

Statement by R. Dawson on summary of Paquette's report of his views on the draft political resolution submitted by the IEC Majority Tendency for the coming World Congress

I abstained in the political committee vote on this summary. I would note that Paquette's contribution is his own and now that of the PC majority--but not that of the Lenin-Trotsky Faction.

Paquette's report zeros in on what he defines as three central errors in the political resolution--"its analysis of the detente, of popular frontism, and its line on the "new mass vanguard."

While I agree that there are many things wrong with the draft, <sup>supplementary comments</sup> after reading it, hearing comrade Paquette's ~~summary~~ and the criticisms of other pc members I do not think Paquette's ~~summary~~ case as outlined in ~~this~~ summary. is made.

1 - I do not see any substantial difference between the evaluation we made of the detente in our political resolution and that expressed in the draft political resolution before us. I do not see how it can be said that the on-going revolutionary process as noted in the resolution is based on some kind of rigid schema ".....leadt of all one "which admits no twists, turns or downturns." Paquette's criticism poses as many problems as its solves--~~what~~ what does it mean, when it says that the resolution doesn't "recognize a deep change in the world situation."? Has the rise in the radicalization been blocked ~~etc etc~~ ! ! !

2 - How can it be said that the draft resolution puts "the fourth International on record as favouring Popular Fronts in key countries." ? How can it be said that the IEC majority tendency document draws "diametrically differential conclusions from the Chilean tragedy" than we do ; that the resolution, instead of pointing out that "the chief lesson is that a mass revolutionary party was needed" concludes that "the weakness of reformism is the main lesson" ; What is this section trying to prove ---that the authors of the resolution do not understand the historic role of reformism ? What does the <sup>Paquette</sup> ~~document~~ mean when he writes "As if reformism was not strong enough in Chile to success-

fully carry out its historic function of betraying the socialist revolution."

Yes, the implications of this paragraph are truly astonishing.

5 I too agree with what I recall <sup>to be</sup> the chief criticism Mary-Alice Waters made of the European document and her comments on the so-called concerns of the vanguard and the concerns of the working class which has to make the revolution. But can it be denied that there is a new mass vanguard as described in the political resolution draft and what has such an observation to do with a breakthrough theory that replaces that of guerrilla warfare, as Raquette's notes claim? I do not see how it can be claimed that ~~the~~ draft resolution the IEC majority only "tip their hat to the concept that we must fight programmatically to win over this vanguard" to our program and to our movement? and that it is clear that the resolution is not talking about a transitional strategy.

I am aware of our experiences with some of the leaders of the IEC Majority Tendency and resolutions that they have prepared and have been passed at congress with our support, with being informed subsequently that they contained concepts that were substantially different than what we had thought and what the congress had discussed when approving them, with phrases and formulations that lend themselves later to different interpretations. In the past we have challenged such interpretations and have refused to recognize them. We have fought out the specific and concrete issues when the hidden concepts were revealed and used to claim that the question at issue had already been settled and with our vote. We stood by our understanding of what we voted for.

However we are confronted with a specific resolution and with the need to deal in debate with what it actually does say. I assume we still hope to influence other comrades across the globe who are studying this document. We will not influence anyone in the world movement and only miseducate our own forces if we carry the line of Raquette's criticism. It is a form of factionalism that does not serve the interests of the Lenin-Trotsky faction because it is irrational.