

May 10, 1974

To the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction Steering Committee

Dear Comrades,

Attached are two letters which summarize much of the discussion that took place at the April 20 meeting of the United Secretariat. The first is a letter from Mary-Alice to Ernest written after an informal discussion on April 21. The second is a letter from Ernest to Joe Hansen, which was received May 7.

Ernest's letter recapitulates the discussion from his point of view. A few additional comments are in order.

* * *

1. The formal United Secretariat meeting was less than five hours from start to adjournment. The only substantive discussion concerned the French presidential elections and the line of the newly formed Front Communiste Révolutionnaire.

At the United Secretariat meeting itself comrades of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction (Johnson, Marcel, Martínez, Galois and Thérèse) sought to get an accurate picture of the line of the French comrades, probing to see how they justified calling for a vote for Mitterrand on the second round of the elections and whether there was agreement on this policy amongst the leadership of the IMT.

Subsequently several comrades spent additional time in Paris, discussing with the supporters of the LTF there, talking with other comrades in the FCR, attending some of the election activities, and gathering election material from all the various groups and currents.

On the basis of the information assembled from these discussions and a reading of the French press -- both bourgeois and workers -- the comrades on the LTF bureau feel very strongly that the United Secretariat majority is making a fundamental error in supporting the French leadership's call for a vote for Mitterrand on the second round.

Mitterrand is formally running as the candidate of the Socialist Party. But the SP is not breaking from the Union de la Gauche which we have characterized as an embryonic popular front. On the contrary, Mitterrand is the de facto candidate of the Union of the Left, put forward as their common standard bearer in a bid to realize the class-collaborationist governmental project of the Union of the Left. In such a situation, to call for a vote for Mitterrand on the pretext that he is the candidate of the Socialist Party can only stand in the way of explaining to the French working class the real dangers inherent in the popular front Union of the Left, which is not a united front of the working class standing in opposition to the bourgeois political machine.

In the 1973 legislative elections it was possible to call for a vote for the candidates of the CP and SP as a class vote, counterposing this to a vote for the Union of the Left. In the

2.

current presidential elections such an attempted counterposition becomes nothing but a left cover for support to a popular-front candidate. Only one post is vacant and the French working class is being asked to vote not for a party of their own class but for an individual candidate, who more and more disassociates himself even from his own party in his bid for support from the so-called center groupings of the bourgeoisie, including the "left" de Gaullists. Under these conditions, to call for a vote for Mitterrand can only signify calling for a vote to establish a popular front Union of the Left government. This violates Marxist principles.

At the United Secretariat meeting and at the major public election rally at the Palais des Sports in Paris on April 29, Ernest Mandel made it quite clear that he and the rest of the majority leadership of the international are in complete agreement with the position adopted by the French comrades.

This turn necessitates our following up the educational job begun last year in the letters to the Political Bureau of the Ligue Communiste from the Political Bureau of the Spanish Liga Comunista (SWP Internal Information Bulletin No. 8 in 1973), and from the Political Committee of the SWP (IIDB Vol. X, No. 14). But in the meantime we thought it important to indicate to comrades in the faction leadership our initial judgment on the question of the French elections.

* * *

2. At the United Secretariat meeting we made four additional LTF nominations for the United Secretariat. We informed the secretariat that we would not attempt to comply with the restrictions placed on us at the IEC (i.e., that further nominations had to be "top" American leaders) because we considered that motion to be an attempt to deny us the right to choose our own representatives, a violation of Leninist norms. Since four slots on the United Secretariat had been left open for us by the IEC (cf. IEC minutes sent out April 19) we made four nominations: Arturo, Crandall, Pepe and Williams. We also moved that comrades Martínez and Johnson be immediately added to the bureau of the United Secretariat, and that comrade Josephine be added to the bureau's staff.

There was no discussion of these nominations in the United Secretariat. Ernest simply announced that they would discuss them in their caucus and let us know their response.

