

April 21, 1976

To the Leninist Trotskyist Faction Coordinators

Dear Comrades,

Enclosed are the following items:

1. A translation of a statement sent by former members of the Portuguese PRT to the LCI of Portugal, the United Secretariat, and the LTF Steering Committee.

2. A report on the March Secretariat meeting by Johnson.

Attachments to report:

A. Translation of February 10 letter from Lutte Ouvrière.

B. Translation of United Secretariat majority reply to Lutte Ouvrière.

C. Galois motion on Lutte Ouvrière letter.

D. Galois motion on IIDB

E. Walter motion on IIDB

F. Walter proposal on division of space in IIDB.

4. Article by Ricardo Hernandez submitted to Inter-continental Press.

4. Letter from Joseph Hansen regarding Ricardo article.

5. Report on Mexico to the Socialist Workers party political committee by Barry Sheppard, with attachments. (National Committee members will have received this with minutes of the April 16 Political Committee meeting.)

6. Letter from Jack Barnes to the United Secretariat. (National Committee members will have received this with minutes of the April 9 Political Committee meeting.)

Comradely,

Caroline Lund

TRANSLATION

Copies to: Liga Comunista Internacionalista
United Secretariat of the IV International
Steering Committee of the Leninist Trotskyist
Faction

The undersigned expelled members, as well as members who -- because of their disagreement with these expulsions and method used in the entire process of incrimination -- have left the PRT since the February 1, 1976, plenum that approved the sanctions, make it known through this statement that:

1. The accusations were not objective. Written charges were not presented. All the evaluations made orally against the members under attack had the weight of accusations.

2. The membership of the party in its entirety was denied the right to become acquainted with the basic material of the inquiry as well as the method of investigation of what was referred to by the central leadership as "rumors."

3. The expulsion proceedings were prejudiced by the confusion deliberately created by the party leadership in raising the possibility that comrades like Evaristo or Ernesto, both Trotskyist activists for five years and elected members of the central leadership, might be linked to the extreme right -- the ELP -- or to the extreme left -- FUR. This was openly stated by Comrade Sá Leal at a meeting of cell leaderships in Lisbon where problems of "factional origin" were discussed.

4. Not a single one of the members against whom sanctions were applied was given the chance to formulate a defense in writing, since it was only at the plenum that they learned that they were under accusation and what the bases of the charges were.

5. During the plenum, called on one day's notice, the atmosphere that prevailed was an emotional one, charged with physical and psychological coercion, which was the logical outcome of the entire method used.

6. In the discussion of the agenda and throughout the entire meeting, both the central leadership and the presiding committee of the plenum tried to prevent comrades under accusation from taking up the charges in their political context. They continually insisted that the question was not a political one but an organizational one.

7. The charges of "provocative, antiparty factional activity" were not proved.

8. Since the organization is in a pre-congress period, such methods pose an impediment to airing political differences with the central leadership in an atmosphere of open, democratic discussion.

9. In accordance with the organizational norms of the IV International, the congress is the supreme and sovereign body. Therefore, the sanctions should be discussed at that level. If we are not allowed to be present, to participate and defend ourselves politically on the basis of written charges, this will constitute a new example of misrepresentation and violation of the organizational principles of Leninism-Trotskyism.

10. The forced removal of members who continue to support the IV International and building a section of the Fourth International in our country will divide the Trotskyist forces and prevent clarification of the political positions -- which is a necessary precondition for the building of the Revolutionary Workers Party in Portugal.

In view of the above, we demand that the Leadership of the PRT:

1. Immediately reinstate the undersigned expelled members in the Partido Revolucionário dos Trabalhadores,

2. Permit our participation in the Congress, the highest sovereign body, which should make the final decision on the proceedings.

We await a reply, which we request be made within one week and sent to the following address: [address in original].

Lisbon, March 26, 1976

The expelled members:

s/ Ernesto
Frederico
Alexandre
Marta
Catarina
José

Suspended:

Gonçalo
Américo

Members who left the PRT since the plenum in solidarity with the expelled:

s/Aduzuea (?)
Francisca
Otelo
Silvia
Maria
Marina
Andrea
Rosa

Report on March 13 -14, 1976 United
Secretariat meeting by Johnson.

At the March United Secretariat meeting there were discussions on Portugal, Spain and the Congress of the Soviet Communist Party. There were also discussions on several organizational questions.

Comrade Aubin reported on the coming elections in Portugal. He indicated that the conditions for the workers movement during this election period were less favorable than during the 1975 elections. The division within the working class remains quite deep and the level of activity of the working class has been lower in the post-November 25 period. Because of this it is harder to foresee the results, and it is even possible there will be a higher rate of abstention within the working class.

Many of the "far left" groups will be participating in the elections. However, he reported that most of their campaigns were generally rather sectarian and abstract, and in most cases these campaigns are on a smaller scale than in 1975.

Both the LCI and the PRT have filed lists of candidates although at the time of the secretariat meeting it was not clear whether the PRT candidate would be placed on the ballot. The LCI will run 330 candidates in all election districts except for the Azores. The PRT will run about 50 candidates in four election districts. An attempt had been made to run a common election campaign. Although a long series of discussions were held, it finally was not possible to agree on the platform.

From Aubin's report it appeared that the major disagreement revolved around the governmental question. The LCI proposed that the platform include the demand that the Communist party and Socialist party break the pact with the MFA and form a government implementing an anticapitalist program responsible to a democratic congress of the unions. The PRT disagreed saying that the SP was the main party of the working class and was responsible for the sixth government. Therefore, in order to expose the SP, we should call for an SP government. The LCI and PRT are still having discussions to see how much collaboration they can maintain during the elections. Representatives of the LCI and PRT were not present for this discussion.

It is interesting to note that the demand by the LCI that the SP and CP form a government independent of the MFA is a new position. As recently as the February IEC meeting, the resolution presented by the IMT indicated that the general formula "for a workers and farmers government" should not under present conditions be concretized in a call for an SP-CP government.

The discussion on Spain centered on the growing opportunities for our movement in the current upsurge of struggles. The documents and interviews with representatives of the LC and LCR-ETA VI appearing in Intercontinental Press give the best view of the positions and activities of both organizations.

A statement was prepared on the 25th Congress of the CPSU. However, because of the short time between the conclusion of the Congress and the United Secretariat meeting, it had not been distributed to members. Thus the discussion was preliminary. The statement will be circulated to United Secretariat members and will be placed on the agenda of the next meeting for a decision.

The remaining items on the agenda were the election of the Bureau, a letter from Lutte Ouvrière, the IIDB, the organization of the World Congress discussion and some items relating to Intercontinental Press.

