

September 7, 1974

To the Political Committee

Dear Comrades,

Enclosed is some additional material pertaining to the applications for SWP membership from the Baltimore Marxist Group, Baltimore; the Revolutionary Marxist Collective, San Francisco-Berkeley; and the Socialist Union, Los Angeles.

1. Baltimore Marxist Group. A report on a July 24, 1974 meeting held between Gus Horowitz and Bitsy Myers of the SWP and several members of the BMG; a letter dated July 30, 1974 from Gus Horowitz to the BMGers; and a letter from Michel S., one of the BMGers, to Gus Horowitz (mistakenly addressed to "Don Horowitz").

Also enclosed is a copy of this group's July 12, 1974 application for membership and a July 20, 1974 letter to the group from Gus Horowitz. These two items were already sent to you earlier.

2. Revolutionary Marxist Collective. A letter from Barry Sheppard to this group, dated July 29, 1974; a letter from Jeff Powers to this group, dated August 6, 1974; and a letter from this group to the SWP, dated August 16, 1974.

Also enclosed is a copy of this group's July 9, 1974 application for membership that was sent to you earlier. Also enclosed is a copy of a letter from Jim Collins of this group to the IT party, which we received anonymously from Chicago.

3. Socialist Union. Letters from Barry Sheppard to the Socialist Union, dated August 5, 1974 and August 12, 1974.

Also enclosed is a copy of this group's July 16, 1974 application for membership and an earlier letter from Barry Sheppard to the Socialist Union dated July 17, 1974. You have already received this earlier material.

Comradely,

Gus Horowitz

Report on Meeting with Applicants for Membership in the SWP
July 24, 1974

Present: Bitsy Myers, Washington, D.C. Organizer, SWP;
Gus Horowitz, Political Committee, SWP; Rick E.,
Michel S., D.M. of the Baltimore Marxist Group. (The
two other members of the BMG who had applied for
membership in the SWP, Jack S. and Lisa S., were
out of town and unable to attend.)

We began by asking them their political views on various questions. These are reported below. During the conversation we were told that the views expressed by one or another individual, unless otherwise specified, reflected the views of the group as a whole.

We asked their opinion of the SWP's line and activity in various areas. With regard to the labor movement, no specific criticisms of the SWP line were expressed (other than those described in regard to the Black struggle); but they told us that they thought the SWP did not place high enough priority on work with sectors of the working class that are in motion.

With regard to the Black struggle, they said they disagreed with the SWP call for an independent Black political party. Rather than raising the demand for preferential hiring and upgrading of Blacks and other oppressed nationalities, as the SWP does, they said that they counterposed the demands of jobs for all, and the sliding scale of wages and hours. They said that as far as they could determine from The Militant, they agreed with our intervention in the District One struggle in New York.

With regard to PRDF, Watergate and related issues. They said that they thought the PRDF suit sows illusions in the working class and was too legalistically oriented. They favored involvement in the impeachment movement, with the goal of attempting to broaden it. Impeachment is not enough, they said, but the demand for impeachment can be used. They said they thought the SWP should have given political support to the impeachment demonstration in Washington.

Regarding SWP election campaigns. They said that they were not opposed to running election campaigns in principle, but thought that the SWP placed far too much emphasis on election campaigns. This can sow illusions, they said.

Furthermore, they expressed the opinion that the SWP placed too much of a priority on work in support of PRDF and in election campaigns, and that this cut across the ability of the SWP to intervene with maximum effectiveness in the labor movement.

They told us that they were aware of the political debate that had been going on in the SWP, and they were in general agreement with the views expressed by the IT.

July 24 Meeting/2

On international questions, they told us that they were familiar with the debate in the Fourth International, had read many of the internal documents, and were in general agreement with the political positions of the IMT on Argentina, Bolivia, Europe, and the World Political Resolution. They were still discussing Vietnam and China among themselves.

We asked them where they had obtained the internal bulletins of the Fourth International and of the SWP. They said they got them from the Socialist Union in Los Angeles. They were aware that the SWP attempts to restrict circulation of these bulletins to members only. We asked them why they had not told us previously that they were receiving internal bulletins of the SWP from the Socialist Union, so that the SWP could attempt to find out the causes of this breach in its internal security. They said that up until now their relationship with regard to the SWP was not such that they thought it appropriate to inform us about this.

Rick E. had once been a member of the SWP. He resigned in July, 1972 and for a while he was a sympathizer of the International Socialists, an opponent organization. We asked him about his statement of resignation from the SWP (attached). He said that what he meant in saying that he disagreed with "the Party's orientation" was disagreement with the SWP's orientation toward work in the labor movement. Regarding the antiwar movement, he said that he thought the SWP's line failed to help develop an anti-imperialist consciousness. He said that his opposition to the SWP position on nationalism referred 1. to the SWP position on the Middle East, where, he said, we should have counterposed the slogan of a socialist federation of the Mideast to the slogan of a democratic, secular Palestine; and 2. opposition to the call for an independent Black political party. He said that he still subscribed to the political views expressed in that resignation statement, which at that time had led him to decide that he could "no longer function as a member of the Party."

