

14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014

March 12, 1977

No. 5

To the Leninist Trotskyist Faction Coordinators

Dear Comrades,

Enclosed are the following items:

- 1) Statements by Mogen Pedersen and Torben Kristensen, translated from the RSF (Denmark) Internal Bulletin Serie 11, No. 1.
- 2) A January 1977 letter from Ricardo to the United Secretariat.
- 3) A January 7, 1976, letter from Greco to Petisa.
- 4) A February 8, 1977, letter from Jim Percy SWP (Australia) to the Political Committee of the Japan Revolutionary Communist League.
- 5) A February 8, 1977, letter from Jim Percy to the United Secretariat.
- 6) A series of organizational resolutions adopted by the Bolshevik Tendency which appeared in the Portuguese PRF discussion bulletin.

Comradely,

Caroline Lund

Caroline Lund

(TRANSLATION)

[The following is the concluding part of a report by Mogens Pedersen on the February 1976 International Executive Committee meeting, translated from Serie 11, No. 1 of the internal bulletin of the RSP of Denmark.]

As I said, there is a tendency for the discussion in the International to proceed in a more fruitful way than before. It is to be hoped that this tendency will be reinforced in connection with the discussion for the next world congress, where a series of problems central to the international class struggle today are to be discussed. The Fourth International has a great future ahead of it and a [illegible] long history behind it. The discussion leading up to the next world congress can assure this future, among other things, by including a discussion of the past. In this way, a general clarification can be achieved in the International, more effective unity, and more fruitful intervention. Against this background, a more outgoing approach can be taken, for example, toward the various organizations that claim to be Trotskyist, such as Lutte Ouvrière, the Workers Socialist League, the OCI (Lambertists), and others.

In the discussion opening now, we have to keep our minds and our ears open. In this connection, I do not think that any rational objective is served by maintaining the International Majority Tendency and the Leninist Trotskyist Faction. The LTF, as a minority, can point to the differences it has with the incumbent leadership on Portugal as arguments for maintaining/redefining a tendency. But I think that maintaining a faction is factional. That would appear to be an attempt to cover up political weakness (and organizational decline) by accusations that the leadership is carrying out various maneuvers against the minority, which therefore has to have a faction to defend itself.

At the same time, it is clear that there are disagreements on a series of principled questions, such as the national question/permanent revolution; the defense of democratic rights/development of elements of workers democracy/bourgeois democracy up to the social revolution.

But discussion of these problems combines now with the discussion of new, current issues, and there is a possibility for the formation of new lines, new tendencies, in the discussion. Therefore, I think, as I said, that the IMT should also be dissolved. There is at the present time no need for a majority tendency, and certainly not for one with a platform based mainly on the issues and documents of the Tenth World Congress as opposed to a platform for the next world congress. Moreover, different conceptions have appeared from time to time inside the IMT.

The IMT has not been dissolved. The discussion for the new world congress has been opened internationally, and written contributions will soon be sent out in the RSP. Since I think that the IMT should be dissolved, there can be no arguments for my being in the IMT. So, I am leaving it. With regard to the principled questions mentioned above, I am on the "IMT side," that is, I agree with what IMTers, such as Mandel, have written on these questions and disagree with

what LTFers such as Gus Horowitz (SWP) have written. There may be a different conception regarding the question of the workers government. With regard to the IMT's platform, I have already outlined what kind of criticism I think should be made of the Europe document in the conclusion of the proposal for a Central Committee report to the Third Congress of the RSF, Point 6 (Conclusions), pp. 1-5, IB No. 115 (Congres-bulletin nr. 7).

I hope in a later report on the evolution in the International starting from the last world congress to go more into the principled questions (the national question; democracy) and a more specific IMT self-criticism on Latin America.

Mogens Pedersen, September 17, 1976.

* * *

[The following is a statement by Torben Kristensen translated from Serie 11, No. 1 of the internal bulletin of the Danish RSF.]

After a hasty reading of MP's report on the IEC meeting in February, it seems to be that a number of his main conclusions are correct. I am sorry that the pressure of time made it impossible for me to take a more precise position toward this report, perhaps in the form of a report of my own, if that would have been useful.

The most important thing here is the principled political and organizational conclusion MP drew in his report, a conclusion I believe was entirely correct.

