

July 31, 1974

To the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction Steering Committee

Dear Comrades,

Enclosed with this mailing are the following items:

1. A letter from Walter to the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party proposing an "emergency" meeting of the United Secretariat for August 25-26, and a reply.

2. A statement adopted by the membership assembly of the Compass Tendency in the GIM concerning the split of the Internationalist Tendency from the SWP, plus a longer contribution by Compass written for the International Internal Discussion Bulletin.

3. A letter from Bill Massey to the SWP Political Committee, protesting the Control Commission investigation, along with a carbon copy of a letter from Massey to the United Secretariat on the same subject. Both letters are dated June 26, 1974, but were received on July 10, 1974.

4. A letter from Polly Connelly, Ed Hoffmans, and Don Smith dated June 28, 1974, announcing their resignation from the Internationalist Tendency effective June 26, 1974. The letter was received on July 5, 1974. Connelly, Hoffmans, and Smith were dropped from the SWP membership rolls on July 5, 1974, along with all the others who were members of the IT party as of the time of the IT's split convention May 25-27, 1974. According to their letter, their resignation from the IT was not based on rejection of the IT split, but took place over "the question of Stalinism."

5. A letter dated July 9, 1974, from a group of four members of the Revolutionary Marxist Collective in the Bay Area applying for membership in the SWP; and a letter dated July 29, 1974, from Barry Sheppard to this group, summarizing the discussion that took place at a meeting with them and the SWP's proposals to them to hasten their integration into the SWP.

Similar letters were received from two other groups claiming agreement with the IEC majority, one in Baltimore and one in Los Angeles. Similar proposals have been made to them.

6. A document of the IT party entitled, "Statement of the Political Committee of the Internationalist Tendency of the Socialist Workers Party and the Young Socialist Alliance, July 5, 1974." The document lists five people as comprising the Political Committee of the IT party. One of these five, John Hutton, was formerly a member of the YSA, but not of the SWP. The IT newsletter report of June 6, 1974, reporting on the IT split convention states that six people were elected to the IT PC.

7. A letter dated July 17, 1974, from Bill Massey of the IT party to the Political Committee of the SWP, written on behalf of a list of IT party members. There are five people who were on the list of IT party members dropped from the SWP on July 5,

2.

1974, whose names do not appear on the list sent in by Massey: Polly Connelly, Ed Hoffmans, and Don Smith from Chicago; Steve Smith from Houston; Sandy Hall from Oakland-Berkeley.

8. A reprint of an article that appeared in the July 19, 1974, issue of Workers Vanguard, newspaper of the Spartacist League. The article, reporting on the IT split from the SWP, is clearly aimed at recruiting the IT party members to the Spartacist League. Note that the article also quotes from two documents that are not available to the SWP: 1. a "circular letter of June 11 to the IMT by IT leader Bill Massey"; 2. a document by Don Smith explaining his June 26, 1974, resignation from the IT.

Comradely,

Mary-Alice

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

July 13, 1974

To the Political Committee of the S.W.P.

Dear Comrades,

We are in possession of your letter of July 4 and of the material to which that letter refers. We have considered your request that the proposal for a special world congress should be placed on the agenda of the next meeting of the United Secretariat. We concur with that request.

Given the gravity of the situation, we think that an emergency meeting of the United Secretariat is required in the month of August, although the last United Secretariat session had decided to hold the next Un. Sec. meeting only in September. The earliest possible date to have a quorum of Un. Secr. members assembled seems to be August 25-26. We therefore tentatively call the Un. Secr. meeting on these dates, but are willing to consider an earlier date if you should request so and make definite proposals in that respect.

Fraternally yours,  
For the United Secretariat/  
Bureau  
s/Walter

-----  
COPY

COPY

COPY

-----  
COPY

New York, New York  
July 22, 1974

Walter

Brussels

Dear Walter,

On July 18 we received your letter proposing, in response to our letter of July 5, an "emergency" meeting of the United Secretariat on August 25-26. You indicate that this is "the earliest possible date to have a quorum of the United Secretariat assembled."

As this date is less than two weeks before the regularly scheduled United Secretariat meeting of September 7-8, it seems to us that it would be advisable to maintain the dates of the September meeting. All United Secretariat members have been informed of the September dates for several months, thus assuring maximum attendance at this meeting which will take up our proposal for a special world congress.

Comrade Johnson will be leaving Brussels for New York on July 31. If there are any matters you wish him to convey to us you can contact him before he leaves.

Comradely,  
s/Jack Barnes  
National Secretary  
Socialist Workers Party

COPY

COPY

COPY

KOMPASS  
Tendenz in der GIM

Peter Selig, 6 Frankfurt/M  
Kl.Friedberger Str.13

to the  
United Secretariat of F.I.  
ccPolitical Bureau of the GIM

July, 15., 1974

Enclosed find a 'Statement of the Membership Assembly of the KOMPASS Tendency/GIM' concerning the split of the Internationalist Tendency from the Socialist Workers Party, which is adopted unanimously by the membership assembly July 13.

Enclosed find, too, the contribution entitled 'The Danger of a Split in the International', related to the same issue.

The memb.ass. of KOMPASS Tendency decided unanimously to submit this contribution officially to the national and the international discussion.

The KOMPASS Tendency did not vote on this contribution itself, because this contribution includes an estimation of the events and not a point of decision.

THE STEERING COMMITTEE  
of the Kompass Tendency

s/Arnold

STATEMENT OF THE MEMBERSHIP ASSEMBLY OF  
THE COMPASS TENDENCY (GIM)

The Tenth World Congress (Fourth Since Reunification) succeeded, after long discussion and attempts to find an organizational compromise, in agreeing by an overwhelming majority upon a "Nine-Point Agreement on Measures to Help Maintain Unity of the Fourth International," by which the acute danger of a split could be prevented. Now the unity of our movement is confronted with a new and difficult test: A de facto split has occurred in the Socialist Workers Party (which is prevented by reactionary legislation from being the formal section of the International in the USA). The Internationalist Tendency in the SWP, which belongs to the International Majority Tendency (IMT), is accused by the SWP leadership and control commission of having formed its own party-like organization, operating both inside and outside the SWP, and of having violated the organizational discipline and statutes of the SWP in numerous ways. The SWP leadership has already drawn the conclusion that in view of this the IT is a separate organization and has left the SWP. They regard the members of the IT as no longer members of the SWP. The material on this case presented in International Information Bulletin of the SWP No. 6/74, above all the reproduced original documents of the IT, is indeed alarming and severely incriminating to the IT.

Thus there has occurred a new split in a section between followers of the international majority and the international minority. The split is all the more grave in that it takes place in a section that plays a key role in the international faction struggle, and because it takes place after the world congress and the agreements made there and thus places in question or even invalidates the organizational results of the world congress.

Thus the world Trotskyist movement faces an acute danger of a split, a danger even sharper than before the world congress. It is now necessary for all political forces in the Fourth International to live up to their responsibility for the unity of the international and to use all their means to prevent a split, which could throw our movement back years. In this connection it is our view that a special world congress, which could throw our movement back years. In this connection it is our view that a special world congress, which the SWP leadership now calls for, can be a means of working against the danger of a split, and especially a means of avoiding a "cold split." But the call for a special world congress is premature as long as the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International has not met and used its authority and powers to overcome the present crisis.

