POLITICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES, Number 30, July 7, 1971

Present: Barnes, Breitman, Britton, Dobbs, A. Hansen, J. Hansen, Horowitz, F. Lovell, Novack, Sheppard, Stone, Waters

Visitors: Benson, Jones, Kerry, S. Lovell, Seigle

Chairman: Horowitz

AGENDA:

1. Administrative Committee Report
2. Membership
3. World Movement
4. Convention Preparations
   a. Reporters
   b. Labor and Antiwar Panels
5. NPAC Convention
6. National Abortion Action Conference
7. Chicano Denver Conference

1. ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

a) Madison correspondence (see attached).

Barnes reported.

b) Protest on Security Editing

Sheppard reported.

Motion: To concur with security editing of Administrative Committee on "On the Method of Marxism and the Proletarian Orientation" and reject the appeal of the authors Liz M., Mary-Jane H., Norman H., and Pepe M. (see attached).

Carried.

c) Graumann, Wald and Levitt request.

Sheppard reported.

Motion: To send letter to Graumann, Wald and Levitt (see attached).

Carried.

2. MEMBERSHIP

Britton reported recommendation by the Denver branch that K.P. be readmitted to party membership.

Motion: To concur with the recommendation of the Denver branch.

Carried.

3. WORLD MOVEMENT

Sheppard and Hansen reported. (See attached materials.)

Motion: To send draft statement to United Secretariat. (see attached).

Carried.

4. CONVENTION PREPARATIONS

Barnes and Lovell reported for Administrative Committee.

Motion: To assign the following convention reporters.

The International Situation - J. Hansen
The Internal Discussion in the World Trotskyist Movement - Waters
Israel and the Arab Revolution - Horowitz
Political Resolution - Barnes
Women's Liberation Movement Resolution - Stone
Chicano Liberation Movement Resolution - A. Camejo
Black Liberation Struggle Report - D. Morrison
Organization Report - Sheppard
Presidential Ticket - Seigle
Youth Report - To be assigned by NEC

Carried.

Motion: To organize special panels on the trade union and antiwar questions.

Carried.

5. NPAC CONVENTION

Benson reported.

Motion: To approve the report. (Report to follow)

Carried.

6. NATIONAL ABORTION ACTION CONFERENCE

Stone reported.

Motion: To approve the report.

Carried.

7. DENVER CHICANO CONFERENCE

Britton reported.

Motion: To approve the report. (Report to follow)

Carried.

Meeting adjourned.

COPY COPY COPY

14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014

July 8, 1971

Dear Ernest,

Enclosed is a letter to the United Secretariat that the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party voted to send at its July 7, 1971, meeting. The letter is self-explanatory.

Comradely,
s/Jack Barnes
Organization Secretary

cc: Members United Secretariat

COPY COPY COPY

New York, N.Y.
July 7, 1971

To the United Secretariat
of the Fourth International

Dear Comrades,

We have studied attentively your statement concerning our letter of May 11, 1971, in which we voiced our concern over the "Domingo" letter. We have also weighed the arguments advanced by Comrade Maitan in his "Introductory Note to the Letter Signed Domingo," his note correcting the English translation of the "Domingo" letter, and his "Reply to the Political Committee of the SWP." The apprehensions we expressed over the "Domingo" letter have not been allayed. They have, instead, been increased.

In our letter of May 11, we suggested that the majority of the United Secretariat issue a statement on the "Domingo" letter along the following lines: "...(a) making it absolutely clear that the impression created by the content of the letter that the author was speaking in behalf of the Latin American Commission and the United Secretariat has no correspondence with the truth; (b) specifically dissociating the United Secretariat in its majority from the views expressed in the letter, particularly the factional attack on the La Verdad group and Comrade Moreno; (c) informing the movement what the 'Comité uruguayo (IV Internacional)' actually represents, and -- if this still remains unknown to the members of the United Secretariat -- indicating that an investigation will be undertaken to ascertain the facts."