The discussion in the International has gradually shifted to new questions. And now a new world congress discussion is underway over new questions. On this ground alone it would be wrong to maintain the old tendencies which were based on the earlier discussion. Such a hardening into 'permanent blocs' would automatically tend to invalidate and distort any new discussion from the start. This holds no less for a tendency that has the majority in the International. As for the minority, they can advance other arguments for maintaining a tendency. (It is up to these comrades to justify this.) A clear consequence of the position expressed above is leaving the IMT. I announce this herewith.

Over and above the views expressed above--which are based on the way democratic centralism must work if there is to be any meaning to what we say about democratic procedure in an international party such as the Fourth International--I can mention a position on a more immediate question that makes it still more necessary to leave the IMT.

In the most recent period of discussion in the International--in particular over our position on the Portuguese presidential election--it has become clear to me that I am in deep disagreement with the IMT policy and its method for working out this policy, as this was expressed for example by Alain Krivine in the PCR discussion in Rouge.

I agree much more with the views put forth by Gérard Filoche in this discussion, or by Pat Jordan in the discussion in the IMT that was published in Red Weekly. But now the new discussion must show who in the International agrees with whom about what.

* * *

(TRANSLATION)

Dear Comrades of the United Secretariat,

I received your letters and am taking the opportunity to send you more evidence on the kind of intervention the Morenoists are making within the International.

The letter which the Political Committee of the old Liga Socialista sent and the United Secretariat misplaced, specifically called on this body to withdraw this destructive agent of Morenoism (Greco). His main job was to paralyze the LS and promote the split as well as to prevent the unification. This request was made to the comrade from the United Secretariat who came here, but nevertheless the United Secretariat did not take action on this matter.

Recently, the aforementioned comrade came to Mexico to encourage indiscipline within the PRT. The leaders of the Bolshevik Tendency in Mexico have said that they will not respect the decisions of the leadership and this in fact is happening.

All of this began when Greco arrived in Mexico. Cynically, for that is his style, he announced that his tendency would not accept discipline since the PRT was a federation of tendencies. He boasted to the members of our party and even to the Bolshevik Leninist Faction that if the leadership of the party expelled them for breaking discipline, the "Mexican model" would collapse and if the leadership did not expel them, the leadership would collapse.

Fortunately, this destructive element has left Mexico--to the misfortune of the Central American comrades--for he has gone to live there.

These disloyal acts carried out by Moreno can only be explained in the context of the entrism this tendency is carrying out in the Fourth International. This position became very clear when Greco himself stated at a Central Committee meeting of the old LS (and this was recorded in the minutes) that the GCI (in his opinion) was a tactical problem and that the principle was not to build the Mexican section of the FI but to build a Bolshevik party in Mexico. This could be achieved by unifying with the GCI, maneuvering with it, or even by destroying it.

I hope that the coming World Congress will discuss the disloyal organizational methods of Morenoism and put an end once and for all to his anti-FI work.

On the subject of the congress, I am advising you that of the three comrades on the IEC, two are for holding the congress in December and one for holding it in May. The three approve of the decision to postpone it.

With regard to my document in reply to Hansen, a great deal of time has passed since I authorized deleting the references to IP, my stay there, and the reference to the Militant which also bothered the comrades. I agree that these types of things should be deleted from the text. What surprises me is the ability of the SWP comrades to hold up a document for such a long time, almost a year. This leaves much to be desired in the way of the democracy one can count on within the International in a confrontation with a powerful current.

There has been no way, other than through publication in our former organ, El Socialista, to reply to the slanders of an international leader. He is fully capable of delaying a reply for almost a year, if not longer. Moreover, we agreed not to publish it in any (public) organ of the International and that it should go into the Internal Bulletin, which has been delayed for a length of time that is more than unacceptable.

That's all for now.

Fraternally,
s/Ricardo

(January, 1977)

(TRANSLATION)

January 3, 1976
Mexico

Dear Petisa,

Forgive my delay in writing. As I told you, I was completely wiped out after the Congress and I did nothing but sleep, eat, etc., without much desire to write nor things to write about since we had constant communication by phone with all of you. Since there is still nothing new that we have not already discussed over the phone, don't expect political letters until Eduardo and I write the memorandum, just before he leaves. The only important thing, that we already discussed today on the phone with H. is the question of these people's split, preceded by the theft of the majority of the party's infrastructure. I think they have gone mad from being so petty-bourgeois, or else they are being used as pawns in some international maneuver that I can't quite perceive. If the latter is the case, I think it could be part of a very violent attack by the Yankees against us for being interventionists, bureaucratic, etc., etc.

