

New York, N.Y.  
December 15, 1973

To the Steering Committee of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction

Dear Comrades,

Enclosed in this mailing are the following items:

1. A report by Stateman on the November 23-25 convention of the Japanese section.

2. A letter from Dumas in France, plus the platform of the newly formed "Against the Stream" tendency in France. Some of the other documents mentioned in this platform are currently being translated and will be printed as soon as possible.

3. A statement by the Compass Tendency in Germany, outlining what a vote for their tendency means.

4. A letter from the leadership of the Compass Tendency to the United Secretariat, calling attention to the fact that Pierre Frank and members of the IEC Majority Tendency have been conducting discussions with opponents of the GIM, without even informing the elected leadership bodies of the section.

5. Three documents relating to the tendency struggle inside the Basque ETA VI. This culminated recently in the expulsion of supporters of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction from ETA VI, because they demanded the right to maintain an organized tendency. An introductory note to these documents explains in more detail the evolution of the situation in Spain.

6. An exchange of letters between comrade Kailas Chandra in India and comrade Gus Horowitz, concerning the IEC Majority draft political resolution.

At the convention of the Communist League of India, held the first weekend in December, the overwhelming majority of delegates supported the positions of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction. According to a report from Stateman, who attended the convention, on Latin America the vote was 16 for our balance sheet, 2 for the IEC majority, 6 abstentions or not voting. Of the delegates who spoke during the discussion, 18 said they were politically with the LTF. Of these, 13 joined the LTF at the convention, 5 (including Kailas Chandra) decided not to join the faction. Two other delegates said they were neutral, and 2 were for the IEC majority.

The two delegates supporting the IEC majority are probably the only two members of the section with those views.

Comradely,  
Mary-Alice

INITIAL REPORT ON JAPANESE CONVENTION Nov. 23-25, 1973  
by Stateman

Membership: There are 225 members in the section, 106 in the Tokyo region, 56 in the Sendai region, 50 in the Osaka region, 7 in the southern island of Kyushu, and 6 in Okinawa.

The format was presentations by Sakai, for the Japanese Political Bureau, Tariq for the IEC Majority, and myself for the LTF and Secretariat minority -- on each point before the world congress.

The IEC Majority document on Europe has been translated and circulated for some time, as well as Mary-Alice's criticism. The documents on Latin America, including the Balance-Sheet, were out only a week before the convention. Delegates were elected not on the basis of votes for the opposing international resolutions or the resolutions of the Political Bureau.

Only delegates were present, a total of 43.

The first point was on Europe. Sakai outlined the PB resolution. The main points he made were: (1) The PB supports the general characterization of the coming prerevolutionary situation in Europe contained in the IEC Majority document. (2) This puts dual power and the self-defense of the working class on the agenda -- tasks which cannot be separated from party building. The minority doesn't understand the objective situation, and therefore doesn't understand these tasks and line (dual power and arming of the working class) as immediate perspectives. (3) The PB supports the document on the new mass vanguard. (4) This vanguard is radicalizing young workers, and represents a new stage in the youth radicalization.

But the PB has some criticisms. The document doesn't base itself on the perspective of the Socialist United States of Europe. It should analyze Europe as a whole, and make clear the perspective of the socialist revolution in Europe. It has no analysis of the trends towards capitalist integration, e.g., the EEC, and the relation of Europe to the colonial countries such as Ireland. The document should be more clear on and have analysis of European revolution as a whole, integrating analysis of contradictions and different situations in the different countries. Problems of Ireland, Spain, for example, are not dealt with, and our specific tasks in relation to such problems are not dealt with.

The slogan of United Socialist States of Europe should become more than propaganda.

The document's line is building sections on the basis of the perspective of dual power country by country. This can leave room for empiricism, since other tasks (women, youth, etc.) are not integrated into the program. It should concentrate on the idea that the purpose of the party is to be an instrument to lead to the taking of power, not just the building of dual power.

We should build youth organizations to reach the young workers. Has differences on the balance sheet of entryism. Supports the "three tactics" part of the document, however. A section should be added on the historical development of European imperialism since 1939.

Tariq gave a weak presentation, as if he wasn't much in-



terested. Comrades later said I "took advantage" of him by going second. At any rate, there was no overt support for the minority position in the discussion that followed. The following is a sampling of remarks made in the discussion, with the comrade's city indicated:

Extreme north, in Sendai region: had no discussion in ranks, only in city bureau. Had some criticisms of deriving dual power line from general considerations.

Sendai: supports PB analysis of critical support to European document.

Akita (in Sendai region): haven't discussed.

Another comrade: thinks both sides are empiricist a bit. Wants to know what the SWP does, what the SWP minority is doing in the working class.

Tokyo: We have had similar experiences to those of European sections and feel sympathy with them and with the document. (This idea was repeated over and over by different comrades.)

Osaka: We had general meeting to discuss. Split in International should be avoided. No one supported the minority.

Kyushu: European document should be supported as a starting point. Mary-Alice's criticism is based on pre-Ninth World Congress method.

Sendai: Analysis on dual power is OK, but relation between vanguard and mass not clear in European resolution.

Sakai: Tariq explained that dual power line comes from objective situation. Stateman does not follow the logic of his own admission that objective situation can produce big struggles. Mass vanguard and question of power is the central question. In Japan, will have the most extreme movement of new mass vanguard.

Another comrade: Agrees on dual power and workers control line, but thinks that Tariq is somewhat spontaneist. Stateman says that Tariq is economist, but SWP is economist because it doesn't pose the problem of power.

Nishiyama (member of PB): SWP opposition to the European document shows the character of the SWP. This was the basis of the Cannon-Pablo debate. SWP just stands on general Trotskyist positions.

Myamoto (Osaka leader): Minority thinks we must leave open more possibilities (concerning objective situation). Also, thinks that workers control is only part of transitional program, while the majority concentrates on this point. Minority has a general character, while majority concentrates on specific activity. Agrees with majority. We should educate and prepare our activists for the struggle in the near future. SWP poses dual power as only one among other possibilities. How to prepare for coming confrontation? What Stateman says is correct in general, like Nishi [abstract, general principles]. So he supports majority and opposes minority.

Tokyo: Agrees with Nishiyama on method [Cannon vs. Pablo]. Minority is in opposition to Japanese section's thinking. But majority document is present orientation, not how to build party.

Nishyama: SWP stands on general [abstract, general] Trotskyist positions. Experience of Japanese section confirms position of European document. SWP position is grounded in history of SWP and we have to find out more about that. But it would be sufficient to talk of radicalized layers, not "new mass vanguard."

Sakai: The basic problem is that all struggles, strikes, etc., now objectively pose dual power, pose the question of power. That is the central problem.

The Transitional Program is a program for power, and can only utilize it in situation when power is posed, not in the general day-to-day struggles. The European document itself is wrong on this question.

Agrees with European document on importance of new mass vanguard. But still have to criticize from the standpoint of party building because document is weak on program.

[Has a suspicion that the idea Tariq presented on the need for the International to write a document about what kind of socialism we want contains "structural reform" ideas. This was said by my translator, not Sakai.]

#### On Latin America

Sakai: Ninth World Congress resolution said that city uprisings are unlikely. It underestimated city struggle. It contained a guerrilla war deviation. Armed struggle must be linked to the masses.

The present majority position is correct but is a 180° turn from the Ninth World Congress.

The minority correctly criticized guerrilla war but not sufficient on armed struggle.

Quotes resolution of POR in 1969. Says this raised slogans for mass movement and for armed struggle, but these were not related or connected.

Armed struggle should be based on mass struggle.

Real record of POR, line of POR, was an obstacle during the rise of the mass struggle. Responsibility for this lies with the Ninth World Congress, not the POR. While the POR changed its line in 1971, this didn't leave enough time before the coup to apply it.

