

14 Charles Lane  
New York, N.Y. 10014

October 30, 1973

To the Steering Committee of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction

Dear Comrades,

Enclosed are a number of items for the information of the faction steering committee.

- 1) A report on the October 23-24 meeting of the United Secretariat.
- 2) A copy of the IEC Majority's reply to our faction declaration.
- 3) Information concerning new internal discussion bulletins available in Spanish and French.
- 4) Copies of an exchange of correspondence between the international commission of the Lambertists and the United Secretariat.
- 5) Copies of two letters from Gus Horowitz to comrades in the Middle East.
- 6) A translation of the tendency declaration of the Revolutionary Marxist Tendency in the Italian section.
- 7) An article from SWP Discussion Bulletin Vol. 31, No. 25 by Barry Sheppard concerning the SWP's handling of the goon-squad attacks on the CP and SWP by the National Caucus of Labor Committees. This question is being raised as one of the "scandals" circulated by the IEC Majority faction, and the article by Barry Sheppard explains exactly what the SWP leadership did and why.

Comradely,

*Mary-Alice*

Mary-Alice Waters

## To the Steering Committee of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction

REPORT ON THE UNITED SECRETARIAT MEETING OF OCTOBER 23-24, 1973

The main disputed point placed on the agenda of the United Secretariat meeting by the Bureau was the series of events that led up to the decision of the IEC Majority Tendency supporters in the Canadian section to split and join the Revolutionary Marxist Group, an opponent organization. (See report on the split in Canada by the Political Bureau of the LSA/LSO, sent to the steering committee last week.)

The written report of the LSA/LSO Political Bureau was placed before the United Secretariat. After reading the report, the IEC Majority Tendency members requested that there not be any discussion on the report until the November meeting of the United Secretariat, as the report presented a different factual picture of the situation than the one they had received by telephone from the IEC Majority supporters in Canada. They asked for time to get written material, and this request was agreed to by the representatives of the Canadian leadership who were present.

As indicated in the IEC Majority's reply to the declaration of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction, their version of the "facts" is that IEC Majority Tendency supporters in Canada were expelled for publicly presenting the line adopted by the 1969 congress of the Fourth International as opposed to the line adopted by the last convention of the LSA/LSO. (Enclosed is a copy of the IEC Majority Tendency's reply to the LTF, which will be printed in IIDB Vol. 10, No. 20.) As the report of the LSA/LSO Political Bureau makes abundantly clear, that version of the "facts" had nothing to do with reality.

### World Congress Preparations

The next meeting of the United Secretariat and Parity Committee, which will take place next month, will discuss and try to agree on: 1) the list of sections and sympathizing groups, their size, and how many mandates each will be entitled to; 2) recommendations to the congress concerning small nuclei of groups with less than 30 members; and 3) recommendations regarding observers at the congress from minorities that are too small to be normally represented in the delegations from sections and sympathizing groups. The next Parity Committee and United Secretariat meeting will also discuss the special world congress fund drive and how payments should be handled.

The opening of the world congress has been definitively fixed for the beginning of the year, and it was agreed to try to hold the congress to a week or less. The Bureau has established a special subcommittee to organize the congress. They excluded from this subcommittee all United Secretariat members who belong to the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction. Thus the world congress is being organized by the IEC Majority faction, which takes full responsibility for all arrangements, including security. The congress will be held someplace in Europe, but no further details will be made available until the eve of the gathering.



Each section and sympathizing group will be permitted to send a maximum of one delegate for each mandate. We proposed, and it was agreed, that youth organizations sympathizing with the Fourth International should be permitted to send leadership delegations with voice but no vote. We felt it was correct not to place youth organizations in the same category as sympathizing organizations of the Fourth International -- which are groups on their way to becoming sections. Members of youth organizations become members of the Fourth International by joining the section of the Fourth International in their country, and we don't expect youth organizations to have standards for membership as rigorous as those adopted by a section or a sympathizing group of the Fourth International.

#### The Discussion Bulletin

French-language discussion bulletins numbers 17-23 have now been printed. The contents of these bulletins are listed on an enclosed sheet.

Also enclosed is a list of Spanish-language bulletins that are available from New York. These are reprints of translations or bulletins prepared by the comrades of the PST, with help from other Latin American sections and sympathizing groups.

The comrades of the IEC Majority informed us that they have completed a number of translations into Spanish, including their political resolution and their China document, but we have not received either copies of these items, or a full list of what they have translated into Spanish.

There are approximately 50 resolutions, amendments or discussion articles submitted to the IIDB and accepted by the United Secretariat that still remain to be printed in English. Most of these are currently in the process of being translated from other languages and will be printed as soon as they are available.

In a number of cases the United Secretariat decided to waive its deadline for receipt of material for the IIDB. It was agreed to allow the majority leadership of the British section to submit answers to Comrade Gerry Foley's discussion article "The Test of Ireland" (Vol. X, No. 17) and to answer Comrade Alan Harris's contribution to the discussion dealing with the record of the IMG since the last world congress (this article will appear shortly in the English bulletin). The United Secretariat also agreed to the request of the Kompass Tendency in the German section that it be allowed to submit material after the deadline, including amendments to the European resolution, comments on the political resolution, and a counterresolution to the IEC Majority's resolution on armed struggle in Latin America.

There continues to be disagreement over the translation of material into French (see Appendix III) of the IEC Majority faction's reply to our Faction declaration). The IEC Majority maintains that they are only obligated to translate and publish material submitted since the December 1972 IEC. They refuse to publish some of the material submitted before that, such as Comrade Germain's report to the 1969 IEC, or the material re-

lated to the 1969 split in the IKD in Germany. We pointed out that the United Secretariat statement on the IKD split, for example, is far from irrelevant to the current internal situation in the International. In it the United Secretariat unanimously outlined what does and does not justify a split in a principled Leninist organization. This was before the deepening of the factional struggle in the International.

The IEC Majority has also decided that they will not translate Gerry Foley's article "The Test of Ireland" into French even though they admit it was submitted prior to the deadline and met all the requirements enumerated by the United Secretariat. They insist that he "summarize" the article. They also announced that they refuse to translate the three contributions to the discussion by the comrades of the Liga Comunista (formerly Encrucijada) in Spain. In line with their decision at the September United Secretariat meeting, they announced that they will translate any 25 pages the LC chooses (give or take a couple), but no more. All three contributions will be printed in full in Spanish and English.

The IEC Majority agreed that they will guarantee translation and publication of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction's political resolution, further comments on the European resolution, and an answer to the Latin American armed-struggle resolution whenever these are received. They will also publish the contributions from the PST on Argentina and Bolivia whenever they are received.

#### IEC Majority Faction Reply to Leninist-Trotskyist Faction

After receiving, translating and studying the IEC Majority's reply to our faction declaration it is clear that both the faction steering committee and the SWP Political Committee will have to demand the right to reply. However, since the United Secretariat has agreed to allow IMG and GIM comrades to reply to material they were unable to read or study prior to the cutoff date, we assume the United Secretariat Majority will permit replies to their faction statement to be published in the IIDB.

Members of the faction steering committee are now working on a draft political resolution, another contribution on the European discussion, and an answer to the IEC Majority's faction statement.

#### Middle East War

The United Secretariat unanimously adopted a statement on the Mideast war, after various changes proposed by us were incorporated. [See IP, Nov. 5, 1973]

We pointed out that it was unfortunate the Fourth International did not release a statement while the war was still going on. This would have been especially helpful, given the ambiguities in the line carried by the press of some of our European sections. Rouge especially, failed to clearly state that we are unconditionally in favor of the victory of the Arab armies.



Letter from the Lambertists

Attached are copies of an exchange of letters between the international commission of the Lambertists and the United Secretariat. The second letter from the Lambertists, dated October 10, was received just prior to the United Secretariat meeting. Consideration of a response was postponed until the November meeting.

Precongress Discussion in the European Sections

A meeting of revolutionary Marxists from France, scheduled for mid-October, at which spokespersons of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction were to present our positions to leading comrades for the first time, failed to materialize. We were later informed that this was because of a security problem beyond anyone's control. Thus no discussion has begun on even a leadership level amongst the largest bloc of supporters of the Fourth International.