Michel S. had once been a member of the YSA. He resigned in January, 1971. After a while he went to France and from August, 1971 until February, 1972 he was a member of the Ligue Communiste. On his return to the U.S., he went to San Diego. He became a sympathizer of the I.S. He says that he did not contact the YSA in San Diego. We asked him about his statement of resignation from the YSA (attached). He said that on the question of the Mideast, he thought that the SWP was dead wrong in supporting the demand for a democratic, secular Palestine. He said that he had changed his views concerning the characterizations of the SWP contained in his statement of resignation. He said that he would now characterize the SWP as a revolutionary socialist party with serious programmatic problems. He said that with the IT no longer in the SWP, the SWP is "less than the nucleus of the revolutionary party."

D.M. was not previously politically affiliated. He is the same D.M. who is described in the July 2, 1974 SWP Control

July 24 Meeting/3

Commission report as having attended the IT convention, May 25-27 in Chicago. During our discussion he denied having attended the IT convention. He said that he had driven to Chicago with the ITers, but did not attend the sessions. He said that in Chicago he had held informal discussions with ITers about the convention.

We asked them about the Baltimore Marxist Group. They said that there were five other members of the BMG, but the others were out of town at the moment. It was not certain whether the others would also want to apply for membership in the SWP.

They said that the BMG had its origins in an earlier group, the Washington, D.C. Red Circle which was founded in the fall of 1973. This was a study group, which also held some forums. Only three people from this group are in the BMG today.

In January, 1974 they went to Baltimore and set up the BMG. Activities of the BMG include work around Chile through the Chile Resistance Committee. They told us that the CRC intervened in the May 11, 1974 Chile demonstration, distributing a leaflet with the United Secretariat statement. They said that the CRC still exists, but that it is basically a contact list. In addition to Chile work, the BMG has also participated in activity in Baltimore protesting the importing of Rhodesian chrome, in picket lines at Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., and in work at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County campus. They participate in two socialist study groups, one of which is a contact class for the BMG, and the other of which is a general study class.

They have also carried out irregular sales of the Old Mole, paper of the Canadian BMG, and Red Weekly, paper of the British IMG. We asked them why they had not sold The Militant since it is directed at an American audience. Michel said that the Old Mole and the Red Weekly more accurately reflected the positions of the Fourth International. Rick added that they also more accurately reflected the positions of the BMG.

We told them that as part of the process of getting to know each other better, we would be willing to make our internal discussion bulletins available to them. We inquired about their own internal development, and asked them if they had ever drafted any documents or conducted a written internal discussion. They said that all their internal discussion had been oral; there was no written documentation.

We asked them why they wanted to join the SWP. They said they wanted to dissolve the BMG into a much larger organization that was part of the world Trotskyist movement.

Since they held differing views from those of the SWP on various questions, they expected that if accepted into membership they would participate in the internal discussions. They said that they had heard about the IT split, but had not seen the SWP Internal Information Bulletin containing the documenta-

July 24 Meeting/4

tion on it. We said that we would make this bulletin available to them, and proceeded to give a brief explanation of some of the material in the bulletin. We pointed out that party loyalty was the bedrock of membership and stressed the proper norms of functioning for tendencies and factions in the SWP. We encouraged them to study the SWP's 1965 resolution on the organizational character of the party. We stressed that the IT, having split from the SWP and formed a rival party, was viewed by the SWP in the same general way as other opponent groups.

D.M. said that he had heard that the IT members would be accepted back into the SWP after a three-month probationary period. We explained that he had been misinformed.

We proposed a series of common activities in order to facilitate the dissolution of the BMG into the SWP. These included: 1. joint work in selling The Militant, and in obtaining Militant subscriptions in Baltimore. The Washington, D.C. SWP branch had already begun Militant sales in Baltimore, and we proposed that this work be carried out together with the BMG; 2. BMG participation in work in support of the SWP election campaign in Washington, D.C. In particular, help was requested for the petitioning mobilizations that were underway in Washington; 3. work with the SWP in support of the September 11 Chile demonstrations called by USIA. We explained that it was SWP policy to carry out Chile work by helping the USIA, and that we would like the BMG to help convince the CRC supporters to participate in this work; 4. participation by SWP members in the two study groups in which the BMG participated, to help win the other people in these groups to Trotskyism; 5. attendance at forums; financial contributions to the SWP.

They said that they agreed that before being accepted into the SWP, they should carry out activities such as the above. But first they wanted to study the facts about the IT split and study about the norms of the SWP with regard to the proper functioning of tendencies and factions. They said that they have not had any organized contact with the I.T. They said that they planned to ask the IT about its views concerning the split in the SWP.