Quotes resolution of PRT (Combatiente). Basic line is Cuban-type people's war. PRT was dissolved into ERP. PRT couldn't intervene in mass city struggles. The majority of the United Secretariat started to criticize PRT, then Santucho split. Majority admits mistakes of PRT. Basis of errors is one-sided approach to armed struggle. Majority admits this.

International has responsibility to make a clear history of Argentine Trotskyism.

The PRT (Verdad) avoids concrete question of power, dual power and arming of the masses.

The PRT (Verdad) has a left-pacifist position. Its election campaign was left-pacifist.

Minority position stresses method of Transitional Program, but real character of minority is to avoid central question of power.



We have to learn from Lenin's 1905 experience. IEC should work on a program for Argentina and regroup splits from PRT, PST, into a new section.

-----  
I won't go into discussion because there wasn't much. Most was questions. Many hostile questions about the PST. Also questions to Tariq about does his new position mean a change in line. Tariq finally said that there are differences in the majority over that. He also said that the Ninth World Congress made mistakes on guerrilla war, but stands on new position (Statement on Armed Struggle in Latin America by IEC Majority).

Sakai summarized that as on European discussion, majority is more correct because it is trying to orient towards coming confrontations.

Sakai on organization resolution from PB:

1) At the Ninth World Congress, new generation represented in Canadian, SWP and French sections. French CL couldn't participate fully.

2) After the Ninth World Congress, new turn and leap made. Now main force in the International is the new generation.

3) Main significance of the Tenth World Congress is that the new generation meets to discuss. This will be the first time that the Japanese section sends a delegate and participates.

4) Must have a thorough discussion of all political questions before the International.

5) At the Tenth World Congress these questions cannot be settled easily.

6) The congress should make clear who is the majority and apply democratic centralism.

7) He reads 10 points. Japanese section supports the 10 points.

8) Thinks that discussion after the world congress should be public on the political questions -- would help us grow.

In response to a question, indicated that Japanese section would continue its own translation of documents and discussion on Europe and Latin America although these are closed for international bulletin.

Tariq made these points:

1) Tries to blame any split on us for forming a faction.

2) Points to Canadian section. Says crisis is a result of the Canadian section's not having recruited group who supports IEC Majority. This violates spirit of 10 points.

3) No such thing as the "secret faction."

4) Exclusion of IT from SWP National Committee very bad.

5) Says they will not expel the PST, although he doesn't think it should be made the section. And, will not "play games" by saying that PST doesn't represent the sympathizing group. Characterised PST as "centrist."

-----



There was no discussion on the political resolution before the convention. The night before the PB drew up the following:

- 1) Agreement with general analysis of Europe, loss of hegemony by American imperialism, analysis of workers states.
- 2) Criticisms of the resolution:
  - a) fails to analyze the victory of the Vietnamese revolution, and its meaning for world revolution;
  - b) fails to analyze impact of crisis of bureaucracy in USSR on world situation.

They have some amendments.

Tariq didn't speak. I had time only to quickly discuss the detente and Chile. The PB reporter agreed with me on the popular front character of the Allende regime.

Votes: unanimous on PB reports on everything, except one abstention on Europe.

The above is from notes and I have included only or mainly what the Japanese said.

Le 6/XII/1973

Dear Mary-Alice,

1) I was very sorry indeed to have been unable to meet you when you were in Paris.... I tried but it appeared really it was not possible to manage. Please, next time you know you're coming, send a note or a telegram...

2) As you have seen, no doubt by discussing with the two French comrades, Krasno and Reiner, things are beginning to change inside the French section. We decided to create a tendency on the subject of the international debate which constitutes a traumatism for everybody: for us first! For the whole organisation! It will be very difficult, given the backwardness of the French comrades about the problems of the 4th International, but it is on the whole positive to have begun such a battle. I can't comment too long in this letter.

3) You have received, I suppose:

-- The two documents by Kompass: Europe and Amerique Latine; yes, I received this last one in English.

-- One 80 pages typewritten document on Europe and a platform of the Marxista-revolucionaria Tendency in Italie. (We can send you the address if you have nothing from them, which would surprise me.)

-- One first document by our tendency in France: "Contre le Courant."

-- the November 17/18 "communiqué" -- Frankfort.

4) We shall have next week one whole bulletin composed of:

-- A préambule sur les documents de la tendance "Contre le Courant";

-- Plate-forme de la tendance (enclosed here)

-- Frankfort communiqué.

-- Dumas/lesage: "En avant vers une troisième tendance internationale au sein de la IVE Internationale."

If the SWP was to decide to translate and publish those documents for its International Information Bulletin as you did for the first declaration by Marcel (Belgium) and Kompass, may I suggest that they should be put if possible in the same bulletin and in the following order (it seems to me more comprehensible than what will be done here!):

a) Frankfort

b) Preamble

c) Plate-forme

d) Dumas/Lesage

e) "Contre le Courant" -- Krasno, Reiner...

-2-

Another good idea would be to have the German and the Italian document on Europe in the same bulletin as the French one signed by Eleanore, Samuel, etc., who wrote a fascinating document about the "new large vanguard," but unfortunately did not make up their mind to join us in the tendency...

That's all for to-night. The demonstration of the general strike was exhausting to-day: 9"-30 -- 16"30! And I know, I can't say everything in this letter. I know I should explain how we see the differences between us and the LTF...too long! Let's discuss them next time.

Very fraternally,

Dumas

cc: (Secretariat de la Tendence CLC)

But this was not an "official" letter!



## Platform of the 'Against the Stream' Tendency [France]

(I) The comrades who have signed below have joined together after having discussed the political reasons that make it impossible for them to affiliate with either of the two international tendencies formed following the December 1972 International Executive Committee meeting.

The debate carried out in the Fourth International over the last four years leads to the following conclusions:

(a) The IEC majority bases the perspectives and tasks of revolutionary Marxists on a mechanistic analysis of the period, on an analysis that stakes almost everything one-sidedly on a deepening of the aspects of the crisis of the imperialist system, on the "irrepressible rise" of struggles in the three sectors of the world revolution; on an analysis that idealizes the character and political function of the "new broad vanguards"; all of which finally leads to an underestimation of the specific tasks of building a revolutionary Marxist workers party with mass influence.

(b) In the process of making certain principled and abstract criticisms of the majority's political line, the LTF (Leninist-Trotskyist Faction) avoids a series of fundamental problems that revolutionary Marxists must integrate into their strategy; this is the case for the question of preparation for armed struggle on the part of the vanguard.

(II) Given these circumstances, the comrades who have signed below refuse to accept the way the debate has been organized since the Ninth World Congress; they also refuse to accept any responsibility for either the dead end to which it has led the Fourth International, or for the split dynamic it involves. It should be acknowledged that the Fourth International is composed of tendencies proposing different orientations that do not go beyond the framework of revolutionary Marxism, which in our opinion is the framework in which the two present tendencies are situated. Only the political education of the cadres and the membership, along with the application of the Bolshevik tradition of democratic centralism, will permit the political homogenization of the members and sections of the Fourth International that is indispensable to its functioning and transformation.

(III) Given the poor conditions for preparation of the world congress -- and in spite of them -- the comrades who have signed below have decided that it is absolutely necessary to form an organized tendency and to refuse to accept being limited to written contributions to a debate that would thus remain a monopoly of the two international tendencies. For these comrades, the Tenth World Congress is only a first step toward the formation of a third international tendency -- a tendency for which the objective need is already clearly felt, and for which the initial nuclei already exist.

(IV) The Against the Stream Tendency is based on the general line of the following documents:

-- "Against the Stream," by Krasno, Reiner, and Lemalouf;

-2-

-- "Forward with the Building of a Third Tendency in the Fourth International," by Dumas and Lesage;

-- The November 18 Frankfurt "Communique."