A supporter of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction is currently making a tour of Italy, speaking about the European resolution. A report will be sent out to the faction steering committee when this tour is completed. Recently we received a copy of a tendency declaration from the Revolutionary Marxist Tendency in the Italian section. [Enclosed]

Comradely,

*Jack*

Jack Barnes

October 29, 1973

INTERNATIONAL INTERNAL DISCUSSION MATERIAL IN SPANISH

(October 31, 1973)

No. 1: Boletín de Informaciones Internacionales, published by SWP

La Radicalización Mundial y Las Tareas de la Cuarta Internacional (Proyecto Resolución del Tercer Congreso Mundial desde la reunificación [Noveno Congreso Mundial])

Balance del Movimiento Estudiantil, por Daniel Bensaid y C. Scalabrino

Una Contribución Sobre la Discusión de la Radicalización de la Juventud (Resolución votada por el Buro Político de la Liga Comunista de Francia)

Informe Internacional (Adoptado por el Noveno Congreso Nacional de la YSA, 28 de Diciembre de 1969), por Caroline Lund

No. 2: Boletín de Informaciones Internacionales, published by SWP (also printed by PST [Argentine])

Argentina y Bolivia: Un Balance, por Hugo Blanco, Peter Camejo, Joseph Hansen, Anibal Lorenzo, Nahuel Moreno

La Crisis Política y Las Perspectivas de la Lucha Revolucionaria en La Argentina, por Livio Maitan

Declaración de la Tendencia Leninista-Trotskista  
Critica al Proyecto de Resolución de la Mayoría del Secretariado Unificado, "La Construcción de los Partidos Revolucionarios en Europa Capitalista" -- Una Primera Contribución, por Mary-Alice Waters

Dos Líneas, Dos Métodos, por George Novack

No. 3: Boletín de Informaciones Internacionales, published by SWP

Proyecto de Resolución Sobre América Latina

Un Documento Insuficiente, por Livio Maitan

Consideraciones al Proyecto de Resolución Sobre América Latina, por Joseph Hansen

Retorno a la Senda del Trotskismo, por Peng Shu-tse

Posición de la Delegación Mexicana con Respecto a la Resolución Sobre América Latina del Secretariado Unificado de la Cuarta Internacional Para el Noveno Congreso de la Propia Organización

Carta de José Valdés

Resolución Sobre América Latina Adoptada por el Noveno Congreso Mundial (Tercero después de la Reunificación)

Informe Sobre el Noveno Congreso Mundial (Tercero Después de la Reunificación), por Joseph Hansen

Carta de Hugo Blanco a Joseph Hansen, enero 1970

Una Contribución a la Discusión Sobre la Estrategia Revolucionaria en América Latina, por Joseph Hansen

Carta de Livio Maitan a Hugo Blanco, marzo 1970

Guerra de Guerrillas: La Lección de China (carta de un trotskista chino)

Carta de Hugo Blanco a Livio Maitan, octubre 1970

Una Vez Más Sobre las Perspectivas Revolucionarias en América Latina: Defensa de Una Orientación y de Un Método, por Livio Maitan



No. 4: Boletín de Informaciones Internacionales, published by SWP  
(also printed by PST [Argentina])

Texto Preparatorio Para la Conferencia de las Direcciones de las Secciones Europeas del Año 1972, por Vergeat y Delphin  
La Construcción de los Partidos Revolucionarios en la Europa Capitalista

En Defensa del Leninismo: En Defensa de la Cuarta Internacional, por Ernest Germain

Bolivia: Balance y Líneas de Orientación (Resolución del CEI)

Carta al P.R.T. (Combatiente)

Algunas Divergencias Fundamentales Entre el P.R.T. y la Mayoría de la Internacional

En Tomo a las Posiciones Mantenido por la Liga Comunista Francesa en las Elecciones Legislativas de Marzo de 1973, por Comité Central de la Liga Comunista Española

Las Precondiciones para un Congreso Mundial con autoridad (Abril 9, 1973, resolución del Secretariado Unificado)

La Nueva Situación en la Cuarta Internacional, Declaración de la Fracción Leninista-Trotskyista

Recomendaciones a los Delegados al Próximo Congreso Mundial (10 puntos adoptados por el S.U. Setiembre 19, 1973)

No. 5: Boletín de Informaciones Internacionales, published by SWP (will be available in 3-4 weeks)

La Orientación Estratégica de los Revolucionarios en América Latina

Nota Introductoria a la Carta Firmada Domingo

La Crisis del Movimiento Trotskista en la Argentina

Carta del Comité Político del S.W.P. al S.U.

Resolución del Secretariado Unificado Referente a la Carta del 11 de Mayo de 1971 del Comité Político del Socialist Workers Party

Respuesta al Comité Político del SWP, por Livio Maitan

Julio 7 de 1971, Carta del Comité Político de Socialist Workers Party al Secretariado Unificado

16 de Mayo 1971, Carta de Stein a la Dirección Nacional del SWP

1 de Junio 1971, Carta de Joseph Hansen a Stein

15 de Junio 1971, Carta de Stein a Joseph Hansen

24 de Junio 1971, Carta de Joseph Hansen a Stein

30 de Junio 1971, Carta de Joseph Hansen a Stein

Respuesta al Camarada Stein, por Peter Camejo

Una Carta Sobre Bolivia, por Raimond

Para Una Buena Preparación del Próximo Congreso de la Cuarta Internacional, por C.C., PRT

Por la Construcción y el Fortalecimiento de las Secciones Latinamericanas de la Cuarta Internacional, por L. David, Miguel Fuentes, Antonio, Ines

Aportaciones a la Discusión en la Cuarta Internacional Sobre Tactica y Estrategia en América Latina, by A. Iber, J. Montero, et T. Ismael

Las Lecciones de Bolivia, por Aníbal Lorenzo

NOUVEAUX BULLETINS INTERNATIONAUX DISPONIBLE EN FRANCAIS

(30 Octobre 1973)

Nouvelle Série: Documents et informations de sociologie

- No. 17 Des questions de méthode au sujet du document européen,  
A. Duret
- No. 18 Les divergences d'interprétation de la "Revolution  
Culturelle" au dernier congrès mondial et leurs  
implications théoriques, par la Tendance Majoritaire  
du C.E.I.  
La paille et la poutre, réponse a la lettre du polit-  
ical committee du SWP adressée au BP de la LC-  
dissoute
- No. 19 Les racines sociales du stalinisme chinois et la dis-  
pute dans la Quatrième Internationale, par Les Evans
- No. 20 Projet de résolution politique, par la Tendance Majori-  
taire du C.E.I.
- No. 21 Résolution du premier congrès nationale de la fraction  
bolchevique de la IV Internationale - S.U. (groupe  
issu du PRT(C) d'Argentine)  
Quelques considérations sur la polémique ouverte par  
le Xème congrès mondial et la nécessité de la con-  
vocation d'un congrès mondial extraordinaire -- par  
la faction bolshevique de la IV Internationale - S.U.
- No. 22 Un début de révision du marxisme, de E. Germain  
A propos d'un projet de résolution sur le travail  
femme dans l'Internationale, ou l'illustration  
d'autres débats, par Tamara et Verla
- No. 23 La révolution arabe: problèmes, état présent et per-  
spectives, par Jaber (Liban), Sami (Iraq) et Vergeat  
(France)  
Lecons d'uruguay, par Carlos Rossi et A. Toussaint



To the United Secretariat of the Fourth International

May 28, 1973

Comrades,

The International Bureau of the Organizing Committee for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International, meeting in Paris April 20-23, made an examination of where the organizations that claim to represent the Fourth International stand today internationally.

As you know, the picture is marked by differences on a whole series of questions. But the situation turns around a central question that remains unsolved in every country -- how to build leading revolutionary parties through applying the principles of the Transitional Program. Anyone can see that the differences over this question cut through the various regroupment formations that claim to represent the Fourth International.

In particular, the International Bureau discussed the documents submitted for the Tenth World Congress of your international organization.

It noted, with respect to the "two lines" on the place of "guerrillaism" in building revolutionary parties of the Fourth International in Latin America, that the differences "have extended beyond that continent ...to distinct though allied questions. ...bearing essentially on the way to build mass revolutionary parties in the situation in which the Fourth International finds itself today."

For the purposes of analyzing the world situation and the problems raised by the struggle for the Fourth International in the conditions that arise today from the position of the organizations claiming to represent the Fourth International, the International Bureau declares that the organizations regrouped in the organizing Committee for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International are prepared to participate in the Tenth World Congress of your international organization.

This proposal is motivated by a whole series of considerations, the main ones of which are as follows:

1) The particularly favorable objective conditions for building strong sections of the Fourth International are not sufficient in and of themselves to resolve the central question of how to create a revolutionary leadership of the proletariat. To give only one example, the general strike of May-June 1968 did not lessen the differences among the organizations claiming to represent Trotskyism in France. Quite to the contrary, these differences deepened along the same lines as the problems raised in the preparation for your Tenth Congress. Let us add that this development is by no means limited to France.