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

[January, 1971]

To the Membership of the Washington YSA

Marx, in his 18th Brumaire, agreed with Hegel that history repeated itself. But he qualified this: the first time as tragedy, the second time as farce. If what is happening in the Mideast is a farce, it is a cruel one, with one class paying the bill as usual--consciously or unconsciously, the working class of that region will suffer for the popular front tactics of Fateh. Instead of fascism, the enemy is Zionism, instead of Comintern betrayal, the traitor is the petty bourgeoisie. I know the dislike you have for Marxist terminology (such as "petty bourgeois")--unlike the Communist Party, you don't even use it to defend yourselves. This is because, basically, you are not a Marxist organization. The more one reads Trotsky--and here I will be accused of idolism--the more one realizes that the American "Section" of the 4th International is not Trotskyist. It is a centrist organization, which like the Pout in Spain, will strangle itself through its own opportunism and ineptitude. The YSA Convention confirms this, with its mock show of unity for centrist programmes.

But, back to the Middle East. Here is where the pseudo-Internationalism of the SWP/YSA shines forth. I would rather have been wrong. I would rather have been convinced that ALL the other sections of the 4th had been wrong. But unfortunately Marxists must be realists. Our support of the DPF would not have changed much in the balance of forces--FATEH, like the "growing YSA," is a large organization. Yet, as Internationalists it was our duty to put our socialist programme forth, which would have meant critical support of the growing Marxist organization: DPF. What I realize, however, is that it was not only because of the relative ineffectiveness of the SWP/YSA (due to its small size) to influence the course of events, but rather it stemmed from the profound degeneration of the SWP. This, by the way, is also symptomatic of the Workers League. I was accused of "Pabloism of the worst nature" by Lucy St. John, for advocating what she called a "liquidationist" solution to the Mid East situation. Yet, the real comrades of the 4th International have made clear that the only Palestinian organization which we could support unconditionally in the Middle East is the Palestinian section of the 4th which remains to be created. The same goes for Israel. We support critically, meanwhile, the Israeli Socialist Organization as it is the only working class party which is revolutionary (and, it follows, anti-Zionist).

As a Trotskyist, I must give my resignation from the YSA as a matter of principle. I remain, therefore, within the Fourth International and loyal to the United Secretariat. It is not simply a matter of principle or of conscience. I feel that I will play a more constructive role outside the YSA, an organization which reminds me too much of the bureaucratic centralism of the once-revolutionary Bolsheviks.

Michel Sidman

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

July 15, 1972
Washington, D.C.

Dear Comrade Bitsy Meyers,

As a result of my well known differences with the SWP position on such fundamental issues as the Party's orientation, the antiwar movement, nationalism, and the Middle East, I can no longer function as a member of the Party. This communication constitutes my resignation from the SWP.

s/Rick Ehrmann

cc: Barry Sheppard

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014

July 30, 1974

Baltimore Marxist Group

Rick E.
Michel S.
Jack S.
Lisa S.
D.M.

Dear Comrades,

I am writing to summarize the situation as it stands right now regarding your applications for membership in the SWP.

A meeting was held on July 24, 1974 between Rick, Michel, and D.M. of the BMG; Bitsy Myers, Washington, D.C. Organizer of the SWP; and myself, from the Political Committee of the SWP. Jack and Lisa were unable to attend the meeting, but their application still stands, and I assume Rick, Michel and D.M. will report to them on this first meeting between us.

Most of the discussion concerned the political views of the SWP and the BMG on world and national politics.

During the discussion you stated that your proposal was to dissolve the BMG into the SWP.

In order to facilitate the dissolution of the BMG into the SWP, we proposed the following to you: 1. That we jointly carry out sales of The Militant in Baltimore, and sell subscriptions jointly also. 2. That the BMG help in the work of building the SWP election campaign in Washington, D.C. In particular, we requested that you help in the petitioning mobilizations that have been underway in Washington. 3. That the BMG work with the SWP in support of the September 11 Chile demonstrations called by USLA. As we explained, it is SWP policy to carry out Chile work by helping the USLA, and we would like the BMG to help convince the supporters of the Chile Resistance Committee to participate in this work. 4. That SWP members participate in the two socialist study groups in which the BMG works, in order to help win the other people in these groups to Trotskyism. 5. That you attend forums. 6. That you contribute financially to the SWP.

You stated that before agreeing to the above proposals, you wanted to study the facts about the split of the Internationalist Tendency from the Socialist Workers Party, and to study the 1965 SWP resolution on the organizational principles of the SWP. In particular, you said you wanted to study the norms of the SWP with regard to the proper functioning of tendencies and factions.

July 30/page 2

Enclosed is a copy of SWP Internal Information Bulletin, No. 6 in 1974, "Materials Related to the Split of the Internationalist Tendency from the Socialist Workers Party." The cost is \$2.10. If you want any more copies, let us know and we will send them promptly (or if it is more convenient, copies should be available from the Washington, D.C. branch of the SWP.) Also please let us know if you want any more copies of the 1965 SWP resolution, "The Organizational Character of the Socialist Workers Party."

