14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014
January 9, 1976

TO MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Dear Comrades,

Enclosed are copies of materials distributed at the plenum, for your information in case you did not pick them up there.

Comradely,

Doug Jenness /dr

Doug Jenness
SWP National Office

COPY

To the January 1976 Plenum of the National Committee of the Socialist Workers Party

Dear Comrades,

Once again, we want to draw your attention to the serious situation created in the IVth International by the fact that the recommendations of the February 1975 IEC regarding the collective reintegration of the IT comrades into your party have not yet been implemented, practically one year after they were voted and adopted.

We obviously differ on the antecendents [sic] of this dispute, and regarding the responsibilities involved. But about one statement of facts there should be no difference of opinion. As long as the February 1975 IEC recommendations have not been implemented, the highest degree of tension will persist in the F.I. between the majority and the minority. Rightly or wrongly, the majority of the leaders and the members of the F.I. are convinced that a matter of basic principle is involved in that dispute: the question of equality of rights between various tendencies inside the F.I.

Rightly or wrongly, the majority of leaders and members of the F.I. believe that your party's leadership has victimized the IT comrades of the I.T. for the "crime" of coming out, as an organized and efficient faction inside the S.W.P., in favor of those positions of the F.I. majority with which you disagree. Under these circumstances, the continuation of the debate in the international trotskyist movement occurs under conditions of basic inequality of chances for different tendencies. The comrades in solidarity with SWP positions enjoy full tendency rights and in fact operate as highly organized factions inside all those sections which are led by IMT comrades. However, the comrades in political solidarity with the IMT are systematically purged or demoralized inside the SWP. Such inequality of chances is obviously intolerable for the IMT. It will not be tolerated by them.

We urge you to take this fact into account, regardless of whether you agree with the interpretation of events underlying it. Surely the opinion of the majority of the leaders and members of the F.I., an organisation with which you are in general political solidarity in spite of existing tactical differences and even if reactionary legislation prevents you from being members, cannot be a matter of indifference to you. Surely, the question of reintegrating a couple of dozen comrades more into the SWP, comrades who have made unmistakenly clear their willingness to accept discipline and the organisational principles of the SWP and to act accordingly, should not be a matter of great concern to an organization of the size of the SWP. Surely, the formal right of local branches to decide upon that matter (i.e. to procrastinate as they have procrastinated since the May 1975 SWP Plenum), should weigh less heavily upon your judgment than the question of normalizing your relations with thousands upon thousands of organized trotskyists the world over, who regard this matter as <u>the</u> key question of the moment, for the above mentioned reason of principle.

We therefore urge you to settle, at your Plenum, once and for all, the collective reintegration of all those members of the IT who have applied for membership, and who unmistakingly declared their willingness to accept the discipline of the SWP, on the basis of their political conviction that the building of the marxist revolutionary party in the United States is identical with the building of the SWP.

If you act in a responsible manner, as your whole history and tradition commands you to do, we are sure that relations with the FI will become rapidly as normal as they were for many years. Political differences, important as they may be, can then be discussed in a calm and constructive way, without in any way obstructing daily fraternal collaboration. The removal of organisational grievances is a precondition for such normalization.

The IMT Steering Committee,

Aubin

December 23, 1975

COPY COPY COPY

Dec. 23, 1975
[received December 29, 1975]

Dear Jack,

Enclosed you'll find the copy of two letters which the USEC decided to-day to send to the respective addressees.

Fraternally yours,
/s/ Walter

* * *

December 23, 1975

To the leadership of the LSA/LSO, Canadian section of the F.I.

Dear Comrades,

We have received and discussed your answer to the letter of the USEC/Bureau of Dec. 12 relative to the invitation of the Quebecois grouping adhering to the "OCRFI" to your national convention.

We note your statement that your invitation of that grouping occurred before you had received the October 1975 USEC minutes, and without your having been informed, prior to the reception of these minutes, about the contents of the two motions voted during the October 1975 USEC meeting on the relations between the F.I. and the "OCRFI". We accept your statement.