2) We propose participating in your congress because in our opinion for the first time since 1952-53, the current discussion

embraces all the main questions of principle, strategy, and tactics and thus makes it possible to resume on new bases and with a considerably richer international experience the debate that led to the split in the Fourth International proclaimed in [omission in text]. The Fourth International has been driven into an impasse by Pabloism. The perception of this impasse, the experience of this impasse, is ineluctably opening the way for discussion and analysis of all the questions underlying the differences that have spread beyond the confines of the organizations claiming to represent the Fourth International. This development attests to the need for making a new survey of the panorama of the international workers movement, for taking account of the changes that have occurred and for making a correct assessment of the new groupings, and in this framework proceeding to an examination of the differences that arose in the Fourth International in 1950-53 and which have since considerably broadened.

3) A long experience, which extends over almost a quarter of a century for some of us, attests to the fact that there can be no question of going back on our positions or coming around to a method, Pabloism, which we still consider alien to Marxism. While we are willing to learn through the experience of discussing together, we are clearly not abandoning our ideas in the slightest.

We will fight for our ideas and our positions on the basis of respect for workers democracy, staying within the context of the agenda established by your leading bodies themselves.

4) In proposing to participate in your Tenth World Congress, we declare ourselves ready to discuss, at your convenience, all questions, including those raised by the activity and positions of the organizations adhering to the Organizing Committee for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International.

5) We consider that in the present conjuncture it is possible to develop a clear discussion on the differences that exist and in a different sort of context than the one in which the 1952-53 split occurred and hardened.

Therefore, the International Bureau proposes that it be allowed to participate in your Tenth World Congress with the status of observer.

Signed: The International Bureau of the Organizing Committee for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International.

P.S. We declare our readiness to meet with a delegation to discuss the manner in which we will participate and, of course, to take care of the material costs of our participation.



July 16, 1973

To the "Organizing Committee for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International"

Comrades,

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International examined the request you made to participate in the next World Congress of the Fourth International.

To begin with, we note that that step on your part contrasts markedly with the numerous slanderous attacks you have publicly hurled against our movement and its members: our comrades of the Ligue Communiste put up "crypto-Stalinist candidates propelled by the bourgeoisie," Comrade Gonzales Moscoso was "suspected" of "working on behalf of the Bolivian government," the comrades of the SWP were "valets of the class enemy..." whose actions placed them outside the camp of Trotskyism and of the working class." Your step also contrasts with the fact that, at the time of your split with Healy, you reproached him for having made contact with us.

In your letter, where it is no longer a question of such slanders, you perceive on the contrary that "anyone can see that the differences over this central question cut through the various regroupment formations that claim to represent the Fourth International." Stated another way, you seem to forget the slanders you hurled behind the scenes in order to place yourself on the plane of political differences which could be normally debated. This would constitute an altogether laudable step forward on your part if, at the same time, you publicly disavowed the slanderous attacks you repeatedly spread against the Trotskyist organizations you were politically separated from. As for us, we cannot accept the ways of the bourgeois politicians who insult each other in the halls of Parliament and then get together in the pub.

For our part, we have always carried out the political debate with all tendencies in the workers movement with an eye towards clarifying the differences and, with those who claimed to be adherents of Trotskyism, seeing if there was a possibility of reenforcing the Fourth International. It follows from the terms of your letter that this is not your objective:

"We propose participating in your congress because in our opinion for the first time since 1952-53, the current discussion embraces all the main questions of principle, strategy, and tactics and thus makes it possible to resume on new bases and with a considerably richer international experience the debate that led to the split in the Fourth International proclaimed in 1938, reconstituted in 1943-46."

You thus think that the conditions are propitious for causing a larger and deeper split in the Fourth International. This splittist objective is again clearly acknowledged in the resolution you adopted at the very same session where you decided to make the request to participate in the next World Congress of the Fourth International:

Letter to Lambertists/page 2

"We must base our perspective of work on the opening of discussion with the best elements who are conscious of the betrayal of Stalinism, Social Democracy, petty-bourgeois nationalism, and Pabloism [under this heading you mean our movement]....Our tactic, flexible vis-a-vis all currents that declare for the International, seeks to separate out the groups orienting themselves, or susceptible to orienting themselves, towards the program of the Fourth International...." (la Vérité, pp. 148-9, April 1973.)

We have a totally different conception from yours. You search for platforms from which to consolidate and enlarge splits. You want to hold "open conferences" which, apparently, brought you some disappointments (split with the SLL, split with Varga) instead of producing a split within the others. We are preparing our Congress through democratically conducted debates, with the desire to end up in the strengthening of our organization and in a common orientation for the whole Fourth International. The debate which you want to conduct you are entitled to carry on through your press; we will respond there in the manner we judge most appropriate for us. But there is no question of according you the platform of the World Congress to aid your splittist undertaking.

We are ready to reexamine this decision if you alter your splittist objectives, if you publicly agree to recognize and implement the decisions of the World Congress, as outlined in the current statutes of the International, and if your activity conforms to such a change in orientation.

Internationalist communist greetings,

for the United Secretariat of the  
Fourth International

E. Germain



TRANSLATION

COPY

TRANSLATION

COPY

TRANSLATION

TO THE "UNITED SECRETARIAT OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL"

October 10, 1973

Comrades,

The organizations, groups and individual members adhering to the Organizing Committee for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International have noted the response to our request for participation in your Tenth World Congress, signed by Comrade Germain on behalf of the United Secretariat.

The Organizing Committee has instructed its International Bureau to communicate to you our regret at the decision you have taken in rejecting our proposal.

Without trying to reply to all the points in your letter, some of which should be corrected if they are to strictly correspond with reality, we have no intention of denying the sharp character of the factional struggle initiated in 1950 inside the International.

In this respect, it is obviously impossible to deny that the first and most important of the actions which explains the violence of the polemics was the expulsion of the majority of the P.C.I. from the International [Parti Communiste Internationaliste -- Internationalist Communist Party, French section of the Fourth International at that time], from which the O.C.I. [Organisation Communiste Internationaliste -- Internationalist Communist Organization] emerged. This was because, among other things, the PCI majority defended the Ten Theses presented in the international discussion by Comrade Germain.

Is it also necessary to recall that, while the majority of the P.C.I. formally pledged at the time to apply the line of the majority of the International, which we characterized as "Pabloist," the split stemmed from the refusal of the I.E.C. [International Executive Committee] to guarantee the right of those who disagreed to constitute an international tendency. The majority of the P.C.I. rejected such practices which have the effect of stifling discussion, in flagrant violation of the historic struggle of Trotskyism for respect of the principles of workers' democracy.

Today as yesterday, we continue to believe that no matter how far back the discussion concerning the principles of the Fourth International may go, it is absolutely necessary to uphold the methods of workers' democracy.

Because we consider these methods still to be correct, we cannot subscribe to the paragraph in your letter in which you write: For our part we have always carried out the political debate with all tendencies in the workers movement with an eye towards clarifying the differences and, with those who claimed to be adherents of Trotskyism, seeing if there was a possibility of reenforcing the Fourth International."

That was not the case in 1950-53, and that is why it would be improper to consider certain characterizations as a unilateral practice, for we can readily list numerous insinuations and statements you hurled against us which could easily be labelled "slanderous."



In addition, we think it necessary to correct your charge that our proposal is motivated by the desire to provoke a split in your ranks. Are we responsible for the splits in Canada, Argentina and Spain? Without counting the older splits in France, Germany, Latin America and elsewhere, and the fact that since 1968 the majority of the young members of the Italian section of the United Secretariat have gone over to open anti-Trotskyism in the course of a series of splits.

Our proposal to participate in the Tenth Congress called by the United Secretariat is aimed at advancing toward the solution of the problems at issue by opening wide the international discussion.

In this connection we would like to give precise details to correct this passage in your letter: "Your step also contrasts with the fact that, at the time of your split with Healy, you reproached him for having made contact with us."

Your information is certainly very inadequate. The proposal that G. Healy contact the United Secretariat was made by the French delegation of the O.C.I. during a meeting of the International Committee. What the French delegation rejected was Healy's method. As is his habit, he sought to sidestep a discussion on questions of principle, by substituting matters of procedure having more to do with diplomacy and maneuver. He sought to avoid openly stating the aims and objectives which the I.C. [International Committee] had expressly mandated him to do. No Marxist can approve that method.

We continue to believe that the paralysis of the International -- shown, for example, by the absence of an effective intervention of the Fourth International in the critical period that the Chilean working class has been going through -- has left an open field for class-collaborationist Popular Front policies. Clearly this situation is rooted in the problems raised by the present discussion which, we repeat, "embraces all the main questions of principle, strategy and tactics" posed before the supporters of the Fourth International.

The aim of our proposal was and remains to assure the theoretical clarification of problems, in order to rise above the sectarian, opportunist and ultraleft-adventurist deviations, which reflect the pressure of hostile class forces, the Stalinist bureaucracy and reformism on the organizations claiming to adhere to the Fourth International.