In our opinion, there are other documents that in large part parallel the theses set forth by the Against the Stream Tendency:

-- The counterresolution on Latin America by the Compass Tendency in the German section;

-- The amendments to the European document by the same comrades;

-- "New Vanguard or Building the Revolutionary Party," a contribution to the debate by Comrades Eleonor, Lesueur, Nemo, Roc, and Varlet.

Signers: Lemalouf, Lesage, Dumas, Reiner, Krasno, Letourneau, Maria J.R., Decampe, Manuel, Rose.

December 1973



Compass Tendency in the GIM

Frankfurt, Nov. 11, 1973

To all Groups and Supporters of the GIM:

The following are the positions of the Compass tendency on the questions at issue at the Tenth World Congress (Fourth Since Reunification). They are presented for a vote in the branches of the GIM during the pre-world congress discussion period.

### 1. European Document

For the Compass draft resolution for changes in the European perspectives document as presented and motivated in International Internal Discussion Bulletin Vol. X, No. 10.

For the necessity of deciding upon an EPD at the world congress as a general perspective for capitalist Europe. Against the position that no general perspectives document for capitalist Europe should be decided on.

### 2. Latin America Orientation

For the Compass tendency's draft resolution "On the Orientation of the Fourth International in Latin America" as presented in IIDB Vol X, No. 22.

Against the draft resolution of the IEC Majority Tendency "On the Question of Armed Struggle in Latin America," IIDB Vol. X, No. 20.

This first-mentioned draft resolution summarizes the Compass tendency's position on the controversy over Latin America in the International. For this reason we are not submitting a separate document on Argentina and Bolivia, because, first of all, we believe that these points in the discussion are subordinated to the general orientation, and second of all, because we are not in a position, nor do we feel that it makes sense, to add our own views to the "battle of facts" over the Bolivian and Argentinian experience.

Therefore we are supporting the position on Argentina and Bolivia that is most acceptable to us.

### 3. Bolivia

For the analysis and evaluation of the Bolivian developments set forth in sections 1-7 and section 9, paragraphs 1-4 of the IEC Majority Tendency's draft resolution "Bolivia -- Results and Perspectives" (IIDB Vol. X, No. 6.)

Against the general line of this draft resolution "Bolivia-- Results and Perspectives" since this is a reaffirmation and reinforcement of guerrilla orientation, which we regard as incorrect (on this point, see especially IRB np. 7, p. 15) [We haven't received this bulletin in New York yet].

For the general line of Part II ("The Lessons of Bolivia") of the IEC Minority Tendency draft resolution "Argentina and Bolivia -- the Balance Sheet" (IIDB Vol. X, No. 1). If a vote is taken on anything beyond the general line of the text, we will abstain.

"The Lessons of Bolivia" unlike "Bolivia -- Results and Perspectives" offers no thorough general analysis but basically limits itself to dealing with the orientation and practice of the POR



(Combate). We agree with the assessment that the Latin America line of the Ninth World Congress led the POR to an incorrect orientation. However, there are a whole number of details in the discussion on the facts that are disputed. Moreover, in our opinion, a whole series of points such as the assessment of the Popular Assembly need more precise discussion, and above all, it seems to us that the document is overly limited to a critique of the POR(C) and contributes too little to the formulation of an alternative line, including a correct conception of military work. (On this point, c.f. section 3C of the Compass resolution in IIDB Vol. X, No. 22.) Therefore we will only vote for the general line.

#### 4. Argentina

Against the IEC Majority Tendency draft resolution "Perspectives for the Revolutionary Struggle in Argentina." This resolution contains valuable elements of an analysis in its first ten sections, elements that can be adopted in a new overall document. However, in contrast to the Bolivia resolution of the IEC majority, this analysis is combined with attempts at justifying the incorrect orientation adopted in Argentina in such a way that we cannot vote for even part of it.

For the general line of "The Lesson of Argentina" (Part III of the draft resolution "Argentina and Bolivia -- the Balance Sheet." If a vote is taken on the literal content of this document we will abstain.

A number of elements of general analysis are lacking in this draft resolution. In this respect the majority resolution is partially superior to it. However, in contrast to "The Lesson of Bolivia," "The Lesson of Argentina" contains a thorough analysis of the period treated (since 1969), an analysis we agree with in its broad outlines. This analysis has to do with the assessment of the development of the class struggle and the politics of the PRT/ERP. Once again the draft resolution is in its presentation of an alternative line, and once again it avoids going into the problems of party military work. Possibly the authors take as their point of departure the tacit assumption that the PST is the alternative and nothing more need be added. For these reasons, and once again because in a number of details the facts are contested (e.g., "How the ERP Flag Got on the Coffin") -- only a vote for the general line.

#### 5. Recognition of the PST as the Section

At the Ninth World Congress the PRT (Combatiente) was recognized as the section purely for reasons of numerical size -- because it was in the majority after the 1968 split. Comrade Maitan acknowledges this as the only possible criterion in such a case ("Let's Keep to the Issues, Let's Avoid Diversions!").

That is, if the then PRT (Verdad), the present PST, had been in the majority at that time, it would now be the section. In the meantime, the PRT (Combatiente), the PRT/ERP, has left the International. If we go back to the 1968 split and the criteria established then, nothing can stand in the way of recognizing the PST as the section. This is not a case of recognizing a completely new section -- in such a case according to Comrade Maitan (op. cit.) the political criterion would be primary -- rather it is a matter

of recognizing an organization that was already recognized as a sympathizing group at the Ninth World Congress and was not recognized as the section solely for reasons of numerical size.

Up till now, we have been able to conduct only a few discussions with the comrades of the PST. Our impression is, however, that we have differences with the PST on a number of questions. One question is that of the parallel military apparatus. At the same time, we maintain that these differences are in no way larger or qualitatively distinguishable from differences we have with other sections -- without our contesting their status as sections in any way. Therefore:

For the recognition of the PST, sympathizing group of the Fourth International, as the Argentine section of the Fourth International.

These five points of the platform of the Compass tendency in the GIM were unanimously agreed upon in the Compass tendency membership meeting in Frankfurt on October 27, 1973.



Compass Tendency in the GIM

November 28, 1973

To:

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International

cc: Pierre Frank

Joe Hansen

Political Bureau of the GIM

Dear Comrades,

At its November 24, 1973, meeting, the CC of the GIM dealt at length with the regroupment tendencies in the Trotskyist organizations in West Germany outside the Fourth International, which formed out of the 1969 split in the German organization. It decided to seek organized discussions with these groupings. In particular it decided to immediately seek discussions with the minority of the former KJO Spartacus, which broke from the KJO Spartacus about three weeks ago and is now vigorously seeking discussions with the GIM. On this occasion a few members of the CC of the GIM supported the view that this grouping could quickly be brought close to the GIM.

In fact, even before this CC meeting and before these decisions were made, an organized discussion with this grouping took place, although not with the Fourth International and the GIM as a whole, but rather with a tendency in the Fourth International and a tendency in the GIM. On the occasion of Comrade Pierre Frank's visit to the Berlin GIM group, where he spoke as a representative of the IEC Majority Tendency in the international discussion, a candid discussion took place with the Berlin section of this grouping that split with Spartacus, in which besides Pierre Frank (IMT) a number of comrades in the "Internationalist Tendency" of the GIM (supporters of the IMT within the GIM) took part, among them CC members of the GIM who belong to the IT (and the IMT). The CC, the PB, and the organizational secretary of the GIM were not informed about the discussion that had taken place at its November 24 meeting. The CC accepted this report without taking a position.