The next day during a meeting between Ernest, Duret, Martínez, Johnson and Thérèse, they informed us that they would be willing to accept three of the four nominations, but not comrade Arturo. To justify this new attempt to pick and choose who amongst our leaders they will accept, Ernest advanced the same arguments as those included in his attached letter -- that Arturo, as a consultative IEC member, does not have decisive vote and you cannot include anyone on the United Secretariat who has no vote.

We pointed out that comrades Domingo and Williams as alternate members of the IEC have nothing but a consultative vote, yet they were acceptable as members of the United Secretariat. In fact, alternate members of the IEC have always been included on the United Secretariat despite having no vote. The attempt to

3.

exclude Arturo is a unilateral decision to bar some IEC members from serving on the United Secretariat. The decision violates the most elementary democratic norms, and is in violation of the nine-point agreement adopted by the world congress which explicitly states that "full members and consultative members shall have the same rights in everything except voting." The decision to reject Arturo is simply a new attempt to read the PST out of the Fourth International.

They also reiterated their refusal to place comrade Martínez or comrade Johnson on the bureau unless and until an American is sent to oversee their functioning in Brussels. They thus confirmed their intention to convert the bureau into an instrument of their faction.

None of these specific proposals or nominations from the LTF will appear in the minutes of the April United Secretariat. They refused to allow us to place our nominations in the record unless they could write their response into the minutes. Since the United Secretariat meeting was over, it was agreed to take up this question formally at the May United Secretariat meeting.

* * *

3. We are in the process of preparing a response to Ernest's letter concerning the publication of documents from the world congress. It should be noted that their new "even-handed" formula of no public attacks on any section or sympathizing organization of the Fourth International contradicts their argument against publishing the Argentine balance sheet of the LTF.

Two points are involved in their proposed editing of Joe's counterreport on the question of armed struggle in Latin America. (see report mailed to faction March 25)

In the first paragraph they object to our assertion that their line on armed struggle can not be limited to Latin America, but is in reality a line for the entire world. Ernest informed us that this is a security question because if we make such an assertion then prosecutors in Europe will quote the LTF as an authoritative source in contending that the Fourth International has a "minority violence" line in Europe.

We pointed out that it is not our political judgment of their line, but their own articles, statements, resolutions and actions that pose whatever security problems may be involved.

Comrade Martínez commented that taken at face value the logic of Ernest's position is that it is okay for Latin American comrades to face prosecution for the line adopted by the world congress, but not Europeans.

In the last two paragraphs of the armed struggle report, what is really involved is a subjective reaction to our pointing out the meaning of the position they adopted toward the assassination of Carrero Blanco. They want to eliminate all reference to this question which some of them find embarrassing.

We informed them that we would recast the three paragraphs they object to and remove any genuine security problems, but that we could not accept any political editing of our documents

4.

to remove points they don't like.

As it now stands, what documents will be published and in what edited form remains undecided. Further negotiations may have to be undertaken at the May meeting of the United Secretariat.

* * *

Also enclosed with this mailing is a report from comrade Magan Desai on the activities of our comrades in Gujarat during the recent mass upsurge there.

Comradely,

Mary-Alice

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

Brussels
April 22, 1974

Dear Ernest,

When you return from your speaking engagements in Britain it would be best if you wrote Joe a response to his letter of April 15 regarding the publication of documents from the world congress.

I have given him a preliminary report so that he and other comrades in the ITF leadership can be considering your proposals. However, I think recent experience has convinced us all that it is not wise to rely on comrades' recollections of what happened or what was said in meetings. It's best to have proposals in writing. For that reason I think you should drop Joe a letter summarizing our discussion of April 21.