In view of your refusal, we advance a new proposal:

-- The International Bureau of the Organizing Committee, in its October session, placed on the agenda a discussion on the role of the national bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie in the oppressed countries in connection with the Anti-Imperialist United Front, as part of the balance-sheet of the struggle for the Fourth International in Latin America. Several documents will be submitted to the discussion. We propose that the documents accepted at the end of the meeting of our Bureau be made available to you and that they be considered as a contribution to the discussion at the Tenth Congress.

-- The International Bureau is going to publish the draft report on building Revolutionary Parties in Western Europe that you are submitting to your Tenth Congress. The O.C.I. is pre-



paring a document on this question.

We propose accordingly that these documents be circulated in the ranks of the organizations affiliated to the United Secretariat, as contributions to the Tenth Congress. Similarly we pledge to make available to the membership of the organizations affiliated to the Organizing Committee all documents and contributions that in your opinion should be brought to the attention of our members.

In conclusion we would like to add: it goes without saying that, out of respect for the principles of the Transitional Program of the Fourth International and workers democracy, and on the basis of a broad and complete international discussion which alone can create the grounds for defining clear political positions and accomplishing practical tasks in the reconstructed Fourth International, we are prepared to abide by democratic centralism.

With Trotskyist greetings,

The International Bureau of the  
Organizing Committee for the Recon-  
struction of the Fourth International

P.S. With respect to the Varga affair, we think that the sharpness of the factional struggle should not provide pretexts behind which an agent provocateur can pursue his work. We have published documents and carried out a thorough investigation, some elements of which cannot be made public for reasons of security. We are prepared to furnish the United Secretariat and all workers organizations with the documents in our possession. What is involved is the defense of the workers movement against Stalinist provocation. The struggle against Stalinism and its provocations, begun under Trotsky's leadership in 1923, should serve as a lesson for everyone.

COPY

COPY

COPY

New York  
October 24, 1973

Beirut

Dear Jaber,

The text of the completed interview was received here, and it will be published in the coming issue of IP. Parts of it will also be published in the Militant. Rouge has also published it, as I suppose you have seen by now. Also, a statement was received from the ISO(M), which was published in Rouge, and which will be published in the next IP and Militant. I didn't go to see the ISO(M) after all, but hope to have the chance sometime soon.

When I returned here, I learned that while I was away New York had received a new statement from the IEC Majority Tendency for publication in the International Internal Discussion Bulletin. The statement includes a list of additional names of individual comrades who have joined this tendency. I was surprised to see your name on the list, because you had not told me that you had formally joined the IEC Majority Tendency. I recall that you had told me that you were leaning to the IEC Majority Tendency positions, but at the same time you had indicated that you had not yet had the time to study the debate very thoroughly.

I was particularly surprised to see the name of Sani also on the list of members of the IEC Majority Tendency. I had gotten the impression from my discussions with him that he had not yet made a thorough study of the documents in dispute; to adhere to the IEC Majority Tendency, for example, requires agreement with the line of the Europe document, the Germain document, and new documents on Argentina and armed struggle in Latin America in general.

What surprised me even more was the fact that this list of new members of the IEC Majority Tendency was attached to a statement in answer to the initial declaration of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction. This answer was submitted not in the name of one or several members of the IEC Majority Tendency, but in the name of the Tendency as a whole. I do not know how you could have agreed to sign such a statement, since before I got to Lebanon you had not even seen the statement of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction. Yet right at that time, the IEC Majority Tendency answer to it had already been submitted for publication.

Perhaps what happened is that some smaller sub-committee of the IEC Majority Tendency has been delegated with the authority to issue statements in the name of the Tendency as a whole. If so, then the International should be made aware of this fact, because the delegation of such authority is one of the distinguishing marks of a faction, as distinct from an ideological tendency. It implies disciplined acceptance by all faction members of the actions of a delegated leadership sub-committee of the faction. If this is actually what happened, then I interpret it as one more confirmation of what we have said -- that the IEC Majority has been functioning not as a tendency, as it still claims, but as an undeclared, secret faction.



One of the consequences of such procedures bears directly on your own situation. This new IEC Majority Tendency statement is very unrestrained in its tone (I consider it vitriolic), and includes a very sharp attack on the SWP, an attack which in my opinion is slanderous and based on outright falsification of the facts about SWP actions and decisions. I had previously suspected that rumors along these lines were being spread, and for that reason I asked you if you had heard anything about the SWP convention and if you had any questions to ask about it or about the SWP's general methods of functioning. You did not raise anything, which I took to be a sign that such rumors had not reached you. Now, your name is attached to a statement incorporating such rumors, without your having had the opportunity to verify their authenticity with me.

Did you actually see this statement before agreeing to it? I would find that very hard to believe.

Please write and let me know if I have misinterpreted anything wrongly. Please share this letter with Sani also.

Please remember your pledge to continue sending in articles for publication in IP and the other press of the world movement. It is very important, and useful for everybody.

In addition to all the other myths that were exploded by this latest war, we have seen many signs of the increased possibilities for winning people over to an anti-Zionist position in the USA. Of course, this is still the position of a small minority, but the difference between today and 1967 is immense. From reading le Monde I get the impression that big changes have occurred in France on this question also. I am waiting anxiously to hear what type of response the ISO(M) got to its position.

Fraternal greetings,  
Gus

COPY

COPY

COPY

New York  
October 25, 1973

Haifa, Israel

Dear Mikado,

I received your letter of September 18 when I got back to New York.

I didn't come to Israel because of the outbreak of the war. I thought that problems could have developed with a visit under the circumstances, not to speak of the fact that it was probably an inopportune time for you to arrange for discussions on the FI. I did try to call you to discuss the situation, but the telephone lines were all tied up (they still are even now). So -- I hope to have another chance sometime before the world congress.

The International Internal Discussion Bulletin (vol. X, no. 18) carried the statement of the five ISO(M) comrades in support of the IEC Majority Tendency. I am uncertain of what you mean when you say that you "may not agree with all the positions of the International Majority Tendency, especially concerning the path followed in Latin America and the insufficient criticism of that path by the International leadership." The question of Latin America is at the heart of the differences, and agreement with one or another tendency presupposes acceptance of the basic written documents on these questions that form a key basis for the formation of each tendency. I assume, then, that your agreement with the IEC Majority Tendency means agreement with the basic line of its written positions on Latin America, and that your criticisms are minor within that framework.

Regarding some of the other points made in your statement:

1. I frankly do not understand what is meant by the statement that there is a debate over "the character of the period." I have heard this argument expressed by comrades in several countries, but I have never seen any documented evidence that this is an issue in dispute. In fact, regarding both Latin America and Europe, the written documents of both sides indicate that there is agreement on the intensifying crisis of capitalism, the greatly enhanced possibilities for revolutionary developments, and the expanded opportunities for building the Fourth International. The differences have arisen over the practical orientation of our movement in these situations. And as far as Latin America is concerned, the difference was specifically over the line of the last world congress which explicitly called for a practical orientation toward guerrilla warfare. That is the written, documented record.

2. I agree with you that the question of the method of building Leninist parties is an issue under dispute (and, I add, not just in a prerevolutionary period), as is the application of the Transitional Program. But here again, the examples of Bolivia and Argentina offer a good test in practice of the two approaches toward party-building and applying the Transitional Program.

3. You charge the Leninist-Trotskyist Tendency with having a "spontaneist concept of the relationship between the party and the masses: the party spreads ideas to the different sectors,



the masses spontaneously carry them out." Where have we ever said such a thing, or anything even closely resembling this? I have heard this charge before, just as I have heard the charge about the nature of the period, but I have never seen any documented evidence to prove it. Nor is this charge part of the written, documented basis for joining the IEC Majority Tendency.

4. You charge the Leninist-Trotskyist Tendency with having a propagandistic concept of the Transitional Program. I do not understand the basis for such a charge. How would it be reflected for example; in the record of the SWP in the antiwar movement or the women's liberation movement, or the record of the Argentine PST in the labor movement there? This issue, too, is not part of the documented basis for joining the IEC Majority Tendency.

5. You charge the Leninist-Trotskyist Tendency with having a sectoral concept of the Transitional Program. Here too, I am not sure what is meant. I hope you do not believe that we think that the struggles of different social sectors (such as youth or oppressed nationalities) can be conceived in isolation from the overall class struggle. In fact, the two documents, The World-wide Radicalization of Youth and the Tasks of the Fourth International and the Transitional Program for Black Liberation, explicitly reject such a mistaken concept. The very purpose of these documents is to provide a means of connecting the struggles in these sectors with the overall class struggle. They are not conceived as substitutes or partial replacements for the Transitional Program, but as applications of the Transitional Program to the specific struggles concerned (just as the Transitional Program itself indicates). This question, also, is not part of the documentary basis for joining the IEC Majority Tendency.