We call upon the GIM, as the German section of the Fourth International, to play an active role in the effort against a threatening split. We call upon the central committee members of the Compass Tendency to propose to the central committee of the GIM a common initiative in defense of unity, and to energetically support a prompt meeting of the IEC at the earliest possible moment, and further to support the immediate convening of an international commission of inquiry or the international control commission in order to assist the search for an organizational and political solution to the crisis through an impartial examination of the events and facts.

Passed unanimously by the membership assembly of the Compass Tendency, July 13, 1974.

2.

--The IT no longer regards the SWP as its own organization, but as one field of work among others. Consequently, the IT undertakes its "own" external work. It is said of this work that it is increasingly "more important than work in the SWP itself." Even the publication of their own newspaper was already being planned.

--The IT has a regular organizational structure, with an organizational office, paid full-timers, "double-layered" leadership (corresponding to a central committee and a political bureau), delegated national conferences, etc. There are minority tendencies within the IT, which, however, defend the majority line of the IT on the "outside," i.e., in the SWP. In other words, they act toward the SWP as toward a separate (not to say competing) organization.

--In its own internal bulletins the IT conducts its own discussions of political fundamentals (not merely of the tactical questions within the purview of a tendency) without bringing these contributions into the general discussion of the SWP or making them known to the SWP.

--The IT has its own "security policy" with regard to the SWP leadership, with internal tendency pseudonyms, disguised covers of its bulletins; that is, it acts conspiratorally in its own party as it would against the class enemy.

All these things are serious and justify the characterization of the IT as a separate organization. Langston/Langston write in their letter of resignation from the IT that a "separate organization" is the logical consequence of these steps (IIB, pp. 23).

But certainly the most serious point, which is made apparent by a study of the internal IT texts, is that there is not sufficient political agreement of the IT with the SWP for them to work in a common organization. Thus the IT characterizes the SWP as "degenerated" and "deadly sick." Therefore it is to be feared that the points listed above do not represent mistakes correctable by the IT, but rather the reality of two distinct organizations: the LTF-led SWP majority and the IT.

But the matter appears in a somewhat different light when one examines the formal accusations of the SWP leadership, which led to the Control Commission's proceedings against the IT, in the course of which were "discovered" the above-mentioned weighty facts, which unambiguously put the blame for the split on the IT. These accusations for the most part concern matters that in most other sections of the Fourth International would hardly have led to accusations before the Control Commission: attending (public) meetings of other groups without authorization by the party; contacts with education and discussion circles outside the party without party authorization; selling, without party authorization of the newspapers of other sections and sympathizing groups of the Fourth International in addition to SWP material at Chile demonstrations; and so on. In addition, there is the serious charge of having crossed the boundary between the SWP and its youth organization, the YSA, in tendency work and having brought

3.

IT adherents in the SWP and YSA together within a single IT. Here the SWP leadership poses the problem of "double democratic centralism" in an extreme form: On the one hand the YSA is "guided" politically by the SWP and a representative of the YSA as such sits in the Political Bureau of the SWP. On the other hand, the YSA is supposed to be a completely "independent" organization; that is, SWP members must represent the official line of the SWP within the YSA because the latter is "external." An IT adherent in the YSA who is not a member of the party can thus advocate in full the line of the IT there, but one who is also a member of the SWP cannot do so, and can even be forced to defend the line of the LTF inside the YSA.

This method is in fact suited to discredit the idea of a youth organization (a pet idea of the LTF) in the other sections of the Fourth International. We know from our own rich experience of the relationship between the GIM and RKJ that such a procedure is impractical and politically unacceptable.

Unfortunately it is impossible to separate the grave reasons for a split that have been "discovered" from the -- in our judgment insufficient -- official accusations of the Control Commission. It is obvious that this specific "centralist democracy" of the SWP constitutes an essential reason that the IT established de facto its own organization and evolved out of the party. Apparently the IT had come to the position where it could no longer breathe politically inside this straitjacket of "assignments," restrictions, and prohibitions, in which the difference between party discipline and harassment seemed to disappear. In this connection it is to be noted that the SWP leadership or control commission apparently used "detective" methods against the IT; otherwise it would be unthinkable that such a volume of damaging materials would have come to light.

But even when the problem is viewed from this aspect, the behavior of the IT cannot be defended, because formally the SWP is of course right in all points. The ITers know the SWP and its statutes and accepted them when they joined. They knew that their actions would not be viewed with "European" eyes but would be measured against the statutes and organizational principles of the SWP and that by this measurement their actions were breaches of discipline (breaches, moreover, that were continually repeated at various times and places). And even in the European sections it is the task of the leadership to determine how the line of the Fourth International is to be applied and disseminated; it is not left to the pleasure of tendencies or individuals. In the GIM also, an individual cannot simply produce his own leaflet and distribute it with the argument that it is "his right and his duty to disseminate the line of the Fourth International," even if the content of the leaflet does conform to the line of the Fourth. Otherwise 25 GIM members at a demonstration could distribute 25 different leaflets, all of which "conform to the line of the Fourth International."

The first conclusion that we must draw from the material presented in IIB 6/74 is that the most important task now, as it was earlier, is to intervene to maintain the unity of the Fourth International and to fight against the acute danger of a split, while at the same time we must discuss how this unity can in

4.

general function usefully: not, in any event, in the way the SWP majority and the IT function together.

#### The Relationship of the IT to the IMT

Central to an evaluation of the real possibilities of a split in the international on the basis of the events in the USA is of course the question of the relationship between the IT and IMT.

The IT, which is very heterogeneous (see appendix), finds its cohesiveness first of all in opposition to the SWP leadership. But naturally it requires a clearer and less diffuse distinguishing characteristic: It tries to find this in membership in the IMT. It is not for nothing that the IT leadership again and again poses greater integration into the IMT as the decisive thing. This is not merely internationalist rhetoric and an opportunist attempt to rely on the bayonets of the international majority for support, but also essential for its very existence because identification with the IMT is at present the only way in which the IT can transform itself from a bloc into a tendency.

However, one can see that opposition to the SWP leadership remains the decisive motive for the IT when the IMT takes up the question of the SWP. On this point the IT, which very much wants to "integrate" itself into the IMT, refuses to obey the IMT.

From the material published in IIB 6/74 it is clear that the various leading organs of the International Majority Tendency unambiguously opposed the split course of the IT. The IMT did not merely express an opinion but also came to completely clear decisions, most importantly that the IT should cancel its national conference.

The IT informed the IMT that it would not recognize these decisions, and it openly violated them. The IT declared "the struggle against the IMT majority position on the SWP" as its most important task. The IT quite clearly proceeded entirely contrary to the decisions of the IMT.

Moreover, if one takes as a basis the firm fact -- of which there are many proofs -- that the IMT within its ranks practices a faction discipline, and if one places the proceedings of the IT within the overall tactics of the IMT, then one is forced to draw the following astonishing conclusion: Before its split with the SWP, the IT "split" de facto from the IMT.

But it would be rash to draw the further conclusion from this that the danger of a split in the international is unreal. The actions of the IT work their own dialectic upon the IMT: Through its violation of IMT discipline in the question of the SWP, the IT has the chance to become the majority in the IMT. With this violation, the IT has created a "fait accompli" that is difficult for the IMT to swallow. To exhort the IT to abandon its split course in the SWP is one thing. To let the IT drop like a hot potato in the international after its de facto expulsion from the SWP is another. The IMT will hardly see off the brach it is sitting on: the confidence of its followers in the power of the international leadership to protect its followers.