However, we cannot accept your argument that even now, after having received the text of the motions voted at the October 1975 USEC meeting, the question of the invitation of the Quebecois grouping adhering to the "OCRFI" is a purely national tactical matter for the Canadian section alone to decide.

We are faced with an international offensive of the "OCRFI" which, under the guise of a unity maneuver, pursues the avowed and openly expressed goal of splitting the F.I. The Quebecois grouping which is a member of the "OCRFI" has, to our knowledge, never dissociated itself from this goal, nor has it clearly condemned the use of physical violence and slander against political opponents inside the working class movement, systematically practised by the O.C.I., the main component of the "OCRFI".

Furthermore, any attempt at "regroupment" in Quebec or in Canada -- as different from punctual united front agreements which any national section is of course free to conclude with any working class organisation -- with the Quebecois formation adhering to the "OCRFI", without a previous clarification of these questions, without a clear break of that grouping with the "OCRFI", and without serious guarantees against double membership, would be in contradiction with the organisational and political principles of the F.I. as defined by the statutes.

We therefore request you to suspend your invitation of the Quebecois grouping adhering to the "OCRFI" to your national convention, pending clarification of the above-named issues. If you would not conform yourself to this decision, the USEC would have no choice but to:

(a) request that a delegation of the GMR/RMG defends before your national convention the positions of the Fourth International leadership developed in the third, fourth and fifth paragraphs of this letter, and strongly condemns the violation of discipline involved in that invitation, which could only be considered as a questioning of the organisational structure of the F.I. as defined by the statutes;

(b) submit to the incoming I.E.C. the question of the Canadian section's leadership's breach of discipline.

We hope that you will conform yourself to our decision, even if you don't agree with it, and that you will avoid a further sharpening of the conflict arising out of the question of how to handle our relations with the "OCRFI".

We do not reject in any way the possibility or advisability of moves made by either the FI or by national sections towards the "OCRFI" or its national groupings to probe the possibility for discussion, collaboration or even regroupment with some or many of these forces. But such moves, in order to be productive from the point of view of building the FI and its national sections, should be made after previous consultation of the USEC, in common agreement of all the forces of the F.I., and not as factional maneuvers or unilateral decisions by any separate section or part of our world movement.

Fraternally yours,

For the United Secretariat
of the F.I.,

Walter

TRANSLATION TRANSLATION

United Secretariat of the
Fourth International
December 23, 1975

To the Central Committee of the OCI

Comrades,

At its December 22-23, 1975, meeting the United Secretariat of the Fourth International decided to send you the following resolution, adopted at that meeting:

"The United Secretariat of the Fourth International has been informed by the Socialist Workers Party leadership that in an exchange of letters with the OCI leadership the latter invited the United Secretariat to attend its next congress. The United Secretariat asked the LCR, its French section, for its opinion on this matter.

"The Central Committee of the LCR provided a report indicating that the OCI has repeatedly used violence against militants from other organizations within the workers movement such as the Spartacists and LIRQI, as well as against LCR militants who were intervening to put a stop to such methods. As a result, the LCR Central Committee proposed that the United Secretariat demand that the OCI leadership make a public self-criticism concerning the matters mentioned in its report, and that it explicitly condemn all forms of violence within the workers movement. This would constitute a precondition for taking the OCI request into consideration and for deciding how to deal with it.

"The United Secretariat recalls that the Fourth International has always vigorously condemned the use of violent methods within the workers movement, methods used by the reformists against revolutionaries for a long time and expanded on a monstrous scale by the Stalinists. The United Secretariat decides to adopt the proposal of the LCR Central Committee and instructs its Bureau to communicate the present resolution to the OCI."

