should take on four areas of work:

"1. Coordination and centralization of the fractions now working toward the construction of revolutionary Marxist nuclei in the Maghreb. This means that the commission should receive regular and direct reports from the comrades in the Maghreb countries and from the Algerian, Moroccan, and Tunisian fractions and should oversee their work politically. The general orientation of the fractions should be discussed in the commission (entrism, relations with other groups, etc.) as should the political attitude of the fractions on more general questions (response to Boumeddiene's institutionalization plan, Sahara, etc.).

2. Coordination of the work of the groups in the Arab East. It is obvious that no political body in Europe can substitute itself for the leaderships of the groups on the scene, nor could it become a genuine political leadership in the sense of guiding the daily or even weekly activity of these groups. But the commission can and should hold regular discussions on the political situation in each country (based on regular reports from the countries themselves), the political line of the groups on the major questions, their activity, and so on. The most elementary considerations of the process of collective discussion dictate that the isolation of the Egyptian and Iraqi comrades from the International be ended. This can only be done if regular discussion and exchanges occur within some International body. In addition, even in the cases of Israel and Lebanon, discussion of the groups' activities and line should be the affair of an International body and not simply the groups themselves.

3. The commission should become the vehicle for International discussion of the general political problems of the Arab revolution. Since, as pointed out above, the International bulletin will devote only a relatively small number of pages to these questions, the commission should initiate a written discussion and should establish technical facilities for mimeographing, discussion bulletins, distributing them, and discussing them orally. Concurrently, these bulletins can be circulated to the ranks of the organizations in the Arab world, the Arab commissions in various sections, and individual comrades in cases where commissions do not exist, as well as the United

Secretariat Bureau. This discussion could deal with such points as: existence or not of an Arab nation; question of an Arab Leninist party; character of Zionism; the national question in Palestine; problems of the Kurdish revolution; history of the Communist parties in the Arab world; development of capitalism and the political structure in the major countries of the Arab world, etc. Part of this discussion may involve differences and be polemical; in many cases, however, it will be rather a question of research, discussion, and education, the production of a body of texts that can help to educate our militants.

4. While the Arab commission cannot replace Munadil, it can attempt to partially fill the vacuum left by the temporary disappearance of Munadil. The aim should be to produce an Arabic journal to appear on a regular basis directed at both the Arab countries themselves (and Israel) and the Arab communities in Europe, taking account of the modification of that milieu as described above. The journal should be a theoretical magazine dealing with the central political and historical questions of the Arab revolution. The commission should designate a subcommittee of several comrades to be in charge of editing the journal and of making a concrete proposal on size, regularity, printing location, etc. The general contents of each issue should be discussed by the commission as a whole; they may include, for example, translations of articles that have appeared in Inprecor or other journals of the FI, adaptations of some of the articles produced under point 3 above, articles solicited from the comrades in the region, articles specifically written by members of the commission, etc. The establishment of such an organ would also provide a potential organizational vehicle for contacts with Arab and Kurdish militants."

At its first meeting on October 9-10, 1976, the reorganized IAC decided:

"to propose the following comrades as members of the Commission: Jafar, Gérard, Jon, Gallois, Selim, Majida, Daniel (from the Algerian fraction). In addition, it was decided that there should be a representative of the Moroccan fraction. The meeting proposed that Jon be delegated to explain the reorganization plan and bureau decisions to Ben, who should then hold a meeting with the Moroccan fraction to choose a representative, provided they were in agreement to implement the plan of work decided on by the Commission and approved by the bureau. It was also decided that the Tunisian fraction was not yet strong enough politically or organizationally to be represented on the Commission. As soon as this situation could be rectified, however, the Tunisian fraction should also select a representative to the Commission."

The overall thrust of the reorganization plan is for the IAC to become the authoritative leadership body within the International on the Arab East. In the proposals for its composition, of 8 members proposed, only 2 IEC members are included. The IAC is therefore not projected as a subcommittee of the IEC like the United Secretariat is, for example. However, its tasks as set out in the reorganization plan tend to go beyond the general framework of the coordinating tasks suggested for commissions in point 17 of the statutes of the Fourth International. We do not suggest that the IAC was acting independently and did not have the agreement of the United Secretariat Bureau for

its reorganization proposals. We consider that the IAC was correct in thinking that it had this agreement. We have been unable to determine whether there was a formal meeting of the United Secretariat Bureau which discussed out all the reorganization plans or whether the proposals were agreed informally by individual Bureau members. In whatever way the proposals were adopted, the responsibility for them lies with the United Secretariat, which is also ultimately responsible for the day to day functioning of the commission. It appears that the decisions of the United Secretariat Bureau would be in contradiction with point 19 of the statutes of the Fourth International, which gives only the IEC the right to form commissions.

The FFC takes note that this is stressed by the fact that many of the tasks outlined for the reorganized IAC would more properly be those of the IEC, the leadership body elected by the delegates to the world congresses, or to any body it delegates specific tasks. For instance, the United Secretariat can and does have discussions with section leaderships or their representatives. Such discussions include political analysis and major tactical questions. They are of a collaborative nature and have to be carried out within the framework of the statutes of the Fourth International.

Given a situation where formal contact breaks down for 2-3 months, it would be the function of the United Secretariat to make a political analysis and draw any conclusions necessary for the work of our comrades. We could only conceive of the United Secretariat taking this course if it had first exhausted every possibility to make contact with the section. Problems will arise if there is a lack of understanding of the collaborative nature of such discussions and of the statutory rights of sections to determine the tactics they engage in. We have already taken up problems relating to the Lebanese section in this regard.

The FFC takes note that the October 1976 meeting of the Arab commission took a decision for three of its members to hold a meeting to discuss how to organize Middle East work in France and make proposals to the next meeting of the IAC. We think such discussions should have been held in collaboration with the leadership of the LCR, which is responsible for political activity of the Fourth International in France.

One of the reasons given for the failure of the IAC, set up in February-March 1976, to function is that the factional problems of the LCR Arab commission were referred to it. The question arises as to why problems concerning the functioning of the French Arab commission were not taken up and dealt with by the LCR leadership.

The FFC questions the correctness of the IAC's initiating a discussion bulletin as outlined in task number 3. The issues proposed as possible discussion points cover questions which are of concern to the world movement as a whole and some of these issues are known to involve differences. Written contributions on such questions should be made available to the ranks of the entire International through the discussion and information bulletins of the Fourth International. It does seem incorrect procedure that a decision to publish and allocate material and financial resources to produce a theoretical magazine dealing with the central political and historical questions of the Arab revolution was taken by a commission. Such a journal would be a journal of the Fourth International and, like Intercontinental Press/Inprecor, would require a decision from the leading bodies of the International. Such a decision could be taken by the IEC in the framework of setting up an IAC, or by the United Secretariat as a separate task.

It is possible that the United Secretariat Bureau has already reconsidered some of the proposals of the reorganization plans of the IAC. We note in a letter from Comrade Rothschild to the United Secretariat Bureau dated February 8, 1977, that the Bureau had tentatively agreed to a text on the "Central Arab Commission" which changed the composition and tasks adopted by the reorganized IAC. We have not yet seen this text, but in any case we think our comments are relevant on the basis of the information we already have. Nevertheless, the FFC strongly feels it would be necessary to regularize the tasks and composition of the IAC, in accordance with the statutes of the Fourth International, by a decision of the IEC.

Signed:  
David  
Susan Williams  
March 1978