5.

It is therefore very probable that the "fait accompli" will (or already has) change the majority of the IMT anti-splitters, which doubtlessly existed at the time of the decisions against the IT's split course, into a majority that is willing to risk a split. And this change in the majority position of the IMT takes place in a situation in which the leaders of the IMT (and the leaders of the anti-split front in the IMT) no longer have control of events. They must react according to a logic that they did not choose.

But this intricate logic of the relationship between IT and IMT goes still further: The IT drew its confidence to risk a split course in the SWP precisely from its membership and "integration" into the IMT whose discipline the split course violated. Prior to their integration into the IMT, the same comrades, as the Proletarian Orientation Tendency, drew back from this course (in contrast to others, who have in the meanwhile set up their own anti-Pabloist groups in the USA). This expresses itself in the fact that the IT regards itself as the "nucleus of an American section of the Fourth International" (although the SWP has been the American section -- even if not so legally -- ever since the founding of the Fourth); in the fact that the IT equates itself with the Fourth International and treats the SWP as outside the Fourth ("There are very few followers of the Fourth International in the SWP, there are more outside it"); in the fact that the IT designates the supporters of the IMT as the sections of the Fourth International in North America, namely the RMG in Canada and itself in the USA (whereas in reality it is well known that the LSA/ISO and the SWP are the sections, although the SWP cannot be so officially because of reactionary legislation); and in the fact that the IT in its violations of discipline claims to have the right, independently, "to put into practice the decisions of the Tenth World Congress."

How will the relationship IT/IMT take form after the split in the SWP? An important indication will be the treatment accorded by the IMT to those IMT supporters in the SWP who resigned from the IT in opposition to its split course but remain supporters of the IMT. Before the split, the IMT had decided that all its supporters in the USA must be members of the IT. If the IMT were now to recognize Langston, Langston and Co., who resigned from the IT, as members of the IMT, this would be an important step against a split.

#### The Tactics of the SWP Leadership and the IMF

The SWP leadership has documented and proved the course followed by the IT and its split with that formal perfection for which it is known. The decisive conclusion that it has drawn in regard to the international is the need for a special world congress. This demand, it should be noted, has many aspects.

For one thing, the call for a special world congress is a formal mistake, and to be sure, a calculated one, since in formal questions the SWP is very good. Before a special world congress there is the International Executive Committee. Only if the SWP receives no satisfaction from the IEC is the call for a special world congress justified. Contrary to its usual practice, the

6.

SWP chooses not to exhaust all the measures, first of all, all the possibilities offered by the statutes.

This is, of course, no accident. The SWP expects nothing from an IEC composed according to the voting relationships at the Tenth World Congress. The primary goal of the LTF with a special world congress is neither a split in the International (as the IMT is sure to impute to it) nor the hindering of a split (as it will say of itself), but to organize the ostracism of the IMT before the entire international.

For a long time the LTF has sought to prove that the IMT is a manipulative secret faction. It has tried for a long time to demonstrate this thesis with revelations concerning the "Domingo affair," the letter (which was not made known to the U.S. and the IEC) from the leaders of the IMT to the PRT of Argentina, and the "Barzman letter." But the LTF was continually unable to score a resounding victory with the followers of the IMT. The IMT leadership always succeeded in taking the wind out of the LTF's sails with some sort of pithy explanation.

Now the LTF has available ammunition of a quite different caliber, and it plans to use this opportunity to open the eyes of the "silent majority" in the international.

Now it has proof that the IMT practices a faction discipline, proof that amounts to a reversal of political relationships: the letter from the Los Angeles group of the IT to the IT leadership stating that they have always been and still are opposed to the Latin American line of the IMT -- in the voting for the world congress, these comrades, out of faction discipline, voted for the Latin American line of the IMT.

Thus the LTF has proof that the authority of the tenth world congress is no longer so simon-pure. With a majority of only 50.5 percent for the line on Argentina, for example, a few cases of faction discipline prevailing over conviction could suffice to change a slim majority into a slim minority.

Now the LTF has the proof that the IMT has its own organizational apparatus parallel to the International, that the IMT, for example, has erected structures that according to the statutes can be erected only by the world congress or the IEC, such as the forming of continental bureaus, the NAB (North American Bureau) in which the IMT makes the decisions for its "sections" for North America.

The LTF is betting that at a special world congress all these facts will open the eyes of the IMT membership to what is going on. But if this proves fruitless and the IMT members shrug their shoulders over this sort of revelation, then it cannot be excluded that the LTF will "write off" the IMT sections and proceed on a split course.

The third aspect of the LTF's demand for a special world congress is that, independently of the motives of the LTF, it can prove to be a means to hinder a split in the Fourth International.

7.

It is obvious that neither side -- IMT or LTF -- has any wish to assume formal responsibility for a split. We have explained the reasons for this often enough. The real greatest danger is obviously that of a "cold split." This could occur in the form that both sides come up with mutually incompatible interpretations of the split in the SWP -- the LTF saying that the IT has split and thus violated the decisions of the Tenth World Congress and placed itself outside the international, and the IMT saying that the SWP leadership expelled the IT and thus violated the decisions of the Tenth World Congress. The two sides would part company over these two incompatible interpretations without either side formally declaring a split. Both sides would justify their position with 2,000 pages of documents and declare themselves to be the "legitimate" Fourth International, and the clientele of both factions would applaud their leaders and be persuaded that they were members of the "real" international.

Such a "cold split" is of course not possible at a world congress. There both sides face the necessity either to find a solution and to accept majority decisions or to walk out and thus take on the formal responsibility for the split.

Our position is therefore the following: According to the statutes, the IEC is the highest body between world congresses. It is the task of the IEC to remove the acute danger of a split that has arisen and to solve the pressing crisis.

We therefore advocate the immediate summoning of the IEC at the earliest technically possible moment. Only when all possibilities in the IEC have been exhausted can the question of a special world congress be posed responsibly. If the IEC confirms the assumption that a special world congress remains the only way of preventing a split, then we will support the calling of a special world congress.

But we will struggle against any maneuver that regards a split as a "fait accompli" because of the IT's split with the SWP and thus attempts to split the Fourth International in a "cold way" behind the backs of its membership.

#### The Reality of the Split Danger

The reality of the split danger lies in the fact that, contrary to the situation at the Tenth World Congress, the split in the SWP opens no possibility of an organizational solution. Political solutions are unavoidable. From the standpoint of principle, this is an advantage, but practically it creates an unprecedented split danger.

The reason is this: Both before and at the Tenth World Congress we fought bitterly, as is well known, against the "Canadian" solution. This solution meant that alongside the LSA/ISO as the section, a split-off from it (the present RMG) was recognized as a sympathizing organization. This was an unsurpassed affront to the statutes and was forced on the LSA/ISO against its will by the IMT and the majority of the LTF. We fought against this solution neither because of sentimentality nor because of any penchant for Canada, but because of a quite sober consideration:

8.

