

14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014

May 3, 1977

No. 7

To the Leninist Trotskyist Faction Coordinators

Dear Comrades,

Enclosed are the following items:

- 1) Report on the Central American Trotskyist Conference, by Roberto Torres.
- 2) Report on the Congress of the Costa Rican PRT (Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores), by Roberto and Rodrigo.
- 3) Letter from the Groupe Marxiste Revolutionnaire (GMR) of Québec to the Groupe Socialiste des Travailleurs du Québec (GSTQ), the organization in Canada that is affiliated to the Organizing Committee for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International.

Comradely,

Caroline Lund

Caroline Lund

TRANSLATION

Report on the Central American Trotskyist Conference

By Roberto Torres

A conference of sympathizing organizations of the Fourth International in Central America was held March 14-16, 1977, under the auspices of the Liga Socialista Revolucionaria (LSR--Revolutionary Socialist League) of Panama and the Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores (PRT--Revolutionary Workers party) of Costa Rica.

The hosts opened the conference by pointing out that the central objective was to "arrive at agreements for strengthening the Fourth International in Central America." A three-point agenda was proposed: (1) a report by each of the organizations present on the situation in their respective countries and on "their political positions and their experiences." (2) A report by Alfonso Ríos (who functioned as a representative of the United Secretariat and of the Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores of Mexico) on the United Secretariat's plans for coordinating the work of the Central American organizations. And (3) a report on perspectives for joint work.

Members of the following Trotskyist organizations were present: Bloque Socialista (BS--Socialist Bloc), Colombia; Liga Marxista Revolucionaria (LMR--Revolutionary Marxist League), Nicaragua; Liga Obrera Comunista (LOC--Communist Workers League) Colombia; Liga Socialista (LS--Socialist League), Mexico; Liga Socialista Revolucionaria, Panama; Organización Socialista de los Trabajadores (OST--Socialist Workers Organization), Costa Rica; Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores, Costa Rica; Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores, Mexico. Comrade Greco was also present. He is formally a member of the Mexican PRT and (as he explained to me), a member of the leadership of the Bolshevik Tendency in the Fourth International.

The OST of Costa Rica

The first report the conference heard was from the OST of Costa Rica, given by a comrade from that organization.

Apparently the ultrasectarianism that various Trotskyist organizations in Central America and elsewhere have practiced toward the OST has begun to break down. During the conference no one objected to the presence of leading members of the OST, although we were informed that the member of the Nicaraguan LMR who was present had some reservations that weren't raised. These perhaps influenced his decision to remain simply an observer and not present a report.

The relevant points of the report by the comrade from the OST were the following: The situation in Costa Rica is marked by growing instability. This is shown by the increasing attacks on the standard of living of the population, the monopolization of the land

in the hands of the landlords, the high level of unemployment, and the government's budget deficit. As a result, there have been a number of important conflicts in which sectors of the workers and their allies have mobilized for their demands. Outstanding among these are the strike by the electrical workers of the Instituto Costarricense de Electricidad (ICE--Costa Rican Institution for Electricity, the state electric company), and those by the agricultural workers in the banana and sugar-cane industries. In the ICE strike, the government made a great display of its newest repressive equipment, and a police bullet tore off the leg of a worker during the strike.

The rise in the price of coffee on the world market has given a certain respite to the private companies, and they have gained a margin of maneuver in the negotiations over the workers' demands. But in the state sector, in view of the growing public debt of the government, there has been intransigence on demands such as higher salaries and appropriations for education, medical services, welfare assistance, etc.

There has also been a growing series of attacks on democratic rights, rights that are valued highly by the Costa Rican people. The police have been significantly reinforced with new repressive equipment. The possibility of amending the constitution to allow for the creation of a standing army has been raised. Costa Rica hasn't had such an army up to now. Another case has been the expulsion of two foreigners for political reasons, and the harassment left organizations have begun to suffer at the hands of the immigration authorities for the participation of "foreigners" in their ranks.

Trotskyism in Costa Rica confronts various opponents on the left, with which we compete to recruit radicalized persons. The Partido Vanguardia Popular (Peoples Vanguard party), the Costa Rican CP, is an old-line Stalinist party and the largest group on the left. (It supports the constitutional amendment for a standing army, as well as the regime's new birth-control policy that eliminates free contraception.) The Partido Socialista (Socialist party), which was once affected by the Cuban revolution, is in crisis and has suffered greatly from its lack of ideological definition. The Movimiento Revolucionario del Pueblo (Revolutionary Movement of the People), of Castroist origin, is also in crisis and has suffered numerous splits.

