

New York, N.Y.
November 19, 1973

TO THE STEERING COMMITTEE OF THE LENINIST-TROTSKYIST FACTION

Dear Comrades,

Enclosed for your information are the following items:

1. A letter sent to the faction coordinators in the SWP to provide some guidelines for organizing the preconvention discussion in the SWP branches. Since the letter contains information about documents that are in the process of being prepared, we thought it might be useful for the international faction also.

2. The declaration of the Compass Tendency in Germany. This will appear shortly in an Internal Information Bulletin of the SWP.

3. A letter from Karl on behalf of the Compass Tendency.

4. A letter from Gus Horowitz to Kailas Chandra in India. The letter is explained in the letter to the SWP faction coordinators.

Comradely,

Mary-Alice
Mary-Alice Waters

14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014
November 19, 1973

TO LENINIST-TROTSKYIST FACTION COORDINATORS

Dear Comrades,

The purpose of this letter is to give comrades some guidelines that may be useful in organizing the preconvention discussion.

For presentations on both Latin America and Europe, comrades should keep in mind that Joe Hansen's contribution "On the Underlying Differences in Method" was not available prior to the August convention of the SWP. This has since been adopted as part of the platform of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction. Appropriate sections of the Hansen contribution can easily serve as the basis for reports on Bolivia, Argentina and the European document.

In addition, a number of other important items have appeared since our convention.

On Latin America: Peter Camejo's contribution "Bolivia -- Once Again on the Facts" contains further specific information about Bolivia, answering some of the main distortions and falsifications contained in the Germain document.

There are two new resolutions from the IEC Majority faction. One is their brief resolution entitled "On the Question of Armed Struggle in Latin America" (vol. X, no. 20). The second is their rewritten resolution on Argentina (vol. X, no. 21). Some sections of this are unchanged from the original version published in vol. X, no. 6, others have been rewritten.

Also since our convention, a third international tendency has emerged. This is the Compass Tendency, formed by a number of the central leaders of the German section. The Compass declaration of tendency will be printed shortly in an Internal Information Bulletin of the SWP (a copy is enclosed). Compass has recently voted to adopt the general line of Parts II and III of "Argentina and Bolivia -- The Balance Sheet," and to support the recognition of the PST as the Argentine section of the Fourth International (see enclosed letter from Karl).

The Compass Tendency has submitted two documents to the IIDB. One is a resolution "On the Orientation of the Fourth International in Latin America," which appears in IIDB vol. X, no. 22. The Compass resolution is submitted as a counterresolution to the IEC Majority's document on armed struggle in Latin America. Except for one section, the line of the Compass Tendency on Latin America is the same as ours. The major difference revolves around the section of their counterresolution entitled "On the Parallel Apparatus." Here the Compass Tendency implies that every section must establish a separate military apparatus at all times regardless of concrete considerations such as size, political context, etc. However, the evolution of the Compass Tendency has been toward the positions of the LTF and away from those of the IEC Majority, so with further discussions our differences on this point may narrow.

(The Compass Tendency has also submitted a contribution on the European discussion. This is currently being translated and will be printed as rapidly as possible.)

There is a fairly large quantity of material on Latin America

yet to be published. Most of this was submitted to the discussion bulletin about the middle of October. Given the exceptional quantity of translation involved, these items will not be available for several weeks -- at the earliest. The documents not yet published include: a major contribution by Hugo Moreno on Argentina and Bolivia; an article on Bolivia by Martine Knoeller; and two contributions from the Red Faction of the PRT.

The Red Faction is a small group of former PRT members who have declared that they do not agree with the decision of the PRT leadership to quit the Fourth International. The Red Faction supports the line of the IEC Majority Tendency on Argentina and Latin America. In fact, the two Argentines who are listed as members of the IEC Majority faction (IIDB vol. X, no. 22 -- Appendix IV of the "Old Wives' Tales") are from the Red Faction. After his trip to Argentina last summer, Livio reported that the Red Faction has about ~~60~~ members. This is the group the IEC Majority is obviously considering recognizing as the section in Argentina.

On Europe. Again, comrades can use Joe Hansen's document as a guide to a presentation on Europe.

A contribution to the discussion by a number of European leaders of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction is planned, but the document itself will probably not be published prior to our convention.

In addition to Joe Hansen's document, comrades may want to refer to Gerry Foley's contribution "The Test of Ireland," and the exchange of correspondence on the electoral policy of the Ligue Communiste. A contribution by Alan Harris on the "turn" of the Ninth World Congress and the IMG will be published in vol. X, no. 23. Any of these items could be the basis for a separate oral contribution to the branch discussion.

In addition to these documents which develop the positions of the LTF on Europe there will be three contributions from the comrades of the Liga Comunista (formerly Encrucijada) in Spain. One of these will appear in the IIDB shortly. The other two, which the United Secretariat majority refused to print in the IIDB, on the pretext that they are too long, will appear in an SWP Internal Information Bulletin.

The positions of the IEC Majority faction are developed in Pierre Frank's answer to Mary-Alice Waters, in the document by A. Duret "Some Questions of Method Concerning the European Document," and in Livio Maitan's report on workers struggles in Europe. Livio's report is even good for a few laughs -- especially when he tries to talk "concretely" (point 8) about how to intervene in the workers struggles.

Another SWP Internal Information Bulletin that will be available next week contains the key documents and articles from the discussion in the Ligue Communiste last year on the question of "minority violence" and terrorism. This is the debate referred to and quoted from in both "Bolivia and Argentina -- The Balance Sheet" and the criticism of the European document. We have translated and printed this material so that comrades can read and judge it for themselves. Not everyone will have the time to read the entire bulletin (80 pages) as soon as it comes out, but it would be useful to make sure that at least one or two comrades are familiar with it and prepare short contributions to the branch discussion utilizing this material.

On the Political Resolution. The Leninist-Trotskyist Faction is drafting a counter-political resolution. Given the fact that we did not receive the IEC Majority's political resolution until the end of September, and then had to wait for a translation to be approved, it is unlikely that our political resolution will be ready much before the world congress. Discussion on the political resolution should be postponed until the end of the preconvention period, in any case.

The leadership of the YSA has assigned a comrade to draft an initial criticism of the IEC Majority political resolution, to help guide the discussion in the YSA. That article will also be useful to comrades assigned to report on the political resolution in the branch discussions. It will at least point out some of the key flaws in the IEC Majority resolution and indicate the lines along which the LTF political resolution will differ.

Discussion on Vietnam can be incorporated under this point. For documentation, comrades can refer to Jack Barnes' "Evaluation of the December 1972 IEC Plenum" (IIDB, vol. X, no. 9, pp. 26-29), and the articles by Gus Horowitz and Geoff Mirelowitz in IIDB vol. X, no. 15.