We suggested further that the "Domingo" letter be published in the Internal Bulletin, together with the clarifying statement by the majority of the United Secretariat and our letter of May 11.

We were pleased that you agreed to publish the "Domingo" letter in the Internal Bulletin together with our letter of May 11. On the other points, however, we feel that your response failed to measure up to the requirements of the situation, and represented a default in leadership responsibility.

For example, you did not inform the movement what the "Comité uruguayo (IV Internacional)" represents. From Comrade Maitan's "Reply to the Political Committee of the SWP," we gather that he, too, does not know what it represents. He refers merely to a group which "if my memory is correct" utilized the name at times.

Thus you ignored our suggestion that if you did not know the identity of the "Comité uruguayo (IV Internacional)" an investigation was in order. The ranks of the world Trotskyist movement are still in the dark as to who it was that received, translated, mimeographed, and distributed the letter signed "Domingo." Was it done by a section? A sympathizing organization? Or an isolated individual who happens to be on Comrade Maitan's private mailing list? Do not the cadres of the Fourth International have a right to such information?

We suggested that you specifically dissociate the United Secretariat from the views expressed in the "Domingo" letter, particularly the factional attack on the La Verdad group and

Comrade Moreno. You did not do this. Consequently we have no choice but to conclude that you share Comrade Maitan's views in this respect.

Finally, we suggested that you make it absolutely clear that Comrade Maitan was not speaking in behalf of either the Latin American Commission or the United Secretariat.

You did this; but in such a way as to deepen our concern. You stated that the "letter signed Domingo is a private letter sent by a member of the US in his own name, and not in the name of a body of the International." You then justified this as being perfectly legitimate: "The US holds that the content of the letter signed Domingo does not go beyond the normal limits of a personal letter devoted to differences under wide discussion within our movement."

We maintain that the content of the letter, with its subheadings and footnotes, shows on the face of it that it is not a personal letter but a factional document aimed at lining up comrades in a secret way.

The fact that the majority of the United Secretariat could consider that the writing of such a document by one of its members is a perfectly normal private matter raises a number of questions in our minds as to the concepts and procedures regulating the functioning of the body entrusted with leadership of the Fourth International between meetings of the International Executive Committee.

1. It signified that any member of the United Secretariat is free to act on his own as a private individual in handling situations of a grave nature that require mutual discussion, evaluation, and decision. Such a practice reduces the United Secretariat to a federation of heads of commissions, who consider it normal not even to inform each other at times of important decisions they have made and processes they have set in motion.

2. It opens the way to abuses of a most serious nature, such as operating behind the back of the United Secretariat and behind the back of the leaderships of sections.

3. It fosters the formation of personal cliques and similar unhealthy groupings put together in secret by this or that individual member of the United Secretariat.

4. If it is considered normal for Comrade Maitan to operate in such fashion it must be considered likewise normal for other members of the United Secretariat to operate in a similar way. The question follows automatically: Who else in the United Secretariat is sending out comparable factional letters to his own private mailing list? The position taken by the majority of the United Secretariat on the question of personal privilege in such matters places the entire committee under a cloud. A serious blow has thus been dealt to its authority and to its claim to be serving as a collective leadership.

Comrade Maitan's attempted defense of his letter does nothing toward counteracting these conclusions.

First of all, we will take up some small matters. In the "P.S." to his "Reply to the Political Committee of the SWP," Comrade Maitan suggests that a security question was involved in revealing that he used the pen name of "Domingo." If the rules of security were violated, the first infraction occurred when the author appended the name "Domingo" to a document that does not contain a single item involving any real security matter.

Of course, if he has organized a secret private faction, then a security question would be involved -- for the faction. To avoid that security problem a simple procedure was open: submission of his document in his own name for publication in the Internal Bulletin.

