

September 12, 1974

To Leninist Trotskyist Faction Coordinators

Dear Comrades,

The enclosed material deals primarily with the international response to the Internationalist Tendency's split from the SWP. We are preparing reports on the faction steering committee meeting in August, and on the September 7-8 United Secretariat meetings. They will be ready shortly. In the meantime we wanted to get out the enclosed items.

Included with this mailing are:

1. A statement by the Political Bureau of the RMF, the Swedish section.
2. A resolution adopted by the Central Committee of the GIM, the German section.
3. A letter to the United Secretariat from the Central Committee of the Liga Socialista, the Mexican sympathizing organization.
4. A motion adopted by the <sup>N</sup>ational Executive of the Socialist Action League, New Zealand section.
5. A letter to the United Secretariat from the leadership of the Socialist Workers League, Australian sympathizing organization.
6. A letter to John Benson from Roberto M. of the Revolutionary Marxist Tendency in Italy.
7. Correspondence between the IMT supporters in the SWP and the national office of the SWP, including a statement by the IMT supporters concerning the split.
8. A letter from Gus Horowitz to Barry Sheppard commenting on the items in point 7.

Other material enclosed is:

1. The IEC Majority Tendency's reply to the LTF declaration that is attached to the minutes of the World Congress.
2. An exchange of correspondence between the Political Bureau of the Swedish RMF and the LTF comrades in the RMF.
3. A translation from the Aug. 16 issue of Internationalen, weekly paper of the Swedish section, of their introductory note published along with the United Secretariat statement on the PST.

Comradely,

Ed Shaw

A SHORT STATEMENT BY THE RMF POLITICAL BUREAU WITH REGARD TO THE IIF'S LATEST PROVOCATION AGAINST THE INTERNATIONAL (THE EXPULSION OF THE IT FROM THE SWP)

### I. On this statement

This is a brief statement for two reasons. A majority of the Political Bureau of course stands behind it, but not everyone could be reached, and the others have not had the opportunity of a full, common oral discussion. Moreover, at the time of its writing we did not have the comments of the IT on all this. Nonetheless, we thought it important to point up certain aspects of what happened and inform the comrades of the Political Bureau's opinion. We are following this question carefully. We are preparing for a thorough discussion at the coming National Leadership meeting and are working up a resolution to be presented to this meeting.

### II. On procedure

All comrades who are at home have probably gotten the International Information Bulletin by now in which the SWP leadership motivates its actions. (Attention: This bulletin should only be loaned to participants.) Some comments on what is taken up and what is not taken up. Firstly, the Political Committee's decision of July 7 is only a formality. The fact that we have such a bulletin in our hands (a bulletin of 146 pages including material dated July 4!) shows that the material was ready long before this. Furthermore, and more importantly, the IT comrades were given no chance for a trial, that is the right to answer and confront their accusers in a party hearing. Finally, we cannot consider it correct that the SWP leadership on their own initiative sent this bulletin all over the world without submitting it to the Secretariat.

### III. The Tasks Before the International Control Commission

There is no reason for us to comment on the separate points in the SWP leadership's indictment of the IT before we get more information (including the IT's comments). So we will come back to that point. However, we think that it is proper for the United Secretariat when it deals with this question to order the International Control Commission to investigate the reasons for these expulsions and the procedures used, including the IT's longstanding complaints against the SWP leadership (see, for example, Bill Massey's last letter in the IIB bulletin, which is only the latest in a long series of letters to the SWP leadership and the United Secretariat). Naturally it is possible that the International Control Commission will conclude that the IT committed a breach of discipline so serious as to justify any disciplinary measure. But in this case it would also have to weigh any breach of discipline against the fact that for decades the SWP leadership has built up statutes and introduced an internal party regime (at variance with our conception of democratic centralism) which give it the formal possibility of taking disciplinary actions against any opposition current. Finally, the International Control Commission must also take up the SWP leadership's charge that the



2.

IMT has engaged in an "international conspiracy" against the I/TF. (It is surprising that the SWP leadership itself has not brought this question before the International Control Commission. In view of its attitude to the IT, shouldn't it have worked to get the IMT expelled from the International? Doesn't this indicate what would have happened if the I/TF had gotten a majority at the Tenth World Congress?)

#### IV. The IT's position

We consider that the US should call on the International Control Commission to investigate this whole complex. We think, moreover, that the IT must be given the right during this entire period to present its view to the United Secretariat, the International Control Commission, and the International, that is, that the IT should not be excluded from the International.

#### V. On the demand for a new world congress

The SWP leadership has raised the demand for a new world congress to discuss some of the aspects of the expulsion (the "secret faction" and similar questions). This must be flatly refused. We don't have any time for a new pre-congress discussion following immediately after the previous one, where certain aspects of the expulsion of the IT would be put in the foreground. This question will be dealt with, but in the bodies elected by the Tenth World Congress and according to the procedure prescribed in the statutes of the International. The objective role of the SWP leadership's demand is to sabotage the functioning of the International as an international political organization.

What has happened brings up for us another side of the matter: the need to begin immediately a deepgoing discussion in the international on the economic and political evolution in the USA and the tasks of revolutionists there. The political resolution of the Tenth Congress includes a reference to such a discussion, which may be the most important one facing the Eleventh World Congress. This is the type of discussion we want to see carried out in the International and not an organizational debate over the figments of the I/TF's imagination and its provocations.

Signed for the Political Bureau: Dagmar, Frej, Rooth.

Resolution of the Central Committee of the CIM  
for the Preservation of the Unity of the Fourth International  
July 28, 1974

The international discussion before the Tenth World Congress was characterized by a number of differences over the balance sheet of our movement since the Ninth World Congress as well as over the orientation for the coming period.

Some of these differences were serious, but they did not negate the common Trotskyist program.

Therefore, by an overwhelming majority, the Tenth World Congress took the position that a split in the Fourth International, which would be unprincipled under these circumstances, could be avoided. This required that cases of organizational conflict that arose in the course of the tendency struggle between the IMT and the LTF would have to be subordinated to the goal of preserving the unity of the International.

In this respect, both sides, IMT and LTF, made concessions and thus made possible the adoption by the World Congress of the "Nine Point Agreement of Measures to Preserve the Unity of the International." This was only possibly by finding a general formula that could be applied equally to both sides, regardless of differences in circumstances between individual cases. This meant that in certain cases the organizational norms and principles of our movement had to be suspended. Nevertheless, the Tenth World Congress took a principled position with this resolution: It placed the avoidance of a politically unprincipled split above all organizational questions.

On the other hand, there was unanimous agreement at the Tenth World Congress that the International could not continue to exist on the basis of violations of organizational norms and principles.

For this reason, the World Congress added a basic principle to the Nine Point Agreement -- that this agreement and its individual points could in no way serve as a precedent, one which could be applied after the World Congress as well. Moreover, this was emphatically underlined by the fact that the hitherto provisional Statutes of the International were unanimously adopted by the World Congress. The explicit purpose of these decisions was to discourage all future potential splitters in the national sections and to restrain them from their course. As far as the past and the present were concerned, the point was to keep splits in the national sections that have already occurred from becoming the grounds for a split in the International. As for the future, the intention was to halt the continuation of the "creeping split" which has been spreading from country to country.

Under these conditions, the de facto split in the Socialist Workers Party is a blow against the decisions and the goals of



the Tenth World Congress. The danger of a split in the Fourth International is posed in the sharpest manner. The organizational achievements of the Tenth World Congress are again called into question. The situation is even more threatening since the two large international tendencies concerned, the IMT and the LTF, have conflicting interpretations of the events in the SWP:

While the SWP leadership (and LTF) hold that the Internationalist Tendency (IT) transformed itself into a separate organization and split from the SWP, the IT (and IMT) hold that the SWP expelled the IT. Each side maintains that the other is responsible for violating the Tenth World Congress Nine Point Agreement.

In this situation, which is extremely threatening for the unity of our movement, the Central Committee of the GIM, German Section of the Fourth International, calls on the leading bodies of the International to exercise their full political authority in order to take measures against the present split dynamic and to help preserve the unity of the International.

In addition, the CC of the GIM calls upon both sides, the SWP majority and the IT, to take no further steps that would deepen the conflict and make it more difficult to overcome the present crisis, but rather to exhaust all opportunities for collaboration with bodies of the Fourth International in order to reach a political and organizational solution.

To this end, the CC of the GIM suggests the following measures to the international bodies:

--that the United Secretariat charge the International Control Commission (ICC) elected at the Tenth World Congress to make an investigation of the events in question in the SWP and on an international plane (in so far as this is relevant) and report the results of this investigation to the leading organs of the Fourth International;

--that the United Secretariat call a plenum of the International Executive Committee at the earliest possible moment (i.e., before the end of 1974) so that this highest body between world congresses can exercise its authority to avert the danger of a split and work for the solution to the present crisis. This plenum will give the SWP the opportunity to submit their demand for a special world congress for a vote;

--that in the meantime the SWP and the IT refrain from public attacks on each other and from publicizing the de facto split.

