

International Internal Discussion Bulletin

volume XII number 2

January 1975

Contents

Report of the Control Commission of the Socialist Workers Party, July 2, 1974	3
Motions Adopted by the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party, July 4, 1974	13
Statement Adopted by the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party, July 4, 1974	14
Appendices to the Report of the Control Commission of the SWP	
I. First National Conference of the Internationalist Tendency, by Alec; from Internationalist Tendency Newsletter of June 6, 1974	17
II. A Reply to Comrade Massey from Los Angeles, from IT Bulletin IV	23
III. Resignation from the IT by Berta Langston and Bob Langston, from IT Bulletin V	27
Statement of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International Regarding the Call for a Special World Congress of the Fourth International Adopted by the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party on July 4, 1974	36
The Myth of the 'IT Split' — Purge Politics of the LTF	47

The International Internal Discussion Bulletin is the English-language edition of the internal discussion bulletin of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International.

It is published by the Socialist Workers Party as a fraternal courtesy to the United Secretariat of the Fourth International.

Bulletin Department, 14 Charles Lane, New York, N. Y. 10014

Report of the Control Commission of the Socialist Workers Party

Submitted July 2, 1974

Part I

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

On June 20, 1974, meeting in plenary session, the National Committee of the Socialist Workers Party passed the following motion: 'As provided for in Article VI of the Party Constitution, the National Committee (1) turns over to the Control Commission the material concerning the May 11 action and the letters from comrades Massey and Barzman, and (2) designates comrade Horowitz as the National Committee member of the Control Commission.'

Article VI of the Constitution of the SWP is as follows:

"Section 1. A Control Commission of five members shall be elected as follows: the Convention shall elect four members and the fifth member, who shall be a member of the National Committee, shall be designated by the National Committee. The Control Commission shall have full authority to investigate any individual or circumstance which it may deem necessary, and shall have power to delegate any of its authority to representatives.

"Section 2. The Control Commission, on completion of its investigation in each case, shall present its findings and recommendations to the Political Committee for action. Action shall be taken by the Political Committee, or by the National Committee, in those cases referred to it by the Political Committee.

"Section 3. In those cases where the Control Commission finds it necessary to intervene, its authority shall supersede any local investigation or trial.

"Section 4. It shall be obligatory on every member of the Party to furnish the Control Commission or its authorized representatives with any information they may require."

The Control Commission is composed of the following four comrades: Anne Chester, Barbara Matson, and Helen Scheer, elected by the 1973 SWP national convention, and Gus Horowitz, designated by the SWP National Committee, in accordance with Article VI, Section 1 of the constitution. (The other comrade elected by the national convention, Duncan Ferguson, died on April 29, 1974.)

Evidence Examined

All four members of the Control Commission were able to meet together in New York City during June 20-24, to conduct a series of interviews in person and by telephone, to examine the documentary material, and to consult together by telephone before submitting this report.

In conducting our investigation, we were guided in particular by the following documents:

1. The constitution of the Socialist Workers Party.
2. "The Organizational Character of the Socialist Workers Party," resolution adopted by the 1965 convention of the SWP and reaffirmed by the August 1973 convention of the SWP (available in an Education for Socialists bulletin bearing the same title).

These documents set forth the fundamental organizational principles of the Socialist Workers Party.

The Control Commission was able to examine the fol-

lowing evidence, including both documentary material and interviews:

1. The files of the national office of the SWP dealing with the Internationalist Tendency. These include a substantial amount of correspondence from John Barzman, Bill Massey, and other IT members alleging harassment or other improper procedures taken against the IT. The files also include letters and documents from various SWP leadership bodies or from comrades writing in their capacity as elected SWP leaders, or as individuals; these materials deal with many of the same incidents contained in the correspondence from the IT members. Also included in these files are branch minutes and other branch records. Also included are copies of letters and other material received from the YSA national office relating to the Internationalist Tendency. We decided to confine our investigation to materials dating since the August 1973 convention of the SWP.

2. The transcripts of the remarks made to the June 1974 plenum of the SWP National Committee by Comrades Barzman and Massey.

3. We twice interviewed representatives of the Internationalist Tendency. First, we met briefly with Bill Massey on June 20, 1974; Comrade Charles of the International Majority Tendency was also present. We informed Comrade Massey that we had received copies of his 14-page letter of June 9, 1974, to the Political Committee of the SWP. We asked him if he had any further information to add to this letter that would be of help to the Control Commission. He said that at this time he did not have anything to add. (In the concluding part of his letter he also states that "I feel that these sixteen points cover the situation adequately.") On June 23 there was a second meeting, this time with John Barzman and Bill Massey. A report on that meeting is appended to this report.

4. During the course of the June plenum of the National Committee we were able to meet with many elected executive officers from various branches across the country for the purpose of obtaining information and verification of information already received. We were also able to talk by telephone to several comrades in other cities to obtain and verify information.

5. In the course of our investigation, we were able to obtain copies of several internal discussion bulletins and internal newsletters of the Internationalist Tendency. The Socialist Workers Party had never been informed of the existence of these documents.

Evaluation of Evidence and Recommendations

After examining the secret internal discussion material of the IT, the Control Commission concluded that this was sufficient by itself to enable us to arrive at the conclusions and recommendations that appear below. We decided that this evidence was so overwhelming that it was not necessary to spend a great deal of time to ex-

amine many of the specific incidents, allegations, and counter-allegations. We did examine some of these, and append a few documents to this report. This material can be considered as specific illustrations of the general conclusions that can be drawn from the IT documents themselves.

Following is a summary of our findings, our conclusions, and our recommendations:

1. These documents give proof positive that the IT is a separate party organization operating both within the SWP and outside the SWP. The IT party has its own secret, highly organized and centralized independent party structure functioning on all levels, nationally and internationally. It has its own party discipline that supersedes SWP discipline. It determines its own areas of external activity and establishes its own relations with opponent groups. Persons who are not members of the SWP, the YSA, or the Fourth International are allowed to participate in its deliberations and are given access to its internal bulletins attacking the SWP. It describes the SWP as "deadly sick" and the SWP membership cadre as "politically incapable of either understanding or putting into practice a revolutionary line."

Just prior to the IT National Conference, held in Chicago May 25-27, several comrades resigned from the IT, while remaining ideological supporters of the IMT's political positions. Among them were Berta Langston and Bob Langston, whose statement of explanation for resigning from the IT was published in the internal bulletin of the IT (appended). In it they pointed out to the IT that the line of the IT leadership "would lead not merely to instances but to patterns of organizational indiscipline in regard to the party and the YSA." They warned that "the comrades of the ITPC [ITPolitical Committee] are projecting a line the logic of which is precisely to build a rival organization to the SWP." They added that "the logic of the ITPC's position is that the IT, defining itself as the nucleus of a section in the U.S., would begin to combine the exercise of political leadership of groupings outside the SWP and YSA with an entry tactic inside the SWP and YSA." They said that this course "would intensify the dangers of a split in the International." They said that the positions put forward by IT leader Williams [the evidence shows that Williams is a pseudonym for Bill Massey] "is not a marginal or peripheral one in the IT; it comes equipped with all the authority and prestige of the leadership." They concluded that it was necessary to resign from the IT prior to the IT national convention, stating

that "our differences with the ITPC are of such a magnitude on a fundamental question as to make continued collaboration within a tendency impossible. . . [for us] to continue to struggle within the IT—with its internal bulletin, a possible tour, election of delegates, a convention—would be in practice precisely to cooperate in helping make the IT become what we urgently hope it doesn't."

Further documentation proves that what Comrades Berta Langston and Bob Langston quite accurately saw as the logical outcome of the IT course has occurred. The IT has been set up as a rival party to the SWP.

The Control Commission finds that the establishment of this rival party is in violation of the constitution and organizational principles of the Socialist Workers Party. We also note that it is in contradiction with the statutes of the Fourth International and the organizational principles and traditions of the world Trotskyist movement.

The Control Commission recommends that the Internationalist Tendency's status as a separate, rival party be recognized and that the members of the Internationalist Tendency party be informed that this status places them outside the constitutional provisions of membership in the Socialist Workers Party.

2. Regarding the status of the ideological supporters of the IMT who are not members of the IT party. Berta Langston and Bob Langston contended in their document that it is possible to be an ideological supporter of the IMT and to abide by the SWP constitution. They also recognized that it is not possible to hold membership in the IT and abide by the SWP constitution.

The Control Commission recommends that supporters of the IMT political positions who are not members of the IT party remain members of the SWP as long as they abide by the constitution of the SWP, the organizational principles of the SWP, and the democratic centralist norms of the world Trotskyist movement. We note that the rights of membership include the right to form a tendency or faction, within the bounds delineated by the 1965 document on organizational principles of the SWP.

3. The evidence clearly establishes the complicity of members of the elected leadership of the Fourth International in the IT's decision to form a rival party. But the full extent of this complicity, and further documentation detailing it, are not available to the Control Commission of the SWP. The jurisdiction of this Control Commission is limited to the SWP, and we do not have the power to obtain information going beyond this limit.

Part II

Findings

We found a discrepancy between the way in which the leaders of the Internationalist Tendency describe themselves in documents that they make available to the entire SWP and the way in which they describe themselves in their own internal discussion documents that have been kept secret from the SWP. For example, in his letter of June 9, 1974, to the Political Committee (appended) Bill Massey states that "the IT is not a faction, secret or otherwise, it is a tendency." But in the IT's secret internal discussion bulletin, IT leader Vincent (John Barzman) describes

the IT as "not merely an ideological tendency, but the nucleus of a future section" (his article is appended). Vincent's description of the IT as the nucleus of a future section is repeated in several of the documents.

The IT Is a Separate Party

Even this description, however, understates the situation. The IT's description of its own structure and method of functioning clearly indicates that it is already a separate party. One example is given by the report on the IT

national convention which is published in the June 6, 1974, issue of the secret "Internationalist Tendency Newsletter" (appended). The report opens as follows:

"The first national conference of the Internationalist Tendency was held in Chicago on the Memorial Day weekend, May 25, 26, 27. The conference had been preceded by a discussion period of three months which elicited twelve discussion bulletins containing thirty-four different contributions to the discussion. Discussion around these took place in every area of the Tendency. Delegates were elected on the basis of five persons per delegate. There were twenty-four delegates and ten consultative delegates."

The convention elected a Presiding Committee. It also elected a Nominating Committee which brought in recommendations for a new IT Steering Committee (National Committee). A Steering Committee of 19 full members and 10 alternates was elected. (One full member later resigned.)

Following the convention of the IT, there was a Steering Committee Plenum. It elected a Political Committee. The report on the IT convention states that "The PC will consist of the six PC members now resident in Chicago plus 3 other members of the Steering Committee not resident in Chicago at this time. The PC, with the approval of the Steering Committee, will recommend the three additional members who will move to the center in Chicago."

In addition to such procedures, the IT documents reveal that there is an IT national office, a fulltime staff, and provisions for various commissions. For example, the IT convention report on Work in the YSA, which included the proposal for a "special YSA commission," was accepted unanimously. Another article in the IT newsletter indicates that a YSA commission of 10 members was established.

The June 6 IT newsletter also informs us that "the center is currently discussing putting regional travelers on full time in Houston, Chicago and New York." It also informs us that the IT is organized into "local tendency units." The newsletter also calls upon each local unit to elect an executive committee, to supervise the carrying out of the work of the local unit.

The IT internal communication of June 14, 1974 (appended), gives additional information about the party structure of the IT. The communication, signed by Gilbert, for the IT PC, was sent to "Steering Committee Members, Area Organizers, Financial Directors, and Publications Directors."

This communication reveals that the IT has decided upon a subscription drive for *Inprecor* with assigned quotas for each local unit of the IT, and a sales campaign for *Inprecor*, for the *Old Mole*, publication of the Canadian Revolutionary Marxist Group (RMG), and for *International*, publication of the British International Marxist Group (IMG), with proposed quotas for the regular bundles to be taken by the local units of the IT.

The communication calls for substantial financial commitments by IT members and asks that "all areas adopt a policy of regular payments to the center based on their membership figures." The IT Steering Committee has adopted a recommendation of "a \$7.00 per person sustain-er per week to the center."

The communication describes some of the purposes such funds are needed for: this includes back debts for *Old Mole*

bundles, for domestic and international travel, and for printing costs for the "Chilean supplement" distributed on the May 11 demonstrations; money is also needed for full-time IT staff and for travel expenses for an IMT representative on tour in the USA; in addition money is requested in order "to have a really interventionist role in the YSA preconvention discussion nationally"—this includes travel subsidies for YSAers travelling to the upcoming YSA National Committee plenum. Money is also requested for the publications program of the IT—several pamphlets have been projected as part of this publications program.

In these activities and projections, the secret IT structure functions as a parallel party structure.

The IT Determines Its Own Independent Areas of Activity

The main areas of work to be carried out by the local units of the IT are defined in the June 6 IT newsletter as these three:

1. Internal education and the elaboration of IT perspectives. Also better internal organization such as "taking and sending regular minutes to the center, raising the financial commitment to the tendency, learning to organize meetings more efficiently. . . ."

2. Intervention in the SWP and YSA. The IT newsletter describes this as just one of three areas of IT activity. The document by Estreugal and Rahdrik (appended) quotes from the draft political perspectives document by Hank Williams (Bill Massey) who states that "we just want the tendency locals to work out as *part* of their overall work a continued and well rounded participation in the activities of the branches" (emphasis added). The IT newsletter states that in this work "the intervention into the YSA is the most important priority." An article by Inessa in the IT newsletter outlining "Our Tasks in the YSA" states that "some of our own regional probing can be done while fulfilling YSA assignments . . . however, the most returns will come from forays into the region. . . ." In all of the IT documents the YSA and SWP are treated as a unit, and SWP members who are not members of the YSA are also encouraged to participate in the "intervention into the YSA."

3. Public work by the IT, which is described in the IT newsletter as "contact work for the F.I." This work includes "contact work at the job, at school, or in the course of trade union or political activity." A goal is to "develop a periphery of people who listen to us. . . ." The IT newsletter also states that ". . . we can even take actions given a favorable relationship of forces." In describing the public work of the IT, the Estreugal-Rahdrik document states that "by no stretch of the imagination can this be called 'participation in the day to day work of the branches.'"

The IT Violates the SWP Constitution

The structure and method of operation of the IT are in violation of the constitution and organizational principles of the SWP, which make it explicit that the SWP has the right to regulate both its internal affairs and the public activity of all SWP members.

The 1965 resolution on the organizational principles of the SWP states: "A dissenting minority has the right to organize itself, but the conduct of organized minorities,

just as that of every individual member, must be subject to regulation by official party bodies. The party is therefore entitled to organize its internal discussion and to determine the forms and limits. . . . Official party bodies must determine correct procedure, both in public activity and in the regulation of internal affairs, on the basis of the party's principles and statutes" (page 20).

When organized groupings are formed in the party, there are three key norms that must be observed to insure party unity and to uphold the principle of democratic centralism.

1. While a faction has the right to meet privately and determine its own structure, it must inform the party as a whole of its organizational nature: its basis for membership, its structure, its membership composition, its leadership composition, the powers of its leadership bodies, and the extent of its discipline.

2. A faction must loyally participate in the work of the party, including participating in the internal activities of the party, in external party-building activities, and in fulfilling financial obligations to the party. Faction finances and faction activity are permitted; but the needs of the party take precedence over the needs of the faction. Any faction finances or faction activity must be carried out only within the context of maintaining normal membership obligations in these areas.

3. The conduct of the faction, in both internal party matters and in external activity, is subject to the direction of the official party bodies. Faction discipline must be subordinate to party discipline.