6. On the slogan of a "democratic and secular Palestine" -- we have discussed this before, so it is not necessary for me to repeat our position on it at any length. The SWP supports this specific democratic slogan. But I was surprised by the language you used: you say that this SWP position means "uncritical support to a slogan that was the entire program of the petty-bourgeois leadership of the Palestine resistance movement." You know that the SWP does not support (critically or uncritically) the petty-bourgeois programs of any of the Palestinian resistance organizations, although we do support all of these organizations in their struggle against Israel and imperialism. Comrades reading your statement might get a mistaken impression that we gave support to the programs of one or another of these groups.

Furthermore, I fail to see how supporting a democratic slogan raised by a petty-bourgeois group is an example of tail-ending. We also support the demand for immediate Israeli withdrawal from all occupied territory -- even though this demand is raised by the bourgeois Arab regimes, as their "entire program." But this is not tail-ending. Tail-ending would occur if one limited one's demands to such as these. But you know very well that the SWP raises the demand for a socialist revolution, and a whole series of other demands designed to mobilize the masses for a socialist revolution, which is the only way to fully realize and guarantee these democratic demands which are part of our program.

This question, also, is not part of the documented basis



for joining the IEC Majority Tendency.

7. On the question of tail-endism by "certain leaderships" in the Leninist-Trotskyist Tendency. I wish you had not been vague about who you had in mind, because it makes it difficult to answer. I assume you include the leaderships of the LSA/LSO in Canada and the PST in Argentina, both of which are accused of this charge in the Germain document, which is one of the bases for the IEC Majority Tendency.

This is first of all a matter of establishing the facts. For both Canada and Argentina, I do not think that the Germain document establishes its case. In the case of Canada, the answer to Comrade Germain's charges by Comrades Riddell and Young (IIDB vol. X, no. 16) appeared after your own statement of support to the IEC Majority Tendency, so you obviously did not have the chance to study it in advance. I think it is a devastating refutation of Comrade Germain's charges -- as well as exposing his mishandling of the facts. In the case of Argentina, the documentary record of the PST is available in IP; this material has been recently collected together and published in an Education for Socialists bulletin along with some new material. I think an objective study of this record disproves Comrade Germain's contentions.

-----  
My main point, which I repeat, is that I consider it permissible to adhere to one or the other tendency only on the basis of the written documents that form the political basis for each tendency.

I am sure that we could have had a very good discussion on all these questions. I know you and the other comrades would have had much to say (and I, of course, would have had a lot more to add to the above brief comments).

There is one new development, however, that bothers me. When I returned to New York, I learned that in the meantime the IEC Majority Tendency had submitted a new document for publication in the International Internal Discussion Bulletin. It is an answer to the initial statement of the newly-formed Leninist-Trotskyist Faction. The IEC Majority Tendency's answer is written in what I consider to be a very sharp, unrestrained tone, and it contains very harsh criticisms and condemnations of the organizational functioning of the SWP -- which in my opinion are based on outright falsifications of the facts about the SWP convention and SWP decisions. One of the most disturbing things about this is that it is written not in the name of one or several individual comrades who are members of the IEC Majority Tendency, but by the Tendency as a whole. In fact, attached to this statement are the names of the new members of the IEC Majority Tendency, including the names of the five Israeli comrades. Since the IEC Majority Tendency still claims to be a tendency and not a faction -- specifically, it claims to have no internal discipline and no steering committee empowered to issue statements in the name of the Tendency as a whole -- one is left with the impression that this document was seen and approved by all members of the IEC Majority Tendency. I was rather surprised that you would have agreed to sign such a document.

I agree with you on the necessity of both sides conducting



themselves with the necessary restraint to avoid a split. Despite the depth of the political differences, and the fact that the differences are deepening, I believe that there is no political basis to justify a split. Under such circumstances, anyone acting with the intention of carrying out a split would be acting in an unprincipled fashion. Similarly for condoning the actions of would-be splitters. Both sides have the responsibility to act maturely and attempt to prevent such a disastrous event from occurring.

The discussion in the International, I am sure you will agree, is of such importance that it merits the most careful study and calm consideration. Only in this way can the issues be resolved in a principled way, and without damage done to our movement. And if this discussion -- which is just beginning for most comrades -- can be conducted in such a spirit, it will have a tremendous educational benefit for everyone.

-----

I read the ISO(M) statement on the war and thought it was good. I hope you will be contributing more statements and analysis.

It is clear that one of the most important results of the war was the shattering of the myth of Israeli military invincibility. This will surely have an effect in dispelling any spirit of despair among the Arab masses. Another important development was the proof that there exists potential for building anti-Zionist sentiment within the United States. Such sentiment is still the feeling of a small minority, but the contrast between now and 1967 is striking. I got the impression from reading the French papers that this was similarly true of France. Of course, we are all anxiously awaiting news from you about the receptivity you got to your ideas.

Please share this letter with the other comrades.

Best regards,  
Gus

CALL FOR THE FORMATION OF THE REVOLUTIONARY  
MARXIST TENDENCY

Gruppi Comunisti Rivoluzionari, Italian section of  
the Fourth International

The course of the international discussion and the positions taken by different tendencies in the internal discussion in the various sections clearly demonstrate the following points:

a) The world discussion is still far from coming to a conclusion. New elements, new information, and new contributions continue to pour in, enriching the subject matter of an already quite rich discussion:

b) The bearing of the differences originally expressed on the question of Latin America has now extended to other important sectors of the world revolution, crystallizing finally in a discussion on the methodology of building an international revolutionary party.

c) The two tendencies that initially polarized the discussion do not represent all the positions existing in the International. From this standpoint, the formation of so-called third tendencies is quite a significant phenomenon.

d) Although belatedly, the main documents are beginning to be translated and to become known to the ranks. This is helping to revive the discussion and get it going again even in those sections where the debate has been less lively up till now. The arrival of documents and information is enabling comrades in the less well-informed sections who are not members of the IEC to begin to take part actively in the discussion. At the same time, positions adopted hastily on the basis of one-sided information and reading one or two documents are being put totally in question, and if they are confirmed subsequently, it will be on the basis of a fuller understanding. (We find no difficulty in admitting frankly that some of the signers of this appeal, after familiarizing themselves with a series of documents and facts important for understanding the real terms of the debate, have had to revise in part some of the positions they had taken in the past.)

e) This last point brings up a matter that is still vital today for a better development of the pre-congress discussion -- the question of information. Without information, or with only partial or distorted information, members can of course finally cast their vote but they certainly cannot acquire a political understanding of the problems now facing the Fourth International.

f) The most acute dangers of a split in the International seem to have diminished since the unanimous adoption of the ten-point resolution by the US on September 19, 1973. Nonetheless, there are a series of elements that require members of the Fourth International to remain on guard against a resurgence of such dangers and against any violations of democratic centralism.

The Revolutionary Marxist Tendency has already made an initial contribution to the European discussion, proposing a detailed program for building the revolutionary party in Italy. This con-



tribution, like that of the Italian Central Committee, or those of other European sections or sympathizing groups, is offered to the International to enrich the discussion initiated by the IEC majority's document on Europe and the criticisms of it raised by Comrade Waters.

On the basis of our present knowledge and the international documents that have been translated and made available to the Italian section, the members of the Revolutionary Marxist Tendency declare their agreement on the following points:

1) The criticism of the European document of the IEC majority presented in Part I of the "Controprogetto di documento politico" [Counter Political Resolution] submitted to the national conference in Bolletino Interno, no. 18, of October 8, 1973 (points 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8, and 11 on pp. 1-9 and pp. 17-20).

2) The general guidelines for building the revolutionary party in Italy summed up in Thesis 5 of the "controprogetto di documento politico" (pp. 55-60 of Part II in Bolletino Interno no. 18, of October 10, 1973).

3) The general lines of the assessment of the experience in Argentina and Bolivia contained in "Argentina and Bolivia: a Balance Sheet."

4) The necessity of fighting to preserve the unity of the Fourth International against any tendencies toward a split that might arise and against any violation of democratic centralism from whatever quarter it comes. In support of these last two points, the Revolutionary Marxist Tendency declares itself ready to block with any other tendency against attempts to divide the International or violate democratic centralism. This position corresponds to the spirit of the two declarations approved unanimously by the US (April 9, 1973, and September 19, 1973), which have not yet been translated into Italian.

5) Conscious of our own limitations and the difficulties arising from the lack of information in the Italian section about the international discussion, the Revolutionary Marxist Tendency will fight for a better circulation of international information and in particular defend the right of all tendencies to present their own positions as clearly as possible on all occasions.

To join the tendency or make contact with us, write to M. Polverosi, via L. Caro 38, Roma, Italia.

Signed: Antonella, Paolo, Raffaele, Roberto.

Rome, October 19, 1973.