We should like to point out that so far as the Fourth International as a whole is concerned, we were the ones to call the attention of the United Secretariat to the existence of this document and its circulation in Latin America, something the author had not seen fit to do. Was this a violation of security rules on our part? We acted in a responsible way by bringing the document to the attention of the United Secretariat. Unfortunately the majority of the United Secretariat did not seem to welcome what we did.

Comrade Maitan protests our sending the La Verdad group a copy of our letter to the United Secretariat. The La Verdad group is both a sympathizing organization and directly involved as one of the subjects of the "Domingo" letter. What about the "Comité uruguayo (IV Internacional)"? By what statutory right is it to be placed in the favored category of being on Comrade Maitan's private mailing list while the La Verdad organization -- not to mention the United Secretariat -- is excluded?

On the alleged mistranslation of "we" and "I," Comrade Maitan refers to his habit of using the Italian "noi" or French "nous" which, he says, "the translators of the IP normally and correctly translate as 'I.'" The translators of IP inform us that they only stumbled upon this quirk after some years of mistranslating Comrade Maitan's "noi" or "nous" as "we." However, what does this have to do with the "Domingo" letter? That document was circulated in Latin America in a Spanish translation in which the "noi" or "nous" was translated as "nosotros" and not "yo." To grasp the impact and import of the document as it was circulated among our Latin American cothinkers, it is necessary to know that the pronoun "nosotros" was used throughout. The correct translation of "nosotros" is "we."

If a translating error was made, it was committed by those who translated the "Domingo" letter into Spanish. Obviously they were under the impression that Comrade Maitan was speaking in some official capacity for the International and not as a private individual. This impression was strengthened by such authorative-sounding declarations as the following: "Since that time the La Verdad group, disregarding the responsible attitude the congress took...has indulged in unacceptable factional maneuvers, provoking a deterioration in its relations with the International."

A more important issue than the translation of "noi," "nous," or "nosotros" is the innuendo made by Comrade Maitan that Comrade Pedro took a special secret trip to Argentina on the invitation of the La Verdad group to attend an underground congress they had organized. The United Secretariat knew in advance that Comrade Pedro was making this trip to Latin America. It was undertaken in relation to defense work in behalf of the political prisoners in Peru and was timed in accordance with that task. So far as we know, Comrade Maitan was in favor of this work as was the rest of the United Secretariat. Certainly he registered no objections that came to our attention.

These points amount to little more than quibbling. A truly serious item is Comrade Maitan's view of the reunification in 1963, to which we called attention in our letter of May 11. In the "Domingo" letter, Comrade Maitan stated: "The question arises why we have not discussed the problems of the Argentinian section in the past. By hindsight we can conclude that we should have stimulated a discussion and complete clarification long before now. We note, however, that it was difficult for us to intervene in the period immediately following the entry of the Argentinian organization into the International in the aftermath of the reunification and that we relied on a process of progressive assimilation."

It is to be observed that in correcting the "mistranslation," Comrade Maitan specified that the "we" in this passage is correct. Consequently it is absolutely clear that he is expressing what he considers to have been, and to still be, the joint views of the comrades formerly with the International Secretariat.

We observe in particular Comrade Maitan's use of the phrases "entry of the Argentinian organization into the International" and "we relied on a process of progressive assimilation."

In his "Reply to the Political Committee of the SWP," Comrade Maitan uses similar phrases: "...we maintained that, in principle, even Healy and Lambert could enter the International...." (Emphasis added.) He repeats the formula again in relation to Argentina: "We were, with all the more reason, for the entry of the Argentine organization...." (Emphasis added.)

We conclude from this that Comrade Maitan and the other comrades whom he includes in his "we," took the view in 1963 -- and have held it ever since -- that the reunification consisted of the "entry" of the International Committee into the Fourth International, to be subjected to "a process of progressive assimilation" thereafter.