The OST, for its part, has been considerably strengthened. It now has twelve members who function full-time, and it publishes 4,000 copies of its monthly newspaper Qué Hacer?. With three branches functioning in San José, Heredia, and Liberia, it has about fifty members.

The OST's main tasks are the following: developing an approach to the other left organizations, in anticipation of the upcoming presidential elections; work among university students, such as

participating in the student movement rejecting tuition at the university; trade union work, in which the OST's role in the formation of the Organización Sindical de Trabajadores de Guanacaste (Guanacaste Workers' Trade-Union Organization) stands out; work among women and against the new birth-control policy; spreading revolutionary Marxist ideas; the sale of Qué Hacer?; and financial work to sustain the activity of the organization (there are some 100 sympathizers of the OST who make regular contributions). The OST is also making a big effort to maintain contact with the international movement, exchanging materials, attending congresses and meetings, etc.

The PRT of Costa Rica

The PRT of Costa Rica was next in the order of reports at the conference. However, the comrade of the PRT explained that he was not going to present a report, since everyone there had attended the PRT's congress that had just ended the day before. Those present were limited to asking the comrade questions, which he answered partially and which Greco, who was assisting the PRT comrade, completed answering. The discussion turned mainly around the doubts raised by the comrade from the LOC of Colombia, who insisted that the axis of work adopted by the PRT lacked anticapitalist slogans. Alfonso Rios also objected that the PRT's orientation suffered from the absence of calls for the formation of soviet- or semisoviet-type committees in Costa Rica. Greco answered these arguments, characterizing them as "student-like" and pointing out that there was a difference between general propaganda for Trotskyist ideas or for the revolutionary program, and agitation around a slogan that correspond to the present "stage" of consciousness of the Costa Rican masses. Rodrigo, of the OST, focused more on explaining to the comrade from the LOC the actual level of mobilization in Costa Rica, instead of trying to pin a label on the situation.

Almost everyone participated in this discussion, and the debate followed more or less the factional divisions in the international.

The LSR of Panama

The next report was given by a leading member of the Liga Socialista Revolucionaria of Panama. The report dealt mainly with the LSR's position on the military government of Torrijos and the struggle for Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone. Torrijos took office through a coup in 1968. His government has tried to play the role of arbiter among the various factions of the Panamanian ruling class. The government is at present seeking to "renegotiate Panama's dependence" on American imperialism (in the words of the LSR comrade). It is a "Bonapartist regime sui generis," basing itself on the discontent of the Panamanian masses in order to negotiate a new canal treaty with Washington. Its margin of maneuver, however, has been stretched very thin, and it has set back certain conquests of the masses--such as the right to strike--and has restricted democratic rights, against the opposition of even the bourgeois courts.

According to the comrade from the LSR, the present development of the Panamanian government may mean the Torrijos regime is losing more and more of its character as "Bonapartism sui generis," and is being transformed into a repressive military dictatorship.

In September 1976 the National Guard severely repressed the mobilizations of the Panamanian workers. The workers were struggling for economic demands, against the reforms of the labor code that eliminated the right to strike, and for the expulsion of American imperialism from the Canal Zone. As a result of the defeat inflicted on the workers, the mobilization of the masses is declining at present, and Torrijos has opened a political offensive, launching a big anticommunist campaign.

The comrade also reported on developments inside the LSR. The organization broke with the "Camiloists" (followers of the Colombian guerrilla leader Camilo Torres) and approached the Fourth International. It adopted at its foundation the policy of "unity in action/outflanking" that has been recommended by the International Majority Tendency, and oriented itself toward the student organizations FER and Guaycucho. The comrade described this course as "ultraleft and propagandist."

In January 1976 the LSR suffered a crisis. The majority of the leadership had adopted a characterization of the Torrijos government as "petty bourgeois." (I wasn't able to obtain documentation about this point, although the comrade promised to send it to me.) It was deduced from this that there could be no bloc with the bourgeoisie on the question of democratic rights. This was why the LSR did not campaign against the expulsion of various opposition figures from the country, such as Miguel Antonio Bernal.