On the "Old Wives' Tales": An answer to this document is being drafted, taking up the slanderous falsifications of our positions. In a certain sense the publication of the "Old Wives' Tales" is a step forward. This is the kind of gossip and slander the IEC Majority has been circulating for several years, but they have always before refused to put them down on paper so that they could be answered. Now we can take them up and expose every sentence for the lie it is.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter from Gus Horowitz to Comrade Kailas Chandra in India. In early October Kailas received a letter from Mandel, who was trying to persuade him not to join the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction. The letter contained many of the same slanders and falsifications as the "Old Wives' Tales" -- plus a few new ones. Gus's letter to Kailas takes up Ernest's accusations in much the same way we plan to answer the "Old Wives' Tales."

Tom Kerry is also preparing an answer to the "Old Wives' Tales" dealing specifically with the question of democratic centralism. This should also be very valuable.

On other questions: There is no need to organize separate discussions at this time on the youth radicalization in general, women's liberation, the national question, the Arab East, Stalinism, etc. These questions remain open for discussion following the world congress, and there will be additional written contributions on all these topics.

It would be useful, however, to have someone prepare a contribution to the oral discussion taking up John Riddell and Art Young's answer to Germain on the real record of the Canadian section. A very large portion of Germain's document -- which is a tendency document of the IEC Majority -- consists of a slanderous attack on the Canadian section, singled out as the prime example proving the right-opportunist character of the LTF. Riddell and Young's document does an effective job of demolishing this fabrica-

-4-

tion.

Comradely,

Mary-Alice

Mary-Alice Waters
for the Leninist-Trotskyist
Faction

P.S. Also enclosed is a copy of Bill Massey's latest ammunition run -- a letter to the SWP Political Committee with a copy to the United Secretariat.

COPY

COPY

COPY

Chicago, Illinois
October 29, 1973

The United Secretariat
Fourth International
c/o Ernest Germain

Dear Comrades;

I write this in my capacity as the national coordinator of the Internationalist Tendency of the Socialist Workers Party. The Socialist Workers Party as you know is prevented from membership in the Fourth International due to reactionary legislation.

My reasons for writing at this time is to bring to your attention what we consider a very serious situation inside of the Socialist Workers Party and to ask that the Secretariat take action in this regard.

The situation in our party is such that it threatens the democratic rights of co-thinkers of the Fourth International and unless action is forthcoming from a body more responsible, than the leadership of the Socialist Workers Party, will have dire effects on the health of the Trotskyist movement in the United States.

This situation has been created, we feel quite knowingly, by the leadership of the Socialist Workers Party. Therefore it is only to have been expected that our past pleas to this leadership would, as they have, go unheeded. The following facts illustrate the situation as it now exists:

1. Transfers: The transferring or the allowing to transfer of comrades from one branch of the Party to another. Since the SWP convention in August of this year, transfers have been placed at the disposal of the National Committee of the Party, which has invested the Political Committee with the power to make all decisions in this regard. This was a change from a previous situation wherein each branch could decide whether to transfer a comrade or grant the request of a comrade to transfer for other than political reasons. (This did not exclude the right of the national leadership to ask comrades to transfer on national assignments.) The only reason for this change was for purely factional reasons on the part of the national leadership.

This has been confirmed in that there exists a double standard in permitting transfers to comrades. Those of the Leninist Trotskyist Faction are transferred quickly and without problem. Those of the Internationalist Tendency are made to write out statements which prove that their requests are not for "factional reasons" but for personal reasons.

While LTF comrades are transferred immediately and received immediately by the branch they transferred to -- IT comrades are made to wait months before permission is granted and are not allowed to participate in the branch meetings prior to the granting of the permission, which as I stated has taken months to achieve. There is one particularly illustrative case in this regard. Comrade Jean Sav., of the LT faction received a transfer from Philadelphia to Houston, prior to her having arrived in Houston -- the branch leadership placed her on the executive committee of that branch. At the same time Comrades

Cathy Mat. and Judi R. of Oakland and Houston respectively, transferred to Chicago where they waited two months without being able to speak, vote or otherwise participate as members of that branch of the Party. The situation of Comrades Judi and Cathy was also reflected in the treatment of other comrades such as Mike F., John C., who also waited two months before their transfers were allowed. In three out of four of these cases -- the comrades were transferring into branches where their companion ("husband" or "wife") lived. These situations were not unknown to the leadership of the Party which held up their transfers while granting those of every member of the Leninist Trotskyist Faction in short order time.

Still pending are transfers of several comrades. Jeff M. who is a member of the Internationalist Tendency and who transferred to Chicago during the summer from Minneapolis and who returned to Minneapolis after failing to gain entry into a university in the Chicago region. He has waited some three months now without anything being done on his request for transfer. This is his punishment, we would suppose, for having voted for the Internationalist Tendency.

Comrades Pat and Martha Q. who came to Chicago during the summer and attempted to get jobs in order that they could move into the Chicago region. Jobs are a particular necessity for these two comrades in that they have two young children to care for. When it became impossible to find employment in Chicago -- they requested to return to Madison, where they have carried out Party building work in relation to the building of the Young Socialist Alliance in that area. Pat and Martha have in the past run in Wisconsin as candidates of the Socialist Workers Party. It is also nearly three months since they requested their transfers and still nothing. (Except that they have been refused the rights to continue in the work of building the YSA which they have carried out, very successfully for years.) Again the only reason for this is the fact that they voted for the Internationalist Tendency at the last convention.

Comrade Lauren C. who moved from Oakland to Chicago for personal reasons -- job and school, has waited a couple of months and still has not received his transfer as yet. It was necessary for him to move before his transfer came, due to the long wait. David Wu. of the LTF who transferred from Boston to Chicago had no such long wait to endure in this regard nor did Susan L. who transferred from New York to Boston. The benefits of supporting the LTF become quite concrete for members of the Socialist Workers Party. (It may be pointed out that David W. and Susan L. were transferred on assignments not for personal reasons. However this just reflects the fact that members of the LTF receive assignments while the members of the IT do not. This is not a new situation of course, every minority tendency in the SWP has been treated in a like manner. Members of the former Proletarian Orientation Tendency were removed from positions of responsibility for no other reason than the fact that they held minority views.)

Comrade Beth S. of the Oakland-Berkeley branch asked in late September for a transfer to Chicago. It was well known to the Organizer Comrade Frank B. that Comrade Beth was joining her companion of over five years who was a member of the Chicago branch. Yet she was told that she must write out a request that would prove that this transfer was for personal rather than

factional reasons. Comrade Beth had indicated that she wished the transfer to take place as of December 1st. This gave the leadership over two months. However she received Comrade Frank B.'s sternest admonition "that if you leave Oakland prior to the approval of your transfer you will be in big trouble." This system of intimidation and indignity is set into operation in order to create an atmosphere of demoralization in order to drive comrades with dissident views out of the Socialist Workers Party. It starts off by creating the attitude that they are second class party members. As in fact they are now. For instance have any members of the LTF been made to write out statements proving their transfer requests are personal rather than factional? Have any members of the LTF been made to wait months for their transfer requests to be approved? Have any been told that if they move prior to a long waiting period that they will be in big trouble? The answer is of course, no. (We wish that we could have appended Comrade Frank B.'s instructions, to this letter but upon request from Comrade Beth to have them in writing, he refused.)