Secondly, we hope that the comrades of the IMT will not feel compelled to rush into print with the world congress documents before there is time for us to consider your latest proposals and perhaps make alternative suggestions. We recognize the desirability of publishing the documents as rapidly as possible and will do whatever we can to facilitate this. However, it will certainly be more conducive to relaxing tensions within the international if we can arrive at a common judgment on what documents should be published and in what edited form. I would not exclude the possibility of reaching agreement, and it is certainly worth taking a couple of weeks to try and work it out. The importance of printing Quatrieme on May 15 as opposed to June 1, for example, hardly outweighs the importance of trying to resolve so important a question.

At any rate, I will not be back in New York until May 5, so your letter to Joe will not slow things up. It will probably reach New York before I do.

One final point. In addition to the section of the resolution on Argentina dealing with the PST (point 36) there is at least one other section that contains similar accusations and characterizations of the PST. That is point 22 (page 20 of the edited French draft). I would assume from the general tenor of our discussion on Sunday that the comrades of the IEC majority would also agree to delete those references to the PST from the public document. Perhaps in the letter to Joe you could indicate how you would propose to edit point 22 as well.

Comradely,
s/Mary-Alice

cc: Joe

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

April 30, 1974

Dear Joe,

This is to confirm the oral acknowledgment of, and answer to, your letters of April 15 and 16, given to Mary-Alice on April 21. As I had to leave that same evening on a previously planned lecture tour in Britain, I was unable to write this confirmation before my return to Brussels, and asked Mary-Alice to inform you immediately about the contents of my reply.

Contrary to what you assume in your April 15 letter, we are ready to drop from the publicly circulated version of the resolution on Argentina adopted by the Xth World Congress all criticisms made of the P.S.T. We propose to put just suspension marks in point 22, and to replace point 36 with the following sentence: "Point 36 of this resolution concerning the orientation of the PST is published in an Internal Bulletin".

Likewise we are ready to change the passage of the resolution which indicates the reasons why the PRT (Combatiente) was recognized as official section of the FI at the IXth World Congress. We propose the following sentence which seems in strict conformity with the record: "The IXth World Congress recognized the PRT (Combatiente) as representing the continuity of the Argentine section of the FI, because it spoke in the name of a national congress convened by the majority of the previously united section's Central Committee, whereas a minority of that Central Committee, which constituted the "La Verdad" group, refused to recognize the authority of that congress". Is this formula acceptable to you?

However, precisely in the light of our dropping all public criticism of the PST -- whose policies we strongly disagree with, which we consider on several key issues in open breach with leninist principles, and which were condemned by the majority vote of the Xth World Congress -- two conclusions become obvious:

1.-The publication, either of your revised version of the article "Argentina, Bolivia, a Balance-Sheet", or of the final two paragraphs of the minority's counter-report on armed struggle, is totally unacceptable to us (With regard to the first paragraph, a few words' change, as indicated to Mary-Alice, could make publication possible). Both these texts contain sharp attacks on our Bolivian section, on our British section, on our Spanish comrades, attacks which, as you so aptly describe, are fallacious, being based on exaggerations, malicious half-truths and outright misrepresentation. These arguments, characteristic of the most vulgar level of deadend factionalism, were answered in various documents during the discussion preparatory to the world congress and again at the congress itself in such a definitive way, that one would think all responsible leaders of the International would join in blocking any new attempt to revive them.

We would consider any publication of such attacks for public circulation as a public attack on the majority tendency of the F.I. and a public attack upon the decisions of the world congress itself. This would leave us no choice but to print also in public the

2.

various answers such attacks have already received in the internal bulletins of the pre-world-congress discussion, as well as additional replies they make necessary.

It strikes us as really inadmissible that you make such a strong case against publishing criticism of the PST adopted by the World Congress, and then calmly go on requesting the right to publish public criticism of a whole series of organizations of the FI supporting the majority. Such double standards are certainly not favorable to a decrease of tensions in the International.

