

New York, N.Y. 10014
April 11, 1974

TO THE STEERING COMMITTEE OF THE LENINIST-TROTSKYIST FACTION

Dear Comrades,

Enclosed are two items relating to the recently held convention of the GIM, German section of the Fourth International. The first is a letter from the Kompass Tendency in the GIM to the United Secretariat. The second is a report on the convention by Comrade Johnson.

Comradely,

Mary-Alice
Mary-Alice Waters

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

KOMPASS
Tendenz in der GIM

Herbert Obenland
D-6000 Frankfurt/M
Nordendstrasse 30

To the
United Secretariat

March 29, 1974

As you probably are informed by the leadership of the German section, the outcome of the 5th National Convention of the Gruppe Internationale Marxisten (GIM), German section of 4th International, was the following:

Total number of votes, represented by delegates present: 305

	for	percent	against	abst.	not voting
"Program for Action" of the Internationalist Tendency	141	46.2%	156	8	-
"Perspective Document" of the Kompass tendency	136	44.6%	157	4	8
"Political Resolution" of the IT-tendency	25	8.2%	269	9	2

The Convention took the following decisions:

- 1.-to give the IT as the biggest minority a majority in the new Central Committee (full members 16-12-2 = 30; cand. memb, 5-4-1=10) and 50% representation in the ControlCommission (3-2-1=5)
adopted with few votes against and abstentions
- 2.-that the latest date for the next GIM-Convention will be January 1975; adopted unanimously
- 3.-to publish all three documents together with an introduction written by the new P.B. with consultation of the 3 tendencies
adopted with a majority of appr. 20 to 25 votes
- 4.-to continue the literary discussion limited to 50 pages per month; to reopen the oral discussion 3 month before the next convention
adopted with a majority of appr. 20 to 25 votes

All these 4 decisions resulted from motions made by the Kompass tendency.

There are no differences on the question of the results of the NC and the authority of the NC-decisions.

But there are obviously differences in the question of the interpretation of the result and the decisions. Such differences were expressed by Central Committee members of the I-tendency.

To help to prevent the German section from going into a severe crisis after the Convention, we therefore ask the United Secretariat to answer the following two questions. These answers should be not ambiguous or open to different interpretations, and should be brought to the knowledge of the membership of the German section.

- 1.The IT-document got 141 votes for and 156 votes (an absolute

2.

majority) against. Does this mean, that this document is adopted or rejected by the National Convention?

2.The other tendencies gave the IT as the strongest minority a majority in the new Central Committee. Was this dependend on the decision of the Convention, e.g. the other tendencies, or was this a granted right of the IT to get this majority?

For the steering committee

s/Arnold

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

April 4, 1974

Dear Comrades,

Just a short note on the conclusion of the German conference. The final result on the voting was 141 for the IMT, 136 for Kompass and 25 for the LTT. This is the number of members not delegates. It does not include candidates, that is anyone who joined after October 1. There are about 75 candidates. Also about 10 or 15 did not vote.

Herwart had indicated that he thought Kompass would agree to form the majority of the leadership if the difference were only 2 or 3. When the results of the vote were announced, Herwart immediately made a proposal that the largest minority form the leadership. This appeared to be a proposal from the Kompass leadership. His proposal for the Central Committee was 16 IMT, 12 Kompass and 2 LTT. He also proposed that since all documents were defeated there was no way to distinguish between the documents. Therefore the main document of each tendency should be published at the same time with an introduction written jointly by the three tendencies. Also a convention should be held in November and the discussion bulletin remain open. This eventually passed with amendments that the convention be no later than January and the bulletin be limited to 50 pages a month.

However, there was first a discussion that tended to harden the factional lines. Herwart apparently had not consulted on his proposal in advance. After a recess for a caucus, Mintoff opposed three points. 1. There had to be some way of making the IMT document more important for example publishing it first. 2. the convention could not be held that quickly and the new leadership should decide when to hold it. 3. The discussion should be closed now and the new leadership should decide when to open it.

Herwart and Dieter opposed this along the lines that all documents were defeated. We must have a clear leadership which will test its line, but you cannot imply that the convention approved one line over any other. Also since the convention had rejected all lines the discussion had to continue and we needed a relatively quick convention. This convention had to decide these questions. What was clear was that no one trusted the IMT to make an objective decision.

Pierre then spoke. He said that he had refrained from the discussion till now on the political debate, but the role of the international leadership was to help sections solve organizational problems like this. He pointed to the successful intervention in Britain. The majority of his contribution was his "personal opinion" that he saw no need for a lot of continued discussion. He tended to favor all of Mintoff's proposals. His contribution was not well received by the majority of people there.

The LTT members think that Herwart's insistence on the 2 to 3 difference before he would accept the leadership indicates that he really did not want the leadership. They also think it is possible that Kompass did not have enough people who would move to Frankfurt to provide a day to day leadership. The 3 or 4 central Kompass leaders declined to serve on the Political Bureau at the Central Committee meeting following the convention. Here Pierre attacked them for having a similar policy as the LTT toward

2.

the US and the bureau. I decided not to talk to Herwart the next day because I felt it just might look like we were putting too much pressure on him. No one has seen Herwart since the conf.

I think the LTT did well. What they attempted to do was put forward a positive approach for activity for the section. They concentrated on youth work, women's liberation and a balance sheet of Vietnam work for a guide to anti-imperialist work. Seven different comrades made contributions, most of them for the first time. They had planned and organized their contributions and collaborated in their preparation. This is really their first experience with a convention because in reality there was no pre World Congress convention.

They were pleased with the results and feel they have further opportunities to win support. My impression is that the Kompass supporters are very open to our ideas and the results of this conference will increase their openness. Most of them remain quite eager to talk to North Americans and Argentines.

Also Krasno was there. He said that the central leadership had dissolved Contre le Courrant. The reason was that they were a national tendency on international issues. The international discussion is closed there now and the national discussion has not opened. Therefore there is no basis for their existence. This of course does not apply to the majority or the LTF because they are international tendencies.

Comradely,

Johnson