There was a struggle of tendencies. It arose over organizational problems, but was extended to political points such as the need to raise democratic demands. There was only one declared tendency, the Democratic Tendency, which stressed the necessity of raising democratic demands.

The August 1976 congress adopted a change in the political line of the LSR. The "vanguardist" policy was replaced by one of carrying out three campaigns: defense of the standard of living; for democratic rights; for Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone and the return of the canal to Panama.

As a result of the internal crisis at the beginning of 1976, the LSR stopped regular publication of its paper Revolución Socialista, which had a run of 2,000 copies. They now project publishing a bi-weekly. At the present time Revolución Socialista comes out monthly, in mimeographed form.

At present the LSR has forty-two members in seven cells.

After the report, there was a full discussion. The Bloque Socialista of Colombia distributed a mimeographed article taken from their press, in which can be found some peculiar conclusions derived from the term "Bonapartism sui generis." The comrades of the LSR also presented a written position in mimeographed form.

The discussion took place on two questions. One was raised by the comrade from the LOC: He said the slogan demanding immediate return of the canal should not be raised unless workers control is demanded at the same time. The other question was raised by Rodrigo, in reference to the mimeoed contribution from the Bloque Socialista. The term "Bonapartism sui generis," he said, was never used by Trotsky; the reactionary character of regimes such as Torrijos' should be clearly explained, since they are antiworker governments--antiyouth, antidemocratic, etc.

The comrades of the LSR seemed to be in agreement with the fact that the Torrijos regime is, to say the least, inconsistent with its nationalist demagogy, and is a government that represses workers, students, and dissidents in general. Greco did not intervene on this particular point, although he did defend the peculiar idea of the BT that the struggle for democratic rights is a "tactical" question. He also said that even if Trotsky hadn't created the category of "Bonapartism sui generis," it had to be created in any event.

Comandos Camilistas--Espartaco--LOC, of Colombia

The next report was given by a leading member of the Liga Obrera Comunista of Colombia. The comrade spoke generally about the positions of the LOC and the objective situation in Colombia.

He also reported that the LOC had arisen from a split in the Bloque Socialista, caused by "programmatic, tactical, and organizational differences, and by different international alignments." The LOC proposed a Trotskyist unification congress among the Bloque Socialista, the Grupo Marxista Internacionalista (International Marxist Group), Comandos Camilistas (Camilist Commandos), and Espartaco (Spartacus). But, he said, the LOC is not going to enter the Bloque Socialista as the GMI has, because the Bolshevik Tendency, to which the BS is affiliated, has a policy of creating parallel organizations in the international.

The LOC claims a membership of some 130 persons. It will hold a congress in May to unify the LOC, the

CA..6

Comandos Camilistas, and Espartaco. The comrade estimated that the fusion of the three organizations will result in a membership of about 500.

The Bloque Socialista of Colombia

A leading comrade from the Bloque Socialista of Colombia gave the next report. He spoke extensively on the history of the workers and peasants movement in Colombia during recent decades, and on the BS's analysis of the present situation. The BS publishes some 6,000 copies of a weekly newspaper, and claims a membership of six to seven hundred. The comrade protested the fact that the LOC, the Comandos Camilistas, and Espartaco maintain a "sectarian and exclusionist" position toward the BS, since it has not been invited to participate in the fusion process that the three groups are carrying out. He reported that they have excluded the BS from their committee of liaison.

The PRT and the IS of Mexico

Alfonso Ríos and I reached agreement on presenting a brief report on the situation in Mexico. He spoke about the situation of the economy and the government following the devaluation of the peso, and I took up related developments in the class struggle in recent months. Afterwards I described briefly the situation of the Liga Socialista, of which I am a member. I spoke about the work we are carrying out and about our position on unification with the Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores.

Ríos ended his report on Mexico by talking about the PRT. Besides reporting his estimation that the PRT now has some 1,000 members nationally and that it publishes the weekly newspaper Bandera Socialista, he upbraided the Bolshevik Tendency for the behavior of its members inside the PRT.

For various reasons the discussion on Mexico and Colombia opened as soon as Ríos finished his report. Greco answered Ríos, saying that the cause of the Mexican PRT's present problem is not the BT, but the method with which the fusion was carried out. He gave more or less the same arguments that are contained in his letter to the United Secretariat on the unification process that culminated last September in the founding congress of the PRT.

