New York
July 18, 1974

TO THE STEERING COMMITTEE OF THE LENINIST TROTSKYIST FACTION

Dear Comrades,

Enclosed with this mailing are:

1. A report on the July 3 meeting of the United Secretariat.

2. United Secretariat minutes prepared by Comrade Johnson.

3. An exchange of correspondence between me and Comrade Walter concerning the IMT's list of nominations for consultative IEC members.

4. An exchange of correspondence between Comrades Pierre Frank and Joe Hansen concerning IP's coverage of the French presidential elections.

5. A statement by former members of the Mezhrayonka Tendency concerning the IMT's declaration on the world congress.

6. A letter from the YSA national leadership to all members of the YSA, informing them of the IT's split from the YSA.

To date there has been no response from the International Majority Tendency to the statement by the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party and its call for a special world congress of the Fourth International.

We have been informed that the leadership of the GIM plans to translate into German and publish several of the key documents concerning the IT split for distribution to the membership of the German section. The Liga Socialista of Mexico and the LSO in Canada plan to publish similar bulletins in Spanish and French. The Spanish and German translations are finished and will be out shortly. The French will take a little longer.

Comradely,

Mary-Alice

TO THE STEERING COMMITTEE OF THE LENINIST TROTSKYIST FACTION

Report on the July 3 United Secretariat Meeting, by Johnson.

No substantive political discussion took place at the July 3 United Secretariat meeting, which lasted only three hours and fifteen minutes. The LTF members present were Johnson, Martínez, and Williams. Only nine of the 14 IMT members were present. Karl did not attend. The points dealt with were Argentina, Portugal, publication of the internal bulletin, United Secretariat minutes, the French elections and finances.

1. Argentina. The longest discussion took place on Argentina. This was broken down into two points: (a) the statement attacking the PST for an "opportunistic and rightist attitude," which was adopted by the majority at the last United Secretariat meeting; and (b) a solidarity campaign with the PST against the murderous attack they face.

a. The majority had clearly decided to publicly issue the statement it had passed at the May United Secretariat meeting. The United Secretariat members who belong to the LTF argued against this on several grounds. First, the PST comrades had informed us they were preparing a reply to the statement, as had been requested by the IEC Majority. In addition, Comrade Arturo had written a letter to the United Secretariat stating that the PST had not signed the "statement of the eight," and correcting this misunderstanding. Finally, because of the situation in Argentina following the death of Perón, the PST leadership was unable to send a comrade to the July 3 United Secretariat meeting to discuss this and other questions directly, as they had planned to do. We pointed out that in these circumstances it would be incorrect to publish any public comment, much less the United Secretariat majority's attack on the PST for "opportunism."

We pointed out that there have already been several public attacks on the PST in the May and June issues of Combate, the paper of the Fracción Roja. In addition, the majority's resolution on the Argentine situation adopted at the world congress (including the section attacking "Morenoism" and the "legalist," "syndicalist, "opportunist," etc., line of the PST) is being publicly circulated in Argentina. Already a process has been set in motion in Argentina that is in open contradiction to the nine-point agreement. Publishing the United Secretariat statement could only accelerate this process. The task of the United Secretariat should be to attempt to reverse this process, not deepen it.

Finally, we pointed out that the public attacks that have already appeared in Argentina may force the PST to defend itself publicly. If the United Secretariat statement is made public, the PST will certainly find it necessary to make its reply public also. Such a public debate is not in the best interests of the Fourth International, and if the IEC Majority goes ahead, they will be assuming responsibility for this step.

Despite these arguments, the majority voted to make their attack public.

b. The second point on Argentina was the projection of a campaign of international solidarity to help the PST against the vio-

lent attacks they are facing. It was reported that articles had appeared in Inprecor and a number of the European papers, and as more information was received it would be published. It was unanimously agreed to call for an international campaign. This includes publicizing as widely as possible the facts about what is happening in Argentina and securing the broadest possible support for the PST.

2. Portugal. Comrade Duret reported that he had been to Portugal. In the discussion it was mentioned that the LCI was preparing the first issue of a legal newspaper and was setting up a headquarters. Comrades were referred to articles in Inprecor numbers 2 and 3 for a political evaluation. Comrade Martinez suggested that in the future when more than one United Secretariat member is present in Portugal, it would be useful if some collaboration could be worked out.

3. Internal Bulletin. Walter made a proposal concerning publication of the 48-page monthly discussion bulletin. At the September 1973 United Secretariat meeting, it was agreed to limit the world congress agenda to five points and conduct a literary discussion on the remaining issues in a 48-page monthly bulletin. This agreement was reaffirmed at the world congress in the nine-point agreement, but no bulletin has yet appeared.

