

July 23, 1974

To the Political Committee

Dear Comrades,

Attached are two items:

1. A copy of a letter written by Jim Collins of the Bay Area Revolutionary Marxist Collective. A photocopy of the letter enclosed in an envelope postmarked in Chicago was sent anonymously to Gus Horowitz. The name of the original addressee is unknown, but the letter was evidently sent to the IT leadership. Collins' signature on the letter as well as the typewriter marks match other letters that we have from Collins.

2. Excerpts from a personal letter sent by John (Butch) Hutton of the IT party to an SWP member who was formerly in the Bloomington YSA local along with Hutton, and has been a personal friend of his. Hutton, who prior to the IT split was in the YSA, but the the SWP, is identified as a member of the IT PC in the IT PC's statement of July 5, 1974.

Comradely,

Gus Horowitz

dJuly 10, 1974

JUL 23 1974

Comrades,

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

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

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

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

Massey at the regional Chile conference in May

Garth at the meeting described in the SWP split document

Charles at the Chile ~~meeting~~ Solidarity Committee ~~xxxx~~ film

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

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

We also intend to work closely during this whole process with members inside the SWP particularly Garth and Carlos. We ~~we~~ would suggest the tendency approve joint meetings under adequate security ~~precautions~~ precautions of course; ~~to~~ to refuse such meetings in the guise of security seems incorrect given our current need to coordinate strategy and tactics closely.

We would also hope that in future the tendency leadership would contact us directly about any big change in the situation nationally; we can be conveniently reached at Barry's office or personal phone number, which we believe is in the ~~xxxx~~ hands of the IT.

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

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

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

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

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

Thirdly, we have received no copies of the OLD MOLE since May. We have not even received the Chile supplement as yet. Can Chicago check on this or are we to deal directly with 2 Toronto?

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

Fifthly, are we to receive copies of the IT internal mailings? In particular, we would like to receive all the information everyone else in the tendency gets about the recent ~~xxxxxx~~ expulsion from the SWP. We would also like to be included in any preparations ~~x~~ for a Central Committee meeting which may be planned in the future, and some information about our representation in such a meeting now that we have applied to the SWP.

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

Yours,

Jim Collins

Jim Collins

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

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

10 July, 1974

Dear Sandi,

This is one of the most difficult letters I have ever had to write; it probably won't be too much fun to read, either, but some things have to be said. . . .

If the SWP and YSA leaderships felt that the IT had organized a rival "party within a party" and was double-recruiting they had every right in the world to bring us up on charges. Both the SWP (Article VIII) and YSA (Article IX) constitutions are quite clear on procedures to be followed here. If you go back and read the stuff on the 1963 expulsion of the Sparts, you'll find that these procedures--involving written charges and a trial with provisions for defense--were followed, although the charges against Robertson and the others were virtually identical with those made against us. Even John Zanelotti--a Wobblinist spy--got a trial. But now the SWP and YSA leaderships circumvent their own constitutions and purge us with no opportunity to defend ourselves and no right of appeal.

"What good would a trial have been?" you might ask. "The evidence is clear." Well, there were at least a few points we could have scored, Sandi. For one thing, the idiots running the SWP and YSA made a few mistakes in their purge. Included in the expulsions were at least 4 people who had resigned from the IT (Don Smith, Polly Connolly, Ed Hoffmans, Sandy Hall) and informed the party of that fact. There were a number of others (Lauren Charous, Mike Tormey) who were either on extended leaves of absence or had been inactive for several months and had never received any of the infamous internal bulletins or documents. A trial might have cleared that up.

Also, the material printed by the SWP is deliberately selected and edited for their own purposes. They publish, for example, a series of documents such as the Carapace document and the Rahdnick-Estreugal amendments which the records shows were either rejected (the amendments) or never even came to a vote (Rico, Carapace, the Alexander document). In an international bulletin we will publish what the SWP left out--including a series of communiques with the IMT which make it entirely clear that we were not going to split under any circumstances.

Then there is the matter of the mysterious non-YSAer, non-SWPer who supposedly attended the May Conference. We could show--and will show--that Bitsy Myers is a numbskull, that we have not 8 but 10 IT members in D.C. and that all nine who attended were in either the SWP, the YSA, or both.

Then there are the open lies. We talked to Alfredo Lopez of the PSP, Sandi, and he flatly and completely denies that he said anything at all resembling the charge in the document--he was, in fact, furious and wanted a copy of that page of the document to show the PSP leadership. The same is true of the alleged conversation between Bitsy Myers and "D.M." of the Baltimore Marxist Group.

I could continue this for some time, but you can read our rebuttal in the international bulletin. The point is that we were given no opportunity to defend ourselves prior to our expulsions.

Christ, Sandi, even the CP gave Cannon a trial when they expelled him in 1929. We got nothing. Some comrades in the IT have been in the party for dozens of years, and they suddenly found themselves expelled without a hearing. Mark Lause in Houston had just given the SWP \$150 and had spent two nights scrubbing the floor of the new hall; John Singleterry in NYC singlehandedly took charge of Militant sales to over 40 newstands in the city--he was making his rounds when the purge hit. Peter Geller in Houston was the YSA petition director--he was working on a mobilization when he got his letter. Ed Hoffmans in Chicago was out petitioning to get the party on the ballot--the SWP carefully avoided giving him his letter until he had finished petitioning. (No harm getting a little work out of him 1st, after all.) The whole affair was disgusting. (The aftermath has been worse for some comrades--the SWP is trying to get an NYC woman removed as an USIA leader even though USIA is an "independent" group, another comrade has been dropped from a union slate, etc.)

I'm not asking you to agree with our politics, 'cause I know you don't. I'm not even asking you to approve all of our actions. I'm just pleading with you to consider how we were expelled and to read our rebuttal when it comes out with an open mind.

Our opinion is that our expulsion is the SWP's retaliation for the USec statement attacking the PST for signing the accords with the bourgeois parties. (And this was not a misunderstanding the PST has not "self-criticized." We have the Avanzada Socialista where it "self-criticized"--it said the printing of their name was an "error" but defended the forming of pacts with bourgeois parties to defend bourgeois democracy. Worse, since Peron's death it has signed a new one.) Our expulsion is tied in with the refusal of all LTF sections to pay dues to FI since the 10th World Congress, the public attacks on the FCR (including a public attack at an election meeting by Art Young of the ISA, who denounced the FCR by name to an audience which contained Sparts, Maoists, etc.), etc., etc. . . .

s/Butch