

Information, Education & Discussion

Bulletin

In Defense of Marxism

Published by expelled members of the Socialist Workers Party (U.S.A.)

<u>C O N T E N T S</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Introduction.	1
Statement by Members of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International Invited to Attend the SWP National Committee Plenum, August 8, 1983.	4
Sound the Alarm by 4 Suspended SWP National Committee Members, September 7, 1983.	6
The Political Purge in the American Socialist Workers Party - A Statement Adopted by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, October, 1983	9
Declaration of 19 Members of the United Secretariat.	11
Resolving the International Crisis of Revolutionary Leadership Today (Draft Resolution Submitted to SWP National Committee Plenum by 4 Suspended NC Members, August 6, 1983).	16
<u>New International Slanders FI</u>	37

No. 1 December, 1983 \$3.00

Editor, FRANK LOVELL

Send requests, materials, financial contributions to

Bulletin I. D. O. M.
P. O. B o x 1 3 1 7
New York, N.Y. 10009

INTRODUCTION

With this first number of the Bulletin in Defense of Marxism we publish some recent documents in the struggle for the continuation and development of a working class political party capable of taking power in the United States and initiating a new social order of peace, freedom, and prosperity throughout the world.

Since Karl Marx discovered the economic laws of capitalist development more than a century ago the radiant future that he foresaw has often been overcast with doubts. Every socially conscious person today must question how humankind managed to gain control of the physical environment on planet Earth and failed to master social relations among the world's human inhabitants. What are the causes of war? Why are we at the brink of self-extinction? How will the fate of the world be decided? These ancient questions are more urgent and ominous in today's atomic age than ever before. Yet Marx and his collaborator, Frederick Engels, in the last century explained human history for the first time in such a way as to demystify these questions. They demonstrated beyond rational doubt that it is possible for mortals to control their own destiny.

At the core of the great message of Marxism is the demonstrable conviction that the historical tasks of the present epoch can be successfully accomplished only by the modern industrial working class. In order to fulfill its historic mission the working class must organize its own political parties in all countries, and these parties must be united ideologically in a world organization.

Acting on this conviction in 1864 Marx helped organize and inspired the International Workingmen's Association, known later as the First International. It could not survive the defeat of the Paris Commune in 1871, and ceased to exist in 1876. It proved to be the anticipation of a more broadly based organization, the Labor and Socialist International.

Founded in 1889, the Labor and Socialist International, or Second International, survived as a viable working class organization until 1914, the outbreak of World War I. That war shattered the Second International. Engels had participated in its affairs until his death in 1895. And it was in the councils and congresses of this organization, and in its national sections, that the ideas and leaders of the successful Russian revolution were nurtured. They were tested first in 1905 and again in 1917 when they proved victorious.

In retrospect Lenin saw the Second International as the necessary bridge to the Communist or Third International, which was founded in 1919 by the leaders of the Russian revolution and their supporters around the world. To help the struggles of emancipation in all nations against imperialist exploitation and oppression Lenin and Trotsky, co-leaders in Russia, lent experience and ideological guidance. But the forces of reaction prevailed.

After a series of lost opportunities and defeats of working class revolutions in the post-World War I period, including the destruction of the Bolshevik party in the Soviet Union by the Stalin-led bureaucracy, the Third International was transformed into a tool of international diplomacy by the Soviet governing clique. The Communist International was formally and officially dissolved by its Executive Committee in 1943, during World War II, on orders from Stalin.

When the Third International proved incapable of understanding and explaining the rise of fascism and failed to challenge the victory of Hitler in Germany in 1933, the need for a new Leninist international was clearly demonstrated. The International Left Opposition, which Leon Trotsky had founded, then issued a call for the Fourth International in August 1933.

The Fourth International was founded in 1938, largely through the efforts of the Socialist Workers Party (USA) and its leader James P. Cannon. The draft program of the new International, "The Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International" (also called the Transitional Program), was prepared by Trotsky.

The Socialist Workers Party severed all organizational ties with the Fourth International when the U.S. government passed the Voorhis Act in 1940 to selectively punish working class organizations with international connections, but the SWP has until recently retained ideological solidarity with the FI.

This break with the program and organizational principles of the Fourth International is what the documents published here for the first time relate to. They are products of a struggle within the SWP to prevent the present leadership of that party from abandoning the principles of Marxist internationalism as understood and developed by Lenin and Trotsky in the Third International, and later explained and applied by Trotsky and his ideological associates and followers in the FI.

In this struggle the entrenched SWP leadership has resorted to organizational maneuvers and finally to expulsions of the opposition to avoid the necessary debate on the meaning of Marxism today.

Our first item from this struggle in the SWP is the statement of two guests from the United Secretariat of the FI who were present at the SWP plenum of the National Committee in August 1983 and witnessed the de facto expulsion of four opposition members of the SWP National Committee. Their statement reveals some of the background of these expulsions, as viewed and understood by these co-thinkers who had not been directly or intimately involved in the struggle.

The second item, Sound the Alarm, is a warning by the expelled SWP National Committee members to all sections, sympathizing groups, and members of the FI. This was issued on Sept. 7, one month after their expulsion.

The third item is a statement adopted by an overwhelming majority of the United Secretariat at a meeting in October 1983 where the SWP crisis was discussed at length by representatives from the major sections of the Fourth International.

Partly in response to the warning from the expelled SWP opposition leaders, but also because of their independent political differences with the SWP leadership, nineteen members from several sections of the FI signed a politically motivated declaration of support for the SWP opposition. It is our fourth item.

The fifth item is a draft resolution on the world political situation, submitted jointly by the four opposition leaders at the SWP plenum where they were formally "suspended." This draft, Resolving the International Crisis of Revolutionary Leadership Today, was not intended as a finished product. It was submitted as a contribution to the SWP's pre-

convention discussion which was then three months overdue and about to be further postponed for another nine months. Despite the bureaucratic violations of Leninist organizational methods by the SWP functionaries, this resolution succeeds in breaking through artificial organizational barriers to present Marxist positions on most of the big political questions that divide the majority and minority in the SWP today.

Support of the Cuban revolution and the Castro regime is clearly stated in the resolution. But there is a difference over this question between the SWP majority leadership and the opposition which certainly affects (and may determine) most of the other differences.

One of these differences is over the assessment of the revolutionary events in Nicaragua and Grenada. There is no disagreement about the need for all revolutionists in the world to welcome and embrace these developments, and to defend the revolutionary governments which have come to power in Central America and the Caribbean. But the present majority in the SWP leadership -- in the name of embracing these revolutions -- has begun to adapt incorrectly to the weaknesses of Castroist ideology, throwing overboard the theoretical legacy of the Marxist movement.

From this incorrect political adaptation flow the differences which have emerged in the SWP and the FI on the validity of the theory of permanent revolution, political revolution in Poland (the need for the Polish workers to overthrow the Stalinist bureaucratic caste), the brutal regime in Iran, the struggle for Palestinian liberation, and a series of other questions -- all of which are defined in this resolution.

The last item is a statement that appears in the December 1983 issue of Quatrieme Internationale, theoretical journal of the Fourth International. It exposes a slanderous attempt by the SWP leadership to discredit the FI.

We believe this material will be of interest and value to comrades in the radical movement as well as those in the SWP and FI who hope to see the revolutionary party in the United States develop. A leadership that expects to build a mass working class party in this country, and elsewhere in the world, must be prepared to explain and defend its program to the widest possible working class audience.

Most of the material in this issue is presented in its original form, as submitted or received, to cut expenses. Financial contributions to help publish more numbers of this bulletin are welcome. A January issue is ready for printing. The frequency and circulation will depend on the support the Bulletin generates.

In coming issues we will publish documents, discussion articles, and reports on the class struggle that are relevant to the crisis in the SWP and the coming World Congress of the FI. We hope to gain a wide readership and influence the ideological struggle in defense of Marxism in the SWP and Fourth International. These organizations, whatever their present difficulties and limitations, remain the best prospects for promoting the socialist future.

Please let us know if you want to receive issue No. 2, January 1984.

Statement by guests from the United Secretariat of the Fourth International at the plenum of the SWP National Committee, August 8, 1983, on proposed suspension of 4 NC opposition members.

The proposed suspension of comrades Bloom, Lovell, Weinstein and Henderson from the SWP National Committee on the charge that they are acting as a "secret faction" can only be interpreted as an act of overt political hostility to the Fourth International as a whole. This action, if taken, creates a qualitatively new stage in that crisis of the Fourth International, which was initiated by public attacks on programmatical and political positions as well as the organisational integrity of the Fourth International, by the SWP leadership.

In our opinion the proposed suspension of the comrades of the two minority tendencies is a basic violation of the membership norms of the Fourth International, its sections and sympathising organisations.

No evidence has been presented here for the existence of a secret faction in the SWP N.C. No effort, as far as we know, was made to ascertain the view of the minority comrades before this charge was levelled. No questions seem to have been addressed to the minority comrades on their attitude to the foundation of the charge that dissolving the bloc between a caucus and a tendency in the National Committee amounts to a secret basis for the existence of a faction.

The minutes of the Presiding Committee Meeting No. 1, dated August 6, 1983, report that cde Barnes holds the view that "split actions by supporters of the NC minority faction have qualitatively accelerated". This turns reality completely on its head. An unprecedented organisational attack is under way, led by the leadership of the SWP, against comrades holding minority views - views that in many cases happen to be close to those of the majority of the International. This attack has now culminated in the entirely unprincipled and factional proposal of cde Barnes and the Political Committee to qualitatively deepen a split course of the SWP through the mechanism of the charge of a "secret faction".