Now on the summary of the discussion on Portugal that H. asked me for. I won't go into detail because there is nothing new. Cristina gave a report repeating what the Key Issues (document) says. All she added was that in reference to Angola we are neither with the imperialists nor with the Stalinist bureaucracy. And she insisted on the demand of the troop withdrawal.

Then Manolito from the GCI spoke. He had a pretty good position, making the same principled criticisms that we make, but diluting the tactical questions of using democratic demands into a correct general abstraction that, in the course of a workers revolution, the bourgeoisie attempts to halt it through the road of the demo-bourgeois counterrevolution. He said that "we are not against free elections or the constituent assembly." And he concluded by making fun of Cristina because of the Angola thing, asking her what good was the demand of withdrawal of Portuguese troops now that these had already withdrawn.

Then Mary-Alice Waters spoke. She came out with an ultraleft line, trying to show that the LFP's document said the same thing as we did: that their strategic axis was the construction of soviets and the taking of power, but that it was pointless to repeat that many times because the question is to see with what political line we would build those soviets and take power, and thus the emphasis had to be on the slogan for the united front and those that would enable us to win over the socialist workers. The only point at which she came down on us was in reference to a letter from H. to Joe, where we say that the tactic of the united front of the CP and SP becomes secondary because the united front goes through the organs of dual power. She insisted (and insinuated that we proposed this) that to call for the building of soviets or something similar without the united front with the CP and SP was to create ultra-vanguard, sectarian organisms which were not real soviets at all because the mass parties were not part of them. She raised the question of a

workers and peasants government based on the struggle for the Constituent Assembly where there is a CP-SP majority. She did not mention Angola.

I spoke on the central points of the memorandum. But first I said that every revolution, until now, had provoked not only one but two deviations among marxists: opportunism and ultraleftism. That I thought the same thing was happening in Portugal. That the majority was the ultraleft wing and the SWP was the opportunist wing. I explained that our agreement with the SWP had been principled because it was made in order to fight against a criminal ultraleft guerrilla, etc., deviation, right at the moment when the uprising was beginning and where the obsolete Trotskyist movement had to begin by learning how to talk to and root itself in the mass movements. But that the emergence of the first workers revolution was breaking that agreement as the SWP began leaning toward opportunism.

Then I went into the differences in the same way that the memo raises them. Waters had also said that the Key Issues (document) was based on the same guidelines of the Transitional Program. I read the titles of the chapters of the TP and accused Mary-Alice Waters of ignorance, pointing out the miniscule or non-existent role assigned in it to democratic demands in the imperialist countries. I pointed out our differences in analysis concerning the existence of dual power, and I cited, in order to stress our position, a quote from David Frankel, taken from IP, where he says that the biggest mass demonstration since May First of 1974 was the one called during the VI government by the workers commissions, and I asked them to explain to me the contradiction between that quote and what they said to the effect that there are no workers commissions worth a damn in Portugal. Then I went on to the question of the line, which I explained in the same way that the memorandum does it. There I pointed out that the Key Issues (document) was worthless because it was a mish-mash of demands, that is, that its only objective was of a propaganda nature because it failed to give tasks for Trotskyists to participate with a political and organizational line in the class struggle. I linked this discussion on Portugal to the one that took place in the LS showing that the problem is the same: either a propaganda group content with having some fairly good slogans, or a party rooted in the class struggle and trying to win the leadership.

I then went into the question of the united front, pointing out that, for us, the building of soviets was different in Portugal than it had been in Russia. That the building of soviets would happen parallel and simultaneously to the destruction of the reformist workers parties and that, for that reason, we saw the soviets not as the product of the CP-SP united front, but as the united front of the class that was emerging as the workers broke with the CP and the SP. Then I got into the workers and peasants government, clarifying it with this example: as far as we're concerned, if a CP-SP government comes out of the Constituent Assembly, the likelihood is that they will form a bourgeois government, as bourgeois as the British Labor Party when it won the elections. Then I got into Angola and really made them look like fools. I finished up with a single phrase (my time ran out) where I said that the discussion the LS has had was posed on an international scale.

