

COPY

[to the P.C. members]

COPY

London
January 7 [1976]

Political Committee of the SWP

Dear Cdes,

There is an evident disparity between the resolution of the IMG Political Committee on relations with the WSL and the Bulletin (Blick-Jenkins) group, which we assume you have received via cde Sheppard, and the letter of Caroline Lund dated 22 December to Alan Thornett and Tony Richardson/Robin Blick/Mark Jenkins. We consider that relations with the Bulletin group, which is part of the OCRFI, must be handled via the U.Sec, and as regards the WSL we are in favour, with the agreement of the U.Sec, to an exchange of IIDBs but as yet not to exchange of bulletins of national organisations. This evidently differs from the proposal in cde Lund's letter which is for an exchange of SWP bulletins. We assume that this letter from cde Lund, to judge from the date, was sent before you were informed of the resolution of the IMG PC.

We suggest that to sort out the questions involved, it appears there may have been some misunderstanding or confusion when cde Barnes was in Britain or that the norms of distribution of bulletins may be rather different in the United States to Britain, we suggest that cdes from the IMG PC meet with cdes from the SWP PC when they are next in Europe to attend as observers at the U.Sec. It may well be that an organised discussion on this point will arrive at agreement. In the meantime we would request that you do not send any bulletins to the WSL or "Blick-Jenkins" groups. It should be relatively easy to clarify what is involved.

We enclose for your information a copy of a letter sent from the IMG to the WSL.

Revolutionary greetings,

/s/

Alan Jones
For the Executive Bureau
of the IMG

cc: U.Sec.

COPY [for P.C. members]

COPY

London
January 12 [1976]

Dear Jack,

The enclosed is particularly relevant in the light of the rather negative attitude taken by the WSL on certain aspects of your visit. Whether through internal circular or word of mouth the WSL membership has been given details of this trip and evidently encouraged to use it as an argument to use with IMG members that the Fourth International does not exist (!) and that they will not need to discuss with the FI but merely treat it as a group of national sections and organisations who would be sections if it were not for reactionary legislation. This is not an argument for not approaching and discussing with the WSL, on the contrary we are both doing this organisationally and you will see some material in our press, but it is an argument for being very careful as regards questions of form.

As regards bulletins it does appear that there is some difference in practice between the United States and Britain on this which we should discuss. We would not propose that you inform the WSL or Bulletin at present concerning further action on bulletins but merely let it ride until we can discuss it -- which is only a couple of weeks. There is no need to explain a delay of this small time.

Comradely,
s/ Alan Jones

* * *

COPY

COPY

12/1/76.

To WSL.

Dear comrades,

The IMG notes your statement in your theoretical journal as to your intention to open principled political discussions with the USEC of the Fourth International.

Accordingly, flowing from the meeting with comrade Barnes, (a member of the SWP Political Committee, and an observer at the USEC due to reactionary legislation preventing him being a member), we would propose a meeting between the leaderships of the two leaderships to discuss:

- a) the exchange of international documents.
- b) the procedure for opening a debate on the positions of the USEC.

Maybe you could contact me at the above address to arrange a mutually convenient date.

Fraternally,
B. Grogan