Copies to the International Majority Tendency, the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction, and the Kompass Tendency

QUESTIONS CONCERNING OUR DEFENSE  
AGAINST THE GOON ATTACKS  
LAUNCHED BY THE NCLC

by Barry Sheppard

*The Militant* recently received a letter from Comrade Gerald Clark criticizing the tactics the party has utilized in defending itself from the goon attacks launched by the National Caucus of Labor Committees. His letter concludes with the rhetorical questions: "Has the SWP given up the principle of working class solidarity against class enemies in favor of putting trust in the 'justice' of the bourgeois courts?"

Comrades probably find it odd that Comrade Clark would think that the pages of *The Militant* are an appropriate place for a SWP member to charge that the SWP has gone over to putting trust in the class enemy. The editors thought that this was not the proper place for an intraparty discussion and decided not to print the letter. However, the issues raised by Comrade Clark are important and should be answered.

The following is the text of Comrade Clark's letter (all emphasis in the original).

\* \* \*

June 29, 1973

To the Editors:

I was quite interested to read in *The Militant* (June 29, 1973) two articles concerning the use of bourgeois courts by working class organizations. The first article entitled, "Teamsters sue Fitzsimmons, back UFWU," had to do with a group of rank-and-file Teamsters who filed suit in the Los Angeles Superior Court charging the union's top officials with entering into a conspiracy with grape growers to bust the United Farmworkers Union.

Regardless of the truthfulness of such charges, the tactic of one section of the union movement bringing another section of the movement—however reactionary—into the bourgeois courts to settle differences has always been opposed by revolutionary socialists. The reasons are simple: It is a *principle* within the revolutionary workers' movement that differences of opinion, including the resort to violence, can only be resolved by the working class itself. No bourgeois court can provide "justice" whenever the working class is involved in a fight for its rights. It never has and never will be "impartial" toward the class struggle.

But the tone of the article was one of *approval*! Take this quote for example: "As soon as certain technicalities can be ironed out with Superior Court Judge Campbell Lucas, Giler (the attorney for the Teamster group) plans to submit the suit. . . ." No criticisms follow this statement! The entire article simply explains what is happening. By implication, and from what *The Militant* has already written on the UFWU-Teamster dispute, the reader has no real choice but to conclude that the paper approves of such tactics. Is this the proper way to educate Farmworkers and Teamsters interested in working class solidarity?

But the photo beside the article, showing a group of

rank-and-file Teamsters picketing a Safeway store, indicates that *The Militant* also supports that kind of a tactic—a public protest oriented toward mobilizing the ranks in solidarity with the United Farmworkers struggle. But why is there no comment about this *correct* tactic? Surely you were aware of the details concerning this demonstration?

The second article is related to the first. It was entitled, "Arrest of NCLC thugs demanded in N. Y." It begins: "Three Socialist Workers Party members filed criminal charges against National Caucus of Labor Committees (NCLC) goon Steve Getzoff on June 15. . . ." The article also quoted from a statement issued by Norman Oliver, SWP candidate for mayor of New York, which called upon "the 'New York Police Department and the District Attorney's office to arrest these thugs and bring full criminal charges against them in order to stop these outrageous violations of democratic rights.'"

Now, is it the position of the SWP and *The Militant* that NCLC is *not* a working class organization? If so, what kind of organization is it? Fascist? Bourgeois? Petty-bourgeois? The question is not unimportant. Because if NCLC *is* a working class organization, would it not be incorrect to bring suit against it in a bourgeois court? But even if it weren't, certainly the SWP doesn't believe the New York Police Dept. is capable of stopping "these outrageous violations of democratic rights" perpetrated by the NCLC thugs?

Is it not true that the founders of NCLC came out of the SWP just like so many other small groups which exist on the left today (IS, SL, WL, CSL, etc.)? Aren't all of these groups still part of the workers' movement? Why, then, should NCLC be characterized any differently? Its fascist-like tactics are not new to the workers' movement either. They were first introduced by the Stalinists—which the SWP still considers a part of the working class.

Historically, revolutionary organizations have utilized the bourgeois courts and other bourgeois institutions to strengthen the position of the working class vis-a-vis the capitalist class, and at the same time, to dispel the illusions of the masses in bourgeois democracy in general. *But never have they used the bourgeois courts against another working class tendency, regardless of the crimes it may have committed.* (One need only mention here the numerous crimes of the Stalinists against workers and the Trotskyists to show the extent to which a working class tendency can degenerate and still remain a part of the workers' movement.)

What is the significance of these two articles? Has the SWP given up the principle of working class solidarity against class enemies in favor of putting trust in the "justice" of the bourgeois courts?

s/Gerald Clark  
Oakland, Calif.

\* \* \*



I will take up the following points raised by this letter: (1) Is it a violation of principle ever to demand that the bourgeois authorities protect our rights? (2) Is it a violation of principle to demand that bourgeois authorities protect our rights, in situations where we are under physical attack from a tendency in the working class? (3) How do we characterize the NCLC? (4) Why did we use the tactics we have in defending ourselves from the NCLC goons? (5) The suit brought by the rank-and-file Teamsters.

1. *Is it a violation of principle ever to demand that the bourgeois authorities protect our rights?*

Comrade Clark is not clear on this question. He says, "Historically, revolutionary organizations have utilized the bourgeois courts and other bourgeois institutions to strengthen the positions of the working class vis-a-vis the capitalist class, and, at the same time, to dispel the illusions of the masses in bourgeois democracy in general." On the other hand, the central argument advanced by Comrade Clark is that "No bourgeois court can provide 'justice' whenever the working class is involved in a fight for its rights. It never has and never will be 'impartial' toward the class struggle." This argument applies not only to cases where we are physically attacked by other tendencies in the working class, but also to the more general case of such attacks on us from any quarter.

Comrade Clark is correct when he says that the courts are not impartial in the class struggle. The courts are not impartial when the NCLC or the Stalinists use goon tactics against us, and they certainly are not impartial when the Ku Klux Klan, the Legion of Justice, Cuban gusanos, or other right-wing thugs attack us. In any conflict between the bosses and the workers, between racists and Blacks, between reactionaries and socialists, etc., the bourgeois courts and other authorities are not impartial and do not dispense justice equally.

In situations where we are under attack from any quarter, we have to start from the assumption that the capitalist authorities are "neutral" against us. We never place reliance upon them. Our primary line of defense is reliance upon ourselves and whatever forces we can mobilize in defense of our rights, including in the organization of the physical side of that defense.

But at present in the U. S., the capitalist class does not rule through a fascist dictatorship, but through a system of bourgeois democracy. Certain democratic rights have been formally won by the masses through struggle. The extent to which these rights are real for the masses and for organizations of the working class depends on the relation of forces. The working class in general, and ourselves in particular, can win certain concessions and protection of our rights, depending upon what support we can mobilize in the context of the overall relation of class forces. We have been able to win certain defense cases, for example, against attempts by the capitalist authorities to victimize us. Recently we have won cases extending our rights to be on the ballot.

In certain cases where we have been physically attacked by right-wing forces, we have utilized the tactic of demanding that the authorities protect our rights, and we have pressed for the arrest and conviction of the right-

wing thugs. This was done to help build our overall political defense against such attacks, which was the main thrust of our defense effort. Some examples of where we did this have been in defense against the armed attacks on our headquarters by gusanos in Los Angeles, the Klan in Houston and the Legion of Justice in Chicago. In Los Angeles and Houston, these attacks were carried out with lethal weapons. In all three cases, part of our overall defense effort was to demand that the authorities arrest and convict the culprits. We put no trust in the capitalist authorities by doing this. But the campaign put pressure on them, helped expose their lack of enthusiasm in prosecuting the attackers, and even helped expose their direct complicity with the attacks. This aided our overall defense effort and was a factor in halting the attacks in these cases.

The general democratic right we are appealing to when we make such demands is that of equality before the law. This right was raised in the bourgeois-democratic revolutions, and represents an important gain for the masses. It is a right we support, and would certainly be included in the constitution of a workers state. While we know that the capitalist state systematically violates this right, there is nothing wrong with our demanding that it apply to us.

2. *Is it a violation of principle to demand that the bourgeois authorities protect our rights, in situations where we are under violent attack from a tendency in the working class?*

On this question, Comrade Clark's answer is an unambiguous "yes."

This argument would put us in a peculiar position. Let's look at a few examples. Some years ago, our national office was firebombed. We notified the police, and conducted a campaign demanding that the police investigate the incident and arrest and convict those responsible. We suspected, and the police investigation later tended to corroborate this, that a right-wing group was responsible. The cops dragged their feet on the investigation—an example of a violation of our democratic rights. But we demanded those rights. Now suppose that it had turned out that the attack actually came from the CP or a group like the NCLC? Would we then have had to say, "Oh, since it turned out that a working-class tendency firebombed us, we drop charges, because, you see, we would have pressed charges if the attack was carried out by a capitalist-class tendency, but not if it was carried out by a working-class tendency." Further suppose that the authorities themselves went ahead and pressed charges anyway—would we then support a defense committee for those who firebombed us, in the name of working-class solidarity?