I threw in Trotsky's quote about dedicating 9/10 to Spain, and explained that this is what we were trying to do in Portugal, and my final phrase was: "What do the comrades of the SWP do? They send a reporter." THE END.

Then Eduardo took the floor and raised the question of the Oberlin tapes. And finally Mary-Alice Waters took the floor to reply that they were not going to edit the tapes because if they did so, from then on no one would dare to speak frankly in a meeting, thinking that everything a person said would be published in writing (sic). The meeting ended with this brilliant argument.

This last thing is pretty interesting. The Yankees are a lot more degenerated than we supposed (or, at least, than I supposed). They are more and more turning to arguments like "don't hurt the delicate psyche of the pettybourgeoisie." At the Congress, Mary-Alice Waters raised several incredible things: 1) that to send leaders to work in the ranks was to "humiliate" them; 2) that activists are "human beings" and that we have to be able to understand their errors (even "grave errors" such as accusing R. of being a police agent); 3) that self-criticism was not a Trotskyist method, but a Stalinist method that had infiltrated the ranks of our movement; 4) that we should not make class characterizations.

In other words, pure bullshit.

In conclusion. I think that, politically, the fact that the Cristinistas cleaned out our headquarters is pretty good for us. They have left secretly, in a minority and stealing. The political committee resolved: a) to suspend from the party the entire FBL and call a special convention for Easter weekend to expel them; b) to allow any comrade from the FBL who declares that he was not consulted about the robbery and who repudiates it, to rejoin the LS. Their reentry will include full rights, including the right to form a faction. It was also agreed to denounce this in two places: The Prepa Popular, where we plan to announce that the FBL members cannot set foot on the Prepa because they are thieves (the Prepa is being led by us) and in the university workers union, where we will do the same thing with four of their people, stating their first and last names, which will also serve to uncover the fact that, during the two years they have been there, they have been taking the floor during the assemblies without saying they were members of the Liga. (Don't worry about the "police" connotations because there are no political reprisals in that union.)

Besides that there will be the international work and our work with their ranks, to the extent that they have not been consulted--a fact which we still don't know for sure--. On Wednesday we will hold an open meeting of middle cadres of the Federal District to prepare a city-wide membership meeting to be held on Saturday.

I'll finish by reporting on Eduardo. His presence here is a big help. He hasn't argued with anyone and everyone listens to him with respect. He is very popular with the rank and file. The only one he argued with was me, on two or three occasions, only one of which had some political content, and the others being merely around theoretical or futuristic speculations. He claims that I have a petty bourgeois method of discussion, which is nothing new. But he also has a shitty method, although he refuses to admit it. What can we do. Even so we maintain good relations.

Those are all the political matters. I don't plan to write again until the memorandum, at least while we stay in touch by phone.

PERSONAL SECTION:

Dear Petisa,

Don't curse me for my delay in writing to Carlitos. There are times when really the last thing one gets inspired to do is write personal letters of any sort. If it weren't for the fact that after the Congress I went on vacation and, later hooked up with a chick, I was even beginning to think that a factional struggle like this one, where one plays a leadership role--not as a middle cadre, as in the last one where I participated, the one with the combos--brings about a total emotional and sexual stupidity. Anyway, the fact is that, with the cleaning out of the headquarters, the factional struggle's most striking aspect has ended. All that remains now is to do a documented summary of all this, so that it can be reraised on an international scale and begin to work to move the party here forward. With Eduardo's arrival, after the post congress, I set out to do tourism (that will be the subject of two or three letters to the little monster), to pick up the chick I mentioned, etc. Unfortunately, the above-mentioned chick turned out to be--really this time--a liberated woman, who hangs out with one of the leaders of the LS, and so the thing is dying as quickly as it began, since I'm not in the mood to get myself into another type of struggle (the leader I am referring to is not terribly liberated, he is rather the perfect example of a Mexican machista.)

Mexico, January 7, 1976.