For his part, the comrade from the LOC explained why his organization has not fused with the BS. In other words, he explained the differences that led to the split.

The comrade from the BS, besides answering the LOC comrade, mentioned the strange proceeding through which the great majority of the members of his organi-

zation joined the Bolshevik Tendency: The membership was given a time limit of three or four months in which to "choose a side" [tomar partido] in the international discussion. For the leaders of the BS it is "criminal" to abstain from taking a position in such an important debate. I don't remember precisely what he said about the fate that befell those members who might have needed more than four months to adopt a position on a discussion that has already lasted eight years.

The Plans of the "United Secretariat"

The last day of the conference was devoted to the other two points on the agenda, the first of which was a report by Ríos on the "proposals of the United Secretariat for coordinating the organizations in Central America." Ríos reported that the United Secretariat had "decided" to send Comrade Riel to live in Mexico; that the "International Commission" of the PRT would function as a sort of Latin American bureau; and that the PRT would finance a special publication for Central America.

I asked Ríos if there had been an official resolution of the United Secretariat on this point, and if there would be an official communication from some leading body of the international to verify this. Ríos answered that he didn't know of any official decision and that he had been informed of Riel's plans by a telephone call. Apparently excited, he explained to us the necessity of "centralizing" the Fourth International, that the United Secretariat required more resources and greater freedom of action, that the IMT has the "right" to direct the center, and that the ITP and the BT weren't collaborating at present with the center.

Rodrigo, of the OST, reminded Ríos of the provision in the statutes of the Fourth International, according to which the United Secretariat has no power to create "commissions" to try to "lead" the work of the sections in specific regions. Much less, said Rodrigo, could any "commission" of the PRT function as a Latin American Bureau, or any publications of this "commission" have official authority.

For Greco, on the other hand, it was "very good" that Jean Pierre would be transferring to Mexico, for several reasons: He would establish official relations between the United Secretariat and the Latin American organizations, and he would further the development of the preparatory debate for the next world congress. From Greco's point of view, the problem did not merit major discussion.

Perhaps I was in error, but in my opinion Ríos was laying out for us some schema that has been worked out by the IMT, and not something that had been presented to the United Secretariat for approval. All the elaborations

of Ríos about the "plan" seemed quite absurd to me, and besides that, I also have my doubts about the "official" character of Ríos's role as a representative or an "envoy" [enviado] of the United Secretariat to the PRT congress and to the conference in Costa Rica. (Ríos explained to me later that he had not been named by the United Secretariat but by the Bureau.) Whatever the case, the whole thing smacks strongly of "commissarism."

After the discussion, Ríos finally drew back several points: the "international commission" of the PRT wasn't going to be a Latin American Bureau but only an auxiliary and administrative body to aid Riel in his work; the magazine published by this commission, Revolución Socialista, is the sole responsibility of the PRT; and--to satisfy a request by Greco--he would put in writing a brief declaration concerning the trip of Riel to Mexico. (See appendix.) This discussion couldn't go much further, since at the time there was no way to confirm the official character of the plans to send Riel to Mexico. But our position remained clear--as long as there is no official decision, Riel will be simply an envoy of the IMT and not of some leading body of the international.

The last point on the agenda consisted of a series of unreal proposals. They aren't worth the trouble to detail; none of them will be possible to realize. Two more realistic points were also approved: the OST and the PRT of Costa Rica would join forces to build a committee in defense of the victims of repression in Central America, and the conference would issue a statement calling for solidarity with the struggle for Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone. This statement will be published in some organ of some Central American Trotskyist organization.

March 17, 1977

* * *

Appendix to Report on Central American Trotskyist Conference

San José
March 16, 1977

Statement by Alfonso Ríos on Comrade Riel's Residing in Mexico

Comrade Riel, a member of the United Secretariat assigned to Latin American work, is coming to live in Mexico City in June and will remain there for approximately one year.

During his stay, he will be able to gain more of a first-hand acquaintance with the problems of the region and thereby to improve still more his knowledge of the area and his work concerning it.

The Mexican section of the Fourth International will put all its political and administrative resources at Comrade Riel's disposal to enable him to carry out his assignment as a member of the USec.