One rationale for the treatment of the members of the IT in this regard vis-a-vis transfers is the fact that comrades of our tendency transferred into areas prior to the SWP convention thereby using their rights to transfer for tendency gain in the voting for delegates. However, this is easily seen as baseless upon investigation. Comrades of the IT who transferred in this period were as follows:

1. Comrades Pat and Martha Q. They have been attempting to transfer from Madison for some time. The fact that they have two children to support creates an especial necessity that they have employment. While I can understand that their case is not a normal one, in that most of our party comrades do not have children, it is a particular problem that a working class organization should attempt to understand. It is also, I imagine difficult for our national committee to understand the need on the part of these two comrades to have outside employment, since the overwhelming majority of that body has never found it a necessity in their own lives. When it was impossible for them to get employment in Chicago -- they requested to return to Madison. Their two votes were not necessary for the one delegate from the Chicago area.
2. Comrade Jeff M. who transferred from Minneapolis to Chicago. There are numerous of these type of transfers every summer. Student comrades transfer from one branch to another and attempt to locate in the new area and because they are students to continue their academic pursuits. Now certainly if the party were to decide to take student comrades off of the campus for use in another way, it would be irrelevant whether a student comrade could get onto a campus in this city or that. But since this is not the policy (which I think is in this regard correct) then when a comrade, such as Jeff is unable to continue his schooling in Chicago, it is not unwise for him to return to the area where he can finish it. Again Comrade Jeff's vote was not necessary to achieve a delegate from the Chicago branch.
3. Comrade Mike F. who transferred into Chicago for personal reasons due to a severe illness on the part of his parent. He made it known prior to his transferring from New York to Chicago that it would be temporary in nature. Again his transfer

did not hinge on whether the IT would get a delegate in the Chicago branch.

Comrade Ted Stacy transferred from Houston to Chicago and Comrade John Barzman transferred from Chicago to Houston. These two transfers tended to negate one another with relation to whether Chicago or Houston would gain or lose in connection with delegates votes.

4. Comrade Kari C. transferred from Oakland to New York but since she was kept out of the Party in Oakland purposefully until after the deadline allowing members to be able to vote -- her transfer can not be seen as an attempt to gain a vote anywhere. I might mention that this was not the only case where comrades who were suspected of being in favor of the IT political positions were purposefully kept out of the Party. Two other random cases were Comrade Larry N. of Chicago (who had been in the YSA for over 4 years) and Comrade Kathy K. of Washington D.C. (also a YSA member). So it is not only transfers that are used for factional gains by the LTF but also the membership policies.

5. All the other transfers or pending transfers were after the Convention and therefore had no "vote getting" purpose at all. Comrades Cathy M., Judi R., John C. were to join comrade/companions in their respective branches. Comrade Beth S. is the same and Comrade Lauren C. is for job and educational reasons.

Finally, let me say that in attempting to overcome the purely factional nature of the 15 votes per 1 delegate ratio fixed by the SWP/LTF leadership for the SWP convention, I did discuss with Comrade Lew Jones the Party's rules on transferring comrades from one area to another to allow a truer representation for our tendency. This was after I, on behalf of our tendency, had protested the increase of necessary votes per delegate from the 7 of 1971 to the 15 of 1973, even though the size of the Party had not increased in any manner approximating this increase in delegate ratio. It was after proposing to the Party leadership that they adopt the methods of other Trotskyist groups in the Fourth International in the choosing of delegates. That is to allow regional voting, i.e. in Oakland the IMT supporters received 13 votes-in San Francisco-the IMT supporters 4 votes, in Los Angeles they received 9 votes and in Portland they received 1 vote. Totalling 27 votes but they received no delegate. This was also true of the east coast branches and of areas in the Mid-west. Even with the 15 to one ratio, the IMT supporters should have, based on the actual voting support they received, had at least six delegates-however at the convention they only had three representatives. I discussed the transfer policy with Comrade Jones for two reasons. One, in light of the Party leadership refusal to grant a system whereby a minority would have adequate representation to present its views, I thought of every possible means to overcome this situation. Secondly, I wanted an interpretation from a Party leader on whether this was permissible. Since nothing in the statutes, the 1965 organizational document or the convention call addresses this question, I sought the leadership's advice. Comrade Jones would tell me nothing at all-nothing. One further thing since in the past the leadership has used the transfer policy in the most grossly factional ways (the sending of over 50 comrades into the Oakland-Berkeley branch following the 1971 convention in order to drive out the minority comrades-it was somewhat successful I might add)-I had a justified fear

that this might be done again at convention time this year. I might add that in Portland in 1971 at the last minute the Party leadership transferred their supporters into that branch in order to prevent the Proletarian Orientation Tendency from getting a delegate.

This is the situation today in the SWP with regards to the use of transfers as part of the "war" against the IMT and its supporters in our Party.

II. DISLOYALTY. At the recent SWP convention, our Tendency which represented 9% of the Party was denied representation on the leading Party body, the national committee, because we were "disloyal." No one in our tendency or the tendency as a whole has ever been brought up on concrete charges of disloyalty. If there are disloyal actions that any individual or the Tendency as a whole has ever committed it is unknown to us and remains a secret of the leadership of the Leninist Trotskyist Faction. While it may be the contention of the SWP/LTF leadership that we think disloyal thoughts, this too has not been explained. Nor could it be, for it is baseless. The only rationale to explain the charge (label) of disloyalty is that our tendency is opposed to the political line of the LTF. However to label this as disloyalty to the SWP is to turn from Trotskyism to Stalinism for our norms of democracy. Further if this were only a label it would be bad enough but as stated above, this unproven and false allegation is used as the reason for denying our rights for representation on the national committee. We are in fact excluded from being treated as normal party members. We are "outlaws" or "illegitimates" in our own Party because of our political views, which of course also happen to be the political views of the majority of the world Trotskyist movement.

In many branches this has been used to deny us representation on the branch executive committees. Where this is not possible (Houston) the executive committee meetings become meaningless charades-form with no content. In Oakland, the branch organizer Frank B., bluntly (or perhaps crudely) stated that our tendency comrades could not be placed on the executive committee because they are "disloyal." Comrade Frank is a member of the National Committee of the SWP. This crudeness was too blatant for the national party leadership to abide and therefore under the guise of giving us a "clean slate" in order "to allow us to prove our loyalty," a comrade of our tendency was added to that branch's executive committee. However, since we never have been disloyal (nor were we ever charged concretely with being so) we reject this "clean slate" approach and we see no need to prove our loyalty. This type of reasoning is more at home in a Kafka novel or in the recesses of the Stalinist mind. Rather we would propose that the SWP/LTF leadership work to earn its own "clean slate" by immediately repudiating their charges that the IT is a disloyal tendency. Then in order to effectively convince the Party as a whole, that they take actions flowing from this repudiation. Such as the placing of our representatives on the National Committee of the Party. Further the restoration of assignments of a responsible character to members of our Tendency. The ending of the policy inaugurated after the 1971 convention of running majority slates in the branches for the executive committee. Comrades with minority political views have been denied equal treatment in the Socialist Workers Party as a matter of course for over two years. This has caused many comrades