Small addendum to the political part. My relations with Eduardo are deteriorating. I don't know what they told him to do when he came here. But one of the two has to be responsible for the work in Mexico and the other must be under his discipline when there are differences. He is a national leadership comrade, but many of his attitudes here seem to me rather haughty. If he is going to direct the work in Mexico during the period that he is here, I should have been informed of that. I don't expect a national leadership comrade, either in Mexico or elsewhere in the world, to be under my discipline. But I do expect a political attitude from him, based on the fact that I am the one who will have to continue the work when he is gone. Differences emerged over the type of document that should be written for the IV. I don't know how to resolve these differences. Obviously, he is more politically experienced than I am, but I think that I know better than he does how to write a document. The matter reached a point where I decided to write my own document and, if need be, have a discussion in the leadership of the LS to approve one or the other. Maybe we'll reach an agreement later on, or maybe not. He says that H. assigned him over the phone to take charge of preparing the document. H. told me the same thing. Anyway, the relations are not at all clear. The other variant I am considering is accepting that he do whatever strikes his fancy, and the hell with it. But in that case I will not be in any way responsible for what happens. Aside from that, he continues to be the same beast as always, although only insofar as his relations to me are concerned. I have nothing but praise for his activity with the LS and his relations with the comrades here.

I am not leaving him a copy nor will I have him read this note. That would only make matters worse. In any case, have him read it when he arrives there and, when I get back, if necessary, we can discuss it, although it will be pointless by then.

s/Greco

SWP
Sydney, Australia

February 8, 1977

Political Committee
Japan Revolutionary Communist League

Dear comrades,

Enclosed please find copies of correspondence between cde. Sakai and our party.

We want to raise several matters in regard to Sakai's visit and his letter to us.

Firstly, as we pointed out to cde. Sakai, we were disappointed in the way his visit was organised and his lack of collaboration once here. We want to ask if cde. Sakai was travelling and acting on behalf of the JRCL during his visit.

Secondly does the JRCL PC agree with comrade Sakai's letter to us and in particular his call for disciplinary action against the fused members of our party?

Thirdly, we want to register a strong objection to comrade Sakai's behavior in regard to his contact with Malaysian Maoists while he was here. Our National Committee member Allen Pinjen has informed us of the following facts:

Cde. Sakai was informed of our work in this area and our journal, Malaysian Socialist Review. Its major rival is a Maoist oriented publication called Malaya News Service. We are in a desperate struggle with MNS in the student movement. In spite of this cde. Sakai arranged to meet with these people without consulting us as to whether this would be wise. In fact we think that it undermines our work but since meetings had already been arranged, it was agreed that cde. Pinjen should be present at these meetings too. However we think the whole incident damaged the credibility of the FI as a whole in the eyes of these Malaysian students.

When talking about the 1977 Asian Youth Conference, Sakai suggested that someone could be invited from MNS. We object to this. We think that your first priority should be to invite Malaysian Trotskyists, not Maoists. If you have the funds for more than one then we still do not think that giving a platform to our deadly rivals can help the cause of Malaysian Trotskyism. It would be preferable to invite two Malaysian Trotskyists rather than have a wrangle between us and them in public in Japan.

Comradely,
s/Jim Percy
National Secretary

cc: USFI

SWP
Sydney, Australia
February 8, 1977

United Secretariat
Brussels

Dear comrades,

We want to call to your attention a grave matter that concerns relations between our party, a leader of the IMT, the IMT steering committee and the international centre.

Last year in October we heard from a member of the Communist League that a visit to Australia by Comrade Pat Jordan was imminent. This information was not conveyed to us by the leadership of the CL but inadvertently by a rank and file member. We immediately approached a Political Committee member of the CL who denied any knowledge of such a visit, or even a proposed visit.

After Comrades John McCarthy and Peter Robb fused with our party they confirmed to us that the PC of the CL had in fact received a letter proposing a visit by Comrade Jordan. At the time they say they objected to the proposal. We then pressed the remaining leaders of the CL on this matter and they claimed that they had denied knowledge of the matter before because they had only received a letter that referred to a visit by Comrade Peterson, not Jordan! Moreover they claimed that the letter was to the IMT in Australia, not to the CL. Lacking any access to a copy of the letter we decided to let the matter drop for the time being.

Since that time however it has become clear that the proposal for a visit was made not to the IMT but to the PC of the CL. In a letter to John McCarthy from the steering committee of the IMT dated 15/12/76 we read:

"The IMT is, of course, deeply committed to the unity of forces supporting the Fourth International and is working to overcome divisions of our forces at a national level. It was on this basis that we informed you of the proposal for comrade Peterson to visit Australia to assist the unification process. We note that there was no reply from the Political Bureau of the Communist League to our letter on this question." (Our emphasis.)