The IT violates all three of these norms. It is neither an ideological tendency nor a legitimate faction. It is qualitatively different from either.

The IT Functions Secretly

The entire structure of the IT, as disclosed in its internal bulletins, has been kept secret from the party. Furthermore, when Bill Massey and John Barzman were asked directly by members of the Control Commission if there existed a steering committee or other leadership body of the IT, they did not answer; Bill Massey only replied that he would "think about" the question (see report appended).

There is an IT "security policy" *vis a vis* the SWP. It is designed to hide IT activity from the SWP. This security policy includes the use of pseudonyms that are not party names and deceptive covers attached to the secretly circulated IT discussion bulletins (see appended examples). This security policy extends to the IT's own internal functioning, as shown by the listing of two of its bulletins as having "restricted" circulation within the IT (see appended list of IT bulletins). One of these "restricted" bulletins bears the title, "Unless We Believe the SWP To Be Reformable. . . ."

The IT also attempts to impose organizational discipline, as evidenced by the decision of the IT Political Committee on May 4, 1974: "To reject the resignation of Comrades Berta Langston and Bob Langston on the grounds that it is contradictory to their open support to the International Majority Tendency" (appended to the document by Berta Langston and Bob Langston). Thus, the IT attempts to require all ideological supporters of the IMT to join the IT. But the IT has not informed the SWP of the nature and extent of its discipline.

The articles published in the secret IT internal bulletin and newsletter, and the decisions of the IT national convention also show that the political basis for membership in the IT is different from the positions stated in the declarations of the IT published in the SWP internal bulletins.

The IT Does Not Participate Actively in the Work of the Party

In his letter to the SWP Political Committee of June 9, 1974, Bill Massey alleges that "no effort whatsoever has been made to integrate comrades of the I.T. into areas of work that they would participate in wholeheartedly or with relatively less tension." The Control Commission found, on the contrary, that the IT, by its own choosing, does not participate actively in the work of the SWP.

The August 1973 convention of the SWP took note of the lack of participation by IT members in the party-building activities of their local units.

However, the 1973 convention decided to wipe the slate clean on this past record of inactivity and to move forward with the expectation that all members of the party would participate fully and loyally in its work.

As part of the Control Commission investigation, we examined many statistics and reports on the activities of the party branches. From these reports we were able to determine the functioning of the members of the IT after the August 1973 convention. The material examined shows that the IT's policy of non-participation in party-building activities has not changed since the convention. A few examples follow.

Militant Sales. The SWP projected an 18-week spring sales campaign with the goal of selling 10,000 *Militants* in a single week. In Chicago, no member of the IT sold more than a total of 8 *Militants* over the course of the entire 18 weeks. The average number of *Militants* sold per IT member per week during the sales campaign was 0.2. The average number sold per week by non-IT members in Chicago was over 8.0.

Financial Contributions. In the IT internal communication of June 14, 1974, the IT Steering Committee projects a sustainer goal of \$7.00 per person per week to the IT center. In this context, the communication states: "Some areas such as Houston and Philadelphia have been "models financially" as well as in other ways."

The members of the IT in Houston and Philadelphia have not been "models financially" with respect to their local branches of the SWP. In Houston, the average weekly sustainer of the IT members is \$1.62. The average weekly sustainer of non-IT members in Houston is \$8.40. In Philadelphia, two IT members lowered their weekly sustainer from \$10.00 to \$2.00 after joining the IT. The other two IT members in Philadelphia have a weekly sustainer of \$2.00 and \$1.00 respectively. The average weekly sustainer of non-IT members in Philadelphia is \$9.15. We found this same pattern of financial boycott on the part of IT members to exist around the country.

Participation in Branch Functions. We also found a general pattern of low attendance on the part of IT members at branch meetings, forums, and other branch functions. In Oakland-Berkeley, no member of the IT had attended more than 3 out of the last 10 forums, and only 3 IT members had attended any of the 10 forums at all. In Washington, D.C. IT members averaged an attendance at less than half of the branch meetings.

SWP Election Campaigns. In Texas, the party is conducting a major campaign to obtain over 50,000 signatures in order to have the SWP placed on the ballot in the fall elections. The IT members in Houston, Texas, make up 31.7 percent of the membership, yet they collected only 5.92 percent of the signatures that had been collected as of June 7. Out of 1119.7 total hours petitioning by that date, the IT members together contributed a total of 89.

These are only a few illustrative examples drawn from a general national pattern of inactivity by the IT in all aspects of party building that have been decided upon as priorities by the SWP. This can only be described as a systematic and sustained boycott of party-building activity.

We also examined the IT internal communication of June 14, 1974, regarding bundles, assigned quotas, and subscription campaigns for publications of the British IMG and Canadian RMG. The IT has unilaterally decided to organize its own public sales campaigns for these publications. They have not proposed sales campaigns for these publications to the SWP Political Committee. Nor is there any mention made of the need to organize such sales under the direction of the appropriate SWP bodies responsible for propaganda work or to organize sales of the publications of the American Trotskyist movement.

The Socialist Workers Party has the responsibility and authority to decide upon the best way to advance the ideas of Trotskyism in the United States. The SWP has placed first priority on sales of *The Militant* and *International Socialist Review*. The IT sales and subscription campaigns decided upon unilaterally by the IT have no relation to the campaigns decided upon by the SWP as a whole.

The same general conclusions can be drawn with regard to the decisions of the IT, as disclosed in the IT internal newsletter and communication, for assignment of personnel. Transfers from one city to another, or assignments to one area of work or another are made unilaterally by the IT. There is no consideration given anywhere in any of these IT documents to the needs of the SWP in making such assignments.

The conclusion drawn by the Control Commission is that the goals and political priorities for activity by members of the separate IT organization are determined totally independently of the goals and priorities decided upon by the SWP.

The Control Commission also notes that party-building activity is not merely a desirable norm. It is a criterion for membership, as defined in Article III, Section 1 of the SWP constitution: "Every person who accepts the program of the Party and agrees to submit to its discipline and engage actively in its work shall be eligible to membership." These responsibilities are spelled out in more detail in the 1965 resolution codifying the organizational principles of the SWP.

The IT Rejects the Discipline of the SWP in Internal Matters

The Control Commission has concluded that the internal documents of the IT and the other evidence in our possession reveal a consistent pattern of violation of SWP discipline by the IT. These violations occur in both in-

ternal and external matters, including both mass work and relations with opponent political groups. The Control Commission notes that this pattern of IT violations of SWP discipline has been escalating since the August 1973 convention of the SWP, and has become very blatant in the past two months.

The 1965 document on the organizational principles of the SWP emphasizes that "the party exercises the right to regulate its internal affairs" (page 13). The IT has flouted this democratic centralist principle. Two areas bear special mention: the conduct of internal political discussion and the conduct of SWP members in the YSA.

The IT's Secret Internal Political Discussion

In the early 1960s the Robertsonites claimed the unconditional right to determine their own conduct inside the party. The 1965 SWP resolution rejects this claim, saying that "to grant such demands for special license to organized minorities would strip the party of the right to regulate its internal affairs and would undermine its whole democratic-centralist structure. . . . The party would become converted into an all-inclusive federation of autonomous factions; it would degenerate into a political jungle where perpetual factional warfare prevailed" (page 15).

The 1965 resolution further states that "the party is therefore entitled to organize its internal discussion and to determine the forms and limits" (page 20). The time, place, and extent of all internal discussion are determined by the democratically elected leadership bodies of the SWP, not by an arbitrary group of individuals within the party. A faction has the right to circulate drafts of proposed documents among faction members for the purpose of preparing material for presentation to the party as a whole. But an organized faction can circulate its own internal discussion bulletin only on the condition that it receive the prior approval of the party and that its bulletin be made available to the party.

The IT has violated this principle of Leninist organization. There is even one contribution to the secret IT bulletin that affords an ironic commentary on the IT violation of SWP norms. The article by Carapace, et al. (appended) voices the opinion that breaking democratic centralist norms should not be allowed *within the IT*: "We argue for a break with the traumatic democratism inherited from our passage in the SWP . . . a comrade or a group of comrades, whether they pay for the material or not, cannot take it upon themselves to launch a discussion or a debate or widely circulate documents without the organization's approval; this is not centralism, it opens the door to chaos and it is *absolutely inadmissible*" (emphasis in the original).

Carapace et al. misunderstand the SWP when they think that the SWP has failed to note the fact that the IT has been breaking the democratic centralist norms of the SWP. In fact, the record shows that the SWP, in order to maximize the chances for political clarity in the discussion, has bent over backwards in abstaining from using organizational measures to deal with the IT's growing pattern of violations of discipline. Many warnings were given in an attempt to allow the IT a chance to alter its course.

The secret circulation of private internal discussion bulletins by the IT has apparently been going on for a long

time. Leaders of the IT, Vincent, Hank Williams, Mitchell, and Mike Patrick (all pseudonyms), have a contribution in IT bulletin No. 8, in which they refer to a question that "was discussed in response to the Gregorich-Passen split in the 'Jules Verne document' circulated in the PO [Proletarian Orientation Tendency]." (The relevant section of the Vincent-Williams-Mitchell-Patrick document is appended.) The Gregorich-Passen split occurred on October 26, 1972, long before the formation of the IT. The SWP has never been informed of a "Jules Verne document." Nor had the SWP been informed by Bill Massey of the preparations for the Gregorich-Passen split from the SWP.

The formation of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency was announced openly in the SWP during the 1971 pre-convention discussion period. The fact that the secret circulation of the "Jules Verne document" is part of the pre-history of the IT shows that some component of the IT has been functioning as a secret faction on a permanent basis. The 1965 SWP resolution points out that "temporary groupings that arise out of conjunctural political differences should not be perpetuated regardless of principled considerations indicating the need for their dissolution. . . . A danger arises that such permanent formations may degenerate into unprincipled cliques bound together by personal associations" (page 13).

The unprincipled combinationism that the 1965 resolution warns against is evident in the IT document entitled "A Reply to Comrade Massey from Los Angeles" (appended). The Los Angeles group of the IT, in demanding minority representation *within* the IT, write: "The assertion [by Massey] that 'the June 10th Tendency joined the IT on the basis of the platform of the IMT . . . ' is not quite accurate. . . .

"Our views on the role of guerilla warfare in Latin America were expressed quite clearly in the June 10th Position Paper (although guardedly, because it was introduced into the debate with the LTF). In essence we called for a rejection of the guerillaist strategy implied in the 9th World Congress resolution on Latin America (and *explicitly* repeated in the [IEC Majority] resolution on Bolivia of December 2, 1972), and for a return to the Leninist line on the road to power. . . .

"Furthermore, this resolution was singled out as one of the planks in the platform of the IMT. A significant section of the IT is *categorically opposed to this line*, but this found no reflection in the delegation to the congress. *The plain fact is that the resolution on Latin America at the 9th W.C. was fundamentally wrong on the question of guerilla warfare, (no matter what else was right about it), and contributed to the disorientation of a number of Latin American sections*" (all emphasis in the original).

Thus, the Los Angeles IT members assert in the secret IT discussion that they *oppose* the line of the IMT on Bolivia. Nevertheless, when an open vote took place on the IMT resolution on Bolivia in the Los Angeles branch of the SWP these comrades voted *for* the IMT resolution.

This shows the pernicious effects of unprincipled combinationism and secret discussion, as is pointed out in the 1965 SWP resolution. A faction has no right to conduct an internal political discussion that is kept secret from the party, and then to bind its members to discipline on political questions when they participate in the party's internal discussion.

The secret circulation of private internal discussion bulletins denies the democratic right of the party membership as a whole to access to all points of view in arriving at political decisions, and it sets centrifugal forces into motion inside the party. The 1965 resolution clearly explains the implications of such conduct:

"Concentration on private discussions of disputed issues, on the other hand, tends to give the comrades involved a one-sided view and warps their capacity for objective political judgment. Inexperienced comrades especially are made the target of such lopsided discussion methods. The aim is to line them up quickly in a closed caucus, and prejudice their thinking before they have heard an open party debate. When dissident views are introduced into the party in that manner groupings tend to form and harden, and the dissenting views tend to assert themselves in disruptive fashion, before the party as a whole has had a chance to face and act on the issues in dispute" (page 12).

The IT "Intervention Into the YSA"

The activities of SWP members within the Young Socialist Alliance are guided by the unique relationship between the two organizations.

The YSA is in fraternal political solidarity with the SWP; there are many joint activities and common interventions in mass work; the internal discussion bulletins of the SWP and of the Fourth International are generally made available to the YSA, upon request of its elected leadership; YSA members are generally invited to attend SWP conventions; a representative of the YSA, elected by the YSA National Executive Committee, sits with vote on the Political Committee of the SWP.

But the SWP and YSA are *independent* organizations. Each determines its own policies by democratic vote of its own membership. The SWP has no statutory rights within the YSA and the YSA has no statutory rights within the SWP.

In his letter of June 9, 1974, to the SWP Political Committee, Bill Massey states that "the I. T. has held joint meetings with SWP ITers and YSA ITers. . . . We have not hidden the fact that we hold joint meetings, in fact, we have informed the Party about it in the past." The Control Commission notes that it is not sufficient to "inform" the SWP of such activity. Such activity by SWP members must receive authorization from the SWP. The organizational report adopted by the 1971 SWP convention reaffirmed the principle, with specific reference to the YSA, that "party members in *all* areas of work are bound by party discipline."

The record shows that no SWP member in the YSA has ever been put under SWP discipline not to present their views concerning questions under dispute in the world movement when internal discussion has been opened up in the YSA on these questions by the elected YSA leadership. Further, in the YSA pre-convention discussion period in 1973, upon the request of the YSA leadership, the SWP took the exceptional step of allowing SWP members in the YSA to present views contrary to those of the SWP on questions relating to political perspectives in the United States. But no authorization has ever been given to SWP members in the YSA to raise contrary views at all times and under all circumstances.

Not only is the IT intervention into the YSA by SWP

members of the IT unauthorized by the SWP but it is carried out in violation of YSA discipline as well. The pattern of IT violations of SWP discipline already discussed, as well as that which follows, are also violations of YSA discipline. Under no circumstances does the SWP permit SWP members to violate YSA discipline.

Furthermore, the extent of the IT's activity with non-party YSAers is far greater than "joint meetings." The IT newsletter report on the IT convention establishes that the IT members in the YSA who are not members of the SWP and the IT members in the SWP are organized together into one unitary organization on all levels. In fact, the statistics presented in the IT newsletter show that more than one-third of the ITers who were present at the IT convention were not members of the SWP. This violates the most elementary principles of democratic centralism guiding the relationship between the SWP and YSA.

The IT Rejects SWP Discipline in External Work

The IT "security policy" also applies to its external work. The formulations in the IT documents with regard to external work are edited for "security" *vis a vis* the SWP, to hide the IT policy of violating SWP discipline. Nevertheless, a reading of the IT's internal documents makes the facts clear.

The article by Berta Langston and Bob Langston quotes from the Hank Williams (Bill Massey) document to prove that the policy of the IT is to put itself forward in public as an independent entity. The Williams document states that "our major thrust must be carefully drawing up a line for the party to implement in specific situations, and then showing how it should be carried out. More can be shown with actions than words. This will force us to start thinking in motion rather than in position. Working out a line and putting it into practice is better than talking about it only." The Williams document states, concerning groups outside the SWP, that the IT "must work with them."

Berta Langston and Bob Langston also emphasized that there is a "lack, anywhere in the [Williams] document, of any specification that when we carry out those actions that speak louder than words, those actions should be carried out under the supervision of the appropriate leading bodies of the SWP and YSA." They concluded that the line of the IT "would lead not merely to instances but to patterns of organizational indiscipline in regard to the party and YSA." And they stated that "the comrades of the ITPC [IT Political Committee] are projecting a line the logic of which is precisely to build a rival organization to the SWP."