Election of the Bureau. This item was necessary to formally elect a new bureau after the IEC. The IMT stated that the Bureau should include representatives of all three international tendencies. However, the main axis of the discussion by IMT members was that since May 1975 the LTF has not participated in the Bureau. They said that they insisted that LTF members begin functioning on the Bureau on a daily basis. It was raised that "people will begin to question what LTF members are doing in Europe" if they are not functioning on the Bureau. Of course, there have been longstanding disagreements over the breakdown in the functioning of the Bureau. The fact is that the IMT has transformed the Bureau into an instrument of its own faction. The new Bureau was elected including representatives of the PST and holding open several places for members of the LTF to be designated later.

Lutte Ouvrière. The United Secretariat discussed a reply to a February 10 letter from Lutte Ouvrière proposing discussions among organizations claiming to be Trotskyist. Their letter and the IMT reply are attached. The statement accompanying the Lutte Ouvrière letter, entitled, "Putting an End to the Crumbling of the International Trotskyist Movement," can be found in the March 11 LTF mailing, as well as in SWP Internal Information Bulletin, No. 6 in 1976. The IMT rejected attending the exploratory conference of the four organizations as observers, rejected political discussion with these groups, and presented them with an ultimatum on the organizational question instead. The LTF members of the United Secretariat introduced a counter-motion, which is also attached. It was agreed that we propose a meeting between a delegation of the United Secretariat and a delegation of the four organizations signing the letter.

IIDE. At the January 1976 United Secretariat meeting, the IMT voted to postpone publication of three contributions to the International Internal Discussion Bulletin. One of these was the report by Mary-Alice Waters adopted by the January 1976 meeting of the SWP National Committee. The SWP again submitted this report for the internal bulletin. Again the IMT voted to postpone publication of the report. The motions by Galois and Walter are attached. Although the IEC opened the pre-congress discussion, no articles have been accepted for publication at this time.

Organization of the pre-World Congress Discussion.

During the Secretariat meeting we were presented with a proposal on the organization of the discussion. It is attached. We raised several points in connection with it. First, we wanted some time to think about it. Secondly, we thought others, such as the German Kompass tendency should be consulted. Third, the PST-led grouping has not submitted any "written platform" as of yet.

Intercontinental Press. The IMT complained that an article by Ricardo on the split in the Mexican Liga Socialista (reprinted elsewhere in this mailing) and the resolution adopted by the IEC meeting had not yet appeared in Intercontinental Press. Some IMT members also objected to the reprinting of the two documents in the March 6, 1976 issue on the Mexican elections. They stated in the course of the discussion that, in their opinion, the editorial policy of IP continues to be one of the greatest sources of tension in the International. A letter from Joseph Hansen regarding the Ricardo article is printed elsewhere in this mailing.

Attachment A. T R A N S L A T I O N

Letter from Lutte Ouvrière to United
Secretariat. February 10, 1976.

Dear Comrades:

In the name of the four organizations that have signed the attached statement, we invite you to participate in an exploratory conference concerning the issues raised in this statement. It will take place Sunday, March 14, in France.

This conference aims at bringing together the various Trotskyist groups that are not satisfied with the international formations in existence at the present time, so that they can consider what international relations could be established between them.

Of course, the content of this appeal is in no way a condition for participation in the conference. All the questions it raises can be broadly discussed.

If, in this context, you wish to meet with us separately prior to the conference in order to discuss our respective positions at leisure, we are more than ready to do so.

If you agree in principle with such a conference, we would appreciate your notifying us as soon as possible so that we can inform you of the practical details in sufficient time.

With internationalist greetings.

Lutte Ouvrière

Attachment B

LETTER FROM UNITED SECRETARIAT MAJORITY IN REPLY TO
LUTTE OUVRIERE

Brussels, March 9, 1976

Dear Comrades,

We have received your circular letter of February 10, 1976. In our opinion, it raises two separate problems.

The March 14, 1976, meeting clearly involves groups that are not part of an effective international organization. Whatever its weaknesses as an organization -- weaknesses we are aware of -- the Fourth International does exist and is growing and developing. Thus there is no reason for us to participate in an exploratory meeting with comrades who seem to want to persist in denying this obvious fact.

On the other hand, the concerns reflected in your statement "To put an end to the crumbling of the world Trotskyist movement" correspond to our own. When you regret "the inability to maintain the organizational unity of the movement," we agree. But when you add "the inability to select an international leadership recognized by all the Trotskyist groups," and the existence of a "plethora of competing international leaderships with different followings," we venture to make two comments.

First, even in Trotsky's time, in spite of his immense political and moral authority, it was not possible to unite all the groups adhering to revolutionary Marxism. So let us not aim for an impossible unanimity that could turn out to be a pretext to avoid seizing the opportunity to bring an end to needless fragmentation.

It is at least evidence of an unrealistic attitude to put "international leaderships" that represent only a handful of national organizations to which one could add at most some insignificant grouplets, on the same footing as the Fourth International, which is present in more than fifty countries and has thousands of members, clearly the majority of Trotskyists on a world scale. It has succeeded in maintaining its international organizational unity in spite of -- or perhaps we should say as a result of -- frank, impassioned political discussions in its ranks conducted with full regard for proletarian democracy; the right to form tendencies; the refusal to prohibit factions; and the decision to conduct some debates on important questions publicly. This certainly represents a change with respect to some episodes of the earlier history of the international Trotskyist movement, a change that results precisely from the strengthening of the Fourth International. A learning process is going on as well, about which discussion is possible and necessary, and which we do not try to present as a definitive model or ideal.

We are in full agreement with you when you write: "some of the disagreements within the Trotskyist move-

ment involve questions of the utmost importance. But it is precisely within a Trotskyist movement capable of rising above sectarianism and ostracism and allowing a broad confrontation of ideas that these different analyses could truly be discussed."

One obvious conclusion flows from this: that the refusal to maintain a common organizational framework is precisely the root of the sectarianism and the organizational ostracism that has done us so much harm in the past and that even today causes splits that have no justification in principle, making programmatic agreement subordinate to differences over tactics or over conjunctural analysis. This is not to diminish the importance of the real political differences that currently exist among the groups that consider themselves Trotskyist, even if at times these differences are less pronounced in daily political activity than in factional polemics that have a sectarian ring.

In our opinion, the question that must be answered by any group adhering to Trotskyism is the following: is it or is it not possible for them, on a national or international level, to join with the majority -- if not virtually the entirety -- of Trotskyists, on the basis of democratic centralism, even when they know they will be a minority tendency for the time being or perhaps for an extended period, provided that they retain all rights to defend their own positions within the organization and on occasion even publicly, at times of pre-Congress discussion. Are they prepared to become involved immediately in common public actions as a practical test of this possibility?