Our tendency welcomes the attention that the CC of the GIM is paying to this regroupment process, a process that may have positive results for us. Further we gather from the report on this discussion that was given by IT comrades in the CC that these comrades who have split from KJO Spartacus expressed their understandable desire to become acquainted with the positions of all tendencies in the GIM. There is no majority tendency in the GIM at the present time. Since the Fourth International does not recognize different rights or conditions for different tendencies, our tendency, of course, claims the right that the IMT and the IT have already exercised for themselves. Therefore, we too will conduct our own discussions with this grouping insofar as it desires to have such discussions with us. This does not contradict our readiness to take part in GIM "tendency parity" discussions with this grouping. We welcome such discussions and hope that they will soon come about. What is at issue here is, rather, a normal consequence of our equal rights with the IT as a tendency, as well as our interest in seeing that the former Spartacus comrades do not get a one-sided picture if the discussions with them have already been taken up on the tendency level.

Herbert Obenland  
6 Frankfurt, Nordenstrasse 30

The Steering Committee  
Albert - Juan - Karl



## Introductory Note

The attached documents relate to the tendency struggle during the last year between pro-LCR (En Marcha) and pro-LC (Encrucijada) factions in the Basque Nationalist Organization ETA VI (Euzkadi ta Azkatasuma -- Basque Nation and Freedom).

Included are:

1. A letter to the United Secretariat from the Communist League (formerly Encrucijada).
2. A letter to the United Secretariat from members of the Leninist-Trotskyist Tendency (pro-LC) in Eta VI who have been expelled from ETA VI.
3. Two letters to the United Secretariat from the (pro-LCR) ETA VI leadership.

During 1972 (that is, prior to the split in the LCR, the Spanish sympathizing organization) the LCR had won influence in a left wing of ETA that was moving toward Marxism. In the fall of 1972 at the Sixth Assembly (national congress) of ETA, there was a split. Two organizations resulted. One, calling itself ETA V, is a nationalist-terrorist organization. The other was a centrist grouping which included Trotskyists and called itself ETA VI (the "VI" refers to the Sixth Assembly). Later, a large centrist grouping, nearly half of the organization, calling itself ETA (Mino) ["Minority"] split from ETA VI.

What remained of ETA VI, under the leadership of pro-LCR elements, conducted a discussion on the question of joining the Fourth International and fusing with the Spanish Trotskyists. Meanwhile, the debate in the LCR between the En Marcha and Encrucijada tendencies had ended in a split. Both tendencies, however, appeared in ETA VI in the summer of 1973 and the debate continued up to the Seventh Assembly in the fall of 1973.

One and a half months prior to the Seventh Assembly, the pro-LCR (En Marcha) leadership demanded that members supporting one or another tendency declare themselves in order to determine the size of tendency delegations. Claiming that undecided members were somehow less serious or important than those who declared for a tendency, the leadership also decided to give many more votes to members belonging to a tendency than to non-aligned members (this was later modified to one vote for every 3 members in a tendency versus one vote for each 4 undecided members). Aside from the obviously undemocratic weighting of votes, the pro-LC ETA members viewed this as an attempt to block consideration of their views, because members had to declare for tendencies before the documents of the minority were even available.

At the Seventh Assembly, the ETA VI split. The pro-LC minority was expelled for refusing to dissolve their tendency. The majority fused with the LCR,

The pro-LC minority won the organization in the city of Pamplona, where ETA VI had important influence in the working class and had played a significant role in the June 1973 Pamplona general strike.

As explained in their letter to the United Secretariat, the three main charges of the ETA Leninist-Trotskyist Tendency

-2-

members are: (1) their documents were not circulated in time to be discussed or read; (2) the weighting of votes was undemocratic and alien to Trotskyist tradition; and (3) they were denied the right to maintain a tendency, also a violation of Leninist norms. All three charges are expressly confirmed in the letter to the United Secretariat from the pro-LCR "Leadership of ETA VI."

Ed Shaw



TRANSLATION

TRANSLATION

TRANSLATION

TRANSLATION

November 20, 1973

To the United Secretariat  
of the Fourth International

From the Political Bureau of the  
LC (s.o.f.i.)

Copy: Steering Committee  
of the IFF

Comrades,

The members of the Leninist-Trotskyist Tendency, expelled from the ETA VI at its Seventh Congress, have given us the enclosed letter to send to the United Secretariat since, following their expulsion, they have no other way to send it.

Along with the letter they have sent us a set of documents that explain the position of the pro-En Marcha leadership throughout the debate in preparation for the Seventh Congress. These texts can be a valuable aid for a specific understanding of the development of the Seventh Congress discussion. We can soon send you copies of them.

Fraternally,  
For the P.B. of the LC  
(s.o.f.i.)

TRANSLATION

TRANSLATION

TRANSLATION

TRANSLATION

To the United Secretariat  
of the Fourth International

From the Leninist-Trotskyist  
Tendency Expelled From ETA VI

Dear Comrades,

After our expulsion at the end of the Seventh Assembly the members of the Leninist-Trotskyist Tendency believe it is necessary to inform you of the fundamental violations of democratic centralism that have taken place during the debate and at the Seventh Assembly. We believe that the United Secretariat -- through an investigation by the International Control Commission -- can effectively use its moral authority to guarantee internal democracy in the ETA VI and maintain the unity recently broken by our expulsion. For our part we are prepared to accept whatever decision the United Secretariat or the IEC makes that guarantees the rights of minority tendencies within the ETA VI within the context of a democratic centralist functioning and in keeping with the traditions of the international Trotskyist movement.

The fundamental facts which indicate that the Seventh Assembly of the ETA VI was bureaucratically prepared and carried out by the pro-En Marcha leadership, thus denying the members of the organization the benefits of a democratic debate, are:

1) Publication of discussion documents. The document "Construct the Party on the Basis of the Transitional Program," the central document presented by our tendency for debate and vote at the Seventh Assembly, came into the hands of the membership as a whole only two or three days prior to the convocation of the assembly. Other contributions of our tendency to the discussion, such as an answer to Miguel's document on "The Two Leagues," were not even printed. Because of this, the great majority of our membership, especially those in the provinces such as Guipuzoes, had no knowledge of our positions, and therefore, did not have a political basis for rejecting them.

2) Election of delegates to the Seventh Assembly. The leadership of ETA VI in charge of preparing the Seventh Assembly, made up totally of members of the pro-En Marcha Tendency, basing themselves on the decisions of the second part of the Sixth Assembly, established that the votes of members declaring for one tendency or another one month and a half prior to the Seventh Assembly should have a higher value than those members who had no definitive positions at that time. This forced many members to take a position rapidly, without sufficient political basis, and limited the time of discussion. But, above all, it signified, against all Leninist norms, giving more weight to the opinion of some comrades as against others. The members who declared for a tendency received one delegate for every three members, while members who had not declared for any tendency had a representation of one for every four members.

For our part, we protested each of these bureaucratic measures of the leadership without any results. In spite of this, in order to be able to pursue the debate, we accepted the assembly as organized by the leadership; in the same manner, we are prepared to accept the new leadership elected by these methods in this assembly and to respect party discipline in all areas of intervention, as long as we are guaranteed the right to defend our position within the organization.

But, the leadership of the pro-En Marcha Tendency did not want to carry through the debate to its full conclusion, it did not



-2-

want to continue the debate which only began with the holding of the Seventh Assembly, it did not want to discuss in depth their positions against ours before the entire organization. Thus, the majority of the Seventh Assembly, by-passing the most elementary norms of democratic centralism, shoving aside the discussion, decided to dissolve the tendencies. But at the same time it refused to give any guarantee to open a period for discussion in preparation for the Tenth World Congress, where, in the main, the debate is the same as the now truncated debate in ETA VI: The construction of the party as a section of the Fourth International.

Our position was to refuse to dissolve our tendency, considering that the debate was not settled. This was the reason we were expelled.