It is the view of the United Secretariat delegates present at this National Committee plenum of the SWP, August 1983, that the proposed suspension of the NC minority comrades is in fact directed against their political views. We wish to make it clear that disciplinary actions on this basis and where it is not substantiated that the comrades involved have been engaged in public breaches of discipline or hostile acts against the SWP and the Fourth International should not be recognized by the F.I.

Such disciplinary actions, under such conditions, do not mean that the comrades concerned in any way have forfeited what would have ^(been) their rights as members of the Fourth International if the reactionary Voorhis act had not existed.

[When the above statement was submitted at the point on the SWP plenum agenda dealing with the proposed suspension of the 4 minority comrades from the National Committee, a request was made that it be annexed to the minutes.]

Sound the Alarm

To All Sections, Sympathizing Groups, and Members of the Fourth International:

Since the August 1981 convention of the U.S. Socialist Workers Party, the current party leadership has been carrying out a revisionist course which threatens to destroy that organization as a revolutionary party. The open repudiation of the historic program of Trotskyism, in particular the attack on the theory of permanent revolution, has been imposed on the membership in a step-by-step process--through the pages of the party's press and other public activities, as well as through an internal "education" campaign of anti-Trotskyist classes, educational conferences, and speeches.

The content of Jack Barnes's public 1982 YSA convention speech, published in the inaugural issue of New International six months after it was delivered; and the editorial attack on Ernest Mandel's defense of our program in the August 6, 1983 issue of Intercontinental Press (Mandel's article was also published months after it was submitted) are the clearest and most recent expressions of the programmatic break with the Fourth International and with our Trotskyist heritage. These are policies promoted by the entire leadership, its editorial boards, and all party institutions. They are not simply the opinions of a few individual SWP leaders.

The promotion of this new theoretical line of the Barnes leadership (actually a rehash of old slanders against Trotsky and Trotskyism, long ago thoroughly refuted) has been accomplished without any discussion or vote inside the party. This is true despite repeated requests by many comrades for such a discussion. Even when opening a discussion was constitutionally mandated for the regular pre-convention period, the leadership postponed it--first for three months, replacing it with an educational conference, and then for an entire year. Only spurious reasons were presented for this. The muzzling of the opposition through this process clearly reveals the complete unwillingness of the current majority leadership to allow any serious consideration of these questions by the party ranks, and exposes their lack of confidence in their ability to defend these policies before the membership.

In order to assure that no discussion of these anti-Trotskyist, liquidationist policies will take place a massive slander campaign against the opposition, and an unprecedented wave of expulsions of party members with opposition viewpoints has been implemented. The right to constitute internal party groupings (tendencies and factions) was suppressed. (Party members have even been denied the right to participate in an organized way in the pre-World Congress discussion of the Fourth International, in direct violation of the statutes of that organization.)

The erosion of internal democracy reached a new level at the August 1983 National Committee meeting with the unprecedented suspension on the eve of the meeting of the four minority NC members

so that they could not attend, and then their suspension--in fact their de facto expulsion--from the party itself, in an attempt to isolate them from party members. The opposition leaders were falsely accused of being responsible for the crisis in the party, which has in fact been created by the policies of the majority itself. Since the suspension of the NC members, the thinly disguised purge of other party members in disagreement with the central leadership has been accelerated.

The expulsions, the ban on tendencies and factions, and the twice-postponed convention are merely the organizational manifestation of the anti-Trotskyist political course which the current SWP leadership has embarked upon.

These organizational measures carried out by the SWP leadership are not only undemocratic; they amount to a de facto and unprincipled split which the majority leadership is solely responsible for engineering. We, the undersigned four suspended National Committee members, state categorically that we are opposed to any such split. We will fight for our reinstatement into the party and the National Committee and for the opening of a free and democratic discussion of the differences. We will advocate a reversal of the current destructive course and a return to the historic program of the SWP.

The split in the SWP being carried out by the Barnes leadership is only the national expression of a political line which they are beginning to implement on a world scale--through the formation of an undeclared international faction in the Fourth International. It is clear that much more than just the existence of the SWP as a revolutionary Trotskyist organization is at stake. At the recent Oberlin conference, open to non-members of the SWP, leaders and members from other countries joined in the attacks on Trotskyism and the Fourth International. They even attacked their own sections where they were in a minority--without any authorization to do so by the sections' leadership. This clearly reveals the threat to the existence of our world party which the onslaught of the current SWP leadership represents.

We, the opposition NC members in the SWP, have been at the forefront of the political struggle against these policies and have witnessed the blows on our party and on the International most closely. Merely advocating the official positions of the Fourth International has become grounds for expulsion from the SWP.

It is time to sound the alert for our entire world movement. We call on all comrades to vigorously take up this struggle, to reject abandoning the Fourth International for a nonexistent "new mass Leninist international" as the SWP leadership proposes, and to act decisively to combat the danger that threatens us. There must be an opening of the discussion in all sections and convening of the World Congress on the earliest possible date. The political struggle against the revisionism of the SWP leadership must be a major focus of that World Congress. It is vital that we confront this challenge to the program, and to the very existence of the Fourth International, and that we mobilize every comrade in this effort.

We must reaffirm the continued validity of the Trotskyist program--the only real continuation of Leninism today--on a world scale. The task of building the International and its component sections cannot be accomplished except within this framework. We must rally to the defense of the International and its program against the revisionist line of the SWP's undeclared international faction.

September 7, 1983

Steve Bloom

Steve Bloom

Lynn Henderson

Lynn Henderson

Frank Lovell (lv3)

Frank Lovell

Nat Weinstein

Nat Weinstein

THE POLITICAL PURGE IN THE AMERICAN SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY
STATEMENT BY THE UNITED SECRETARIAT

1.

The decision by the SWP National Committee at its August 1983 plenum to suspend (in reality : expel) the four minority N.C. members - comrades Bloom, Henderson, Lovell and Weinstein - from first the National Committee and then the party as such, and the new wave of expulsions of comrades with minority views initiated at the Plenum, represent a qualitative escalation of the purge of oppositionists underway in the SWP.

The de facto expulsion of the N.C. minority comrades is designed to prevent their participation in the international discussion in the pre-world congress period and in the political life of the Socialist Workers Party.

These measures are in defiance of the norms and traditions of the Fourth International, which also used to be those of the SWP.

This attempt to destroy political opposition by arbitrary organisational means is an attack on the fundamentals of proletarian democracy and undermines the basis of political collaboration both in the SWP and in the International. It has led to a de facto split carried out by the SWP leadership in the American party.

2.

In the last period and especially after the August 1981 SWP (USA) convention, the SWP leadership has carried through a number of revisions of traditional positions of the SWP and the International.

A leadership concerned about its democratic authority would have ensured a democratic process of discussion on these issues involving all the ranks of the SWP.

But on the contrary the SWP N.C. plenum in May 1983 , which according to the normal schedule would have opened a pre-convention discussion , instead postponed it. At the same time it rejected en bloc appeals of a large number of expelled members , victims of a series of new norms - including a de facto banning of tendencies.

The period following the plenum which should have been a pre-convention period , was further marked by an escalation of disciplinary proceedings . The August 1983 N.C. plenum then in turn decided to put off the convention another year, until August 1984.

Thus instead of organising a political discussion in the SWP and doing everything to limit organisational tensions inside the party in order to facilitate that discussion, the SWP leadership embarked on a different course..

3.

During this process of adoption of a range of new positions compared to traditional views of the SWP and the International, the SWP leadership's participation in the political life and discussions of the International has markedly declined.

For example it has failed to propose a single positive written resolution on any political question in the International, in spite of the fact that it has systematically voted against the draft resolutions proposed to the IEC meetings of 1981 and 1982 and a series of United Secretariat meetings during the same period, including drafts for the world congress.

Moreover, the SWP leadership has unilaterally taken questions of internal debate in the F.I. to the public and launched major attacks against leaders and sections of the International. For instance, the Mexican PRT has been treated as an opponent organisation in the Central American solidarity work. And the Australian section and leadership has been attacked as being degenerate and adapting to racism and the chauvinist ideology of Australian imperialism.

Simultaneously the SWP leadership has started to create an organised international current which in reality is an unprincipled grouping without any platform presented to the International and its members.

All these actions of the SWP leadership severely endanger the unity and integrity of the Fourth International.

4.

This October 20-24 United Secretariat meeting declares that the four N.C. minority comrades have been victims of a de facto expulsion because of their political differences with the SWP leadership. The United Secretariat therefore continues to regard them as members of the F.I. (to the extent that this is compatible with American law). All other victims of the political purge of SWP oppositionists will be treated the same way.

The United Secretariat urges the SWP leadership to reverse its organisational course and immediately and collectively reintegrate the expelled comrades.

Until this is done, the United Secretariat recognises that the comrades expelled from the SWP because of their political views will have no choice but to organise collectively in order to, on the one hand participate in the world congress discussion and fight for their political views, and on the other to continue carrying out their responsibilities as revolutionary class struggle militants.

The international will maintain relations with these comrades.

The United Secretariat finally urges the SWP leadership to fully participate in the present pre-world congress debate by submitting its views on all the questions under debate to the members of the International, through written documents.

Declaration by 19 Members of United Secretariat

1) At the August plenum of the SWP (USA) National Committee (NC), following the Oberlin educational conference of the SWP, all four minority members of the NC (Comrades Steve Bloom, Lynn Henderson, Frank Lovell and Nat Weinstein) were suspended -- first from the National Committee and then from the SWP.

This has been combined with a purge of a new layer of members in political disagreement with the central party leadership launched at the August NC plenum.

These actions represent a qualitative escalation of the campaign of political expulsions, underway in the SWP for many months. It is an act of direct hostility to the Fourth International and is in defiance of its norms and traditions, which also used to be those of the SWP.