To reply "no" to this question is to make fragmentation inevitable. To hope for political unanimity is obviously utopian. Moreover, the more the movement grows the more differences of tactics and analysis will multiply, at least periodically. The more it becomes implanted in the working class the more it will be subject to contradictory pressures, resulting from the uneven development of the class struggle on the international and even the national level.

To reply "yes" to this question is to declare oneself in favor of a process of national and international unification on the basis of democratic centralism, a process we initiated in 1963 which has by no means been completed, which we are trying to pursue, and which implies in any event that democratic centralism be applied in a different manner at the international level than at the national level. This is specified in our statutes, which prohibit Congresses or international leaderships from administra-

tively changing the composition of national leaderships or deciding on the tactics of national sections.

We are open to any initiative directed toward extending and completing this process of unification. We are prepared to meet with a delegation from your four organizations with a view to discussing such practical initiatives. Obviously we are opposed to any initiative aimed at provoking new splits under the guise of "discussions" or "regroupments."

In our opinion, a "broad political discussion" is not necessary before taking a position on this fundamental question. The Trotskyist cadres are fully acquainted with the existing differences within the movement.

A new discussion will not reveal anything we did not know before. We do not object to a discussion on principle, but for us that is not what is essential. The essential thing is to take a stand on the feasibility of a common organizational frame-work in spite of our well-known differences and to specify under what conditions this is possible for each group. We see this discussion as urgent and vital. In it we take the position Leon Trotsky relentlessly

defended between 1933 and 1940 against any formula for international "regroupment" with the London Bureau, which was based on the rule of unanimity, leading to complete paralysis and abstention as far as international action was concerned; and for strengthening the Fourth International as an organization as well as politically.

The idea of discussing a draft program among all those who consider themselves revolutionary Marxists seems quite pointless to us. At the same time, we would point out that building an international organization that is more than a federation of national groups, and an international organization that is built parallel to and jointly with the national organizations, is for us part of the program, a reflection of the objective character of the class struggle and of the social revolution in the imperialist epoch. Whoever does not accept this will fall sooner or later into "national-Trotskyist" practices, which sooner or later lead to "national-Trotskyist" deviations.

Awaiting your reply, we send you
our communist greetings,
The United Secretariat of the
Fourth International

Attachment C

MOTION BY GALOIS

The United Secretariat decides:

1. To write a letter to the four organizations welcoming their proposal for a discussion and suggesting a meeting between a delegation from the United Secretariat and a delegation from the four organizations for the purpose of exploring what steps are possible to advance this discussion.

2. To accept the invitation to attend the exploratory conference called by the four groups, and to attend in the capacity of observers. If it is not practical to arrange to send a delegation at this late date, the United Secretariat will inform the four groups that it was only for practical reasons that we could not attend.

Attachments

Attachment D. Galois Motion on IIDB:

To publish the World Movement Report by Mary-Alice Waters, adopted by the National Committee of the SWP on January 4, 1976 and the four appendices to the report as published in SWP IIB No. 2 in 1976. This contribution should be published as soon as is technically possible.

Attachment E. Walter Motion on IIDB.

Given the subject of this report by Comrade Mary-Alice Waters, given the fact that it comes already after the publication of two other SWP internal reports in the IIDB, given the fact that it is now to be published within the framework of the pre-world-congress discussion and will suscite obviously a lot of unproductive polemics, given the fact that it is unbecoming to open the pre-world-congress discussion with such a type of discussion, the United Secretariat decides:

- a) to publish this report
- b) to postpone its publication till after the prior printing of at least one political resolution on one of the questions proposed on the world congress agenda.

Attachment F. Walter proposal on division of space in IIDB.

Rules for the division of space in the IIDB.

1. As a general rule, space will be divided as follows:

- 25% IMT
- 25% minority faction
- 25% grouping around the PST inasmuch as they constitute a tendency on a written platform.
- 25% non-engaged.

2. 3,6, and 9 months after opening of the discussion period, the situation will be reviewed in light of material received, in order to respect these proportions. This means that while in the beginning, material will be published in a general way according to chronological order of submission, at regular intervals priority will be granted to material necessary to respect roughly the above-mentioned proportions.

3. An attempt will be made to avoid excessive over-representation of any of the tendencies in the first phase of the discussion. so as:

Attachments

a.) not to endanger the ultimate respect of the above-mentioned proportions.

b.) enable a real debate and not to take up excessive space with documents elaborated before the real debate starts.

4. If excess material is submitted falling into the fourth category, priority will be given to material submitted either by leaderships, or by "non-committed" majority or strong minority groupings inside sections, like, e.g. the European Kompass tendency.

5. A parity commission of the three international tendencies will oversee the application of these rules.

The Facts on the Split in the Liga Socialista
By Ricardo Hernandez

The article that appeared in the February 16 issue of Intercontinental Press [The reference is to the Spanish translation of the article. The original appeared in the February 9 issue of Intercontinental Press, page 195] entitled "The Split in the Liga Socialista," has forced me to answer publicly. It is very damaging to the Fourth International to carry on polemics of this kind. I would have preferred that this answer remained within the ranks of the international. To argue in this way only provides enemies of the Fourth International with ammunition in slandering our movement. Equally sad for me is having to undertake a polemic of this kind against Comrade Hansen. Many of us not only respect him for having been a secretary to Leon Trotsky but also for having been our teacher. Nevertheless, by committing the error of having made this situation public, Comrade Hansen leaves me no other alternative but to justify our political line before the readers of IP, among whom I have comrades and friends,

First of all, it is necessary to indicate that this polemic over the split in the Liga Socialista of Mexico is not the most important one in our movement nor the one best able to advance it at the present time. I think that the real differences with Comrade Hansen and the political line of which he is an advocate lie in the discussions that our international is conducting at present on the burning current problems of the world revolution: the revolution in Portugal and the civil war in Angola. The latter is decisive, since the differences on Portugal and Angola in our movement are taking place within the democratic framework that characterizes the international, a framework quite different from that of the sects that discuss only absolutely secondary organizational and personal issues. The way in which Comrade Hansen has taken up the split in the Liga Socialista is an example of the latter: trying to cover up the real questions in debate, presenting a panorama of factional struggles completely outside of the real context of the Mexican organization and of the international.

At the same time, these polemics and the attitude of Comrade Hansen are not at all the best way to promote the growth of a strong section of the international in Mexico.

Who Represents the 'Tradition' of the Liga Socialista?

Comrade Hansen holds that the comrades who split the LS represented the majority of its main founders. He says: "The FBL [Fraccion Bolchevique

Leninista] included most of the founding leaders of the Liga Socialista."