We wished to present you with our views on these events even though not in a detailed form, because we believe that advice or a decision from the US can prevent the hardening of a split which, without doubt, delays the construction of the section of the Fourth International in Spain. We remain at the disposition of the US to clarify whatever facts you need or to provide the documents considered necessary.

Communist greetings, Long Live the Fourth International.

Leninist-Trotskyist Tendency  
Expelled from ETA VI

November 1973

To the IEC of the Fourth International and to the United Secretariat

Comrades,

Through a long period of political differentiation that fundamentally began in the first part of the Sixth Assembly with the split with the radical nationalists -- who later went under the banner of ETA VI -- and became deeper in the second part of the Sixth Assembly last year with the break with the minority wing captured by eclectism...

After a prolonged process of debate which lasted nine months, accompanied by a centralized and planned intervention in the class struggle following the orientation laid out by the second part of the Sixth Assembly...

We assumed in this period our organizational responsibilities, promoting unity in action on a privileged basis with the LCR, which was to find an even higher expression in the signing of the protocol agreement regarding the discussion of problems relative to the unification of our two organizations last May...

The Seventh Assembly of ETA VI held recently has decided to add our organization to the ranks of revolutionary Marxism through various resolutions which we can synthesize as follows:

Regarding politics:

1) Reaffirming the permanent character of the proletarian revolution in Spain along the lines of the resolution "Toward the Revolutionary General Strike," drawing on and expanding the orientation in the editorial of the Fourth International of June 1972, "Spain, the weak link in the imperialist chain in capitalist Europe," and the Second Congress resolution of the LCR.

2) Adopting a tactic of constructing the party based on the text "The Building of Revolutionary Parties in Capitalist Europe," approved by the majority of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, applying the general line of said document to the specific conditions of our country in the manner the document itself recommends.

3) Concretizing our intervention in the different sectors depending on the actual situation and the objective of the adopted "Tactic of Construction of the Party" (win hegemony in the new vanguard).

In the organizational area:

1) Proclaiming our affiliation to the Fourth International, prepared to give all our efforts to the task of theoretically, politically and organizationally strengthening it with the aim of constructing the mass revolutionary International which the world proletariat needs to achieve its objectives.

2) Adopting a concrete manner to commence, from today, the process of fusion with the LCR, a project which -- maintaining still relative autonomy between the two organizations -- is expressed essentially by the formation of a unified central committee (of which one third of the members have been chosen in the Seventh Assembly) and the publication on a national scale of the public organs (Combate and Comunismo) as organs of the unified LCR-ETA VI leadership.

The Seventh Assembly of ETA VI has decided, likewise, that



the unified central committee will decide the concrete forms (statutes) under which we will ask for our integration in the Fourth International, based on our resolutions and those of the Third Congress of the LCR, beginning with our direct and active participation in the Tenth World Congress.

We would like to indicate that the comrades of the Communist League (f.s.f.i.) and, above all, of the LCR (s.o.f.i.) played a fundamental role in overcoming all the obstacles we found on the path of making our old nationalist ETA a Trotskyist organization.

We believe that this is a correct and valuable application in practice of the orientation of the IEC of the Fourth International for creation of sections not only through lineal growth of the primitive Trotskyist nucleus, but also through bringing centrist organizations closer, but only when this coming together is realized on the basis of firmly maintaining the organizational and political principles of revolutionary Marxism.

Long Live the Fourth International!

Iraultza Ala Hil!

October 1973  
Leadership of ETA VI

1. This autonomy will be maintained until the holding of a fusion congress which approves the total unification of our two organizations. There, the statutes and name of the new organization, like its leadership bodies, will be decided upon by the totality of the delegates coming from the two organizations.

To the United Secretariat of the Fourth International

The objective of this letter is to answer the accusations made by the Communist League (Spain) and the ex-tendency pro-Communist League (LC) of our organization, the accusation of illegal and factional bureaucratism. Possibly when you receive this letter you will have in your hands one or various written accusations along these lines. Because of this we consider it opportune to clarify all the questions beginning with the conditions under which the assembly was held in order to then go on to what occurred at it.

1) At our last congress (second part of the Sixth Assembly), held at the end of 1972, it was decided not to paralyze the internal debate, but to continue and deepen it with the objective of overcoming, as soon as possible, the centrist context within which -- and we were conscious of it -- we still found ourselves. The type of debate which was approved at that congress was limited to choosing between what we could call "the Trotskyist currents."

At the beginning the only defined current that existed was the one maintaining positions approximating those of the LCR. Later, the internal debate received a new impulse when a pro-LC tendency was constituted, both tendencies being definitively structured at the beginning of the summer (on June 17 the platform of the pro-LCR tendency was submitted; and July 11 that of the pro-LC tendency).

Therefore, the duration of the internal debate was nine months (from the beginning of January until the end of the summer), the last three months with two structured tendencies, a time-span we believe amply sufficient for the preparation of a congress.

Another fact which must be taken into account is that at the time of its constitution the pro-LC tendency asked for a minimum of three weeks postponement, the Central Committee decided to postpone a month and a half, twice the time requested by the comrades.

The comrades of the pro-LC tendency criticized as factional a decision of the leadership in reference to trips by the tendency. The problem was posed in the following manner.

a. - The two tendencies had the right to visit all the cells in the organization, it was obligatory to attend all the meetings called by either of the two tendencies.

b. - That is how it was done, without any problem, in Vizcaya and Navarre.

c. - In Guipuzcoa ( a province that suffers the strongest repression and police control of the entire country) the comrades missed ten appointments, altering the normal organizational functioning of the organization and placing the members of that province in danger.

d. - On this basis, the provincial Committee of Guipuzcoa asked and obtained from the Executive Committee a regulation that from then on if the comrades in that province called new meetings, attendance would be optional. That is to say: each cell would decide whether to attend or not, without the possibility of disciplinary action being taken against them for not being present.

e. - The Central Committee ratified this decision.



2) The development of the Assembly.

a) At the beginning of the assembly the comrades of the pro-LC tendency, before the meeting constituted itself as a Congress, proposed the postponement of the meeting because in their view the necessary requirements for a democratic assembly had not been met and the organization had not reached a sufficient understanding of the topics in debate. They based the above affirmations on the following:

I) Documents

The fact that the last two bulletins had been distributed to the organization only two or three weeks before the congress, and that the text of their tendency, "Towards the Revolutionary General Strike" -- their most important document according to the pro-LC tendency was distributed to the organization one week prior to the congress, meaning that the minimum time required by the statutes of the Fourth International had not been met.

Regarding the above it is necessary to point out that:

--According to the decision of the Central Committee, all the documents had to be submitted to the Congress Committee (a Parity Commission to prepare the congress of one delegate for each tendency) by the first of September.

--In this Congress Committee it was decided by both tendencies that in order to better counterpose the two alternative positions we would include documents from both tendencies on the same topics in the different internal bulletins. The comrades systematically failed to comply with this decision, obstructing the clearness of the debate, delaying the publication of bulletins and disorganizing the work of the internal publication apparatus.

--The pro-LCR tendency handed in all of its documents within the time specified. The pro-LC tendency handed in one text ("Towards the Revolutionary General Strike") approximately 15 days after the deadline. Nevertheless, since the comrades affirmed that this was their main document, it was published (not being planned, it created a new disruption for the internal publication apparatus). This is the history of the text distributed one week prior to the congress.

The argument of the comrades that this failure to comply was due to their being swamped with tasks that they had to confront is annulled if we keep in mind that the pro-LC tendency collected internal documents of the LC and presented them as texts of its tendency (for example, the document "Towards the Revolutionary General Strike" presented to the Congress Committee was composed of some pages in handwriting, others by typewriter, and most by photocopies coming from the LC). We do not at any time criticize this method of functioning by the tendency. What we do criticize is that, while not preparing their own documents, they used the pretext that the amount of work they had to do prevented them from complying with their organizational obligations.