We want to make several comments on this revealing passage, and on the whole affair.

Although from the above passage it is clear that it was not the case in this instance, it is conceivable that the IMT steering committee might want to consult the Australian IMT and arrange a visit by an IMT leader here for a multitude of reasons. That's fine of course. But when such a visit is proposed to aid unification, it seems elementary that the other side to the unification should also be in on the plans. Otherwise any visit would only be considered a factional maneuver from start to finish and certainly would not aid unification.

But from the context it is clear that since the CL PC was to reply then presumably they were asked. If this is so then who exactly did the asking? Was it the IMT steering committee? Were they asking on their own behalf or on behalf of the United Secretariat? We point out that the CL is not, in spite of some misconceptions on the part of its current leadership, affiliated to the IMT in some way. If the letter was from the IMT why did they choose to write a letter to only one party here? Why not write to the SWP leadership too?

Moreover we would like to know if the proposal was that comrade Peterson tour on behalf of the IMT or the United Secretariat. If there is any proposal for a tour from the United Secretariat we do ask that we at least be consulted at the same time as the CL. Please tell us in exactly what bodies this question was discussed.

Without prejudging your reply to the questions we have asked we feel that there has been a grave blurring of the lines between leaders of the IMT acting as such and acting in their capacity as leaders of the United Secretariat. We hope there is some other explanation for all the facts.

We further note that over two months since the original proposal Comrade Peterson himself has still not solicited an opinion from the SWP leadership in regard to his proposed visit. Whatever capacity it is intended he operate in while here it would seem to be high time that we were brought into the picture, at least if it is intended that he actually help the unification process.

Please pass copies of this letter on to whatever bodies need to read it.

Comradely,
s/Jim Percy
National Secretary

cc: LTF, New York

[The following resolutions recently appeared in the Internal Bulletin of the Portuguese PRT, along with the platform of the Bolshevik Tendency. They are translated from the Portuguese.]

RESOLUTION NO. 1

For the Unity of the Fourth International

The leadership of the Fourth International is at the moment going through a political crisis so profound that it could lead to a split in our International. The Bolshevik Tendency is thus obliged today to take as its central objective a principled position of struggling in defense of the unity of the International. This crisis can be fully overcome only when a politically homogenous and Bolshevik leadership is built in the Fourth International.

Nevertheless, the problem of the unity of the Fourth International is today of first importance, given the centrifugal forces at work within it--i.e., the process of disintegration the IMT is going through and the united front tactic the LTF is developing in relation to sects outside our World Party. The only way to effectively overcome these centrifugal tendencies is through undertaking two main and interrelated tasks: to continue the tendency struggle for our political positions as expressed in the general line of the Bolshevik Tendency Declaration; and to appeal for the formation of a parity leadership of the Fourth International by the IMT, BT and LTF. That is, form a parity committee of the three tendencies in the United Secretariat which would function at most until the Twelfth World Congress on the basis of political agreement on definite tasks (and not just on the basis of general programmatic agreement, as several leaders of the IMT propose in order to achieve the unity of the Trotskyists in various countries).

As a guarantee that our participation in the parity committee will be governed by the rules of principled conduct, we can propose to the International leadership that from now on all discussion that is not of an organizational or practical nature be public. Political discussion can be carried on by the journals and publications of the respective organizations. We make this proposal bearing in mind that at its February 1976 meeting the IEC considered that the public discussion carried on up to now has not endangered the unity of our world movement.

In view of the fact that authorized spokespersons for the IMT have on repeated occasions appealed for the formation of a tendency to save the unity of the Fourth International, we state that we are prepared to discuss the exact terms of such a proposal.

RESOLUTION NO. 2

Support and Strengthen the PST (Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores-Socialist Workers Party), LS, Venezuela (Liga Socialista, Socialist League), and BS (Bloque Socialista, Socialist Bloc) Colombia, Publishing House.

Bearing in mind that the joint efforts of the PST, the LS (V) and the BS (C) to establish a publishing house that will be very important for disseminating Trotsky's works in Spanish, we appeal to each and every member of the International, and especially those who form the BT, to take on the task of selling and distributing these books and to do so in an active way in keeping with the seriousness and responsibility of this vital effort.

