

NOV 5 1979

X: Gms
(give to mlb)

22.10.1979

Bureau
United Secretariat
France.

Dear Comrades,

1. In October the 10th, on our special pre- world congress convention we were asked to discuss the question of representation to the world congress, comrade Mikado surprisingly gave the following message from the USec Bureau:
 - a. We are puzzled by a call addressed to us not through the leading bodies of the organization.
 - b. The bureau does not intend to intervene in the question of representation to the world congress.

2. On the 3.10.79 I made a telephone call to comrade Lunder and told him that there was a danger of split in the organization. In a private discussion comrade Mikado held with me that day he told me that he and some other comrades consider "opening a file" against me. This was expressed in their determined refusal to have the representation to the WC on a parity basis.

3. I would like first of all to express my agreement with the Bureau's announcement. However I find it necessary to clarify the circumstances in which this situation developed. The telephone call should be viewed as an extraordinary measure that was taken at a time of crisis in our organization: a threat to the integrity of the party. Mikado's letter from Oct. the 4th to me, and my answer to him can give an accurate picture. (see appendixes).

4. After a clarification in the secretariat, it became clear that there was no basis whatsoever to the accusations and complaints brought against ex- P/C/G/ members. The interview I gave to the IP/IN. (10.9.79 issue) does indeed reflect the R/C.L.'s political positions and the central committee's resolution from August 1979. The editing of the convention documents was done according to the general line of the convention. The paper "Matzpeg" reflects our positions, is regularly published, and its quality is steadily improving. It seems to me that these clarifications, that unfortunately were not asked for before the letter was sent, contributed to pacify the atmosphere in the party.

5. On the question of representation: Since there were strong factional tensions, we found it necessary, in order to strengthen the unity of the party, to propose that we continue to work on a parity basis that is kept today in all the leading bodies of the organization. All our attempts to raise this question in secretariat meetings and in the C.C. met obstinate resistance explained

explained by the argument that "it would be ridiculous that an organization of less than 30 people will send two representatives."

In the pre-world convention we made two motions:

- a. That the convention approve two representatives, (one as observer) to the World Congress; one ex R.C.L. and one ex P.C.G. .
- b. That the political basis for electing our representative to the World Congress will be support of the proposals of the U.Sec. majority caucus.

On both motions the vote was decided according to the old lines. Ex R.C.L.' ~~COMRADES~~ voted against both motions. Comrade Mikado was elected by that same majority to represent the organization.

6. The pre-world convention proved that in spite of the clarifications we have not overcome the factional tensions yet. Unfortunately this could put unnecessary difficulties to the discussion on the turn into the industry in Israel.

In my opinion this is a very important discussion in the fight to base Trotskyism inside the working class in Israel. I have no doubts that the time has come, and we should do it now.

I hope the participation of our representative in the W.C. will help to advance our organization and will enrich the discussion on the political perspectives of the building of the section of the Fourth International in Israel.

Comradely

Yacov.

copy: RCL sec.

NOV 5 1979

APPENDIX NO. 1

4.10. 79

Dear Yakov,

Following our conversation yesterday I would like to clarify the following points:

1. There is no one in the leadership of the R.C.L. who is interested in, wants to or conducting a personal campaign against you. Furthermore, the attitude of all the comrades of the secretariat and the C.C. has been in many cases to avoid criticisms and complaints, assuming that its necessary to give the unification process time, and in order not to put obstacles in this process.

2. Lately, and especially since your return to the country (from the S.V.P. convention t.n.) the incidents which deserve ~~response~~ response have multiplied, not all relating to you personally. This necessitates that the leadership of the organization responsibly, collectively and in a ^{balanced way} ~~balanced way~~. Only after we will have found that we can't face these problems collectively, we we shall have to find other ways to deal with these questions.