The de facto expulsion of the NC minority, because of their defence of the programmatic continuity of the SWP and the Fourth International, is designed to prevent their participation in the international discussion in the pre-World Congress period and in the political life in the Socialist Workers Party.

The goal is to isolate the SWP NC minority by arbitrary organisational means from the ranks of the International and the SWP.

This attempt to destroy political opposition by organisational means is an attack on the fundamentals of proletarian democracy. Thus it undermines the basis of political collaboration both in the SWP and in the International.

The actions of the present SWP (USA) leadership are in total contradiction to democratic centralism and the statutes of the Fourth International, which lay out a democratic framework for the resolution of political differences.

These expulsions represent a de facto course by the SWP leadership toward splitting their party, the Fourth International and its sections.

2) The full meaning of these organisational measures can only be understood against their political background.

In the last period -- and especially after the August 1981 SWP (USA) convention -- this leadership has increasingly challenged key sections of the historic program of the Fourth International, around which the entire movement has been united. These include permanent revolution, the political revolution in the bureaucratised workers states, the dialectics between the three sectors of the world revolution, the role of the Fourth International and the defence of its organisational integrity.

These programmatic revisions have gone hand in hand with the adoption of gravely mistaken positions on major events in world politics. The outstanding examples are the adaptation to the counterrevolutionary bourgeois Khomeini regime in Iran and the shrinking from any real action to defend Solidarnosc in Poland from bureaucratic repression. There is also the political line followed during the Malvinas war which involved down-

playing the need for the Argentine workers to continue an uncompromising struggle against the bloodstained Argentinian dictatorship.

During this period -- when the leadership of the SWP (USA) was carrying through a whole series of programmatic revisions without any previous discussion in the SWP ranks or any ratification by an SWP convention -- the participation of the SWP leadership in the political life and discussions of the International has markedly declined.

For several years now, including the 1981 and 1982 IEC meetings and all the USec meetings that have taken place since then, the SWP (USA) leadership has systematically voted against the draft resolutions proposed. Yet it has failed to propose one single positive written resolution on any political question.

This course has been accompanied by several attacks on sections and leaders of the Fourth International. The Mexican PRT has been treated as an opponent organisation in Central American solidarity work. A deliberate attempt has been made to discredit it in the eyes of the Salvadoran revolutionary movement. There is also the characterisation at the August 1983 NC plenum of the Australian SWP leadership as degenerate and adapting to the chauvinist ideology of Australian imperialism.

Simultaneously, the SWP leadership has started to create an organised international current, which is in reality an unprincipled grouping without any platform presented to the International and its members.

In the long run, this approach will not only undermine the activity of the International as a whole but will also foster cliquism and factionalism-- destructive to the interests of all its components including the SWP (USA).

3) The opposition now being expelled from the SWP (USA) was formed in response to the new course bureaucratically introduced by the SWP (USA) leadership.

The activities of the opposition have been centred around efforts to defend the theoretical and political continuity of the SWP and the Fourth International against the anti-trotskyist course.

It is absolutely clear that there is nothing in the political positions advocated by the opposition, or in any action by these comrades that justifies their suspension from the SWP and its NC.

The opposition comrades have demonstrated - through their participation in a number of NC plenums, by their written contributions to the World Congress debate and by their actions - that they are determined to defend the historic positions of revolutionary marxism and the program of the Fourth International. They have tried to convince the party leadership and, to the extent possible, the membership as a whole of the dangers involved in the political and organizational course of the SWP.

They have, on numerous occasions, proposed the opening of a written discussion, and later the call for an SWP convention and a full preconvention discussion.

All these proposals were turned down.

Instead the party leadership through an internal re-education process imposed its programmatic revisions without democratic debate. This is completely contrary to the fundamental responsibilities of leadership in a democratic centralist organisation.

Attempts to question these views, even through normal party channels have been interpreted by the leadership as "reopening preconvention discussion without the approval of the party leadership" and resulted in threats of disciplinary actions.

New "norms" have been adopted for members of the NC who are prohibited from reporting back to the membership anything except those decisions and those points on the agenda that the NC has decided to make available to the rank and file. The very existence of minority points of view or minority reports may not be mentioned unless this has been explicitly decided on by the NC.

The opposition comrades have also been put under special forms of discipline that if consistently interpreted would make effective and positive intervention in the mass movement almost impossible.

Such new forms of "discipline" are in no way commensurate with the needs of democratic centralist functioning.

A leadership obviously has the duty and right to organise and regulate discussions and party interventions. But within the fundamental traditions and principles of our movement, as the continuator of the democratic centralism developed by Lenin, a leadership does not have the right to impose such regulations on discussion which in practice stamp out normal internal political life.

Any leadership in the Fourth International concerned about maintaining its democratic authority would have ensured democratic progress of discussion involving all views in the organisation.

On the contrary the May 1983 NC plenum, which according to the normal schedule would have opened preconvention discussion, instead postponed it. At the same time it rejected en bloc appeals of a large number of expelled members -- victims of the "new norms".

The period following the plenum, which should have been a preconvention discussion period, was further marked by an escalation of the political expulsions.

And the August plenum even voted to postpone the convention to the summer of 1984, a full year later than normal. By this time at least a large part of the known opponents of the new course will have been expelled.

To cover up for the real meaning of this decision the SWP (USA)

leadership announced that it would conduct a poll of the membership which in fact has taken the form of a vote of confidence or no-confidence in the leadership.

The SWP leadership has explained the unprecedented wave of expulsions as the result of the compulsive indiscipline of minority comrades who feel the party is a "cage" or a "prison". This turns the victim into the criminal!

4) The concrete action taken against the four minority NC members at the August 1983 plenum was based on the accusation that they in fact constituted a "secret faction".

This extraordinary charge staggers the mind. The facts are indisputable. The SWP leadership has violated the statutes of the FI, the constitution of the SWP and the norms and traditions of our movement. They have silenced and expelled oppositionists in the SWP going so far as the suspension of the 4 opposition members from the NC and the party.

No proof was presented to the August plenum before the trial and suspension of the four comrades.

No effort was made to ascertain the views of the comrades about the accusation before the charges were formally presented.

The minority comrades requested that a commission be set up to assess the validity of the accusation before action was taken. This request was rejected.

A decision of very great importance for the SWP was rushed through. And it was done in the context of a witchhunt atmosphere -- where innuendos aimed at discrediting the 4 comrades and the opposition as a whole were substituted for evidence.

5) We decide to characterise the suspension of the four NC minority members as a suspension (which for all practical purposes means expulsion) because of political differences -- a political suspension carried out on an organisational pretext. The F.I. cannot recognise this suspension and must state that these comrades remain members of the F.I. (to the extent that this is compatible with American law) with full right to participate in all organised internal discussion.

All other expulsions from the SWP(USA) that are part of this political purge should be treated in the same way.

We appeal to the comrades in the SWP (USA) to halt these political expulsions and re-integrate, immediately and collectively, all comrades who have been expelled for their

defence of the programmatic continuity of the SWP and Fourth International and to carry out a full and democratic discussion of the differences.

We condemn the charges made against these comrades as a means of suppressing minorities and denying the right of tendency, in direct violation of the statutes of the Fourth International.

We appeal to the comrades of the SWP to reverse their present course toward splitting the F.I. and to fully participate in the ongoing pre-world congress debate with all the corresponding rights and responsibilities. We appeal to them to present their views in an open and systematic way for democratic discussion by the world movement.

It's our opinion that if the comrades expelled from the SWP are not immediately and collectively reintegrated and given their democratic rights to fully present their views they will have no choice but to organise collectively in order to on the one hand participate in the world congress discussion and fight for the maintenance and continuity of the programme and tradition of the SWP in the USA and also to continue carrying out their responsibilities as revolutionary class struggle militants. The international leadership has the duty to uphold these rights and collaborate with these comrades unjustly expelled from the SWP.

----- 20.10.83.-----

Resolving the International Crisis of Revolutionary Leadership Today

Draft resolution submitted by Steve Bloom, Frank Lovell, Lynn Henderson and Nat Weinstein to the August 1983 NC meeting

For the agenda point: World Movement Perspectives

The crisis of proletarian leadership has been the decisive factor in world politics since the degeneration of the Russian revolution and the Stalinization of the Comintern in the 1920s. The current world-wide crisis of the imperialist economic system, the resultant radicalization and growing combativity of the working class in the imperialist countries, the rise of revolutionary struggles in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, the crisis of the mass reformist working class leaderships, and the development of the political revolution in Poland all combine to create extremely promising conditions for the resolution of that crisis today.

This will require, first and foremost, the growth and development of revolutionary Marxist vanguard parties which are capable of winning the allegiance of decisive segments of the toiling masses, leading them in the overthrow of the rule of the international bourgeoisie and its agents, and in establishing the proletarian dictatorship as a tool for the creation of an international socialist society.

This has historically been the objective of the world Trotskyist movement; and it was the reason for the creation of the Fourth International in 1938. Although that organization remains a relatively small propaganda nucleus, its forces and influence in some countries have reached a stage where they can play a direct role in the living class struggle; and in many other countries they have promising opportunities for growth. Most importantly, its basic programmatic foundations--which continue the revolutionary perspectives of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky--have been proven valid with every major development of the international class struggle. As we know from all historical experience, these fundamental programmatic questions are ultimately decisive. Our understanding on these essential principles, embodied in such documents as the Transitional Program, is the guide for our practical intervention in the class struggle, and the basis upon which we can build strong sections, with real links to the masses. This remains our primary organizational task.