to drop out of the Party. It has set up an atmosphere that has propelled younger comrades to lose faith in the Socialist Workers Party as a democratic centralist body. It has created deeper political differences than was necessary and resulted in splits from the Party. The expulsion of the Communist Tendency was a "set up" by the actions of the Party leadership, a set-up that the Communist Tendency walked into willingly because they had succumbed to the atmosphere created by the Party leadership and had lost faith in the Party as being a body where different political tendencies could co-exist under Leninist norms. The Leninist Faction was a victim of the factional atmosphere created after the 1971 convention. The taking away of assignments of minority comrades, the Oakland-Berkeley scandal (the transfer of 50 comrades into that branch), the running of majority slates, the removal of minority comrades from the YSA and from any other positions of responsibilities. The "witch-hunt" atmosphere created by searches for "double recruitment" "unlawful political discussion," the bleaching out of Party meetings of any political content by parliamentary devices such as the "one speaker for-one speaker against-three minutes each" rules. The recent expulsion of Comrade Gerry Clarke of the Revolutionary Internationalist Tendency for his political views, is but the latest in a whole series of such methods of the LTF/SWP leadership.

In addition to the above are a more numerous group of comrades who simply left the Party in complete and utter disgust with the methods by which the leadership of this Party treats comrades with political differences. Well over a hundred comrades have left the Party in the past two years for these reasons alone. This is a scandal not only within the Trotskyist movement but outside of it. It reflects on the Fourth International itself and can only be described, to use a term of the LTF-as disloyal to the interests of the world Trotskyist movement. There are facts, such as those stated above that validate and concretize this charge thereby differentiating it from the ones of the LTF/SWP leadership.

Like the transfer policy-the disloyalty charges are meant to create an atmosphere of demoralization and frustration among the minority in order to either drive them out of the Party or to provoke them into making a response that will allow the leadership to throw them out. We look upon this whole affair as a preparation for a split in the Socialist Workers Party by the leadership. It stands to reason that no serious leadership would allow those who it thought were "disloyal" to the Party to remain in the Party. Any leadership that would tolerate a disloyal tendency to remain in a Party ought to be removed for gross incompetence. It is not our opinion that this leadership even thinks this to be true. This is reflected in the fact that they have never brought anyone of our tendency up on charges of disloyalty because they are aware that this charge is an outright lie and a slander. However it will serve as a future rationale and explanation for the expulsion of our tendency. Action must be taken by the International to prevent this split in the Socialist Workers Party and to prevent the continuation of policies that have led to the loss of many very valuable comrades from the Trotskyist movement. Either "disloyal" comrades in a section of co-thinkers must be tried for concrete acts of disloyalty-or the charges must be withdrawn and repudiated by

those who made them. The Party must be made to function in a Leninist fashion. To allow such a situation to continue would be to provide for a split and would be to completely ignore the meaning of the Statutes of the Fourth International which are not contravened by the Voorhis Act.

III. RESOURCES. It is a well known fact in the world Trotskyist movement that the SWP leadership has been on a virtual sit down strike against the fulfillment of its resource obligations to advance world trotskyism ideologically. It has even come to our attention that some comrades of the National Committee such as Cde.s Shaw and Sheppard are rather proud of the fact. That is proud enough that they brag about it to individual comrades. This policy is not one of mere American chauvinism but is a conscious attempt to sabotage the capacities of the world movement in which their political views are a minority. Lacking loyalty to their own minority in their own Party they lack loyalty to the majority in the world movement. The only possible justification for this policy that we have heard is the position of Comrade Tom Kerry, given but not elaborated on, at the last SWP convention when he characterized the leadership of the Fourth International as "centrist muddleheads." However Cde. Kerry's position has never to our knowledge been adopted by the leadership of the SWP unless it is in their dual capacity as leadership of the LTF.

Coupled with this disloyal sabotage has been the complete undemocratic procedures outlined above in treatment of minorities in the SWP. Added to this has been the unwillingness to share any of the financial responsibilities of the minority while at the same time failing to allow an accounting to be given to the Party by the Leninist Trotskyist Tendency-now Faction, on how it has been able to mobilize resources to function. Recently we have been told that the membership of the faction will independently as individuals make sacrifices to allow it to function. However, even if this is now true, it raises, rather than eliminates the question on how this Tendency/Faction has been able to utilize resources in the past. These questions bear an answering. Particularly in light of the fact that the National Secretary of the Party, Cde. Jack Barnes, announced to the recent SWP convention that all the resources of the Socialist Workers Party would be used to conduct the "war" against the present leadership of the Fourth International. Further, in the presence of this writer Comrade Farrell Dobbs states "Why we're so undemocratic that we raise a war chest to fight them and we invite them to come and watch us do it." Since the only fund-raising taken at the Convention were the SWP expansion fund drive and the Militant fund drive, Dobbs was not referring to any purely LTF fund raising project.

With all of this in mind and with the added factor that during the SWP pre-convention period we approached the SWP leadership with the problem of finances in consideration of the fact that our Tendency had financial problems. We requested that they take note of this and offer a solution. We suggested the method of the now ex-Ligue Communiste which finances both the minority as well as the majority. We met with no success. Therefore in light of all of the facts, our Tendency will give only a token sustainer besides fulfilling the dues requirements for members. Until the SWP leadership fulfills its international responsibilities and ends its strike against the international,

until it ends its policy of using all of the Party's resources, our Party, if you please, to fill its war chest-until it ends its completely undemocratic practices toward our tendency, its disloyal attitude toward our tendency, and we mean in actions not word, our policy of giving only a token sustainer will be a policy of the Internationalist Tendency. We cannot be expected to pay into a "war chest" to be used to buy "bullets" to be used against us.

I raise this point because it has recently come to our attention, that Comrade Sheppard-and Comrade Boehm of the National Committee recently brought it to the attention of one of the members of our Tendency, Comrade Ralph Levitt, that his failure to give a sustainer is incompatible with membership in the Party. We understand that similar charges were made concerning Comrades Lew Pepper and Sandy Hall of the Oakland-Berkeley Branch. If these comrades were giving no sustainer they were not following our policy (which may have been due to some financial problems) but if they are giving a token sustainer that is the policy of the Internationalist Tendency, the reasons are outlined above-with the correction of the policies of the SWP/LTF we will change our policy.

We feel that it is necessary for these reasons, also, that an International fact finding commission be set up to look into these policies of the Socialist Workers Party before any further comrades are victimized.

Therefore it is a formal request on our part that the United Secretariat set up a fact finding commission to investigate these matters and to recommend solutions to them. We request that these charges on our part be communicated to all members of the appropriate bodies.

With communist greetings
s/Bill Massey, National
Coordinator, Internationalist
Tendency

cc: SWP N.O.
LTF
IMT
IT

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

K O M P A S S
Tendenz in der GIM

Herbert Obenland
D-6 Frankfurt - 1
Nordendstrasse 30
November 7th, 1973

To
Socialist Workers Party
Mary Alice Waters

Dear comrade Mary-Alice,

thank you for your letter from October 24, 1973. We have no objections against the report by John and we don't think that he misrepresented our positions at the Central Committee meeting in Lux. We think our position is coming out quite clear with our draft "On the Orientation of the 4th International in Latin America", counterposed to the IEC Majority's document on Armed Struggle in Latin America. We hope that this can be made available in the IIDB.