The aim of this argument is to demonstrate that the comrades who split represent the genuine "tradition" of the LS. But the facts indicate something else; obviously instead of a "tradition" an organization in existence three years has all the problems of an organization barely under construction. The first Central Committee elected at the founding congress of the LS was made up of thirteen comrades. Of these, eight supported the positions of the majority (Tendencia Militante) and five those of the minority (FBL). Of the twenty-four members who split from the Grupo Comunista Internacionalista (GCI) in 1972, six remained with the minority and eleven with the majority. For obvious reasons I cannot give their names; however, I am sending Comrade Hansen the communication of October 31, 1972, sent to the United Secretariat and the GCI.

On the Police Agent Accusation

This shameful affair is going to give Healy and Lynn Marcus much to say. Nothing positive can come from dealing with this affair, but since Comrade Hansen has already done so, the least we can do is provide the context in which this accusation was made, which says more than a thousand detailed arguments.

Hansen says in regard to this: "A dispute flared over the way the majority of the Political Committee had handled what might have been a police provocation; that is, material planted to suggest that one of the leaders of the Liga Socialista, Comrade Ricardo, had associations with the police. Instead of at once alerting the Political Committee or the Control Commission as a whole concerning the matter, the two leaders who had run across the material made the mistake of first consulting with individual members of the Political Committee and Control Commission as how to best handle the case. One of the persons with whom they consulted spread the rumor that Ricardo was being deliberately slandered."

The situation was different from that described by Comrade Hansen. As I do not wish to fall into subjective positions, I will quote only two statements by the same comrades who initiated the accusation made at the meeting of the Sixth Plenum of the Central Committee last September. The meeting was taped, so that I am quoting from the tapes. Jaime speaks: "Now, comrades, how was the information obtained? It was through a person linked to the state apparatus. What is the fucking importance of telling you who it is? You want to know?"

What is the reason? Your curiosity has been aroused, comrades? Take the problem into account. This information can be obtained. Look, it is very simple, comrades. My father was well known in the Department of the Federal District; he was head of all the city's urban planning. The mayor, Corona del Rosal, came to my home various times for dinner. But it is clear, it is no good to tell this to the whole world, and these questions. This is obvious; isn't it? I have contacts; and Comrade Cristina, it goes without saying. Her whole family has all kinds of contacts of people like that," Cristina speaks: "Here something has to be clarified: the investigation was not carried out on Comrade Ricardo. This is something that must be very clear. We didn't want to know if Comrade Ricardo was or was not. We purely and simply wanted to know what they had: if they had a cop in the Liga who he was. If it was Ricardo, OK; the same if it wasn't Ricardo."

These statements speak for themselves on the character of the accusation.

It was a comrade of the leadership of the SWP who started the version that a police agent might be involved, according to Comrade Cristina herself. During our congress, we asked the comrade of the SWP leadership who was present to clear this matter up for us, or at least promise to investigate the truth or falsity of this accusation. The comrade flatly refused, and this can be verified by checking the tapes of the congress, held by the FBL. Because of this, the congress decided to suspend, not break, relations with the SWP until the matter was cleared up. Up to the present, the comrades have not disavowed the affirmation made by Comrade Cristina. Comrade Hansen says: "During a recent visit to Mexico, I was told that the Ricardo group had alleged that 'a member' of the Socialist Workers party was involved in 'weaving' the suspicion concerning police penetration of the Liga Socialista. Upto the present, the Political Committee of the SWP has not received any communication whatsoever on this question or the group's reasons for breaking off relations."

Here then is the affirmation of Comrade Cristina in the already mentioned meeting of the Sixth Plenum of the CC: "Yes, and I will say this so you can see that it was not -- and that it can't be understood that way -- what a comrade of the SWP said about Ricardo, and what ... also the comrade (of the SWP) didn't say that Ricardo was a police agent, this should be perfectly clear. It wasn't that that convinced me. The comrade told me that in May, no matter who it was it would be the same. This person told me in May. It is one person, and I am going to explain. Yes, yes it is a leader of the SWP, whom I think that... good, what I think of him is another thing." And Comrade Jaime ratified what Comrade Cristina said: "The question is like this: the comrade informed me that a comrade, concretely of the SWP, had suspicions about Comrade Ricardo, purely subjective."

Comrades of the leadership of the SWP, there is still time to deny the affirmation of Cristina, but if Cristina lied, this would be very grave.

In addition, Comrade Hansen has very little respect for the political capacity of our leadership. According to his version, our CC voted for a line owing to a feeling of solidarity aroused by the accusation made by the future leaders of the FBL.

He says: "At the plenum, Ricardo made much of the error. In fact, together with several backers and the support of a representative of the Argentine Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores (PST), he succeeded in creating such an emotional atmosphere as to preclude rational consideration of the problem. On this basis, Ricardo won a majority of votes."

In the first place, the differences at the Sixth Plenum of the CC were not limited to a controversy of branches versus cells. The minutes of this plenum drawn up by Comrade Jaime himself show that the discussion included the activity of the leadership and the ranks of the organization, and the construction of a youth organization. These differences led to an important difference over the methods of constructing the party. The comrades who voted for this line at the Sixth Plenum of the CC and reaffirmed it at the Second Congress of the LS, decided on the basis of political considerations and not on the fact that I was slandered. Why does Comrade Hansen think that our leadership is not able to go by a political criterion? Why does he believe that it goes by emotional motives? Perhaps Comrade Hansen knows its members. Or does he believe that they are incapable because they are members of a small section, or perhaps because we are a section of an "emotional and romantic people." I would never dare believe that the leadership of the SWP in voting for a line does so from considerations different from those related to a political criterion. Our leadership can make mistakes, but not from emotional but political reasons.

Comrade Hansen also affirms in his article that one of the main themes of the pre-congress discussion related to the accusation. He says: "The Ricardo group made this (the charge of a police agent) one of their main themes in the period leading up to the December congress."

This is completely false. The discussion, the documents that circulated before the congress, the tapes of the debates in the congress demonstrate this. The problem of the accusation was touched on in the final point on the agenda of the congress in which a leadership was elected. We did not recruit anyone to our tendency on the basis of this accusation. On this, Comrade Hansen can be totally sure, although no proofs exist beyond questioning individually each one of our comrades.

In the same way it is absolutely false that the accusation supplanted a political discussion at the congress, as Comrade Hansen says: "In place of a discussion of political issues, they were treated to heated diatribes about deliberate circulation of slanderous rumors of 'association with the police.'"

As already mentioned, after the political discussion, under the last point, the accusation was dealt with. This can be proved.

