

NOV 20 1973

Mary Alice,

They gave this letter to me. They did not want to mail it since I was there. They said it was out of date since I saw them but wanted to deliver it for the record since they had decided to send it at an earlier meeting.

John

Le 6 novembre 1973

NOV 20 1973

A la fraction minoritaire.

Chers camarades,

Nous avons été informés par une lettre du camarade Camejo, déposée la veille à la librairie, que vous ne pouviez être représentés à notre réunion des 1-4 novembre. Nous regrettons votre absence, d'autant plus que la raison invoquée, à savoir que vous avez été prévenus trop tard, ne nous paraît pas fondée. D'une part, vous êtes au courant des conditions particulières qui nous sont imposées, et qui nous ont obligés à annuler une réunion pour laquelle vous étiez venus. D'autre part, vous avez en permanence en Europe plusieurs camarades dont la tâche principale est d'intervenir pour votre fraction. Nous observons également que c'est la deuxième fois que vous vous récusez sur invitation de notre part, la première fois étant en fin mai-début juin.

Nous vous remettrons par ailleurs le planning prévu par nous auquel il sera pratiquement impossible (sauf exception) d'apporter des modifications et nous vous demandons de nous informer au plus tôt des dispositions que vous prendrez pour vous faire représenter.

Fraternellement,

A. Minis

gus gus - *Handwritten*
NOV 19 1973

11/14/73 *John*

Bob Kissinger
2222 N. Bissell
Chicago, Ill.

Jack Barnes (for the Political Committee,
National Secretary
Socialist Workers Party
14 Charles Lane
New York, New York 10014

Dear Comrade Barnes,

I was very happy to hear of the recent formation of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction--which was overdue. But I feel the Chicago branch leadership and/or the national leadership of the party is not completely carrying out the mandate of the last convention.

Over 90% of our recent convention voted against the platform of the Internationalist Tendency--yet it appears the Chicago branch is going to be pressured into allowing the Internationalist Tendency to recruit people to the party based on its program. In August we decided around which program we would recruit.

The case is that of the membership of Larry Novicki, who is a member of the YSA. He has declared himself a supporter of the Internationalist Tendency. As you know, the Internationalist Tendency is a mess--from open party haters to people who just want to do more trade union work. If you read the enclosed note to the Chicago branch organizer it is evident that Larry Novicki has no programmatic agreement with the SWP. The politics of Larry Novicki are in essence that of a hardened political opponent. In his case activism is of little consequence; for there is little chance to educate him after he gets in the party.

What the IT is doing in fact is saying, "We dare you not to take our supporters into membership". Why should we back off from our August mandate? I am continually told that "I don't understand the international situation". What I see and read is that the SWP continues to tour IT leaders but that comrades Camejo and Heisler have had trouble setting up meetings or have been refused audiences while they were in Europe.

We are being challenged in other areas also. At the August convention we decided that transfers would have to be approved by the Political Committee. IT comrades have moved to Chicago since the convention without the approval of the Political Committee and they are daring the party to turn them down.

The above situation plus a near complete boycott of our recent militant banquet by the IT can only have a demoralizing effect on loyal party builders. I intend to fight against recruitment of party wreckers in the future and the present. I would appreciate hearing from you on this matter.

Comradely,
Bob Kissinger
Chicago Branch
John Heilers
Chicago Branch

cc: Copies to Pearl Chertov

and Pat Grogan, convenor, Leninist-Trotskyist Faction-Chicago

STATEMENT TO CHICAGO BRANCH ORGANIZER CONCERNING THE
MEMBERSHIP OF LARRY NOVICKI

near the end of the SWP pre-convention discussion in late July I asked Larry Novicki whether I could speak to him regarding his membership in the SWP. He agreed to do this.

First, I asked Larry Novicki if it was true that he considered himself a supporter of the internationalist tendency (as it was declared by comrade Marxman during a branch meeting). He said he was a supporter of this tendency. I then asked if he concurred with the views of comrades associated with the internationalist tendency who denounce everything the party does--such as comrade Lobado, who just finished speaking. He said that he agreed with those comrades.