-- Finally, there have been some documents of each tendency in the discussion (that is to say, texts not presented as resolutions) that have not appeared. This is due to an overload of work for the internal publications apparatus, the disorder produced by the attitude of the pro-LC comrades and to the clandestine situation within which we work which makes



it impossible to function as well as we would like.

## II) Votes

In the second part of the Fourth Assembly it was decided that in order to promote political clarification in the organization, we would give privileges to the tendencies present in the congress. This assumed that the relationship between members and delegates would be less for the election of delegates by tendencies than for the election of delegates through the province structures (the members not belonging to any tendency participated in these).

Later the Central Committee lowered the differential, finally leaving it as follows:

- for every three members of a tendency -- one delegate.
- for every four members not of a tendency -- one delegate.

Regarding this we have to make the following clarification:

The decision to give special privileges to the tendencies formed, as we have said at our last congress, must be placed in the context in which it was adopted: It was an organization which -- through its split with the radical nationalism of the old ETA prior to the Fourth Assembly -- struggled to end the centrism and eclecticism that had characterized the immediately previous state. It was a unanimous decision of that congress (end of 1972) aimed at using all of its resources to make a definitive decision for a concrete alternative, not only ideological and political, but also -- and before all else -- organizational by means of the necessary internal debate. Since there was no tradition of internal debates, the measure was aimed at giving privileges not to one or another organizational proposal (that is to say, one or another tendency that in turn would mean one or another organizational proposal could be raised) but instead to the sectors of the organization structured in the only tendencies capable of presenting an overall alternative.

Finally, we should note that of all the delegates to the congress one-tenth belonged to the pro-IC tendency, eight-tenths to the pro-ICR tendency, and one-tenth to neither.

III) Lastly, the comrades said the debate by the leadership as projected was false because it separated the national from the international debate which was left for a future time. According to them, we should have carried out a national and international debate at the same time, because the fundamental difference raised was the method of constructing the party, all of which was based on the two different interpretations of the meaning of the Transitional Program.

We are convinced that in the last analysis there is no separation between the national and international debate, between the positions held on one side and the other. But it violated all logic to think that you can take up both aspects of the debate at the same time. From the organizational point of view, in the actual development of the sections and sympathizing groups of the Fourth International, it would be political suicide not to see the specifics of the international debate in relationship to the situation in the different countries where there are organizations that adhere to the Fourth International.



Because of this we believe that the statutes of the Fourth International are correct where they impose at the international level specific, concrete regulations for the world congress with its own discussion period, publication of documents determined by the agenda of the world congress and with the election of delegates on the basis of the positions maintained in the international debate.

Along these lines the leadership of our organization, like that of the ICR, assured that the unified Central Committee will organize the distribution of the international discussion documents and will use all the resources necessary to produce a real debate throughout the entire organization and guarantee that the delegates who attend the Tenth World Congress will be chosen by the entire organization according to the specific regulations.

Regarding these arguments, nine-tenths of the delegates participating (that is all except those of the pro-LC minority) adopted the constitution of the Seventh Assembly of ETA VI.

3) The abandonment of the organization by the pro-LC tendency.

Following the logic of its previous arguments, the pro-LC comrades proposed in the congress that, considering that the discussion could not be settled, their condition for remaining in the organization was that they be allowed to continue as a tendency and function as such.

The assembly took the position that, although it may be that in a Trotskyist organization you can never terminate a discussion, the tendencies are -- after a congress--- automatically eliminated until the new leadership bodies of the organization determine the opening of a new tendency debate and organize the concrete basis for its realization.

In this sense, the congress affirmed that the guarantee of the right to a tendency no longer existed because:

1) The functioning of tendencies in the democratic debate, such as existed in the period of discussion prior to the congress.

2) As a dissolved tendency, the comrades of the pro-LC would have one-sixth representation in the Euskadi (Basque) leadership (a proposal which at first the said comrades agreed to).

3) The right to constitute themselves as a new tendency in the next period of discussion on the international questions which will be opened by the unified Central Committee.

Refusing to accept this decision of the congress and refusing to dissolve their tendency, the comrades of the pro-LC abandoned the organization.

We should clarify that the congress considered that only the delegates present in the congress had abandoned ETA VI, not the whole tendency. But it was noted, as the pro-LC delegates clarified, they had consulted the whole tendency on this eventuality, all the pro-LC comrades deciding to leave the ranks of the organization should the condition they demanded in order to remain in the organization not be accepted by the congress -- as occurred.

c) One last point regarding the intervention at the end of the congress by the comrade of the LC invited to our congress.



The members of the pro-LCR tendency had taken the floor, declaring that the initial position of the pro-LC comrades, that they would remain in the ETA VI, could only be considered an opportunist maneuver.

Totally falsifying the context of the said intervention by pro-LCR tendency members, the LC comrade accused the congress of maintaining a factionalist stance not only toward the pro-LC tendency but also in respect to the minority in the Fourth International and that this would be a very important point when an investigation on the legality of our congress was opened. In order to avoid this type of argumentation we would like to show that:

a) The accusation of opportunism was (as previous facts proved)<sup>2</sup> that these comrades would stay within ETA VI only for factional reasons, not because of any intent to fortify and construct the organization, accepting the discipline of the resolutions of the congress.

b) But, in any case, this logic had to prove itself in practice. Thus the two members of the pro-LC tendency itself first proposed that one-sixth of the new leadership in Euskadi be based on what would be a pro-LC ex-tendency.

October 1973  
ETA VI Leadership

- 1) Actually we know that the ex-pro-LC tendency wrote to the Control Commission of the Fourth International, it does not surprise us that at that moment the organization had not yet adhered to the Fourth International.
- 2) See annex 1. [We have not received it.]

COPY

COPY

COPY

Bombay  
17 November '73

Dear Comrade,

Thank you for sending me a copy of the "Draft Political Resolution" submitted by the IEC Majority Tendency which has since been published in the "IIDB." I am sorry I could not reply to you immediately as I was out of the city in connection with trade union work and did not have adequate time to study the document along with other comrades.

You are perhaps aware that the national conference of our section has been convened to meet in the first week of December (1 to 3) at Baroda when the differences in the FI leadership will be considered and a formal stand on them taken. Meanwhile Comrade Tariq has been sent here on behalf of the IEC majority. We had discussions with him also. He is expected to leave for Japan and on his way back might stop over here to attend the conference.

We did not know this earlier. I am intimating to you so that a representative of the LTF also can participate in our deliberations if it is possible. It may be helpful to have a balanced discussion on the differences. You may discuss this with other comrades and let us know whether it is possible to send anyone. Unfortunately there is not much time for you to make the preparations.

Now my personal views about the "Draft Political Resolution": I think the document has been prepared by the IEC majority with a view to avoiding a direct confrontation with the minority positions on crucial issues involved in the controversy. The one is conciliatory. There is no direct reference to the strategy of "armed struggle" in Latin American countries and "minority violence" in European countries. The relationship with the so-called "new mass vanguard" in advanced capitalist countries has been more clearly explained. The formulations on the characterisation of the Chinese CP has been made somewhat differently. That is not to say that the differences on the key tactical and organisational questions have disappeared.

In fact the statement of the IEC majority "On the question of armed struggle in Latin America" (IIDB Vol. X, No. 20) reiterates the earlier concepts though in a different manner. Happily there is some healthy self-criticism made by the IEC majority about its organisational intervention in Latin America sections. The new emphasis seems to be on the "strategy of armed struggle" being "combined with the struggle for the transitional programme as a whole."