The Canadian solution is a model for a split. A split model that, to be sure, applies very well in this form to only one other country: the USA. But there this precedent is not applic-able without a split in the international (and then it is superfluous), because the SWP will not accept for itself and the USA what the LSA/LSO was forced to accept, and unlike the LSA/LSO, the SWP cannot be outvoted in the LTF. That is, the "Canadian solution" was a split model that in its first and only repetition must lead to the splitting of the international. Now it is necessary to think of something else besides breaking the international statutes.

Before the Tenth World Congress, the international faction struggle was a sort of mad chess game, in which the LTF, thanks to its superior play and scrupulous regard for the rules of play, was able to pile up clear advantages. But at the world congress the game became a poker party in which the bluff of the anti-split front in the IMT won out, supported by the strong nerves of the "solid nucleus" of the LTF. Today both factions are playing "chicken": Two autos rush toward each other, and the first to turn away or brake is the "chicken" and has lost. The stupid thing is only this: if no one brakes, both cars will be destroyed. REMAIN ON GUARD TO DEFEND THE UNITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL!

July 13, 1974

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

Chicago, Illinois  
June 26, 1974

[received July 10, 1974]

The Political Committee  
Socialist Workers Party  
14 Charles Lane  
New York, New York 10014

Dear Comrades,

I write this letter in my capacity as the National Coordinator of the Internationalist Tendency of the Socialist Workers Party and as a member of the International Majority Tendency (even though the Socialist Workers Party is prevented by reactionary legislation from membership in the Fourth International.)

At the most recent Plenum of the Socialist Workers Party, the Political Committee put forth a motion to the National Committee to set up a control committee investigation of the May 11 demonstrations in conjunction with the activities of the comrades of the Internationalist Tendency. We were told that materials such as the letters of various Party branch organizers and letters written by Cde. John Barzman, Cde. Cathy Matson and myself had also been given to the N.C. as part of the basis for the Control Committee investigation. This was the entire specifications announced at the Plenum. (The letters of the various organizers have never been sent by us of the I.T.). The N.C. voted for this recommendation without discussion of any type (we presume there must have been some discussion in the two official Leninist-Trotskyist Faction meetings that took place in conjunction with the Plenum or in the majority of closed sessions of the Plenum from which not only were Cde. Barzman and myself excluded but also Cde. Aubin of U.S..

However in discussing with Cde. Horowitz of the Political Committee and now of the Control Committee, I was told that the control committee will investigate anything it feels needs investigation and that the May 11th events are just one item. Cde. Horowitz proceeded to ask me details concerning the life of the International Majority Tendency, the International Tendency, the Puerto Rican Socialist Party, etc.. He also informed me that these were to be considered "official" questions (This "official" meeting of the Control Commission took place while I was waiting for Cde. Aubin and Cde. Barzman to leave the Plenum room since we were not welcome to stay for the next session dealing with "Opponent organizations", I believe). Only Cde. Horowitz was present. Not only was I shocked by the informality of the control commission, in that it can just walk up to a comrade and start popping "official questions", but by the lack of clarity as to what the specific nature of the investigation is. Does this suggest that any member of the control commission or the body as a whole can just wander up to individual IT comrades anywhere in the country and start a session of the "investigation" on any topic "they" think needs investigation? Then the hodge podge of information is put together to build a case for the disciplining of the I.T. as a whole?

With regard to the only question mentioned in the P.C. motion, May 11th, both comrade Barzman and myself spoke on this matter at the Plenum. We both acknowledged that our Tendency as a Tendency but also as loyal supporters of the Fourth International gave out the statement of the Fourth International on Chile and sold the Old Mole supplement on Chile in addition to carrying out our regular assignments. In many areas we acknowledge that this was done after we had requested the Branches of the Party to carry out their responsibilities in this regard. If it is true to say that the IT had a national policy to hand out the FI statement on Chile and get out the positions of the FI thru the Old Mole Chile statement it is also true to say that the leadership of the Socialist Workers Party had a national policy to not carry out the line of the FI on Chile. This is not a case of tactical implementation but of refusal to carry out the essence of the line of the Fourth International. On this basis the Control Commission is our penalty for carrying out the line of the FI. Further it is meant to intimidate and provoke comrades of the I.T.. Further still it is meant to intimidate other comrades of the Party or the YSA from joining us on the basis of our political ideas, being warned in advance, "that this is what you get if you are loyal to the Fourth International in the United States."

For the reasons of lack of specificity as to why we are being investigated, I as coordinator of the Internationalist Tendency have counseled the membership of the I.T. not to cooperate with this control commission until we have been notified as to the specific and concrete charges or areas of investigation and until the material which forms the basis of the charges or investigation is made available to us.

Secondly, the Internationalist Tendency will ask for an official investigation of the procedures taken by the SWP leadership in this case, that investigation to be made by the International Control Commission or by the United Secretariat. If comrades in political solidarity with the FI can be harassed and punished for giving out the line of the FI on Chile at a Chile demonstration and can be harassed and punished for selling a special supplement of an official group of the Fourth International, on Chile at a Chile demo--and for carrying out the essence of the line of the FI in this regard while the SWP leadership consciously avoids the implementation of that same line--then the idea of a democratic centralist International is a ludicrous joke. This is not the case, however, as we feel will be shown in relation to this "investigation" approved by the SWP National Committee which only allows members of the LTF to sit among it.

We will await your reply before we can give cooperation to this investigation, so we would appreciate an untypically fast reply.

cc: U.Sec  
IMT  
IT membership

Comradely,  
s/Bill Massey, Coordinator  
Internationalist  
Tendency

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

Chicago, Illinois  
June 26, 1974

The United Secretariat  
of the Fourth International

Dear Comrades,

Enclosed is a letter sent by me to the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party. I also enclose a copy of three letters sent on behalf of the Internationalist Tendency to the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party (2 of them--one by Barzman and the other by myself) and the leadership of the Young Socialist Alliance (one of them--signed by Cathy Matson, Coordinator of the YSA Internationalist Tendency).

As the above material makes quite clear, our Tendency after attempting to persuade the leadership of the Socialist Workers Party to carry out the line of the Fourth International with regard to the Chile solidarity campaign, took it upon itself to carry out that line in the forms of the distributing of the September 1973 statement of the Fourth International on Chile and the sales of a special supplement of the Old Mole on Chile. I stress the fact that this was done without in any way neglecting or absenting ourselves from carrying out the assigned tasks that the leadership of the SWP Branches gave us. This same situation is the case with the YSA non-SWP comrades.

The fact that the leadership of the SWP charges us with having done what we already admit to having done would seem to obviate the need for a control committee of investigation. What does need investigation is the fact that the SWP leadership adopted a national policy in opposition to the essence of the line recommended by the International. Not only this but the fact that the leadership of the SWP is now embarked on a campaign of which the Control Committee "investigation" is only a part, to intimidate, provoke, harass and punish those comrades on the basis that they handed out statements of the United Secretariat on Chile and sold a special Chile supplement of the RMG, the official sympathizing group of the FI in Canada is an expression of the deepest hostility on the part of this leadership to the democratic centralist concepts of the International and its own Party.

We see this investigation now being used as a general fishing trip to cause an atmosphere of complete intimidation for members of the I.T. in the SWP and YSA. This is reflected in the fact that Cde. Gus Horowitz states that the Control Commission will investigate whatever needs investigating. Everyone who is aware of the "Barzman letter" conspiracy syndrome of the SWP leadership can imagine the atmosphere developing with the constitution of a Control Commission which has the intentions to investigate everything that needs investigation. Secondly this investigation and new reprisals against the I.T. has the flavor of a blackmail attempt against the International Majority--the leadership of the F.I.. The attacks on the French Sections election campaign and the investigation of the I.T.