At the same time, the CC of the GIM calls upon the international leadership, the international tendencies, and the leaderships of the sections and sympathizing groups of the

July 28 Statement/page 3

Fourth International to exercise their political authority by taking a position for the defense of the unity of the International in order to counter the present split dynamic.

Frankfort, July 28, 1974

Unanimously adopted  
(the LFT CC members  
reserving the right to  
make an additional state-  
ment of their own)



TRANSLATION

TRANSLATION

TRANSLATION

Supplementary Statement on the Resolution  
by the GIM Central Committee, by Erik and Siegfried (LTF)

We support the resolution although in our opinion it takes no position on two fundamental points. These points are:

1. the assessment and evaluation of the IT Party's split from the SWP, and
2. the means and methods for combating the present danger of a split.

On point 1. We consider the report of the SWP Control Commission to be so unequivocal that it is impossible to avoid taking a position. Moreover, we consider it essential that every national leadership conscious of its responsibilities condemn the practices of the IT Party, or at least express their disapproval. As soon as these practices are characterized as "normal" or as "the usual thing," the unity of the International will face a far more serious threat, i.e., the splitters will be encouraged in their activities.

On point 2. On the basis of the published materials, we know that there are elements in the IMT that are on a split course. Furthermore, the report on the IT Party's national convention makes it clear that the authority of the IMT leadership is not sufficient to hold the splitters in check, and that the IMT leadership failed to initiate an open struggle against the splitters. Therefore, we consider calling a special world congress to be essential. We are of the opinion that only the authority of the highest body of the Fourth International can force the splitters back into our ranks. The theme of this congress would be primarily finding common measures for preserving the unity of the world Trotskyist movement.

The discussion of these two points developed along conflicting lines. Since no agreement could be reached, they remained unmentioned in the resolutions. This, nevertheless led Comrade Karl to slander us as "the real LTF split faction." Aside from the fact that normally tactical differences in a discussion on combating splitters held in a politically mature and carefully weighed fashion as well as with a certain degree of political maturity can hardly allow hurling such accusations, we signed the resolution after the expunging of several unclear passages -- but only in order to document a unified will to combat the split danger in the Fourth International. The means and methods indicated in the CC resolution are, in our opinion, insufficient.

Erik, Siegfried

COPY

COPY

COPY

Secretariado Unificado de la Cuarta Internacional.

México, D. F., a 20 de julio de 1974.

Estimados Camaradas:

Nos han causado una gran preocupación los documentos revelados en el Internal Information Bulletin No. 6, 1974. Nos aunamos a la proposición del Comité Político del Socialist Workers Party en que es necesario un Congreso de Emergencia de la Cuarta Internacional.

Comité Central de la Liga Socialista

ccp. Comité Político del S. W. P.

ccp. F. L. T.

\* \* \*

TRANSLATION

To the United Secretariat of the Fourth International

Mexico, D.F., July 20, 1974

Dear Comrades,

We are greatly concerned by the revealing documents contained in Internal Information Bulletin No. 6 in 1974. We agree with the proposal of the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party that an emergency congress of the Fourth International is necessary.

Liga Socialista Central  
Committee

cc: Political Committee SWP  
LTF



COPY

COPY

COPY

Sydney, Australia  
August 15, 1974

United Secretariat  
Brussels

Dear comrades,

At the August 14 meeting of our Political Committee the following motion was unanimously carried:

"The Political Committee of the Socialist Workers League takes note of the grave deterioration of the situation in the Fourth International caused by the decision of the Internationalist Tendency in the SWP to set up and start functioning as a separate party organisation. We add our voice to those calling for a special world congress to attempt to avert the mounting danger of a split in the Fourth International and to reaffirm the Nine Point Agreement of the Tenth World Congress. We urge the United Secretariat to convene such a congress at the earliest possible date."

We would also like to take this opportunity to discuss our dues to the FI. Our records show that we were financial at the rate of Aus\$10 per week until September 2, 1973. At the world congress we discussed with comrade Gisela our situation and suggested that since the FI was not in a position to subsidise the fares for our delegation then we should count our regular dues towards the cost of our international travel. She said that she would put that proposition to the finance committee to last for one year which would make us financial until September 2, 1974. Since we heard no more we assumed that this had been accepted.

Since that period is almost up we would like to propose a similar scheme for the coming period. As you know air travel from Australia to Europe is extremely expensive. It costs our delegate some Aus\$1200 to make the trip. If we are to have any chance of sending even one of our three IEC representatives to the IEC meeting at the end of this year then we will need to divert all our funds for international expenses to this purpose. So we would ask that a similar exemption at the above rate apply for the period through September 2, 1975. This of course will not even cover half the expenses of one delegate but it will help us try to participate in the life of the International.

If we do not hear anything to the contrary we will assume that the above proposal is acceptable.

Comradely,

s/Jim Percy  
National Secretary.

MOTION OF THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE  
SOCIALIST ACTION LEAGUE CONCERNING THE NEED FOR A  
SPECIAL WORLD CONGRESS

The following motion was adopted by the National Executive Committee of the SAL at its meeting of July 24, 1974:

That the National Executive express its concern at the deteriorating situation in the Fourth International as revealed by the split of the Internationalist Tendency from the SWP, and the complicity of the leadership of the International Majority Tendency in the preparations for that split, behind the backs of the leadership of the SWP and the United Secretariat of the Fourth International; and that we add our voice to the call of the SWP Political Committee for an emergency congress of the International, in order to call a halt to the activities of the splitters.



COPY

COPY

COPY

John Benson  
New York

August 16, 1974

Dear John,

I just came back to Rome. I found here the IIB on the split. I read carefully the Bulletin and I came to the conclusion that in the question of the IT your party has respected all the procedure, and done maybe more than this providing in time the 145 pages of explanations to all the members of our movement. While congratulating all of you for this respect of the rules of democratic centralism, I don't feel quite in agreement on the political opportunity of taking such a step which represents a grave danger for the unity of our movement: the problem of course is not only of stating whose fault it is, but of finding remedies for the others' faults. I fear that this question will have heavy consequences for the future of our movement.

In the Italian section, for what I hear, has already began a campaign of slander against your party, heavier than usual. The purpose of this campaign of course is also to cover the last measures taken against the Revolutionary Marxist Tendency:

1) The University cell of Turin, composed only of comrades from our tendency has been dissolved, without any official explanation.

2) Comrade Vito, few days after having found a job in a factory of 500 people (DEA, electromechanics) has been expelled on the charge of having criticized in a meeting the electoral policy of the French comrades. The charge is false because the meeting was called in the local headquarters of Turin, with the militants and few sympathizers and the only differences with the reporter, expressed by Vito (who at the moment was suspended) were: a) it is not true that we are going toward the Third World War, b) the 700,000 votes gained in France by Trotskyist candidates are a victory for Trotskyism. The leadership of the branch of Turin, after the meeting, made up a Control Commission (inexisting up to that moment) violating our statute which says that local CC can be elected only in branch Congresses, and after the 15 days required they obtained the expulsion of Vito from the cell to which he belonged before the suspension, refusing to discuss the question in the following branch meetings. This is against article 22 of our statute which states that expulsion measures can be applied only by the local branch assembly or by the National Committee. Anyway, Vito, after 11 years of Trotskyist militancy, a worker and trade union leader, incorrupted by the bureaucracy and back again at the assembly line finds himself out of the Fourth In. for having supported revolutionary marxist positions.

Things will not end up so easily. The deal is completely illegal and comrade Vito is appealing to the Central Committee. But the fact that in all the question were involved people from the Political Bureau and from the Central Comm. does not leave much hope. Of course it is very difficult to mix up the political persecution against Vito, with the split in the United States, but this is what will happen in the cities where there are no

2.

camarades from our tendency. By the way, the majority of the group of Rome has organized itself in a tendency ("Line of Conduct") and has produced a document of very hard criticism against the National leadership.

I received also the Militant of May 24 with the article by C.Lund on the French elections. Very good. It reflects exactly the positions that we have already taken in the Italian tendency and in some French documents of the camarades of the dissolved CIC.

One thing has shocked all of us. It is the question of the public attack to the PST, completely wrong in the form and in the substance. A criticism was necessary, but not that kind of "Third Period criticism" and not that public attack on a party who is under heavy repression. What is the meaning of this public attack? Is the situation precipitating toward an international split? What's next?

By the end of August we all will be discussing these problems and we will call a national meeting of our tendency for the beginning of September. The 15th the third tendencies will meet in Frankfurt: I'll try my best to be there.

comradely,

Roberto

PS. I haven't yet received any news from the Un.Sec. on the question of Vito.



COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

Catskill, N.Y.  
August 16, 1974

Jack Barnes  
National Office, SWP

Dear Jack:

1. Enclosed is a letter to the Party's National Committee from eight supporters of the International Majority's political positions who had notified the Party leadership of their resignation from the IM. Could you please bring it to the attention of the NC comrades?

2. The signers of this letter have consulted and decided:

a) We will continue to collaborate on the preparation of any documents we think necessary to defend the political positions of the International Majority and the integrity of the Socialist Workers Party, and we will establish whatever temporary and informal structures are necessary to effect this collaboration. These documents will be presented to the Party's leading committees or, at the time deemed appropriate by those leading committees, to the Party as a whole;

b) We will consult to the extent we deem necessary with our tendency cothinkers abroad. Our relation to the IMT is at present purely ideological: We are not at present requesting representation on any IMT body, and we neither regard ourselves as bound by the discipline of any IMT body nor has any IMT body attempted to impose any discipline on us.

Unless we are informed otherwise, we will assume that these decisions are permissible under the PC's interpretation of the SWP's constitution and organizational principles and of the democratic-centralist norms of the world Trotskyist movement.

Comradely,  
s/Bob Langston

Copy: United Secretariat

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

August 15, 1974

To: National Committee, Socialist Workers Party

Dear Comrades:

On July 4, the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party expelled by decree 69 members of the SWP on the grounds that they had constituted a rival party, the so-called Internationalist Tendency Party.

Essentially, the PC's action consisted of three parts. First, acting on a recommendation of the Control Commission, it decreed the existence of a certain rival party. The PC proclaimed the existence of a formation to be characterized not as a tendency, not as a faction -- secret, disloyal or otherwise -- and not simply as a rival political grouping, but as a rival party.

Much of the CC report is concerned with alleged indisplined actions and expressions of a disloyal attitude on the part of some declared adherents of the Internationalist Tendency and with an allegedly high degree of internal organization attained by the IT. The comrades of the CC did not, however, claim to be in possession of any evidence indicating any preparations to undertake any public activities in the name of any group distinct from the SWP and YSA.

Secondly, the PC decreed that 69 members of the SWP belong to this so-called Internationalist Tendency Party. It did not state how it arrived at precisely the figure 69, nor did it describe the method employed to determine which individual comrades were to be selected to be among the 69. Evidently, though, the method of selection was this: All those comrades who had declared their support to the documents that constituted the platform of the Internationalist Tendency before either of the last two SWP conventions were to be regraded as members of the so-called IT Party, except for eight comrades who had taken the step of notifying some Party leader that they had withdrawn from the IT Caucus. That this was indeed the method of selection is supported by the fact that several of the expelled comrades didn't consider themselves members of the IT although they had voted for the platform of the IT. At least one of the expelled comrades had formally resigned from the IT but had neglected to notify the National Office. Neither the CC nor the PC, it should be noted, claimed that any of the 69 comrades expelled thought they belonged to any party but the SWP.

Finally, the PC proclaimed that by constituting this "IT Party" these 69 comrades had placed themselves "outside the constitutional provisions of membership in the Socialist Workers Party." Not one of the comrades was informed in advance that he or she was charged with belonging to a rival party. Not one was given a trial or hearing of any sort at which he or she might have challenged the claim of the PC. Not one of them was offered any opportunity to repudiate any actions or views -- possibly taken or expressed by other



individuals -- for which the PC declared him or her coresponsible, solely on the grounds that he or she had at one time or another indicated support to the declared political positions of the IT.

This expulsion procedure strictly implies that the expulsions were programmatic in character. For unless this is the case, it is impossible that a comrade's declared agreement with certain documented political ideas could classify that comrade as belonging to a group, membership in which places the comrade outside the constitutional provisions of membership in the SWP.

Moreover, the expulsion procedure implies that it is the IMT positions which conflict with the programmatic basis of the SWP. For some of the expelled comrades had not supported the IT's counter political resolution before the August Convention but only, before the December Convention, the documents which the IT shares with the IMT as a whole. In this connection it should be noted that no leading comrades of the SWP have ever asserted -- at least not in any document -- that the IT's positions on U.S. questions are in their eyes incompatible with the programmatic basis of the Party, however wrong-headed they might think them. But certain cautious moves towards characterizing the IMT positions in general as programmatically non-Trotskyist have been taken by LTF leaders. (We refer particularly to Comrade Joe Hansen's opinion, expressed in his report to the New York LTF caucus, that there is nearly sufficient evidence to support an analysis which would demonstrate that the IMT line is petty-bourgeois in nature.)

To date, political positions within the International have progressively polarized around the platforms of the two big tendencies. "Third" currents have lost ground. This is inherent in the process of a tendency struggle in which each side step by step brings forth ever more fundamental issues and thus ever more explicitly defines its line in opposition to the other. Under these circumstances, any leadership action -- like the July 4 expulsions as they were carried out -- which implies that support to the IMT positions is contradictory to adherence to the programmatic foundation of the SWP means in practice to impose the faction platform of the LTF as the programmatic basis of the SWP.

The PC, in short, expelled supporters of the IMT under a procedure that strictly implies the expulsions to be programmatic and it used language insinuating this to be the case. It thereby, in reality, imposed the platform of the LTF as the programmatic foundation of the SWP.

These expulsions raise a number of important questions. Before dealing with the central one, we want to mention a couple of secondary ones.

First, the PC's action is of dubious statutory legitimacy. What is involved here is not whether Article VI or Article VIII



August 15/page 3

of the SWP Constitution governs disciplinary proceedings other than those instituted at the branch level. Nor is any question of the constitutional rights of individual comrades or of organized minorities as against the constitutional powers of leading committees directly raised.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that the comrades of the CC express an opinion in their report which, if it should be adopted by the Party, would render any statute on the rights of organized minorities incoherent. For they write: "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." (It should be stressed that this is only an opinion, for although the comrades of the CC present it as a gloss on the 1965 resolution, The Organizational Character of the SWP, and although they claim for it the dignity of a "principle of Leninist organization," it is not at all implied by anything in that resolution nor has it, as far as we know, ever been incorporated into the statutes of any democratic centralist organization.) But what conceivable sense could be made of a statute that would, on the one hand, grant factions the right in general -- without anybody's prior permission -- in the words of the CC "to meet privately" and "to circulate drafts of proposed documents among faction members for the purpose of preparing material for presentation to the party as a whole," and yet would, on the other hand, deny this right to privacy when faction discussion was transferred from meetings to paper and would permit comments on the proposed drafts to be circulated among faction members only with the prior approval of the leadership?

However, the PC's action does raise a statutory question because the Statutes of the Fourth International impose certain constraints on the disciplinary powers even of leading committees. For Section VII, Subsection 29, Paragraph 8, provides, without qualification, that "members facing disciplinary action are entitled to know in advance the accusations brought against them, to present their defense and, except where it is geographically impossible, to confront their accusers." None of these conditions was satisfied in the case of the expulsion of the IT comrades. (We trust that no comrade would be tempted to deny that expulsion is a disciplinary action, even if that term is never used, even if it is carried out on programmatic grounds, and even if it is decreed by the formula that the comrades in question belong to a rival party and that "this status places them outside the constitutional provisions of membership in the Socialist Workers Party.")

Moreover, it is at least questionable that national sections or sympathizing groups have the statutory authority to expel members of the International Executive Committee. For Section 3, Subsection 9, provides that the IEC "exercises disciplinary powers over its own members." But two of the 69 comrades expelled on July 4 were granted permission by the 10th World Congress to attend meetings of the IEC as fraternal



August 15/page 4

observers, one with the rank of full member, the other with the rank of alternate member, of the IEC.

Likewise important, but not central to this case, is whether it is wise for a leadership to carry out expulsions-- even if it had unchallengeable statutory authority to do so -- through a procedure that strictly implies, and with language that insinuates, a programmatic basis for the expulsions, without explicitly stating that this is in fact the case. And it is not a great deal to expect of a leadership that before carrying out programmatic expulsions, it will initiate, except in the most extreme circumstances, a discussion in the whole organization to explain and defend its view that the conceptions in question are incompatible with Trotskyism or, short of that, with maintaining the necessary minimum of political homogeneity.

Important as these questions are, they are not fundamental.

What is fundamental is that this action by the IWP leadership of the SWP is a second -- and very nearly decisive -- assault on the integrity of the Socialist Workers Party.

The political foundation of the SWP as an organization is its relationship to the Fourth International; politically it is the unit of the Fourth International in the United States, even though it is prevented by reactionary legislation from affiliating to the FI. Its integrity depends on the practical recognition of the principle that as a party, as the organized expression of the FI in the United States, it is distinct from any tendencies or factions that may exist within the FI, regardless of what tendency or faction its leadership and membership, in their majority, may at any given moment support.