Internationalist Communist
greetings,
For the United Secretariat Bureau,

E. Germain.

COPY COPY COPY

[received in N.Y. Dec. 30, 1975]

97 Caledonian Rd
London N.1

Dear Jack,

Enclosed is a copy of the resolution of the IMG PC on the WSL. As you will see the resolution is both rather precise and perhaps apparently rather restrictive or 'severe' in tone. I would therefore like to stress that this is not in any way due to a lack of enthusiasm for an approach to the WSL. On the contrary we consider this a very important question which your visit gave an excellent break for. Neither does it reflect some view we do not want to collaborate with the SWP on this -- again on the contrary we consider that for obvious reasons of history and some contemporary developments the SWP's collaboration in this is invaluable. Furthermore we consciously see this both as a way of showing that despite factional and tendency differences in the International active collaboration on a whole series of projects can and must be actively developed in a way that cuts across faction lines, and to attempt to improve relations between the IMG and the SWP -- relations which in the past five years have on many occasions unfortunately been less than excellent.

It is precisely this latter point however which is the reason why we passed a rather detailed resolution. Experience has shown that -- even leaving aside certain misjudgements or errors which may have been committed -- divergent interpretations not merely of norms of democratic centralism but even of resolutions can develop. For example, leaving aside for the moment who was correct or not -- and you know our views on this, there is no doubt that the OCRFI and the SWP Convention led to a heating up of relations in the FI. Similarly the Benson meeting with the Militant did not exactly make for good relations. (And just so that it does not appear I am making a one sided case you know my views, which I think is that of the majority of members of the IMG PC, on the Pierre Frank/Weiss letter from my vote and statement at the U.Sec). If any such misunderstanding occurred in relation to the WSL it would evidently lead to the exact opposite of what we both want -- i.e. not to an improvement but to a deterioration of relations between the IMG and the SWP and that evidently also interfering with our best chance of an approach to the WSL.

We therefore simply lay down what are our positions on dealing with the WSL in a way which we hope avoids misunderstanding. It is not designed to make things difficult or to suggest that someone is about to do something incorrect, but simply to avoid anything which could mess the whole thing up -- which naturally doesn't mean that we are not open to advice or suggestions on how to proceed if you have alternatives.

As regards the content of the resolution I do not think it contains anything other than that which we discussed except for a clarification on a possible misunderstanding concerning bulletins. When we were discussing this I assumed that we were discussing IIDBs. It occurred to me afterwards, recollecting certain of your remarks, that you might have been referring to internal bulletins of the SWP

as well as International Bulletins published as a fraternal courtesy to the U.Sec. We are not, as you will see from the resolution, in favour of such an exchange at the present time. We consider that exchange of bulletins of individual sections of the FI (or organisations in political solidarity with it such as the SWP), is only correct with an organisation outside the FI, such as the WSL, at a different stage of relations than that which exists at present. You may disagree with this, in which case we should discuss the question, but at present it is our position. (It may be that the problem doesn't exist as you were only referring to IIDBs but this is the type of question we want to avoid misunderstandings on so that blow ups due to unexpected acts do not occur).

fraternally

/s/ Alan Jones

N.B. If you intend coming through Britain in the coming period we should evidently meet to discuss this.

P.S. In the resolution point one refers to your meeting with the WSL but for reasons we agreed when you were here we didn't minute it that way as PC minutes are generally available.

COPY COPY COPY

Resolution of the IMG Political Committee 11 Dec 1975

[received in N.Y. Dec. 30, 1975]

cc. PC SWP
U.Sec

1. The Political Committee approves the action taken by cde Jones and cde Clynes in relation to the WSL.

2. Proposes to the U.Sec (a) to reply to the WSL document by proposing a discussion on national and international questions between members of the IMG (and U Sec if possible) and the WSL and that the discussion should include both the WSL text and the U.Sec Theses on Britain. (b) To agree, subject to satisfactory arrangements on point a, to an exchange of IIDBs with the WSL.

3. Considers that at the present time an exchange of internal bulletins of sections, or of organisations in solidarity with the FI, with the WSL is not justified by the present stage of relations with the WSL and the PC opposes this.