3. The outstanding examples in which comrades of the ex P.C.G. from the leadership of the organization did not function properly and their conduct demands the attention of the R.C.L.'s leadership are, in my opinion the following:

a. Sowing serious doubts in the course of the R.C.L. as it was agreed upon unanimously at the 5th convention. You will agree with me that it is a 'problem' when a part of the leadership doubts/rejects the perspectives agreed upon in the convention less than half a year ago.

b. Spreading these doubts in the ranks of the organization before holding a discussion in the appropriate institutions. (No one will be convinced that this is due to coincidence or telepathy.)

c. An attempt to already carry out - and this before any such position was taken or even discussed in any of the organization's institutions - the first steps of a turn, which, as yet exists only in your head and in your partners' to telepathy or to a secret faction heads. The outstanding examples are:

c.1. The last issue of Matzpen Marxist (the content of the articles, the headlines, the conclusions of the editorial, etc.)

c.2. The selection of certain subjects for the Tel Aviv open forum and their content.

c.3. What happened at the last "workers' committee to which you are responsible.

4. Strange occurrences such as the "disappearance" of of the villages' committee's resolutions;

+ political editing of the 5th conventions' resolutions attempting to ~~change~~ change the general line of the convention's resolutions.

b. by-pass the comrade responsible for re-writing this document and not letting him know ~~a thing~~ about it.

* An unjustified delay in the publication of a booklet ~~with~~

with the convention's resolutions.

A coincidence? mistake? malice? it is a duty at least to ask the question, and in any case to see to it that it doesn't happen again.

5. The interview you gave in the I.P. which doesn't express the R.C.L.'s positions as were put forth in the 5th convention, to say the least.

6. Political censorship in the editorial board of Matzpen Markxisti: I, along with other comrades, were inclined to regard what happened in the Nicaragua article as an unfortunate misunderstanding. After further censorship of Ilan's article (Housing Now), the ~~the~~ headline of the interview from Um El Fahm which doesn't at all express its content, and such other incidents, it would be difficult to assume that it's again a sad misunderstanding. I mentioned here only some of the problems. These problems are ours, at least that's how I would like to see it. (I am also convinced that there are other problems, of other comrades not belonging to the ex-P.C.G, we should also regard these as our problems.)

7. We talked about the duties of the majority and its responsibilities. It seems to me that up till now this majority has been more than responsible and restrained. It gave to the P.C.G members more credit than could be expected, in view of the numerous incidents which could arouse distrust. But there is also the responsibility of a minority in the leadership, especially if it does not see fit (rightly so in my opinion) to organize itself as such.

This responsibility means above all:

- Allowing the leadership work and direct the building of the organization according to its resolutions (whether unanimously or by majority.)

- to cooperate (an expression of yours which I don't especially like) in the ~~realization~~ ^{application} of the institutions' resolutions and their explanation, or at least not to put obstacles. If this becomes impossible - to become an opposition (loyal of course.)

- Not to abuse the broad democracy - in comparison to other organizations in the F.I. - in our institutions, and the relative broad autonomy which the comrades, organizations, institutions enjoy, in order to bypass the leadership and/or conducting a campaign against the majority in it.

- If it is impossible to avoid making mistakes, and so it is, ~~try~~ try to correct them as a leadership and don't leave them to the majority.

- Don't force the majority to open a campaign against a minority in the leadership due to the duties/claims of this minority.

* Your comment from yesterday evening in the Tel Aviv cell meeting which was meant to "explain" your position was typical to what

con. next page

My sense of responsibility prevents me from hiding behind faked modesty; I am willing to help you to build yourself in the organization. This is my responsibility as a central member of the ex R.C.L. who is more experienced than anyone else (except Miha.) Not as a personal favor "to you" or to the ex-P.C.G. I would do this, but as a duty to the ~~united~~ organization and the unity. ~~We (leadership comrades of the ex R.C.L.)~~ We (leadership comrades of the ex R.C.L.) are willing to help you (~~leadership~~ leadership comrades of the ex P.C.G) to integrate in the building of the organization, its leadership, even if and when there are disagreements. This is our responsibility as a majority in the organization (and even 51% is a majority which obliges both the majority and the minority) and in its leadership. As it is our common duty to build a leadership and not leaderships in the eyes of the comrades.