This principle of the distinction between party and faction in no way, of course, contradicts the norm that the party majority has the unconditional right to decide line -- within the framework of the authoritative declarations of the International -- and that every comrade must abide by these majority decisions. Rather, these two principles complement and in practice imply one another. For without practical acceptance of "majority decision -- minority submission," any tendency conflict within the International would immediately tend to disintegrate national units of the FI into distinct, public factional groupings, each raising the claim to be the section, the party. But without strict practical acceptance of the principle of the distinction between party and faction, the authority necessary to lead the party and not merely a faction -- the capacity to assure in practice the submission of the minority to the majority -- is undermined.

On August 9, 1973, the SWP leadership took a step that violated this principle of the distinction between party and faction by solemnly affirming that it would turn the Party organization as such into an instrument of factional struggle. Since that date, it has made no effort to correct that error.

On July 4, the SWP leadership again violated that principle by taking an action that in fact imposes a factional platform as the programmatic basis of the Party. The PC fancifully charges that the IT transformed itself from a faction into a party. If these two steps taken by the SWP leadership remain uncorrected, it will really very nearly have transformed a party into a faction.

Last August 9, the 25th National Convention adopted, at the behest of the Party leadership, a motion approving the general line of the PC's World Movement Report. The heart of that report was a declaration of factional war on the majority of the leadership of the Fourth International. Of five points singled out by the motion for special emphasis, the last was:

"5. The convention instructs and empowers the incoming National Committee to use all the forces and resources at its command to struggle for a democratic world congress and a Trotskyist Fourth International."

Not merely the literal content of the report, but the war ritual enacted in that convention session, made unmistakably clear the meaning of the words "to struggle for. . . a Trotskyist Fourth International." With no change in meaning at all, point five of that motion could have been phrased: "The convention instructs and empowers the incoming National Committee to place all the forces and resources at its command at the disposal of the soon-to-be-declared Leninist-Trotskyist Faction for use in its factional war on the majority of the leadership of the Fourth International."

At its request, the Party leadership received an instruction to turn the Party organization as such -- the greatest "force and resource" at its command and the sum of all the rest -- into a weapon for factional warfare.

The PC, moreover, never issued any simple, clear statement reaffirming the principle of the integrity of the Party, of the distinction between faction and party. In convention reports to the branches and in private discussion some of us had with PC members, the issue was, at best, simply evaded. Nor did the Party leadership ever undertake any actions -- at least prior to the time IMF adherents were placed by young Party supporters of the LTF on the YSA National Committee -- which would even have hinted that that motion would not be implemented with unrestricted scope. On the contrary, what had already before the August convention become a pattern of leadership actions, the factional nature of which has been documented as well as it possibly could be short of a genuine investigation by an international parity body, became even more sharply defined. At the convention itself, this pattern was thrown into sharp relief both by the charges of "disloyalty" and "adhering to a secret faction" raised against supporters of the IMF in the SWP and by the outrageous denial of National Committee representation to the IMF's point of view.



But the comrades of the CC are right when they insist that it is "not necessary to spend a great deal of time to examine many of the specific incidents, allegations and counter-allegations." The simple fact that the leadership requested and got passage of that motion and refrained from any subsequent actions that would suggest any limitation or modification of it in its application, is fully sufficient to explain certain developments.

Adoption of that motion inserted an element of corruption, in the most literal sense, into the Party. Although the 1965 resolution on organization correctly insists that party loyalty is not merely an abstract idea but a standard of political conduct, adoption of that motion overthrew that objective standard. For thenceforth it has been impossible, logically impossible, for any comrade to answer for himself or herself the question, If I act in this particular way, am I being loyal or disloyal to the Party? And this is so, simply because ever since the Party leadership requested and got an instruction to make the Party organization into a factional weapon, it has been impossible, logically impossible, for any comrade to answer the question, If I carry out this assignment, given in the name of the Party, am I in reality carrying out a Party assignment or am I carrying out an LTF assignment masquerading as a Party assignment?

And with the overthrow of that objective standard of political conduct that constitutes party loyalty, there occurred, in certain essential respects, a collapse of leadership authority.

The formal aspect of this collapse of authority is obvious. For from the moment that the Party leadership solemnly declared to every comrade in the world movement that thenceforth every action taken in the name of the SWP would have to be regarded as a weapon of factional warfare, any disciplinary action taken by any Party body that touched on the tendency conflict in the International has necessarily been under a cloud. Under these circumstances, only an international parity body could possess the authority necessary to investigate incidents like those that occurred on May 11 or to take disciplinary action in connection with such incidents.

Furthermore, neither formal nor substantive authority can remain intact for an instant in a party with tendency differences in the absence of rational grounds for confidence that a leadership decision taken in the name of the Party, whether correct or incorrect, is immediately motivated by the shared goal of taking a step towards implementing the program of socialist revolution and not by the precisely not shared goal of gaining some factional advantage for the leadership's faction. Put crudely: Within very broad limits, you can very well expect people to do what you tell them to do, even if they think you are wrong, as long as they have reason to suppose that what you are telling them to do is aimed at achieving what they agree with you ought to be achieved. But it is very hard to expect people to do what you tell them to do if you give them every reason to suppose that what you tell them



to do is aimed at achieving what you think ought to be achieved but they think ought not to be achieved, and not at what both you and they think ought to be achieved.

But since August 9, 1973, when the Party leadership requested and got an instruction to turn the Party organization into a factional weapon, no comrade -- at least no comrade who does not participate in LTF caucus meetings -- has had any rational ground whatever for confidence that any action decided to be carried out in the name of the Party is aimed directly at building the party of socialist revolution and not at strengthening the tactical position of the LTF in its war on the majority of the International's leadership.

Since that day, every dime paid in Party dues or sustainer has inescapably raised the question: Is this dime going to be used to build the Party or is this dime going to be used to build the LTF? Every assignment to sell the publications of the Party has posed the question: Are the contents of these publications really intended to agitate, educate and organize for the socialist revolution or are they intended to win some purely factional gain for the LTF?

Thus, the comrades of the CC completely misunderstand the situation when they write: "If permitted to continue, the actions of the IT would result in the total breakdown of the authority of units of the SWP." Since last August 9, little that the IT comrades did or could do could lead to a breakdown of the authority of the units of the Party. That breakdown occurred at the 25th National Convention when the Party leadership took a step that immediately caused the collapse of its authority into a merely factional authority. From that moment on, the units of the Party -- as distinct from the units of the LTF -- have been functioning without any authority at all. From that moment on, the only objective source of Party, as distinct from LTF, units' ability to command discipline has been the power -- uncontested by anyone -- to lock comrades out of the hall. The leadership has been attempting to lead the Party armed only with factional authority.

It is, of course, possible that some actions undertaken by some ITers were beginning to undermine that factional authority of the Party leadership. This could, certainly, over an extended period of time lead to some impairment in the ability of the SWP to carry out its functions as an organization. If this is so -- and we have no way of knowing -- it simply means that the Party leadership stood before a basic choice: either to make an effort to recover its lost Party authority or, by a purge, to make it easier to lead its faction in the name of the Party. If this problem entered into the decision to expel the IT comrades at all, it is evident which course the leadership chose.

It is easy to understand that the objective meaning of that August 9 motion would escape the notice of some comrades who agree politically with the LTF. It is also easy to understand that many of these comrades -- rank-and-filers and leaders alike -- would begin to identify the Party with their faction.



Indeed, it is hard to explain the CC-comrades' erroneous idea that any IT actions could, after August 9, 1973, undermine Party authority, except on the assumption that they too have fallen victim to that confusion.

Whatever the effects of the 25th Convention on the comrades of the LTF, its impact on the IT was little short of catastrophic.

Of course, any hard-fought tendency struggle in the International stimulates centrifugal forces within the sections and sympathizing groups. Of course, these forces are intensified once a number of splits have actually been consummated. Possibly half-formed fantasies of "greener pastures," fueled by powerful feelings of hope, bitterness and anxiety, were floating around in some IT heads. Possibly a few comrades had even begun to formulate a perspective based on the assumption of the "inevitability" of a split in the International and thus on the "necessity" to prepare for any eventuality.

But the overthrow, in August 1973, of that objective standard of Party loyalty -- followed two days later by the exclusion of the IMT current from the National Committee on the grounds of disloyalty -- and the corrosion of leadership authority by the August convention, necessarily contributed to a qualitative change in the development of the IT.

A conglomeration of false conceptions pertaining to the character of the Party, the functions of the tendency, and the unity of the International -- conceptions which if consistently pursued might well have propelled the IT towards an independent political existence -- began to take shape and gradually to dominate part of the tendency. Given what happened in the convention and the intensely factional atmosphere generally maintained in the Party, this process -- which reached its highest development in the weeks preceding the IT conference in Chicago -- was completely predictable. What is astonishing is not that it occurred but that it did not go much deeper much faster.