Besides this document the Kompass tendency decided at its last membership assembly to support the general line of Part II (The lesson of Bolivia) and Part III (The lesson of Argentina) of "Argentina and Bolivia -- the Balance Sheet." If not only the general line, but the word-by-word text will be put to a vote, we will abstain. The Kompass also decided to vote for the recognition of the PST as the Argentine section of the F.I.

The argumentations for this are enclosed in the "voting formula" of the Kompass for the Tenth World Congress, which will be sent to you in the next days.

If you should be able to translate (among other GIM documents) some texts by the Kompass (those Texts not destined to the IIDB) this would be a great help for us, because most of our cothinkers in Europe can not read German and we are not able to do the translations with DM 1.- per page and will buy a certain amount of such bulletins for our own use in Europe. This concerns all Kompass texts you find interesting enough to translate them for the information of your membership.

We hope you received all German language "Internationale Rundbriefe" and all "GIM-Sonderrundbriefe" well. If you are missing some editions, please let us know.

Rotfront

Karl

DECLARATION OF THE COMPASS TENDENCY

[The following declaration has been translated from the internal discussion in the Gruppe Internationale Marxisten (GIM -- International Marxist Group), German section of the Fourth International. The Compass Tendency has submitted two documents to the International Internal Discussion Bulletin: "On Latin America: The Orientation of the Fourth International" (IIDB vol. X, no. 22) and "Draft for Revision of the European Perspectives Document: 'The Building of Revolutionary Parties in Capitalist Europe,'" which will be published in a coming issue of the IIDB.]

Democratic centralism, the Leninist principle of organization, which the GIM subscribes to as the German section of the Fourth International, is based on the guarantee of the right to form tendencies and factions within the organization on a definite political basis while preserving unity in action and defending the position of the majority in public. It is clear that without this guarantee democratic centralism cannot function at all.

This does not mean that the existence of tendencies or factions is in itself advantageous for the organization. Even when the discipline of the organization is maintained, of necessity tendency struggles absorb the energies of the organization and hinder its practical effectiveness. For this reason, the objective set by a tendency formation cannot be to change the majority-minority relationship within the group. Rather this change must, in the final analysis, be the result of a confirmation or refutation of alternative political conceptions thus leading to an end to the tendency struggle and the creation of a new unity within the organization.

Above all, this process is dependent on how the organization relates to the class struggle. If the organization does this in such a way that it is impossible to sufficiently test the line in practice, tendency formations must inevitably become distorted; this in turn harbors the danger of an unwarranted hardening of the tendency, the inability of the tendency to dissolve itself, and even a split. Therefore every tendency in a living revolutionary organization has to be ready to put its line to the test in practice, recognize the results of this test, and positively or negatively evaluate its existence as a tendency on this basis.

The absence of declared tendencies in the GIM in the past was a deficiency because there were clearly fundamental oppositional currents in disagreement with the majority, but which never based themselves on a principled political program and therefore remained totally diffuse. This contributed to the fact that the GIM majority, which united against these unprincipled opposition groupings, also remained politically diffuse.

It was only the process of differentiation in this politically ill-defined majority, a process that began in the spring of this year, which led to the formation of defined tendencies in the GIM.

The manner in which these tendencies were formed gives a revealing picture of the GIM itself. Neither the tendency close to the IMT [International Majority Tendency] nor the tendency close to the LTT [Leninist-Trotskyist Tendency] grew out of the living process of discussion, experience, and formation of points of view inside the GIM. Rather they resulted from international impulses and agreements within narrow circles. In form they were

established openly in the organization and the internal bulletin. In substance, however, they were established behind the backs of the organization as a whole.

As justification for the formation of an additional tendency we have only the compulsion we are under and our conviction that the positions so far developed by these tendencies are not adequate to arm the organization with a correct line. In contrast, we believe that the line we advance can move the organization a step forward in the present period. Our method is not one of factionally replying to the positions of the other tendencies, but of deriving a line for the organization from the changes in the relationship between the classes and the development of the class struggle, and of determining our perspectives from this and not from the "requirements of the factional struggle." Thus the door is wide open for the other tendencies to join us in bringing about a unifying clarification of the line and the tasks of the GIM. Thus, for us the formation of a tendency is only a tool, a means for an end: like a compass it is intended to help chart the correct course for the GIM.

We are of the opinion that in West Germany we are entering into a period where the initial foundations are being laid for a reconstruction of the workers movement. This reconstruction is taking place under conditions that put the Transitional Program and its method in a position of immediate relevance. We believe that development of class consciousness among the workers in accordance with the transitional strategy offers the only solution for the working class -- not just in the historical sense but in the immediate sense as well. We believe that there is no existing force that can -- even to the slightest degree -- relieve us of the task of systematically developing this transitional strategy, and that therefore it is impermissible for revolutionary Marxists to postpone this task in favor of other "opportunities" and "possibilities," thereby watching the current phase of reconstruction in the workers movement run into one of its historical dead ends.

Therefore we believe that in the light of a concrete analysis of the development of the class struggle and the class consciousness of the West German proletariat, a comprehensive new orientation for our work is necessary.

Proceeding from this general framework, we have established the following points as the provisional platform of our tendency:

1. A reorientation of the GIM along the general lines indicated in Karl's draft resolution "Perspectives for Our Work" on the basis of which Compass will extend and further develop its line.
2. A recognition of the necessity of an alternative reworking of those sections of the European document that, in our opinion, present conclusions that are either false or so ambivalent that they can disorient the debate over program of action for the individual European sections.

Affirmation that in our opinion the approval of the general line of the European document at the last convention was premature, that the correctness and high quality of the general analysis of the European document partially concealed from us serious gaps and unclear points in its conclusions.

The rejection of the IMT's conception of a "new mass vanguard," undefined in class-political terms, in which we must win hegemony. In place of this, recognition of the formation of a new workers vanguard in West Germany in the present period, and recognition that the discrepancy between it and the overwhelmingly student new-left force coming out of the youth radicalization in the Federal Republic is so great that the two cannot be grouped together under the common designation of "vanguard" in any meaningful way.

Further, the clarification that this does not indicate any disdain for the possibilities of working among and recruiting radicalized youth.

3. The recognition that the various progressive mass movements in social sectors or around partial political questions cannot on their own attain their historical goals, which will only be realized with the overthrow of capitalism, that for this reason there is no separate road to these goals, but rather these movements are fundamentally dependent on the development of the class struggle arising from the contradiction between wage labor and capital.

4. For withdrawing the Ninth World Congress Latin America orientation, which calls for a guerrilla warfare strategy, in favor of the general line of the declaration of twelve (later thirteen) members of the GIM leadership: "Why We Did Not Sign the Tendency Declaration of the International Majority" [IIDB vol. X, no. 11, July 1973] or of Comrade Karew's document based on the declaration, as soon as this document becomes available to the whole organization.

