

POLITICAL COMMITTEE MEETING, No. 4, May 10, 1974

Present: Barnes, Breitman, Britton, Camejo, Finkel, A. Hansen, J. Hansen, Horowitz, Jenness, Jones, Lovell, Seigle, Stone, Thomas, Waters

Consultative: Dobbs, Kerry

Visitors: Scott

Chair: A. Hansen

AGENDA: 1. World Movement
2. French Elections
3. Internationalist Tendency Split
4. Plenum Agenda and Reporters

1. WORLD MOVEMENT

Waters reported.

Discussion

2. FRENCH ELECTIONS

Waters reported.

Discussion

3. INTERNATIONALIST TENDENCY SPLIT

Barnes reported. (See attached correspondence.)

Discussion

4. PLENUM AGENDA AND REPORTERS

Barnes reported

Discussion

Motion: To propose the following agenda for the plenum, and to assign the following reporters:

1. World Movement - Report by Waters
2. World Political Situation - Report by Horowitz
3. Political Report - Report by Barnes
4. Organization Report - Report by Sheppard
5. Report on Opponent Organizations - Report by Jenness
6. Report on the Party's Fight for Democratic Rights - Report by Seigle
7. Youth Report - Reporter to be decided by youth

Motion: To reschedule the plenum for June 20-23, 1974,
in New York.

Carried.

Motion by Lovell: To invite trade union directors in
branches where they exist to attend the plenum.

Discussion

For: Lovell

Against: All others

Defeated.

Meeting Adjourned.

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

May 3, 1974

Lower Manhattan Branch

Dear Comrades,

This is to inform you that we have withdrawn from the Internationalist Tendency caucus. We remain ideological supporters of the International Majority's political positions.

Comradely,
s/Bob Langston
Berta Langston

* * *

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

Ralph Levitt
1076 Carol Lane, #99
Lafayette, Ca. 94549
May 7, 1974.

Political Committee
Socialist Workers Party

This is to advise you of my resignation from the Internationalist Tendency. I remain a supporter of the International Majority Tendency, on the political basis outlined in previous documents.

Fraternally,
s/Ralph Levitt

* * *

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

May 7, 1974

Political Committee
Socialist Workers Party

Dear Comrades:

This is to inform you that I have withdrawn from the Internationalist Tendency caucus. I remain an ideological supporter of the International Majority's political positions.

Comradely,
s/Alan Wald

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

May 7, 1974

Political Committee
Socialist Workers Party

Dear Comrades:

This is to inform you that I have withdrawn from the Internationalist Tendency caucus. I remain an ideological supporter of the International Majority's political positions.

Comradely,
s/Celia Stodola

COPY

COPY

* * *

COPY

COPY

May 8, 1974

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

Dear Comrades,

This is to inform you that I have withdrawn from the Internationalist Tendency caucus. I remain an ideological supporter of the International Majority's political positions.

Comradely,
Gerald G.

* * *

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

May 9, 1974

To the organizer
Upper West Side branch SWP:

This is to inform you that I am no longer a part of the International Tendency. I am still a supporter of the International Majority Tendency politics.

s/James M. Morgan

P.C. - May 10, 1974

1. Report on Wld. Movement - M-A

report on U.Sec. Mtg. + follow-up "ex-parity committee" mtg.

French elections -

evolution of the position of French comrades on this question

last time - vote UG ≠ pop front, because no significant sector of the bourgeoisie was involved // was a "reformist alternative"

SP can't be defined in class terms

Character of UG is defined by predominance within it of CP

(we have heard of a critical letter to Pol. Bur of French on this; but ^{we} never saw it)

our letter, etc.

last Dec. or Jan. - Rouge: reiterated UG ≠ PF but was a "reformist alternative" to which the bourgeoisie had to adopt a class vs. class attitude

They were wrong in not previously characterizing SP as a "bourgeois workers party"

They were wrong in saying weight of the CP determined the class character of UG - because

what if all radicals joined the UG?

continued their position of not characterizing UG as a PF - because no significant sector of bourgeoisie was involved - but they did say it had a "popular front dynamic"

Last Dec.