Walter's proposal was to publish five bulletins (one for each month from March to July) with a single topic for each bulletin. However, the proposed material included little in the way of new discussion articles. Instead, it consisted of material such as the world congress minutes, preworld congress discussion material still to be translated and published in French or English, and articles from Avanzada Socialista plus other material relating to the IMT's attack on the PST. The only new discussion articles were two contributions by the Indochinese comrades on the Vietnamese revolution and the Vietnamese Communist Party.

In our opinion, to include old material in the bulletin, or material on subjects other than those previously agreed on, would constitute a violation of the pledge by both sides at the world congress to continue the literary discussion on the specified issues not decided by the congress. We considered it an attampt to use up the available bulletins rather than organize a genuine discussion.

It was finally agreed to simply go ahead and start publishing the material, up to 48 pages per bulletin, regardless of topic.

4. United Secretariat minutes. We protested the way the minutes of the May meeting were drawn up. We pointed out, first of all, that they were inaccurate. Even our motions submitted in written form had been reformulated. Clearly the proposal made by Comrade Pepe in his April 10 letter -- to get accurate minutes by submitting all motions in writing -- has not worked. From now on we will keep our own minutes in order to have an accurate record of the meetings.

Secondly, since we were aware that a number of comrades on the IEC had not been receiving minutes regularly, we asked that this be checked. In the course of the discussion it became clear that

this was not an inadvertent error but that a decision had been made not to send the minutes to all IEC members. Three reasons were advanced for this decision. (1) It was too much work. (2) It was too expensive. (3) There might be a security question because the IEC is so large. We made a motion to resume the previous practice of sending minutes to the IEC (the body to which the United Secretariat is responsible). The IMT members referred this to the Bureau.

5. France and Italy. There was no political discussion under the agenda points on France and Italy. A point on the French elections was placed on the agenda by the IMT members simply to express dissatisfaction with the article by Dick Fidler in the June 3 Intercontinental Press and the coverage in the LSO's Libération. We suggested that the dissatisfied comrades should write a letter to Intercontinental Press and Libération.

6. Finances. The June 28, 1974, letter from the SWP Political Committee to Comrade Mandel was taken up. We suggested that a written reply would be appropriate.

MINUTES OF UNITED SECRETARIAT MEETING July 3, 1974

Convened: 2:15 p.m.

Present: Claudio, Domingo, Duret, Fourier, Georges, Jens, Johnson, Martínez, Roman, Rudi, Walter, Williams.

Chair: Domingo.

Agenda Proposed by Bureau:

1. France: continuation of discussion on the position taken by the FCR during the last presidential elections; report by Fourier.
2. Argentina: a) the political situation in Argentina and the PST's position on "institutionalization" (continuation of discussion); b) solidarity campaign with the PST comrades against the extreme right attacks.
3. Finance: continuation of discussion; report by Jens.
4. Composition of the United Secretariat: continuation of discussion.
5. Situation in Great Britain; report by Alan Jones.
6. Situation in Portugal; report by Duret.
7. Situation in Italy; report by Livio.
8. Miscellaneous.

1. Argentina: Reporter, Claudio.

Discussion: Domingo, Martínez, Johnson, Claudio, Fourier, Williams, Walter, Williams, Johnson, Martínez, Georges, Claudio, Martínez, Domingo, Williams, Walter, Claudio, Martínez, Williams, Georges, Williams, Georges, Williams, Martínez, Fourier, Martínez, Fourier, Johnson.

Motion by Livio: To publish the statement adopted by the United Secretariat at its May meeting.

Motion by Williams: To continue an internal discussion with the comrades of the PST and not make the statement public.

Vote: for Claudio's motion, 7; for Williams' motion, 3.

Motion by Walter: To include the following statement in the minutes:

The attention of the United Secretariat had been drawn to the fact of the publication in Argentina of the full text of the Argentine Resolution adopted at the Tenth World Congress. We do not know whether it is an internal or public publication and it is unsigned. It is contrary to the decision taken at the last United Secretariat meeting not to include point 36 in the public version. The United Secretariat states it has not been consulted and cannot take responsibility for the publication if it has taken place after the last United Secretariat meeting.

Vote: 7 for, 3 abstentions.

Statement by Martínez:

What is involved here is not a question of United Secretariat discipline but the dynamic taking place in Argentina, specifically the publication of this document and the public attacks in Combate on the PST, which must be opposed.

2.

Solidarity with PST against right-wing attacks. Reporter, Duret.

Discussion: Williams, Duret, Johnson, Domingo.

Motion by Walter: The United Secretariat launches an appeal to all sections and working-class organizations internationally to organize a defense campaign for the PST and all other victims of right-wing violence in Argentina along the lines of the appeal already made by the United Secretariat Bureau of June 18.

Vote: 10 for, none against, no abstentions.

2. Finances.

Discussion: Walter, Johnson, Walter, Roman, Johnson, Claudio, Roman, Johnson.