To learn more about the views of the SWP, some of the best sources are The Militant, the International Socialist Review, and the publications of Pathfinder Press. Enclosed is a list of Education for Socialists bulletins, published by the SWP's National Education Department -- you may not have seen all of these.

You told us that you already had copies of many of the internal bulletins of the SWP and the international internal discussion bulletins, which you had obtained from the Socialist Union in Los Angeles. If you send us a list of those bulletins which you already have, we can recommend additional reading to round out the discussion for you.

Comradely,
s/Gus Horowitz

cc: Bitsy Myers, Washington, D.C. SWP Organizer

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

August 15, 1974

Dear Don [Gus Horowitz] :

I wish to withdraw my application for membership in the SWP. I do this as an individual, and not as a member of the BMG, which I am no longer.

Any further correspondence with the BMG should be directed to the following address:

Rick Ehrmann
[street address]
Baltimore, Maryland

Michel S.

COPY

CONF.

COPY

COPY

12 July 1974

Socialist Workers Party
1345 E St. NW (4th fl)
Wash., D.C.

Dear Comrades:

We would like to formally apply for membership to the SWP as individuals. Presently, we are members of the Baltimore Marxist Group. We support the positions of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International and agree to abide by the discipline of the SWP.

Fraternally,

Rick E.
Michel S.
Jack S.
Lisa S.
D.M.

cc: SWP NO, New York City
F.I., Brussels

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

14 Charles Lane
New York, New York 10014
July 20, 1974

Rick E.
Michel S.
Jack S.
Lisa S.
D.M.

c/o Michel S.
Baltimore, Md.

Dear Comrades,

We were pleased to receive a copy of your letter dated July 12, 1974 applying for membership in the SWP.

We would like to discuss this with you as soon as possible. I suggest that your group meet together with myself, as a representative of the Political Committee of the SWP, and with Bitsy Myers, Washington, D.C. Organizer of the SWP. I plan to be in Washington on Tuesday, July 23, and can be available for a meeting either Tuesday afternoon, or anytime Wednesday. Is this convenient for you? You can reach me through Bitsy Myers at the SWP offices in Washington. The address and phone number are:

SWP
1345 E Street, N.W.
fourth floor
Washington, D.C. 20004
tel: (202) 783-2391

Comradely,
s/Gus Horowitz

cc: Washington, D.C. SWP Organizer

COPY

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.

July 29, 1974/page 2

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

Comradely,
s/Barry Sheppard
Organization Secretary
Socialist Workers Party

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

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

August 6, 1974

SWP
1849 University Ave.
Berkeley, Calif. 94703

Barry Biderman
San Francisco, Ca.

Dear Barry,

This letter is to confirm our telephone conversations on July 31 and Aug. 1. During those conversations you indicated to me that the Revolutionary Marxist Collective had rejected our proposals for collaboration. You also indicated that you had your own proposals which you would send to us in writing.

Fraternally,
s/Jeff Powers
SWP organizer
Oakland/Berkeley

cc: SWP National Office
Barry S.
Steve C.
file

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

August 16, 1974

To: SWP (San Francisco); SWP-NO; USFI.

From: The members of the Revolutionary Marxist Collective
(San Francisco-Berkeley) currently applying for
membership in the SWP.

Dear Comrades,

On Friday, July 19, the four members of the Revolutionary Marxist Collective who are applying for admission to the SWP (JC, BB, BG, SS) met with three representatives of the SWP in San Francisco (BS, SC, JP) to discuss our application. At the end of a detailed and fraternal discussion, Cd BS of the SWP made a number of proposals for an interim working arrangement of our group with the SWP, proposals revolving around our submission to the discipline of the SWP in all public activities (such as our work on Chile solidarity) and a commitment to the SWP in terms of financial and political collaboration (selling papers, attending forums, working in election campaigns, etc.).

The focus of our discussion at this first meeting revolved around the question of submitting to the organizational discipline of the Socialist Workers Party. In particular, Cd BS focused on the alleged violations of this organizational discipline by the former Internationalist Tendency in the name of "carrying out the line of the Fourth International" and indicated that any such actions on our part would not fulfill the requirements of admission to the Party.

We objected at the time and we object now to the manner in which the SWP comrades introduced the question of the alleged "violations of discipline" of the former Internationalist Tendency. As we understand it, this expulsion is currently a matter at dispute in the FI and its leading bodies, and thus hardly a proper item of discussion during an application to join the SWP. Even were the item resolved, we would still object to the totally one-sided presentation of organizational disciplinary violations (alleged and otherwise) not only with regard to this tendency but to all previous tendencies as well.