There is the testimony of the comrades of the GCI and of the fraternal delegates of other sections. There are the tapes held by the leaders of the FBL and there are the minutes of the congress. What you say, Comrade Hansen, is a lie.

Comrade Hansen has a curious interpretation of one of the measures taken by the congress: "A decision was made to suspend all the members of the party for a month. Each former member was to go through a period of testing to determine who could be readmitted." No, Comrade Hansen. The decision was that all the comrades were to be tested for a month, retaining all their rights and obligations, and at the end of the period, it would be seen who were the active members and who were not. Those who did not demonstrate their activity would have their voting rights withdrawn by the party unit they belonged to. This measure was urgent owing to the fact that there were many people in the party who did not attend meetings or pay their dues, still less carry out consistent work. Of the supposed 257 with a right to vote, only 190 showed up to elect delegates. That is, more than 60 members did not show up at the party's most important meeting. This was the situation, and we admit that this was not a particular problem affecting only the FBL, but the entire organization as a whole. What we do state is that it was the comrades of the FBL who defended the right to be inactive.

Comrade Hansen Defends an Unprincipled Split

When those of us who founded the LS split incorrectly from the GCI in 1972, the comrades of the SWP tried to prevent it and never approved the split. Because of that we are surprised at the complete support that Comrade Hansen now offers to those who not only broke from our organization but who stole its property as well as its name and that of its newspaper. In place of speaking about a split, Comrade Hansen speaks about the constitution of a public faction. "Upon assessing the bureaucratic actions taken by the Militant Tendency, the leaders of the Bolshevik Leninist Tendency decided that they had no recourse, if they were to succeed in upholding the program and traditions of the Liga Socialista and the Fourth International but to take their case to the Mexican workers. They therefore decided to become a public faction of the Liga Socialista."

This argument is new to me, but at least it represents an advance over the one used by the comrades of the FBL in their first number of El Socialista in which they state: "The process initiated on September 15 during the Sixth Plenum of the CC culminated in the supposed Second Congress of the LS. This process consisted in the constitution of a new organization..." "This attempt to usurp the name, tradition, prestige and structure, however limited they still might be, culminated during the sessions of the congress. The break, the split with the Trotskyist tradition was consummated..."

With the argument that we were the majority, those of us who split (!!!), they try to justify the theft of the property, the name and the newspaper of the Liga Socialista. In this way the behavior of the FBL is justified. "Ricardo also complains about the fact that in going public, the Bolshevik Leninist Faction took items from the headquarters, mainly several typewriters owned by members of the FBL. Perhaps they took more than they should have, such as newspaper clippings they had compiled, and copies of correspondence signed by the leaders purged by the Militant Tendency... In a large organization, the question is quite different; for party property is clearly recognizable and of such proportions as to reduce to insignificance the question of small items owned by individuals. In a tiny organization where elementary equipment is often loaned by individuals, splits can cut ragged lines when the property question raises its ugly head. It is best to try to avoid disputes over such issues."

No, Comrade Hansen, it was not the newspaper clippings or letters signed by the leaders of the FBL that bothered us. It was the electric typewriters, which one can perhaps consider to be personal property, although we consider things donated to the party to be the property of the party. Likewise we are concerned about the mimeograph and all the newspaper equipment, the finances of the organization, the addresses of the subscribers to El Socialista, and the archives containing the history of our party. That we are a small organization cannot justify our being robbed, Comrade Hansen, quite the contrary, it is much more difficult to restore the material. Only with the fraternal aid of the GCI were we able to get out our newspaper. How is it possible that one of the founders of our international movement could fall so low as to justify robbing our organization?

On Our Electoral Policy

Comrade Hansen holds in his article that as a consequence of our political turn, the real differences are beginning to appear. Our electoral policy is proof of this: "The most important item in the January 16-31 issue of El Socialista -- the one put out by the

Militant Tendency -- is a joint electoral platform signed on January 12 by the Central Committee of the Mexican Communist party, the Political Committee of the Liga Socialista, and the Secretariat of the National Committee of the Movement for Socialist Organization (MOS). The joint platform represents the first leap of the Militant Tendency into the wheeling and dealing of Mexican petty-bourgeois electoral politics. The venture explains, in part, why the Militant Tendency went to such lengths to try to stifle the voice of the Bolshevik Leninist Faction and why it became so angry over the decision of the Bolshevik Leninist Faction to speak out publicly."

Comrade Hansen either has a bad memory or he is lying deliberately. The talks with the PCM and the MOS (secret meetings, according to Comrade Hansen) were initiated in May precisely by the future leaders of the FBL. At that time, I was in New York translating for Intercontinental Press. The result of these talks was a common platform that was published in El Socialista (in August 1975) with which none of the comrades of the future FBL disagreed. They changed their opinion later when a letter arrived from New York that criticized the electoral policy that all of us had adopted. This letter, Comrade Hansen, was signed by you. To confirm this, it is sufficient to read the self-criticism made by the comrades of the FBL in the second issue of El Socialista published by them after the split. In it they say that they no longer support the previous line. Hence, Comrade Hansen, you know that this line is not new.

It would be good if IP would publish the platform in its entirety so that it can be judged objectively. Comrade Hansen sees in this coalition an "incipient popular front," which is explainable in view of the mania the leadership of the SWP has for seeking popular fronts on all sides. Hence we underline the usefulness of publishing the platform. We do not rule out the possibility that some error might have been committed, but the leaderships of the SWP and the LS ought to have discussed this jointly, before launching a public attack. Like the rest of his article, Comrade Hansen presents our position with respect to the elections in a slick and factional way. But for the time being we leave this debate aside.

Conclusion

With all the facts I have cited, I consider that I have demonstrated that Comrade Hansen's article is incredibly inexact. But what is the reason that explains the

slanders he launches against a small section and one of its inexpert leaders? It is in fact difficult to explain why Comrade Hansen loses time in such a miserable matter. However, there are profound reasons for his factional behavior. It is significant that a document of that kind should be signed by the most representative figure of the SWP; and the reason why this article so charged with hate and bitterness has been produced is because the leadership of the SWP suffered a political defeat in Mexico which it is trying to cover up as much as possible. The leadership of the SWP knows this and is not trying to go to the heart of the problem. Its reaction is incoherent and reflects the fact that it has not assimilated the lessons of this defeat. Nothing less than the political and organizational line of the SWP was put into practice by the leadership of the LS, I being one of those who initiated this attempt. From January to September, the indisputable leadership of the LS consisted of the leaders who later formed the FBL. I was not in Mexico; nonetheless, they failed. Not because of them, whose individual qualities can be recognized, but their method of constructing the party, the method of the SWP. Proof of that is the fact that they lost the leadership of the organization. They were left with less than a third of the members. It is very easy to explain this defeat by arguing that it was because of the police agent accusation, which was opportunistically (according to Comrade Hansen) seized upon. This way out is too simple, aside from its reflection of the depreciation it shows for the cadres of a small section in Mexico.