4. Believes that collaboration with other sections of the FI and organisations in political solidarity with the FI can be extremely valuable in approaching the WSL and welcomes this collaboration. The PC notes that of course, with the IMG as the British section of the FI, all discussions with the WSL, or other political organisations in Britain, must be agreed to, and carried out under the direction of, the IMG or the United Secretariat.

5. Notes that relations with the WSL are under the control of the IMG and that all contact of members of the IMG or other politica organisations associated with the FI which goes beyond normal contac with members of all political tendencies must be with the agreement of, and under the control of, the IMG.

6. To prepare a PC discussion on a more precise characterisation of the WSL. To prepare internal bulletins on our analysis of the WSL and its politics and on historical material on the FI.

7. To establish a commission of Adair, Clynes, Jones, Peterson to carry on discussions with the WSL.

8. Considers that relations with the 'Blick-Jenkins' group, as an affiliate of the OCRFI, are covered by the resolution requiring U.Sec agreement for discussions with any group of the OCRFI. Considers therefore cde Jones did not have the authority, nor does the IMG PC, to agree to any meetings with this group, considers that an error was made in agreeing to a meeting with this group. The PC opposes any further meetings except with the agreement of the U.Sec.

COPY COPY COPY

14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014
December 22, 1975

Brian Grogan c/o IMG
97, Caledonian Road
London N1

Dear Brian,

We have begun sending you our Political Committee minutes and National Office mailings, as Jack Barnes promised when he talked with you in London. But we have not yet received any of your mailings. Jack suggested we check to see if you had forgotten to put us on the list.

Could you check on one other thing, too? John Ross had told Jack he would send us a copy of the English translation of the pamphlet by Henri Weber on the AJS. Could you remind John, in case he hasn't sent it yet?

Comradely,

Caroline Lund
SWP National Office

* * *

14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014
December 22, 1975

Lutte Ouvriere
B.P. 233
75865 Paris Cedex 18

Dear Comrades,

Upon his return from Europe, Jack Barnes asked us to send you a copy of our catalog of SWP discussion bulletins and its supplement for 1974 and 1975. They are being sent under separate cover, along with an order form listing all our Education for Socialists bulletins.

Feel free to order any of them that you like. Since they involve discussions that have taken place in the past and have resulted in public positions by our party, we consider them to be a part of our historical record. We have made them available for research purposes, for instance, to the libraries of various universities and historical societies. We do ask, though, that you don't publish in your public press materials from these bulletins, except for those that have appeared in the Militant, the International Socialist Review, Intercontinental Press, or the Education for Socialists bulletin series, without permission.

As you will notice, many of the older bulletins are listed as out of print. We do have a few copies of some of them, though, and will be able to send them to you if they are of particular interest.

If there is anything else we can send you, or if we can help you in any other way in studying these documents, please let us know.

Also, can you send us a list of your bulletins as well?

Fraternally,

Caroline Lund
SWP National Office

cc: LCR

* * *

14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014
December 22, 1975

Francois DeMassot
c/o Informations Ouvrieres
87 Faubourg St. Denis
75010 Paris

Dear Francois,

I think you already have copies of our catalog of SWP discussion bulletins, but we have just put out a new supplement covering 1974 and 1975. I have enclosed two copies, as well as copies of a new list of all our Education for Socialists bulletins.

I don't know if anyone explained to you when you were here last summer how we look at the party discussion bulletins. Although they were originally internal documents, they concern discussions that took place in the past and have resulted in public positions by our party, so we consider them to be part of our historical record. We have made them available for research purposes, for instance, to libraries of various universities and historical societies. We do ask, though, that you don't publish materials from these bulletins in your public press without permission, except for material that has appeared in the Militant, International Socialist Review, Intercontinental Press, or the Education for Socialists series.

Fraternally,

Caroline Lund
SWP National Office

cc: LCR
U.Sec.

* * *

14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014
December 22, 1975

Alan Thornett and Tony Richardson
[address in original]
Oxford, England

Dear Comrades,

Upon his return from Europe, Jack Barnes asked us to send you two copies of our catalog of SWP discussion bulletins and its supplements for 1974 and 1975. They are being sent under separate cover, together with a list of all our Education for Socialists bulletins. We have also sent copies to John Lister and to your London headquarters.