This was not the viewpoint of the majority of the International Committee, which agreed to engage in the reunification. The viewpoint of the majority of the International Committee was that in 1953-54 a split had occurred within the Fourth International involving two factions, both of which belonged to the Fourth International. The main political differences that had led to this split were superseded as early as 1957, in the opinion of the majority of the International Committee, and this opened the possibility for a principled reunification of the two sides, which -- if handled correctly -- could lead to the eventual liquidation of the former lines of cleavage, a

complete fusion of forces, and the construction of a genuinely collective leadership.

It was in accordance with this concept that the majority of the International Committee conducted itself following the reunification that took place in 1963 on the basis of a statement of the principles of Trotskyism. The majority of the International Committee proceeded quite consciously to attempt to erase the previous lines of division, which had been superseded, and to genuinely dissolve the factions, beginning with its own forces. It consciously rejected any concept of "a process of progressive assimilation" of the other side.

Comrade Maitan's formulations indicate that he had a different concept of the reunification, and followed -- and is still following -- a different policy from that adopted by the majority of the International Committee. This is what we referred to in our letter of May 11 when we stated that these formulations -- coupled with his excursion back in history to 1951 (in the case of the Argentinian section) -- indicated that he "held reservations about the reunification in 1963 and that he (in agreement with those he refers to by 'we') has acted since then in accordance with these reservations." Perhaps it would have been more accurate to say that he acted in accordance with a policy of trying to progressively assimilate the forces of the majority of the International Committee rather than reunify and fuse with them on the basis of the common statement of principles that both sides had adopted.

The policy of "progressive assimilation" has met with a certain success, it seems. Comrade Maitan observes in his "Reply to the Political Committee of the SWP" that the "most severe proposals" against La Verdad emanate from comrades who formerly belonged to the International Committee. He adds that "the split of 1968 occurred among Argentine comrades who had all belonged to the International Committee before 1963."

We note something else in Comrade Maitan's "Reply to the Political Committee of the SWP" that is disquieting to us. He uses the terms "majority" and "minority" throughout in a way that shows he is not referring to the voting at the last world congress on the resolutions dealing with Latin America, the "cultural revolution" in China, and the radicalization of the youth. He uses the terms "majority" and "minority" instead as referring to crystallized international factional formations. Thus he says, "If the comrades of the minority want a political discussion on all the problems of our movement in Argentina as of right now, I am ready to accept it for my part." Again, "The Comrades of the PC...affirm that a member of the minority found himself in Argentina by chance...." In another place: "A comrade representing the minority can certainly make trips...it would be very positive if the comrades of both the majority and minority participated at the congresses of the sections...." Still another: "...discussion on trips...assures the minority the possibility of expressing its points of view and of asking for all the information it wishes."

Up to this point in the international discussion we have followed a policy of opposing the crystallization of international tendencies.

First of all, we were of the view that while some important differences had arisen and been expressed at the last world congress, no general division into two opposing sides had occurred there, whatever may have been the factional posture of some comrades on certain questions. In addition, we assumed that the areas of common agreement outweighed the divisions in view of the virtually unanimous approval of the general political resolution which outlined the main tasks of the Fourth International for the immediate period ahead.

Upon the renewal of discussion in preparation for the coming congress, it appeared to us that a policy of opposing the crystallization of international tendencies would help ensure maximum freedom of debate. It was a policy, we thought, that would be most conducive to bringing out nuances of thought, would best permit the shifts and changes in views called for by the interchange of opinion, the weighing of arguments, and development of more thoroughly grounded judgments. Moreover, such a policy, we felt, would best foster efforts to broaden the areas of common agreement and bring them to the fore.

Judging from the circumstances surrounding the production of the "Domingo" letter, some of the statements made by Comrade Maitan in defense of it, and the assertion by the majority of the United Secretariat that it is perfectly "normal" to write such letters, it would appear that Comrade Maitan and those who agree with him have been proceeding in accordance with a different policy.