No comrades, from its foundation the organization grew continually. Upon applying their method it stagnated. The members began to feel this stagnation, criticisms of the leadership began to arise. The leadership of the LS reacted in two different ways in this period. One sector began to be profoundly concerned and the other brushed aside the criticisms as organizational complaints. You were always proud of the LS because it inclined very favorably toward the SWP. Now that this orientation failed, you have reacted negatively, with blind hate. To such a degree as to fall into the lowest subjectivism: the falsification of facts that you are aware of. It is genuinely sad that this leadership that had such outstanding success with the movement against the war in Vietnam should react in this way. In the way sects react. You have provided material that sects like Healy's need to feed their "religion." The LTF has split and this has already been reflected publicly. Unfortunately this division is not expressed politically, that is, in relation to the differences on Portugal and Angola, but in its pettiest aspect: the events in Mexico,

COPY

COPY

COPY

LETTER FROM JOSEPH HANSEN CONCERNING HERNANDEZ ARTICLE

Intercontinental Press
New York
March 17, 1976

Bureau of the Steering Committee
of the International Majority Tendency

Dear Ernest:

Since receiving the copy of the article by Comrade Ricardo Hernandez "Los Hechos Sobre la Escision de la Liga Socialista," which you edited, I have given considerable thought to the possible consequences of publishing it. In the history of the Fourth International I do not recall anything remotely resembling this article.

Except for one item (placing the entire membership on trial for a month preliminary to carrying out a purge on the basis of their level of activity), Comrade Hernandez evades discussing the series of measures that converted the Liga Socialista into probably the most undemocratic organization in the Fourth International. He does not discuss the role played by the leadership of the PST in initiating these measures and putting them into effect, important as that role was. Although he criticizes me for not taking up the political issues underlying the split and the related split in the LTF which he avers involves differences over the Portuguese revolution, Comrade Hernandez himself leaves all of this aside. Thus we remain in the dark on the political views he presumably shares with the leaders of the PST which were considered to be so vital as to necessitate engineering an international split.

It is true that on electoral policy in Mexico, Comrade Hernandez defends the common platform that the Liga Socialista (TM) signed together with the Mexican Stalinists. A polemic on this question could prove instructive. However, for Comrade Hernandez this is a minor point and he confines himself largely to pressing for publication of the joint electoral program in Intercontinental Press. (It appeared in the March 1 issue in both Spanish and English.)

Instead of an article along lines such as those indicated above that could help explain the split, thereby serving to speed the process of unifying the Trotskyist groups in Mexico, and that I for one would certainly welcome despite any differences I might still hold with his interpretations, Comrade Hernandez has submitted a polemic based in the main on reviving the "police agent" question and expanding on it. In doing so he offers unverified material and gratuitous assertions that open up a series of new questions.

An article of this type does not conform to the agreement that was reached at the IEC plenum, according to which Comrade Hernandez, in replying to me on the reasons for the split, was to raise no new issues necessitating a public rebuttal. The article he submitted, however, would incite further disputation of a kind decidedly injurious to the interests of the Fourth International, as he himself indicates. It would not be possible, in my opinion, to deny others the right to defend themselves against the truly venomous charges that are advanced.

Aside from this, part of the material--consisting of things that were said in confidential sessions, with no thought of publication--is libelous on the face of it and cannot be published by Intercontinental Press.

To me the worst aspect of the article is what it reveals about the attitude of Comrade Hernandez toward the proposed unification of the three groups in Mexico. The agreement reached at the February plenum of the International Executive Committee on suggested procedure in seeking a principled unification included a clause stating that the comrades who did not recognize the legitimacy of the second congress of the Liga Socialista pledge: "That they have not placed any charges against Comrade Ricardo and that they consider him to be loyal to the Fourth International." And the following statement was added to the foregoing sentence: "The Steering Committee of the Leninist Trotskyist Faction states that it has no reason to doubt Comrade Ricardo's loyalty to the Fourth International."

These statements clearly closed the "police agent" question and the erroneous way in which it was handled by both sides. (The statements in fact confirmed what I had already indicated in my article on the split published in Intercontinental Press.)

Yet Comrade Hernandez disregards these public affirmations as if they meant zero to him. (He does the same with the "robbery" question, which was likewise closed by the agreement reached at the plenum of the IEC.) He writes as if nothing had happened requiring him to rise above the abysmal level of the closed session of the plenum of the Central Committee of the Liga Socialista held last September.

As a tactical thrust taken by his faction, Comrade Hernandez's article must be judged as an attempt to reopen closed organizational issues, the aim being to once again poison relations with the Bolshevik Leninist Faction and place fresh obstacles in the way of a principled unification of the three groups in Mexico.

The real attitude of Comrade Hernandez, as revealed by his article, casts the most serious doubt on the possibilities of a viable unification in Mexico no matter what documents are advanced as the basis for unification.

The first test has already been made. The proposals that the IEC voted for as requisites in seeking to reach a principled unification in Mexico, and that the leaders of both the BLF and the LTF accepted at face value, were not to the liking of Comrade Hernandez. He brushed the agreement aside even while he was under the direct restraining influence of the leaders of the International Majority Tendency. He acted as if the agreement were a mere formality to which little attention need be paid in practice. His article serves notice that no matter what formal documents may be proclaimed, he intends to continue along the same lines that brought about the split in the Liga Socialista. Publication of his article would facilitate the disruptive course of which it is a part.

In light of the above, I consider Comrade Hernandez's article to be unacceptable for publication in Intercontinental Press.

cc: PF,IM

Comradely yours,
s/Joseph Hansen
Editor

P.S. I assume, since you edited the article, that you verified the taped quotations cited by Comrade Hernandez. However, we would greatly appreciate receiving a copy of the tapes so that we can check them ourselves.

Report on Mexico to SWP Political Committee

by Barry Sheppard

The IEC motion on Mexico established a commission of three people to observe the implementation of the motion and to report to the United Secretariat (See SWP Internal Information Bulletin No. 6 in 1976). The first series of meetings of this commission took place in the week of April 4 to April 11. The commission is composed of a comrade of the IMT, one from the LTF, and one from the PST-led grouping. The commission met with representatives from the GCI, Internationalist Communist Group; the LS(FBL), Bolshevik-Leninist Faction of the Socialist League; and the LS(TM), the Militant Tendency of the Socialist League.