At this point I asked Larry Novicki, "if you disagree with everything the party does, why do you want to join?" At this point I went through a list of areas of work that the party is involved in. There was not a single area of work that Larry Novicki thought the SWP had the right line. Larry Novicki stated how the SWP was wrong in all areas of work and how it should be changed. Larry Novicki went on to show his ignorance with regard to the relationship of the SWP to the YSA: he asked me why the SWP would not let him start a trade union fraction in the YSA. Finally Larry Novicki stated he wanted to join the SWP because he agrees with the 9th world congress resolutions.

From the above it is clear that Larry Novicki has no programmatic agreement with the Socialist Workers Party. In August of 1973 the SWP decided around what program it would recruit and build the party. Larry Novicki agrees with none of this program. To allow Larry Novicki to join the SWP would be a breach of democratic centralism and a violation of the rights of 90% of the membership-- who rejected the program Larry Novicki stands for.

It should be stated that Internationalist tendency supporters within the party have every right to keep their views and try to win people over ~~to their program~~ within the party, but not to recruit to their program. The difference is the difference between an all-inclusive party and a democratic centralist party.

Bob Kissinger
Chicago Branch

In U Sec
mail folder
Sept 1974

14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014
Nov. 19, 1973

Sweden

Dear Anders,

Enclosed is an English translation of a draft tendency declaration drawn up by Eddy Labeau in Belgium. This has not yet been submitted to the discussion in the Belgian section, so you should be careful not to let it drift around.

We want to propose that we use the European portion of this draft as the basis for a final contribution to the International discussion, one that would be signed by several of the European leaders of the LTF. To do this we will have to have some collective discussion.

There is a Secretariat meeting Nov. 27-28 that I and several other comrades will be coming over for. Perhaps we can meet in Brussels the first weekend of December. We will have to call everyone to try and arrange whatever is most convenient for the largest number of comrades.

Benny also suggested that I should write you about the comrade who plans to attend the SWP and YSA conventions. Whatever problems there might be on finances, you shouldn't let that stand in the way. I'm sure we can work something out. Let me know what the situation is and what you propose.

Comradely,

Mary-Alice
Mary-Alice

cc: Benson

DEC 21 1973

David Keil
c/o SWP
706 Bway., 8th fl.
New York, N.Y. 10003

December 20, 1973

Ed Shaw
410 West Street

Dear Comrade Ed,

I am the comrade who raised the question of China with you Wednesday night at the Lower Manhattan branch meeting.

I went back over the document and decided to send the enclosed letter to the faction steering committee, care of you since Lew Jones's report in September or October referred comrades to you.

Comradely,

David Keil

David Keil
c/o SWP
706 Bway., 8th fl.
New York, N.Y. 10003

December 20, 1973

Leninist-Trotskyist Faction
International Steering Committee

Dear Comrades,

I am writing you to express some opinions concerning the coming World Congress.

Points #5-8 of "Recommendations to the Delegates of the Coming World Congress," passed unanimously by the United Secretariat, September 19, 1973, specify that votes should be taken on five questions "only," that discussion on these questions be closed for the next year and that votes not be taken on the Cultural Revolution in China, the youth radicalization, women's liberation, the Middle East, Vietnam and Eastern Europe; furthermore, discussion on "conjunctural events in Vietnam and Eastern Europe" is to be excluded from the post-Congress discussion.

I am not able to understand these Recommendations very well, because the LTF leadership has not explained them fully to its members. I assume that they are a result of an agreement between the LTF and IEC majority leaderships.

I would like to request that this agreement be explained to the LTF membership so that we can understand it better.

I would also like to express my opinion that, in the present situation, these proposals are not realistic or advantageous for the world movement. If this is so, the LTF must propose to the next United Secretariat meeting that the "Recommendations" be withdrawn.