5. The readiness to defend, on a principled basis, the unity of the International against the danger of a distortion of the present international dispute through an unwarranted sharpening of the tendency struggle and its acquiring an independent dynamic by the creation of unprincipled blocs or by a narrowing of the democratic conduct of the debate and the decision-making process.

Anyone can become a member of the Compass Tendency who:

-- belongs to the GIM, is in good standing, recognizes the discipline of the GIM and upholds its unity in action without reservation;

-- agrees with the provisional platform of the Compass Tendency presented above, supports the work of the tendency inside the GIM, and takes a loyal attitude toward the tendency in questions that pertain to its positions.

Members of the Compass Tendency are those who:

-- declare their adherence to the tendency and are confirmed as members by it;

-- openly announce their adherence within the organization and inform the GIM leadership of their joining.

Gottingen
September 23, 1973

Albert (CC [Central Committee]), PB [Political Bureau]); Heinz (Control Commission, Heidelberg); Juan (CC, Heidelberg); Karew (CC, Hamburg); Karl (CC, PB); Oliver (CC, Gottingen); Siggi (Hamburg); Werner (CC, Mannheim).

-4-

After its formation, the tendency elected a steering committee consisting of the following comrades: Albert, Juan, Karl.

The GIM internal correspondence address of the Compass Tendency is: Herbert Obenland, Nordenstrasse 30, 6 Frankfurt 1.

COPY

COPY

COPY

November 19, 1973

Dear Comrade Kailas,

Magan sent me a copy of the letter that Walter wrote to you. I think it is an important letter -- not only because of the nature of its accusations, but also because of what it reveals about Comrade Walter's approach in private arguments. So I have written this reply to the main points of his letter. (The copy of his letter that I received was re-typed, not a photocopy; so it is possible that there are typographical errors in my copy. If so, I apologize in advance for any misquotations from Walter's letter due to this.)

Walter raises four main criticisms on political questions, and five main criticisms on organizational questions. There is one common thread, however, that binds all his arguments together -- such a departure from the facts on the real positions of the LTF and the SWP as to deprive his comments of seriousness. Let me take up these nine criticisms one by one.

First on the four political issues that he discusses.

1. On Europe. He says that the LTF is for "routine 'business as usual' in the wake of one general strike or huge strike wave after another." Does he really think that comrades would believe this about the LTF?

The other things he says about our position on Europe are equally hard to take seriously. As you will recall, Mary-Alice Waters had pointed out in her document that the draft resolution of the IEC Majority on European tasks and perspectives was deficient because among other things it singles out the demand for workers control in an artificial manner, to such an extent that it neglects other key demands in the transitional program that are very important for us to raise today in our work -- for example, the sliding scale of wages and hours to fight inflation and unemployment. Rather than taking up this criticism directly, Comrade Walter, in his letter, just avoids it and tries to turn the tables -- he accuses the LTF of proposing that "we should not concentrate on key transitional demands like workers control and workers councils." How can a Marxist seriously respond that way to a real issue that has been raised? How can clarity ever be achieved on the important political questions at stake in our movement through such an approach?

The same must be said of Comrade Walter's handling of the third point on Europe. In her document, Mary-Alice had said that there were growing opportunities to reach workers, and we should take advantage of these opportunities. But she also pointed out that "the question is not whether we must win a base in the working class, but how, given the present size of our forces, their composition, their political maturity, and the present political context in which we are working." And she pointed out how under the present circumstances, the Europe document of the IEC Majority was wrong in belittling student and youth work, work in defense of the colonial revolution, and work in the women's movement. In areas like these, she said, we often had the best possibilities for outflanking the Stalinists and Social Democrats, building our party nuclei, and putting ourselves in a better position to win a mass political base in the working class partially through that process. (See pages 15-16 of her document, IIDB, vol. X, no. 3.)

Rather than taking up this crucial question of how to build a base in the working class, Comrade Walter ignores it. At the same time he blithely accuses us of saying that "we should not turn centrally to the European working class which is in full rising."

2. On the world situation. Here the LTF political resolution is not yet drafted, so Comrade Walter can't be reproached for failing to quote documents when he "states" the LTF position for us. It would be interesting, though, to hear him explain how he reconciles his ability to give a summary of the LTF position with his insistence a few paragraphs earlier that "we can only go upon what they [the LTF] write and publish inside the world movement." (Actually, he does not meet this criteria in any of the arguments in his letter.)

It is possible that what Comrade Walter had in mind was the report given by Jack Barnes at the SWP National Committee plenum in April 1973, entitled "The Unfolding New World Situation." (Published in the SWP Discussion Bulletin, vol. 31, no. 12.) This report can be considered as an initial contribution by the SWP leadership to the discussions on the world political situation, and naturally the American component of the LTF regards it as part of their contribution to help draft the LTF political resolution. But LTF comrades from other countries are also making their own contributions too, and the final LTF draft political resolution will be a collective effort, not that of the SWP alone. So, it would be wrong to assume an automatic equation between this initial contribution of the SWP and the LTF's final position that remains to be drafted.

That's just to make clear how we are proceeding. You would think that Comrade Walter would be able to see this in view of his stress on the need for him to consult internationally in advance of preparing documents. Nevertheless, he gives the "inside dope," averring that we "see the Nixon-Brezhnev-Mao detente as the biggest turn of the world situation since World War II -- not the victory of the Chinese revolution, not the worldwide spread of the colonial revolution in the fifties and the sixties, not the new rise of workers' militancy in Western Europe since 1968, not the growing crisis of the capitalist world economy, but the detente."

I am sure that you were as surprised as I was to read this. It's certainly different from the report given by Jack Barnes at the SWP National Committee plenum.

Comrade Barnes did say that the detente represented a major landmark in the post-World-War-II period. But he did not make a comparison between the significance of the detente and that of the Chinese revolution, the spread of the colonial revolution, or the rise in the class struggle in Western Europe. He was talking about the strategy of the imperialist powers and of the Moscow and Peking bureaucracies as part of the international political framework in which the deepening class struggle continues to develop. He held (see page 3 of his report) that the detente "signifies a displacement of the fundamental post-World-War-II cold-war framework of international capitalist economic and diplomatic relationships and a major shift in the strategy of American and world capitalism with regard to the world revolution." It signifies an alteration of relationships among the imperialist states, and between the imperialist states and the workers states.

It should be noted that Comrade Barnes' report analyzes the detente as a derivative of such major postwar developments as the rising colonial revolution and the increasing strength of the workers states, as well as other factors. This is all conveniently left out of Walter's resumé of our position.

3. Comrade Walter asks if you agree with the LTF position on the Middle East -- the example he gives is the slogan "for a democratic and secular Palestine." But, as you know, the LTF has not adopted a position on the Middle East. Nor, in my opinion, should it at this time. Neither has the IEC Majority faction, so far as I know. It is possible that differences on this question will cut across factional lines. In any case, discussion on the Arab revolution is to continue after the world congress.