In view of this, it is now our opinion that the leaderships of sections and sympathizing organizations who feel concern about these developments would do well to begin consulting directly with each other, particularly in considering what relationship these developments may have to the political differences that have arisen, and what is the wisest course to pursue. This should include the leaderships of declared tendencies in national sections, where they may exist, inasmuch as this is a period of discussion preparatory to a world congress.

We ask that this letter be published in the Internal Bulletin as a statement of our opinion.

With comradely greetings,

Political Committee
Socialist Workers Party

TRANSLATION TRANSLATION TRANSLATION

Ligue Communiste
Section Française de la IV^{e} Internationale

Undated
(Received June 21, 1971)

My dear Joe,

1. I received your letter with the corrected copy of the IB all right. It is in process of being translated. We expect to get it out in French in September after the vacation period and possibly even before.

2. As you know we are holding a cadre school at the end of July. Since one of the subjects under discussion will be Latin America, and since your IB will not be printed in French by that time, would it be possible to get a hundred copies between now and then for the participatns (there are a number!) who know how to read English.

3. I am sending you some photocopies of some pages from a new Lambertiste international bulletin (at the moment we have not been able to get more than two copies of it).

I call your attention to the scandalous way they utilize the differences within the international and particularly the heavy-handed appeal to Hugo.

No doubt a personal reply by the one singled out is required.

See you soon, I hope,
Regards,
Jean-Pierre

TRANSLATION TRANSLATION TRANSLATION

Toronto, Canada
June 22, 1971

Ernest Mandel
Jean-Pierre Beauvais

Dear Comrades,

We have just been informed that the document by Joseph Hansen "In Defense of the Leninist Strategy of Party Building" will not be published in French for some months. This is unfortunate because what it involves is a contribution on what is probably the most disputed question at the moment. As such it ought to be published as rapidly as possible.

In general, the delay between the publication of the documents in English and their publication in French places us in a particularly difficult situation. Continually, in the Canadian section, a part of the movement can read and discuss a document (published in English) which another part of the movement cannot take up, the document not yet having been published in French.

In our section, we are conducting a continuous discussion on the documents concerning Latin America; naturally, we want to discuss Hansen's document. But once again, solely a part of the movement can read it. Our French-speaking comrades thus suffer an injustice.

We are scheduling a discussion on this document for mid-July. In addition, our plenum in the month of August will include a discussion on the International. Thus we need the French version of the document within a short time.

Another factor is the French cadre school scheduled for mid-July. We consider this school to be important; we are sending two comrades to it. In view of the discussion on Latin America that will take place at the school, it is to be hoped that the participants will be able to read Hansen's contribution.

We understand that there can always be problems with it. We are ready to undertake a considerable effort to help in getting out the document in French. We have begun to translate it in Canada. If we send you a complete translation of the document, by airmail, July 5, can you print it before the seventeenth, that is, before the cadre school? It would be available at the school and our delegates could bring back a sufficient quantity for our needs upon returning.

We hope that it will be possible for you to print it in time. Meanwhile we have begun the translation, which we will mail July 5 at the latest.

With revolutionary greetings,

Arthur Young
For the Political Committee of
the LSO/LSA

cc: Pierre F.
Ross D.

COPY COPY COPY

June 24, 1971

Dear Jean-Pierre,

Thanks for your letter with the enclosures.

I was surprised to learn that you do not plan to have the French translation of my reply to Comrades Germain, Knoeller, and Maitan finished before some time in September. We have been repeatedly assured that all the documents submitted for discussion in preparation for the next world congress would be translated and published promptly so that we would not have a situation such as occurred at the last world congress where delegates arrived who had not had an opportunity to even read the contributions in advance. But with delays like this, one cannot but help feel disquieted. Some of the French comrades may want to make a contribution after reading this document. There may be contributions, too, from other countries. All of these may call for answers. What happens to this process if the documents are not translated as scheduled?