2.-The resolution on Argentina was adopted by the world congress. The criticism on Moreno's past and present policies were not something subrepticiously introduced into that resolution at the last minute, but were part of the original draft, at least in its general line. They had been widely discussed in the world movement. It is therefore impermissible to suppress them from the record. If we can agree that they should not be publicly circulated -- and this only on the basis of a general rule that all polemics against sections and sympathizing organizations should not be made part of the public record of the Xth World Congress -- they have however to be included in the internal minutes of the 10th World Congress.

We note with surprise that, simultaneously with requesting the suppression of these passages from the publicly circulating version of the resolution on Argentina, you rushed ahead publishing the world congress minutes, without including these non-published parts of the resolution on Argentina which you want us to suppress for the general public. Thus you put the leadership of the FI before the dilemma of either to go ahead with the publication in the magazines of these segments of the resolution on Argentina (thereby sharing responsibility in increasing internal tensions in the movement), or to become party to a falsification of the record of what actually was voted at the 10th world congress.

We cannot accept such a dilemma. We shall therefore include in the French and other language versions of the minutes those parts of the resolution on Argentina which are not published in the magazines of the movement.

We also believe that it was unwise on your side to just send us a copy of the minority faction's statement to be included in the world congress minutes, and then immediately to go ahead and print it, without new consultation of the Center. You explicitly asked for the right to make a statement in reply to the majority statement, and to draft it only after having read that statement. Yet you deny the majority the right to reply to your own statement. We are back at the use of double standards, which are unacceptable to us.

We therefore insist upon the right of the majority tendency to make a short reply to the minority faction's statement, a reply which will only concentrate on disputed facts. We are quite ready to grant you the right to make a like rebuttal, provided it keeps to a short statement of similar length. All this should be included in the same record, as should be the statement on the miners strike in Britain, the Chilean repression, the solidarity with the

3.

Greek students and workers, which the IEC was empowered to make in the name of the Congress.

In order to avoid new additional confusion and endless re-crimination on these matters, we see no other possibility than to ask you to reprint a complete version of the minutes in English, including a clear indication that the previous version was incomplete, be it through no fault of the editors. We are sorry if this involves additional costs, but we are not responsible for this. May we remind you that you requested, and were granted, a similar procedure of reprinting a whole internal pre-world-congress discussion bulletin already published in French (the minority's draft resolution on China), only because some minor editing changes, which could have easily been reprinted in a subsequent bulletin, had not been introduced into your original draft which, in good faith, we had considered to be a definitive one? Surely, as the present matter involves a problem much more important than that previous one -- i.e. the matter of not falsifying the record of what the world congress actually voted on Argentina -- you will accept this request of ours.

We agree to include comrade Pepe's letter on the March 1974 Un. Secr. minutes as annex to the April 1974 minutes, with a short reply by the Bureau which is responsible for editing the minutes.-- To our knowledge, there are no major changes in the printed text of cde Roman's report as compared to his oral presentation; the only possible changes are editorial and very minor ones.

X X X

We do not agree with your interpretation of the reasons why, after the world congress, and contrary to the expressed intentions of both tendencies, there has been a sudden increase in tension. We believe that the responsibility for that increased tension lies squarely on the shoulders of the minority. The refusal to engage its main leaders in the international leadership, and the delay in regularizing its normal participation in the material effort to have a stronger center functioning -- a decision specifically adopted by the world congress -- could only be interpreted by the majority as shirking a major responsibility which it was dutybound to undertake.

We have made it clear many times during the pre-congress discussion and during the congress, that for us the main test for the minority would come after the congress. After having demanded and obtained a volume of internal discussion which, qua duration, cadres involved and resources spent, goes far beyond anything which a revolutionary movement of our size ever did in the past, including the past of Lenin's party itself, the formal ending of the discussion by a majority vote at a democratically convened and elected congress has to imply that thereupon, for a whole period, the stress would be laid upon public activity of party building, along the line of the majority, and that the greatest part of cadres and resources would be devoted to that task.