The SWP, however, has taken a position of support to the demand for a democratic, secular Palestine. I wish that Comrade Walter would have indicated what he objected to in connection with this slogan. Is he opposed to replacing Israel with a unitary Palestine (which is the key self-determination demand of the Palestinian people)? Is he opposed to demanding the separation of church and state? Is he opposed to struggling for democracy? In addition to the demand for a democratic, secular Palestine, revolutionists certainly have to raise all the other planks in our Marxist program aimed at carrying the struggle through to a successful socialist revolution. And, of course, we differentiate our demands from the Menshevik-Stalinist two-stage concept of forming some abstract, classless democratic state.

The SWP had a very thorough discussion on this question at the time of our 1971 convention. The key documents giving our position have been issued as a collection on Israel and the Arab revolution in an Education for Socialists bulletin. It will be off the presses in a few days and I will send you a copy.

4. Comrade Walter says that the LTF holds "the general concept that 'consistent Indian nationalism' leads towards revolutionary socialism and socialist revolution in India." How can that be taken seriously? It sounds like chitchat thought up while Comrade Walter was banging away on his typewriter.

What Comrade Walter says on the organizational question is just as shallow and unsubstantiated as his comments on the political points. I will take up each item, though not in the same order as he put them in his letter.

5. On Canada. Comrade Walter says that the supporters of the IEC Majority position in the LSA/LSO were just expelled "for the terrible crime of publicly defending the 9th world congress and December '72 IEC line on Bolivia." This may have been Comrade Walter's impression when he was typing his letter, but he really should have taken the trouble to ascertain the facts. No comrade in the LSA/LSO has ever been disciplined for "presenting the line of the Fourth International." What happened was that the supporters of the IEC Majority position took the initiative in splitting from the Canadian section. Here is what they themselves wrote: "We will no longer respect the authority or actions of the Political Committee of the League for Socialist Action. We also wish to inform you that we are terminating all financial commitments to the LSA...." By now, you should have received the Internal Information Bulletin of the SWP, no. 5, November 1973, which re-

prints the documents from both sides of the LSA/LSO relating to this question, and which prove how far off base Comrade Walter's premature account is. (I quoted above from the letter of resignation by his supporters, which is printed in the bulletin.)

A very ominous note in Comrade Walter's letter is his hint about recognizing two Fourth International organizations in Canada. This implies that he is in favor of overlooking the split undertaken by his supporters in Canada, maybe giving them a light reproof, and then granting them some sort of recognition at the next congress. This would open a real Pandora's box for our world movement.

Prior to the split in Canada, there were disquieting signs about the behavior of the IEC Majority supporters in Canada. It appeared that they were acting as if they wished to provoke disciplinary action against themselves. It was clear that if they persisted on this course, it would be to the detriment of the Canadian section and the international as a whole. The leadership of the LSA/LSO talked with Comrade Mandel about this and urged him to intercede so as to save the situation. They stressed the danger inherent in the course of the IEC Majority supporters in Canada. Evidently their appeal to Comrade Mandel was not successful. He did not respond in the way a serious leader should have.

6. Comrade Walter objects to publishing what he calls Jack Barnes' "war speech" to the SWP convention. He is referring to the report for the SWP Political Committee evaluating the situation in the world movement. The report was adopted by the SWP convention.

I found Comrade Walter's reasoning on this point quite revealing. Although he was not present at the SWP convention, has not seen a text of this speech or listened to a tape recording of it, he feels so conversant with it that he can write about it, condemn it, even "quote" from it (It is, he says, a speech that literally "'declares total war' upon the IEC Majority."). Yet, if we should publish the text so that comrades can read it for themselves and make up their own minds about it, then he objects strenuously. If we publish the speech, that's "unwise" and an escalation of tension. If we don't he still feels perfectly free to relay the "inside dope" about it. It's a position like that of a literary critic who reviews books without reading them and who then wants to call in the censor, demanding a ban on the same books so the public can't read them.

7. Comrade Walter notes that the LTF openly calls for a replacement of the present leadership of the FI, which, he grants, is our right. The LTF declaration gives the reasons why such a replacement is necessary -- the political errors of the present majority leadership and their incapacity to recognize and correct these deepening errors disqualify them, in our opinion, from majority leadership. But at the same time, the LTF statement makes it clear that if we win a majority, we would be absolutely opposed to any reprisals.

The LTF statement says specifically, "We also want to make clear that we appreciate the individual abilities and collective contributions of the leaders of the IEC Majority Tendency despite the erroneousness of their present orientation. They have made valuable contributions in the past and we consider them capable of making new ones. If we win a majority at the next world con-

gress, as we hope to do, we want that majority to be reflected in the composition of the incoming leadership so as to assure a change in orientation; but we are against excluding or demoting anyone. To the contrary, we will do our utmost to construct a strong center that includes them as integral components." (IIDB, vol. X, no. 15, p. 10.)

I do not see how Comrade Walter can seriously say that this approach, openly stated before the entire world movement, is one of escalating tension. We state that in our opinion, a change in leadership is necessary, and we explain why in a frank manner -- but also in a calm and reasoned tone, without rancor or bitterness, and without any element of personal depreciation. And you know from your own experience how we have sought to maintain this tone of frankness, but objectivity, in all our personal conversations.

Contrast this with Comrade Walter's letter to you, asking you to "think twice" before joining a faction which, he says, "has as its key purpose to put Peter Camejo and Gus Horowitz in charge of the United Secretariat." It's the LTF's "key purpose" no less! Neither Peter nor I are upset by this statement, which is obviously intended to demean us. But it does raise the following question in my mind. If this is what Comrade Walter writes to you, who have already expressed your agreement with the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction, then what do the comrades of the IEC Majority say when they are among themselves, or talking to the comrades who look to them for leadership. Is the tone of their own discussions about the LTF restrained and objective, or does it encourage those in their ranks who might be prone to immature and irresponsible actions?

Isn't it ironic that Comrade Walter makes such a remark in a passage attempting to show that we are the ones who have escalated tension? And isn't it revealing of his own view of how to approach leadership problems in the international?

8. Comrade Walter accuses the LTF of stating "in each and every section which it controls (this has up to now been repeated in four countries) that it will use all resources of the sections to further the goal of the faction. This is an open violation of democratic centralism, and a monstrous act on behalf of the minority."

The LTF has stated no such policy, and it is false to say so.

I do not know what four countries Comrade Walter has in mind. I do know about the SWP. The SWP does not have a policy of putting party resources at the disposal of any tendency or faction. SWP resources are used only for party activity, that is, to implement the political line of the SWP as decided upon by majority vote at SWP national conventions and as carried forward on that basis by the elected national leadership bodies of the party. Party resources are used for normal party activities such as office space and equipment, publications, staff, travel, etc. Travel includes international travel for the purpose of observing the activities of the world movement, observing the activities of other groups in the world movement, engaging in public speaking tours, reporting important events for the publications, engaging in leadership consultations, and other such activities which are part of the normal functioning of any revolutionary party. This type of activity has been the standard practice of all groups in the world

Trotskyist movement, and remains so. And "resources," I should like to emphasize, is not the same as "finances" to our way of thinking. We rate cadres as our most important resource.