Feel free to order any of them that you like. Since they involve discussions that have taken place in the past and have resulted in public positions by our party, we consider them to be a part of our historical record. We have made them available for research purposes, for instance, to the libraries of various universities and historical societies. We do ask, though, that you don't publish in your public press materials from these bulletins, except for those that have appeared in the Militant, International Socialist Review, Intercontinental Press, or the Education for Socialists bulletin series, without permission.

As you will notice, many of the older bulletins are listed as out of print. We do have a few copies of some of them, though, and will be able to send them to you if they are of particular interest.

If there is anything else we can send you, or if we can help you in any other way in studying these documents, please let us know.

We are also sending you under separate cover an incomplete 1975 set of Revista de America, put out by the Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores in Argentina. Jack said you were interested in seeing them. We are sending you extra copies that we had on hand; sorry it's not complete. I also put in a subscription blank with the address and rates for the PST's publications.

I hope you have begun to receive the Militant, Intercontinental Press, and the Young Socialist; we just today received a new issue of your paper.

Jack said he thought you had put out a couple of discussion bulletins for your last conference. We would be glad to receive them and any future ones you might put out.

Fraternally,

Caroline Lund
SWP National Office

cc: IMG

14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014
December 22, 1975

Robin Blick
[address in original]
London

Dear Comrade,

When he returned from Europe, Jack Barnes asked us to send you a copy of our catalog of SWP discussion bulletins and its supplement for 1974 and 1975. They are being sent under separate cover, along with a list of all our Education for Socialists bulletins.

Feel free to order any that you like. Since they concern discussions in the past that have resulted in public positions by our party, we consider them to be part of our historical record and have made them available to various libraries for research purposes, as well as to others in the radical movement. We only ask that they not be published publicly without permission, except for material that has already appeared in the Militant, International Socialist Review, Intercontinental Press, or the Education for Socialists series.

As you will see, many of the older bulletins are listed as out of print. We do have a few copies of some of them, though, and can send them to you if they are of particular interest.

If there is anything else we can send you, or if we can help you in any other way in studying these documents please let us know.

Jack asked me to tell you one other thing. He mentioned to George Novack that you were thinking about working on a book about the role of democratic demands. George is very interested in this question, and said he would be happy to correspond with you on this project if you are interested.

Fraternally,

Caroline Lund
SWP National Office

cc: IMG

14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014
December 22, 1975

Mark ~~Jenkins~~
[address in original]
London

Dear Comrade,

When he returned from Europe, Jack Barnes asked us to send you a copy of our catalog of SWP discussion bulletins and its supplement for 1974 and 1975. They are being sent under separate cover, along with a list of all our Education for Socialists bulletins.

Feel free to order any that you like. Since they concern discussions in the past that have resulted in public positions by our party, we consider them to be part of our historical record and have made them available to various libraries for research purposes, as well as to others in the radical movement. We only ask that they not be published publicly without permission, except for material that has already appeared in the Militant, International Socialist Review, Intercontinental Press, or the Education for Socialists series.

As you will see, many of the older bulletins are listed as out of print. We do have a few copies of some of them, though, and can send them to you if they are of particular interest.

If there is anything else we can send you, or if we can help you in any other way in studying these documents, please let us know.

On another subject, George Novack says he would be glad to collaborate on your project of writing a book on the Bevan period. Jack said to tell you he was correct in saying that several of the major articles on Bevan signed by Healy were actually written by George. Jack checked back in early issues of Labour Review and found three such articles:

* * *

We assume that you can find these issues at a library, but if not, we could send you photocopies. Jack also says that the steering committee, in essence, that directed the work in the Bevan period was composed of Healy, George Novack, and John Lawrence. So George would be a unique source for you in your project.

Fraternally,

Caroline Lund
SWP National Office

cc: IMG