Today, faced with the historic need of transforming ourselves into mass parties of revolutionary action through the course of participating in and providing leadership for the class struggle, we must reaffirm our basic strategic perspectives, and constantly renew and enrich them as a result of real experiences in the struggles of working people. Those of us in the Socialist Workers Party must particularly reaffirm the centrality of the following programmatic questions: 1) permanent revolution (i.e. the understanding that the only kind of revolution which can fulfill the demands of the masses in the age of imperialism is the proletarian revolution, the socialist revolution, even in those countries where an overwhelming weight of national and bourgeois-democratic tasks

remain to be accomplished, and where these tasks may have a decisive political weight in the revolutionary process); 2) the political revolution against Stalinist tyranny; and 3) the unity and interdependence of the three sectors of the world revolution--the imperialist countries, the colonial and semi-colonial countries, and the deformed and degenerated workers' states.

The most striking feature of the world political situation today is the simultaneous rise of the class struggle in all three sectors, fueled primarily by the international nature of the economic crisis. This creates an extremely difficult situation for the imperialist bourgeoisie and its allies. It is even more true now than it was in the past that each struggle of working people and the oppressed throughout the globe is intimately tied to every other.

When the imperialist bourgeoisie enjoyed a relative class peace with its own proletariat it could focus on putting down challenges to its rule in the colonial world, either directly--Korea, Guatemala, the Congo, the Dominican Republic--or covertly --Iran (Mossadegh), Chile, etc. Even in Indochina, where massive protests by the North American population were instrumental in forcing U.S. withdrawal, the effectiveness of these protests were limited by the lack of significant participation and leadership from mass organizations of the working class.

Today this situation is changing. The campaign being waged at home to impose austerity on the workers in the advanced capitalist countries, and the increasing resistance to that campaign, requires considerable attention and resources from the rulers. Major political initiatives against government policy--like the anti-missiles movement in Europe--have a similar effect.

The potential stakes involved in foreign military adventures by the imperialist powers are raised because of the higher class consciousness of working people. Combined with this are the memory and the political lessons learned as a result of Vietnam which remain quite strong. This has been a major factor limiting the ability of the international bourgeoisie to intervene directly into recent revolutionary developments in Iran, Grenada, and Central America.

A converse process also occurs. The developments in the colonial revolution help to shift the international relationship of class forces more and more against the interests of the international bourgeoisie. They stimulate solidarity movements in the industrialized countries, and help to shatter political illusions which the proletariat in these countries still harbor in "democratic" political institutions--exposing their role as the main defenders of oppression against the colonial masses. Thus every advance of the colonial revolution helps to strengthen the struggles in the imperialist centers.

Combined with these factors, we must consider the impact of the Polish workers upsurge--the highest development so far of the political revolution against Stalinist rule. Despite the propaganda efforts to portray the rise of Solidarnosc as an anti-

communist and pro-capitalist development, the imperialist bourgeoisie recognizes full well the threat which the Polish working class represents to their interests. The crisis of the Stalinist and Social Democratic apparatuses--both the governments and the mass parties--parallels and reinforces the developing crisis of the imperialist system itself. These bureaucratic machines work to prop up that decaying system.

The Kremlin and other Stalinist regimes in power in particular continue to aid the capitalist class by playing their counter-revolutionary role--in the name of "detente" and "peaceful coexistence." They do nothing to stop the bloody Israeli invasion of Lebanon, give scant aid to the revolutionaries in Central America, support the class collaborationist governments in France, Spain, etc.; and give political endorsement to Khomeini, and the Argentine junta (both before and after the Malvinas). All of this in addition to the repression of the Polish workers. The struggle of the Polish masses for a democratic proletarian republic provide an alternative and an inspiration for working people throughout the globe.

The general international situation--this combined crisis--also worsens the contradictions between different imperialist powers, who have conflicting interests and do not always agree on how to advance their common goals. Despite attempts to chart a unified perspective, like the Williamsburg summit in the spring of 1983, these contradictions inevitably emerge. Working people can effectively exploit this situation to gain greater room for maneuver.

It is a serious methodological error to try to extract one aspect of this world-wide revolutionary process, such as the revolution in Central America and the Caribbean--no matter how important it may be in its own right--and elevate it to the rank of "epicenter" of the world revolution around which all else revolves. This misses the essential international and interconnected nature of the entire world crisis of the imperialist system, every component of which is linked to and dependent on every other. By committing this error, the current central leadership of the SWP has consistently failed to appreciate the centrality of other major developments in the international class struggle.

An understanding of this broad scope of the international class struggle allows us to see the many opportunities for constructing a mass Leninist international movement--opportunities which are not at all limited to those developing as a result of the Central American revolution, but which exist around many struggles and in every country. To help create that international and resolve the leadership crisis of the proletariat we must clearly pose a correct solution to the combined crisis on a world scale--the international proletarian revolution in all three sectors. Ultimately, the success of the whole world revolution depends on the outcome of the struggle which we in the United States will wage against the most powerful bourgeoisie in the world for control of the wealth and resources of our own country, Not until that battle is fought and won will any other revolution be truly secure.

Central America and the Caribbean

Some of the most dramatic and important events for revolutionaries today are occurring in Central America and the Caribbean. Revolutionary governments have taken power in Nicaragua and Grenada. They have taken steps which run counter to the interests of imperialism and the native ruling classes, and which have sparked the sharp antagonism of these reactionary forces, who understand the real threat presented by this revolutionary process--the potential for the complete expropriation of bourgeois economic interests.

In other Central American countries similar struggles are gaining strength, and threatening to topple totalitarian pro-U.S. regimes. This process is most advanced in El Salvador, where revolutionary forces similar to the Sandinistas are fighting with a perspective of conquering governmental power, and seem to be on the road to victory.

The revolutionaries leading these events represent the growth and development of the Castroist current. The roots and ideology of that current can be traced back to the Cuban revolution and its impact throughout Latin America. The present course of the Central American revolution stands as striking confirmation of the revolutionary capacity of Castroism.

The most important achievement of Castroism, in addition to conquering governmental power (now in three countries) has been its ability to find the correct solution to the problem of permanent revolution in Cuba; and the Cuban workers' state stands as a model for the solution of the same problem in Nicaragua and Grenada as well as in El Salvador, Guatemala, etc., after the conquest of power in those countries. This will be the key to the future of these revolutions. We must also acknowledge that the weaknesses of Castroism can be seen within these struggles. These weaknesses take the form of theoretical and programmatic gaps and errors (for example on the nature of Stalinism or the role of the neo-colonial bourgeoisie) which result from the specific historical conditions in which the Cuban revolution took place. But up to now it is the positive, and not the negative features that have proven decisive in the current round in Central America and the Caribbean.

The clash in Nicaragua between the masses led by the FSLN on the one hand, and the old ruling classes and their supporters on the other, is becoming sharper and sharper. It has reached the stage of a major armed invasion by counterrevolutionaries backed by U.S. imperialism. A decisive showdown is shaping up that must end either in the overthrow of the still dominant economic power of the bourgeoisie and the creation of a workers' state resting on nationalized property, or in defeat for the revolution.

This is the question of permanent revolution as it has always been understood by the world Trotskyist movement. In the age of imperialism there can be no road to national liberation and economic independence and development in the colonial world except through a

process of proletarian revolution, of socialist revolution. No bourgeois solution is possible because the native bourgeoisie fears the independent mobilization of the masses more than it desires to be liberated from imperialism, and is incapable of breaking out of its subservience to the world market which holds the economies of the less developed countries hostage. Nor can there be any half-way solutions between a socialist reconstruction of the economy and a maintenance of bourgeois property, any "mixed economy, as a long term project. Such a set-up is inherently unstable and demands a relatively rapid resolution in favor of either the working class or the bourgeoisie.

Saying that the colonial revolution today must be proletarian in nature in order to succeed does not mean calling for "instant nationalizations" or for the "immediate imposition of socialism." It doesn't mean ignoring the needs and desires of the peasants, of any other essential allies of the working class. These and other slanders and caricatures of permanent revolution originated with Stalinism in the 1920s and have long ago been thoroughly refuted.

In the course of carrying through the revolutionary process, the working class must include as part of its own perspective the needs and desires of the poor farmers, of semi-proletarian layers and other allies. It will be necessary to determine what democratic and transitional demands can best mobilize the toilers in the fight to overthrow the old regime; and the optimum pace for carrying out the transition to a planned economy after that overthrow. There will be inevitable concessions to alien class forces. None of this changes the fact that unless the government that comes to power in the course of the revolution is willing and able to carry through a proletarian economic program, in opposition to the interests of the native bourgeoisie and imperialism, it will inevitably either accommodate to those forces or be overthrown by them. This is the key lesson of revolutionary efforts in this century, often learned at great cost.

The overwhelming weight of bourgeois-democratic tasks in many colonial and semi-colonial countries (particularly in Central America) does not stand as an obstacle to a perspective of proletarian revolution, but rather reinforces the necessity of it. No section of the bourgeoisie has proven capable of carrying out those tasks, and none will. Only a government which bases itself on the independent power of the workers and peasants and fights for their interests will be capable of solving the national-democratic tasks of the revolution. In order to maintain itself, and the allegiance of the masses, such a government must undertake measures against the interests of the bourgeoisie--as the FSLN and NJM have--and move toward the creation of a workers' state based on nationalized property.

This dynamic explains the unbridled hostility of Washington to these revolutions in its own backyard. It will try by every means it can to push them back and prevent the resolution of the situation in the interests of the workers and peasants. This is the reason for the economic sanctions which have been imposed, the not-so-secret military operations against Nicaragua designed

to undermine and overthrow the Sandinista regime, the plots and sabotage against Grenada, and the military aid to the regimes in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras. However there is not unanimity within the American ruling class on a course of direct military confrontation in Central America. And some of Washington's imperialist allies have also been more inclined to try the road of buying off the Sandinista revolution, or getting the FMLN-FDR to subordinate their struggle to some sort of diplomatic deal.