However, the matter has been raised by the SWP representatives and is of obvious importance for us given our open and public support for the positions of the International Majority Tendency, (which are by the decisions of the recent 10th World Congress the positions of the FI as a whole). We therefore feel it necessary to give our positions on the major questions of politics and discipline raised by the SWP representatives in order to clarify the future discussion. These positions have been arrived at only after lengthy discussion, which explains the delay in writing our response.

Firstly we must state our belief that the expulsion of the Internationalist Tendency (for it was in fact an expulsion as

we read the documents) was totally unjustified on organizational or political grounds and appears to be an attempt to quash internal and international political differences with the politics of the SWP. Moreover, the references in the document to the Revolutionary Marxist Collective are tendentious, misleading and erroneous. The fact that some members of the RMC know some members of the IT is hardly grounds for insinuating factional activity on either our part or on the part of the IT, which we deny and for which the SWP majority has adduced no proof whatsoever.

Secondly, we must state our total astonishment for the political "deviations" of which the Tendency is accused. Since when is selling the press of the FI or handing out official statements of the FI a crime? Since when is it a crime to know and talk to other supporters of the FI inside or outside the party, or indeed with members of opposing political tendencies or beliefs? Since when is it illegal to organize a tendency inside the SWP, for the new interpretations of the SWP majority of organizational discipline practically make any oppositional tendency inside the party impossible?

It is clear that these "deviations" are also assumed to apply to the members of the Revolutionary Collective. For we have stated our open support for the politics of the majority of the Fourth International as did the Tendency. We have sold the press of the Canadian RMG and distributed the Chile statements of the USFI and sold Imprecor, as has the tendency. Moreover, we have put forward in Non Intervention in Chile and in the San Francisco Chile Solidarity Committee the politics of the FI, as well as in our document on Chile which is largely drawn from articles in Rouge and which applies the analysis of the FI to the current situation in the USA. Finally, we try to talk about the politics of the Fourth International with militants inside and outside the party, as did the Internationalist Tendency.

Which brings us to the question of the conditions the SWP sets for our admission into the SWP. What do these conditions involve? They involve:

- ceasing to put forward the position of solidarity with the workers and peasants of Chile in the Chile Solidarity Movement;
- breaking off the political contacts we have gained through our six months of political activity in the Bay Area;
- ceasing to sell the press of the Fourth International, notably Imprecor and the Old Mole.

At the same time as we are under the discipline of the party, we will not be allowed into any internal meetings of the party and have been told or warned that expression of serious political differences with the politics of the SWP to members of the Party or YSA could work unfavourably against our admission into the Party.

These conditions mean nothing more nor less than the political destruction and suppression of the politics of the

August 16/page 3

Fourth International in the Bay Area. The position of the International on Chile cannot be put forward, we are told; nor can the press of the International be sold. And furthermore, you had better not even try to put these politics forward within the party for you will not be invited to our internal meetings and discussions with individuals will weigh against you.

We cannot accept these conditions, which amount to political and organizational muzzling of the politics of the USFI in the Bay Area. This is particularly vital given the disgraceful performance of USLA at the recent regional planning conference for the September 11 events on Chile in this area, where the SWP members present publicly spoke and voted against the politics of the FI as expressed in the recent declaration on Chile solidarity on September 11, politics which we are attempting to carry out.

Having stated our positions on these questions, we would like some points of clarification from the SWP and from the USFI regarding certain questions of organizational discipline and political line.

On Chile work: does admission to the SWP/FI mean that we have to drop our current ongoing solidarity work and sales of literature espousing that position and restrict our politics on Chile to those of USLA?

On publications: does admission to the SWP/FI mean, as Cd BS asserts, that we will not be able to sell the press of other sections and sympathizing organizations of the FI?

On political differences inside the Party: What are exact limitations on organized political tendencies or factions inside the SWP and inside the FI?

On finances: Does the non-payment of 10% of income (a stipulation not in the SWP constitution and not used as the basis for SWP payments, if any, to the USFI) disqualify one from membership in the party?

On party discipline: What are the procedures and approximate time periods for challenging the line of the party on a particular issue, for instance a desire to sell the publications of the FI at a particular demonstration; or the desire to represent the line of USFI statements in public Chile meetings? It seems to us that in certain extreme and very important political situation, political concerns should predominate over organizational fetichism.

In general we would like further clarification from both the SWP and the USFI of what is meant by "carrying out the line of the Fourth International" (which according to its constitution is a democratic centralist International) while at the same time submitting to the organizational discipline of the Socialist Workers Party.

August 16/page 4

Until such clarification, we cannot foresee agreeing to the complete suppression of the politics of the USFI in this area, which the conditions raised by the SWP for our (possible) admission into the party would involve.

We would suggest a meeting with representatives of the SWP as soon as mutually convenient to discuss this response and related issues. In the interim, we will participate in SWP forums and (wherever possible) we will plan our political activities in collaboration with the Party. One such activity would be the implementation of the political declaration of the USFI on the September 11 demonstrations in solidarity with the workers and peasants in Chile.