For our part, we have done our best to translate the documents from other languages into English as soon as we got them, in accordance with the commitment we made concerning translating the material. An example is the way we expedited the translation and publication of the two documents submitted by Comrades Germain, Knoeller, and Maitan, which taken together are almost as long as my reply.

If the problem is to find comrades who can concentrate on the translating work, a possible solution might be provided by the Canadian comrades. I note that in the minutes of the meeting of their Political Committee held June 18 a motion was passed as follows: "To begin French translation of Hansen's latest document on Latin America."

If a copy of this translation could be sent to you fairly soon, this should make it feasible for you to publish the document in French in time for the cadre school. To depend on 100 copies of the text in English -- as you propose -- for a discussion at a French cadre school does not seem to me to be a very happy way of trying to get around the difficulty.

* * * *

On the photocopies you sent us of the first issue of La Correspondance Internationale. The Lambertistes had already sent us a copy of that issue. This is a departure from their previous practice. I think that they decided to revive this publication at this time mainly in hope of influencing our internal discussion. All the material in the first issue appears to have been designed for this.

As to their singling out Hugo Blanco, this is not new. They have followed this line for some time in their English publications. The Workers Press, for instance, ran a long article more than a year ago in which the author professed to find a major difference between me and Hugo Blanco on the Latin-American revolution. I commented on this in a note in the May 11, 1970, issue of Intercontinental Press.

Most of the Healyite material attacking us is being concentrated in the Bulletin -- the weekly paper they publish in New York. Do you get this? I don't like to recommend the extra work involved in following it, unless you think it might be useful to compare the material filling its pages with the occasional attacks carried by the Lambertistes in France.

We will, of course, continue to watch this front for any new developments that might require answers in addition to what has already been scheduled.

Fraternally,

s/Joseph Hansen

cc: Toronto
United Secretariat

COPY COPY COPY

TRANSLATION

Rome
June 23, 1971

My Dear Joe,

I saw an interview with Hugo Blanco published in Panorama. I do not find it scandalous that he mentions the fact that he belongs to a minority tendency. But what is inacceptable is that in a public interview -- which is not an internal bulletin -- he gives our position and still more the majority of the FIR a characterization which neither we nor the comrades of the CC of the FIR accept.

That is why I sent Panorama the enclosed letter. In case you publish the interview, my letter must also be published. Write me what your intentions in the matter are. Consultation is necessary and if no one will be at the weekend meeting, write me.

With fraternal regards,
s/Livio

COPY COPY COPY

bc:Jack B.

June 30, 1971

Dear Livio,

I likewise saw the interview with Hugo Blanco published by Panorama, which you refer to in your letter of June 23. I do not know the circumstances of the interview or whether Hugo Blanco had an opportunity to check the formulations. I have not written to Hugo about the details, nor has he written us.

We had no plans concerning translating and utilizing the interview that appeared in Panarama.

We have, however, scheduled a different interview granted by Hugo Blanco to a Swedish journalist. The journalist appears to have asked both Hector Béjar and Hugo Blanco a series of identical questions. He recorded their answers and published them as if he were interviewing the two of them. As you will see, Hugo's answers are very good while the answers of Béjar are about what might be expected since his capitulation. I hope that this interview will be reproduced by other publications of our movement.

I am sending Hugo a copy of your letter to the editor of Panorama. You do not mention whether you have already done this.

Fraternally,

Joe

cc:Hugo Blanco
Ernest

COPY COPY COPY

bc:Jack B.

June 30, 1971

Dear Hugo,

I am enclosing a copy of a letter to the editor of Panorama written by Comrade Maitan. I do not know whether he has written you directly about this or not. In any case he sent me a copy along with a note stating his objections to the reply you made to the final question of the journalist in the interview:

"El FIR participa en algún movimiento internacional?

"Estamos en la Cuarta Internacional. Actualmente formamos parte de la fracción minoritaria en las cuestiones referentes a América latina porque el Secretariado Unificado de la IV Internacional apoya las posiciones guerrilleristas que nosotros combatimos. Esto, de todos modos, no impide que estemos de acuerdo con las cuestiones centrales de la revolución socialista mundial que defiende la Cuarta Internacional."