The Recommendation that the World Congress not vote on the Cultural Revolution in China is impossible to carry out, because the IEC majority world political resolution presents for a vote its line on China. This is done in a covert, indirect way, by speaking of a "spectacular right-turn in Chinese foreign policy" beginning after the Cultural Revolution, i.e., "since the phase of the liquidation of the 'cultural revolution'" (IIDB #20, p. 12.); by emphasizing the opinion that "conservative features" in China have been generalized since the fall of Lin Biao and that the rehabilitation of Teng Hsiao-ping

accompanies the "new" right turn; by emphasizing that the Cultural Revolution activity "reduced the material privileges of the bureaucracy;" and finally, by asserting that "the radicalism of Maoism in the 1960s had not been solely verbal, but real..."

In addition, the resolution states that "the Chinese socialist revolution gave birth, from the beginning, to a workers state..." which, in the context of Germain's document on China, seems to imply that China was a workers state in 1949, four years before capitalist property was nationalized. This theory of Germain's is in conflict with the Marxist theory of the state.

This section of the resolution represents, in my opinion, an implicit, but nevertheless clear, approval of the position of support to the Maoist faction in the Cultural Revolution. Teng Hsiao-ping was a victim of this faction, gagged by the bonapartist grouping; Lin Biao was a leader of the faction; his departure is not to be mourned as a defeat. Maoist ultraleft rhetoric was not "real" radicalism.

Comrades Peng Shu-tse, Joseph Hansen and Les Evans, as well as the authors of the resolution on China submitted by the seven U.S. members, have demonstrated that the Mao faction was not deserving of support in the Cultural Revolution. They, and those who agree with them, including the majority of the SWP, would undoubtedly take issue with the China section of the IEC majority world political resolution.

This section of the resolution thus violates the "Recommendations" unanimously agreed upon. It would be hypocritical for the World Congress to pretend to take no vote on China, but, at the same time, to take such a vote by voting on the IEC majority's line on China in its world political resolution. The "Recommendations" must therefore be set aside, in my opinion, if the resolution is submitted as it stands.

If the resolution is submitted in its present form, it seems to me necessary that the LTF include in its world political resolution a section on China decisively rejecting the line that China was a workers state in 1949-53, that Maoism is not Stalinism, and that it was correct to support the Mao faction in the Cultural Revolution. Otherwise, the LTF will have no position to present at the World Congress on a central question in the

world debate, a question which will be voted upon at the World Congress at the insistence of the IEC majority. We should point out that these questions in dispute are theoretical ones and historical ones and thus need not be voted on; but if they are voted on, we must present our counter-positions.

Some of the other "Recommendations" also seem unrealistic to me. For example, how can we pretend to take no vote on Vietnam when the IEC majority political resolution states that the situation is "a relationship of forces that is improved" since the cease-fire and that there is "dual power from top to bottom in a large part of South Vietnam." (p.6) ? How can we exclude Latin America, Europe, and Vietnam from the internal discussion for the next year when these are the central areas of difference?

Finally, I would like to suggest that the LTF strengthen its organization, in light of developments, including the deepening of differences with the IEC majority, and the threat of the IEC majority to encourage splits by recognizing splitters as "members of the Fourth International." (IIDB, #20, p. 23.) The faction should hold caucus meetings in each country from time to time, publish an internal bulletin, without restrictions on subject matter, and adopt, by majority vote, positions on each question facing the world movement. These measures are all the more necessary in view of the tendency toward a split and in order to prevent such a split.

I am presenting these ideas to you now so that they can be discussed at the SWP convention in Chicago, or during it.

Comradely,

David Keil

Paris, le 21 novembre

Chère Mary-Alice,

Je m'excuse du retard mis à t'écrire pour te mettre au courant des derniers développements. Ceci est dû au manque de temps, à tout le travail à faire, et à tous les problèmes auxquels on a dû faire face depuis la dernière fois où on a rencontré Peter. Je suppose qu'il vous a mis au courant de ce qui se passait ici.

J'aimerais commencer par te parler en général de la situation pour essayer de te donner une idée de l'atmosphère qui règne et te mettre au courant des derniers développements, ensuite j'aborderai les problèmes qui ont trait plus spécifiquement à nous.