2/

are used as pawns to attempt to balance the actions of the PST in relation to the agreements of institutionalizations. This is a very cynical maneuver on the part of the IATF but one that is in keeping with past practices on this bloc.

Because of the situation existent under these conditions, I, on behalf of the Internationalist Tendency, formally request that the United Secretariat take this matter up and make a formal decision as to whether:

1. Comrades of the I.T. in the SWP are subject to investigation and disciplinary actions against them for selling the Old Mole Chile supplement and distributing the Statement of the F.I. on Chile at the May 11th Chile demonstrations.

2. Whether members of the Fourth International or supporters of the FI in areas such as the SWP, where reactionary legislation prevents membership, can be forbidden to sell the press of the International. Clarification of this is needed not only in relation to May 11th, but in general. This situation has been brought about by the fact that several SWP branches are now voting regularly on what press can be sold at various events. The only constant in this process is that the International press, such as Inprecor and the Old Mole are not recommended and therefore "not allowed". Members of the I.T. do not accept such a restriction and would like to know as to whether they are correct or not?

3. Can a Control Commission be set up to investigate everything that it feels needs investigation or must it have a specificity about the nature of its investigation? Do those comrades under investigation have a right to see what specific charges are being brought against them?

I feel that prompt attention to these matters is in order since in my judgement this series of actions on the part of the SWP leadership is meant to drive or provoke our Tendency out of the Socialist Workers Party by making life within it as unbearable as possible. While we will not allow this to happen it creates an atmosphere that is very damaging to political collaboration and political discussion within our Party. The fact that the Control Commission was set up at the recommendation of a leadership that denied our Tendency minority representation on the National Committee that approved the PC motion to set up the control commission speaks volumes. The fact that the commission is headed up by a member of that same PC is certainly alarming.

With the warmest comradely greetings  
Bill Massey, National Coordinator  
for the Internationalist Tendency

cc: SWP PC  
I.T.  
IMT



COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

June 28, 1974

[received July 5, 1974]

Political Committee  
Socialist Workers Party  
14 Charles Lane  
New York, New York 10014

Comrades:

We are writing to inform you that we are no longer retaining our membership in the Internationalist Tendency.

The reason is that we have serious programmatic differences with the International Majority Tendency on the question of Stalinism. Unlike the IMT, we [do not] believe that centrism is still a characteristic feature of Stalinist political formations. We also characterize the Vietnamese Communist Party as Stalinist, and would support political revolution in North Vietnam.

Therefore, we have resigned from the IT/IMT effective June 26, 1974.

Comradely,  
s/Polly Connelly  
s/Don K. Smith  
s/Ed Hoffmans

Chicago branch

cc: Internationalist Tendency

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

July 9, 1974

To: Socialist Workers Party Headquarters, NYC

Comrades:

The undersigned members of the Revolutionary Marxist Collective (Berkeley-San Francisco) would like to apply for membership in the SWP (and YSA) on the following basis:

- a) agreement with the positions of the Fourth International as expressed in its world conference documents;
- b) desire to engage in public political practice in the name of the Fourth International;
- c) willingness to abide by the discipline of the Socialist Workers Party, which but for reactionary legislation would be the section of the Fourth International in the United States.

The following individuals are applying for membership in the following branches of the SWP:

Jim Collins	SWP	Oakland-Berkeley
Barry Biderman	SWP	San Francisco
Bob Glick	SWP	San Francisco
Susan Schulman	SWP and YSA	San Francisco

We have sent letters stating the above to the appropriate branches of the SWP (San Francisco) with a copy to the USFI in Brussels. These letters also include information about where we can be contacted. The following letter is to inform you directly about our application (on learning from the Berkeley SWP that this was correct procedure) in the hopes that we can be admitted into the SWP as soon as possible.

Yours fraternally,

s/Jim Collins (for the four names above)

COPY

COPY

COPY

14 Charles Lane  
New York, New York 10014  
July 29, 1974

Revolutionary Marxist Collective

Jim Collins  
Barry Biderman  
Bob Glick  
Susan Schulman

Dear Comrades of the Revolutionary Marxist Collective,

The purpose of this letter is to follow up on the July 19 meeting between you four comrades, the SWP Bay Area organizers, and myself. As you know, we made a concrete proposal to you to facilitate the dissolution of the RMC into the SWP. You indicated that you wanted some time to consider our proposal, and would discuss it further with us when I get back on the West Coast.

To aid our discussion, I would like to summarize our proposal. It was as follows:

That the party branches in the Bay Area and yourselves begin immediately a period of close political collaboration, leading toward the fusion of your group in the SWP. Concretely, we propose the following steps to be taken immediately: 1) That your political work be carried out in consultation with the Oakland/Berkeley and San Francisco organizers; to facilitate this, regular meetings would be set up between yourselves and the organizers. 2) That you begin to make regular financial contributions to the party. 3) That you collaborate with the party in helping to prepare and build the September 11 Chile actions being organized by USLA, and dissolve the Chile Solidarity Committee into USLA to strengthen our common work in this area. 4) That you attend forums. 5) That you undertake regular sales of The Militant, working with SWP members on sales teams. 6) That you help in SWP election campaign work.

Jim raised the question of whether you all could receive the internal discussion material of the SWP and the Fourth International in this period of collaboration, and we indicated that we thought this would be a good idea. Bob also raised the question of his work in the AFT; we indicated that this work, as all your political work, should be done in collaboration with the party. If Susan is in a position to work in building CLUW, she should work with our CLUW fraction.

Jim also raised the question of attendance by RMC members at the Oberlin educational conference in August. If you accept our proposal, it would be a good idea for you to come to Oberlin, since you would then have a chance to see the party as a national organization, and participate in discussions about party work in the period ahead.

When I arrive back on the West Coast, I'll get in touch with Jim through the Bay Area organizers.

2.

Comradely,

s/Barry Sheppard  
Organization Secretary  
Socialist Workers Party

cc: Oakland/Berkeley SWP Organizer  
San Francisco SWP Organizer  
Political Committee

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

STATEMENT OF THE POLITICAL COMMITTEE OF THE INTERNATIONALIST TENDENCY OF THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY AND THE YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE--JULY 5, 1974

On July 5, all supporters of the Internationalist Tendency were informed that they had been expelled from the Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance for "forming a rival party". There was no opportunity for self-defense, no trial, and no provision for appeal. This action sets into motion a dynamic which concretely poses a split in the Fourth International. The Internationalist Tendency is firmly opposed to such a split in the world Trotskyist movement; to forestall such a split, we propose the following:

- (1) We do not recognize our expulsion from the SWP and YSA-- an expulsion which is contrary to the democratic-centralist norms of the Fourth International and the SWP. We appeal to the United Secretariat of the Fourth International to intervene against this expulsion of supporters of the FI from its American co-thinker organization.
- (2) Until a decision by the United Secretariat, the members of the Internationalist Tendency continue to regard themselves as disciplined members of the SWP and YSA. Concretely, this means:
  - (a) We will not publicize the expulsions.
  - (b) We will not discuss internal matters of the SWP and YSA with persons who are outside of the Fourth International.
  - (c) We will not intervene against the SWP or YSA in public forums or meetings.
  - (d) In mass work, we will place ourselves under the discipline of the appropriate SWP or YSA fraction.
- (3) We are preparing statements to the SWP Political Committee and the National Executive Committee of the YSA demanding our reintegration into these organizations along the normal criteria for membership in the Fourth International, the SWP, and the YSA--agreements with the general program of the FI, acceptance of the discipline of the Fourth International and the SWP/YSA, and commitment to work as active militants in these organizations.