After reading the IEC majority tendency's "Reply to the Minority's Faction Declaration," I gain the impression that even on the concept of a centralised leadership of the FI some attempt has been made to accommodate the minority criticism, especially in the relationship of the centre with national sections. In other words, I consider the "draft political resolution" as a compromise -- despite the belligerent language used -- and it can serve as a basis for healthy discussion.

We have made our views clear on the differences in the international leadership. The differences centre around essentially issues of a tactical nature and therefore can be con-



tained within a common international organisation. We are opposed to any split in the FI at the crucial juncture when we are likely to have a breakthrough on a global scale. We have welcomed what has rather than been a "massive exchange" of documents insofar as they have served as a big source of education of the new recruits to the FI movement.

Our appeal to all concerned is that these differences should not be stretched to the point of a split. Much of the bitterness, to my mind, has been caused by the conflicts that exist in different national sections (Argentina, Canada, Britain, etc.) between different tendencies rather than by differences at the leadership level. I think you comrades in the SWP, who have been trained in the old traditions of the Trotskyist movement, have a special responsibility in maintaining organisational unity. The bulk of the cadres that have come into the movement in European sections are new to the FI traditions. But it will be a big mistake to drive them out of the movement by creating the atmosphere of a split. A split will prove more damaging to the European sections than what it seems today and despite the "united approach" they have adopted in relation to the minority tendency.

In a sense, I think the political struggle conducted by the minority on a principled basis has yielded positive results. The IEC majority has been compelled to modify its earlier positions and also admit its mistakes at least on issues like its relationship with PRT, etc. Now that the PRT is out of the FI fold there is evidently a new situation even in Latin America.

From my discussions with Ernest in August and with Tariq now, one thing that seems to worry the IEC majority most is the fear that the LT Faction, if it remains a minority, would not honour the verdict of the 10th World Congress and pave the way for a virtual split. We on our part have categorically asserted that the LTF with which we are politically associated would not take such a course. They complain that there are "hot-heads" in the LTF who are spoiling for a split. To that our response was that there are "hot-heads" in the IEC majority tendency also that are spoiling for a split without understanding the deeper implications of such a course. The "Barzman letter," apart from revealing the sectarian attitude of some elements in the IEC majority, at least confirms a basic fact that senior comrades like Ernest are anxious to avert a split. We cannot deny that this is a healthy approach. I, therefore, feel that the LTF must make it explicitly clear that it would abide by the general political line that will be adopted by the world congress while continuing the debate internally whatever be its status after the Congress. That would disarm the "hot-heads" in the IEC majority who are now conducting vituperative campaign against the minority. The FI sections in many countries have yet to acquire the mass bases to enable them to intervene in mass movements. Mistakes will certainly be made by different national sections; but it should be the responsibility of the central leadership to correct them and guide them in a sympathetic manner.

This is a bit of loud thinking I am doing. We know our enemies (including the intelligence agencies in different countries) are following our controversy with great interest although the debate cannot reach the militant ranks of other left parties. Even the Soviet intelligence forces seem to be follow-

-3-

ing the debate, from the casual talks we are having with Soviet diplomats here. For one thing all our mail is open to police security. This is perhaps inevitable.

It is necessary to create conditions for a healthy discussion on differences at the world congress. It may be argued that the national sections did not have enough time to study the various documents that have been circulated. In an organisation like the FI, with its limited resources, there will not be a big change even if the debate is continued for a few months longer. But a split in the FI will benefit only the enemies of the revolutionary Trotskyist movement. We would be setting a good example of our functioning as an International based on the principles of democratic centralism if only we decide to work as a united team despite the present differences.

We shall communicate our views to you after our party conference. With revolutionary greetings to all other comrades including Comrades Joe and Reba Hansen.

Yours fraternally,  
s/Kalais



December 6, 1973

Dear Comrade Kalais,

Mary-Alice is out of town for two weeks, so I thought I would reply to your letter of November 17, 1973, addressed to her. You raised several important points that are on comrades' minds, and that should be considered within the leadership of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction. I think there is a need for this kind of discussion and will give you some of my thoughts on the questions you raise.

First of all, on the IEC Majority draft political resolution. As you estimate it, the resolution represents a bit of a retreat -- "avoiding a direct confrontation with the minority positions on crucial issues involved in the controversy." In one sense, you are right about this, but I think it is a mistake to view it as a "compromise," as you describe it later.

If it indeed represented an effort at reaching a real compromise, there would be similar indications in other documents written by the IEC Majority at about the same time. But this is the only document open to such an interpretation.

As I see it, the IEC Majority political resolution is designed to skate around and camouflage some of the political differences. All the other documents of the IEC Majority show that these differences have not diminished.

For example, in the same bulletin the IEC Majority document on armed struggle in Latin America reads like an addendum to the political resolution. It reaffirms the line of the last world congress. Its criticisms of the PRT (C) are basically only tactical. Considered by itself, the IEC Majority political resolution evades this question. The intent seems to be to shift the dispute over the guerrilla warfare line away from the political resolution so those who are in opposition on this question (their numbers are increasing) might vote for it while those who support the guerrilla warfare line can also vote for it in good conscience, knowing that the matter is handled separately. By this sleight-of-hand a key question that objectively demands to be included in the political resolution is made to disappear.

Similarly with respect to the extension of the ultraleft error to Europe most clearly expressed under the rubric of "minority violence." The IEC Majority political resolution does not use this term. It uses "initiatives in action." But the supporters of "minority violence" know that this is Aesopian language. This becomes quite clear on reading "Let's Discuss Political Differences, Not Old Wives' Tales" in the same bulletin, which explicitly favors "minority violence." (The endorsement is in the form of a complaint that we are "denying" the European sections the "right" to conduct acts of minority violence. See page 27.)

In addition, in "Two Ways of Constructing the Revolutionary Marxist Party and Engaging It in Action," Pierre Frank explicitly defends the firebombing of the Argentine embassy in France in August 1972, following the Trelew massacre of political prisoners in Argentina. He also defends a similar action taken against the Honeywell-Bull corporation offices in France because of their complicity in the Vietnam war. Here is what he says:

"In our opinion, the crime of Trelew required an immediate

response and, as everyone knows, one cannot always summon up mass demonstrations. Thus the question of a vigorous action was posed, and we were of the opinion that the Trelew crime required more than a telegram or a customary gesture. But in the question of Honeywell-Bull, one finds a problem posed that Comrade Mary-Alice didn't seem to suspect. Why did revolutionary militants attack this American firm if not because it made material used against the Vietnamese revolution? We are for the defense and victory of that revolution, of the workers state of Vietnam. On this question we are not just for mass actions but also for the sabotage of the capitalist troops and of their armament....

"The action against Honeywell-Bull, symbolic as it had been, fell into this category...and one can simply regret that there weren't more of them and more vigorous ones." (IIDB, Vol. X, No. 14, p. 10.)

That line, clearly expressed by Pierre Frank, is not rejected in the IEC Majority political resolution. The question is evaded.

What has happened is that in face of the criticism from us, the IEC Majority has drawn back from such open advocacy of guerrillaism as was noticeable at the time of the Sallustro affair. This is all to the good, of course. But so far, there is no evidence that they have changed their line on minority violence or guerrilla warfare. Rather, under pressure from us, they have begun to make some adjustments in the presentation of that line. In the political resolution, the IEC Majority speaks in a more orthodox way. That is all.

Only in that sense does the IEC Majority political resolution avoid a direct confrontation with our positions. But still there is no clear rejection of the type of "minority violence" activities that Pierre Frank and others endorse. Instead, the ambiguities and evasions in the document provide cover for them.

This type of document, which can be interpreted to mean all things to all people, stands in the way of clarity. More than ever, we need clear documents, documents that mean exactly what they say. How else are we to avoid a repetition in Europe of what happened in Latin America? With new disasters explained away with a few words about "elliptical and synthetic" formulas? I don't think we can afford to do that.