3. Composition of the United Secretariat: dropped from agenda.

4. Situation in Great Britain: dropped from agenda due to absence of reporter.

5. Situation in Portugal: Reporter, Duret.

Discussion: Fourier, Duret, Martínez.

6. Situation in Italy: Reporter, Claudio.

7. French Elections: Reporter, Roman.

Discussion: Williams, Walter, Fourier, Walter, Fourier, Johnson, Williams, Walter, Fourier, Johnson.

8. Bureau Report: Reporter, Walter

Proposed publication schedule for 48-page monthly IIDB.

1. Minutes of World Congress, minutes of post-congress IEC, and declarations and statements.
2. Up to 48 pages on differences with PST comrades, including three articles from Avanzada Socialista, statement by Unit Secretariat, letter by Arturo, answer by Bureau, PST reply to United Secretariat, possible answer.
3. Gus Horowitz article on Arab revolution.
4. Other contributions on Arab revolution, including Micha criticism of draft resolution, amendments by authors, up to 48 pages.
5. Discussion articles by Indochinese comrades plus any other material on this question, up to 48 pages.

Discussion: Fourier, Johnson, Jens, Walter, Williams, Johnson, Walter, Fourier.

Motion by Williams: To publish the articles listed by Walter up to 48 pages per bulletin as agreed upon.

Amendment by Walter: For security reasons not to include any other articles in the bulletin containing the minutes.

Vote on amendment: 7 for, 3 against.

Vote on Williams' motion: 10 for, none against, no abstentions.

9. Miscellaneous.

a. Sri Lanka. Fourier requests copy of Sri Lanka CMU letter to Bandaranaike government on exit visa case be sent to sections. Agreed.

b. Chile. Martínez questions appearance of a pamphlet identifying a Liga Comunista as a sympathizing organization in Chile and refers to a letter from the Danish leadership asking the same question.

Discussion: Domingo, Martínez, Domingo, Johnson, Domingo.

c. Chile solidarity campaign. Discussion concerning call for international Chile demonstrations on September 11.

Motion by Walter. To empower the bureau to issue an appeal for September 11 demonstrations.

Vote: 10 for, none against, no abstentions.

d. Minutes. Johnson protests inaccuracy of minutes of last meeting. Even written motions handed in to secretary were changed.

Discussion: Walter.

Motion by Williams: To revert to previous practice of sending minutes of United Secretariat meetings to all elected members of the IEC.

Motion by Fourier: To refer this question to the Bureau.

Vote: for Williams' motion, 3; for Fourier's motion, 7.

Dates set for October Secretariat meeting.

Meeting adjourned 5:30 p.m.

COPY COPY COPY

July 4, 1974

Dear Mary-Alice,

Here is the list of the IEC consultative members, nominated by the IEC majority tendency:

Quique (Spain), Jesus (Spain), Toni (Spain), Jaime (Spain), Miguel (Mexico), Ricardo (Mexico), Saul (Argentina), Jim (Canada), Claude (Canada), James (Australia), Tom (South Africa), Anna (Brasil), Saïd (Middle East), Fred (Austria), Robert (Luxemburg), Mogens (Denmark), Tim (Ireland), Hans (Holland), Carlos (Colombia), Riss (USA), Sven (Sweden), Philippe (Belgium), Jeremy (Great-Britain), Jean (France), Pierre (France), Malin (France), Jules (France), Hugo (Germany), Simon (Italy), Guillaume (Switzerland), Roger (Switzerland).

This for inclusion in the International Internal Bulletin carrying the World Congress minutes.

Fraternally yours,

s/Walter

14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014
July 16, 1974

Brussels

Dear Ernest,

Thank you for the list of consultative IEC members nominated by the IEC majority tendency. It would be helpful if you could go over the list with Comrade Johnson and let him know who the comrades listed are.

There are several things about the list that are somewhat confusing, however. In checking the list of alternate IEC members nominated by the IMT and accepted by the world congress, I find that several names appear on both the alternate list and the consultative list -- Fred (Austria); Mogens (Denmark); Carlos (Colombia); Robert/Metz (Luxemburg). In addition, there are several more pseudonyms which might stand for the same individual -- Brewster/Jeremy for Great Britain; Tim/O'Leary for Ireland; Simon/Edgardo for Italy (Edgardo was erroneously dropped from the list printed in IIDB No. 5).

Does this mean that the comrades now on the consultative list have been dropped from the alternate list? If so, who has replaced them on the alternate list?

Would you please send us the ranked list of alternates for inclusion in the IIDB also. As you will recall, the list accepted by the world congress was not yet numbered.

The most puzzling thing about your list is the inclusion of comrades who come from sections rather than sympathizing groups. The "Agreement on Measures to Help Maintain Unity of the Fourth International" adopted by the world congress states:

"7. Adoption of the following two categories in the membership of the incoming International Executive Committee:
"a. Full status for members of sections.
"b. Consultative status for members of sympathizing groups.
"Full members and consultative members shall have the same rights in everything except voting...."