In the middle 1960s, a gunman came into the Detroit headquarters and murdered one of our comrades and seriously wounded two others. We notified the police and gave them all the information we have about the killer. We also formed a committee that demanded that the the authorities prosecute the killer, and exposed their lenient treatment of him. In this case, the murder was a right winger, apparently acting alone. What should we have done if it turned out that he was from a working-class tendency?

These two examples illustrate the fallacy of Comrade Clark's position that it is a principle that we cannot de-



mand equal protection from the authorities in cases where other tendencies in the working class carry out physical attacks upon us.

The error that Comrade Clark makes is to take a valid principle and attempt to apply it in a situation that falls outside its scope of applicability. We do have a principle of working-class solidarity in the face of attacks by the bourgeoisie. We are opposed to any interference by the by the capitalist class in the political differences within the working-class movement. We are against appealing to the capitalist authorities to intervene into the disputes in the working-class and socialist movements. Although there is a line of blood between ourselves and the Stalinists, for example, we never call upon the authorities to intervene in the political struggle between us.

Along these lines, we say it was a violation of principles for the Stalinists to support the Smith Act proceedings against our comrades in the early 1940s. That was an act of political strikebreaking, of aiding the class enemy in delivering a blow to the rights of all workers.

But differences of opinion in the working-class movement are qualitatively different from the utilization of violence in the workers movement to settle those differences. The goon attacks of the NCLC are not just an extension of the political struggle in the socialist movement—they are just as much a violation of working-class principles as appealing to the bourgeois authorities to settle such differences is. Such attacks are a violation of workers democracy, a violation of democratic rights in general, and unless effectively countered and halted, will harm the socialist and working-class movement. In this case, the demand that the state authorities defend the democratic rights of the victims of such attacks is not at all the same thing as calling upon those authorities to settle political differences within the socialist or broader working-class movement. Insofar as a tendency in the working class utilized such methods, it has forfeited any right to appeal to working-class solidarity to defend such attacks.

There are many examples that could be cited where we have utilized this tactic. I will refer to two: the defense of Trotsky in Mexico and the struggle in the Teamsters union between the international bureaucracy and the revolutionary leadership of Local 574 in the 1930s.

The defense of Trotsky against the Stalinists was the most important instance where our movement had to defend itself from a murderous attack from another tendency in the socialist movement. The main thrust of this defense was a political one of mobilizing whatever forces we could, to counter the mountains of Stalinist slander directed against Trotsky, against the murders of Trotskyists, and against the threat to assassinate Trotsky. But part of that campaign included appealing to the bourgeois authorities, in this case the Mexican authorities, to defend Trotsky's rights. Part of our defense consisted of a physical defense. This physical defense included, but did not rely upon, acceptance of a police guard at Trotsky's home.

When the first attempt on Trotsky's life came in the attack led by Siqueros and his gang, SWP member Sheldon Harte was murdered. We and Trotsky not only cooperated in the police investigation of the crime, Trotsky publicly intervened in that investigation, calling upon the police to specifically investigate the Stalinists. This was necessary to counter moves the Stalinists were making to throw suspicion off themselves and onto us. We called

for the arrest and vigorous prosecution of the perpetrators.

When Trotsky was assassinated, *The Militant* carefully followed the police investigation. We called for exposure of the real criminals, Stalin's GPU, that had ordered the crime. In doing so, we were not calling upon the Mexican police to outlaw or ban the Stalinists, or deprive them of their democratic rights. Nor did we attempt to utilize the Mexican authorities to settle the political questions in dispute between ourselves and the Stalinists. We were demanding that the authorities defend Trotsky's rights. Exactly how we utilized this tactic, of course, was conditioned by the situation, including the nature of the Cardenas regime.

Farrell Dobb's new book, *Teamster Power*, recounts the struggle the leaders of Local 574 were forced to wage against the bureaucracy headed by Tobin. Tobin had sent a force headed by L. A. Murphy into Minneapolis to try to destroy the leadership of 574. This attack included goon assaults. It is worthwhile quoting from the book:

"On the morning of May 21 the new offensive began. Ray Dunne and George Frosig were distributing leaflets and talking to drivers in the freight yards of the Omaha railway. Suddenly a Buick sedan drove up and a gang of Tobin's thugs jumped out of it and assaulted Ray and George with blackjacks. They were severely beaten.

"Ownership of the Buick was traced to L. A. Murphy through a check with the automobile license bureau. This fact, along with an account of the atrocity, was published in the *Northwest Organizer* to inform the labor movement of the new danger. For the record, a protest was also made to the public authorities. But they did nothing about it, as was to be expected.

"Local 574 immediately called a mass protest meeting. Word of the outrage had spread rapidly and the hall was jammed with union members, many of them accompanied by their wives. As the latter development indicated, not since the 1934 strikes had the workers been so aroused. They were more than ready to fight back, and combat veterans that they were by now, they knew it had to be done intelligently.

"Accepting the executive board's advice, the membership adopted a three-point plan of action: efforts were redoubled to obtain speedy renewal of contracts that were about to expire; an assessment was voted to provide a special defense fund; and a resolution was adopted setting forth the basic line for a campaign to mobilize the city's working class against the new goon attack.

"The resolution condemned the gangsterism introduced by Tobin, calling it an open invitation to the enemies of the labor movement. If it could be made to work against Local 574, the other unions were warned, the same methods would be used against them as well. Thus an open challenge had been hurled at the leaders and members of all AFL organizations. It was their duty, acting in their own self-interest, to join in the struggle to free the movement from the menace of thuggery.

"Our appeal fell upon responsive ears. Officers, and especially rank-and-file members of the AFL locals, poured heat on the right-wing officials of the Central Labor Union and the Teamsters Joint Council. They also brought heavy pressure to bear on Mayor Latimer, as did Farmer-Labor Party ward clubs. Finding himself under heavy fire, the mayor felt he had to do something—so he set out to



smear us.

"Late in May a small army of police made a surprise raid on Local 574, charging into our headquarters with drawn guns. They were accompanied by news reporters and photographers. Bearing John Doe warrants for illegal sale of liquor, they searched the premises for evidence. Nothing was to be found, except part of a keg of beer which had been stored away after being left over from a social. Twice more in the next few days the cops descended upon us, but they were unable to spot anything that could be used against the union.

"It was in connection with these smear attempts that Frosig was arrested on the gun charge mentioned previously.

"Taking advantage of the propaganda cover Latimer sought to provide for him, Murphy resumed the physical assaults. In broad daylight on the afternoon of June 3, four rank-and-file members of local 574 driving along Washington Avenue in a passenger car were forced to the curb and ordered out of their vehicle by two carloads of Tobin's musclemen. Some held guns on the union members, while others pulled out blackjacks and beat them. When the victims ran to escape, a volley of shots followed them.

"Bystanders had gotten the license numbers of the thugs' cars, and this information was reported to Latimer with a demand that he take action. As usual though, no arrests were made.

"Instead the mayor held a conference with Murphy and Meyer Lewis. Reporters were then summoned and Murphy issued a statement to them. According to the *Minneapolis Tribune* account, he brazenly accused the victims of 'firing the shots themselves,' falsely asserting that they had done so 'after losing a fight with the employees of Stanchfield Transfer Company,' a firm located near the scene of the crime.

"A week later a Local 574 job steward Harold Haynes was attacked while at work. He had just got back into the cab of his truck after making a delivery. Then the Buick sedan, registered in Murphy's name, pulled up and blocked his way. Five goons leaped out of it. One pointed a gun at Haynes. The other four dragged him out of the car and beat him with blackjacks and gun butts.

"We made a strong protest to Governor Olson. In a letter signed by Bill Brown he was informed that we were holding a special meeting of Local 574 on June 15. We demanded an official answer by then as to what Olson proposed to do about Tobin's criminal attempt, with Latimer's collusion, to destroy a section of the labor movement.

"Coming immediately to our support, the fifth ward Farmer-Labor club insisted that Olson take prompt action. Demands were made that he invoke the executive power of the state to put a stop to acts of vandalism in Minneapolis, and that he uncover the instigators of the plot against organized labor.

"Similar demands upon the governor came from elsewhere in the unions and the Farmer-Labor Party. Since he was coming up for reelection in the fall, it was politically dangerous for him to ignore these pressures, and he knew it. So he passed word along that he would look into the situation right away, pretending that he hadn't known what was going on. Apparently Olson convinced Latimer that it was politically expedient to quiet things

down inside the labor movement, because the physical attacks on us now abated."