RESOLUTION NO. 3

Recommendation to Continue the Regular Publication of "Revista de America"

The political importance of R.A. is evident to the members of the BT. In addition to arming the members of the Fourth for the necessary tasks in each country, it is a fundamental voice for our political positions on the international level. Therefore, it is recommended that regular publication of R.A. be continued. To this end, the collaboration of the International and of our tendency is requested in its sale and distribution. The editorial board of R.A. will take the necessary measures to guarantee its rapid publication and continuity.

RESOLUTION NO. 4

International Tasks at this Moment

Participation in the International's task of extending the influence of Trotskyism throughout the world is one of the top objectives of the Tendency. The needs of the class struggle demand this. At this moment, a rise of the mass struggle in Europe is occurring and some possibilities for openings in Latin America can be seen.

In accord with the above we adopt the following measures:

a) To keep Comrade Ricardo and enough other comrades in Europe to meet the tasks in the Fourth International's leading bodies and so that they can devote themselves to the tasks of organizing the BT in the period leading up to the Eleventh Congress.

b) To lend our support to strengthening Trotskyism in Spain, in view of the fact that a revolutionary process is beginning in that country.

(This page is missing from the available copy of the
LTF Mailing for March 12, 1977)

involved signing a joint platform with the CP. This position was made explicit at the February IEC Commission that considered the situation in the LS. This was done in Comrade Ricardo's presence, stressing that this matter was a tactical problem and pointing out that full consideration should be given to the fact that this mistake was a result of the hastiness of a young leadership, a leadership that had little experience in the class struggle, especially in electoral activity. But it was also pointed out that this error did have the great merit of reflecting a decision to actively participate in all aspects of political life in this country. The BT fully endorses these positions upheld by the PST.

RESOLUTION NO. 7

Paez-Apaza Campaign

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International undertook a solidarity campaign with the PST (Argentina) and its political prisoners who are victims of the Videla government, and especially to save the lives of Paez and Apaza. This campaign extends to all prisoners of the military dictatorship and is being supported by the parties of the International. The defense of imprisoned internationalist militants has a special meaning for our Tendency, therefore, we second the United Secretariat appeal and ask that our BT comrades redouble their efforts in this work.

RESOLUTION NO. 8

Publication of Reports

The publication of the main reports at the founding meeting of the BT is approved.

RESOLUTION NO. 9

Support to the Uruguayan PST

Considering the brutal repression suffered by the PST (U) in a country where governmental terrorism has reached the highest level in the world, we commit ourselves as a tendency to giving maximum help to the Uruguayan comrades and to proposing that the next United Secretariat (October 16) decide on an international campaign along these lines.

RESOLUTION NO. 10

For Building Unified Sections

The BT recommends to the Colombian BS that it call for a Unification Congress, based on principled criteria, of all the Trotskyist organizations, the congress to be held no later than November 1977. It also recommends to the LSR (Liga Socialista Revolucionaria-Revolutionary Socialist League) in Spain and the

LSR in Italy that they carry out principled fusions with the organizations of the Fourth in their respective countries with the same date as a deadline. Also it hails the process of discussion that is developing between the PRT and the LCI in Portugal with the objective of attaining a principled unity.

RESOLUTION NO. 11

Publication of "A Scandalous Document".

We support the proposal of the Spanish comrades to ask Comrade Moreno to publish as a book, "A Scandalous Document," his polemic against the Majority and especially against Comrade Mandel. This should be done to better arm our tendency and because the great majority of the members of the Fourth International are not familiar with this important theoretical and political tool.

Publication should take place before the end of the year.

RESOLUTION NO. 12

Basic Documents

The BT adopts the following as its basic documents:

- "Bolivia and Argentina - A Balance Sheet"
- "A Scandalous Document"
- Spain (articles in Revista de América): "The Bells Toll for Franco," "From Franco's Garrote to the Monarchist Trap," "Letter from Spain," and also a letter from Comrade Moreno to the Spanish LSR comrades.
- Portugal: The exchange of letters between Hansen and Moreno concerning the discussion of the document, "Key Issues...". The criticism of this document. The letters of comrades Peng and Chen.
- Angola: Document on Angola discussed at the founding meeting of the Tendency.
- Notes on the document by Barnes, "Europe vs. America and the Crisis of World Stalinism."

* * *