Alfonso Ríos

Sent by the Bureau of the United Secretariat and the Mexican PRT as an observer at the congress of the Costa Rican PRT.

TRANSLATION

Report on the Congress of the Costa Rican PRT

By Roberto and Rodrigo

The Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores (PRT) of Costa Rica, formerly the Liga Comunista Internacionalista (LCI), held its first congress on March 11-13.

The congress was constituted as a full membership meeting, not as a body of delegates. In addition to the twenty-one members present with voting rights, several sympathizers of the ex-LCI and members of various Trotskyist organizations in Latin America attended as observers. Alfonso Ríos acted as the representative of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International at the congress.

It should be noted that, of the two authors of this report, Rodrigo was present from the beginning of the congress, while Roberto attended only the last day's sessions. The invitation to Rodrigo, of the Organización Socialista de los Trabajadores (OST), to attend the congress marked a significant change. Up to then, the LCI had carried out an ultrasectarian policy toward the OST, totally ignoring the other Trotskyist organization in Costa Rica.

The general policies of the ex-LCI have undergone drastic changes as well. This can be attributed to the presence of Greco, a leading member of the Bolshevik Tendency in the Fourth International, who had resided in Costa Rica for the last two months.

The first point taken up by the congress, which was convened Friday evening, was the approval of a series of rules for the discussion. Under these rules, all the observers were barred from attending the sessions on "organizational" points. These included a disciplinary action, the statutes, election of the leadership, and so on. Only Alfonso Ríos was allowed to sit in on these points.

On Saturday, March 13, the "Program and Principles of the Party" were discussed. This was followed by a discussion around several proposals made by an observer from the OST. Many of the remarks made by this comrade were accepted, although there was a difference over the conception of a "workers and peasants government." The viewpoint of the OST was that "workers and peasants governments" did not necessarily mean "dictatorship of the proletariat," while Greco defended the position that "workers and peasants government" is the same as "dictatorship of the proletariat."

The first "organizational" point taken up by the congress concerned a disciplinary measure: the expulsion of R. for not having paid a special financial pledge on time. R. was not present during this session. He argued that, on the one hand, the manner in which he was notified that his case was going to be discussed was unacceptable--the night before, a handwritten note had been put under the door of his apartment--and that, on the other hand, the point was going to be dealt with in

the absence of the United Secretariat representative. In fact, Ríos arrived at the congress only after the point had been discussed.

R. also said that he could not pay the dues or special pledge to which he had agreed, because he had planned to obtain the money that the ex-ICI had solicited from him by means of a loan, and that he planned to use part of this money to solve his serious personal financial problems.

Since his expulsion, R. has applied for membership in the OST, and had also appealed his case to the leadership of the international, since there had been rumors--supposedly spread by the ex-ICI--to the effect that he stole funds from the organization.

The second "political" point of the congress concerned the period, the political conjuncture, and the tasks in Costa Rica. On this point, a motion by Greco was passed, which said that the observers could have the floor only after the report, and could not intervene until the point was finished. The purpose of this motion was to prevent the OST observers from having a chance to participate in the discussion.

The reporter for the PRT dealt primarily with the political axis of the organization's work for the next period, which he said would be the struggle to defend and raise the standard of living, for the right to organize unions, and for democratic rights.

Andrés made a contribution for the OST, pointing out, among other things, that the measures taken by the Costa Rican government were tending to create a large repressive apparatus. As an example of this, he pointed to the creation of an army, since Costa Rica has not maintained a military force up to now. He said it was crucial to broaden the scope of the demands to include sectors such as public employees, women and students. He pointed to the Costa Rican government's offensive against free contraceptives, and also discussed the upcoming presidential elections.

The discussion on this point lasted until Sunday morning, March 13. Finally, the point on PRT-OST relations was taken up, under which the presiding committee presented a motion that effectively ruled out a course toward a principled unification. The motion admitted that there had been a sectarian policy toward the OST, which had begun to be superseded with the invitations to the OST to attend the congress as observers. However, the motion stated that unification could not take place on the basis of "general principles," but that "concrete agreements" on work in Costa Rica was necessary. Now, in the course of the congress, the OST had expressed irreconcilable differences. Therefore, no unification was possible.

Ríos tried to amend this motion to make it sound more acceptable, but did not succeed. For its part, the OST stated that it did not consider the differences manifested at the congress irreconcilable.