In other words, the world congress decision precludes the type of list you have submitted.

Comradely,

s/Mary-Alice

P.S. Several months ago you said the IMT was drafting a further statement on the outcome of the world congress, replying to the Leninist Trotskyist Faction statement. We have not yet received this.

cc: Johnson

COPY COPY COPY

June 4th 1974

Dear Joe,

I have been told that you were entering hospital to undergo an operation. I hope it will not be too painful for you and that you will recover quickly. In such circumstances for you, I would have prefered not to write the present letter, but politics has its obligations.

With this letter I send a rather lengthy article on the French presidential election for IP which I wrote on instructions of the United Secretariat, because both IP and The Militnat were wrong on this subject. First of all, our French movement was put on the same footing as the other extreme left organisations and even more place was given to the lambertists and the pabloites who were practically absent from the campaign. Second, the articles by Fidler, Lund and Tony Thomas have left aside every important and decisive for the future aspect shown by this election, they treated this election as if it was like any other one, and they have dealt only with our vote for Mitterrand on the second round.

Fidler's first article spoke of gaullists choosing a successor to Pompidou (it is the title of the article), whilst the election was the opportunity for the French bourgeoisie to get rid of the gaullist regime. Any connaisseur of French politics knew that it was on the agenda, without the result being certain. This fact has not be emphasised in any of the articles, nor the fact also that if France has a president, it has yet no definite regime replacing the gaullist regime and French bourgeoisie lacks now strong political parties. That is the first big hole in the articles.

None of the articles underlines the polarisation and the enormous vote for Mitterrand -- around 13 millions -- nor the predominantly working class composition and youth composition of this vote. I give in my articles figures that speak for themselves. Thomas saw only the "slim majority" for Giscard. The present situation as subsequent to May 68 upsurge and to many big struggles (Lip, etc.) is not at all explained. That is the second big hole in the articles.

And here comes the third hole: nothing has been said of the nearly 700.000 votes for the extreme left. This vote does not lose its importance because Larguiller had 600.000 for the nearly 100.000 of Alain. Our duty is to explain as well the total as the difference. I do it in my article, stressing also the importance of such a vote in the present upsurge of the masses. Let me say in passing that at no time has the Militant mentioned the publication of Rouge as a daily paper for three weeks. We are not healyites and dont think that a daily paper is the alpha and omega of revolutionary politics. But "le Quotidien Rouge" was one of the most important experience of our international movement, a very polemical very lively, very impressive paper which our movement can be proud of. It was sold daily between 12 and 15.000 copies. Not a word about it!

All the articles you published were centered on presenting the Union de la gauche as a "popular front" and concluding that we should have abstained at the second round. The definition given

of the "popular front" as a class collaborationist policy with bourgeois (or not) in the government is so general that it brings one to conclude that there was already a "popular front" in France and other countries in 1914, that the Churchill government in 1940 was a "popular front"...I dont know how you define the Attlee government in 1945, the present Wilson government, perhaps too "popular front" governments? Instead of analysing the different forms the reformist policies of the stalinists and the social-democrats take in different social and political circumstances (which have also to be analysed), you put one same label out of time and cricumstances, explaining nothing and preventing to define a tactic appropriate to each different case. If one should believe Lund's article, it is the mao-stalinists who alone have "hasten the time when workers will no longer be fooled by the trap of popular frontism". Thomas reproaches Mitterrand for having not defended a "class programme" and called for a workers' government. Did he expect that from any socialist or stalinist leader? In the growing political crisis in France, you are proposing us to abstain, that is to be preachers of socialism and not participating in the struggles of the masses, in fact to help Giscard to be elected. The crisis of bourgeois leadership, the upsurge of the masses, the growth of the extreme left, France marching towards huge crises, your writers could at least have learned that from "Rouge". They practically saw nothing of that. They saw only our falling in the trap of popular frontism. You do not analyse concrete situations, moves and trends of social forces, policies of political forces, you deal only with labels. As I told you at the last World Congress, you have obsessions, yesterday ultraleftism, to-day popular frontism.