[" Does the FIR participate in any international movement?

["We are in the Fourth International. At present we form part of the minority faction on questions relating to Latin America because the United Secretariat of the Fourth International supports the guerrillerista positions that we are fighting. In any case, this does not prevent us from being in agreement of the central questions of the world socialist revolution maintained by the Fourth International."]

What Comrade Maitan objects to most, as he has explained in his note to me, is the public characterization of the majority position as "guerrillerista." To make such a characterization in an internal bulletin would be within your rights, he indicates, although he would, of course, disagree with it.

I should add that up to now, we of the SWP have opposed the formation of an international "minority" tendency -- and even more so a faction. Our hope was that this policy would make it easier to hold a free discussion on the points of difference that were voiced at the last world congress and that have become more pronounced since then.

Likewise we have done our best to keep the dispute within the discussion channels provided by the movement. We have not succeeded altogether, as the Healyites managed to get hold of some of the internal documents. They published extracts which were picked up in turn by Pablo. He commented on them in his magazine. I suppose, too, that the dispute within the FIR is a matter of public knowledge.

The fact that news about the differences would become known, especially in the vanguard, was to be expected in my opinion. However, I do not see cause for excitement over it, since all sides are doing their best to keep the discussion on an internal level.

With revolutionary greetings,

s/Joe

cc:IM
Ernest

COPY COPY COPY

TRANSLATION

Rome
June 22, 1971

To the Editor of
Panorama
Buenos Aires

Dear Sir,

I read the interview with Hugo Blanco published by your magazine.

It goes without saying that the Fourth International considers Hugo Blanco an exemplary militant who merits the respect of all revolutionists for his acts as a leader of the peasants of Cuzco and for his struggle in face of bourgeois justice in his country. I will add that the Fourth International shares the analysis that Blanco makes of the Peruvian political situation under the military junta of Velasco Alvarado.

Nevertheless, I must state that the majority of the Fourth International, as expressed democratically in the world congress of 1969 and which included the majority of the Latin-American Trotskyists, does not accept the characterization of its line as "guerrillerista." The Fourth International has always rejected the conceptions that were summarized above all in the pamphlet written by Regis Debray, the theoretician at the time of "foquismo." We hold that small groups, divorced from the mass movement and its dynamics, can never fruitfully apply the guerrilla method and develop the revolutionary war which the domination of Yankee imperialism and the so-called national ruling layers imposes as the only solution for those who seek socialist solutions in Latin America. Already at the unification congress in 1963, we stated that "guerrilla warfare conducted by landless peasant mining and precipitating the downfall of a colonial or semicolonial power," but under condition that the role of leadership be that of revolutionary Marxist parties. Our conceptions, at the present stage, inspire the line and the actions of the Bolivian revolutionists (POR-Gonzales) and correspond to the orientations of the Argentine militants of the PRT and the ERP, who have proved in practice that they reject any concept of an elite, and are seeking a link with the masses, with their needs, their aspirations, and the real development of their struggles.

It is necessary for us to state also that Hugo Blanco is speaking in the name of a minority, even with reference to his country, and that the Peruvian Trotskyists who support the international majority reject any conception of armed struggle divorced from the worker and peasant masses.

Cordially,
s/Livio Maitan
Member of the U.S. of the
Fourth International

COPY COPY COPY

TRANSLATION

Rouge
14 rue du Fbg., Saint Denis
Paris 10

Paris, June 15, 1971

Dear Comrade Joseph Hansen,

I received your letter of June 1, 1971. While awaiting a political reply to my letter of May 16, 1971, I would like to make only one observation of a technical nature:

For a possible English translation of the article on Brazil (by Pinheiro-Mattos), I would like to ask you to please use the copy that I sent you dated last March 8. The fact is, unfortunately, that in publishing this article in Quatrième Internationale a series of misprints and typographical errors were made, and words and even parts of sentences are missing. The version that I sent you, which is a complete one, will in addition be the one that will be published in Cuarta Internacional, the Spanish magazine of the U.S.