Finally, as per our earlier request (at the July 19 meeting), we would request that the SWP make available such documents as further clarify the currently disputed questions, documents from both International and Internal SWP debate and discussion.

Fraternally,
s/Jim Collins
for the RMC members
Jim Collins
Barry Biderman
Susan Schulman
Robert Glick

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

CC

C Y

COPY

[Letter from Jim Collins to the I.T. party]

July 19, 1974

Comrades,

This letter is in lieu of minutes about the recent activities of the RMC and particularly our relations to the SWP and the IT.

After the discussions with Charles, the RMC had a number of meetings where we discussed carrying out the mandate of the IMT as outlined by Charles about the specific way of applying to the SWP. Three of us decided to carry out this way if that became necessary at the end of our outside group discussion; SK decided against; CA and EB were not in town at the time, but EB is leaving the country and CA is not returning until the end of August (?). Neither was likely to agree to the perspective of the IMT in any case.

On hearing of the expulsion of the tendency, the three of us who had decided to comply eventually by the IMT perspectives agreed to carry out the application in that manner immediately. A letter was written and sent yesterday; also the first personal contacts with SWP members indicating our decision was made by JC in Berkeley yesterday.

As expected, the only thing the SWP was interested in was "Who we talked to in the tendency and the IMT". They said that all other considerations would be handled by their national office in New York. We have decided to tell them that we spoke to the following people on the following occasions, who tried to convince us to join the SWP:

Massey at the regional Chile conference in May

Garth at the meeting described in the SWP split document

Charles at the Chile Solidarity Committee film

None of these was prearranged; there are no letters; the other interchanges that have taken place were at public meetings of various types (particularly Chile), etc. It is important that this information be understood and accepted by the Tendency here (Garth) and nationally (Massey) and by the IMT (Charles). Also that Jim received letters with Zaslow and Rich in Baltimore if they demand that type of information; but the letters were thrown away; and we don't volunteer the information.

We intend to follow up our application with appearing and perhaps intervening at SWP public meetings; and discussing the applications with individual members and sympathizers of the SWP and the YSA. We are going to contact the tendency here about also indicating our knowledge of the expulsion of the IT from the SWP and our disapproval of that. If okayed, we will start discussions on this next week in private discussions with SWP and YSA members.

July 19, 1974/page 2

We also intend to work closely during this whole process with members inside the SWP, particularly Garth and Carlos. We would suggest the tendency approve joint meetings under adequate security precautions. Of course to refuse such meetings in the guise of security seems incorrect given our current need to coordinate strategy and tactics closely. We would also hope that in future the tendency leadership would contact us directly about any big change in the situation nationally; we can be conveniently reached at Barry's office or personal phone number, which we believe is in the hands of the IT.

For the next month, at least, we have defined our main area of work as being in and around the SWP-YSA and with the IT on this question. We are also continuing our work in the Chile Solidarity committee and NICH though little happens in either at the present time. A full discussion on Chile perspectives will take place this Sunday.

Our study group has been going now for two weeks; we are hoping to continue this as a permanent thing with a stable and growing number of supporters. A copy of our subject matter is enclosed (this is an abbreviation and alteration of suggested study matter from an outline for the IMT by Blackburn).

At the present time, we are trying to get together some analysis of the other formes on the far left, notably the Maoists and the anti-Leninists (SR, RA, NAM). This will be for some newspaper or journal articles as well as for internal discussion.

We are sorely in need of sufficient and timely publications of the FI. We would like to know if Chicago can handle these for us or if we should order directly. We intend to send in a check for INPRECOR subscriptions shortly; in the meantime we must report that we have only been getting ten copies of cc 0 and "1" which is entirely insufficient; we want 30 cc an issue please.

Secondly, our RMC postal address works if addressed not to any individual or another person than RMC. We would like mail to be readdressed to this PO Box.

Thirdly, we have received no copies of the OLD MOLE since May. We have not even received the Chile supplement as yet. Can Chicago check on this or are we to deal directly with Toronto?

Fourthly, we have not received the new copy of International as yet. Have these been sent out?

Fifthly, are we to receive copies of the IT internal mailings? In particular, we would like to receive all the information everyone else in the tendency gets about the recent expulsion from the SWP. We would also like to be

July 19, 1974/page 3

included in any preparations for a Central Committee meeting which may be planned in the future, and some information about our representation in such a meeting now that we have applied to the SWP.

As a personal aside, I would hope that documents would be prepared for the eventuality that the tendency will not be allowed back into the SWP; and also some statement from the leadership of the tendency for the joint functioning of the tendency and the outside groups in the interim, as well as afterwards.

Yours,
s/Jim Collins

P.S. As indicated by phone, cd. SS has joined the RMC and is applying with us to SWP and also YSA.