The documentary material of the IT itself shows clearly that these conclusions by Berta Langston and Bob Langston are accurate.

We note further that the Estreugal-Rahdnik document states that "many comrades of the IT have been invited over the years to give classes, participate in discussion groups outside the party, help build united front actions, etc. We will continue to do these very same things; and if the SWP leadership attempts to prevent us from doing contact work, they will be in direct violation of the agreements reached at the Tenth World Congress, and the issue can be fought out on that basis." Estreugal and Rahdnik feel that the "agreements" reached at the World Congress release them from any obligation to conduct public

work under the supervision of the SWP. Accordingly, they argue for loosening the IT "security policy" in this regard: "There is no need to engage in such activity furtively or feel that we may be violating security."

The IT newsletter of June 6, 1974, states that the trade-union resolution was *passed unanimously* by the IT national convention. One passage in that resolution is as follows: "The fact that we are in the SWP automatically poses the question of what to do with potential recruits that we are able to draw around us. . . . if the potential recruits find joining the SWP an uninviting alternative then we have the duty to help sustain their interest in the politics of the Fourth International through a variety of means including study classes, reading programs, action interventions, and social functions (tavern raps, dinners, parties, etc.). It is entirely possible that concentrations of potential recruits may desire to coalesce in some organizational form." (The relevant section of the IT trade-union resolution is appended.)

Thus, the IT policy is to build groups in the labor movement behind the back of the SWP.

The Control Commission feels that the IT documents, in themselves, are sufficient to prove that it is IT policy to violate the discipline of the SWP in public work. There are three aspects of this policy to note in particular: (1.) It is IT policy to carry out its own public activities and public interventions in mass work regardless of decisions by the SWP unit in charge of such activities. (2.) It is IT policy to carry out unauthorized work with groups outside the SWP. (3.) It is IT policy to construct its own groups in the mass movement behind the back of the SWP.

Our investigation has also uncovered specific instances showing how the IT applies its policy of violating SWP discipline in public work.

The May 11, 1974, Actions and Other Examples

In his letter of June 9, 1974, to the SWP Political Committee, Bill Massey acknowledges the responsibility of the IT leadership for the public IT intervention on the Chile solidarity demonstrations that occurred on the weekend of May 11, 1974. In their remarks to the National Committee on June 23, 1974 (appended), Bill Massey and John Barzman reiterated this position. Bill Massey stated, "there is no facts in dispute, or it hasn't been brought out, since we've taken the position that we've done what you have charged that we have done, we admit that and take responsibility for it, we don't promise to discontinue it at all."

Our review of the documentation concerning the incidents of May 11 shows that the essential facts are these: (1.) The various local units of the SWP decided upon a certain tactical course of action on these Chile solidarity demonstrations. (2.) The IT was present during these discussions in most branches and was aware of the SWP policy on these demonstrations. (3.) The IT had proposed an alternative tactical course of action in some local units of the SWP, the IT proposals were discussed, and the IT proposals were rejected. (4.) The IT did not appeal these decisions to higher bodies of the SWP. (5.) The IT, acting in a coordinated, uniform way on a national scale, carried out in public the tactical course of action that had been rejected. For the most part this public intervention by the IT consisted of selling

the *Old Mole*, newspaper of the Canadian RMG, or distributing the September 1973 statement of the United Secretariat on Chile rather than carrying out the assignments that they had been given by the local units of the SWP.

In his letter of June 9, Bill Massey offers the following justification for the IT rejection of SWP discipline in public activity: "Our comrades have the right to sell the press of the International and they have the right to hand out the statements of the F.I. We would prefer that the Party implement that line in its own tactical form, but if the Party refuses to do this, then we will, without shirking other assignments, continue defending the line of the Fourth International. We acknowledge having done it on May 11th and we promise to do it again when the need arises."

We note two things about this argument.

1. It does not describe the real position of the IT. The secret IT documents show that the IT has a *general* policy of carrying out its own activity in public, regardless of whether it is authorized by the SWP or not, and this general policy of unauthorized public activity by the IT is not limited to cases like Chile work, in which the IT has a political difference with the SWP. (We also note that no elected leadership body of the Fourth International has ever objected to the tactics of the SWP in carrying out Chile work.)

There are reports in the files we examined that show that the IT carries out its own independent public interventions in cases where there is no disagreement on political line in the world Trotskyist movement. We append one such report, a letter dated June 16, 1974, from Pat Grogan of the Chicago SWP branch to the SWP national office. Her letter indicates that on the day concerned members of the IT refused to carry out their assignments decided upon by the branch, and instead carried out the unauthorized assignments that they had been given in the IT. This violation of SWP discipline included an independent IT intervention in a rally on behalf of Soviet dissidents. We note that on April 20, 1974, the United Secretariat discussed work on behalf of Soviet dissidents and agreed unanimously on how to conduct this work.

Thus we conclude that the policy of the IT has nothing to do with its argument that it is necessary for the IT to carry out the line of the majority of the Fourth International.

This argument is simply part of the IT's "security policy" used to provide cover for its unauthorized public activity, and its rejection of SWP discipline in public activity.

2. The argument is wrong on the face of it. There are no grounds whatsoever to allow any individual or group of individuals to take it upon themselves to decide when, where and how to implement policy. In fact, the IT actions are not only in violation of the constitution and organizational principles of the SWP, but they are also in contradiction with the statutes and organizational principles of the Fourth International.

The statutes of the Fourth International state the following:

Article 31: "National sections exercise jurisdiction within their own countries. . . . National sections exercise disciplinary powers over their own members."

Article 15: "In no case has it [the IEC] the power to alter the majority rule of a regularly elected leadership of a national section." (*International Information Bul-*

letin, January 1969, part 1, pp. 11, 8)

Not even the IEC has the right to do what the IT arrogates to itself!

The IT argument is also in contradiction with the IMT Political Resolution adopted by the 1974 World Congress, which the IT says it supports. That resolution states: "The task of the center cannot consist of making authoritative decisions about the tactics of national sections; this is forbidden by the International's statutes."

The article by Berta Langston and Bob Langston also shows up the falsity of the argument raised by the IT: "As far as we know, however, to appeal to the [World] Congress to justify such activities is incorrect. As far as we know, there is nothing in any document adopted by the Congress that would confer on a grouping within a section the authority to carry out any line in the name of the International; nor is there, as far as we know, anything in any document that prescribes any *tactical* line for the United States in carrying out the political line of the FI." (emphasis in original)

If permitted to continue, the actions of the IT would result in the total breakdown of the authority of the units of the SWP. Democratic centralism would be thrown overboard.

The IT Violates SWP Discipline in Work With Groups Outside the SWP

The internal documents of the IT show that it is the policy of the IT to carry out its own independent political work with outside groups behind the back of the SWP. This is a very serious violation of SWP discipline; all work with outside political groups, especially work involving opponent groups must be carried out under the close and direct supervision of the SWP. Full information on all such activities must be provided to the SWP units responsible for such work.

The Control Commission has concrete evidence of IT violations of SWP discipline in this area. This includes not only instances of unauthorized political work with outside political groups, but also instances of IT work with such groups in direct violation of decisions against such activity by local SWP units. We append evidence that shows the following:

- Unauthorized IT intervention in the national conference of the Attica Brigade, a Maoist opponent group.
- Unauthorized IT work with the Puerto Rican Socialist Party of New York.
- Unauthorized work in the Stalinist-dominated Emergency Committee to Defend Democracy in Chile in San Jose, California.
- Unauthorized work with the Revolutionary Marxist Collective in San Francisco and Oakland-Berkeley. This includes unauthorized participation in a closed study circle of the RMC by a member of the IT.
- Unauthorized work with various opponent groups in Minneapolis.
- Unauthorized work with various opponent groups in Madison, Wisconsin.
- Unauthorized work with the Baltimore Marxist Group and Chile Resistance Committee.

Attendance at IT National Convention by a Non-Member of Either the SWP or YSA

We append a report showing that a person from the

Washington, D. C., area who is not a member of either the SWP or the YSA or of any section or sympathizing organization of the Fourth International attended the national convention of the IT. This was in complete violation of the organizational norms of functioning by party members. *This person was present during discussion on how the IT planned to intervene in the SWP and YSA!* Furthermore, the Washington, D. C., branch of the SWP has never at any time decided to give internal SWP bulletins to this person, or even to inform him about the internal debate in the world Trotskyist movement. Nor has it ever been proposed in the branch to do so. Yet he was made familiar with the internal discussion in the SWP and the Fourth International.

This person was also made familiar with the secret documents of the IT. In them he could read various statements attacking the SWP such as those in the Williams document that the SWP is "deadly sick" and that its cadre "are politically incapable of either understanding or putting into practice a revolutionary line." He could read in the Carapace, et al. document a description of the SWP and YSA as the "the SWP sect and its bastard offspring." A perusal of the IT internal documents will show many other similar statements.

The IT Is a Rival Party to the SWP

The documents of the IT provide overwhelming proof that the IT is a separate party organization operating both within the SWP and outside the SWP. It has its own highly organized and centralized independent party structure functioning on all levels. It has its own party discipline that supersedes SWP discipline. It determines its own areas of external activity, independent of and in violation of SWP decisions concerning external work. Except for payment of dues (not financial sustainers), it violates every criterion of membership in the SWP, as defined in the constitution and organizational principles of the party.

In their resignation document, Berta Langston and Bob Langston stated that the logic of the IT line was "precisely to build a rival organization to the SWP." The documents of the IT clearly show that this logic has been carried out to its conclusion.

The IT party writes off the SWP. Berta Langston and Bob Langston quoted from the Hank Williams (Bill Massey) document giving the IT estimate of the SWP. The SWP is described as having a "petty bourgeois methodology" and "the methodology of a right wing opportunist sect." The SWP is judged "deadly sick," and it is concluded as "an objective fact that the cadre of this party are politically incapable of either understanding or putting into practice a revolutionary line."

The above statements of the IT are not those of a group that is loyal to the Socialist Workers Party, and that sees the SWP as the nucleus of the mass revolutionary Marxist party that must be built. They are not the statements of a loyal minority that has confidence in the cadre of the party and that seeks to convince the majority through force of argument, and that pitches in to help build the party while retaining dissident views.

The 1965 SWP resolution pointed out that party loyalty is at the very foundation of membership:

"To begin with, loyalty is far more than an abstract idea; it is a standard of political conduct. The party's

whole democratic-centralist structure is founded on the rock of organizational loyalty. Without loyal members the party, as a voluntary organization, would have no basis upon which to maintain the necessary discipline in carrying out its revolutionary tasks. Disloyal people don't believe in the party, they won't pitch in selflessly to help build it, and they will resist and evade discipline. That is why the organizational resolution adopted at the SWP's founding convention specified that unconditional loyalty to the party is required of every member" (page 10).

Far from seeing the SWP as the nucleus of the mass revolutionary Marxist party in the United States, the IT assigns that role solely to itself. As Berta Langston and Bob Langston explained, the IT sees itself as "an organized grouping essentially independent of the SWP and linked to the FI as the nucleus of its 'future' and 'true' section in the United States." The Williams document, as amended by Estreugal-Rahdnik also states that the IT is the "nucleus of the future section of the Fourth International in the United States." The IT newsletter report on the IT national convention states that "the section of the Rahdnik-Estreugal amendments on the nature of the SWP were passed as the beginnings of a discussion within the IMT."

Berta Langston and Bob Langston said that "the logic of the ITPC's position is that the IT, defining itself as the nucleus of a section in the U.S., would begin to combine the exercise of political leadership of groupings outside the SWP and YSA with an entry tactic inside the SWP and YSA."

The IT convention decided that its members in the SWP should retain nominal membership for the moment. The IT documents make it clear that this is a tactical decision, and that the IT is prepared to split formally whenever it sees fit. There is evidently a dispute over this tactic, with several IT members urging an immediate open split. The IT newsletter report on the IT convention states that "the objective reality of our existence within the SWP/YSA conflicts in some cases with our subjective desires." The Alexander position, as reported in the IT newsletter, calls for the speedy withdrawal of the IT from the SWP and the formation of an open organization. It is expressed in the "restricted" document, entitled "Unless We Believe the SWP To Be Reformable...." The Rico document (appended), written in April, calls for "preparation for a sovereign body in the next 3-5 months."

The Carapace, et al. document, signed by a section of the IT leadership, also argues for the quick, open-split position, prefacing their remarks by saying that "we have weighed our words carefully." They state early in their document that "the transformation of the tendency into a revolutionary organization has been correctly recognized by the SC [Steering Committee] to be the number one item on the agenda." Later they add, "we must prepare the rest of the International and the revolutionary movement at large for what is going to happen. . . it must be clear that we are preparing ourselves and by taking our first steps toward acting as if we were an independent organization we are quite correctly moving across the Rubicon."

The documents of the IT show that it has, in fact, crossed the Rubicon. It has consummated a split. It is a separate, rival party to the SWP.

PART III

The Problem of Complicity of Some Leaders of the Fourth International in the IT Split

The evidence contained in the internal documents of the IT establishes the complicity of a section of the elected leadership of the Fourth International in the decision by the IT to split from the SWP and form an independent party. The leadership of the IMT (International Majority Tendency), which includes elected leaders of the Fourth International, was fully aware of the evolution of the IT, had access to its internal discussion documents that had been kept secret from the SWP, participated in the discussions about IT split policy; yet it never, at any time, informed either the elected leadership of the SWP or any of the elected leadership bodies of the Fourth International about the splitting course that was being undertaken by the IT. Documentary evidence proving this is contained in the IT newsletter of June 6 and the internal communication of June 14.

In addition to the IMT Steering Committee, an IMT international leadership body whose composition has not been revealed to the Fourth International, these documents show that there are other elements to the IMT structure.

Below the IMT Steering Committee there is an IMT Bureau and an Enlarged IMT Bureau. Below this, there is at least one regional body, the North American Bureau (NAB). The North American Bureau is not a body of the Fourth International, but of the IMT. In fact, the existence of a "North American Bureau" has up until now been kept secret from the SWP and the International as a whole. The membership of the IMT Bureau and the Enlarged IMT Bureau has also been kept secret.

According to the IT newsletter, the North American Bureau is attended by "comrades from the North American sections" (emphasis added). The IT internal communication of June 14 speaks of the *Old Mole* as "the paper of the Canadian section of the IMT" (emphasis added). These sections are not recognized bodies of the Fourth International. We note that in Canada the section of the Fourth International is the LSA/LSO, and that in the United States, where affiliation to the Fourth International is prohibited by reactionary legislation, the SWP is considered to be the only organized expression of the Trotskyist movement.

We also note that the internal IT document entitled "A Reply to Comrade Massey From Los Angeles" speaks of "the IEC of the IMT."

All of these statements indicate the existence of a secret parallel international apparatus, different from that of the recognized and duly elected bodies of the Fourth International.

The leadership bodies of this parallel international apparatus conducted discussions about the IT split policy prior to the IT convention. The IT newsletter reports that prior to the IT convention there was a meeting of the NAB, attended by "comrades from the North American sections" and also a "representative of the IMT Bureau." Discussion took place "on perspectives for the building of a section in the United States" and on the upcoming IT convention. After this meeting, the same questions were discussed

in the Enlarged IMT Bureau. Hank Williams (Bill Massey), who attends meetings of the IEC of the Fourth International as a fraternal observer, was present at this meeting.

The IT newsletter also tells of the existence of a "full IMT Bureau report on the American situation, the SWP, and the perspectives of the IT." This report was presented in its entirety at the IT national conference. The SWP has never seen this report nor been informed of its existence.