We call for the reintegration of all comrades of the Internationalist Tendency who sign these statements. We reject any scheme which would require individual application for "readmission", probationary periods, and selective re-admission. All comrades in the Internationalist Tendency were expelled; all must be reintegrated.

- (4) We are preparing a detailed response to the accusation of "an IT split" made in the SWP Internal Document "Materials Relating to the Split of the Internationalist Tendency from the Socialist Workers Party". We reaffirm that tendencies

within the SWP and YSA have the right to internal discussion about perspectives, tactics, and platform; we also defend the right of tendencies to choose their own leadership bodies, organize conferences, and take votes on their line that will be presented to the party. We absolutely reject the notion that the May IT Conference was a "split convention"; on the contrary, we will show that the decision of the IT was to function as an active tendency within the SWP and YSA and as a part of the International Majority Tendency of the FI.

- (5) We call upon all supporters of the Fourth International in the United States outside of the SWP and YSA to apply for admission into these organizations along the criteria of their political agreement with the general line of the FI, acceptance of FI and SWP/YSA discipline, and commitment to work as active militants of these organizations.

The Fourth International is threatened by a deep crisis; it can only be resolved through a common effort on both sides to reach a principled agreement. We stress our determination to build a strong and unified Trotskyist movement both in the United States and around the world.

This statement was approved by Comrade C., member of the IMT and of the United Secretariat.

Political Committee  
of the IT

John Barzman  
John Hutton  
Bill Massey  
Cathy Matson  
Pat Quinn

cc: All IT members  
United Secretariat  
SWP PC  
YSA NEC  
IMT

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

Internationalist Tendency of the Socialist Workers Party  
c/o Bill Massey, National Coordinator  
Chicago, Illinois  
July 17, 1974

Political Committee  
Socialist Workers Party  
14 Charles Lane  
New York, New York 10014

Dear Comrades,

The undersigned members of the Internationalist Tendency of the Socialist Workers Party demand their immediate re-integration into our Party, The Socialist Workers Party. We base this demand on the attached statement that was approved by Comrade C., a member of the United Secretariat and a member of the IMT. (A relatively large number of comrades who were not mentioned in your letter informing us that we were a "rival party", but who have like the entire Internationalist Tendency been defacto expelled while we do not mention those comrades in this letter nonetheless we do include them in our demand for immediate reintegration into the Party.)

At Large  
Mike Hoffheimer

St. Louis  
Mark Lause

L.A.-West

Ed Medard

Ned Moore

Boston  
John Montello

San Francisco  
Garth Chojnowski  
Emily Ford

Debby Shayne

Judi Shayne

Ron Warren

Brooklyn  
John Singleterry

Detroit  
Randy Prince

Twin Cities

Jeff Meisner

Chicago  
Bill Banta  
John Barzman  
Ann Marie Capuzzi  
Lauren Charous  
Mark Lobato  
Bill Massey  
Cathy Matson  
Guy Miller  
Debby Pope  
Martha Quinn  
Pat Quinn  
Judi Rossi  
Beth Semmer  
Ted Stacey

Houston  
Jeff Beneke  
Bruce Clark  
Cheryl Clark  
Randy Erb  
Peter Gellert  
Howard Gerber  
Danny Laird  
Bill Peterson  
Jana Peleusch  
David Rossi  
Jeanne Shaffer  
John Shaffer  
Roy Simmons  
Russell Welch

Lower Manhattan

Hedda Garza

Frank Manning

Rich Mitten

Charlie Post

Bill Yaffe

Philadelphia  
Robin Block  
Harry Brent

L.A.-Central/East  
Sunny Foreman

Oakland-Berkeley

Tim Kissner

Fran McPoland

Lew Pepper

Mike Tormey

Portland  
Peter Kirshner

John Van Leuwen  
Gene Warren  
Sue Warren  
Judy Wollacott

Upper West Side-N.Y.

Joseph Harris

John Chairret

Kari Chairret

Washington D.C.

Les Gulf

Kathy Kersey

Marilyn Lerch

Tom Quinn

cc: United Secretariat, IMT, I.T. membership  
Encl.: Statement of the I.T. P.C. of July 5, 1974

Comradely,  
s/Bill Massey, for the Internationalist  
Tendency of the Socialist Workers Party

## End of the "United" Secretariat?

# SWP Stages Mass Purge

The Socialist Workers Party/Young Socialist Alliance this 4th of July resolved three years of mounting internal struggle by the brutal mass expulsion of the supporters of the Internationalist Tendency (IT). Forty-five party members, 45 youth members and 25 dual members were expelled—a total of 115, the largest single split in the SWP in 21 years. This abrupt act in the United States may well lead, even within a matter of weeks, to the definitive rupture in the "United Secretariat of the Fourth International" between the SWP-led Minority ("Leninist-Trotskyist Faction," or LTF) and the International Majority Tendency (IMT) which the U.S. IT supports.

For the past five years the United Secretariat (USec) has been polarizing ever more sharply between the fake orthodoxy of the reformist, legalist Minority and the impressionistic revisionism of the centrist, petty-bourgeois Pabloist Majority. Brain-truster for the Majority (whose main base is the French organization currently calling itself the Front Communiste Révolutionnaire) is the facile, erudite, academic European Ernest Mandel, while the

spokesman for the Minority has been the American SWP's intellectual technician Joseph Hansen.

The SWP expulsions were accomplished by the simple expedient of notifying every IT supporter "that the Internationalist Tendency's status as a separate, rival party be recognized and that the members of the Internationalist Tendency party be informed that this status places them outside the constitutional provisions of membership in the Socialist Workers Party." The peculiarly tortured language in proclaiming, not an expulsion, but the recognition of a new "Internationalist Tendency party" standing outside the SWP is an attempt to put a defensible face on the expulsion in confronting the SWP's international associates, in the light of the "Tenth World Congress" agreement prohibiting new splits and organizational reprisals. In addition the SWP immediately published a massive 146-page *Internal Information Bulletin* (No. 6, July 1974) to its membership attempting to justify the expulsion. The Statement on the IT expulsion adopted by the SWP Political Committee on 4 July concludes with the ultimatis-

tic demand: "To avert the danger to the international arising from the actions of the IMT, we call for the convocation of a special world congress of the Fourth International as provided for in the statutes of the Fourth International... Only a special world congress can now isolate the splitters and reverse the disastrous orientation now being fostered by the prosplit wing of the IMT."

### Technique of the Big Lie

To justify its accusation of IMT "splitters" the SWP had to make a fraudulent case against the IT. The core of the case is the Political Committee Statement's assertion that in fact the expulsions are based on the *previous* split of the IT: "the split was consummated at the May 25-27 national convention of the Internationalist Tendency held in Chicago."