Les quelques personnes qu'on avait rencontrés avec Peter ont écrit un texte "contre le courant" et une plateforme de tendance qu'ils ont soumis au "comité de rédaction". Il paraît que le "comité de rédaction" a sous-estimé à premier abord l'écho qu'ils pourraient avoir. Au même moment Dumas de son côté écrivait son propre texte... etc. Aujourd'hui les groupes Dumas-Krasno sont dans le processus de fusionner, en même temps qu'ils attirent vers eux une frange intéressante de personnes plus ou moins vieilles dans l'organisation. Un processus très intéressant s'enclenche dans l'organisation. Ils ont rencontré ce week-end des représentants de "Kompas" et de la tendance de Roberto pour discuter de la possibilité d'une troisième tendance internationale et des positions qu'ils ont en commun. Pour le moment ils n'ont pas de positions très fixes, ils les découvrent plutôt, ils sont très confus, pas clairs, oscillants, essayant de prendre un peu de la MMF et un peu de la LTF, tout en caractérisant les deux comme "centristes".

Depuis la rencontre avec eux et Peter, il fut pratiquement impossible d'avoir une discussion avec le groupe de Krasno (ils sont un peu sectaires sur la question), nous venons seulement d'en avoir une, grâce à la présence de D. et de North. De toute façon ça ne change pas notre position à nous, à savoir les pousser à avoir le maximum de discussion avec nous, saisir le maximum de chances pour débattre, travailler avec eux et avec les gens qui sont autour d'eux. Nous ferons tout ce qui est possible dans ce sens là.

Je vais essayer de te parler un peu plus concrètement de ce qui se passe, pour illustrer un peu l'atmosphère. (c'est assez limité, car je n'ai qu'une vue assez partielle, et de Paris uniquement, mais je suppose qu'ailleurs aussi des choses similaires doivent se passer). La discussion commence d'une façon un peu plus "sérieuse" (tout est relatif). Nous avons déjà eu une réunion où Pedro, Rops, et une troisième personne du "colloque" étaient présents. Pedro a fait le rapport, un rapport général, confus, apolitique. Il a parlé du SWP "qui ressemble un peu aux lambertistes ici" et du PST "qui ressemble un peu aux partis d'avant 14" (il n'a pas dit combien "un peu"). De même qu'il a expliqué qu'ils avaient tout essayé pour convaincre la LTF d'envoyer des représentants, chose que la LTF a finalement accepté de faire à la fin de la semaine, peut-être. La réunion était très intéressante, dans la mesure où il y avait énormément de gens qui étaient présents, et qu'une ~~grande~~ majorité des gens qui sont intervenus dans la discussion ont critiqué la MMF. (même s'il y a uniquement 9 ou 10 personnes qui sont intervenus). Krasno a fait le rapport pour sa tendance. Il a voulu dès le départ très nettement se différencier et prendre ses distances par rapport à la LTF, même sur les points où ils disent être d'accord avec nous. Il n'a pas été assez loin dans ses critiques, en tous les cas il a par exemple été moins critique en comparaison avec leur déclaration de tendance initiale. Ensuite il est intéressant de noter par exemple que l'intervention de Dumas était par contre plus complète, et qu'il exprime beaucoup plus clairement une série d'accords avec la LTF. Bien sûr moi

et J-P ont est intervenu, mais ce qui manquait terriblement c'était un représentant de la UFF. Heureusement que la présence de North et de D. va changer un peu la situation de ce point de vue la.

Ceci m'amène finalement à te parler de ce qui se passe avec nous d'une façon un peu plus précise. Nous avons décidé non seulement d'écrire un texte, mais aussi d'appeler à la formation d'une tendance. Nous pensions que c'était nécessaire pour toute une série de raisons, et nous continuons à penser que ces raisons sont toujours valables. Donc nous avons commencé moi, J-P, et Steve à rédiger ce texte. (Chloe était d'accord avec nos positions politiques, mais ne voulait pas se déclarer pour des raisons tactiques, C. aussi était d'accord avec nous mais pour d'autres raisons, elle ne pouvait pas le faire). Nous avons quand même décidé de commencer le travail concrètement à nous trois. Nous avons travaillé sur le texte qui était presque rédigé. Cependant mercredi passé J-P a ~~eu~~ changé d'avis. Ce n'est pas qu'il n'est plus d'accord avec nos positions, au contraire la-dessus il a dit clairement qu'il continuera à les défendre, mais il a d'autres perspectives en vue, et que donc il ne veut pas avoir les mains liées par la déclaration. Il compte s'engager dans un travail avec la commission économique et développer un peu ses idées par rapport à ses questions. donc pour lui il ne peut avoir le temps et la possibilité de faire les deux. Or nous ne pensons pas que moi et Steve pouvons à nous deux seuls faire face à tout le travail qu'exigerait une tendance, mis à part le fait que "nous venons tous les 2 du SWP"...etc