The motion by the presiding committee on this particular point was finally passed. However, a counter-motion by Ríos received a considerable minority of six votes.

The subsequent points were on "organizational" questions, which neither Roberto nor Rodrigo were able to attend. We were, of course, informed that under the point on the statutes the PRT was approved as the name of the organization.

Afterwards, Ríos informed us of a major incident that occurred during the point on the election of the leadership. This incident was provoked by the fact that, when the votes were counted, the presiding committee discovered that one of the ballots contained five question marks instead of five names. One of the members of the presiding committee threw away the ballot, calling it a "fraudulent vote." According to Ríos, the person who had cast the "fraudulent vote" got angry, and took the floor to say that he had voted this way because he did not have confidence in the leadership. After this verbal skirmish, he again asked to speak. This was denied, but he took the floor anyway, to say that he was resigning from the PRT. Ana, a member of the presiding committee, replied, "Don't make petty-bourgeois remarks." He left the room, followed by four other members of the PRT.

According to what Ríos told us, we were able to establish that, outside the congress meeting place, where the observers who could not attend the election of the leadership for reasons mentioned previously were waiting, the author of the "fraudulent vote" went up to Rodrigo to ask to be accepted as a sympathizer of the OST. At the present time, this comrade and three others who have resigned from the PRT are holding discussions with the OST.

Ríos also told us that a meeting took place inside the congress hall to discuss the error made by Ana. According to Ríos, he strongly upbraided this comrade for her behavior, and said that what was involved were methods utilized by the Bolshevik Tendency, methods that are extremely dangerous.

At the end of the discussion, Ana made a humiliating "self-criticism," in which she said that she herself was the one who was "petty-bourgeois," and that her error had absolutely nothing to do with the BT. The congress established a commission to apologize to the ill-treated comrade who had left the room.

On Monday, March 14, as a supplement to the congress, a "plenum" of PRT members was held, to which Ríos, Roberto and Greco were invited, in order to explain the positions of the IMT, LTF and BT, respectively. The members of the OST were also invited to attend.

This "plenum" could not be very enlightening, since the proponents were allowed only thirty minutes to explain a discussion that has been going on in the international for eight years. However, it would have been an error not to attend.

The results of the "plenum" were encouraging, in everyone's opinion. Four former members of a centrist formation in Costa Rica (the MRP), who attended the PRT congress as sympathizers, formed a favorable impression of the positions of the OST. Since the plenum, they have recognized that the LTF's positions are better, and are asking to have discussions with Rodrigo. The congress had clarified for them the methods and political positions of the BT. At the present time they are sympathizers of the OST.

March 17, 1977

* * *

TRANSLATION

Montreal, April 5, 1977

TO: Groupe Socialiste des Travailleurs du Québec

Dear Comrades,

You must surely be aware that, following a series of clarifications on both sides, the two organizations to which we are affiliated--the OCRFI and the Fourth International--reached the conclusion that it would be possible to open a public political discussion between our two currents (each current having characterized the other, last October, as revolutionary and Trotskyist).

However, we must recognize that, here in Québec, there has been no counterpart to such a procedure as yet. Numerous differences, both with respect to general politics and to tactics, have been responsible for the considerable distance between our respective organizations. We believe, however, that in light of the present political period, ongoing exchanges and discussions between our organizations are not only possible, but desirable.

On the other hand, such a procedure cannot be separated from a clear political characterization of our organizations, which must be based, at least, on each recognizing the other as a workers' organization. We feel that our position on the GSTQ has been clearly defined in the greetings given to the conference of the Montréal branch of the LSO/LSA this past February (attached). Unfortunately, there is still much confusion surrounding the GSTQ's present characterization of the GMR.

Therefore, we think there is a need at this time for a clear, public and unambiguous characterization of the GMR. This letter constitutes our request for such a characterization.

Along this with, we are proposing that an initial meeting take place between our respective leaderships, that could begin to set matters right, with the aim of clarifying our respective political positions. We think that such a meeting could take place in the next few weeks. If you agree, please get in touch with Léon Peillard or Yves Desjardins at our bookstore, to make definite arrangements.

Communist greetings,

Political Bureau of the GMR
[Groupe Marxiste Révolutionnaire]

cc: United Secretariat, LSO/LSA