The U.S. government must also come to grips with the continuing memory of the Vietnam war among American workers, and the risks it runs of sparking a class confrontation on its home ground with any renewed attempts to use its own troops in counterrevolutionary adventures in other countries. At some point, in some country, as the colonial revolution advances, the American ruling class must decide that the stakes have become high enough and that the risk must be taken; we must be prepared for the possibility of direct imperialist intervention at all times. But we cannot predict exactly when or where this will take place.

Meanwhile the U.S. government continues to use every means at its disposal, short of the actual engagement of its own combat forces, to try to turn back the revolutionary tide in Central America. This makes the tasks of international solidarity with these revolutions particularly important for North American revolutionaries. We must take every opportunity to organize and mobilize working people, members of oppressed nationalities, students, and others around the basic demand of "U.S. hands off!" All such efforts will lay the essential foundation for the kind of movement which will become necessary and possible should the direct use of U.S. forces occur.

Poland and the political revolution

Another new revolutionary current has emerged in a different sector of the world revolution in the form of Solidarnosc in Poland. The initial goals of this movement were for independent trade unions, basic economic demands, and democratic liberties. But in pursuing those demands Solidarnosc and the Polish masses came squarely up against the political reality of bureaucratic rule, and the all-pervasiveness of that rule in the workers' states dominated by Stalinism. The unavoidable logic of even the simplest demands led to a situation in which the power of the organized workers and their allies was pitted directly against the repressive apparatus of the bureaucratized workers' state.

The situation faced by Solidarnosc today, and since Jaruzelski's December 1981 coup, is considerably less favorable than in the previous period of open legality. The military takeover was a significant set-back, which put the Polish workers on the defensive. But this was by no means a decisive or crushing defeat; the Stalinist apparatus has not been able to reassert its uncontested control over society. The underground resistance continues in myriad forms: illegal bulletins, Radio Solidarnosc broadcasts, work slowdowns, and mass rejection of the new officially sanctioned unions. Stikes and demonstrations have re-emerged as a major form

of struggle, for example when Ana Waltynowych was put on trial, or on May Day 1983. The massive outpouring of support for Solidarnosc which was evident during the Pope's visit in June 1983 shows conclusively that the repressive measures of Jaruzelski have totally failed to achieve their objectives.

There is little room for the Polish bureaucracy to maneuver, and few concessions they can offer to restore their brand of social peace. They have been unable to force or cajole any of the leaders of Solidarnosc to make a deal such as that proposed by the Polish church hierarchy--something the Pope may also have tried to advance during his tour. All of this indicates that continuing conflict between the bureaucrats and the masses in Poland will be on the agenda for some time to come, and the basic political question--who will rule the workers' state?--will become more and more clearly posed.

This is the question of political revolution; the bureaucratic parasites must be thoroughly purged by the working class, and not an ounce of their influence and privileges allowed to remain intact. This can only be accomplished by a real mass revolution. It is completely incorrect to describe this process as a simple "democratization" of the workers' state, an idea which can be, and has been, proposed even by sectors of the bureaucracy itself.

There can be no historic compromise between the interests of the masses and those of the bureaucracy. Unless the bureaucracy is overthrown by a real political revolution it must inevitably turn on the masses. It is this indisputable fact which put the political revolution on the order of the day in Poland during the height of the workers' upsurge there, and which makes it still a burning question for the Polish masses. This is the only alternative to the domination of the bureaucrats.

Recognizing that the problem of the political revolution is objectively posed by the Polish workers' upsurge says nothing at all about the timing or tactics of such a revolution. Only those closest to the scene of action can really say whether there was any period during the Autumn of 1981 when the Polish workers could have actually taken state power into their own hands. But whether or not they could have actually taken state power given a leadership with the desire to do so, it is clear that only the strategic perspective of taking power--an understanding that this is the only way to win the demands put forward by the Polish workers--can serve as an adequate framework for the Polish masses in pursuing their objectives.

The discussion on this question within the Solidarity movement was and still is quite extensive. This testifies to its extreme relevance in Poland. A differentiation has developed among the leaders of Solidarnosc between those who have tended toward accepting the idea of a compromise with the bureaucracy, and those with a perspective for a revolutionary solution. (There are, of course, many shades of opinion within the framework of these two general categories.) This discussion will certainly continue within the ranks and leadership of Solidarity, along with discussions on other questions which are not yet clarified for the Polish masses--such as the need for a clear alignment with all of the struggles of

working people and the oppressed around the world, from South Africa to El Salvador.

One of the most striking features of the Polish events is the combination of the political revolution with the national struggle to be free of oppression by the Kremlin. Polish nationalism, on the whole, has played a progressive role, serving as a strong stimulus to the antibureaucratic struggle, and helping to unite the working class with its allies in the rest of the population. It seems likely that the political revolution in other Eastern European countries, and in the USSR itself (where Great Russian chauvinism plays a significant part in maintaining bureaucratic domination) will display similar features.

Revolutionary Marxists around the world have been in the forefront, and correctly so, of solidarity with their Polish sisters and brothers; urging the mass institutions of the working class in the capitalist countries--the unions and mass parties--to send material aid to Solidarnosc, and to demand the release of imprisoned Solidarnosc leaders and others. It is essential that active support for the Polish workers' struggle be carried on by the working class, and particularly by its most conscious sectors. If this is not done it reinforces the misconception that the real friends of the Polish workers are the anticommunists and bourgeois politicians.

In the United States revolutionary Marxists have an indispensable educational role to play concerning the real meaning and stakes of events in Poland; including the work we can do through our own forums, and through our election campaigns and our press. But we can also participate with other forces in the labor, student, or radical movements in sponsoring meetings which directly present the Polish workers' side of the story (for example a tour of a Solidarnosc representative) or in teach-ins and debates. We should also promote discussions of the Polish situation at union meetings, rank and file fact-finding trips to Poland, and attempts to collect material aid directly for the Polish workers themselves. American workers, like our sisters and brothers in other countries must focus particularly on the hundreds of political prisoners. We must demand their release and an end to the trials. An overwhelming international outcry is needed to defend these victims of bureaucratic repression. We should also raise the demand of an end to economic sanctions against Poland, and cancellation of Poland's debts to U.S. banks.

Engaging in such activity will give us the opportunity to reach a much broader audience than can be done simply in our own name, and to work side by side with others who are genuinely interested in helping Solidarnosc. There is a big discussion taking place, and there are many people we can influence and win over to a correct perspective. Solidarnosc has had a big impact on the American working class because of its basic strategy of building an independent union, which has major implications in this country.

Palestine and Iran

The revolutionary developments in Poland and in Central America and the Caribbean stand as positive examples of what can be accomplished by revolutionary mobilizations of the masses when they develop a consistent perspective of class independence and defense of their own interests. In the Middle East in recent years we have also seen powerful mobilizations of the masses, which toppled the Shah of Iran, organized a general strike on the Israeli occupied West Bank, and resisted the assault of the Zionists in Lebanon for three months. In contrast to the events in Poland and Central America, however, the situation in the Middle East primarily shows what kind of problems are created when such mass mobilizations come under the leadership of bourgeois or petty-bourgeois forces with a class-collaborationist outlook.

The Iranian revolution which toppled the Shah occurred shortly before the victory of the Sandinistas in Nicaragua. Yet while in Nicaragua the masses have been able to move toward independence from the stranglehold of imperialism and to organize themselves independently to fight for their own interests, the Iranian revolution has seen the ever-increasing subordination of the workers and peasants to the rule of the bourgeois government headed by the Islamic Republican Party (IRP).

In the course of the revolution, the masses were drawn under the leadership of the clergy, representing the interest of the Bazaar. Populist and anti-imperialist rhetoric were used to turn the mass movement into a battering ram against political rivals of the IRP--both the more Westernized bourgeois forces, and the organized left. In addition to the sponsorship of overtly right-wing goon squads (the Hezbollahi, or "partisans of God"), the clergy channeled sectors of the revolutionary-minded masses into organizations sponsored by, and serving the interests of, a new repressive bourgeois state apparatus. These included the Komitehs, used to repress militants on a local basis; the revolutionary guard corps (Pasdars), used as an armed wing of various cliques in the government--particularly in the brutal repression against the oppressed nationalities; the Jihad for construction, which functions primarily as a tool to pacify the countryside and as an army corps of engineers.

Because of their nature as vehicles to coopt revolutionary elements, these movements began by including honest anti-imperialist militants. But since these were not real independent organizations of the masses, the government has been able to control them, purge them, and increasingly incorporate them into the state. This is now seen, for example, by the introduction of ranks into the Revolutionary Guards, and the creation of a ministry for them in the government.

Today in Iran, the workers' Shoras (councils) have almost entirely lost their independence (where they continue to exist at all) and in most cases have been replaced by the Islamic Anjomans

(societies) which were set up by, and are subordinate to the IRP. The regime has launched an overwhelming repression. Torture is again routine, and the executions number in the thousands and still continue. This is directed primarily against the oppressed nationalities, the left, and the working class, and has had a devastating effect. At the same time the real counterrevolutionaries--the Savak agents (many of whom remain in positions of power) and the pro-Shah officer corps in the army--are treated with kid gloves. The government has completely undermined the educational system, launched attacks on the rights of women, and maintained the oppression of the national minorities.