These are our duties as a majority, and mine as the most experienced member of the leadership (except for Miha.) This is how we regarded things up till now and this is how I would like to see things. Thus, under the condition that you, and yourself as a central member of the ex P.C.G. will conduct yourself as partners to a common goal: the building of one leadership and an attempt to help the process of integration, even if and when there is not full agreement on all points.

Yet if your behaviour (as opposed to your positions) are not responsible, if incidents such I have ~~described~~ described multiply, ~~and~~ and the only way to cope with them will be in the hands of the majority of the leadership, while the minority works - consciously, or even worse, unconsciously - to keep the old factional lines, then ~~it~~ is our duty as a majority in the institutions whose job is to lead - to conduct the campaign which your behaviour will determines if it opens or not. (Precisely this is the responsibility of a minority: to decide when to start an initiative against the majority and when not to, if and when there are disagreements.) And I will then dedicate the same amount of energy as I did before and after the unification 5th convention for the unification and the fusion of the organizations.

There will not be a situation in which only part of the organization's leadership has a monopoly over the struggle/ the right to

(continued). should not be done. The majority, (in this case myself, after ~~having~~ having been authorized) could use the C.C.' report to say anything that comes to his mind without letting anyone answer. Up till now I have always ~~without an exception~~ without an exception, (in the C.C., in the branches, to comrades) gave a factual report without explanations, evaluations, leaving them to the appropriate forums. Yesterday you have made an dangerous precedent. (Even if there was an "explanation to the vote" ~~which then wasn't~~) Because whoever puts forth a draft resolution does not explain it outside of the resolution itself. There was no place to raise it in a C.C.'s report to a cell meeting just as I have never raised any explanations, reasoning or the content of the discussion.

criticize. I think that among the mistakes/errors and blunders of the ex P.C.G. members of leadership there is a combination of political attitudes which I don't share, and inexperience. With the first we can deal positively on condition that you are willing to learn from the experience of the other. ^{for this I am still at your service.} Yet, if it appears that the minority in the secretariat continues to act as such - it means that a permanent minority ^{has crystallized} which is not a partner to the building of the organization according to the course put forth by the majority in the bodies chosen for that purpose then:

1. We will stop being large toward 'mistakes' which are caused by inexperience and different evaluations.
2. We will carry out the regulations and organizational principles literally and not with the flexibility which is now misused (then we will also prove that we know how to be disciples of J.P. Cannon who even surpass their leader in their ability to lead an organization behind a unified leadership which gives itself quite a broad breathing space)
3. We will see it as our duty to stop keeping the mistakes and internal questions of the leading bodies, since if the hope to change and convince internally is lost, there is only one choice left: to expose and explain outwards.

In the struggle ^{it} it is forced upon us the organization will lose a lot. Yet I do not doubt that in the final analysis it will be for its benefit and I have no doubt that the authority of the leadership of the P.C.G. will be badly hurt.

This letter to you Yacov, is a last attempt from my part to appeal to your revolutionary consciousness and to the sense of responsibility of the comrades of the ex P.C.G. leadership. We will build one leadership; we will ~~not~~ let the majority (which does not have to be identical to the ex R.C.L.) lead the organization according to its course loyally and in cooperation.

During 2 years, I have dedicated all my personal energy convincing the comrades of the R.C.L. in the possibility and the necessity of mutually building with the P.C.G. In this sense, I, personally have a multiplied responsibility for the situation which has developed. The same amount of energy and decisiveness I am willing to give to destroy the leadership of the ex P.C.G. if and when it is clear to me that it is not a partner to the building of the organization - as I see building- but to its ruin.