Unfortunately that is not all. Last year when you disagreed with our tactics in the parliamentary elections, you wrote a letter explaining your divergences. We answered, granting that on two points the Ligue was in the dark or had made an error. (I have not seen the SWP leadership doing that once.). We are now after the World Congress which has given us a majority, after we have given our views on the Union de la gauche. We did not expect you to change your views, but at least not to attack our views. You could have expressed your disagreement for the vote Mitterrand in a simila way as last year. Instead of that, you proceed to a public attack on the activity of the French section in the Militant, using this organ as if it were an internal bulletin. Dont say to me, as did comrade Mary-Alice, that there was no attack because our organisati was not mentioned, the article was from a contributor to the paper not a statement of your Political Committee. Stupid as you may thi we are, we know that such articles in their form would not have bee written and published in the Militant if it had not been decided by it. <u>What is the purpose of this public attack</u>, if not to poison the relations inside our movement. You have not to my knowledge nov for two months taken position inside the SWP nor have you informed your members of the signature by the PST of a statement with bourgeois parties for the defense of bourgeois regime, but you have rushed to attack the positions of the French trotskyists previously discussed and voted at the World Congress. What is that if not losing its self-control by factionalism carried to the extreme? It will hurt all our movement, but the SWP more than us, who will still act in the most responsible way.

Yours fraternally,

s/Pierre

COPY COPY COPY

June 13, 1974

Dear Pierre,

I am out of the hospital and almost back in circulation. You were, of course, right to disregard a temporary indisposition like this in taking up a political question that you considered of importance. I had told the comrades several weeks before that it was almost certain you would send an article providing a roundup of the results of the election as you had on previous occasions. So they were expecting the article. I was surprised only that it was somewhat delayed.

On the translation, it would have been best to get your approva on the final text in view of some of the points you raise in your letter. However, that would have meant an additional delay that would have affected the timeliness of your contribution. I thought we should not wait. The article arrived after the deadline for the current issue, but by an extra effort and by holding up other material already made up, it was possible to squeeze it in. So that's what the comrades did. In case there are any serious errors in translation, you can send corrections, which we will be glad to run

One possibility is the sentence on page 779, column 2, translated as: "The French CP is still linked to the Kremlin, but the latter, owing to a different world situation, deals directly with bourgeois governments that take their distance from Washington. The Kremlin supported de Gaulle and Pompidou, and in the very midst of the recent election campaign, the Soviet ambassador in Paris publicly took a position (through a diplomatic ploy) in support of Giscard, arousing unconcealed anger from the Communist party." Your manuscript read: "Le PCF est toujours lié au Kremlin, mais celui-ci, en raison de la situation mondiale différente, trouve directement des gouvernements bourgeois qui prennent leurs distance: de Moscou; il avait soutenu de Gaulle et Pompidou et, au course même de la récente campagne électorale, l'ambassadeur soviétique à Paris a publiquement pris position, sous des formes diplomatiques en faveur de Giscard, suscitant une colère non feinte du Parti communiste." As you can see, we substituted the word "Washington" for "Moscow." Perhaps we did not understand what you wrote, or something was left out of the manuscript. Anyway, the reference to "Moscow" did not seem to fit into the context.

On your criticisms of the material by Comrade Fidler that appeared in Intercontinental Press, you are correct in noting its one-sidedness. It was not our intention, however, to present a rounded analysis of the French election. To do justice to the subject, such an article had to be written in Paris by someone who had the opportunity to follow developments at firsthand. Besides our distance from the scene, we were handicapped by the fact that we had to rely largely on the coverage in Le Monde. For some inexplicable reason, we stopped receiving Rouge regularly after it was converted into a daily. Only a few issues reached us and then only with great delay. We still do not have a complete file. I note what you say about "le Quotidien Rouge" being a "very polemical, very lively, very impressive paper which our movement can be proud of." I do not doubt your description. It makes me all the more eager to read it. Perhaps you can arrange to have a set, as advertised, sent to us.

Meanwhile we received by airmail the publication of the other far-left groups. We thought enough material was available to prese the main opinions and arguments of the far left on the Mitterrand candidacy, which we felt was of some interest in and of itself.

On the rest of your criticisms, I will take up only a couple of points at this time. First on your contention: "You do not analyse concrete situations, moves and trends of social forces, policies of political forces, you deal only with labels. As I told you at the last World Congress, you have obsessions, yesterday ultra-leftism, today popular frontism." Have I dropped an obsession about your concessions to ultraleftism and replaced it with an obsession about your concessions to popular frontism? A debate on such a topic can hardly be of much interest. I do not hold that you have stopped conceding to ultraleftism and are now on an opportunist kick. The opportunist deviations, such as they are, fall within a general line that bends toward ultraleftism. That was the explanation, as I am sure you will recall, that we offered for the opportunism displayed by the Bolivian comrades in their involvement in the FRA. Their participation in this fraudulent bourgeois-dominated front was intended to advance their ultraleft proguerrilla line. In the French elections, I had the impression that the main axis of Comrade Krivine's campaign was not free of ultraleftism and that if any errors of an opposite kind were made they fell within this general orientation.

On your point about the Ligue having acknowledged a couple of errors in the parliamentary elections, I agree that this was an excellent move. It made a very favorable impression on me as well as other comrades. I do not know why you add, "I have not seen the SWP leadership doing that once." For one thing, this is an overstatement. In political level, the SWP is not that low as not to understand that the most effective way to overcome an error and gain from it is to acknowledge it; and, still more important, rectify it. If necessary I could cite an example or two.