There was a national conference of the IT at the place and dates indicated. But the funny thing is, it had a very different outcome than that alleged by the SWP. The IT delegates went into that conference with various draft

resolutions and amendments whose thrust was that they saw little long-term future for themselves in the SWP/YSA. But the Bureau of the IMT made very forceful recommendations to the conference, and the IT adopted the perspective of "building a strong Tendency in the SWP in the long-term sense."

The IT was dead serious about remaining in the bureaucratic stranglehold of the SWP as was made absolutely clear in this same circular letter of 11 June to the IMT by IT leader Bill Massey, who concluded: "In short, we urge the comrades of the IMT, who we recognize as our political leaders, to take strong actions to help us democratize the SWP, so that we can carry out the perspectives of the Bureau. Without your strong actions, we will die trying, but we will die."

Massey's conclusions about dying were straightforward and bore early fruit: on June 26 Don Smith, a founding leader of the IT, and two associates abruptly resigned from the IT expressing in the course of their resignation profound demoralization and disorientation. (They still made the unaltered SWP's expulsion list as ITers, how-



ever.) Smith noted: "The transformation of the Internationalist Tendency from a group seeking to 'build the nucleus of the future section' to one seeking to 'become a strong tendency within the SWP' completely changes our political situation." He recommended that the IT break with the IMT and suggested that it itself break into four constituent tendencies.

### Behind the Usec Fight

The fundamental driving force behind the escalating polarization of the Usec is that the two counterposed wings are responding to different pressures and appetites. The European-based Majority continues to race recklessly along the archetypically Pabloist road of striving for some kind of "revolution" other than the victorious class struggle of the proletariat, without the creation and ascension to real leadership in that struggle of a Leninist vanguard party as a condition for victory. Having abandoned (but never disavowing) universal "entrism" (tailing and hoping to pressure Stalinist, social-democratic or Labourite bureaucracies or big-time colonial nationalists) the Usec has in rapid succession put forward various impressionistic shortcuts to social revolutionary success without the class-conscious proletariat: a peasant-guerrilla road to power in Bolivia, the "red university" strategy which sees students as the key social layer; "from the periphery to the center" as the means whereby their French student graduates turned bank clerks or school teachers can somehow find the

road to the Stalinist-led industrial proletariat.

The new jargonistic cover for this petty-bourgeois impressionism is the discovery of the New Mass Vanguard, comprised of all the discontented young Europeans who, of course, don't even necessarily know they are supposed to be a vanguard and who embody every kind of manifestly false, mainly anarcho-Maoist, program. Rather than viewing the heterogeneous strata of militant, disaffected young workers and students as potential raw material for a Leninist party, the Usec turns them into a New Mass Vanguard, a semi-Leninist semi-party waiting to be found by the Pabloist vanguard-detectors.

Thus the thin, pulsating layers of Pabloists are fated to walk the earth looking for the "easy way." But what happens when they find it? When one of their local formations has locked on and acquired some significance—something tangible to sell out—then the centrist rhetoric of the Usec suddenly becomes an impediment to be sloughed off: the Ceylonese LSSP got into a popular-front government; Michel Pablo himself got to be a senior advisor to the Ben Bella government in Algeria; the Argentine PST, along with the representatives of six bourgeois parties and the CP, even got to meet with Peron. Of course Mandel himself didn't make it, being bounced in 1960 as a top advisor and had to hit the road for the infinitely less satisfying "student power" (thus the tabling of deep entrism—enter the "red university").

The SWP hit the time briefly

with the Vietnam peace movement and has been shopping around, mainly unsuccessfully, for a successor. SWP National Secretary Jack Barnes, his personal appetites for greater power and global post notwithstanding, and his SWP are above all seeking to fend off and suppress the Usec Majority's appetites for miscellaneous (mainly verbal) extremism which are not only embarrassing but downright dangerous for the SWP's main chance as a radical power-broker to social movements in the United States, hopefully thereby to acquire the basis to become a successful mass new domestic social-democratic party. So for several years the SWP has employed its presumed authority and very considerable material resources to bend the Usec to its needs and will.

### The IT Is Expendable

The 112 comrades of the IT are essentially but a pawn in the far-flung international calculation and counter-calculation as the two wings of revisionist ex-Trotskyism maneuver to destroy one another's credibility. The Usec Majority evidently sees that a break with the SWP and its allies cannot be long postponed (see our account of the "Tenth World Congress" in *WV* No. 42, 12 April). But to avoid the appearance of a major international split which would undermine its own presumed legitimacy as "the Fourth International," the IMT may have hoped to tackle the Minority piecemeal. They temporized, so the story goes, until the exhibition, under the tumultuous condi-

tions in Argentina, of the naked reformist appetite of the PST (see article in this issue) should compel the SWP to acquiesce to the elimination of its major LTF ally. Apparently, Barnes simply struck first, precipitating the crisis of his own choosing at his own time.

Whether by calculation in order to isolate the SWP, or because the shameful conduct of the PST has become an albatross the Usec can no longer wear, and whatever the accompanying Machiavellian calculation, this is the logic of thrust and counter-thrust. And so the IT, having accepted the perspective of continued suppression, demoralization and disintegration inside the SWP, suddenly finds itself on the outside while the IMT considers the next move in the gambit.

The prospects in any case for the IT are unenviable, above all because of the "comrades of the IMT, who we recognize as our political leaders," as Comrade Massey put it so clearly. In its desperate thrashing about, the IT has tried to persuade itself that the Pabloism of the United Secretariat is only a shibboleth, an empty political epithet. They are finding out differently. The organizational consequence of the Usec's objectivist, tailist line is disinterest and contempt toward the painstaking building of communist cadres. What are 112 ITers in the United States to the Pabloist mind?—after all, the automatic unfolding processes of the New Mass Vanguard or some successor gimmick will certainly bring thousands; surely one speech by Ernest Mandel in a suitable mass

meeting could win far more, so why worry about small change like the political death of the IT, which is merely the major part of three years of left oppositional activity in the SWP? Thus it is not subjective evil or ill will that causes the USec tops (the superstars Mandel and Alain Krivine, the more pedestrian Pierre Frank and Livio Maitain) to look upon the IT not as comrades but as pawns; this willful destructiveness is only the necessary corollary of their impressionistic politics.

### Evolution of the IT

The comrades of the IT, leaders and ranks alike, are mainly young and inexperienced. They sought, not always steadily or without capitulations, to move left in the degenerated SWP, that school for opportunism with its hypocritical, brutal regime which willfully connives at the destruction of internal critics. The initial oppositional declaration of the left wingers was "For a Proletarian Orientation" introduced for the 1971 SWP Convention, some two years after the fight in the USec had begun. Though narrowly focused and ahistorical, this document was a promising beginning for an SWP left wing. It cast Ernest Mandel as the principal theoretical fount for the SWP's departures: "However in the last several years Comrade Ernest Mandel has developed a theory which challenges these basic Marxist definitions [on the centrality of the industrial working class to socialist revolution]. And the SWP leadership has neither

criticized Mandel's assertions nor analyzed the implications these assertions have for the strategy of the revolutionary party. In fact, our party has been following the logic of Mandel's position without admitting it."