Fraternal greetings,
Stein

COPY COPY COPY

June 24, 1971

Dear Comrade Stein,

Thank you for your letter of June 15, 1971.

In accordance with your request, we are going ahead and utilizing the copy of the manuscript which you sent us as the basis for an English translation of the article by Pinheiro-Mattos on Brazil.

I am disappointed that you did not send me a copy of the May issue of Quatrième Internationale as I requested in my letter of June 1. You stated in your letter of May 16 that the article in question was published in the issues of March and May. As yet neither I nor anyone else that I know of here has received a single copy of the May issue of Quatrième Internationale although it is now almost the end of June. It is hard to understand why you decided against airmailing me a copy.

As to a "political reply" to your letter of May 16, you stated that what was "most important" and what you considered to be a "question of principle" concerned the alleged rejection by the editor of Intercontinental Press of the article on Brazil submitted by Pinheiro-Mattos. From your letter of June 15 I gather that you now recognize that you were mistaken in your assumption.

With regard to the objections you leveled in your May 16 letter against making it possible for our own circles to read the contribution of the Ponto de Partida group to the general discussion in Latin America on tactics and strategy ("Concerning a Kidnapping in Brazil"), I assume that since you have submitted your May 16 letter for publication in the Internal Bulletin that possible replies will similarly be submitted for publication there.

Fraternally,

s/Joseph Hansen

cc: United Secretariat
Political Bureau of the Ligue Communiste
Political Committee, Socialist Workers Party
Editor, Quatrième Internationale

COPY COPY COPY

June 30, 1971

Dear Comrade Stein,

This will acknowledge receipt of a copy of the May issue of Quatrieme Internationale. It came in today's mail.

I note that the envelope was postmarked June 24, 1971. There may have been a delay of a day or two in delivery because the old address of Intercontinental Press was used. We have written twice asking that Quatrieme Internationale. like the other publications of our movement, be mailed to our new address; but as yet no attention seems to have been paid to our request.

In any case, we finally received a copy of the issue of Quatrieme Internationale containing the second part of the article on Brazil by Pinheiro and Mattos which was dated as having been written last January. We plan to publish an English translation of this part in the July 12 issue of Intercontinental Press. The first part will appear in the July 5 issue, wiich is now at the printers.

Comradely yours,

s/ Joseph Hansen

cc: United Secretariat
Political Bureau of the
Ligue Communiste
Political Committee,
Socialist Workers Party
Editor, Quatrieme Internationale

COPY COPY COPY

June 30, 1971

Dear Joe,

When I came back from vacations, I was shocked to hear, from your correspondence with Jean-Pierre, that the suggestion had been made to postpone the publication of your long contribution to the international discussion until September. This suggestion was made from a purely routinist administrative point of view, taking into account various technical difficulties (the tying up of the IBM-machines in Paris before August, as the result of the comrades having to move them from the old "Rouge" headquarters to the new one; the temporary break-down of the Ghent printing machine which is awaiting a spare piece etc.) and the unaccustomed length of your article.

From a political and organisational point of view, such a delay is of course inadmissible, and we decided to do everything possible to publish your article before the end of July. We shall try to have it ready for the French language international cadre school, but that we cannot guarantee (the Canadian comrades promise to send in the translation on July 5, but this leaves barely a week to correct, type, mimeograph and assemble some 120 pages, which is a lot, on 3.000 copies). It will be not so nicely produced as it would have been with the IBM machine and the Ghent printing plant, but speed is more importance than niceness in this case. We shall try to make it identical to the previously printed French Internal Bulletins. I hope this will satisfy you.

* * *

Warmest greetings,

s/Ernest