After the IT national convention, another meeting of the North American Bureau was scheduled. According to the IT internal communication of June 14, this meeting has been set for July 15, 16, 17. The communication gives the tour schedule of a representative from the IMT Bureau, who will tour the U.S. for the IT prior to the NAB meeting. It is the same comrade who attended the June plenum of the SWP National Committee. This comrade is a member of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International.

Thus, the IMT leaders not only participated in discussions with the IT prior to the IT split convention, but they retain their relations with the IT after the split was consummated at the IT convention.

Furthermore, we note that this parallel international apparatus attempts to impose discipline on the supporters of the IMT within the SWP. The IT newsletter says that at the meeting of the Enlarged IMT Bureau a motion was passed saying that "members of the SWP and YSA who support the IMT must join or rejoin (in the case of 9 comrades who recently resigned) the IT." Not only does this motion indicate that discipline is imposed, but it is an instruction to members of the SWP to violate SWP discipline by accepting non-SWP members of the YSA as members of the IT.

Finally, we note the reports in the IT newsletter about political differences inside the IMT Bureau concerning the evaluation of the SWP. Whereas the Williams [Massey] leadership of the IT writes off the SWP, the majority of the IMT Bureau thinks that the Williams document "incorrectly viewed the degenerative process of the SWP as completed." The IMT Bureau requested the IT to cancel its convention; the request was rejected by the IT. And still not a word about this was said to the elected leadership bodies of the SWP or of the Fourth International.

The RMG representatives present at the IT convention expressed agreement with the IT position in this internal dispute. They called for active collaboration between the IT and RMG in "the struggle within the IMT to break it of illusions concerning the SWP."

Further information is required to establish the full extent of the collaboration of leaders of the Fourth International in the split of the IT from the Socialist Workers Party. But since the jurisdiction of this Control Commission is limited to SWP members, we do not have the power to investigate this aspect of the case.

**Motions Adopted by the Political Committee
of the Socialist Workers Party
July 4, 1974**

1. To adopt the Control Commission's two recommendations: (1) "That the Internationalist Tendency's status as a separate, rival party be recognized and that the members of the Internationalist Tendency party be informed that this status places them outside the constitutional provisions of membership in the Socialist Workers Party," and (2) "That supporters of the IMT political positions who are not members of the IT party remain members of the SWP as long as they abide by the constitution of the SWP, the organizational principles of the SWP, and the democratic centralist norms of the world Trotskyist movement."

2. To instruct each branch to re-register its membership by removing from its rolls as of this date all of the 69 known members of the Internationalist Tendency party.

3. To send the attached letter to the 69 known members of the Internationalist Tendency party.

4. To send the attached letter to all branches and at-large members.

5. To adopt the draft Political Committee Statement.

6. To immediately make available to the membership in an internal information bulletin all the relevant material on the split of the Internationalist Tendency party.

Statement Adopted by the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party, July 4, 1974

The report of the Control Commission of the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) proves conclusively that the Internationalist Tendency (IT) has organized a split in the SWP. Systematically prepared in the period beginning immediately after the last world congress, the split was consummated at the May 25-27 national convention of the Internationalist Tendency held in Chicago.

The IT documents previously kept hidden from the SWP and the Fourth International as a whole were obtained by the Control Commission within the last two weeks. The material contained in them is of the gravest concern for the entire world Trotskyist movement, for it demonstrates that the leadership of the International Majority Tendency (IMT), including elected members of the United Secretariat, was involved in the split operation carried out by the IT.

The secret documents received by the SWP Control Commission show that the IMT leadership had full knowledge of the months-long engineering of the split in the SWP and *did not inform the leadership of the SWP or the leadership of the Fourth International*. Instead, the IMT leadership allowed the split operation to proceed and helped to cover it up. This was a victory for the wing of the IMT that is driving to split the Fourth International.

The prosplit wing of the IMT, which considers the IMT to be the "real" International, includes the Internationalist Tendency and the leadership of the Canadian Revolutionary Marxist Group. The May 1973 Barzman letter named individuals who held a split orientation. This prosplit wing views the League for Socialist Action/ Ligue Socialiste Ouvriere (the Canadian section), the Argentinian Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores, the Socialist Workers Party in the United States and undoubtedly other sections and sympathizing organizations of the Fourth International, as "deadly sick," whose cadres "are politically incapable of either understanding or putting into practice a revolutionary line." This wing of the IMT has been pushing for some time for a split in the International. They had anticipated that an open split would take place at the last world congress, and were bitterly disappointed that this was not the outcome of the congress.

Having been dealt this blow by the majority of the delegates at the world congress, the prosplit forces in the United States began immediate preparations to split the SWP. Within a few days after the adjournment of the congress they opened a three-month secret discussion in the IT culminating in the IT national convention. Their object was to blow apart the unity made possible by the nine-point "Agreement on Measures to Help Maintain the Unity of the Fourth International" that was adopted by the congress.

The IMT leadership was not only privy to the secret discussion opened in the IT on how and when to split the SWP, it participated in this discussion. The IT report on the national convention of their new party states that a document adopted by the "IMT Bureau" warned

that the course the IT was embarked upon would lead to a split and the "establishment of the IT as a flimsy group outside of the SWP." *Not a single one of the IMT leaders took the course that could have prevented the split in the SWP.* Responsible leaders would have immediately placed before the elected leadership bodies of the SWP and of the Fourth International the information they had of the split plans of the IT, and sought the aid of the leaderships of the SWP and the Fourth International to prevent the split.

The entire IMT leadership took the opposite course. *They placed loyalty to their secret faction above loyalty to the Fourth International*, and thus became captives of the splitters who proceeded to present the IMT with an accomplished fact.

We have warned of the destructive logic of such methods of functioning before. In 1971, when we discovered the secret factional political document circulated by a leader of the United Secretariat within certain selected sections and groups in Latin America (the "Domingo" letter), we asked the United Secretariat to repudiate this method of functioning. Unfortunately, the majority members of the United Secretariat failed to heed our advice. Instead they deepened the error by asserting that such procedure was perfectly correct and normal.

At that time we pointed out: "The fact that the majority of the United Secretariat could consider that the writing of such a document by one of its members is a perfectly normal private matter raises a number of questions in our minds as to the concepts and procedures regulating the functioning of the body entrusted with the leadership of the Fourth International between meetings of the International Executive Committee.

"1. It signified that any member of the United Secretariat is free to act on his own as a private individual in handling situations of a grave nature that require mutual discussion, evaluation and decision. Such a practice reduces the United Secretariat to a federation of heads of commissions, who consider it normal not even to inform each other at times of important decisions they have made and processes they have set in motion.

"2. It opens the way to abuses of a most serious nature, such as operating behind the back of the leaderships of sections.

"3. It fosters the formation of personal cliques and similar unhealthy groupings put together in secret by this or that individual member of the United Secretariat.

"4. If it is considered normal for Comrade Maitan to operate in such a fashion it must be considered likewise normal for other members of the United Secretariat to operate in a similar way. The question follows automatically: Who else in the United Secretariat is sending out comparable factional letters to his own private mailing list? The position taken by the majority of the United Secretariat on the question of personal privilege in such matters places the entire committee under a cloud. A se-

rious blow had been dealt to its authority and to its claim to be serving as a collective leadership" (July 7, 1971, "Letter from the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party to the United Secretariat," reprinted in *International Information Bulletin* No 4 in 1971 and in *International Information Bulletin Reprint, Discussion on Latin America*).

This warning went unheeded. In March 1973 it came to light that six members of the United Secretariat had engaged in private political discussion with the Argentine PRT on burning questions that were under discussion by the whole International. They did this behind the back of the United Secretariat and on the eve of the December 1972 International Executive Committee (IEC) meeting that had as one key item on its agenda the balance sheet on our movement in Argentina. These six members of the United Secretariat kept their real views and actions *secret* on this central question in dispute at the IEC meeting where it was discussed. This document was not submitted to the *International Internal Discussion Bulletin* for publication until four months later.

Then, the May 1973 Barzman letter showed that the IMT leadership as a whole was operating as a secret faction. Barzman indicated that the IMT had a Steering Committee, whose composition was kept secret from the International. Applicants for membership in the IMT were required to accept "IMT discipline" and their applications were voted on by the IMT Steering Committee. These requisites for membership are among the distinguishing marks of a faction—in this case a secret, undeclared faction.

This contrasts sharply with the methods employed by the Leninist Trotskyist Faction (LTF). The LTF was openly declared. Its membership, leadership, structure, and limits of its discipline were all openly stated. All of the political documents of the LTF have been published in the regular discussion bulletins of the Fourth International; *none* have been secret for a secret discussion. The entire international is aware of the real positions of the LTF and of differences within the LTF when these occur.

The groups and individuals supporting the LTF have lived up to the conditions for adherence to the LTF outlined in the declaration of the formation of the faction:

"4. Faction discipline does not transcend the discipline of sections or sympathizing organizations of the Fourth International.

"5. Members of the faction must conduct themselves in a completely loyal way in sections of the Fourth International or sympathizing organizations, maintaining their activities and financial obligations in an exemplary way."

The secret IT documents shed new light on the structure, discipline, and methods of functioning of the IMT secret faction. It has become more highly structured since the Barzman letter was written. We learn that the IMT has an international "Bureau" and an "Enlarged Bureau." The composition of these bodies is kept secret from the International. There is a "North American Bureau"—presumably of the IMT—which is composed of representatives from the "sections" in North America. The existence of the North American Bureau has been kept a secret from the Fourth International as a whole, the SWP, and the Canadian section of the Fourth International.

We learn that a political discussion has been opened in the IMT on the political situation in the United States,

and that the IMT Bureau has prepared a document on this question, a document that also deals with the SWP and the perspectives of the IT. The existence and content of this discussion has been kept secret from the SWP and the Fourth International. Like the discussion held in the IT preceding its national convention, this discussion in the IMT is not an example of the normal circulation of material within an openly declared faction or tendency, the object of which is to prepare the documents of the tendency or faction for submission to the regular bulletins of the official internal discussion.

The object of this secret discussion is the opposite—to *hide the real views* of the various components of the secret faction from the International as a whole. The Barzman letter revealed that some leaders of the IMT considered it to be the arena where the "real" discussion takes place. The new documents brought to light by the Control Commission show that this is now an operating principle of the IMT as a whole, on a national as well as international scale.

The IMT secret faction is disciplined to such a degree that it adopted a motion giving various instructions to the IT, even instructing it to violate SWP organizational norms and discipline by accepting non-SWP members of the YSA as members of the IT. It even instructed those IMT supporters who resigned from the IT over disagreement with the IT's split course, to *rejoin the splitters*.

The Barzman letter consisted of a report to the Internationalist Tendency of negotiations Barzman was conducting on behalf of the IT concerning the IT application to join the IMT. Barzman's report indicated that one of the conditions for joining the IMT was that those members of the IT who disagreed with the IMT line on guerrilla war would have to support the IMT line in the discussion in the International, as part of accepting IMT "discipline." The secret IT documents discovered by the Control Commission demonstrate conclusively that this was in fact the case.

In "A Reply to Comrade Massey from Los Angeles," the Los Angeles grouping within the IT states that it is and always has been opposed to the IMT line on guerrilla warfare and to the IMT Bolivian resolution submitted to the last world congress. Nevertheless, all members of the IT, under IMT *faction discipline*, voted for the IMT Bolivian resolution in the pre-convention discussion in the SWP in preparation for the world congress. Such unprincipled combinationism is not in the tradition of the SWP and the Fourth International, which demands political honesty and faithfulness to principles.

The fact that the IMT placed its members under discipline to vote for its resolutions even if they disagreed with the fundamental line of those resolutions throws doubt over the validity of the votes cast at the last world congress. We ask: how many delegates to the world congress voted for the IMT Bolivian resolution, for example, who were in fact opposed to that resolution? Enough to reduce the bare 50.7% majority of delegate votes this resolution received to a *minority*?

The IMT Bureau apparently approves of the breaches of SWP discipline organized by the IT. At the recent plenum of the SWP National Committee, Comrades Massey and Barzman asserted they would continue their boycott of SWP finances. They reiterated that the IT would decide

and carry out its own tactical interventions in public activities whenever it decided that the tactics decided democratically by the SWP branches were inadequate. They would also, they stated, continue to concentrate on selling the "press of the International" (in which they include the *Old Mole* of the Canadian RMG and the British IMG's *International* magazine) regardless of the decisions of the SWP to campaign to increase the circulation of the American Trotskyist press.

A member of the United Secretariat, who is also a member of the IMT Bureau as the secret IT documents reveal, was present at the SWP National Committee plenum. He presented the summary for the IMT after these statements were made by Massey and Barzman, yet he made no dissociation from these assertions by Massey and Barzman. Thus the SWP leadership could only conclude that these assertions by Massey and Barzman stand as IMT policy.

By its actions the IMT leadership has contravened its own Political Resolution which was adopted by the World Congress. This resolution states: "The task of the center cannot consist of making authoritative decisions about the tactics of national sections; this is forbidden by the International's statutes." It is also in violation of the statutes, which state: "Rather than exercise disciplinary measures of its own in instances of differences with a national leadership, the International Executive Committee should seek to rely on persuasion and recommendations. In no case has it the power to alter the majority rule of a regularly elected leadership of a national section."

In violation of the statutes and the Political Resolution adopted by the world congress, the "center" overturns the tactical decisions of a sympathizing organization and its branches.

Further, this "center" is not even one of the duly elected leadership bodies of the Fourth International. No motion was adopted by the United Secretariat instructing the SWP to concentrate on selling the *Old Mole* and the *International* rather than the American Trotskyist press. No motion was made in the United Secretariat instructing the SWP to utilize *Inprecor* as their primary weapon in *contact work* "on the job" rather than the American Trotskyist press. Because such motions themselves would have been such a blatant violation of the statutes and such a gross trampling upon democratic centralism, the "center" which gave these secret instructions to the IT had to be a secret body, presumably the IMT Bureau.

We also note that, at the very time the Bureau of the United Secretariat was consulting with the national office of the SWP on organizing the distribution of *Inprecor* in the U.S., the IMT "center" went behind the back of the SWP to organize distribution of *Inprecor* through the IT.

Such a conception of "democratic centralism," applied by a secret parallel international center that operates behind the backs of the elected leaderships of sections, that overturns majority rule and the democratic decisions made by the sections or sympathizing groups, that seeks to determine tactical questions even down to what leaflet will be distributed at a given demonstration, will wreck the Fourth International if it is not opposed and rooted out. Under such a conception not a single section or sympathizing group would be able to function as a democratic-centralist organization. No self-reliant na-

tional leaderships democratically selected by the ranks on the basis of their own class-struggle experience could emerge, capable of building the kind of proletarian combat parties necessary to carry out the historic mission of the Fourth International.

The IMT leadership has set up a secret apparatus paralleling the elected official bodies of the Fourth International. Parallel to the IEC, there is the IMT Steering Committee; parallel to the United Secretariat, the IMT Enlarged Bureau; parallel to the administrative Bureau of the United Secretariat, the administrative IMT Bureau; parallel to possible regional bureaus (which, according to the statutes of the Fourth International, can only be established by the IEC), there is the IMT North American Bureau and perhaps several others; parallel to the sections and sympathizing organizations of the Fourth International, like the Canadian LSA/LSO and the Socialist Workers Party, there are the "sections" of the IMT.

This disciplined secret apparatus places loyalty to itself above loyalty to the Fourth International. It has usurped the functions and authority of the United Secretariat. It holds its own "real" secret discussions. In the case of the SWP, it seeks to overturn the democratic decisions of the elected leadership concerning tactical questions in the United States, to impose its own tactical line on the SWP, and thereby destroy the SWP's democratic-centralist character. It does this in violation of the Political Resolution adopted by the world congress and codified in the statutes of the Fourth International. The cadres of the Fourth International cannot assume that this method of functioning is restricted to the SWP, but must assume, as in the case of the "Domingo" letter, that it is being applied to other sections and sympathizing groups.