We understood that the main spokesman for the minority confirmed that common understanding of democratic centralism in his concluding speech at the congress. We expected actions to confirm these intentions. When we however noticed that the minority designated for participation in the leadership bodies of the FI not a

single one of its previous representatives in the United Secretariat, and not a single of its reporters at the world congress, we could not but have serious doubts as to the willingness of the minority to apply its own expressed intentions. When we read your speech delivered before the minority faction caucus in New York of March 12, 1974, we see therein confirmation that you have had second thoughts as to the possibility of applying the normal rules of democratic centralism inside a united world movement, second thoughts which have no relation whatsoever to any "provocative" act of the majority but which are clearly of a political nature, as you say so quite openly. As they turn around a political document which was known to you for months prior to the world congress and which the spokesman of the minority knew (and knew to have been voted) when he made his concluding speech at the World Congress, it seems to us that powerful pressure was brought to bear upon him inside his faction to change his course towards a decrease of tensions, and that these pressures unfortunately have already born fruits.

It is neither a question of the absolute number of minority representatives on the United Secretariat (we made it clear many times that we were quite ready to increase that number, provided the minority designated its real leaders to that body) not a question of the formal right of the minority to designate its own representatives on leadership bodies. It is a question of what is implied by the choice the minority has made of its representatives. For us, it implies a shirking, if not a refusal, to share normal responsibility at leadership level.

We repeat that for us this is the main test: whether the minority is willing to take its share of responsibility in leading cadres and material resources in the leadership of the International, along the line adopted at the 10th world congress. A refusal to do this means, in our eyes, a retreat from Trotsky's concept of an international organization, in the direction of the concept of a loose federation of tendencies or factions. It would imply that the world congress votes and decisions become void of any practical implications for the minority. This would, from the point of view of the majority, degrade the pre-world-congress discussion to the level of exercises of an international debating club. This is not and will never be our concept of building the F.I., and we shall not accept it.

The proposal announced to us at the last United Secretariat meeting of having comrades Pepe, Crandall and Williams nominated as members of the United Secretariat is at last a step in the right direction, of correcting the mistake made by the minority in selecting its representatives in that body from the exclusive point of view of factional convenience and not from the point of view of building the F.I. We accept these proposals. The nomination of comrade Arturo however we cannot accept. It goes against the 10th World Congress agreement. There never was any question of consultative United Secretariat members, all the more so as all IEC members (including consultative ones) have the statutory right to be present at United Secretariat meetings anyway (but not at the Center's expenses). You yourself did not envisage such a novel interpretation of the 10th World Congress agreement, as you yourself abstained from nominating a representative of your faction's strongest component to the United Secretariat, at the IEC meeting

5.

immediately following the world congress.

On the question of the composition of the Bureau we cannot change our position. It is the duty of the minority to show its willingness to participate in the day-to-day leadership of the International by delegating at least one of its key political leaders to such a function. We are perfectly ready to include comrades Johnson and Martinez also among Bureau members, as soon as that additional nomination occurs.

However, to indicate our good will, we are ready to involve comrades Johnson and Martinez -- as well as comrade Samantha as a technical assistant -- immediately in the day-to-day work as members of the leadership team which does the actual Bureau work, on a full-time basis, provided the resources of the Center are increased (on our present resources we would be unable to do so), and provided this increase is not limited to exactly covering the expenses of the minority members of leading bodies (wages + traveling expenses) but includes a reasonable contribution to support the activities of the international center.

Relaxation of tensions could be instantaneous, as soon as we receive adequate proof that the minority respects the general spirit and letter of international democratic centralism rules. After a long period of democratic internal debate, it should now be ready to take a share in the responsibility and costs of building the FI along the line adopted by majority vote at the world congress. We hope that it will live up to this test and that we shall be able to utilize the increased opportunities for strengthening our International in the coming months and years by a common effort.