I am enclosing a copy of an article that Geoff Mirelowitz of the YSA has submitted to the YSA pre-convention discussion bulletin. It is a critique of the IEC Majority draft political resolution. He notes in particular the way in which the militarist deviation of the IEC Majority affected their analyses of Vietnam and Chile.

\* \* \*

On the organizational questions.

Here, in my opinion, the new IEC Majority document, "Let's Discuss Political Differences, Not Old Wives' Tales," is of special significance. This document, it seems to me, represents a big step backward from the ten-point agreement reached unanimously at the September United Secretariat meeting. In tone and spirit, "Let's Discuss..." represents a lamentable lapse by the IEC Majority. Its misrepresentations along with its bellicose language cannot help but give a green light to those in the IEC Majority who believe a split is inevitable, perhaps even desirable, and are willing to



drive ahead disregarding the dangers.

I think that the IEC Majority supporters who just split from the Canadian section took it that way. I'm also convinced that the decision to split was not just an internal Canadian decision by the supporters of the IEC Majority in Canada. Undoubtedly they got bad advice from some of their cothinkers in Europe. And no advice from others who could have stopped them but didn't.

The Barzman letter, you observe, indicates that "senior comrades like Ernest are anxious to avert a split." Barzman's report is strong evidence for the accuracy of this impression, particularly since Barzman indicated that there is a directly opposite view in the IEC Majority; that is, some of the leaders are spoiling for a split. This places heavy responsibility on comrades like Ernest. The greatest danger lies in the fact that Ernest in particular does not seem to be rising to the occasion and exercising leadership in the responsible way required. For instance, he did not do anything to try to avert the split in Canada. You know, the leadership of the Canadian section had become very worried about the deteriorating situation and appealed to him beforehand to intervene. They were certain that his intervention would be decisive. But he simply didn't do anything. What do good intentions matter, if nothing is done to implement them?

Meanwhile, the IEC Majority produced "Let's Discuss...". I take it that the author of that was Pierre Frank, who is "senior" to Ernest. That article certainly did not help restrain the wing of the IEC Majority who prefer a split, as Barzman indicated in his letter.

What is motivating those who prefer a split and who seem to be setting the line in practice -- to judge from what happened in Canada -- is the desire to break free from our pressure which constrains them from moving away from the methods of the Transitional Program.

They are, it seems to me, becoming more not less responsive to the moods and pressures of the ultraleft milieu they are working in. They see great possibilities if only they were able to move more freely in this milieu.

"If only," they think, "if only we could be free of those propagandistic, conservative, traditionalist-minded, archeo-Trotskyists, then we could really advance."

It comes through in the "Let's Discuss..." document, where the author talks about minority violence. "By retreating from this turn and by reducing the role of our sections, as such, to a propaganda role, the minority actually denies them the right to take any action on their own, including, of course, any action of minority violence." (My emphasis -- IIDB Vol. X, No. 20, p. 27.)

How revealing! In what way do we deny the sections the right to take any action on their own? The only thing standing in the way is the spotlight of political criticism we throw on minority violence as a deviation from the method of the Transitional Program.

The LTF has said before, and we say again, that a split would be unjustified. But I do not agree with the statement in your letter that "the differences center around essentially issues of a tactical nature." The differences are political. Moreover, they are deepening. They are even beginning to touch on our theoretical



evaluation of such questions as Stalinism and the postwar over-  
turns of capitalism. I think Joe's document proves this case well.  
The different positions, as expressed in the written documents we  
have before us, have not, however, reached the point where a split  
is justifiable on political grounds. That is centrally important  
to us and why we oppose a split.

But this is all the more reason to cool down the atmosphere.  
Organizational measures, no matter what their intent, cannot solve  
the leadership crisis now facing the International. Only through  
further clarification of the issues at stake can we hope to find  
a solution.

The author of "Let's Discuss..." takes just the opposite ap-  
proach. To him, the debate itself, and not the political differ-  
ences and the crisis in leadership, is the source of tension and  
danger. Here is how he puts it: "On the contrary, prolonging the  
debate well beyond the limit provided for by the statutes is now  
provoking a cumulative tension that is resulting in national splits."  
And what is the solution to the "problem" of too much discussion?  
"It is now necessary to pull the emergency cord on this dangerous  
process, reverse the engines, and open up a period of detente in  
which public activity and building the International will take  
precedence over internal debate." (Page 23.)

But on what line is public activity to take place? That is  
the question of questions.

"Democratic centralism" -- at least the IEC Majority's con-  
cept of it -- is the emergency cord the author of "Let's Discuss  
..." has in mind. And that, too, is reason for disquiet. For, in  
addition to the highly factional tone that you pointed out in the  
"Let's Discuss..." document, it also lays out with considerable  
explicitness a concept of democratic centralism that cannot facili-  
tate building the Fourth International. I do not at all agree with  
your estimate that the IEC Majority has made an attempt in this  
document to "accommodate the minority criticism, especially in the  
relationship of the center with national sections." It seems to  
me they have done the contrary.

Will it now be considered a violation of democratic centralism  
for Peter Camejo to write an article in the ISR critical of Gue-  
varaism? Will it be permissible for Pierre Rousset to publish a  
book in France arguing that the Vietnamese CP is non-Stalinist,  
but a violation of democratic centralism for the ISR to run a  
critical review of that book? Talk about a double standard! If  
either of these is a violation of democratic centralism, then  
every section violates democratic centralism when it publishes  
analyses that do not always conform to the positions of the major-  
ity on current events. What would imposition of centralism of that  
kind do to the relation between the center and the sections?

A good example is the Sallustro kidnapping. The Militant,  
standing on the position that kidnapping is not in the tradition  
of Marxism, called attention to its ineffectiveness as a tactic.  
The author of "Let's Discuss..." implies that publishing an edito-  
rial of that nature was not in keeping with the norms of the  
Fourth International. (He says nothing, naturally, about the in-  
appropriateness of the kidnapping itself, or of the editorials  
and articles in the newspapers of the European sections hailing  
this terrorist action as Trotskyist.) We have said, and we mean  
it, that we would run a similar editorial again under similar



circumstances. Would that put us in violation of democratic centralism, or just double-standard democratic centralism?

If these are examples of the type of democratic centralism that the IEC Majority wants to impose after the world congress, then it is a "democratic centralism" that is not in keeping with the previous norms of the International or its statutes. And if that is the case, then the IEC Majority should say so, because it means changing the statutes and it means going counter to the spirit and the letter of the unanimous 10-point agreement reached at the September 1973 United Secretariat meeting.

You say, "...one thing that seems to worry the IEC Majority most is the fear that the LT Faction, if it remains a minority, would not honor the verdict of the 10th world congress and pave the way for a virtual split."

Will we accept the authority of the decisions of the coming world congress? Yes, if it is a democratic world congress. Whether it will be a democratic and authoritative world congress remains to be seen. What are the conditions that would make it such? They have already been specified. The April 1973 unanimous United Secretariat statement and the unanimously agreed upon 10 points of the September United Secretariat set forth the conditions for a democratic and authoritative world congress. What more need we say? If these conditions are met, then both sides agree that the decisions of the world congress can be considered authoritative.

The big danger to unity stems not from any unwillingness on our part to accept as authoritative the decisions of a world congress that conforms to these unanimously agreed upon conditions. The big danger stems from the desire of the split-minded wing of the IEC Majority faction to get rid of our pressure, no matter what the consequences.

\* \* \*

Well, this has been another long letter. Enough for now. But the issues you raised are important. Write and let me know what you think.

I assume that you meant to bring your thinking to the attention of the leadership of the LTF. So we are sending a copy of your letter and my thoughts on it to the steering committee.

Regards,  
s/Gus