Most important, out of greater loyalty to its own secret faction than to the Fourth International, the IMT leadership has permitted and helped cover up a split engineered by its followers in the Socialist Workers Party.

By taking this course of action, the IMT leadership has broken the nine-point "Agreement on Measures to Help Maintain the Unity of the Fourth International" adopted by the last world congress. This places the unity of the Fourth International in the gravest danger.

To avert the danger to the international arising from the actions of the IMT, we call for the convocation of a special world congress of the Fourth International as provided for in the statutes of the Fourth International. Section II, Article (6) of the statutes includes the following provision: "A special World Congress can be convoked at any time by the International Executive Committee or by one third of the national sections." Section IV, Article (9) includes: "In the intervals between sessions of the International Executive Committee, the United Secretariat acts in its name and with its powers except that it cannot organize subsecretariats or commissions."

Let the whole International debate the real views of the various components of the IMT. Publish all the secret political resolutions and discussion, including the IMT discussion on the American political situation and the SWP, and submit them for consideration by the whole world movement. Only a special world congress can now isolate the splitters and reverse the disastrous orientation now being fostered by the prosplit wing of the IMT.

July 4, 1974

Portions of the Internationalist Tendency Newsletter of June 6, 1974

1. FIRST NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE INTERNATIONALIST TENDENCY

By Alec

The first national conference of the Internationalist Tendency was held in Chicago on the Memorial Day weekend, May 25, 26, 27. The conference had been preceded by a discussion period of three months which elicited twelve discussion bulletins containing thirty four different contributions to the discussion. Discussion around these took place in every area of the Tendency. Delegates were elected on the basis of five persons per delegate. There were twenty-four delegates and ten consultative delegates.

Eighty six persons attended the conference, 79 of whom were members of the IT, six were members of the Revolutionary Marxist Group (Canadian sympathizing group of the FI), and one member of the International Marxist Group (IMG - British Section of the FI).

The comrades attending the conference were mainly young people, with 73% between the ages of 20 and 29, 19% between the ages of 30 and 39 while 8% were 40 or older. Thirty three of those attending were members of the SWP, 32 were members of the YSA and 14 were members of both organizations. Women made up 31.6% of those attending (25 ITers and two visitors) while 54 ITers and five visitors were male.

On a geographical basis, comrades from 18 different cities in 14 different states attended. Seven regional locals of the YSA attended. The largest contingent of comrades was from Chicago (21); this was followed by Houston (12), Washington (9), New York City (8), Madison (5), Los Angeles (4), Portland (3); two from each of Philadelphia, Paterson, New Brunswick, St. Louis, Iowa City, and San Francisco. One person came from the following areas: Kansas City, Milwaukee, Boston, San Jose, and Minneapolis.

Thirty-nine ITers in attendance are active members of trade unions. The largest bloc were in railway unions, with a total of 8 comrades (5 in UTU, 2 in BRAC and 1 in Brotherhood of Railway Carriers); this was followed by AFSCME - 7 comrades; IBEW - 3 comrades; Bakers Union - 3 comrades; AFT - 2 plus one member of the AAUP; 2 each in OPEIU, OCAW and United Steel Workers of America. One person each from United Auto Workers, Teamsters, Communication Workers, IATSE and the Printers Union (AFL-CIO). Two comrades in attendance were retired workers, two were full-time IT staff persons, eight were students and seven were unemployed, the rest being non-union workers.

Perspectives Discussion

The initial discussion was procedural, focusing on the adoption of an initial agenda, election of a Presiding Committee, a Nominating Committee for the new IT Steering Committee. There was discussion on the merits of a nominating commission with several objections raised. The proposal for an eight-member nominating commission (2 from each of North-South-East and West voted by the delegates in regional caucuses, with Comrade Mitchell chairing without vote), was adopted with two comrades voting against it.

Following the procedural discussion Comrade Hank Williams gave a report on the most recent session of the Enlarged IMT Bureau and on the meeting of the NAB which preceded the IMT Bureau meeting. At the NAB the comrades from the North American Sections disagreed very firmly with the representative of the IMT Bureau on perspectives for the building of a section in the United States. The request to cancel the IT conference was rejected and it was proposed that any perspectives adopted by the IT conference and the IMT Bureau be tentative so that further discussion within the IMT could take place.

At the IMT Enlarged Bureau meeting a motion was passed which noted that the Hank Williams document perspective was not in conformity with the perspectives of the IMT and that certain ambiguities of the H.W. document should be rectified; that an immediate discussion must be opened between the IMT and the IMT Bureau on the perspectives for the class struggle in the United States and the initiatives of the IT comrades; that the IT should recruit people politically to the FI and organizationally to the SWP, and in the case of groups who supported the FI and the 10th World Congress, that the IMT would fight for members of these groups to be recruited and accepted into the SWP - each and every one of them without exception; that members of the SWP and YSA who support the IMT must join or rejoin (in the case of 9 comrades who recently resigned) the IT. One comrade in the Enlarged Bureau meeting abstained on this motion, while all the others including Hank Williams voted for it. Comrade Williams along with three other members of the Bureau submitted statements indicating that they did not see a contradiction between the perspectives of the IMT and the IT. A motion that indicated that there only seemed to be a contradiction was defeated receiving six votes and two abstentions. Some comrades in the bureau felt that with a workers upsurge in the U.S. many radicalizing workers would go into the SWP and that it could grow to the size of 5 or 6 thousand quickly which would enable a viable IT to reach a thousand of them and draw them to its ranks. Comrade Williams totally disagreed with this perspective. Comrade Williams stressed that the IMT would have to make a strong effort to democratize the SWP in order that the IT be able to carry out its tasks in the SWP and the building of a strong tendency - this was generally agreed to by all of the Bureau comrades. It was also agreed that the comrades who resigned recently from the Tendency in no way represented a serious leadership element, however it was felt that they should be told to rejoin and that those from the East Coast in particular could bring theoretical abilities to the Tendency. The IMT bureau will send a representative shortly to meet with comrades in the main centers of the Tendency.

Following lunch, discussion was open on the adoption of a perspectives resolution. Four proposals were put forward: the general line of

1. "Which Way Forward." drafted by Hank Williams. Vincent was the reporter for this position, calling for the vote to be based on his oral report, which took into account the IMT Enlarged Bureau recommendations.

2. A series of amendments to the H.W. document by Estreugel and Rahdnick; the reporter was Comrade Nora. These differed from the original in three major ways: (1) they contained a much more lengthy analysis of the SWP, (2) they qualitatively differentiated between the SWP and YSA as areas of work de-emphasizing the former, (3) they stressed contact work on as yet independent elements.

3. A counter-resolution "Unless we Believe the SWP to be Reformable..." introduced at the conference by Alexander. It stressed the irreconcilable differences between the IT and the LTF. It called for a conference within six months to decide whether to remain in the SWP and YSA and emphasized the need for a stronger Leninist organization of the IT constituted as a faction within the SWP. The counter-resolution also said the IT should look with benevolence upon supporters of the FI outside the SWP and YSA pulling together into a national organization with its own press.

4. A proposal by Thor Ladislav which reflected the views put forward in the document of Tom K. which was felt by the outgoing Steering Committee to constitute a counter resolution. Later Comrade Thor changed this and along with Comrade Archie Shepp proposed that the three other positions be rejected and that the incoming PC draft a new document. They questioned the sincerity of the H.W. document stress on recruitment work inside the SWP and YSA.

Discussion was concluded on the perspectives discussion. Following the summaries of the four reporters, time was granted for translation of the full IMT Bureau report on the American situation, the SWP, and the perspectives of the IT as put forward in the H.W. resolution.

The report which had previously been given by the Bureau representative to the NAB meeting, argued that the H.W. document posed problems, in that it incorrectly viewed the degenerative process of the SWP as completed and in that context seemed to set in

motion a series of events leading to the expulsion of the IT and the establishment of the IT as a flimsy group outside of the SWP. It called for a hard political fight inside the SWP and proposed rejection of the H.W. document, cancellation of the conference and the opening of a discussion within the IMT.

The final votes on the perspectives discussion were:

1. On the motion from Archie Shepp and Thor L.: 3 for, 20 against, 0 abstentions, 1 not voting.
2. Alexander's counter-resolution: 2 for, 21 against, 1 abstention, 0 not voting.
Consultative: 0 for, 10 against, 0 abstaining, 0 not voting.
3. Amendments by Estreugal and Rahdrik: 8 for, 15 against, 1 abstention, 0 not voting.
Consultative: 2 for, 7 against, 1 abstention, 0 not voting.
4. General Line of Vincent's oral report for the PC proposal: 18 for, 6 against, 0 abstaining, 0 not voting. Consultative: 9 for, 1 against, 0 abstaining, 0 not voting.

Comrade Alexander made a four point motion in regard to the IMT Bureau statement which had been read by Vincent:

1. Stating agreement with the NAB in rejecting the position of the IMT Bureau.
2. Rejection of the motion of the Enlarged IMT Bureau.
3. Accepting the authority of the IMT Enlarged Bureau but pledging to seek to reverse the decision.
4. The opening of an immediate discussion in the IMT on North America.

The resolution passed 19 for, 4 against, 0 abstentions, 1 not voting, 1 absent.

The section of the Rahdrik-Estreugal amendments on the nature of the SWP were passed as the beginnings of a discussion within the IMT and the PC will welcome all contributions on the subject, but discussions between the IMT and IT on this matter will be a leadership to leadership basis.

RMG Greetings: Other Reports

The conference then heard a comrade from the RMG who brought greetings to the IT. She stated that the RMG fully identified with our debate and called for active collaboration between the RMG and IT in 4 areas: 1) the development of a perspectives for North America (2) the struggle within the IMT to break it of illusions concerning the SWP (3) a joint exchange of experiences in regard to interventions and party building (through the Old Mole, pamphlets, etc.) and (4) joint contacts at all levels.

Comrade Cisco then presented the proposed trade union resolution. He emphasized that crucial confrontations would occur in basic industry and spoke on the reasons for the delay in the response of the working class to ruling class initiatives (and of possible changes in this regard), on recent strike actions and demands, and the role of caucuses. He stressed the importance of the public employees unions in the general trade union struggle. He noted that the question of the Labor Party while not an immediate question is useful as a propaganda call. Discussion centered on local experiences with strike support activity and on the difference between proletarianization and implantation. The trade union resolution passed unanimously.

Inessa then introduced the Black Report. She rejected the idea that Blacks are a nation, discussed the concept of Black control of the Black community which she pointed out was whatever its merits, solely a democratic demand, not involving any question of self-determination. She described the special oppression of Blacks as racial-cultural and as part of the lower layers of the working class, and stated that they would play a vanguard role in the revolution. She discussed the concept of action committees which would aid in extending the organization of Blacks as a part of the working class struggle against oppression. She listed priorities in regard to recruitment of Black YSA'ers, intervention into the YSA and YSA-sponsored meetings,

Errol presented the position of the document "The National Question: Setting the Record Straight". He stressed that there should be no support whatever to nationalism, Black

or otherwise (although he felt that this was not a point in dispute). He stated sectoral movements would increase and that the working class must support all struggles against oppression. He considered support to preferential hiring and advancement to be a decisive question, and stated that "Jobs for All" was meaningless in this regard. The position of Black Control of the Black Community is inferior to the call for Community Control of the Ghettos. He argued that Blacks have the potential to become a nation. He stated that it is incorrect to only support working class parties saying that he called for critical support to LaRaza Unida Parties and other such formations.

Ophelia presented an amendment to the Black struggle section of the Hank Williams document as a counter to both Black resolutions. She argued that Trotsky was right in 1939 and stated we should not rule out the possibility of the development of a Black nation. She added that Mexico should be included in any discussion of North American perspectives.

There was a vigorous discussion in which Comrade Carlos argued that Blacks are a people/class in the sense of A. Leon's analysis of the Jews. A motion by Comrade Kirk to take no vote on any of the Black resolutions failed.

The votes of the delegates on the Black Struggle resolutions were as follows:

1. On the motion of Ophelia: 1 for, 19 against, 2 abstentions, 1 no vote, 1 absent.
2. On the motion from Errol (for "Setting the Record Straight): 5 for, 12 against, 6 abstentions, 0 not voting, 1 absent.
3. On motion of Inessa (in favor memorandum by Vincent): 15 for, 3 against, 5 abstentions, 0 not voting, 1 absent.

Vietnam

Next followed the discussion on Vietnam. Vincent spoke first in favor of the Palomar Position. He stated that the tendency could not survive in the American left without a clear understanding of where it stood on the Vietnamese revolution. The interest in methodology does not reflect a sectarian inward deviation, but the necessary foundation to build a firm cadre with an objective view of the SWP's theoretical heritage. He said the NLF was a proletarian force intent on establishing a workers state over the whole country and that dual power presently existed. The characterization of the Algerian Ben Bella regime as a workers and farmers government had been a mistake. Because the VCP had no subjective safeguards against becoming enmeshed in the process of bureaucratization, its leadership would have to be replaced. He emphasized the importance of international solidarity.

Elvis then reported on the counter-proposal from the Los Angeles comrades. He argued that it is a mistake to take theoretical and methodological positions on Vietnam now. He attacked certain concepts of the Palomar resolution, especially the idea that the Accords were a partial victory and that dual power exists now in the South. He saw Vietnam as a stalemate. He criticized the idea that a military victory by the NLF would automatically create a workers' state, pointing to Austria from 1945-55.

Carapace then introduced a counter-proposal - an amended form of the original Carapace 7-point Statement sponsored by both Carapace and Alec (who withdrew his original amendments to Palomar in favor of the revised Carapace document). He read the amendments, which eliminated a number of vague or misleading statements, according to Carapace. He labeled the VCP a revolutionary empiricist organization; it is a revolutionary party which jeopardized its very existence by breaking with the USSR.

There followed considerable discussion at the end of which a motion made by L.A. delegates to not vote on any position failed by 7 for, 16 against, and 1 absent. The votes on the reports were:

1. The revised Carapace document: 3 for, 15 against, 2 abstentions, 4 not voting. Consultative: 0 for, 9 against, 0 abstentions, 1 not voting.
2. Comrades from L.A. then withdrew their alternative position and introduced a four-point statement on Vietnam instead:
 1. Stressing the need for International solidarity.
 2. Calling for "Victory to the NLF" as a slogan.
 3. Noting the necessity to criticize the shortcomings of the VCP.
 4. Calling for continued discussion on Stalinism until the next conference.

13 for, 11 against, 0 abstaining, 0 not voting

Consultative: 4 for, 2 against, 4 abstaining, 0 not voting.

3. The Palomar Resolution: 11 for, 10 against, 1 abstaining, and 2 not voting (initial vote) A revote was taken when Comrade Thor Ladislav asked to change his "not voting" position to a vote against. The final vote on the Palomar resolution was: 11 for, 11 against, 1 abstaining, 1 not voting.
Consultative: 6 for, 2 against, 4 abstaining, 0 not voting.
4. The Amended Palomar Resolution: 9 for, 12 against, 3 abstaining, 0 not voting.
Consultative: 4 for, 5 against, 1 abstaining, 0 not voting.

YSA - Organization - Elections

Mike Patrick then gave a report on Work in the YSA. He stressed the need to work in regional locals first. The regional centers will draw in many of the regional comrades during the summer months thereby requiring stress on work in all the regional centers. There is need for a YSA profile; each area should provide empirical data for this. We plan regional tours, with a focus on new areas. The reporter proposed a special YSA commission, to aid the Tendency's intervention into the YSA. The general line of this report was accepted unanimously.