I disagree, of course, with your accusation that a "public attack" was launched by the Militant against the "activity of the French section." The signed articles that you refer to expressed the opinions of the authors. I do not know why you bring the Political Committee of the SWP into this and mix matters up still more by asserting that the Militant is being used "as if it were an internal bulletin." When the Political Committee of the SWP considers an issue important enough, it has always stated its opinion in a frank and open way whether this opinion is voiced publicly or internally. You will recall, I am sure, how it acted in the Sallustro affair, and you mention how it acted in the case of the French parliamentary elections. In the current situation, after collecting and weighing all the facts, the Political Committee can be expected to state its opinion if it feels that the issues warrant it, and not operate behind the back of the leadership of a section.

I hardly know what to say about your suggestion that the artic were part of a factional plot to "poison the relations inside our movement." The source now poisoning relations inside the Fourth International is the policy of exclusion and hardening of internal divisions that your faction adopted, apparently in line with its co cept of democratic centralism, following the world congress. I don'

expect to persuade you of the damage this error is doing to the international, still less convince you to change course; I mention it to point up the flimsiness of an argument that singles out the Militant's incomplete coverage of the French elections as a "public attack" on the French section designed to "poison relations."

The question of the PST and the statement you refer to is a separate issue. I do not see any real problem in handling this after the facts are clarified.

Comradely yours,

s/Joe

P.S. We did not receive the zero number of Inprecor, which is dated May 9, until June 10; that is, three days ago. This was the first that any of us in New York saw it. While the bundle was marked "airmail," there was not nearly enough postage on it, so it came via boat, and apparently a slow one at that.

Issue No. 1 (dated June 6), which I suppose was the next one to be published after issue zero, arrived today. Postmarked June 8, it came in the normal time for airmail from Brussels. We also received a copy of the French edition.

As yet we have not received the Spanish edition. This would be especially useful for IP, particularly in providing us with Spanish translations of documents and key articles. Would you mind asking the comrades in charge to check this out?

COPY COPY COPY

June 21st 1974

Dear Joe,

I sent you a few days ago the corrections to the translation of my article on the presidential election. Moscow instead of Washington was actually a slip of the pen.

Your letter of June 13 says that the articles by Fidler, etc. on the French election express "the opinions of the authors" and that the responsibility of the PC of the SWP is not engaged. So I must assume that the PC of the SWP does not control in some way the Militant. I must also assume from your letter that the authors of these articles were eager to condemn the views of the far left groups whose papers they had received by air mail, while ignoring the positions of the FCR. I have therefore to be satisfied with the knowledge that these articles were directed only against these groups and not against the FCR.

Concerning the PST, probably there too the leadership of this organisation is not controling what its paper Avanzada Socialista publishes, even if it publishes a statement signed and published all over Argentina with the name of the PST. Indeed your letter shows the mistake I was making concerning the relations between your papers and the leaderships of your organisations. I dont know if this mistake expresses an ultraleftist or an opportunist deviation.

I remain nevertheless your faithful co-thinker.

s/Pierre

COPY COPY COPY

KOMPASS - Tendenz in der GIM

To the
United Secretariat of F.I.

July,10.,1974

Comrades,

enclosed we are sending you a Declaration. The undersigners of this declaration submit it for publication in the International Internal Bulletin (or International Internal Discussion Bulletin).

It is also submitted by the Kompass-Tendency Germany to the internal Rundbrief of the GIM.

Rotfront

s/Karl

COPY COPY COPY

DECLARATION

concerning the 'Statement of the Majority Tendency at the Conclusion of the Tenth World Congress of the Fourth International'

The 'International Majority Tendency' within the 4th International has considered it necessary to add a Statement to the minutes of the Congress subsequent to its conclusion. This procedure - which is not quite usual in our movement - has been accepted by the International Minority (LTF) on condition that they could add a counter-declaration to the minutes of the Congress as well. Both Statements are included in the minutes of the World Congress (IIDB Vol.XI,Nr.5; April 1974) and have thus come to our knowledge.

This 'Declaration of the Majority Tendency' deals with the 'International Mezhrayonka-Tendency' - we were members of during the 10th World Congress - in a way which is not acceptable to us, and is considered by us as a threat to the future functioning of Democratic Centralism inside the 4th International.

The IMT introduces its Statement with the sentence:

> "The majority tendency accepted numerous organizational compromises in the preparation for, and the course of the World Congress."