Fraternally yours,

s/Ernest

Baroda, India
April 12, 1974

Dear Gus,

We had anticipated the mass upsurge in Gujarat ever since December, 1973, when the food supply was disrupted in the hostels located in the campuses. Through our student wing the Study and Struggle Alliance, we had begun to prepare to meet such a situation at Baroda and Surat by organizing our group and likeminded students and teachers around it. But due to numerical weakness and the inexperience of our student comrades we could not face the upsurge in a well-enough way when it erupted here.

During this whole period we were busy up to our necks on the industrial front, agitating for 100% dearness allowances through a couple of workers committees in the textile mills organized by our proletarian comrades. In spite of skyrocketing price hikes and the scarcity of edible goods, none of the left-led workers organizations except us was in the forefront of this struggle. So our tiny group was engaged in it on both the students and workers fronts during this time. On the 10th of January, 1974, under the leadership of a workers committee, a hunger strike for 100% dearness allowances was observed before the office of the millowners federation. We had planned a big demonstration of some hundreds, which is rare and most difficult for leftist trade unions at night. On the same day a bread riot started at Ahmedabad; by night it had engulfed Baroda and other cities. By 8:30 P.M. a curfew was imposed in many cities. From that day up to the 14th of March the major cities of Gujarat remained under continual curfew enforced either by the armed state or center reserve police and occasionally by the army. Since that day we had to gear up our organization to attend to the tasks on the student front in order to be in the mainstream of the student movement.

In spite of our numerical weakness, our student grouplet is fairly well-known among active student circles on campus due to our activity since 1971. Moreover, on the eve of this upsurge our group formed an SMC (Student Mobilizing Committee) in order to project our alternative to the SAC (Students Action Committee) formed by the elected representatives of the university union. The composition of this latter committee consisted of reactionary and rowdy elements backed by a rich person prospering in wine and bootlegging activity. This person was the right hand man of the deposed chief minister, Mr. Patel. This SAC tried hard to incorporate the SMC, in which the SSA (Study and Struggle Alliance) was dominant. The leaders of the SAC even contacted me in order to persuade me to press the SMC to join with the SAC.

Because of the reactionary nature and "goondism" of the leaders of the SAC, our SMC refused to merge with it. We agreed to have joint activities on the basis of agreement, issue by issue. This SAC of Baroda used to indulge in stone-throwing, bus-burning, and creating a panic atmosphere on the sheer strength of a student mob interested in such activities, and stayed away from promoting organization and understanding of the issues involved in this agitation. Hence, the united front reached with the SAC could not last long due to their intolerance of our manner

2.

and way of conducting the struggle. Their undemocratic functioning pushed our group into such a position that the situation was not conducive to carrying out and pursuing our orientation. Our press statements and the distribution of our leaflets were vehemently opposed, with the SAC acting like fascists. Our comrades were threatened. Still we remained part of the mainstream.

By the end of January there was no organized student movement at Baroda. It had petered out due to the policies of the SAC and the limitations of the SMC. The main epicenter of "dis-organizationally organized" agitation was Ahmedabad, where we had contacts among the college teachers, but no student organization, and partially at Surat, where our comrades -- B and the group around him -- became part of the Student Struggle Committee (SSC). B was able to project himself as one of the topmost leaders of it because of his past experience, skill, patience, and ability to apply the art of tactical flexibility that is acceptable within our principles. This has helped us to accumulate basic cadres to the Study and Struggle Alliance there. This has focused attention on us a revolutionary-minded serious grouplet having new perspectives and a healthy left orientation, with a distinct image different than that of the opportunist Communist Party.

After the dissolution of the state assembly of Gujarat, the prestige of the Surat group attracted the attention of Adibasi aborigine students from the rural-based small towns in the Surat area. Our comrades are now trying to build up contacts among them to win them politically, and to extend our initial work among the rural poor.