Hank Williams then gave the organizational report. He noted that the IT had been heterogeneous at birth in Toronto, some differences had been overcome and others further clarified. We need a major orientation to the YSA; we must fight to have the IMT push the democratization of the SWP, we are against any split in the SWP and must fight the LTF on this question. We will have another conference in February. We hope to have tours by IMT representatives. The newsletter will become biweekly going to the entire tendency while a PC mailing will go to the steering committee on a weekly basis. The Steering Committee will meet four times a year with the next meeting projected for the time of the YSA convention. It is necessary that the PC stop acting as a consensus leadership and function as a real political leadership eliminating ambiguities and vacillations. We must escape from our regionalist conceptions and the IT must stop the tendency toward being an assortment of pressure groups. A heavy stress must be put on basic Leninist-Trotskyist education.

Estreugal introduced the idea of a commuter PC. While both the supporters of the "commuter PC" and the outgoing PC recognized the shortcomings of the old PC as representative of the breadth of the Tendency, the commuter supporters argued for a PC in which all the residents would not have to live in Chicago. Rather the Chicago PC members would become a resident bureau for all day to day and emergency decisions, and full PC meetings would occur monthly to decide all important non-emergency decisions.

Others called for fighting the problems through more frequent Steering Committee meetings and "enlarged PC" meetings. They criticized the Estreugal position as a step backward toward less political centralization as costly and unworkable. A straw poll on the question of a commuter PC revealed that among the delegates 10 favored it, 13 opposed it, and 1 abstained.

The general line of the organizational report was accepted unanimously.

The open session of the conference ended with the singing of the International.

In closed session the delegates heard the report of the nominating committee. Discussion was opened and motivations and demotivations were made. A steering committee of 19 was elected, however one comrade who was elected felt it necessary to resign. An empty slot was left vacant so that the Steering Committee is of 18 with one empty slot and 10 alternate members.

Steering Committee Plenum.

The question of a commuter PC was debated again. The vote by the Steering Committee was: 7 for, 11 against, 1 absent. One "consultative" vote was added to the against votes.

Mike Patrick made a motion for a nine member PC which passed with a unanimous vote.

The PC will consist of the six PC members now resident in Chicago plus 3 other members of the Steering Committee not resident in Chicago at this time. The PC with the approval

of the Steering Committee will recommend the three additional members who will move to the center in Chicago.

A Review

The IT conference indicated that the Tendency still has many problems to overcome: discussion is not closed on some issues. The Center must be strengthened and regional attitudes overcome. The objective reality of our existence within the SWP/YSA conflicts in some cases with our subjective desires. The period between today and the February IT conference will be a difficult one in many ways. Any weaknesses and difficulties, however, must be assessed in the light of our gains and advances. The IT has developed considerably from its origins; from a loose confederation of local tendencies only tenuously oriented toward the FI, it has become a component part of the International Majority Tendency. We have not surrendered nor have we become cowed by the bureaucratic methods of the SWP/YSA leadership and we have extended considerably our freedom of criticism and action within these organizations.

Most importantly by our conference we demonstrated in practice our political and organizational alternative to the LTF. The IT conference was marked by free open and thorough discussion in which differing currents were viewed not as heresies to be stamped out, but as mirroring differing perceptions of the class struggle. Debate was not a tiresome prelude to annihilating opposition, but a healthy normal manner in which to hammer out a correct line. IT comrades for the first time were able to project, plan, and put into operation our policies and our structures. The result was that even the vigorous debate which marked the conference produced not despair over differences but enthusiasm and determination.

From IT Bulletin IV

A REPLY TO COMRADE MASSEY FROM LOS ANGELES 4/23/74

We do not wish to continue the exchange with comrade Massey on the level of a quarrel over organizational incidents. We are satisfied that in the case of the letter to the IMT, the error was inadvertent, and we consider the matter closed.

However, on the matter of minority representation, comrade Massey's letter raises a number of larger questions that need clarification. We believe it is important that the ground rules for a healthy internal life be established right from the beginning. In addition, comrade Massey appears to misunderstand the status of our political differences with the center, and we will try to clear this up first.

The assertion that "the June 10th Tendency joined the IT on the basis of the platform of the IMT..." is not quite accurate. The statement by the June 10 group announcing our fusion with the IT explicitly qualified our adherence to the platform of the IMT and the IT resolution by reaffirming the views expressed in the Position Paper of June 10th and the document on Nationalism. Comrade Massey neglected to mention this in his letter, just as he did in the report on the fusion.

We did this precisely so that there would be no misunderstanding as to where we stand. Now, when a group of comrades, comprising a significant fraction of the tendency, announce that they stand on documents spelling out their special views, then, to our way of thinking, you have a clearly defined minority.

Then comrade Massey suggests that even if there had been a political basis for the June 10th group at the time of the fusion, this is no longer the case, because our views on Latin America have now been adopted by the majority and are "reflected in the resolutions adopted at the 10th World Congress." Apart from the fact that this would have no bearing on the selection of delegates prior to the congress, we can only say that if this were true, we would be delighted to forego all claims to representation. But is it really true?

Our views on the role of guerilla warfare in Latin America were expressed quite clearly in the June 10th Position Paper (although guardedly, because it was introduced into the debate with the LTF). In essence we called for a rejection of the guerillaist

strategy implied in the 9th World Congress resolution on Latin America, (and explicitly repeated in the resolution on Bolivia of December 2, 1973), and for a return to the Leninist line on the road to power, i.e., popular revolution of all the exploited and oppressed classes led by the urban proletariat. We wrote, "...it is of the utmost importance that the resolution which will guide the work of our Latin American comrades ~~point~~ unambiguously in the direction in the direction of mass work and away from guerilla warfare at this time." We are not aware that this is now the official position of the IT. If it is, it should be duly recorded and reported. As far as we know, the position of the IT is one of uncritical support to the IM.

Has the IT itself eliminated the basis for this controversy by self-correction? At the time of the June 10th document, we were encouraged by what appeared to be movement in the right direction. However, it must be said bluntly now, that the corrections have been empirical, superficial, equivocal, contradictory, and extremely inadequate. The proof is that after indignantly denying that it ever supported a guerillaist strategy, the IM of the IM approved a resolution on Bolivia which postulated that the "specific form of armed struggle for an entire period could only be guerilla war", and this of a "continental dimension." Furthermore, this resolution was singled out as one of the planks in the platform of the IM.

A significant section of the IT is categorically opposed to this line, but this found no reflection in the delegation to the congress. The plain fact is that the resolution on Latin America at the 9th W.C. was fundamentally wrong on the question of guerilla warfare, (no matter what else was right about it), and contributed to the disorientation of a number of Latin American sections, yet the leadership refuses to recognize this and limits its self-criticism to euphemistic phrases, "elliptical formations, one-sidedness" etc., while repeating the very same error. We assume that this is partly due to reasons of face saving vis a vis the LIT, and partly an attempt to satisfy everyone, including the author of the Bolivian resolution. But these considerations count for nothing compared to the urgent need for a fundamental reeducation and reorientation of our cadres, and this can only be done by an honest, forthright recognition of the full extent of the errors of the 9th WC and the reaffirmation of the Leninist strategy for the socialist revolution in underdeveloped countries. If the majority of the IT is ready to join us in our effort to bring this about, then the major issue separating out the June 10th group will vanish.

On the question of national and women's movements, the differences are not as well defined. We have put forward a clear cut position in our document on nationalism; no support whatsoever to nationalism, full support to all movements against national oppression. Although we did not submit a document on women, we indicated that the same basic two sided policy applied. We frankly saw this document not only as an attack on the SWP's petty-bourgeois nationalism, but as a criticism of the IT resolution which we believed was at the very least ambiguous on the subject of support to national and women's movements.

The IT resolution was, we think, defective on this score, primarily by omission... but not by oversight, since none of our amendments aimed at clarifying this question were accepted. It is in order to determine how much agreement or disagreement there is on this question that we have introduced our document on nationalism for adoption at the upcoming conference.

There remain two questions concerning ground rules referred to above. If we understand comrade Massey correctly, he advances two more arguments for failing to provide the June 10th group representation; One, that we did not declare ourselves an official tendency, and did not demand our legal rights, and second, that our

differences were not of a "principled character."

Regarding the first, we find it hard to believe that comrade Massey really insists that every loose, temporary grouping that develops around a particular question immediately crystallize into an organized tendency, (which after all, is the same as a faction), before he will acknowledge that its views should be represented. There has been no attempt to set up an organized group or even to maintain regular contact between L.A. and Bay Area comrades who comprised the June 10th grouping. We prefer it that way, and would not like to be forced into organizing a formal tendency in order to gain recognition.

The comrades from Los Angeles did not want to push for a delegate when only two were to be selected, and the CG proposed comrades Massey and Vincent. Comrade Massey was informed, in Chicago, of our desire for representation. If we knew that a third member of the IT would be admitted, we would have certainly proposed a representative of the June 10th group. We were not concerned about a vote at the congress, but with voice in the IT deliberations. If comrade Mitten did not speak at these meetings we assume it was because he did not find it necessary to do so since he had no special or dissident views to put forward. Obviously, a representative of June 10th would have spoken.

However, in our opinion, it is the responsibility of leadership not merely to allow, but to insist that in all gatherings where disputed issues are to be considered, minority viewpoints receive reasonable representation. We further believe that these political considerations take precedence over questions of "rewards or penalties" or of the personal merits of individual comrades, praiseworthy though they may be.

Nor can we agree that the principle of representation applies only to "principled questions." Actually, Comrade Massey unwittingly calls into question any minority rights at all. On the one hand, he says that if the differences are "principled", "this raises the question as to the (principled) character of the fusion", or to put it more directly there shouldn't have been any fusion. The inescapable conclusion is that there is no room for minorities, or at least minority representation in the IT. We do not think that comrade Massey has followed through the logic of his arguments.

In fact, the movement has experienced perfectly legitimate tendencies, factional struggles and splits over questions of strategy and even tactics (entryism, etc.). It is true that a tendency (or a faction) is generally more homogeneous than a party. Indeed if the tendencies, in the international were divided solely over the question of the role of guerilla warfare in the Latin American revolution, we would not be in the IT. We would have to form a separate tendency. But we all know that far more is involved. We believe that in spite of some serious errors pertaining to guerilla warfare, the IT (and IT) represent authentic Trotskyism, while the LTF is a genuine petty-bourgeois right wing.

Furthermore, because of the SWP leaderships dead-end factionalism and monolithic proclivities, the struggle has resulted in a division into two hostile camps with the permanent threat of split. We are therefore not dealing with temporary tendencies around particular issues, but with two rival international organizations that are embryonic parties, somewhat similar to the relationship between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks in the RSDLP. Under these circumstances the IT (IT) must of necessity take on a broader character, and will inevitably include tendencies and groupings within it, and they are not likely to be based on issues of fundamental principle.

We have been indoctrinated in the "lessons" of the history of faction fights and splits in the SWP. The chief "lesson" is that any serious opposition to the official line must result in political warfare, a power fight and a split. This, indeed, is the tradition of the SWP, but not of Lenin's party. Trotsky described the internal life of the Bolshevik faction (and then party) as a "seething democracy", in which the struggle of tendencies and factions were the rule. Yet the Bolsheviks suffered far less splits than the SWP, because the struggles were conducted in a spirit of mutual respect, honesty, and loyalty, not one of monolithic, rigidity, in which every opposition is seen as a deadly enemy and a "challenge to the leadership" to be shot down.

We believe that the unity of the IT rests on solid programmatic foundations, even though it is not entirely homogeneous. With a new and healthy atmosphere the debate over differences can lead to political maturation and stronger unity.

Passed by the Los Angeles IT, 7 for, 1 against, 1 absent.

Resignation from the IT by Berta Langston and Bob Langston

Comrades of the Internationalist Tendency: Bob and Berta Langston, Catskill, New York

With this letter to you, which we are requesting the ITPC to circulate in the bulletin or newsletter, we are announcing our resignation from the I.T. This is a step we have taken only very reluctantly; it is, however, an unavoidable one. For it has become clear to us that we have a difference of such fundamental character with the ITPC as to make further principled collaboration within a tendency impossible. This difference concerns not one tactical question or another, nor even a specific programmatic point, that might be resolved through discussion on the basis of a shared methodology. No, the difference pertains to the very self-definition of the tendency and hence to all the tasks confronting it. This difference is inseparable, moreover, from a difference in political characterization of the party and the YSA.

The logic of the ITPC document is, in effect, to impose a self-definition of the IT as an organized grouping essentially independent of the SWP and linked to the FI as the nucleus of its 'future' or 'true' section in the United States. (pp. 10, 17). Correlative with this definition, Comrade Williams presents an implicit but quite clear characterization of the party. It is dominated by a 'petty-bourgeois methodology' which it is now seeking to foist on the world movement (p.8); it is an "objective fact that the cadre of this party are politically incapable of either understanding or putting into practice a revolutionary line" (p.10) and this explains why the IT does not have more adherents; the party cadre "was recruited and trained in the methodology of a right wing opportunist sect." (p.9). The party is "deadly sick." It is clear that the correct label for such a moribund formation would be degenerated opportunist sect.

We, on the other hand, regard the IT, with respect to its present perspectives and tasks, as an organized tendency within the SWP and YSA, that is, as a grouping that has the goal of changing the line and practice of the party and youth in certain specific ways. It is an integral part of the International Majority Tendency within the FI. And just as the IMT has no political existence independent of or outside the FI, so too the IT has no political existence independent of or outside the organized presence of the FI in the United States -- the SWP and YSA. All members of the IT are bound by the discipline of the party and youth because they are bound by the discipline of the FI. That discipline includes the duty to put forward the declared political positions of the FI even on those points on which at present the comrades of the LTF are unable or unwilling to. That discipline precludes any organizational political activity outside the SWP or YSA in whatever form that is not under the supervision of the appropriate leading bodies of the SWP and YSA.

Correlatively, we regard the SWP as what it in fact is -- the U.S. section of the Fourth International, which is prevented by reactionary legislation from formally taking its place in the ranks of the FI. Politically, we characterize the SWP as a revolutionary Marxist organization marked by significant tendencies towards opportunism and sectarianism. Politically, it is the revolutionary Marxist character of the SWP that binds it to the FI and us to its discipline; it is the existence of the opportunist and sectarian tendencies that make necessary an organized tendency to combat them.

We do not, of course, deny that the party may in the future degenerate into a finished opportunist-sectarian formation. We maintain, however, that whether it does or not depends to some extent on how supporters of the IMT characterize the party and define

their tasks now. We do not, of course, argue against the building of an unblunted instrument -- to use Comrade Williams' phrase -- for the proletariat and its vanguard. We are proposing a course that would help sharpen the existing instrument and help assure that if, at some point along the way, a portion of that instrument becomes an obstacle, the remaining part would be sharp enough to cut through that obstacle too. The path the ITPC is proposing leads in the opposite direction; Comrade Williams' perspectives and definition of tasks tend toward the production of two obstacles -- one a large and well-endowed opportunist sect; the other a tiny sect condemned to try and hide under the aura of the accomplishments of revolutionists abroad with whom it proclaims its political solidarity.

But no one has been able to show, in a way consistent with Marxist method, that the party has already degenerated into an opportunist sect, that quantity has already been transformed into quality. And all attempts to demonstrate that completed degeneration have heretofore terminated in a mass of pseudo-concepts -- 'Pabloism' being the most usual general one --- that have both reflected and pushed forward the sectarianization of the groupings that have taken as their point of departure the battle against that alleged degeneracy. Unfortunately, it seems to us likely that comrades who adopt the characterization of the party and definition of the IT contained in Comrade Williams' document -- with its complete lack of concrete analysis -- will soon begin generating sectarian pseudoconcepts to justify politically the actions that must logically flow from that characterization and definition. In fact, as we shall see, that process has already begun -- in the ITPC document.