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

August 5, 1974

Socialist Union
c/o Milt Zaslow

Dear Comrades of the Socialist Union,

This is to confirm my telephone conversation with Milt to the effect that we will meet with the comrades of the Socialist Union at 10 a.m. Saturday, August 10 at the SWP hall, 710 S. Westlake.

In preparation for this meeting, we make the following proposal: To facilitate the dissolution of the Socialist Union into the SWP, we propose that the comrades of the Socialist Union begin immediately a period of close political and organizational collaboration with the SWP in Los Angeles.

Specifically, we propose that the comrades of the Socialist Union, during this period of collaboration, carry out their political work in all areas in collaboration with and under the direction of the L.A. SWP branches, and to accomplish this, that regular meetings be set up between the Socialist Union comrades and the branch organizers. This would include the following: 1) Comrades of the Socialist Union would take regular sales assignments of The Militant each week, functioning as part of the branch sales teams. 2) The SU comrades would collaborate in helping to build USIA in Los Angeles and in helping to build the September Chile demonstrations under USIA slogans. 3) The work of those SU comrades who are helping to build La Raza Unida Party be carried out under the direction of the SWP branches. 4) The work of SU comrades involved in building CLUW or in other union work be carried out in collaboration with and under the direction of the appropriate party fractions. 5) Comrades of the Socialist Union would be assigned to help build the SWP election campaign; the Socialist Union would issue immediately a public statement supporting the SWP campaign. 6) All comrades of the Socialist Union would make regular financial contributions to the party, according to their means. 7) SU comrades would regularly attend branch forums. 8) Any study classes currently being conducted by the SU would be organized in collaboration with the branches of the SWP.

If the comrades of the Socialist Union accept this proposal for a period of close collaboration with the Los Angeles branches, leading to the dissolution of the Socialist Union into the SWP, we would also like to suggest that it would be a good idea for as many of the SU members who can make it to come to the Socialist Activists and Educational Conference the YSA and SWP are holding August 17-25 in Ohio. This would help you get a better picture of the party nationally, and give you the opportunity to participate in the discussions we will be holding there about party work for the fall.

cc: Political Committee
L.A. organizers

Comradely,
s/Barry Sheppard

COPY

CC

COPY

COPY

August 12, 1974

Socialist Union
c/o Milt Zaslow

Dear Comrades of the Socialist Union,

On Saturday, August 10, 1974 a delegation from the Socialist Union met with a delegation from the SWP to discuss the question of the dissolution of the Socialist Union into the SWP. At this meeting, you stated that our proposal to begin a period of organizational and political collaboration between the SU and the SWP, as outlined in my letter of August 5, was unacceptable to you. You stated that while you were not opposed to beginning a period of collaboration in principle, you objected to our proposals because you do not want to help build the Socialist Workers Party during this period of collaboration.

We suggested, and you agreed, that you prepare a written counter-proposal, outlining the kind of collaboration you would like to have preparatory to the dissolution of the SU into the SWP. We all agreed that we would hold another meeting after we had had a chance to consider your counter-proposal.

There are two other matters that developed in the course of the August 10 meeting that we think you should clarify as part of your counter-proposal.

The first of these concerns the political evaluation of the SWP held by the SU. During the meeting, reference was made to the fact that some of the present members of the SU were formerly members of the SWP. One SU comrade, Comrade Mickie H., resigned from the SWP as recently as April 15. When she resigned, Comrade Mickie submitted a statement to the SWP, which charged that the SWP had "abandoned its revolutionary duty in the U.S." and internationally, and that the SWP lacked an "international perspective" as well as a "class perspective" which makes the SWP "an obstacle to the world revolution rather than a part of it." She concluded: "These observations and conclusions have led to my conviction that the SWP/YSA will not be the vanguard party of the American Socialist Revolution. This is the cause of my resignation." At the August 10 meeting, I read aloud these passages of Comrade Mickie's statement, and Comrade Mickie, who was present as part of your delegation, said that she still holds to the characterization of the SWP contained in these statements. Comrade Milt Zaslow, when asked what characterization the SU would make of the SWP, replied that while the SU considered the SWP to be within the Trotskyist movement, it was "sick" and only "possibly reformable."

We would like to know how many members of the SU hold opinions of the SWP similar to Comrade Mickie's, and would like

August 12, 1974/page

to know exactly what is the political evaluation of the SWP held by the majority of SU members.

The second matter came up when Comrade Zaslow stated that there was a new condition to the SU's proposal to join the SWP. He stated that the application of the SU to join the SWP was conditional upon the Internationalist Tendency party being re-admitted into the SWP. I explained that the ITP had split the SWP, and therefore was no longer part of the sole sympathizing organization of the Fourth International in the United States.

We would appreciate your clarification of this point.

Comradely,
s/Barry Sheppard

cc: Political Committee
East-Central L.A. SWP organizer
Westside SWP organizer

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

Los Angeles,
July 16, 1974

City Organizer
Los Angeles Local
Socialist Workers Party

Dear Comrade:

We, whose names appear below, are members of Socialist Union, a local independent Trotskyist organization. We are in essential agreement with the program, policies and organizational principles of the Fourth International, have been circulating its press, and popularizing its policies and its work. We are naturally eager to be associated with the International and to help build a strong section in the U.S.