At Baroda the situation was a bit different. As I mentioned earlier, the mass student agitation had receded at the end of January, 1974, due to the lack of program and impractical direction. Except for rowdy and arrogant leaders and their few "storm troopers," no one from among the mass of students was interested in such agitation. Hence we had to make the choice of continuing the agitation through our student organization, the SSA in order to explain the meaning of the bread riots caused by the price rise and the scarcity of grains among the working-toiling masses and poor strata of our city. This was the only alternative left before us to put forward the correct line for student activity among the masses and to recruit students on this program from these areas. This was the opportune moment to fuse our ideologically molded young comrades with the poor masses through the area in which our workers comrades and their friends reside.

There was both enthusiasm and lack of confidence among our comrades of working class and petty bourgeois origin (students). But we went ahead.

In February -- the month of tension, repression and anxiety for the masses -- our whole party plunged into mobilizing for mass work through street corner meetings, personal contacts, etc., encouraging the formation of "People's Committees" to fight the greedy and tricky grain dealers, the supply department of the government, and police repression in the poor localities. While the other left parties and their student wings confined them-

3.

selves to press statements and unprincipled maneuvers to gain popularity in the nearly dead SAC, we were able, through the SSA, to forge the bond of fighting friendship with toiling masses of the slums and lower income people. By the beginning of March, 1974, Peoples Committees had been formed through strenuous efforts in more than a dozen areas. When the state legislative assembly was dissolved -- due to democratic sentiment of the whole mass of Gujarat -- by the 15th of March, our organizations in the poor people's areas were organizing around the issues that caused the food riots. Since then no students', workers', or political party in Baroda, except for us, had agitated or organized for this. (Of course they do issue their press statements regularly.) On the 9th of March, we were able to organize a small demonstration based on our activities in the workers committee and Peoples Committee. This was a unique experience for us and for them, as dozens of students marched with them shouting the slogan: "Fraternity of Students and Toiling Masses, Zindabad!" [long live!], along with other slogans reflecting the issues and grievances involved.

On the basis of this new experience and enthusiasm a bigger demonstration of 500 was successfully organized on the 29th of March. This was well planned weeks in advance. This time the SSA, the workers committee and the Peoples Committee jointly held a march under their separate banners through the main avenue of the city. The march culminated in a rally before the office of the district collector, to whom a memorandum was submitted describing the harassments caused due to the mismanagement of the supply department of the authority and the mischief of the grain shop merchants. This had a good impact among the student community, teachers, workers, and left parties who now look towards us with respect. Even the CPM, which previously used to neglect us, has started pampering our student and worker cadres. They have offered their student contacts to work in the SSA with the bid to enter healthy competition between the Stalinist and Trotskyist students in the Trotskyist-oriented SSA. This process has begun this month. The same is the case on the workers front where the CP and CPM workers have started a new workers committee in another textile mill under our guidance.

I would humbly assert that we are no more a grouplet confined merely to study-circle and debate-discussions involving a few students and a couple of workers, as these grouplets have started agitation and mass activity which has rallied around dozens of new activists supported by hundreds of followers from their respective sectors.

That means we have multiplied by a fewfold the number who can become our comrades in the course of their politicalization in an organized way. Baroda still remains the pacesetter in many ways for our comrades in different parts of Gujarat. An overall gain is that the SSA has started functioning at Surat and Ahmedabad and will function in more towns in the coming months. A training camp for 100 selected students is being organized by the SSA to be held on April 29, 30 and May 1, 1974, at the headquarters of the SSA. We have already issued 50,000 leaflets explaining our concept of the dissolution of the evils of capitalism and for reconstruction of the new society.

4.

Now we have started extending our program and influence in different groups and sectors of the student community, in mills and factories, and in the lower middle class and toiling masses areas. This limited, but qualitatively new breakthrough has been achieved through the planned efforts and hard work of the last three months. Now we have achieved something, even though it is still meager in comparison with the gigantic tasks we face. Believe it or not, the Communist League of Gujarat is being transformed into a grouplet having limited roots among the masses.

We are planning to celebrate May Day, not in the office, but in the street through processions and mass meetings.

Fraternally yours,

s/Magan Desai