Among these "Compromises" it lists:

> "Recognizing the Mezhrayonka de facto as an international tendency, when the statements published during the Congress (declaration of tendency, and the "semi-dissolution" statement) demonstrate its lack of a clear basis. The Mezhrayonka was set up and maintained for one week in order to "obtain a quarantee of equal rights" with the supporters of the majority and minority and "to defend the unity of our movement" (how?). It got 2.5 percent of the mandates. This sort of thing tends to deprive the very concept of international tendencies of its meaning (since the concept of forming international tendencies requires presenting political perspectives on the questions in dispute that constitute an alternative orientation to that of the other tendencies and an alternative for our movement as a whole)."

These "concessions" are qualified by the IMT in the following way:

> "These organizational compromises are considerable. They can make the development of our movement more difficult in certain cases. They put some of our organizational principles partially in abeyance."

We strongly reject this interpretation made by the IMT. Our recognition as a tendency at the World Congress was neither an organizational "concession" nor did it "put our organizational principles in abeyance". We say on the contrary, that a refusal of us would have meant a violation of these principles, because a part of the 4th International would have been excluded from the deciding-process in the International without being excluded or suspended or having left the movement.

Since the 'Statement of the Majority Tendency' addresses a readership which to a large extent is not familiar with the details, it is necessary to recall some of the facts:

1. The Mezhrayonka-Tendency did not come into existence out of a clear sky, nor did do by a sudden "maneuvre" during the World Congress, but its delegates - with the exception of Cde.Chandra - all have been elected delegates at the basis of their sections on those positions they advocated at the World Congress.
Cde.Chandra subsequently joined these positions and the Tendency during the Congress, while on the other side Cde.Dumas, who represented two mandates on the 'Contre le Courant'-ticket, dissociated himself from some of its positions and kept his distance from the Mezhrayonka Tendency. Both cases are in accordance with the freedom of mandate and in conformity with the principles of our movement.

2. The Mezhrayonka Tendency has made its postions known on all subjects under discussion at the World Congress and defended them during the debate. We admit the right of the IMT to reproach our positions with "lack of clarity". But the assessment of a tendency's position by another tendency can be no criterion for the recognition and the legitimacy of the tendency concerned. The next step would be, not to recognize a tendency because a majority position considers those positions to be "wrong".

It is correct that we ourselves regarded the degree of homogenisation among us prior to the World Congress as unsatisfactory. We think, however, this true for the Majority Tendency as well. Let us recall that at the time of the formation of the IMT only the European Perspective draft was available (and not documents to "all questions in dispute"); that some members of this Tendency, Cde. Beauvais in any case, did not vote for the Argentine and Bolivia resolution of their tendency, but for a "promise" (that these resolutions after the vote at the IEC would be discussed and reversed inside the IMT); that during the pre-Congress discussion on Europe every author of the IMT gave a different interpretation of the EPD and a different definition of the "New Mass Vanguard" in the pages of the IIDB; that prior to the World Congress and during the Congress the IMT undertook far-reaching and substantial changes and amendments to documents that had been adopted as "programmatic basis" of the Tendency before, amendments, that for instance in the Armed Struggle resolution expressed the exact opposite of the original formulation. We did not differ from the IMT in the unsatisfactory degree of homogenisation, but in the different conclusions we have drawn from that: we considered the formal formation of an international tendency to be premature.

3. It is true that the Mezhrayonka Tendency did not submit document on all questions in dispute, but it had adopted positions on all these questions.
On one hand the documents "On the Orientation in LatinAmerica" (which was the only counter-resolution to the draft submitted by the IMT on the Armed Struggle in LA), and on Europe (by the Compass Tendency Germany) had been introduced in time (October 73) for the discussion in the International.
On the other hand concerning the Political Resolution we did not get beyond a written criticism of the IMT-draft, distributed at the Congress itself, and we did not formulate own documents on Argentina and Bolivia. But, as we see it, this objection does not hold good either. For example, the International Minority had not submitted written counter-resolutions on all questions either, that is to say on the Question of Armed Struggle in LA and on Europe, because the LTF did not agree methodological to submit such documents. So we regarded it wrong and unrealistical for us to submit our own

interpretation on details and facts in Argentina and Bolivia.

4. The Statement of the Majority Tendency defines an 'international tendency' in a way we can not accept and that can not be derived from the Statutes of the 4th International, either:

> "The presentation of political perspectives on the questions in dispute that constitute an alternative orientation to that of the other tendencies and an alternative for our movement as a whole." (emphasis added)

In our opinion this rather looks like a definition of an international faction. According to the principles of our movement 'tendencies' are ideological currents which may as well be formed on basis of some important questions - or even one. And our statutes do not make any distinction on this point and do not require of an international tendency that it meets the criteria of a national faction. In our opinion the IMT actually puts an excessive stress on the formal difference between a 'tendency including positions on international questions' and an 'international tendency', a distinction which is necessary, but can only get such an importance if one advocates an extremely federalist conception of the International. Our Statutes do not include any instructions like "a certain number of signatures from a certain number of different sections."