Here, we must write something about our role in the IT, because on the floor of two branches LTF comrades -- and not the newest rank-and-filers, either -- have accused some of us of disloyalty because we did not go the Party leadership with information about the tendency.

While we participated in the IT caucus, we were guided by the following general conceptions, which we still regard as sound:

- 1) Given the stage of development of political differences reached thus far, a split in the International would be unprincipled and would seriously undermine the gains achieved in recent years by a number of sections and sympathizing groups;

- 2) Whatever political and organizational mistakes it has made, the SWP leadership has not failed any decisive test of its capabilities; nor has anything happened that could justify the conclusion that the Party itself has become something other



than a revolutionary Marxist organization;

3) Thus, it is today impossible to make any organizational contribution to building the mass revolutionary party of the future that will overthrow the American bourgeoisie except in, with and through the SWP;

4) The function of any body of IMT supporters is to help the Party overcome its deviations by convincing comrades of correct political positions;

5) Any actions that could impair the ability of the SWP to carry out the functions of a revolutionary party or that, by their provocative character, could conceivably intensify the danger of a split -- even if they did not involve breaches of discipline -- had to be avoided.

We thus regarded and regard as thoroughly false and pernicious some of the ideas concerning the character of the Party, the unity of the International and the functions of the tendency that prior to the May conference were apparently coming to be rather widely held in the IT. Likewise we regarded and regard some actions taken by some ITers as utterly unjustifiable. Before we resigned from the IT, we argued as vigorously as we could against all incipient expressions of those ideas. We sought in every possible way to dissuade IT comrades from undertaking any kind of actions that, whether they involved actual infractions of discipline or not, could have even the appearance of involving such breaches or be otherwise provocative.

In doing these things, each of us made mistakes. One mistake, though, we did not make. We did not go to the Party leadership with any of our apprehensions about the possible implications of the IT's development. The reason is simple. Even if we had any individual, personal reasons to suppose that particular leading comrades, or all of them collectively, could be expected to intervene in such a situation in a nonfactional way -- in a way aimed at restoring the integrity of the Party rather than at embarrassing opponents in the International tendency struggle -- the Party leadership left us not the narrowest principled bridge to them. For they had requested and gotten instructions to utilize any information or opinions we might offer them as weapons in the LTF's factional war. Under these circumstances, had we turned to any SWP leading bodies, we would in no sense whatever have been simply rank-and-filers bringing to the attention of the Party leadership a situation which urgently required their loyal intervention, however harsh it might be; we would have been simply and solely informers for the LTF wing of the SWP.

The way the Party leadership, having selected its moment, finally did intervene confirms that from an immediately practical point of view, too, we were wise not to violate that consideration.

We think the struggle we conducted within the IT, as well as our withdrawal from it when that became necessary -- along-



side the larger number of comrades who share our general conceptions but did not leave when we did -- helped to counteract the incorrect responses within the IT to the IMF factionalization of the Party.

However that may be, the decisive role in reversing this process was played by the central IMT leadership.

To have recognized that there was such a reversal, it wasn't necessary to have had private conversations with individual ITers -- as we had the opportunity to do -- and thus to have learned of the careful rethinking going on within the IT of those central questions: the character of the Party, the unity of the International, the function of the tendency. The attachments to the report of the CC itself offer ample evidence of this re-evaluation: above all the willingness of the conference to adopt in practice the positions outlined by the IMT that were apparently in sharp contradiction to all those false conceptions that, to judge from the IT discussion documents, had been gaining ground; and also the decline, following the May conference, in the number of reported activities by ITers that were in any way provocative or could conceivably be regarded as involving breaches of discipline.

The May IT conference was in reality just the opposite of what the CC claims it was. It was not the meeting that launched the IT as a "rival party." It was the meeting that halted any drift towards a split on the part of IT comrades.

But this turn could not be completed overnight. Contrary to a widespread myth -- the myth of the existence of a super-disciplined IMT secret faction -- the IT comrades' lips and tongues and arms and legs are not moved by strings that stretch from Brussels or Paris to Chicago and Houston. Only through a process of intense discussion between leading comrades of the IMT and comrades of the IT could the centrifugal forces be totally defeated and could this turn be consummated with the IT completely homogenous with respect to the questions of the nature of the Party, the unity of the International, and the functions of the tendency.

It is thus very simply a slander when the PC charges the IMT Bureau with complicity in any plot to split the SWP. Rather, the IMT Bureau intervened in the only way open to it to reverse any drift towards a split. It utilized its substantive authority. This authority over the IT comrades derives, of course, largely from the leading IMT comrades' stature as the main articulators of the political current to which the IT adheres and from their stature as leaders of the International and of various national sections. But in no small measure, too, this authority derives simply from the self-induced collapse of the authority of the SWP leadership as a party leadership. The IMT Bureau utilized this authority to do everything it could to offer the SWP leadership the chance to recover its lost authority, by getting the IT comrades once again to accept the discipline of the SWP freely and unambiguously.



August 15/page 11

And for this, the comrades of the IMT Bureau are accused of complicity in a plot to split the SWP.

To summarize:

On August 9, 1973, the SWP leadership dealt a first massive blow at the integrity of the Party when it violated the principle that demands strict organizational distinction between faction and party. The inevitable consequences of that violation of principle began to unfold in the form of the development of certain elements of a drift towards a split among supporters of the IMT in the SWP. Then, just at the moment when, thanks to the intervention of the IMT leadership, this process had been reversed, the SWP leadership again massively assaulted the integrity of the Party by an action that objectively imposes the LTF platform as the programmatic foundation of the SWP: It expelled the great majority of supporters of the International Majority's political positions under a procedure strictly implying the expulsions to be programmatic while using a formula of expulsion strongly insinuating just that. At the same time, it slanderously accused the majority of the leadership of the International of complicity in a plot to split the SWP.

Under these circumstances, it is hard to see how there can be even the beginning of the restoration of the badly mutilated integrity of the Party, of the reestablishment of that standard of political conduct which is Party loyalty, and of the recovery of the authority the Party leadership must have if it is to lead the Party and not merely a faction, without these first steps:

- a) The speedy reintegration of all those IT comrades who are prepared to commit themselves to abide by the constitution and organizational discipline of the SWP and the democratic-centralist norms of the world Trotskyist movement;
- b) A clear reaffirmation in practice by the SWP leadership of the principle of the distinction between party and faction;
- c) The retraction by the SWP leadership of its slanderous accusations against the majority of the leadership of the Fourth International.

Whatever the intentions of the PC, these expulsions can only seriously endanger the unity of the International.

This is so, first of all, because the most brutally obvious interpretation of these assaults on the integrity of the Party is that at some point in the unfolding of the international tendency struggle the LTF leadership of the SWP decided that a split in the International was necessary and that these actions are merely the maneuvers required to consummate that split. This interpretation may well appear to many comrades in the world movement to be the only possible one -- and with considerable plausibility.



The timing of the PC's July 4 action confers on it an especially provocative character. It came just at the moment when the dangerous drift of a part of the IT had been reversed but before that turn had yet been consolidated. It will thus inevitably appear to many comrades in the world movement that the LTF leadership of the SWP wants to produce that "prosplit wing" of the IMT it has talked so much about, as a step in a plan to split the International while attempting through a maneuver to shift the blame for the split onto the IMT.

In a more immediate organizational sense, too, these expulsions can only be highly dangerous. To throw a group of comrades who agree with the International Majority out of the SWP with the false allegation that they had formed a rival party in practice to provoke them, indeed to dare them, to go public, to set up shop with a public forum, a leaflet or a newspaper. It is to encourage the revival of that dynamic that in the years before the last congress led to splits in almost every country where there were substantial numbers of supporters of each of the big tendencies in the International. Fortunately so far as we know, all of the comrades of the IT -- no doubt with the firm encouragement of the IMT leaders -- have kept their heads and refused to be provoked as yet.

Despite all this, we still aim to convince the decisive section of the Party that the International Majority has not broken programmatically with Trotskyism or, short of that, that the political differences have reached such a depth and clarity as to justify a split. We hope to win the LTF comrades away from a course that would lead to an unprincipled split in the International. We hope that these assaults on the integrity of the Party are the result of serious errors of judgment, not of any intention to split the International (although it is impossible to explain errors of such magnitude without assuming a degree of factional blindness and a certain willingness to play brinkmanship with the unity of the International for the sake of factional gain).

Needless to say, we hold the opinion that the PC's decree expelling the 69 IT comrades is an outrage, an act devoid of any legitimacy. But we do not see that this action by the PC offers any grounds to alter the essential views we defended inside the IT. Especially now, moreover, loyalty to the Fourth International and to the SWP seems to us to require that all sides avoid contributing, in any conceivable way, to any exacerbation of the present crisis in the International. Thus, despite the illegitimacy of the PC's action, we are maintaining strict discipline in this as in all other matters. In particular, we are conducting ourselves in all personal relations with the expelled comrades strictly in accordance with Article VIII, Section 8, of the SWP Constitution.