We see from this quote that after one attack, we notified the authorities for the record, that is, to help prepare our position to counter these attacks. Later, we were able to mount a powerful campaign that included demanding that the governor "invoke the executive power of the state to put a stop to acts of vandalism in Minneapolis, and that he uncover the instigators of the plot against organized labor." This campaign, based on the mobilization of the union rank and file, and of the labor movement in general, was aided by this demand, and became powerful enough to put a stop to the attacks in the political context of Minnesota at that time.

So we see that neither Trotsky nor the SWP considered that in such cases we could not as a matter of principle demand that the capitalist authorities protest our rights, or the rights of a left wing in the unions which we were in the leadership of, against physical attacks launched by a tendency in the socialist or labor movement. It is a tactical, not a principled question.

Perhaps some further examples will help Comrade Clark understand the difference in calling upon the capitalist authorities to intervene in the political disputes within the socialist movement, and demanding that those same authorities grant us our rights in the face of a violent physical attack on us by a tendency in the workers movement. It would be unprincipled for us to have aped the Stalinists and have called for the conviction of the CP Smith Act defendants. Those trials were an attack on the democratic rights of the whole working class and socialist movement, and the principle we follow in such cases is summed up in the slogan, "an attack on one is an attack on all." But this is an entirely different thing than the trial of Trotsky's assassin, although both the Foley Square defendants and Mercader belonged to the identical Stalinist movement.

Demanding that the governor of Minnesota utilize his executive powers to stop Tobin's goons is a different thing than if we had called for the jailing of Tobin to settle the political dispute in the union.

### 3. *How Do We Characterize the NCLC?*

Comrade Clark points to the fact that the leaders of these groups he mentions came out of the SWP. That doesn't prove anything, of course, so did James Burnham.

All of these groups can be characterized as petty-bourgeois sects, operating in the socialist movement and therefore in the workers movement, and are working-class tendencies. This still remains true of the NCLC. In the case of the NCLC, however, we must note that its campaign to attempt to destroy the CP and ourselves by physical means is being utilized by the cops and right wingers. It is becoming more and more stridently anticommunist. Whether this results in the NCLC becoming transformed, and moving right out of the socialist movement, is too early to say, in my opinion.

### 4. *What Were the Reasons for the Tactics We Adopted in Defending Ourselves from the NCLC Goon Attack?*

The major thrust of our line from the beginning of the announcement of "Operation Mop-Up" has been to mobilize the left to repudiate the NCLC and such tactics within the movement. This campaign has included attempting to



whatever extent possible to form a united front physical defense to repulse NCLC attacks on any tendency in the left, to keep them out of radical meetings, etc.

We rejected calling upon the police to defend our meetings or the meetings of others. We did this for a number of reasons. First, we decided that with proper organization, we would be able to defend our own meetings. The police could be counted on to attempt to utilize their presence at our meetings to victimize us. In the case of the NCLC attacks, we must assume that the cops would be "neutral" against us, possibly working with the cops inside the NCLC. Where possible, because we cannot rely on the bourgeois authorities to protect our rights, our first line of defense is ourselves and those forces we can mobilize in defense of our rights.

The CP took the opposite course. They placed reliance on the police as their primary defense, and refused to attempt to mobilize the left in a united front effort to repulse the NCLC thuggery. In one instance, this resulted in the cops coming into a CP hall before a meeting was begun, removing table legs and anything else that the CP might utilize to defend itself, and then leaving. Shortly thereafter, the NCLC showed up with clubs, and succeeded in hurting a number of CP members and disrupting the meeting.

Our tactics have been far more successful. The NCLC has to be taught that it cannot physically destroy us. In that regard, the experience they had at Columbia, and especially the education they received when they tried to break up the Detroit educational conference by attacking with clubs, chains, etc., did more to aid the campaign to stop the NCLC than anything the CP did.

The CP's tactics reflect their general class-collaborationist outlook. They placed primary reliance on the cops, rather than on a campaign of mobilizing the left to defend their rights and viewing any tactic of demanding that the authorities protect their rights within the context of such a campaign.

Our tactics began with the recognition that we must rely primarily on ourselves and those forces we can mobilize. However, there is another important point we must take into consideration in deciding tactics. We begin with our understanding of the nature of the capitalist state. We know that the capitalist state will not dispense justice equally. As Comrade Clark correctly points out, the state is not impartial. We must rely on ourselves first of all, and in the long run, help teach the working class to rely on its own power to defend its rights, and to place no reliance at all in the capitalist authorities to do this. But the very reasons why we place no confidence in the capitalist authorities to dispense justice fairly, indicates that there are limits, determined by the objective situation, on the physical means we can utilize to defend ourselves, without walking into police victimization. In the given situation in the country today, for example, it would be utter folly for us to attempt to counter an attack on ourselves with lethal weapons (guns and knives) by similarly arming ourselves. That would set us up for a murderous police trap, much as the Black Panthers were set up. Consequently, part of our decision to rely on our own forces to defend our meetings was predicated on the level of weapons utilized by the NCLC. We could stop them if they used clubs; if they utilized lethal weapons, we would not have been able to effectively counter them on that level, and would have had to review our decision

not to notify the police.

The NCLC has now apparently changed its tactics. Educational experiences such as the one they received in Detroit, the dispatch with which their goons were removed from in front of our headquarters throughout the country, and our demonstrated preparedness to defend all our meetings undoubtedly had had an effect upon them. Obviously, we must continue to keep our guard up until the danger from this quarter passes. But the NCLC has now launched a different kind of attack, not directed at breaking up meetings, but at ambushing individuals or small groups of comrades. It was this kind of attack that resulted in Comrade Jesse Smith's arm being broken. In the face of these new thug tactics, we had a new problem, in some ways similar to that which I cited from *Teamster Power*. Although we did take certain precautions concerning comrades entering and leaving the hall, we could not hope to provide a continuous personal guard for all comrades. Should we counter such attacks by striking back with similar attacks? There is no principle involved, but if we were to do this, we would be making a first-class blunder by providing the cops with a good opportunity to set up a trap for us, and by playing into the hands of the authorities who are attempting to picture the NCLC attacks as a "squabble on the left." To do nothing to defend our comrades is impermissible. Thus we decided, as part of stepping up our political campaign against the NCLC, to demand the arrest and conviction of the thugs who attacked Jesse Smith.

In no way does this imply that we place reliance on the authorities. This is a subordinate part of our overall campaign, which remains to mobilize the left against the NCLC. This aspect of our campaign will not harm our exposure of the role police agents-provocateurs are playing in the NCLC attacks, but can help it just as in the case of the Klan attacks in Houston, where our campaign demanding that the city authorities take action against the Klan complimented our exposure of police collusion with the Klan.

If Comrade Clark rejects the use of these tactics, he should tell us what other tactics we should use in this situation. Otherwise he sounds as if he is telling us that because of what he considers to be principle, we just have to take it if the NCLC uses such ambush tactics, or uses guns against us. That certainly would not inspire the working class with confidence in such "principles."

##### 5. *The Suit Brought by Rank-and-File Teamsters*

Comrade Clark refers to an article in *The Militant* concerning a suit brought by a group of rank-and-file Teamsters against Fitzsimmons and other top Teamster officials, charging them with conspiring with the grape growers to bust the United Farm Workers Union. According to the article, the suit singles out the large sums of Teamster funds going to the goons who have attacked the UFWU pickets.

The principled questions involved in utilizing the courts against such goon tactics within the labor movement have already been discussed. There is another aspect to this question that relates to the method utilized by Comrade Clark of reducing tactical questions to formulas. Our principles help guide our work. But they also have limits of applicability, and sometimes one principle comes into



conflict with another.

For example, we are opposed to strikebreaking. But there are strikes that we do not support. An example was the 1968 teachers strike in New York, which we characterized as a racist strike against the Black and Puerto Rican communities. At that time, our teacher comrades opposed the strike, and our presidential candidate, Fred Halstead, led a group of parents in opening a school shut down by the strike.

We are in principle opposed to government interference in the unions. But recently we supported a suit brought by the NAACP against the steel bosses and the steel union, against racial discrimination by both. We have supported suits brought against some unions by women workers under the Civil rights Act. If the Equal Rights Amendment

passes, we can expect more such suits.

Concerning the recent struggle in the United Mine Workers against the Boyle machine, we warned the miners of the dangers of government intervention into the union. At the same time, we certainly did not object to the opposition group demanding that the authorities arrest and convict the murderers of Yablonsky—whether those killers were from the bosses, the Boyle machine or both. Similarly, we would be opposed to the rank-and-file Teamster group Comrade Clark mentions placing any reliance on the government, or seeking government aid in settling the political dispute they have with Fitzsimmons. But we have no objection to their bringing suit against Fitzsimmons using their dues to hire goons to attack the UFWU.

July 17, 1973