5. And this actually is the real problem with the Mezhrayonka Tendency at the 10th World Congress: the International Majority did not recognize us de facto as an 'international' tendency as it claims in its Statement, - though truly speaking this would have been the correct way to solve the problem, and though some of the IMT-leaders (Germain) initially had agreed to proceed in this way. The "Majority of the Majority" however insisted on a de jure version of an "international tendency", otherwise, they declared, they would not concede us any rights to defend our positions as a tendency at the Congress. For this reason, really on their "command", we ad-hoc formalized ourselves as 'International Mezhrayonka' to an International Tendency, as we had announced it for this (expected) case before the World Congress.

The Statement of the Majority Tendency so turns reality upside down. They accuse the Mezhrayonka of its sporadic existence of one week only, though this particularity was only due to the "this-way-or-nothing" pressure from the Majority of the Majority. In this we see another indication that parts of the IMT do not conceive democratic centralism as conscious expression of material condition but as a catechism of rules to be used skilfully for the tendency struggle.

6. The fact that the IMT takes the numerically small extension of the Mezhrayonka (2.5% of the delegates) as an argument for their contention that the recognition of the Mezhrayonka was a "concessio constitutes a deplorable lapse. In our movement the right to form a tendency has always resulted from political positions and never from the numerical size. Unfortunately there is a precurs to this formulation: the leadership of the French section demanded the submission of at least 30 signatures as a condition for the recognition of CLC as a tendency. Instead of correcting this mistake by one of its sections, the IMT extended this mistake on the international level.

7. The formula saying that by forming the Mezhrayonka we wanted to get the guarantee of "equal rights" with the two big blocks IMT

and LTF is ambiguous. We made sure to get the rights of a tendency at the World Congress. We did not ask for an equalization with the IMT and LTF nor did we get it. We did not misjudge the qualitative difference in quantity.
At the discussion on Armed Struggle in Latin America for instance the IMT and the LTF each had 11 speakers, and "all the other together" had 5. Since 2 Japanese and 1 Argentine (who weren't in any tendency) wanted to speak, the Mezhrayonka just conceded the right to have 2 speakers to defend their counter-resolution in the discussion (the only written counter-resolution to that point at all). We accepted this. But we cannot consider this proportion as an exaggerated concession to us.

To sum up we think that
a. the presentation of the Mezhrayonka in the Statement of the Majority Tendency is misleading, since it abriges the question in a way that the real course of events can not be seen anymore, and
b. this presentation is little educative for the cadres of the 4th International in that it deals with the formation of a tendency in the way of a "privilege" and its recognition as a "concession In this Statement we see the danger to narrow the possibilities of forming a tendency in the future and to increase the conditions for a tendency to be recognized - of course always with reference to the "present rapid growth of the International."

Membership Assembly of the Kompass Tendency (GIM) June 9, 1974

Steering Committee of Tendenza Marxista Rivoluzionario (Italy)

Justine - Krasno - Lemalouf
former members of the Steering Committ of Contre le Courant-tendency (France) (dissolved by the French Centr.-Comm.)

APPENDIX

Copy

To the Comrades of the Compass Tendency in the GIM

Dear comrades,
During its session at May 29,30 the USFI discussed your letter from May 2nd. The USec cannot fulfill your request to publish your Document on LatinAmerica in connection with the publications of the World Congress. The USec thought that, considering the modest size of your tendency on international level, such a publication would constitute a precedent which in view of the existing growth of the International and the unlimited freedom of tendency within its ranks would pose unsolvable problems in the future. In case you come to know that your document is not available in a particular section, we would join you in the request to ask the respective section to publish your document in an internal bulletin.

Fraternal Greetings
For the USFI
Walter

Copy to PB of GIM

P.O. Box 471 Cooper Station
New York, N.Y. 10003

July 4, 1974

TO ALL MEMBERS

Dear Comrades,

At its July 4, 1974 meeting, after careful consideration of the documentary material gathered by the Control Commission of the Socialist Workers Party and made available to the NEC upon our request by the SWP Political Committee, the National Executive Committee of the Young Socialist Alliance passed the following motion:

"That the Internationalist Tendency's status as a separate rival organization to the YSA be recognized and that members of this rival organization be informed that this status places them outside the constitutional provisions for membership in the Young Socialist Alliance."

In compliance with this motion, each local is instructed to remove from its rolls as of this date all known members of the Internationalist Tendency party listed in the enclosed letter.

All political relations with members of the Internationalis Tendency party must now be carried out under the direction of the appropriate elected bodies of the YSA.

Please read this letter to the next local meeting and call it to the attention of all members. The full report of the SWP Control Commission is available to all YSA members from the SWP National Office, 14 Charles Lane, New York, N.Y. 10014.

Comradely,

Andrew Pulley

Andrew Pulley
National Chairman,
for the YSA National
Executive Committee