The SWP convention also adopted the following motion: "The convention instructs and empowers the incoming National Committee to use all the forces and resources at its command to struggle for a democratic world congress and a Trotskyist Fourth International." This motion means precisely what it says, and no more. For example, in addition to publishing the International Internal Discussion Bulletin in English for use throughout the world (some 4,000 copies of each issue, published without cost to the world movement), the SWP is also putting resources into the publication of the Spanish-language edition of the IIDB, the publication of which is a prerequisite for a democratic world congress. Activities such as that fall within the scope of the convention motion.

What about expenses specifically incurred by any of our cadres in support of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction? This would include expenses for faction mailings and faction meetings, and similar faction activities. The SWP does not devote any finances to this. Many SWP members have joined the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction, and have pledged financial support to the faction. It is from voluntary contributions like these that the faction expenses are met, not from the SWP budget.

In regard to this latter point, our policy is in conformity with the declaration of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction. Point no. 5 listed under the heading, "Structure of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction," says the following: "Members of the faction must conduct themselves in a completely loyal way in sections of the Fourth International or sympathizing organizations, maintaining their activities and financial obligations in an exemplary way." (IIDB, vol. X, no. 15, p. 11.) I stress that in the SWP the supporters of the LTF must not lower their financial obligations to the party in order to contribute to the faction. They must continue their pledges to the party, just as before joining the faction. Any contributions they make to the faction are in addition to their obligations to the party, not in place of such obligations.

This policy stands in marked contrast to that of the supporters of the IEC Majority in the SWP. These comrades have lowered their pledges to the SWP -- usually lowered their pledges drastically -- on the grounds that they had to contribute to their own tendency. In other words, their tendency contributions came first, and the party came second. We regard this act on their part as disloyal; i.e., not in conformity with the principles and tradition of our movement. They have also sought to justify lowering their pledges to the party on the false grounds that SWP funds are spent for factional purposes. The implication is that as long as the SWP has a line different from that of their faction, they do not feel bound to fulfill the normal financial obligations that other members have.

In fact, we have just received a copy of a letter that Bill Massey, coordinator of the Internationalist Tendency in the SWP, wrote to the United Secretariat. After detailing a series of organizational gripes against the SWP, and some unsubstantiated accusations along the same lines as in Comrade Walter's letter, he says explicitly, "Therefore, in the light of all of the facts, our Tendency will give only a token sustainer besides fulfilling

the dues requirements for members." I should like to emphasize that giving a "token sustainer" is completely out of line with the obligations of party members and violates the party constitution on this matter.

For the sake of international norms, I hope very much that these comrades do not feel that in so acting they are getting encouragement from Comrade Walter or other leaders of the IEC Majority faction. It is Comrade Walter's responsibility, as a central leader of the IEC Majority, to point out to his cothinkers in the SWP that such behavior is wrong. In fact, the IEC Majority ought to feel duty-bound to state its position about the general norms on this question openly, before the entire world movement, just as the LTF has done.

9. Comrade Walter's ninth accusation is really scurrilous. He charges that the LTF "has never put even a tiny fraction of its resources at the disposal of the world movement to build the FI, and now puts all its resources at the disposal of the minority faction."

He does not offer a shred of evidence to prove this, and the reason is that he cannot. It is totally false.

Moreover, for obvious reasons, this subject cannot be discussed. The accusers cannot publish their "evidence," nor can the accused reply. So why does he bring up an accusation like this? All it does is insinuate the existence of a scandal and poison the atmosphere.

I'm sure that you recall the period after the 1971 IEC meeting. At that time, an attempt was made to reestablish collaborative relations in the international center, which had broken down in the previous period. The attempt began to work well for a while. In that atmosphere of lessening tension, there was no problem in reaching agreement about the obligations of each section and sympathizing organization. While neither side since then has changed the level or nature of its contribution to the work of the world movement, Walter now makes a factional interpretation of a situation which he and the others now in the IEC Majority previously found acceptable.

The organizational friction on this point is just a reflection of the polemic over political differences. I know that you are perfectly aware that in other times Comrade Walter would have been among the first to see this. It is regrettable that he should have got caught up in such low-level factionalism.

Well, this has turned out to be a rather long letter. I think Joe Hansen has said in a document somewhere that distortions can often be tossed off glibly and succinctly, but it can take a lot of space to correct them.

Walter's letter was very interesting. I think that it is reasonable to assume that it is an example of what must have become typical of the arguments used in private against the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction by Walter and other leaders of the IEC Majority faction. We have heard rumors about this and have seen it spill over into the debates in some of the sections and sympathizing organizations (Canada, for instance).

I hope you have received IIDB vol. X, no. 20, containing the

reply to the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction declaration by the IEC Majority. It is entitled, "Let's Discuss Political Differences, Not Old Wives' Tales." It contains some accusations similar to those in Comrade Walter's letter to you, including many distortions and misrepresentations. In a certain sense, it is an unworthy document, given the serious nature of the political issues under dispute in the Fourth International. But at least its publication offers us the opportunity to answer before the entire world movement the type of scurrilous charges that have previously been circulating around as corridor gossip. That answer is now in preparation.

I'm sure you also noted the disparity between the relatively restrained tone of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction declaration and the document of the IEC Majority in answer to it. It makes a mockery, doesn't it, of Comrade Walter's charge that we are the ones escalating the tension in the world movement.

Frankly, I think that the tone and nature of this new document by the IEC Majority runs counter to the spirit of the 10-point agreement reached at the September 1973 United Secretariat meeting. ("Recommendations to the Delegates of the Coming World Congress," IIDB vol. X, no. 15.) I hope that this does not mean that some comrades in the IEC Majority are reconsidering the wisdom of that agreement. For our part, we will still adhere to it -- in spirit as well as in letter.

Given the depth of the differences, and the heat already generated in the discussion, it will require leadership capacity of a high order on both sides to prevent an unwarranted split. For both sides, this implies the necessity, not only of organizational compromises wherever possible, but also of maintaining a mature and restrained tone in private discussions and correspondence. It is a law of politics that you cannot maintain a rigidly split personality -- one for public consumption, and another in private. Inevitably, the tone and nature of private political discussion will spill over into the open debate within the international. I suspect that this is what has happened in the case of the IEC Majority document, "Let's Discuss Political Differences, Not Old Wives' Tales."

Several new political documents by the IEC Majority or its supporters have been submitted to the discussion, and they have just been published or are now being prepared for publication. The debate on China, the national question, and the struggle against the oppression of women indicate that our world movement is in the process of discussing some fundamental theoretical questions, and that the discussion on these questions scheduled to continue after the world congress will be among the most important in the history of the FI. This makes it all the more important for both factions to set a good tone in the pre-world congress discussion, because the discussion over these broader theoretical questions merits the most calm and carefully considered study by everyone in the world movement.

Best regards,
s/Gus

P.S. I am sending copies of this letter to Magan and to the steering committee of the LTF for their information.