The outlawing of the Tudeh (Communist) Party in the spring of 1983, and the arrest of thousands of its members and leaders shows the inexorable logic of this process. The Tudeh Party had followed a slavish policy of praise and political support for the "anti-imperialist" government under Khomeini, thinking that in this way it could avoid the repression which it had (at best) failed to oppose (and at worst given cover to) when used against others. In reality, this policy sealed the Tudeh Party's fate. After progressively destroying democratic rights and institutionalizing torture and summary executions with the acquiescence of the Tudeh party, Khomeini brought down the axe which the victims themselves had helped to sharpen.

The present situation in Iran is not an inevitable result of the revolutionary process. It is the result of the failure of the Shorahs and other mass organizations to develop an independent proletarian perspective, and of their reliance on Khomeini and the clergy to point the road forward for the revolution and carry out a policy in the interests of the toilers. Had the Iranian workers and peasants developed instead a leadership which explained the need to rely on their own strength, and to seek alliances with the oppressed nationalities (the Kurds, the Azerbaijanis, etc., who represent 60% of the population) in their fight for self-determination, the outcome could have been qualitatively different. A reversal of the trend toward the consolidation of a repressive bourgeois government in Iran depends on the renewal of independent class mobilizations by the workers and peasants, directed against the Khomeini government and their own bourgeoisie as well as against the external threat from imperialism.

The IRP government in Iran, like many other bourgeois nationalist regimes in the developing countries, has sought to use the struggles of the masses to better its own position in relation to imperialism. It has also, particularly in the initial stages of the revolution, felt compelled to make significant concessions to the masses' anti-imperialist, and particularly anti-American imperialist aspirations. For these reasons it has taken a number of genuine anti-imperialist measures, and is not viewed by Washington and its allies as a reliable bulwark to defend their interests. This, in turn, has resulted in the attacks, both economic and military, by imperialism on the present Teheran government.

Revolutionary Marxists support every anti-imperialist measure taken by the government, and strive to push this dynamic as far as possible. We must participate in, and be in the forefront

of, defending Iran against counterrevolutionary efforts, either direct or indirect, by the imperialists--such as the 1980 Iraqi invasion. This is because the task of overthrowing the Khomeini regime is a task for the Iranian workers and peasants themselves, not one for the international bourgeoisie. It is the task of revolutionary Marxists seeking to build a section of the Fourth International in Iran to help the masses establish their own government--a workers' and farmers' government--which is the only kind that can carry on a truly effective anti-imperialist struggle. In the long run, even the most militantly bourgeois nationalist regimes must reconcile themselves with imperialism--as the IRP government appears to be attempting today, with its overtures to West Germany and other countries for example--since they cannot offer any truly independent path of development.

The Israeli invasion of Lebanon in the summer of 1982--and the response of the Palestinian resistance and the Arab governments to it--also demonstrated the difficulties created by the lack of a clear proletarian perspective, in this case for the Palestinian and Arab masses. The majority of bourgeois and monarchical Arab governments have no ability to fight Zionism, nor any serious interest in doing so, as illustrated by their passivity during the latest war. These regimes have been unable to reach an accord with Israel primarily because of the overwhelming opposition to such a course within their own populations. If they could get away with it, they would gladly opt for the "Camp David" solution.

Working people can have no illusions about the desire of the various "socialist" or bourgeois nationalist regimes in the Arab world to fight imperialism. And we cannot hesitate to condemn them for their crimes against the masses, even (or especially) when these occur in the name of "anti-imperialist unity." It was the "anti-imperialist" and "socialist" Baath clique which launched an atrocious war against the Kurdish people of Iraq, as well as the counterrevolutionary invasion of Iran. The Syrian government, part of the "steadfastness front" against Israel, proclaims all sorts of anti-imperialist objectives, while refusing in fact to fight imperialism in any meaningful way. It uses its rhetoric, among other things, to cover up such crimes as the 1982 bombardment and liquidation of Hama, one of its major cities, and scene of an uprising against the government.

The main leadership of the PLO commits a serious error when it includes these and other Arab governments, as well as the Palestinian bourgeoisie, within its strategic framework of pan-Arab unity in the fight against Israel. We stress the word strategic because it is important to differentiate between this and temporary tactical, or military, alliances which are by no means excluded under conditions like those in the Middle East. But the strategic perspective of a common struggle with the Arab ruling classes has seriously crippled the Palestinian cause, and has led to a situation where its demands and perspectives are limited to those which will not alienate its bourgeois allies.

The task of Palestinian national self-determination is a task which can only be carried out by the Palestinian workers and peasants along with their allies, the toiling masses in the other Middle Eastern countries including Israel. But Arafat and the current he represents within the PLO, while not hesitating to mobilize the Palestinian people (at least their armed contingent) when they have been forced to do so, prefer to make deals at the top with the enemies of the masses--the representatives of the Arab ruling classes. This is the reason for their policy of "non-interference" in the affairs of the Arab states, which simply means not opposing the rule of the Arab kings and bourgeoisies. This strategic approach has left the PLO politically unprepared for events like the murderous attack launched by King Hussein in 1970 that drove the resistance forces out of Jordan.

The divisions in the PLO which have taken the form of armed confrontations between "Arafat loyalists" and "rebels" reflect, at least to some extent, these real contradictions of the Palestinian struggle today, created by this traditional class-collaborationist policy. This is true regardless of whether those who oppose Arafat are able to develop a clear alternative perspective, and regardless of the diplomatic advantages which various Arab governments, Israel, or the imperialists try to gain from the divisions in the PLO.

A revolutionary appraisal of Palestinian nationalism and of Arab nationalism, which are tremendously progressive forces, must combine the nationalist with a proletarian revolutionary perspective. Only through the socialist revolution in the Middle East can the Palestinian masses win their liberation from the yoke of imperialist oppression and overthrow Zionism.

The overtly reactionary, as well as the "progressive" bourgeois nationalist regimes in the Middle East all share a fear of the revolutionary mobilization of the masses which is essential in this process. Many of these governments are themselves the products of national revolutions against European colonialism, but the bourgeois nationalist revolutions that took place in the region failed to liquidate imperialist domination of these countries. A revolution of the scope necessary to liquidate the racist Zionist state and win over the Jewish working masses will clearly require a proletarian perspective.

This does not in any way belittle the importance of the national struggle, which in a situation like the one in the Middle East is likely to play a predominant role in advancing the necessary mobilization of the masses. It rather underlines its importance. There can be no socialist revolution in the Middle East without the national revolution playing a major part. But at the same time any national revolution, to be successful, must from the beginning be a socialist revolution as well. Only a perspective that refuses to compromise the independent interests of the workers and peasants --which means a perspective of proletarian revolution--can successfully mobilize the masses in their struggle for national liberation. We must insist on this fundamental lesson, which revolutionary Marxists have confirmed again and again.

There is no guarantee that Israel would have been defeated in Lebanon, or that the situation would be significantly different today in the Middle East if the PLO had followed a different policy over the last ten years (though at least in the 1975-76 Lebanon civil war a real opportunity existed for the Lebanese and Palestinian workers and peasants to take power and create their own government). But the actual policies the PLO did follow made any success much more difficult if not impossible. Even if all that is on the agenda is a defensive struggle, a correct approach to strategic tasks makes it possible to understand who are the reliable allies, and on what programmatic basis they can be mobilized.

Solidarity with the Palestinian struggle is a primary responsibility for revolutionary Marxists, particularly in the United States. Demands and slogans which can help mobilize working people in objective support for the Palestinian cause revolve around these themes: U.S., Israeli, and other Imperialist forces out of Lebanon; no arms sales or military aid to Israel; self-determination for the Palestinian people. We must develop these ideas in our agitational work and in our proposals for action. In addition, through the vehicle of our more general propaganda we must explain our support to a victory by the PLO over Israel.

In the same way that the revolutions in Central America and the Caribbean demonstrate the basic applicability of permanent revolution in a positive way, so the recent experiences in Iran and Palestine demonstrate it in the negative. This takes nothing away from the heroic struggles of the Iranian and Palestinian masses themselves. The toppling of the Shah will always remain an historic achievement no matter what the final outcome in Iran. This act itself was an important blow against the power of the imperialists. The resistance of the PLO to the Israeli seige of Beirut is a proud chapter in the history of that struggle, and an inspiration to all fighters against tyranny and exploitation. But history shows time and again that even the most powerful mass mobilizations are not sufficient in and of themselves to lead to victory. They must develop a perspective of overthrowing the bourgeoisie, and they must develop a leadership capable of acting decisively to establish a proletarian government.

The growing class polarization in the imperialist countries

Though less dramatic than events in Central America and the Caribbean, in Poland, or in the Middle East, a new situation has begun to take shape in the imperialist countries which will ultimately be decisive for the international class struggle. This has expressed itself both in terms of an increased economic struggle--a fightback against austerity--and in a number of important political battles. This process is uneven from one country to another, but clear signs of its development can be seen throughout Europe and North America.

The Western European working class has long had a militant trade union tradition in most countries. This tradition is playing an important role today when the workers are faced with the ever-mounting take-back drive of the employers in their attempt to

make working people pay for the capitalist economic crisis. But the European workers have learned that the fight against austerity cannot be waged on the trade-union level alone. They are also seeking a political solution for their dilemma.

This has manifested itself in the historic electoral victories for Social Democratic parties in France, Greece, Spain, and Sweden. There is also the development of the Bennite current in the British Labor Party, and the leftward shift of the rank and file base of that party. This can be expected to continue in the wake of the Thatcher electoral victory, which mainly reflected the inability of the traditional Labor Party leadership to present an alternative.