By 1973 in their letter of 19 January again declaring a tendency, signed by Bill Massey, John Shaffer and Don Smith (SWP *Discussion Bulletin* Volume 31 No. 1, 8 April 1973) the oppositionists clearly inclined to the USec Majority while still expressing criticism of its guerrilla war line and reservations about its hailing of Third World Stalinism as a pragmatic revolutionary leadership. By 27 May 1973, in their Declaration as the IT, they had come out for the general line of the IMT, and they ended up voting unconditionally for all IMT positions. Thus a tendency which began by criticizing the SWP for tailing Mandel, architect of the petty-bourgeois "neo-capitalism" line, today condemns the SWP for refusing to embrace this same Mandel.

### Bureaucratic Centralism

The SWP leadership has not failed to make considerable demagogic exploitation of the IT's turnout, while doing its level best to drive the oppositionists down such a destructive road into indiscipline and/or into the arms of the IMT. Accompanying the political degeneration of the SWP, the life of oppositional elements in that party has gotten correspondingly shorter, nastier and more brutish. The SWP Control Commission Report justifying the IT's expulsion, in the current SWP *Internal Information Bulletin*, makes a

new long step in "regulating" out of existence any remnants of factional democracy within the SWP.

The 1965 SWP Organizational Resolution adopted to justify the expulsion of the Revolutionary Tendency (precursor to the Spartacist League) still had a certain elasticity. Our tendency had written on 25 March 1963 in a statement to the SWP National Committee (reprinted in our *Marxist Bulletin* No. 4-1) that "The Minority declares: 1--that it *has and will* strictly abide by the democratic-centralist practices, discipline and responsibilities normal to the Trotskyist movement; 2--that it will not surrender the necessary and essential attributes and functions of an organized and internally democratic tendency; 3--that it recognizes the right of existence as an organized tendency is only justified by the most serious political differences such as all sides acknowledge exist within the party today."

In his reports motivating our exclusion from the party Farrell Dobbs brooded aloud about point 2, but was forced to expel us for "disloyalty." This was reflected in the 1965 resolution, the gist of which can be summarized as: (1) factions are permitted in the SWP, (2) factionalists are disloyal people, (3) disloyal people are expelled.

Barnes' present-day SWP removes the ambiguities left in 1965. Thus the Control Commission Report states: "While a faction has the right to meet privately and determine its own structure, it must inform the party as a whole of its organizational structure; its basis for membership, its struc-

ture, its membership composition, its leadership composition, the powers of its leadership bodies, and the extent of its discipline"; "But an organized faction can circulate its own internal discussion bulletin only on the condition that it receive the prior approval of the party and that its bulletin be made available to the party"; and "A faction has no right to conduct an internal political discussion that is kept secret from the party, and then to bind its members to discipline on political questions when they participate in the party's internal discussion."

Both the IT and our tendency when in the SWP were denied representation on the SWP National Committee. Such denial of representation for oppositions has been normal SWP practice these last ten years. This adds another dimension to the Control Commission's new restrictions on factional activity. Thus a majority faction, declared otherwise, always has the automatic secrecy, protected by party discipline, of privacy in higher bodies (including the restricted circulation of minutes) while it thrashes out its own factional platform. Meanwhile caucus or faction participants are to be denied the right to subordinate minor differences to major issues in order to present a common front within the party. For a politically-based faction to demand privacy in its deliberations and put forward a disciplined common front within the party is fully principled and necessary. How many times did Cannon in the CP or the SWP or Trotsky in the Russian CP do this very and utterly necessary thing? Conversely how many times has anyone seen SWP majority-

It is break common front in the last ten years? A row on bloc is when primary differences are subordinated to secondary ones.

The SWP accuses the IT of acts of indiscipline or hostility. The primary responsibility for the maintenance of discipline and good party practice rests in the first place with a majority, and above all in its own conduct. Only then can it legitimately make corresponding demands on all other elements in the party. The SWP Majority has been concretely and massively disloyal and undisciplined, excluding the IT from its rightful share in the official leadership and depriving ITers of all significant opportunity for responsible party work. This deliberate practice of the Dobbs and later Barnes leadership, which facilitated the capitulation of the IT into the ostensibly protective arms of the IMT, has successfully driven out all oppositional elements from the SWP. All oppositions but one, that is, The Revolutionary Tendency refused to quit, refused to break discipline and refused to capitulate to Healy's "protective" arms. That's why they had to throw us out for our views solely and then cook up the 1965 resolution and its current escalation.

The IT in endless letters and documents of protest has shown itself to be particularly and vehemently sensitive to the suppression of its democratic rights. But it stood by while the Revolutionary Internationalist Tendency, led by Gerald Clark, was suppressed, framed up and expelled, and all appeal not only denied but ignored through the

common action of both the SWP and the IMT. The SWP had analyzed the USec fight and drew conclusions from roughly the same quarter as the SL. As we note in the document "Declaration for the Organizing of an International Trotskyist Tendency" (printed in this issue) one of the aspects of the principled Leninist movement is even-handedness in discipline, not the importation into the allegedly Marxist movement of the common practice of reformist bureaucrats: step on the little ones, smash the troublesome ones and crawl before the powerful ones.

### What Next for the IT?

Some of the IT's positions are not bad. It opposes the SWP's sectoralism ("self-determination") and a separate party for everyone) and the line that U.S. blacks are a nation. But for the IT as a tendency, though surely not for many of the individual members, its revolutionary fibre is damaged.

Conceivably, as the result of an unlikely deal, the IT could be forcibly restored for a time to the bosom of the SWP. As Massey implied, down that road lies death. Or if the current USec crisis stops short of a complete international rupture, the IT could for a time become a public "sympathizing group" pledged not to openly criticize the SWP. In the event of a complete international split, as now appears probable, the IT will become the new USec Majority group--all heterogeneous 112 of them, along with the several sympathizing circles scattered

around the country and maybe even the nine IMT supporters still in the SWP.

The IT grouping will find that a USec franchise will not cut a lot of ice as they begin to be squeezed on the right by the tenfold-larger SWP and on the left by the several times larger Spartacist League. The IT will find, when and if it is permitted to set up shop publicly, that it is mistaken in many of its SWP-derived prejudices about the irrelevance or ineffectiveness (as to political origins, prior work and present practice) of the SL of the U.S., now a section of a bourgeois and *principled* democratic-centralist international tendency. Moreover, the IT's implantation within the labor movement is primitive and its practice opportunistic with a kamikaze overlay. Given the current gloomy economic prognosis, the IT will find it difficult to improve its trade-union involvement; should it manage to do so, however, it will find the SL there as an established competitor, not least in the IT's projected target industries.

Unlike the IT, the SWP has a niche to fill--but that niche lies unequivocally outside the authentic Trotskyist movement. The original split in the Fourth International took place in 1952-53. The SWP then, despite its developing weaknesses, fought against the Pabloites on the qualitatively superior political platform. Then, a decade of accelerating degeneration brought it down to the centrist level of Pablo's International Secretariat. The resulting European-centered USec has continued on the

same center of merry-go-round now-erased more recently by some thousands of new youth. But the SWP continued its rightward motion. It, as first suggested by Dobbs' condolence telegram to the widow Kennedy, is locked in fundamentally to the American scene and ultimately its activity is at the pleasure of the American bourgeoisie. The preconditions for its reformist participation in American life are fully prepared. It awaits only new and bigger opportunity. ■

## Workers Vanguard

July 19, '74