This applies to me and to the P.C.G.. This applies to me and you.. I am not a child any more. I have had enough factional struggles. Yet I have also learnt from them. Among other things I learnt is that in such struggles one must not wait till it is too late and when you decide to take this path you must know that you have to take it through to the end, without "pity" which quickly turns to cruelty. There is yet time to correct; there is great revolutionary potential in the comrades of both the R.C.L. and the P.C.G.. It is a pity to lose it. The leadership of the ex R.C./L. acted up till now responsibly and maturely. (This does not mean

faultlessly). The ex P.C.G. members should learn from this and not see it as a weakness.

Your friend

Likado.

APPENDIX NO. 2

7.10.79

To Likado,

It seems to me that the picture of the situation in our organization, which you draw in your letter from Oct. the 4th, is very partial and consequently, your conclusion are, in my opinion false and even hasty. Moreover, your letter does not even pretend to explain the reasons that led to a situation in which you are forced to write me a letter as the "last attempt to appeal to my revolutionary consciousness." From your description it seems that the major problems in the building of the revolutionary party in Israel is the ex P.C.G. members. So much so that you find it necessary to warn that you are ready "to give the same amount of energy and decisiveness" that you have put in the fusion process, "to destroy the ex P.C.G. leadership"- if and when "it becomes clear to me that you are not a partner to the building of the organization but to its ruin."

On June the 20th you reported on the unification process to a representative of the U.Sec; in it you said that there was a real fusion, the votes in the party bodies cross the old lines, and that you didn't expect problems in the future. Two months later we have reached a situation in which we have a "majority" in the party that is driving to a split!

In your letter you claim that there is a "majority" in the organization, apparently composed of ex L.C.R. members and a "minority" composed of ex P.C.G. comrades. In my opinion this assertion has no basis at all, and since it doesn't reflect reality I can't but ask what brought you to such an assertion?

The second question that should be asked is: what is the political basis of this majority if it really exists? According to your letter such a majority does exist and you belong to it, and it seems you are its main spokesman. To say the truth, it took me some time to solve the mystery of since when does such a majority exist and what characterizes it?

I then remembered that the first time the word majority was mentioned, was before the unification. After the joint C.C. approved all the documents and it became clear that we reached a wider basis for the unification than was anticipated, we held the last

joint C/Ce, and then you demanded heatedly that you want a clear majority of the RCL of 2 to 1 in every body of the unified organization. For us, PCG comrades, it was another concession made in order to reach the unification. Here begins the "majority's" history. Against who did the "majority" fight? It undertook the hard and sacred mission to fight against ... the organizational conceptions of the PCG.

Although the convention proved beyond doubts that there is no place for a "majority" and a "minority" the majority continued to exist; at first as "a responsible and restrained" majority, later it became less restrained, and today the responsibility has almost disappeared. The "majority", however found a political basis: the resolutions of the 5th convention which were adopted unanimously at the unification convention. And against who does it organize? against the "minority", that, "sows grave doubts in the RCL political course as determined unanimously in the 5th convention".

However if we take into account that the "minority" has no doubts about the convention resolutions and, for that reason, sows no doubts in the ranks of the organization, we will quickly reach the conclusion that there is no ground to have a "majority" and a "minority" in the organization. The truth is that politically there is more in common than in disagreement. Except for Cuba and Indochina there is a wide agreement in the CC on the documents of the World Congress, on the PLO, on Nicaragua, on our approach toward the women's movement, the housing movement, our approach to the Workers League etc..

Some comrades in the leadership, however, think that we should apply the international line of the F.I. in Israel. Is this what you call "to sow doubts in the League's course"? Those sinners who want to discuss a question the whole International is discussing, that constitute the basis of the World Congress, are for you the "minority". You have turned them into a minority "before a proper discussion in the organization" took place. Since such a discussion has not taken place yet, I claim that such a minority does not exist, and if ~~XXXXX~~ in the future a majority and minority will be formed, it will be on the basis of clear political lines and not on the basis of doubts.

Do your words mean the International line of the F.I. is opposed to the documents of the unification convention?

Since you bring "evidences" for the existence of a "secret faction" or a "telepathy connection" by steps that were taken to carry out the turn, I have no way but to refer to them. What are the "stark examples"?