Donc, pour toute une série de raisons, nous avons décidé uniquement d'écrire un texte, sans nous déclarer, et de continuer à faire le travail comme nous le faisons maintenant, à savoir présenter nos idées dans nos groupes individuels, continuer à faire des rapports, et intervenir dans toutes les réunions.

Je pense, que c'est à peu près tout ce que j'ai à dire. Je ne sais pas si tu as reçu les derniers textes pour la discussion en France (Debat et discussion, édité par le centre de recherche socialiste) et d'autres textes. Au cas où tu ne les a pas recus, je pourrais te les envoyer, ce serait intéressant. D'autre part je serai très intéressée de savoir ce que tu en penses.

En attendant d'avoir de tes nouvelles,

Salutations révolutionnaires,

Mona

JAN 2 1974

Stockholm, Dec. 22, 1973

Dear Mary-Alice.

This letter is to confirm that we have received the document "On the Orientation of the Fourth International in Europe". We think it is very good and certainly support its publishing.

Of course some concrete examples and experiences from different countries would make it even better. We, for our part, will as soon as possible send you a letter with some aspects from the development in Sweden. As we all, however, want the text published ~~as soon as possible~~ with as little delay as possible we immediately send this letter.

Comradely

LTF/RMF

Anders Beckin

24.12.73

Dear Mary-Alice,

We have read the draft and would like to propose some amendments.

The first of these amendments deal with the nature of Stalinism. We are inclined to agree with the position of the LTF-members of the USFI, but we would prefer to study the matter more thoroughly before definitely fixing our position on this question. Therefore we propose that the sentences on p. 1 and 8, concerning Vietnamese Stalinism, be changed.

Another possible solution - if you prefer so - ^{could be} the addition of a statement by Marcel, which states that he does not yet express a definitive position on the nature of Stalinism.

Second amendment: p. 5 - to add at the end of point 9: "The analysis of the period can only contribute to the elaboration of the general line of the organisation." We wish to include this amendment because else the IMT could accuse us of having a "timeless" position on the elaboration of the political line and the building of the party.

3rd amendment: p. 13. We propose to omit the sentence "That is how we will build the party." In Europe, with the term "party" is meant an organisation which is actually leading important sectors of the working class. Such an organisation will be built through important re-groupings inside the workers' movement (e.g. your fusion with the Musteites, your 'French Turn'). In its present form the sentence could give the impression that our viewpoint on party-building is one of exclusively individual recruitment by the present nucleus. The idea you wanted to express by means of the sentence we propose to omit, can be included by addition of "to our organisations" after "must be won" in the previous sentence.

Last amendment: the changing of the paragraph: ^(↑ ↓) "As the example of Chile betrayed." Concerning Chile, the paragraph is entirely correct, but from this cannot be drawn the general conclusion that the toiling masses acquire spontaneously the willing and the capacity to take up arms. Another example, the Bolivian one, proves this. As we stated in our tendency-text, we think that one of the important tasks of the revolutionists in Latin America consists in preparing the masses politically for armament by taking initiatives of self-defense from within the mass-movement.

We propose to replace the paragraph by the following one:

"As the example of Chile has once more tragically demonstrated, even where sectors of the working masses are armed, the revolutionary will and combativity of the masses will time and again be betrayed until a mass revolutionary Marxist party is capable of politically destroying the reformist leadership and replacing it."

That's all.

revolutionary greetings,
for our Tendency

Marcel