As evidence for the new characterization of the SWP, Comrade Williams adduces three complexes of problems which were dealt with in the counter political resolution the IT presented last August:

- a) The SWP's 'petty-bourgeois' methodology, meaning, presumably, that complex of linked conceptions and orientations related to sectarianism, single-issueism, mass intervention opposed to vanguard intervention, party-building in the abstract, and emphasis on democratic slogans opposed to transitional ones'
- b) In particular, the party's theoretical and practical adaptations to feminism and nationalism;
- c) Also in particular, the party's failure to rally the more advanced elements on more advanced slogans during the radicalization of the sixties.

With some important reservations -- indicated in a document submitted to the pre-convention discussion -- we generally agree with the analysis and criticism begun in that IT political resolution. In particular, we agree with the August document's treatment of the party's deviations as tendencies, not as elements of a completed degeneration. There is nothing new, concerning these points, in Comrade Williams' documents, not in any document that we have seen produced within the IT, that could justify the new characterization of the party.

Two new points are raised as evidence of the party's degeneracy in the ITPC document: the party's relationship to the process of "recomposition of the left" now underway and three examples from the trade-union field.* Before it could be regarded as such, the IT would have to propose a concrete plan for intervention, for that plan to be rejected by the party, and for the grounds of the rejection to be carefully analyzed. This has not been done nationally; to our knowledge, it has not been done locally. And the paragraphs of the ITPC document dealing with specific areas of work do not even begin to outline such a plan. Moreover, it should be noted that the party has not wholly abstained from this recomposition process. Apparently the regroupment arising from the left-wing split in the Puerto Rican Independence Party has been substantially influenced by the SWP. We cannot judge how well or badly this

add- a) It is impermissible to use the party's insufficient intervention in the mini-regroupment now underway as evidence of degeneracy.

intervention has been carried out; a careful examination of it could be an important contribution of the I.T.

b) In its lack of a sense of proportion and production of pseudo-concepts in the form of 'principles', Comrade Williams' handling of his three trade-union examples rather clearly shows the danger of the sectarianization of the tendency; it does not at all show that the party has degenerated into an opportunist sect.

"The line of the party, Comrade Williams writes, "is to either make no criticisms of the leadership of the unions in struggle, as they did in the Sears strike in the Bay Area -- where the party tail-ended Walter Johnson, a leader of 'Alioto for Governor,' who in turn tail-ended the local labor bureaucracy -- or they put forth no independent class struggle line as they did with the CLUW conference, or they cross picket lines as they did with the strike of the maintenance workers." (pp. 8,9).

The crime in the case of the Sears strike, then, was that the party did not criticize Johnson. With this argument, we are present at the conception -- if not yet the birth -- of precisely one of those sectarian pseudo-concepts. A "principle" is about to leave the womb: Thou shalt not support a workers' struggle without criticizing the leadership if that leadership happens to be of the trade-union bureaucracy. The necessary next step is to enunciate the principle: Thou shalt seek to incorporate into every worker's struggle an immediate, head-on collision with the whole labor bureaucracy.

The need to establish this 'principle' against the SWP's alleged trade-union policy leads to an at least partially faulty analysis of the Sears strike itself. From all the factual information we have been able to gather from the bourgeois and left press, Walter Johnson was not tail-ending the Bay Area bureaucracy as a whole but was virtually at a point of rupture with it. And while, to judge from Comrade AW's report in the tendency newsletter, there were important elements of tail-endism to Johnson in the party's orientation, the party so far as we can judge from the reportage in The Militant was also rather far out in front of Johnson on the crucial point of projected strike policy -- the call for the entire Bay Area labor movement to rally in support of the Sears strikers and to extend the picket lines to Sears outlets throughout the Bay Area, with those lines to be composed of workers from other unions. A detailed criticism of the party's intervention is needed. A concrete counterproposal on how to intervene is called for. An analysis that might show how the party's errors in this or similar cases are related to the general pattern of its opportunist tendencies is needed. A sectarian pseudo-principle, substituted for concrete analysis, we do not need. That kind of "principle" and the trade-union policy consistent with it can well be left to the comrades of the Spartacist League. It may be an aid to their rather successful intervention in the present re-composition of the left; we do not think it will help them win a layer of advanced workers. We don't think it would help us to solve the concrete problems of combining initiatives in action with outflanking the bureaucracy, while preventing isolation of the mass vanguard from the workers' movement.

Likewise, the ITPC's treatment of the CLUW orientation of the party generates a sectarian 'principle': Thou shalt not, under any circumstances, be Best Builders; thou shalt always accompany thy organizational efforts with a definite political line counterposed to someone else's. We think it is necessary to raise the question as to whether programmatic intervention in CLUW was not essential. And we suspect that the party's failure to undertake such intervention was related to the tendency to see CLUW entirely too much in feminist perspective, to approach it with some notion that the mere getting together of a group of trade-union women contains a spontaneous progressive thrust. But we of the IT did not present -- nationally, at least -- any proposal explaining specifically what the party should have sought to gain from its CLUW intervention and how it should have gone about it. The tendency newsletter report suggested, at least, that the party should have made support to the Farm Workers against Teamster union-busting the main axis of

intervention. But possible out of eagerness to demonstrate the party's capitulation to the bureaucrats who controlled the conference, the author of the newsletter article failed to notice a fact that is of some significance in judging whether or not a struggle on the question would have been advisable: the fact that the Farm Workers group at the conference dominated as it no doubt was by the Chavez bureaucracy -- was opposed to a fight on the issue. Would vigorous intervention by the party have found a response in the Farm Workers' delegation? Would it have helped develop rank-and-file sentiment within the IBT against the union-busting of the bureaucracy? Would it have contributed to the development of consciousness of the advanced women workers present at the conference? These seem to us relevant questions. But once again, we have been offered a sectarian pseudo-principle instead of a concrete analysis and a plan of action.

In the case of the New York City school maintenance workers' strike, there was in reality we think, an important question of principle involved. But the ITPC document does not mention a certain fact that is highly relevant to judging the party's attitude -- the fact namely, that the leadership of the maintenance men's union publicly declared that it was not asking teachers to observe the picket line. The leadership of the union, in which we have no implantation, was, in short, declaring its picket line to have an informational character. Under these circumstances, the party recommended that teacher comrades go to their schools and discuss the issues of the strike with other teachers.

We think that was the wrong decision. We think it would have been correct for our teacher comrades to have utilized the opportunity to solidarize with the maintenance workers on the lines, to encourage other teachers to join them, and by precept and example to help strengthen the instincts of trade-union solidarity. This seems to us particularly so, since Shanker of the teachers' union more-or-less invited the teachers to observe the line by issuing assurances that those who did so would not be penalized.

But it is only by some stop-sign conception of principle--the expressions of which by comrades of the LTF we have correctly opposed -- and by a loss of all sense of proportion that Comrade Williams can write in connection with this incident, "A party that can allow its members to cross picket lines without any appreciable outcry is a party that is deadly sick." (p.9). The New York school maintenance workers' strike really was not Hitler's seizure of power in Germany.

In short, the ITPC's trade-union examples do not, any more than the other bits of evidence Comrade Williams adduces without analysis, demonstrate that the party has become a right opportunist, anti-working class sect. The document's handling of them, however, diverts attention away from the need for careful analysis, precise criticism, and concrete counterproposal. And it does demonstrate the serious danger of the sectarianization of any group of comrades who adopts it as their won.

Against Comrade Williams' whole construction, we want to give a few examples, drawn from the past fifteen years, which may be helpful in thinking more clearly about the real character of the party. They suggest, we think, a capacity to make great, timely turns towards broad sectors entering into motion, a tendency to adapt opportunistically, to falsely theorize the adaptations and to transform the revolutionary-Marxist program into a "world-view" to be propagated, and yet an ability at certain crucial political points an ability to reassert the revolutionary-Marxist program in practice and to contain or reverse the opportunist drift.

1) In the late fifties and early sixties, the party was able to turn towards the successive ripples and waves of the Black and student radicalization; in doing this, it was able to orient towards the most advanced currents (Robert Williams and Black self-defense; Cuban solidarity). It was able to understand correctly the Cuban revolution and to act on that understanding. It was able to break with the "Theological" Marxist Healey and, together with the majority of the comrades of the International Secretariat,

to reunite the International.

2) The adaptation in the antiwar movement was only relative. The party and YSA were not simply organizational 'best builders,' putting together a pressure group objectively in support of the Vietnamese Revolution and establishing a milieu in which to propagate the Marxist world view and recruit. We carried a line of principle into that movement of which we were the best builders; the struggle for 'withdraw' against 'negotiate' served in fact to advance the political consciousness of rather broad layers of antiwar activists. The failure to advance slogans of open solidarity with the Indochinese Revolution and to develop the corresponding organizational forms has to be seen in relation to that fundamental achievement. And criticism of the party's antiwar policy has to take full account of the tactical complexity that would have been involved in carrying out both these tasks.

3) The theory of combined revolution in the United States and the closely associated beginning of a revision of Marxism on the national question in general constitute the most serious, explicitly formulated theoretical deviations. Moreover, they stand at the head of the whole sectoralist drift. But they have their roots in a very peculiar ideological adaptation. Black nationalism, that bourgeois or petty-bourgeois current to which the party adapted, was when we first began to champion it, and to a large extent still is today, rejected, bought and defamed by the entire real bourgeoisie and by almost all the petty-bourgeoisie, white or Black. On the other hand, it informed the action of the most advanced layers of the Black militants who were linked to mass struggles. It has been the consciousness of the closest thing to a new mass vanguard organically linked to the working class -- and its most oppressed layers at that -- yet to emerge in the United States. That kind of adaptation, though once it is falsely theorized it encourages opportunistic trends, does not in itself lend credence to the notion that the party is deeply opportunist, sectarian or anti-working class. Moreover, after drifting quite far towards a reformist position in calling for Black control of the police, the SWP-YSA pulled back, corrected, contrary to the opportunist logic.

4) Despite the serious inroads made by feminism in the party's theory and practice, at a crucial political point, these inroads were contained. The party resisted the logic of advancing the slogan of a women's party. And the grounds the party majority gave for rejecting the slogan were not of purely tactical order; on the contrary, despite all its despite all its other failings, the 1971 women's liberation resolution presents a generally correct, programmatic reason for rejection of the slogan. A sectarian, purely theological and propagandistic Marxism would easily have found a way to reconcile itself to the opportunist logic of sectoralism.

5) Likewise, in the case of the gay liberation movement, a sectoralist strategy would have indicated a plunge. And a purely propagandistic Marxism dished out in conjunction with a big "best builder" effort would probably have brought not insignificant recruitment. But the thrust in that direction was halted. And while the majority statements bear marks of compromise and excessive argument from tactical grounds, there was a current in the national committee, represented in Comrade Nat Weinstein's document that opposed the orientation towards the gay liberation movement on clearly programmatic and generally correct grounds, even if Comrade Nat's argumentation was itself overlaid with sectoralist conceptions.

6) A more recent test is provided by Watergate and impeachment. The logic of single issue, sectoralist, best builderism indicated a turn towards an impeachment movement. Sectarian Marxism would have had no difficulty in reconciling itself to this opportunist policy; numerous demands in the press to build a labor party now would have fully sufficed. The party did not respond in this way. Instead, it launched a propaganda campaign centered on the capitalist state's systematic violations of democratic rights. This campaign an opportunist sect with boundless appetites would have launched.

In our opinion, what these examples indicate is that the party is living out the contradictions between the logic of its adaptations on the one hand, and the revolutionary

Marxist program on the other. The correct orientation of the tendency would be to insert itself in this contradiction, to drive forward the resolution of this contradiction on the side of revolutionary-Marxism. This, we think, is the really 'concrete' answer to the question, Can this leadership be reformed?

It seems evident that the party is now beginning to make a turn towards struggles waged at the work places. This turn is belated; it is perhaps not now being pushed forward rapidly enough; there is already and there will be in future much to criticize in connection with it. It is also possible that despite what the IT should do or how it might develop, the party will show itself incapable of carrying through this turn, of moving towards a serious implantation in the work places and unions; it is possible that the turn will remain largely confined to the pages of the Militant; it is possible that the fundamental orientation of the party will be tail-endist and economic, that it will be incapable of drawing around it and educating the most militant elements of worker's vanguard. But it is only on the basis of the kind of sectarian pseudo-concepts pointed to earlier that it would be possible to predict that any of these things are inevitable. We should not orient on such purported 'inevitability'; rather, we should seek to encourage this turn, to criticize concretely its specific deficiencies; to explain the connection with the party's other theoretical and methodological errors, to develop and propose alternatives to false politics.

Corresponding to their false and sectarian method of characterizing the party, the party, the ITPC projects an orientation for the tendency which, if adopted, would tend to lead to an organizational existence of the I.T. independent of the SWP and YSA. Contrary to their intentions -- they write, "We are not attempting to build a rival party to the SWP" -- the comrades of the ITPC are projecting a line the logic of which is precisely to build a rival organization to the SWP. This can be seen very clearly from three passages -- and one striking absence -- in the document:

a) "Our (the IT's) major thrust (within the party) must be carefully drawing up a line for the party to implement in specific situations, and then showing how it should be carried out. More can be shown with actions than words." This will force us to start thinking in motion rather than in position. Working out a line and putting it into practice is better than talking about it only." (p. 16, emphasis added);

c) Finally, in discussing groups that arise outside the SWP-YSA which indicate sympathy with the Fourth International and are engaging in organized political activity, Comrade Williams indicates one of the ways the IT has of 'moving outward:' "We (the IT) must work with them (these groups), getting them the political positions of the Fourth International, telling them what the major campaigns of the International are, and how the International would carry them out." (p. 11, emphasis added).

d) The absence is very simply the lack, anywhere in the document, of any specification that when we carry out those actions that speak louder than words, those actions should be carried out under the supervision of the appropriate leading bodies of the SWP and YSA.

The logic here is clear -- the IT would begin to put itself forward as an independent entity. Likewise, to begin to interpret to groups outside the Party and YSA how we think the line of the International should be carried out in the United States, is to begin to play an active leadership role for these groups, it is to begin organizationally to play that self-assigned role as the nucleus of the true or future section of the FI. in the United States.

We have not yet had an opportunity to see the documents adopted by the World Congress in their final form. As far as we know, however, to appeal to the Congress to justify such activities is incorrect. As far as we know, there is nothing in any document adopted by the Congress that would confer on a grouping within a section the authority to carry out any line in the name of the International; nor is there, as far as we know, anything

any document that prescribes any tactical line for the United States in carrying out the political line of the FI.

In short, the logic of the ITPC's position is that the IT, defining itself as the nucleus of a section in the U.S., would begin to combine the exercise of political leadership of groupings outside the SWP and YSA with an entry tactic inside the SWP and YSA.

The errors of such a course seem to us clear. It would lead not merely to instances but to patterns of organizational indiscipline in regard to the party and YSA. This would tend to intensify the factionalization of the SWP-YSA; it would increase the difficulty of arguments and proposals based on our political conceptions being heard, understood, discussed on their merits, and adopted. In response, the thrust toward the IT's sectarianization would be strengthened; the criticisms would become increasingly alienated from the objective reality of the party and the proposals would tend to be based increasingly on putting a minus where the party leadership puts a plus. At the same time, the trend towards the sectarianization of the Party would be strengthened. The fact of genuine organizational indiscipline would provide ammunition to those elements of the LTF who are inclined to substitute organizational disputes for political discussion. The direction of development would be towards the expulsion of the comrades who take this course in such a way that they would be headed towards a sect existence outside, while all the worst features of the SWP and YSA would be strengthened. It is hard to see how the building of the U.S. section of the FI would be served.