I) The last issue of "Matzpen Marxist". After ~~our~~ ^{our} last discussion

I did not understand, from what you have said, that the paper expresses the turn but on the contrary: "there is too much on international issues.", and the "evidences" relate to excerpts from articles which I'm sure would arouse no worry a month ago.

2) Forums: the subjects chosen (why is the "minority" to blame?) are Chile, the Settlements, the Economic Crisis, "to Be an Arab in Israel". What was wrong with this. And what was wrong with the content said on Chile or the question of the Settlements that you didn't even attend?

3) The Workers Commission: There are many complaints but the answer was given when Ilan and Meir (two ex- RCL comrades) were asked to write a leaflet. Is this a proof for the existence of a "secret faction"?

No! there is no "secret faction", there is no "minority", and there are no doubts. However, you are working full steam ahead against the "minority" identified by you with ex- PCG comrades. This is the reason the "majority" proposed that only one comrade of the ex- RCL will represent us at the next World Congress. Our proposal that ~~the~~ representatives be elected: One ex- PCG and one ex- RCL were rejected by you with formal arguments, when the considerations that directed you were: "No one of the ~~ex-PCG~~ is able to represent the RCL".

I think that such grave injury to ex- PCG comrades is not an injury to us only, but to the party as a whole. It's hard for me to understand what good will come out of turning us into second-rate members. But as I turn the page the "logic" behind this attitude to ex- PCG comrades is revealed. "We (members of ex- RCL leadership) are ready to help you". It seems that after 6 months you have forgotten that we had a fusion! Nobody has done a favour to the other. We did what objectively had to be done to advance the building of the revolutionary party.

We had not been invited to enter the League. Let me refresh your memory, we wrote together the documents that form the basis of the fusion. All those documents that were approved by the RCL or the PCG, and on which we did not vote, do not bind the fused organization. Moreover, we weren't brought into the RCL leadership. The leading bodies were built with a mutual agreement that included 2 to 1 in the leading bodies and that the editors of the papers will be from the RCL and PCG respectively in arabic and in hebrew. From that minute we started building a fused leadership and all we had to do was to act to fuse the leaderships.

The bulk of your letter is dedicated to describe the means you will take against this "minority" if it becomes clear that they want to put sticks in the wheels. But reality and the short history of our organization show that your arguments are false. Your "guests" in the party have always acted for the unity and the benefit of the organization.

I would like to remind the case of the full timer. At that moment,

when out of unclear motives, you did not want^{to} take responsibility and to stand in a fused leadership, the ex- PCG comrades acted with full energy to push you to take your responsibility as a leader of the ex- RCL. This is the way we always saw the building of the organization: to work together, to take responsibility together and to solve problems together.

This is not what you propose. You are full of complaints against the ex-PCG comrades and you do not propose any constructive proposal to solve the problems. On the other hand you hurry up in declaring that you will break the ex- PCG leadership when and if it is clear to you that is not a partner in building the organization "as I see it". Is this your proposal? Is it your opinion that all the problems in the organization will be solved if we ~~we~~ were ready to build the organization the way you see it correct?

No! the building of the organization will be determined according to the understanding of all its members, and not according the way "the experienced leader" sees it. A leader does not use his experience in order to threaten with a split ~~of~~, to break necks, when "less experienced" comrades are not ready to do what he wants ~~them~~ to do.

I hope you will use your experience in order :

- a) ~~to~~ stop the threats of a split.
- b) to stop dividing the organization into factions without political basis.
- c) to enable a democratic discussion in all the bodies, and to enable the members to decide if disagreements arise.
- d) to solve all those problems you raised together.

Finally, I think it will be a mistake from your part if you decide "to go through to the end". If you do that, you will cause a great injury to our party. It will also be a grave injury to the building of the Trotskyist party in Israel. I propose that you stop driving toward a split and that you put all your energy to the common building

with regards,
Yacov.