We have therefore decided to apply for membership in the S.W.P., since it is the sympathizing section in the U.S. (unaffiliated only because of the reactionary Voorheis Act), and to urge other independent supporters of the 4th to do likewise.

We are aware of the division within the F.I. We are in general agreement with the positions of the majority tendency (IMT). Since these differences are obviously permissible within the S.W.P. and the International, this should not present any obstacle to our admission. We are, of course, prepared to abide by the decisions of the party and to accept its discipline.

Our organization grew out of a small study group consisting of independent Trotskyists (formerly members of Liberation Union). Last summer we formed the Socialist Union and began to engage in propaganda and action projects.

We initiated the Farm Workers Support Coalition, which you joined, and which was quite effective, as you know.

Next, we initiated the Lawton-Gardner Defense Committee in connection with the third frame-up trial. This committee is carrying out effective work of publicity, fund-raising and demonstrations. Some of your members have participated in several of these activities.

Our comrades active in La Raza Unida Party were the initiators of the demonstration around the Mexican Consulate on May 18, 1974, protesting the recent arrests and torture of revolutionaries across the border. This was quite successful, (as reported in the Militant), and we were glad to see a contingent from USIA on the picket line.

In addition to these actions which we initiated, we participated in demonstrations organized by others, including the S.W.P. Thus, as you know, we helped to build the May 11th demonstration against the Chilean junta. We intervened with effective banners and literature, which in addition to demanding

July 16, 1974/page 2

freedom for political prisoners, called for support to the resistance and for a Socialist Chile. Our banners also popularized the symbol of the Fourth International.

We also participated actively in the demonstration in the Black community protesting the assault by the police against the community and the brutal murder of the SLA members.

In all public activities we sold and/or distributed literature of the F.I. and some of its sections.

Throughout our brief existence, we have continued our studies uninterruptedly. This has served both to educate our cadres and to win new people to Trotskyist ideas. At present we have a study group in process on the history of revolutions and counterrevolutions in the capitalist era. More than 20 members and contacts participate, including a number of Blacks and Chicanos.

Our action projects, combined with our study groups and participation in community organizations, have born fruit. We have gained 12 new members, including 5 who are members of oppressed minorities, and a number of close sympathizers and contacts. Our Chicano comrades have recently begun a new class in the barrio which looks promising.

Of our 19 comrades, 16 reside in the L.A. area, and 3 in Riverside, and 6 are members of oppressed minorities. We have a fraction of 3 in La Raza Unida Party, 6 in the Food Conspiracy, (a radical community organization), and several in unions. About half of our members were formerly associated with the S.W.P. or the Y.S.A. and have been reactivated.

We are certain that our group can make a substantial contribution toward building a strong local of the S.W.P. in Southern California.

We are prepared to meet with representatives of the Los Angeles S.W.P. local at your convenience to expedite the dissolution of the Socialist Union into the Socialist Workers Party.

Comradely,

Alejandro Ahumado
Don Andrews
Susan Bronn
Woody Diaz
Adrienne di Donato
Jeff Higgins
Mickey Haslam
Jeanne Hoftetler
Nadine Kerner

Samirah Laban
Alvaro Maldonado
Jesus Mena
Melody Roberts
Stephan Santini
Evelyn Talmadge
Frank Wolff
Pearl Wolff
Edith Zaslow
Milton Zaslow

cc: USFI

COPY

CO

COPY

COPY

July 17, 1974

Socialist Union
c/o Milton Zaslow

Dear Comrades of the Socialist Union,

I have received your letter of July 16, 1974, signed by Alejandro Ahumado and 18 others, requesting a meeting with representatives of the Los Angeles SWP local "to expedite the dissolution of the Socialist Union into the Socialist Workers Party."

Of course, we are pleased that your organization has come to the conclusion that it is in "essential agreement with the program, policies and organizational principles of the Fourth International" and therefore you want to join the SWP.

I propose that your group as a whole meet with myself, as the Los Angeles City Organizer and as representative of the SWP Political Committee, and the two Los Angeles branch organizers to discuss this question. For the next few days, however, I will be in the Bay Area, for a similar discussion with members of the Revolutionary Marxist Collective who have also raised the question of joining the SWP. Following those meetings, I am going on to New York for about a week on national SWP business. When I return, I'll put other things aside so we can hold this proposed meeting as soon as possible. Thus, we could hold the meeting sometime during the week of July 29-August 3, if this is convenient for you.

I will contact Milt Zaslow by telephone upon my return to Los Angeles.

Comradely,
s/Barry Sheppard

cc: Westside L.A. SWP Organizer
Central-East L.A. SWP Organizer
Political Committee