It was an error to vote for the Radicals - ^{two reasons} ① principle

② miseducates the vanguard - the left radicals would serve as the bridge to the more significant sectors of bourgeoisie

there is a [Section?]
 New Document by Jebraq on eve of the current elections
 tries to provide a theoretical basis for their position - goes back to old early Comintern & Trotsky material to try to lay a basis for their position on both Chile & France

Jebraq position

UdG = common project of two mass reformist parties
 ∴ To call merely for expelling the ^{few} bourgeois ministers wouldn't solve anything - govt. policies would be the same

repeats Ernest ∴ this is not 1936; this is 1948

Chile - a wkra govt - category 2 - soc-dem wkra govt.
 But became a popular govt when ^{Gen. Prats} came in

France: UdG wants to convert itself into a Pop Front;
 but objective conditions in France preclude this
 (two reasons: ¹ Gaullists have polarized France; ² bourgeoisie has learned the lesson of Chile)

says evolution of UdG is towards a Kerenkyist regime rather than a pop front - a ~~UdG~~

Current Elections

for Mitterand on 2nd round because:

- ① candidate supported by wkra orgs
- ② candidate of SP - same as Wilson, Brandt
- ③ only way to defeat reaction
- ④ wkra have tremendous hope - ∴ UdG victory ⇒ upsurge in the class struggle
- ⑤ we must go through this reformist experience with the u.c.

Ernest - remarks at secretariat

Pol. Committee May 10, 1974

Krivine campaign on 1st round

- improvement in terms of concrete proposals.
- fundamental ~~point~~ ^{axis} of Krivine campaign - lessons of Chile, workers militias, workers must arm themselves, etc.

There is no organized opposition within F.C.R. on this Q., except for

- Roger - SP = a bourgeois party
- LTF supporters - opp. to voting Mitterand
- Centre de Courant et al have fractured on this Q. -

There are no organizations in entire French left opposing Mitterand 2nd round except anti-parliamentarians

PSU - supports M strongly ~~but~~ opposes common program, but ~~not~~ supports common candidate of the left

Lambertists - vote M from 1st round ^(as SP candidate), L.O. & F.C.R. groups divide the w.c. - ~~structure~~ ^(CCI says it is) incorrect to continue strikes or big mass actions during the elections

Lutte Ouvriere = at beginning they did not specify their position on 2nd round, merely saying they would not stand in the way; ^(L.O.M) but they have since come out explicitly for M

On May Day - L.O. contingent was about equal to F.C.R. contingent

L.O. 600,000 votes

F.C.R. 90,000 votes

Revolution = vote L.O. or F.C.R. 1st round
vote Mitterand on 2nd round

Pablo = same ↑; plus from May 20th committee
(May 20 = day after elections)

(4)

Proposals = 1) get accurate press coverage

2) Q. How to handle the internal discussion on this

Jack - ^{our responsibility:} they educational problem // our previous letters were very important from that point of view
entire French left - big pressures
most barren, most crude arguments // by all the groups in T tradition

complete degeneration of scientific terminology // "far-left"
"reformist alternative"
to cover up break from Trotskyist principles

Tom K. - to support Mo. is a historic bet
must speak publicly

Farell - ^{the} most dangerous kind of deviation.

ultra-leftism - has danger of victimization
→ have a better chance of getting away with it - but undermines key
task of revs. - that of introducing an anti-capitalist political line

two sides of the coin // Spanish anarchists during 1930's - absolutely opposed
to parliamentarianism; then in heat of civil war, they go
over to ~~the~~ joining the government

the previous history - every previous gesture to the left
included elements of turn to right
Militant should have an ~~editorial~~ editorial forthwith

Motion: - draw up an analysis
- discuss w/ LTR leadership
- present to USec