Comradely,

s/Berta Langston

s/Ralph Levitt

s/Alan Wald

s/Bob Langston

s/Celia Stodola

s/Gerard Guibet

s/Jim Morgan

s/Peter Graumann



COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

Catskill, N.Y.  
August 23, 1974

To: Gus Horowitz

Dear Gus:

There are three passages in the CC's report on the IT that distort somewhat the views Berta and I expressed in our letter of resignation from the tendency.

On page 6, you and the other CC comrades write: "They /the Langstons/ also recognized that it is not possible to hold membership in the IT and abide by the SWP constitution." Nowhere in the document do we indicate that we recognized any such thing, and in fact we don't think it true. Our point was rather that if the Williams document were adopted and acted on consistently, the IT would very likely become a formation it would be impossible to belong to and "abide by the SWP constitution."

Further, on page 11, the CC report states: "The article by Berta Langston and Bob Langston quotes from the Hank Williams (Bill Massey) document to prove that the policy of the IT is to put itself forward in public as an independent entity." And likewise, you and the other CC comrades write on page 13: "As Berta Langston and Bob Langston explained, the IT sees itself as 'an organized grouping essentially independent of the SWP and linked to the FI as the nucleus of its "future" and "true" section in the United States.'" Again, what we in fact tried to explain and prove was something rather different: that if the Williams document were adopted and acted on consistently, the IT would begin to elaborate a policy of putting itself forward in public as an independent entity and would begin to see itself as a grouping independent of the SWP.

Could you arrange for some kind of notice along these lines to appear in a future Bulletin?

In the present unfortunate situation, it is probably necessary to add that we don't at all regard these distortions of our views as malicious, factionally motivated, or anything of the kind. The scrupulous care you and the other CC comrades exercised elsewhere in distinguishing between our meaning and your conclusions -- usually by quoting sufficient context -- offers conclusive evidence to the contrary.

I am enclosing a copy of this letter for the PC.

Comradely,  
s/ Bob Langston

copy: PC



COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

14 Charles Lane  
New York, N.Y. 10014  
September 6, 1974

Bob Langston  
Catskill, New York

Dear Bob,

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter to the Control Commission dated August 23, 1974.

Comradely,  
s/Barbara Matson

-----  
COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

14 Charles Lane  
New York, N.Y. 10014  
September 6, 1974

Bob Langston  
Catskill, New York

Dear Bob,

This is to acknowledge your letter of August 15 to the National Committee and cover letter of August 16 addressed to me.

We have made your letter of August 15 available to the members of the National Committee.

We also received the copy of your letter of August 23 to the Control Commission. When the discussion bulletin is opened any party member may submit an article indicating their opinion of the Control Commission report, the recommendations of which were adopted by the Political Committee on July 4, 1974.

Comradely,  
s/Jack Barnes  
National Secretary  
Socialist Workers Party

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

New York, New York  
September 5, 1974

Barry Sheppard

Los Angeles

Dear Barry,

Enclosed for your information is a copy of a letter we received in the national office from Bob Langston, along with an accompanying statement by him and the other supporters of the IMT who resigned from the IT party prior to its split convention at the end of May. This material is being sent out to the National Committee for its information.

Here are a few thoughts on this statement that I wanted to share with you (page numbers will refer to the mimeographed copy of the statement sent out to the NC).

The first three pages or so merely comprise the to-be-expected case for the defense in the matter of the IT party. There is nothing really serious in these arguments; in fact, the Control Commission report already answers all of their main points, so there is no need to dwell on them. Comrade Langston and his associates -- despite all their current protests that the IT was a legitimate group in the party -- really registered their definitive opinion back in May, when they voted with their feet and quit the IT party prior to the IT's split convention. By this action, they recognized that the IT had taken a course that was incompatible with party membership.

There is one point in their brief that should be noted, however; that is, one of their challenges to the procedure followed by the party leadership. They say on page 2 that "this expulsion procedure strictly implies that the expulsions were programmatic in character."

Adherence to the IMT program was not the issue, of course. But the procedure by which the IT party members were placed outside the SWP was not, strictly speaking, a disciplinary procedure. They were not charged with an instance, or instances of infractions of SWP discipline (although many did occur). If that had been the charge, then a trial to establish the facts might have been in order (although, here too, a Control Commission investigation supersedes any local trial).

In this case, what was involved was a matter of political evaluation of the secret IT documents. The documents spoke for themselves. It required no trial to evaluate them. As you pointed out in your talk at the national educational conference, the only question of fact that could conceivably have been involved was whether or not these documents were actually IT documents. Once the documents were acknowledged as genuine (and no one has challenged this), then the question of a trial becomes moot. There only remained the matter of evaluating the meaning of the documents.



The Control Commission established, and the PC concurred in this, that these documents proved that the IT had constituted itself as a separate, rival party to the SWP; and the PC then made a political decision that affiliation to that IT party was incompatible with membership in the SWP. In that sense, the PC action of July 4 was not disciplinary; it constituted recognition of a political reality.

The remaining portion of the Langston, et al statement is fantastic. They argue that at the August, 1973, SWP convention the party leadership began to break down the distinction between party and faction "by solemnly affirming that it would turn the Party organization as such into an instrument of factional struggle." They base this charge on their own twisted interpretation of the convention decision to instruct the NC "to use all the forces and resources at its command to struggle for a democratic world congress and a Trotskyist Fourth International."

As you know, that motion meant exactly what it said. It did not mean converting the SWP into a faction. Among the "factional abuses" resulting from the application of this motion were the translation and publication of internal discussion material in Spanish, and the sending of a large delegation of SWP observers to the world congress (including supporters of the IMT, paid for out of SWP funds). I believe that the pressure of our convention decisions was also one of the factors that finally shamed the IMT leaders into translating a lot of the backlog of internal discussion material into French. They did it at the last minute, and they didn't translate all that they were obligated to do, but at least they made an improvement.

Much worse than the fantastic interpretation made by Comrades Langston et al is the conclusion they draw from the August, 1973, convention motion and the July 4, 1974, PC decision on the IT party. Despite the fine legal distinctions they try to draw to take the edge off their argument, they indicate that their first loyalty is not to the SWP but to their faction, the IMT.

Thus, they assert that the adoption of the August, 1973 convention motion "inserted an element of corruption, in the most literal sense, into the Party" (page 6). They speak of a "blow at the integrity of the Party," and of the "badly mutilated integrity of the Party" (page 11).

Furthermore, they assert that ever since the August 1973 convention, the units of the party "have been functioning without any authority at all" (page 7); and they speak later of "the self-induced collapse of the authority of the SWP leadership as a party leadership" (page 10).

And finally, they state that there has been an "overthrow of that objective standard of political conduct that constitutes party loyalty" (page 6). The reason they offer is that

as a result of the August 1973 convention decision, "it has been impossible, logically impossible, for any comrade to answer the question, If I carry out this assignment, given in the name of the Party, am I in reality carrying out a Party assignment or am I carrying out an LTF assignment masquerading as a Party assignment?" (page 6). And they go on to say that there is no basis "for confidence that any action decided to be carried out in the name of the Party is aimed directly at building the Party" -- and they specify that this vote of no confidence applies to financial contributions to the party and to the sale of party publications.

Finally, they insist on a series of steps that must be taken by the party leadership to bring about the "reestablishment of that standard of political conduct which is Party loyalty" (page 11). This can only mean that unless these steps are taken, they will no longer feel bound to observe party loyalty (despite the formal pledge to the contrary in the concluding paragraph of their statement).

It is this shift -- from loyalty to the party to loyalty to a faction -- that explains why Comrades Langston et al never informed the party leadership of the IT splitting operation that was going on. They admit this: "We did not go to the Party leadership with any of our apprehensions about the possible implications of the IT's development" (page 9). They advance as their justification that they had no confidence in the party leadership, which they maintain placed factional interests above party interests. In other words, they accuse the party leadership of doing what they are doing.

Furthermore, these comrades use the same arguments to defend the IMT's complicity in the IT split. They assert that "the IMT Bureau intervened in the only way open to it to reverse any drift towards a split" (page 10) -- that is, through discussion with the IT leaders in the secret IMT bodies, but not through the elected leadership of the SWP. It was not only unnecessary, but would have been an actual mistake, according to Comrades Langston et al, to operate through the elected leadership bodies of the SWP. Even this argument raises another question. Why didn't they go to the elected leadership bodies of the Fourth International? Why was the United Secretariat bypassed?