There were a number of charges made by both the LS(FBL) and the LS(TM). The LS(FBL) charged that the LS(TM) had printed an article that re-raised and extended the issue of alleged charges against Comrade Ricardo of the LS(TM) that he was a police agent, an issue closed by the IEC motion which contained statements by both the LS(FBL) and the Steering Committee of the Leninist Trotskyist Faction that there were no charges or suspicions against Comrade Ricardo.

Most important, the LS(FBL) documented four instances in which members of the LS(FBL) were physically attacked by members of the LS(TM). Two of these attacks occurred after the IEC meeting. (See attached translation of article from Clave.) The representatives of the LS(TM) admitted that in at least one instance, the attacks resulted from a decision by the LS(TM) Political Committee to prevent the members of the LS(FBL) from selling their press. The leadership of the LS(TM) made a declaration to the commission that it was opposed to these methods, and offered to print in their paper a statement to that effect (attached). The leadership of the LS(FBL) welcomed this statement, and said that if it is carried out in practice and the physical attacks stop, this would remove an obstacle to proceeding with the political discussion between the two groups.

The LS(FBL) returned to the LS(TM) the material that was in the Socialist League headquarters prior to the December convention of the Socialist League, with the exception of personal property, as was indicated by the IEC motion. The leadership of the LS(TM) disputed that some of the items not returned were personal property, and broke off any further negotiations with the LS(FBL) until and unless these items are given to them. The TM leadership added that, although they stood by the declaration they had previously made about stopping any physical attacks they were no longer bound to print the declaration in their press. Hopefully the TM leadership will reconsider this stand and go ahead and print this declaration against physical violence. This would begin the process of overcoming the damage done to Trotskyism in Mexico as a result of these attacks.

Both the LS(FBL) and the LS(TM) agreed to exchange political documents and proposed statutes with the GCI, so that the political basis for a principled unification can begin to be explored as outlined in the IEC motion.

The three members of the commission unanimously agreed to make no formal report, recess for several weeks, and meet again in May, after the process of this political discussion has begun.

April 16, 1976

Another Attack by the Tendencia Militante
Assault against the Liga Socialista (FBL)

Two members of the Bolshevik-Leninist Faction of the Liga Socialista (FBL) were assaulted by a member of the Political Committee of the Tendencia Militante on Saturday, March 13, at about noon in the Preparatoria Popular at Nonoalco.

What prompted this new attack was that the two activists were selling Clave in the name of the Liga Socialista (FBL). This was what māde comrade "M.E." of the Tendencia Militante charge into the FBL members swinging.

This is the third time that the Tendencia Militante has resorted to physical violence against the FBL as a substitute for political discussion.

They have said that the other instances were really the individual actions of this or that comrade, but that the leadership "was trying to prevent such things."

It is now clear that this is a dishonest argument, unless they are no longer able even to maintain discipline over members of their political committee.

This is especially serious since the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International, to which both the Tendencia Militante and the FBL belong, recently agreed that the two public factions of the Liga Socialista and the Grupo Comunista Internacionalista (GCI) should adopt a course leading to a principled unification.

In our opinion, this was more than sufficient reason to end immediately the physical attacks against Clave sales teams and members of the FBL.

This has not happened, and this failure puts in question the validity of the agreements made by our international leadership: Can anyone think they can ask us to sit down and discuss whether there is a possibility for a unification with people who are assaulting our members?

Moreover, the guarantee of unrestricted freedom of expression for all political groups has been a tradition in the Preparatoria Popular, and we Trotskyists have always been the principal defenders of this tradition.

We think that the outbreak of fights and attacks within the Preparatoria Popular can only provide the government with arguments to help them repress the school. Only the class enemy benefits from such activity.

These actions by the Tendencia Militante could have very serious consequences. Their attacks tend to start a course that, if continued, could result in an all-out physical struggle among the left groups.

The Bolshevik-Leninist Faction of the Liga Socialista and the comrades active in the Clave sales teams are determined not to play into the hands of the TM's provocations.

For us, the interests of the movement are more important than the bickering among political groups. We think the method for sorting out the different political tendencies is public political discussion. The physical violence employed by the Tendencia Militante is alien to the working class.

We believe that the time has come for the GCI and Rojo, also sympathizing organizations of the Fourth International, to break their silence with respect to this state of affairs. They cannot fail to speak out clearly against the methods used by the Tendencia Militante against the FBL of the Liga Socialista.

TRANSLATION

TRANSLATION

Statement of the Leadership
of the Liga Socialista

Following the split in the Liga Socialista, there have been various incidents of physical violence between the groups that emerged from the division.

The leadership of the Liga Socialista (sympathizing organization of the Fourth International) states:

1. We disapprove of any act of physical violence within the workers movement and above all in the Trotskyist movement.
2. We pledge to avert any repetition of such incidents.
3. The fact that the Fracción Bolsheviqúe Leninista is using the name of the Liga Socialista and of its newspaper does not justify the use of violence.
4. The leadership of the Liga Socialista considers it a duty to investigate these incidents and to call anyone who is responsible for any attacks from our side to order.
5. We also appeal to the ranks of the LS not to engage in violence for any reason.
6. The leadership of the Liga Socialista pledges to make this statement public.

Mexico City, April 8, 1976

COPY

COPY

COPY

April 11, 1976

United Secretariat
Brussels

Dear Comrades:

Please attach the statement from the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party, John Barzman and Joseph Hansen and the enclosed materials to the minutes of the April United Secretariat meeting.

cc: John Barzman
Joseph Hansen

Comradely,
s/Jack Barnes
for the SWP Political Committee

* * * * *

STATEMENT

We recognize that the Revolutionary Marxist Organizing Committee and the former members of the Internationalist Tendency who organized the Hedda Garza news conference in New York on April 6 have shown by this action that they are not seeking to collaborate with the Socialist Workers party; that in view of their action any statements some of them may have made expressing a desire to join the SWP can no longer be taken at face value; that thus they have not acted in accordance with the January 1975 IEC motions defining the status of persons who could be classified as members of the Fourth International were it not for reactionary legislation in the United States; and that these motions therefore no longer apply to them.

Political Committee of the
Socialist Workers party
John Barzman
Joseph Hansen

April 9, 1976

* * * * *

EXCERPT FROM SWP POLITICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES, April 5, 1976.

5. PARTY SUIT AND FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

(J. Hansen invited for this point.)