The Social Democratic-CP coalition governments in Europe will not be capable of resolving the bourgeois economic crisis, or of significantly softening its effect on the working classes, but their election represents a powerful step forward for the masses and improves the general relationship of class forces. It is the task of revolutionary Marxists to demand that the reformist workers parties presently in office break with the bourgeoisie and take decisive measures to halt unemployment, factory closings, and other attacks by the bosses. This policy will expose the reformist misleaderships and help the masses shed the illusions they still hold about them. It will lead to an understanding of the need for a truly revolutionary working class government, which can carry through a complete transformation of economic and social relations.

Events move rapidly in this kind of situation. In both France and Spain the working class has issued a warning to the reformists through the municipal elections in the spring of 1983, which revealed growing disillusionment with the policies of the national governments. There have been major divisions within the CPs and SPs which reflect increased dissatisfaction within the ranks. These things in no way indicate a shift to the right, but rather a desire for a government that truly defends the interests of working people against the bosses. It is this sentiment that presents a major opportunity for the emergence in these countries of a mass based class-struggle leadership.

There are other indications of a new political consciousness and willingness to act on the part of the European proletariat. Most significant of these is the growth of the antimissiles movement. This is a movement directed clearly and decisively against the imperialist remilitarization drive. It is a movement for unilateral (even if only partial) disarmament. The European sections of the Fourth International have correctly been in the forefront of this development, and made it a big priority in their activity, seeking to deepen its connections to the working class by getting the unions actively involved.

The North American, and particularly the U.S. working class is not as advanced in its trade union or political consciousness as are the Europeans. Nevertheless, growing signs of class consciousness are appearing; this lays the basis for a rapid development of the class struggle.

While in Canada the trade union movement launched its own independent political party some years ago, the U.S. workers have so far failed to follow that example. This complete lack of any independent mass expression of working class politics, even if only of a reformist character, is the dominant feature of political life in our country. It puts its stamp on all aspects of the class struggle.

There are signs of a heightened awareness within the U.S. labor movement about this situation and the need to resolve it. The development of a labor party based on the unions is a task of the greatest importance to all working class militants in the U.S. today. It requires particular attention from the revolutionary party.

The tasks which must be undertaken for a defense of the gains made over the past 20-30 years by working people in the U.S. and Canada will require a militant, fighting, class-struggle leadership for the union movement. The current crop of union bureaucrats have no experience with these kinds of struggles, and no interest in developing that experience. Though they come from many different backgrounds, and have different outlooks that reflect different pressures, they are all completely class-collaborationist, and there is no sign that any of this layer are capable of breaking with their past.

But the longer the contradiction continues between the kind of leadership that is needed to advance the class struggle and the kind that is available, the more explosive the situation becomes. There are growing indications that North American workers have begun to draw the conclusions from several years of give-backs and concessions. They have come to understand that these will not save jobs or improve the general economic picture. There is also a growing consciousness about the need for the unions to take a stand on broad social questions--the rights of women and Blacks, opposition to nuclear power and weapons, and against the government's war policies. A large number of unions have taken positions against U.S. intervention in Central America. Even the national AFL-CIO is against recertification of human rights progress in El Salvador. All of this reflects growing ferment in the ranks.

It is just a matter of time before a new leadership begins to develop which can present a consistent alternative policy to the present course of the union bureaucracy.

Other developments in the colonial revolution

The events in Grenada and Central America, and in Poland are the most advanced examples of the development of working class struggles in counterposition to the traditional reformist working class apparatuses. But they are not the only examples. In most countries the general rise in working class combativity has yet to find any real political expression outside of the Stalinist and

Social Democratic blind alleys in which the international workers movement has been trapped for decades. But there are important exceptions to this. One example is the Workers Party (PT) in Brazil.

The developing confrontation between the workers and the capitalists in Brazil was reflected in the significant defeat suffered by the government in the 1982 elections, despite extremely undemocratic election procedures. The PT represents a move onto the political arena of real, mass-based, class-struggle forces with a long experience and tradition in the Brazilian workers movement. In addition to the strong showing made by the PT (strong considering its inexperience and the difficult conditions it faced) the ruling party lost important races to the mass reformist bourgeois opposition party.

In Mexico, too, the 1982 elections demonstrated the growing crisis of bourgeois rule. Here a genuine revolutionary pole, presented by our comrades of the PRT through the candidacy of Rosario Ibarra de Piedra, made an impressive showing and developed a truly mass-based response.

In Latin America in general there has been a renewed development of mass struggles. In Argentina, in the wake of the Malvinas defeat, the military regime is teetering on the edge, with no significant social base. Renewed mass demonstrations and strikes in Chile have threatened Pinochet. In Bolivia, the mobilizations of the tin miners and others forced the restoration of a civilian government, which has little real hope of stabilizing bourgeois rule. In Uruguay, Colombia, Peru--with the imposition of martial law--and other countries there are also struggles taking place.

For American revolutionaries the fight for Puerto Rican independence always has a particular importance. The massive unemployment and oppressive living conditions of the island's inhabitants is a direct result of their super-exploitation by U.S. monopolies. There have been a number of important battles in recent years such as the electrical workers strike, the student strike at the University of Puerto Rico, and the occupation of the "town without fear." The battle also continues for an end to the U.S. military's use of the island of Vieques for target practice. All of this shows a continued combativity on the part of the Puerto Rican people. We extend our full support and solidarity to these and similar struggles, and will mobilize ourselves to do so actively whenever the opportunity arises. We will also attempt to collaborate in joint campaigns with our co-thinkers in the LIT, sympathizing section of the Fourth International in Puerto Rico.

Other parts of the colonial and semi-colonial world have been the scene of important events as well, from South Africa, to Ghana, to the Western Sahara, to India, to S. Korea, to the Philippines, to Micronesia, to East Timor. The efforts of the colonial masses to break out of their bondage is searching for effective expression. Such expression can only be found in these countries through a perspective of socialist revolution, of permanent revolution.

The international economic crisis

Fueling all of the major developments in the international class struggle is the growing structural crisis of the imperialist economic system. It must be emphasized that this is a structural crisis, not a conjunctural one. It will not be resolved after a short period of readjustment. The long period of capitalist economic boom which followed the destruction created by the second world war has come definitively to an end. Markets for products continue to diminish and profitable investment opportunities are fewer and fewer. Industrial production in the main imperialist countries is shrinking. In the United States in the fourth quarter of 1982 the utilization of productive capacity was at its lowest point in history. This results in massive unemployment.

At the same time the tremendous expansion of credit by governments, by industry, and by consumers--which has softened the impact of the crisis of overproduction--has fueled a massive inflation which in its turn threatens to completely destabilize the international economy. So precarious is the situation that a single default by a major corporation, or bank, or country could start a chain reaction with devastating effects.

The impact of this economic crisis can be felt in every sector of the world. Its consequences in the imperialist countries themselves are obvious; and the questions of jobs and of controlling inflation play a major role in political life--along with the question of who will pay for the crisis, the workers or the bosses.

In the colonial and semi-colonial countries the effects of the economic situation are even more devastating. These nations must pay ever higher prices for the industrial and consumer goods they import; yet the prices they receive for the raw materials and agricultural products that they export remain the same, or actually decline. This causes a massive balance of payments problem. The huge public debt which has accumulated in many of these countries as a result of this fuels an inflation which is qualitatively greater than it is in the industrial countries, and the suffering of the masses is much more acute.

The workers' states are also affected by the capitalist crisis. Shrinking world trade means a diminished opportunity for exports to gain much-needed hard currency for the purchase of western-made goods. In a country like Cuba, which utilizes the same agricultural markets as the colonial countries, the reduced prices it receives for its products create major difficulties and result in a shortage of foreign-made commodities. We have already discussed the even greater impact of the international economic crisis on the bureaucratically controlled workers' states of Eastern Europe, which have, over the past several years, significantly mortgaged their future to the western banks, and where the burden of foreign debt is combined with the growing crisis of a bureaucratically managed economy.

We can expect to see, and in fact have already seen, varied attempts by the bourgeoisie to solve their crisis--fiscal manipulations, protectionist schemes, increases in war spending, and similar measures. But none of these can be of any long range help and most will even make matters worse. The only real solution which the imperialist ruling classes can offer is one of cutbacks and austerity. Working people, they assert, demand too much when they expect a decent standard of living in return for their labor.

But the solution of the bourgeoisie will not be quickly imposed on the working class, and it cannot be imposed without big struggles. This will place on the order of the day the question of the working class itself taking matters into its own hands and imposing its own government and its own solution to the crisis.

The development of this class struggle will not be linear. It will have its ups and downs, its ebbs and flows, and its unevenness from country to country, and even within the same country. This will likewise be true of the economic crisis as a whole, which will undoubtedly see periods of relative recovery even within the context of an overall decline. Although the ability of the ruling classes to maneuver and grant concessions is much more limited than it has been in the past, it is wrong to say that there can be no attempts in this direction. We can decisively say, however, that much greater struggles will be necessary for working people to wrest even the smallest concession, or to maintain their present standard of living.

The opportunities and tasks of revolutionary Marxism

The opportunities on a world scale for creating a revolutionary vanguard capable of leading the working class and its allies forward to a decisive victory over the imperialist system have never, since the degeneration of the Russian revolution, been greater than they are today. There is no one tactic or gimmick which can instantly or even rapidly resolve the leadership crisis of the proletariat. What is required is a continuation of the basic Leninist strategy of party building, based on the method of the transitional program, in each country through a combination of activities--depending on the course of world events, the domestic class struggle, and the specific relationship between revolutionary Marxist and other forces vying for leadership and influence in the working class.