The question naturally arises: does the Langston et al statement represent the views of the IMT leadership as a whole? If so, their argumentation represents an advance sample of a line that will be pushed in a possible way by the IMT in the coming period.

One final point. The IMT's complicity in the IT split was just one of a number of actions taken by the IMT that ran counter to the unity agreements reached at the world congress. Among the other major steps they took -- prior to our PC decision on July 4, by the way -- was:



Horowitz/ page 4

1. The decision by Alain Krivine and the FCR leadership to conduct a public speaking tour in Canada in the most vulgar factional manner.

2. The decision by the United Secretariat majority to publish a fallacious and malicious public attack on the PST.

3. The decision by the Spanish-language Cuarta Internacional to make public portions of the IMT's resolution on Argentina attacking the PST that the IMT had agreed to keep internal.

The LTF Steering Committee has met and will soon release a statement assessing the meaning of developments since the world congress.

Comradely,  
s/Gus Horowitz

IEC MAJORITY TENDENCY'S REPLY TO THE STATEMENT  
BY THE MINORITY FACTION

We will limit ourselves to a clarification of the facts in regard to allegations made in the declaration by the IEC minority faction which do not, in our view, correspond to the truth.

1. It is false that "according to the reports presented to the mandates commission," a total of 5,277 comrades voted for the positions of the IEC majority and 5,663 voted for the positions of the IEC minority. No report was made to the mandates commission on the votes cast in Argentina. The figures cited in the minority declaration are partly based on a report made to the sub-commission on Argentina which was never submitted to the mandates commission nor verified by it.

We categorically challenge this figure. According to the rules on counting votes drawn up by the United Secretariat, the number of members who had the right to vote was to be frozen in October 1973. After this date, representatives of the IEC majority tendency were able to verify the attendance of PST members at its meetings. Even allowing for normal absences, they arrived at a figure almost one-third lower than the one presented by the PST delegation in the sub-commission on Argentina. If the verified figure is used, even supposing that all members without exception voted for the positions of the minority faction, the votes supposedly obtained by the IEC minority faction are reduced to the proportion of 40 to 60 which we used in our initial statement.

2. Even on the basis of the number of PST members who were more or less verified -- not to speak of the number of members claimed in the sub-commission on Argentina -- the calculation of votes for the minority positions implies that practically all the members participated in the voting that took place in the course of the meetings (which is highly unlikely), and that the minority faction received more than 99 percent of the votes, since with less than one percent of the votes the majority tendency would have had the right to one mandate -- which it obviously did not obtain. Such a surprising (to say the least) "voting result" did not occur in any of the sizeable sections or sympathizing organizations of the International, which says a great deal about the nature of the organization, the discussion, and the vote...

3. Not having candidate members "vote" and take a position on 150 documents after a few months (and in the case of several sections or sympathizing organizations whose majorities supported the IEC minority faction, after a few weeks of membership in the party!) seems to us more democratic than the opposite practice. The difference here is between a purely formal conception of internal democracy and a meaningful conception.

4. It is not true that the youth organizations "generally" would have expressed a view favorable to the IEC minority faction. The youth organizations in Japan and Belgium, as well as the groups of young people in France, to cite only three cases, surely cannot be included in this category; and they are



2.

hardly among the smallest groups sympathizing with the Fourth International.

5. The statement by the minority faction presents the figures on the vote used to determine the proportions between majority and minority in a peculiar way. The statement correctly notes that the political resolution of the majority tendency received 52.6 percent of the votes, but forgets to add that its own resolution received only 42.9 percent of the votes. The relationship between 52.6 percent and 42.9 percent is clearly a majority-minority one, not at all a "marginal" relationship. But through the excessive weight of the mandates given to the PST, over which there was no control and which were sharply contested -- the minority distorts the real relationship of members jointly verified by the two contending tendencies in the ranks in all the major organizations. That relationship was roughly 60 to 40.

6. Finally, it is not true that the proposals for an organizational agreement submitted to the Tenth World Congress resulted from the "initiative" of the IEC minority faction. These proposals were first discussed in the parity commission preparatory to the congress which was constituted at the proposal of a comrade of the IEC majority tendency, and in working them out the initiative certainly did not come exclusively or principally from the IEC minority faction, to say the least!

Submitted August 8, 1974

RMF POLITICAL BUREAU RESOLUTION ON THE ACTIVITY OF THE  
SO-CALLED LENINIST TROTSKYIST FACTION

I.

As a result of differences that developed on a number of questions in the International since the period preceding the Ninth World Congress, two tendencies were formed at the meeting of the International Executive Committee in December 1973 [sic]. One tendency (the IMT) represented the majority in the International Executive Committee; the other, named the Leninist-Trotskyist Tendency (LTT) represented the minority.

This formation of tendencies in the world movement also had effects in the RMF, first through the constitution of a tendency adhering to the IMT and then of one adhering to the LTT.

In August the LTT transformed itself into the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction. The LTT in the RMF followed this step and also became the LTF.

In the branch meetings where the vote was to be taken for delegates to the RMF's Fifth Congress -- which in turn elected delegates to the World Congress -- the LTF presented the following platform:

- (a) vote for the general line of "Argentina and Bolivia, a Balance Sheet";
- (b) vote against "Bolivia -- Results and perspectives";
- (c) vote against "The political crisis and perspectives for revolutionary struggle in Argentina";
- (d) vote against "On the question of armed struggle in Latin America";
- (e) vote against "The European document";
- (f) Do not vote for the political resolution.

In the period before the Fifth Congress, the LTF consisted, as far as we can tell, of the following comrades: Svedin, Lundmark, Hillstrom, Cliff, Inna, Brolund, Stenfeldt, Rydberg. All were from the Stockholm branch. No change has been reported since that time.

At the end of the pre-congress period, the IMT was reorganized. Previously it had included only comrades in the leading body. Now it was extended to include rank-and-file comrades who sympathized with the IMT's platform and declared themselves willing to fight for it.

II.

At the Tenth World Congress, the documents proposed by the IMT were adopted by a majority vote, and the world congress also elected a new International Executive Committee and Control Commission. There was an explicit and unanimous agreement that the decision of the congress was authoritative and binding once



2.

the preparations for the congress had been completed in accordance with the statutes and democratic procedures.

The norm is that tendencies and factions dissolve after world congresses and that the minority (or minorities) in the leadership of the elected bodies do not maintain a separate organization but work loyally with the majority to test its line in practice. In the situation where the LTF is maintaining its faction, refusing to cooperate in a loyal way with the majority, and obstructing the work of the International and its leadership in an organized and planned way, the former members of the IMT had to have the possibility for guaranteeing the work of leading body in an organized way through ongoing consultation.

Furthermore, the Tenth World Congress did not decide a series of questions that were taken up in the pre-congress discussions. These questions therefore remain open. So here also there is a need for a forum for theoretical discussions and an instrument for continued political struggle. This is the reason that the IMT decided to maintain an international tendency including the comrades in the leading bodies who voted for the IMT's platform at the Tenth World Congress and thus demonstrated that they held a common basic conception.

As regards the IMT tendency in the RMF -- the national tendency adhering to the international IMT that was formed in February 1973 -- its members decided to dissolve their tendency. The only members now in the international IMT are comrades on the international leading bodies. These are also included in the steering committee of the IMT. The comrade who works in the Bureau of the International is on the Bureau of the IMT. The decision on the dissolution of the IMT/RMF was delayed so that we could wait and see what was going to happen on the international scale after the world congress from the LTF side and in anticipation of a systematic discussion of the situation in the International. The decision was made at a meeting held in conjunction with the national leadership meeting in June by the comrades who had adhered to the IMT/RMF. The argument for dissolving the tendency was the fact that it was no longer a question of defending and assuring a hearing for a line at the world congress but of the RMF's elected body applying in so far as possible the decisions of the world congress and the Fifth Congress of the RMF. In this situation, there was no longer any compelling reason to maintain the national tendency.

#### IV. [sic]

IV. As for the LTF in the RMF, it continues to exist. But what is its platform and what is its activity? There is no way to get an idea of this. The comrade included in the national leadership has given no explanations. The only thing that has been offered was an evasive answer from Comrade Svedin to repeated questioning from the Political Bureau. (This is the same comrade who in the debates before the RMF's Fifth Congress declared that naturally the LTF would dissolve itself after the Tenth World Congress.)

On April 24, the Political Bureau sent a letter to the LTF in Sweden in which we made the following demands:

3.

"We ask you as soon as possible to present a report to the Political Bureau regarding the orientation of your work since the Tenth World Congress. In this report we ask that you include among other things, the platform you have been working on since the world congress, the broad lines of this work, and your assessment of how this affects the other work of the RMF."

On June 10, we noted briefly that we had not received an answer to this letter. By way of a response, Svedin delivered the following cheery message dated July 12:

"The International Leninist-Trotskyist Faction continues to exist just like the IEC majority tendency. The comrades who joined the LTF/LTF in the summer and fall are now members of the international faction. On the basis of this program, the tendency continues, as before, to have regular meetings."