Barnes reported that Hedda Garza, representing "supporters of the Fourth International" and "former members of the Internationalist Tendency," and a representative of the Revolutionary Marxist Organizing Committee have announced a news conference for tomorrow morning related to developments brought forward by party suit against government. Hedda Garza and Mike Bartell have been informed in phone calls organized by Jack Barnes for the SWP Political Committee, John Barzman for the supporters of the IMT in the SWP, and Ernest Mandel for the Bureau of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, that any public activity of this kind must be left solely to the SWP. They were requested to cancel the news conference and informed that failure to do so would be considered a direct act against the interests of the SWP and the Fourth International.

Discussion

Motion: To distribute to the news media at tomorrow's conference the statement of dissociation cosigned by Ernest Mandel for the United Secretariat of the Fourth International and Jack Barnes for the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party, the text of which has been agreed to by Mandel, Barzman, and Barnes (see attached). CARRIED.

* * * * *

EXCERPT FROM SWP POLITICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES April 9, 1976

3. PARTY SUIT AND FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Barnes reported Hedda Garza opened April 6 news conference by stating to the press "I'm representing today the Fourth International supporters."

Discussion

Motion: To issue the following joint statement of the SWP Political Committee, John Barzman, and Joseph Hansen:

"We recognize that the Revolutionary Marxist Organizing Committee and the former members of the Internationalist Tendency who organized the Hedda Garza news conference in New York on April 6 have shown by this action that they are not seeking to collaborate with the Socialist Workers party; that in view of their action any statements some of them may have made expressing a desire to join the SWP can no longer be taken at face value; that thus they have not acted in accordance with the January 1975 IEC motions defining the status of persons who could be classified as members of the Fourth International were it not for reactionary legislation in the United States; and that these motions therefore no longer apply to them."

CARRIED.

Statement by John Barzman:

I support this joint statement because I consider it to be valid whether or not any of the comrades involved had followed the IEC resolution up to the April 6 news conference.

John Barzman

Attachments: Party Suit and Fourth International

1. Announcement of News Conference

PRESS RELEASE

April 3, 1976

Expelled former members of the Socialist Workers party, who were members of the Internationalist Tendency of the SWP and are supporters of the Fourth International, will meet with the press on Tuesday, April 6, at 11 a. m.

They will respond to the report submitted to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee by Herbert Romerstein, which charges that the Internationalist Tendency and the Fourth International support terrorism. The illegal surveillance and burglaries perpetrated by the FBI against the Socialist Workers party and the Internationalist Tendency will also be discussed and condemned.

The press conference will be held at the Washington Square Methodist Church, 133 West 4th Street (east of 6th Avenue), in the Parlor Room.

For further information call [phone number in original].

* * *

2. Press Release by Hedda Garza and Ernest Liane

April 6, 1976

For Immediate Release

SUPPORTERS OF FOURTH INTERNATIONAL DENY
"TERRORIST" CHARGES

The Senate Committee on the Judiciary has released the testimony of Herbert Romerstein before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in a 462-page document entitled, "Trotskyite Terrorist International." Publication of this volume takes place at a time when the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been forced to disclose the fact that it has engaged in a long series of burglaries of Socialist Workers party headquarters, as well as a constant harassment of individual members of that party and other left groups and dissenting groups. A group of supporters of the Fourth International, former members of the Internationalist Tendency (expelled from the Socialist Workers party, July 1974) responded today to the charges raised by Romerstein against them and the Fourth International.

The Fourth International supporters, presumed guilty even by the title of Romerstein's report, countered that the purpose of the document is to justify the criminal acts of the FBI which have been brought to light by the Socialist Workers party's court suit against that institution. Romerstein, in fact, is a consultant to the Friends of the FBI, and also, in his own words, "a consultant to State and Federal agencies on problems relating to subversive activities and violence oriented groups."

The former Internationalist Tendency spokespeople contend that "this slanderous testimony is published in an effort to revive the anti-Communist fears of the McCarthy era. It attempts to label those who oppose the violence of the FBI, CIA, etc., as terrorists themselves." They asked, "In Romerstein's concern with subversion, has he forgotten the subversion of the Allende government in Chile by the CIA? In his alarm over terrorism, what is his comment on the terrorism of U. S. napalming of Vietnamese villages, the terrorism of CIA-aided and approved torture of political prisoners in Latin America?" Quoting James P. Cannon, the founder of the Socialist Workers party, they explained, "Trotsky defends the violence of the proletarian revolution as a weapon forced upon it by the violence of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie; never did he renounce a preference for the peaceful way."

The Fourth International supporters stated that the "surveillance" organizations and their defenders have long considered violence justifiable, as long as they are the perpetrators. With revelations of CIA assassination plots, this is now public knowledge. But anyone responding to this violence is hysterically labelled "terrorist."

Another charge made by Romerstein is that the United States supporters of the Fourth International are in fact breaking the Voorhis Act, which forbids membership in an international organization. The author of this act, Gerry Voorhis, has himself called the provisions of this act absurd. The fact is that the U. S. Government, in its ongoing criminal involvements around the world, is violating this very act!

The facts are that Fourth International supporters and members have been in the forefront of the organization of such movements as the antiwar movement, women's movements, etc., and have been among the most outspoken critics of the violence and terrorism of repressive governments. And yet Romerstein's re-

port claims that the counterintelligence program was utilized "to prevent the acts of violence that were being carried out by various leftist and new-left groups. . . ." Nowhere in the testimony is there a shred of evidence of such "violence." Much ado is made, for example, of the fact that Socialist Workers party candidates ran to spread the ideas of the party rather than in hopes of winning elected office. A cursory reading of any American history book shows that all minor parties have stated this as their main purpose, surely not a very "violent" goal! We must assume, then, that the FBI planned to prevent terrorism by terrorizing dissenters, and planned to prevent acts of vandalism by breaking-and-entry vandalizing techniques against dissident organizations!

In conclusion, the Fourth International supporters commented that the report itself was such a hysterical anti-Communist collection of half-truths and fabrications that no one on the Senate committees even noticed that a photograph captioned Charles Michaloux, one of the leaders of the French section of the Fourth International, is in reality a photograph of Giscard d'Estaing, President of France!

* * *

3. April 6 Press Release

April 6, 1976

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

At a press conference held April 6 in New York, Ernest Liane, representing the Revolutionary Marxist Organizing Committee, and Hedda Garza, representing "supporters of the Fourth International" and "former members of the Internationalist Tendency," purported to speak in defense of the Socialist Workers party and the United Secretariat of the Fourth International. However, neither Garza nor Liane, nor any of the individuals or groups they represent are members of either the SWP or the Fourth International. Consequently neither the Socialist Workers party nor the United Secretariat of the Fourth International take any responsibility for their declarations. Both dissociate themselves from them.

Jack Barnes
for the Political Committee
Socialist Workers Party

Ernest Mandel
for the United Secretariat
of the Fourth International