The most important task we have in relationship to the Castroist current, and the revolutions it is leading, is to throw ourselves fully into the effort for solidarity, and against imperialist intervention. This is a project which is possible in every country. In addition, in those countries, mostly in Latin America, where this current is actively involved, along with us, in the class struggle, we must strive to work with them in every possible way to develop united campaigns and perspectives. Through these kinds of activities, as well as through the successes our forces can score in leading the struggles of working people, we will put ourselves in the best position to learn from and emulate the strong side of the Castroists, as well as engaging these comrades in the

necessary political discussion on the important points of programmatic difference which remain between us. In this way we can pursue our perspective of convergence with these forces in a constructive and principled way.

A similar set of tasks must govern our approach to Solidarnosc. We must demonstrate the dedication of revolutionary Marxists to mobilize material aid and political solidarity in support of the Polish workers. We will thereby place ourselves in a position to contribute to the thinking out process, the political differentiation occurring within Poland itself, and help with the consolidation of a leadership dedicated to the perspective of political revolution.

We must have a special relationship to the struggles in Central America and in Poland, because of their extreme political importance for the world revolution today. But we must also have the perspective of throwing ourselves strongly into solidarity with any and every struggle against imperialist domination, or national oppression, or for democratic rights, wherever they should occur, from the Middle East, to South Africa, to Latin America, to Ireland, to the USSR, to China.

In countries where revolutionary Marxist organizations exist, the building of parties rooted in the broadest mass of working people will require close attention to the developing domestic class struggles, as well as to problems of international solidarity. This means participating in and attempting to provide leadership for the unions and other mass organizations. It means attention to the particular struggles of oppressed nationalities, of immigrant workers, and of women. Special attention must also be paid to the struggles of youth, both working class youth on the job and students.

We have answers to all of the problems faced by working people and their allies--answers contained in the basic principles of class solidarity and proletarian internationalism as expressed in the transitional program. We must translate our answers into a language that can be readily understood, and apply them to specific struggles and concerns that emerge out of the broader class struggle.

In all of our mass work, the tactic of the united front must remain our basic approach. This will aid us in building the most powerful activities in defense of working people's interests, and it will allow us to reach those forces we want to increase our collaboration with, as well as helping to expose the misleaderships of the working class.

The turn to basic industry remains an essential task for revolutionary Marxists throughout the world. The growing radicalization within the working class itself provides new openings and opportunities for propaganda, agitation, and action. This dictates that we give top priority to work in this arena. This requires a conscious effort to develop a cadre which in its large majority is part of and rooted in this basic strategic sector of the working class.

The colonization of our existing cadre is the absolutely necessary beginning to this process; but it is only the beginning. Revolutionary militants in industry must strive to gain the trust and confidence of their coworkers by forging inseparable ties with them, and showing through discussion and action that our program can point the road forward to liberation from the insecurity and oppression of life under capitalist rule. This can only be done via a long-term commitment, and through fighting side-by-side with those we hope to reach--demonstrating our capacity to lead in every struggle and on every question, both big and small.

Through this process our primary objective is to convince and recruit a new layer of fighters directly from the industrial working class itself. Only if we do this, only if our parties become proletarian in this sense--made up in large measure of comrades who originate in and are recruited out of basic industry--will we be able to say that we have accomplished our goals in the turn.

It is also essential that the turn to basic industry not be seen as a turn away from other vital components of the class struggle--either important non-industrial sectors of the working class or allies of the class which maintain their own importance. Rather we must use our turn as a means of strengthening and deepening our work in these sectors. We must also recognize that a need to be rooted in working class life doesn't end at the factory door, but requires a concern with the many and varied needs of working people on and off the job.

For the Fourth International

One organizational conclusion flows inescapably from a correct assessment of the opportunities opening up for revolutionary Marxists today--build the Fourth International. Only the Fourth International maintains the programmatic heritage of the Marxist movement from the Communist Manifesto written by Marx and Engels; through the early years of the Communist International under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky; through the development of the Comintern's program by Trotsky and the Left Opposition after Lenin's death in the fight against Stalinism, and in great events --such as the Chinese revolution of 1925-27, the fight against fascism in Germany and France, the Spanish civil war, etc. It is the Fourth International, and only the Fourth International which has applied these lessons to the revolutionary developments of the post-World War II years, and which, to this day, maintains a perspective for proletarian revolution in the imperialist countries, in the colonial world, and in the deformed and degenerated workers' states.

This programmatic perspective of revolutionary Marxism has been fought for and conquered at a great cost in human sacrifice and suffering. To maintain and apply that program is the most important task of our world movement. It becomes doubly and triply important now that the opportunity exists for our international current to influence and learn from the experiences of other

revolutionary forces such as those in the forefront of the battles in Central America and Poland. Demonstrating that we can build our parties based on our program will be one of the most important factors, along with the objective development of the revolutionary process itself, in contributing to any convergence that may be possible--a joining of our own forces with these others in a common political tendency.

An insistence^{e)} on the need to build the Fourth International today and an insistence on the need for programmatic clarity are not organizational fetishism or sectarianism. We all know that in the process of building a revolutionary international many kinds of organizational forms, maneuvers, etc. will be needed. But those in our ranks who today reject building the Fourth International as a correct organizational perspective present no serious or practical alternative. They demand that we orient ourselves toward an as yet non-existent "new mass Leninist international" as if the only thing that was keeping this from coming into existence was our failure to embrace it. Even more significantly, they insist that this requires renouncing our programmatic perspectives on permanent revolution and on the political revolution, along with a rejection of our correct approach to the three sectors of the world revolution.

We have also begun to see the development of a new, and completely non-Marxist approach which tries to fit all developments in the world into either "pro-imperialist" or "anti-imperialist" categories, without making the necessary distinctions between different class forces involved in such struggles. The result of this has been the grouping of the international proletariat in the same "anti-imperialist camp" as certain radical-bourgeois colonial regimes and Stalinist governments, with a concurrent theoretical and practical subordination of the need for independent struggles by the workers and peasants to defend their own specific interests. The "struggle against imperialism" is declared to be a higher task. One clear example of the tragic results of such an approach is the disastrous line of the SWP majority on Iran, and the similar approach taken by some members of the Fourth International in Iran itself.

History has demonstrated time and again that organizational projects undertaken by even the best intentioned revolutionists, if they ignore or deny the importance of program, can only end in disaster. The proposal to subordinate the building of the Fourth International today to the perspective of a new mass Leninist international, especially when this perspective is accompanied by the reckless abandonment of a correct Marxist outlook, must be firmly rejected.

We must instead reaffirm our programmatic perspectives--not because they have been inscribed in stone by those who came before us, but because they have been confirmed and reconfirmed over and over by every experience of the world working class and the international revolution. We must reaffirm our commitment to these principles because without them the working class will be unable to overthrow the capitalists and advance to the reconstruction of the world on a socialist, a humanitarian basis. We must build parties and an international based on that program, seek to gain the leadership of the working class and its allies, and seek to join with all other class struggle, proletarian, revolutionary currents which have and which will arise in order to advance the revolutionary process.

NEW INTERNATIONAL SLANDERS FI

(1) Number 1 of the magazine New International, started by the leaders of the Canadian Revolutionary Workers League and the Socialist Workers Party in the United States, has an introduction by Steve Clark, Larry Seigle and John Riddell, containing the following passage about Jack Barnes's article "Their Trotsky and Ours":

"A U.S. government police agency evidently got into the act too, carrying out a 'Cointelpro'-style disruption operation. A tape was sent anonymously from the United States purporting to be a recording of the speech [given by Jack Barnes]. Its recipients, believing the tape to be authentic and making the mistake of not verifying it, had a transcript made that was then distributed quite widely internationally -- from Britain and Germany to Australia. The political character of the discrepancies between the speech and this Paris transcript show clearly that the anonymous tape must have been doctored."

By amalgams and insinuations, this introduction implies that the United Secretariat, without "verifying" it, circulated a version of Jack Barnes's speech at Chicago that was "doctored" by a "police agency."

(2) These insinuations are a crude lie:

-- at its January 1983 meeting, in the presence of a comrade from the SWP leadership, the United Secretariat heard a detailed report about Comrade Barnes's speech, from its own representative at the YSA convention. In order to be able to discuss precisely the serious political problems posed by this public speech, it asked the SWP comrades to furnish the March meeting of the United Secretariat with a transcript of the speech they themselves would edit, or, if they didn't have time for that, a tape which the United Secretariat Bureau would undertake to transcribe and translate.

Not getting any response from the SWP comrades, the Bureau took the initiative of transcribing and translating the tape that had been received in the meantime. The tape and the transcript were checked by the comrade who represented the United Secretariat at Chicago. The transcript was sent to the SWP leadership, which did not reply either to acknowledge receipt or to comment. Thus the United Secretariat did what it could to "verify" the authenticity of the version sent to its members -- and only to them -- along with precautions contained in the introductory letter dated March 11, 1983.

-- the version of the speech finally elaborated and published by New International in the form of an article, more than six months later, confirms the content of the text given to the United Secretariat in March and the authenticity of the original tape.

(3) As a result, the United Secretariat

a) categorically condemns the unproven insinuations published by New International.

b) stresses that if they had been sincere in their concern and loyal to the Fourth International, the NI editors would not have waited several months to publicly spread such serious accusations, but would have raised the matter immediately and in the framework of the International's normal channels. Their silence and then their public accusation thus demonstrate that it is a case of irresponsibility or of provocation pure and simple.

c) stresses that the public accusation of having been deceived or manipulated by a police fabrication is one of the traditional slanders against the Trotskyist movement, from which the SWP itself has often suffered. For this type of procedure to be introduced inside the ranks of the International is intolerable.

d) asks the NI editors to print the present correction in their next issue and to withdraw their insinuations against the United Secretariat.

e) decides to publish the present motion in the magazine Quatrieme Internationale.

(Translated from Quatrieme Internationale, December 1983)