The final point was our question about the LTF's activity in Sweden in the light of their unusual decision not to dissolve their national faction after the world congress. In view of the LTF's unwillingness to give the details of its work in Sweden, the Political Bureau decided to demand that the LTF/RMF give an immediate answer to the following questions (this answer must either be given in writing before the National Leadership meeting or orally at this meeting):

- (i) what is the faction's platform?
- (ii) How is it organized, on what levels does it exist, what are its routines, what are its functions, how does one become a member?
- (iii) Has there been any change in the membership of the LTF/RMF?
- (iv) what work does it carry out, what is the division of labor, and what effects does this have on the comrades' other political activity?
- (v) what are its relations with the international faction; does the LTF/RMF participate in an international division of labor, and if so what kind.

We also want the LTF/RMF's position on the following three questions clarified:

(a) A leading member of the LTF/RMF, Svedin, took part in the world congress without a mandate from the RMF's Fifth Congress and without the knowledge of the leading body. Since the world congress, he has devoted more of his time to international contacts and the tasks (whatever they are) that these involve. He continues to sit as an alternate member of the Executive Committee without representing the organization in the International of which he is a member. We now want to ask the LTF/RMF the following questions:

- (1) Is Svedin carrying out his international assignment (?) with the consent of the Swedish LTF/RMF?



4.

(ii) Has this work that Svedin has engaged in, which has involved downgrading the work to build the RMF (I), been decided on by the IFF or does this represent his own personal priorities?

(b) and (c) In the period since the world congress, two events have occurred that have great importance for the future of the International. The first is the Argentine PST's open revision of the revolutionary Marxist position on bourgeois institutions, including bourgeois democracy. The second is the expulsion of the IT from the SWP. For the Political Bureau's part, we have passed an initial resolution on the question of the expulsion of the IT from the SWP which has been published as an addendum to a circular to the branch leaderships. We are preparing a more detailed resolution for the national leadership meeting. As regards the question of the PST, we support the statement of the United Secretariat (published in issue No. 13 of Internationalen). We now want clarity on these two important questions for the International. What is the IFF/RMF's position?

On all these points, we will not be satisfied with the usual evasive answer. We want to take a concrete look at the IFF/RMF's activity at the National Leadership meeting and clarify its political positions on these two important questions.

Stockholm, August  
The Political Bureau

ANSWER TO THE POLITICAL BUREAU'S RESOLUTION "ON THE ACTIVITY  
OF THE SO-CALLED LENINIST-TROTSKYIST FACTION"

In the Ten-Point Agreement adopted unanimously by the United Secretariat on September 9, 1973, it was decided that the following questions would be included in the agenda of the coming world congress for a vote: 1) the world political resolution; 2) the orientation in Argentina; 3) the orientation in Bolivia; 4) the perspective for Europe; 5) the statutes of the Fourth International.

At the world congress itself the IMT declared unilaterally that the document on armed struggle published in October would also be included on the agenda and voted on in the world congress. Only some of the organizations had elected delegates on the basis of this document. Therefore, it was only under protest that the LTF delegations at the congress accepted this question being taken up as a separate point on the agenda.

The debate on this question showed that the IMT had evolved to the point of beginning to revise the Trotskyist conception of the arming of the working class. The reporter for the IMT, Comrade Roman, explained also that the question of armed struggle as taken up by the draft resolution could not be limited to Latin America. The adoption of this document must be seen against the background of the IMT's conception that the Trotskyist movement had not previously answered the question of armed struggle.

After the congress, the LTF decided in a meeting held to assess the results:

- 1) to try to reduce the factional tensions in the coming period that had built up in the period before the congress,
- 2) to give the majority a chance to test its line,
- 3) but, in view of the character of the resolution on armed struggle, not to dissolve the LTF, and
- 4) it recognized that the unity of the International continued to be threatened by the majority's conception of "armed struggle."

The platform of the LTF (presented in IIDB, 15/1973) remains essentially unchanged. While some points directly related to the world congress are of course no longer relevant, the LTF's world political resolution is now included.

In the Swedish discussion, the LTF had previously expressed its approval of the Nine-Point Agreement and recognized the congress's authority. It has confirmed the correctness of the decision not to dissolve the LTF, and the same comrades remain members. The Swedish LTF, just as the LTF decided in its meeting immediately following the world congress, has agreed that in the postcongress period the majority's line should be carried out and tested.

Since the world congress, consequently, our activity in the RMF has been very limited. Meetings are called to distribute material from the LTF's steering committee on how the Nine-



2.

Point Agreement is being lived up to as well as on the development of the majority's line and the tendency struggle.

Those charged with convening these meetings and drawing up the agenda are Comrades Cliff and Svedin. Comrade Svedin is the Swedish LTF's representative in the steering committee and the contact person. Besides this, there are no levels or assignment of responsibilities, or financial arrangements in the Swedish LTF. The members of the LTF in Sweden are: Brolund, Cliff, Hillstrom, Irma, Lundmark, Rybegg, Stenfeldt, Svedin in the Stockholm branch. Comrades are admitted into membership in accordance with the procedure laid out in IIDB 15/73, page 12.

The Swedish LTF does not participate in "any international division of labor." The work that the Swedish LTF carries on has no effect on the comrades' other activity in the RMF.

We will answer the Political Bureau's accusations against Comrade Svedin: that "since the world congress he has given more of his time to international contacts and the tasks (whatever these may be) that they involve" and downgraded work to build the organization.

Where have you gotten information that since the world congress Comrade Svedin has devoted more of his time to "international contacts"? Did you just take this accusation on faith? It is true that Comrade Svedin's tasks as the Swedish LTF's representative on the steering committee have involved a number of trips. But this has in no way taken "more" of Comrade Svedin's time.

And on what grounds have you determined that Svedin has downgraded work to build the organization? It is possible that Comrade Svedin's changed personal situation, which involves sharing the responsibility for the care of a child, has meant that he has missed some meetings and paper sales. But the charge about a deliberate downgrading is simply bizarre.

Naturally the Swedish LTF has not decided on any downgrading of any comrade's activity in the RMF. Among the conditions for membership in the LTF, it says: "The discipline of the faction does not take precedence over the discipline of the sections or sympathizing organizations of the Fourth International. Members of the faction must conduct themselves in a completely loyal way toward the sections of the Fourth International or the sympathizing organization, and carry out their activities and financial obligations in an exemplary way."

It cannot be unknown to a number of members in the Political Bureau that in most cases the members of the Swedish LTF are among the most active comrades in the Stockholm branch and in the work of building the organization. Thus, the Political Bureau's accusations seem to be simply an attempt at pure slander. Singling out one comrade in particular does not make things any better.

As regards the "clear political position" the Political Bureau demands from us on the question of the IT split and the US's open attack on the PST, we refer them to the attached state-

3.

ments. Since because of the vacation period only four comrades could attend the meeting on August 23, we have chosen to sign the statements as individuals.

For the IFF, comradely,

D. Hillstrom



TRANSLATION

TRANSLATION

TRANSLATION

Introduction to United Secretariat Statement on the  
PST in the August 16 issue of Internationalen,  
the organ of the Swedish section

The declaration of the United Secretariat, which we are publishing below, presents its view of the general line that the Argentine sympathizing organization, the PST -- Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores -- is following today in the class struggle in that country.

The PST is one of the several sympathizing organizations in Argentina, but without doubt the biggest and best rooted in the working class. This fact, as well as the sharpening struggles in Argentina -- the introduction to a decisive confrontation of class against class -- make it doubly important for the International to make clear its position on fundamental questions of strategy and class alliances. It is necessary to clarify for the ranks of the PST but also for the entire Latin American vanguard that the Fourth International is not in accord with a strategic orientation that in the revolutionary struggles there is leading into a blind alley. An opportunist silence on this point would discredit the International in Argentina, in Latin America, and other parts of the world, hindering the construction of a real Argentine section of the International.

Earlier, the criticism of the PST by the leadership of the International -- and most recently by the majority at the Tenth World Congress -- was kept internal with the aim of best contributing to the correction of the PST's line. But the PST's present practice goes beyond anything that could be called a tactical mistake. It touches on a fundamental question of principle, and in such situations internal polemics are not enough.

The fact that the US expresses its view openly in this way -- in opposition to the view of one of its sympathizing organizations -- corresponds to the continual need to examine the political line of the organizations that pledge allegiance to the International. The PST was recognized by the Ninth and Tenth world congresses as a sympathizing organization precisely because of its basic agreement with the program of the Fourth International. On the other hand, the PST was not recognized as a section because of a deepgoing criticism already made of the party's political line and because of its insufficient loyalty to the International.

August 14

The Political Bureau