The effects internationally of such a course would be perhaps even more serious. It is obvious that such a process would intensify the dangers of a split in the International. It would strengthen the most split-oriented and right-tending elements of the LTF within their own faction. It would inhibit the working out and surfacing of the contradictions within the LTF. It would drive towards a split on a world scale under conditions in which the political differences were not fully clarified, in an atmosphere in which they could not be clarified, and in such a way that the ultimate responsibility for the split would be obscured.

One of the central political tasks of the FI today is to demonstrate, on a world scale, that it is possible to build an international revolutionary Marxist party, increasingly governed by the norms of democratic centralism, that is able to contain within it even major political differences that arise episodically as a result of the uneven development of the world revolution and the different experiences of revolutionists in different countries. One of the major accomplishments of the 10 World Congress was to establish the principled basis for a point of equilibrium on which the differences within the International can unfold without threatening its unity. It provides the possibility of halting that split dynamic that was so evident in the two years preceding the Congress. One of our major tasks -- perhaps our fundamental task -- to make that possibility real. We cannot do that by acting, in any way whatsoever, as an organization independent of the SWP and YSA.

But -- and this is perhaps its most serious defect -- the ITPC document does not even raise the question of the international consequences of its projected course -- except in connection with the odd suggestion that the reason to oppose a split is so that there will be an opportunity for the SWP to fully reveal its nature to comrades abroad.

We think a wholly different orientation is indicated. We think the comrades who support the ITPC should define themselves in fact as a tendency. Our main tasks are, in cooperation with other comrades of the ITPC, to deepen and develop our understanding of North American reality, to develop and deepen our criticism of the theoretical errors of the LTF, to develop concrete criticisms of the errors the Party and YSA make in specific interventions, and to develop and present concrete counterproposals when necessary.

Like all other comrades, we should carry on propaganda, contact and recruitment work. In doing this work, we should explain and defend the line of the FI, bearing in mind that on those questions on which the FI has not declared itself by World Congress resolutions or USec or IEC statements, we are bound by the positions of the SWP and YSA. That does not mean we have to come forward as vigorous defenders of positions with which we personally disagree. We will often find that emphasis on the basic programmatic aspects of Trotskyism, explanation of the activities of Fourth Internationalists around the world, and discussion of FI documents, is a more effective recruiting method than efforts to defend positions we personally oppose. But it does mean that we have to explain those positions correctly and coherently and not introduce positions counter to them. Our basic approach should be -- recruitment to the SWP and YSA on the basis of the program of the FI. In carrying out this work, we should use the press of the various sections and sympathizing groups and of the USec, as well as of the SWP and YSA.

We should in no way challenge or appear to challenge the right of the party and youth leading bodies to direct all organized interventions and all interventions in other organizations.

When we meet comrades who regard themselves as sympathizers the FI and who are trying to establish political action leagues or groups, we should discourage them from that course. We should make every effort to recruit them to the SWP and YSA. We should make every effort to recruit them to the SWP and YSA. We should remain in individual contact with such comrades; we should under no circumstances participate in their groups except after consultation with and approval by the relevant leading body. We should encourage those FI sympathizers who are unwilling to join the SWP and YSA to find specific areas of work in which they can nevertheless co-operate with party and YSA fractions. Even when they are refused admission by the party or YSA, we should still encourage them to find areas of work in which cooperation is possible and to apply for membership again later. Where these comrades have formed groups, we should encourage them to apply for membership as individuals, not groups. We should not do anything that would place any barriers to their admission. We want them in really, we want them in; we want every Fourth Internationalist, who is prepared to abide by the discipline of the FI and party, in. Our basic conception in this regard should be: encourage all Fourth Internationalists to join the party or youth; discourage every tendency towards the development of formations outside the SWP and YSA claiming adherence to the FI.

It seems to us evident that our differences with the ITPC are of such magnitude on a fundamental question as to make continued collaboration within a tendency impossible. Why do we not struggle for this point of view within the IT, at least until the May conference? Two points are relevant here. First, the position upheld by Comrade Williams is not a marginal or peripheral one in the IT; it comes equipped with all the authority and prestige of the leadership. Secondly, the issue, as we see it, is precisely whether the IT will begin to assume the character of a political organization in its own right. Under these circumstances, to continue to struggle within the IT-- with its internal bulletin, a possible tour, election of delegates, a convention -- would be in practice precisely to cooperate in helping make the IT become what we urgently hope it doesn't. Under ordinary circumstances, this paraphernalia within a tendency would merely be the means of discussing and hammering out a tendency policy; in this case, however, given the question in dispute and the sponsors of the position we oppose, this paraphernalia will, we fear, inevitably begin to appear to many comrades as the organizational skeleton of -- a new organization.

We are notifying the party leadership of our resignation with the following message addressed to our branch organizer: "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."

We would of course be pleased to discuss informally these questions with any comrades. We can be reached at R.D. 1, Box 211-A, Catskill, N.Y. 12414

Rejection of Resignation -- statement by the Political Committee.

The following motion was passed at the Political Committee meeting of 5/4/74:

1. To reject the resignation of Comrades Berta Langston and Bob Langston on the grounds that it is contradictory to their open support to the International Majority Tendency.
2. To publish the letter-document sent in to the internal bulletin of the tendency.

Statement of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International Regarding the Call for a Special World Congress of the Fourth International Adopted by the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party on July 4, 1974

[The general line of this statement was adopted by the United Secretariat majority at the meeting on September 7-8]

* * *

The United Secretariat placed on its agenda the request of the SWP that a call for a special world congress of the Fourth International be issued. It has examined the contents of the statement adopted by the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party on July 4, 1974, which argues the case in favor of such a special congress; the report of the Control Commission of the Socialist Workers Party submitted to the PC of the SWP on July 2, 1974; the motions adopted by the PC of the SWP on July 4, 1974; and all matters relevant to these issues contained in the SWP's Internal Information Bulletin No. 6 in 1974, which has been widely circulated throughout the FI by unilateral decision of the SWP; and the IT statement of July 5 protesting the expulsion and demanding immediate reintegration. The United Secretariat has decided to issue the following statement in regard to the above-mentioned material.

The United Secretariat of the FI notes that the July 2, 1974, report of the SWP Control Commission contains the following sentence: "The evidence clearly establishes the complicity of members of the elected leadership of the Fourth International in the IT's decision to form a rival party." (IIB No. 6 in 1974, p. 6). It further notes that the statement adopted by the SWP Political Committee on July 4, 1974, contains the following sentence, "the leadership of the International Majority Tendency (IMT), including elected members of the United Secretariat, was involved in the split operation carried out by the IT . . . the IMT allowed the split operation to proceed and helped to cover it up." (IIB No. 6 in 1974, p. 18).

The United Secretariat considers these accusations to be of the gravest possible nature, for they allege that a substantial part, if not the majority, of the elected leadership bodies of the FI were party to an alleged split of the world Trotskyist movement. It rejects these accusations as unfounded, slanderous, and scandalous. It has decided to transmit the matter of these slanderous accusations to the International Control Commission and requests that this body make a full investigation of all the facts and conditions leading to these accusations and submit a report to the next International Executive Committee on the basis of its findings relative to all these facts and conditions.

The United Secretariat wants to reiterate what it has stated many times before on the occasion of various discussions and disputes within the FI since the reun-

ification of 1963. It is of the firm conviction that an international *organization* can and will be built only if certain rules are respected by all members, sections, tendencies, and factions:

"Respect of discipline of *national sections*, which means the respect of their statutes, of the right of elected leaderships to lead the organization in all public activities, of the right of minorities to full freedom of discussion during pre-congress discussion periods or other occasions of discussion decided by the leadership, of the substantial and not merely formal right of minorities to form tendencies or factions on declared political platforms, of the necessity of subordinating the functioning of such formations to the collective needs of party building under the leadership of the section.

"Respect of the discipline of the International, which means respect of its statutes, of the duty to apply World Congress decisions, of the right of the elected leadership of the FI to lead the organization in all international public activities, of the right of minorities to full freedom of discussion during pre-world congress discussions or other occasions of discussion decided on by the leadership of the FI, of the substantial and not merely formal right of international minorities to form international tendencies or factions on declared political platforms, of the necessity of subordinating the functioning of such formations to the collective needs of building the international under the leadership of its elected bodies."

Obviously, these common rules of national and international democratic centralism should also apply to the SWP, which is prevented by the reactionary Voorhis Act from being a section of the FI but which operates in full solidarity with the world Trotskyist movement.

This means that the United Secretariat has not supported and will not support, uphold or defend any act that violates these rules, whatever formal justification or cover up may be advanced. We consider these rules to be substantive and not at all "formal" in nature.

We consider that defense and application of the program of revolutionary Marxism leading to the victory of the world socialist revolution—the very reason for the existence of the FI—is impossible without the building of an international organization based on the full program and embodied in living cadres acting along those lines. We consider that nowhere in the world are there substantial forces outside of the Fourth International that have shown by historical record any ability or inclination to fulfill that task better or more effectively than the sections of the Fourth International (and the SWP in the United States). We therefore consider that the solution of the crisis of leadership of the world proletariat can be realized only through the building of these organizations. Whatever differences exist today, however substantial they

may be in this or that field, however much a tendency or faction may believe that a radical change in policy or leadership in this or that part of the movement is called for, there is no indication that this basic rule can be challenged and that the building of revolutionary Marxist parties can be achieved more effectively outside that established organizational framework.

The basis of the unity of the Fourth International is exactly this principled political conviction, and not some tactical or diplomatic consideration. We stand on that principled conviction. We defend it everywhere. And we reiterate that without complete and unquestioned assimilation of that conviction, the unity of the Fourth International will be threatened by what we call "organizational sectarianism" or blind factionalism; that is, the tendency of groupings to decide to "go it alone" every time serious differences arise (as they are apt to arise in a world movement like the Fourth International, subjected to the pressure of constantly varying relations between the classes in many countries and in many ways), the tendency to try to "test out in practice" the ability of small factions to "build the party" through the application of some particular gimmick, tactic or shortcut. The same tendency has sometimes been evidenced in attempts by majorities to impose a monolithic situation in national sections. History has conclusively proven that such disruptive organizational sectarianism only weakens the movement as a whole and reduces the ability to test out in practice any tactics, including those advocated by the factionalists themselves.

We also reiterate that in a democratic movement, these rules will be observed only if they are observed *universally*, if no section or tendency, or faction of the movement claims as privileges for itself rights that it is not willing to grant to others and if all aspects of these rules are observed equally. Only on that condition will organizational disputes be eliminated from center-stage and will the movement's political practice become the sole supreme test of whether this or that line defended by this or that formation has shown itself to be effective in building the Fourth International on the basis of its commonly agreed on program.

II

In addition to charging that the IMT leadership helped or covered up a split in the SWP, the statement adopted by the SWP PC on July 4, 1974, makes the following charges against the IMT leadership, that is, against the majority of the members of the United Secretariat and the IEC:

— Operating as a secret faction and engaging in secret political discussion behind the back of the elected bodies of the F.I. (IIB No. 6 in 1974, pp. 18-19).

— Having set up a "secret apparatus paralleling the official elected bodies of the Fourth International. Parallel to the IEC, there is the IMT Steering Committee; parallel to the United Secretariat, there is the IMT Enlarged Bureau; parallel to the administrative bureau of the United Secretariat, there is the IMT administrative Bureau . . ." (IIB No. 6 in 1974, p. 20).

The "proof" advanced to support these allegations is the fact that the IMT leadership was aware of the internal discussions in the IT around an alleged split course,

warned these comrades *against* that course, but did not immediately inform the elected bodies of the SWP and the FI about these trends and did not seek the "aid of the leaderships of the SWP and the FI to prevent the split." (IIB No. 6 in 1974, p. 18)

The accusation that the IEC majority tendency operates as a "secret faction," already made previously by IEC minority members of the leading bodies of the International, is ridiculous and unfounded. The IEC Majority tendency announced its formation and its platform publicly to all members of the FI through statements published in the International Information Bulletin during the discussion prior to the Tenth World Congress. It submitted political documents to that discussion and to the vote of that congress: It designated reporters to that congress, as well as to numerous national congresses that had been held prior to the world congress. It submitted a list of Steering Committee members, these being the IEC members agreeing with the general line of the IEC Majority documents. It submitted a slate of candidates for the IEC at the World Congress, and that slate was elected. There was and is nothing "secret" about any of these normal applications of the right of tendency, upheld by the statutes of the FI. Besides at the end of the 10th World Congress it was stated clearly by common agreement of the two main tendencies at this congress that these were not to be dissolved formally, that the dissolution could be only the consequence of a process within the life of the international.

The grave accusation so lightmindedly advanced by the statement of the SWP PC rests on two assertions:

1. That "secret" parallel bodies are functioning in addition to the publicly and officially declared Steering Committee of the IMT. This accusation is unfounded. What's more, the accusation itself implies a further questioning of the substantive right to form tendencies, as we already warned the members of the IEC when we answered the SWP PC's comments on the so-called Domingo letter.

When formally declared tendencies exist on a political basis, it is absolutely normal that their members consult each other on issues arising out of discussions in leadership bodies. Would the SWP PC deny the right of United Secretariat members adhering to the IEC Majority tendency to consult each other on matters discussed at the United Secretariat? Do they deny that right also to IEC minority members?

Such a denial would imply that the right to form tendencies and factions is in fact restricted exclusively to the right to hold literary discussions in internal bulletins. It would give elected majority leaderships immense privileges of centralisation and would suppress that minimum of centralisation for minority tendencies without which no real tendency struggle could be waged. It would in fact be an important step toward strangling internal democracy and the right to form tendencies and factions inside the FI, an important step toward the bureaucratization of our movement.

We will not accept any such restrictive interpretation of democratic centralism. We will not deny the right of mutual consultation and the elaboration of mutual proposals for individual participation in minority tendency or faction members on leading bodies concerning any proposals coming up at these bodies. But just as we uphold these rights for minorities, we must uphold them

for majorities as well. The SWP PC accuses the IEC Majority tendency of having set up "secret parallel bodies." We reject that accusation. We say that what they call "secret parallel bodies" are merely the normal consultation channels of members of a tendency who are members of leading bodies of the International or of any of its sections and sympathizing groups.

2. That the leaders of the IEC Majority tendency failed to inform the leading body of the SWP and FI of the internal discussion going on in the IT and failed to warn the SWP leadership about the danger of a split involved in proposals submitted to the IT by various individuals? The SWP leadership admits in passing—and in contradiction to the final paragraph of the July 2 report of the SWP control commission as well as to various allegations contained in other paragraphs of the July 4th statement of the SWP PC—that the leaders of the IEC majority tendency warned the IT *against* any course or step that could lead to their expulsion from the SWP. Later, such clearly acknowledged warnings are construed as "proving" that the leaders of the IEC majority tendency "covered up" a split or were even "party" to it!

Here again, what the SWP Political Committee is actually doing is challenging the right of a tendency to have internal discussions. We must strongly stress that this right exists and that we reject such challenges of it. The organisational rules of Leninism do not and cannot entail any "duty" of members of a tendency to "inform" the opposite tendency about internal discussions.

Whether it would have been easier to homogenize the IT around the perspective of building the tendency in the SWP and the YSA and avoid organisational mistakes in the framework of the factional atmosphere of the SWP and the YSA inside a common tendency, or whether it would have been easier to do this through an opened discussion in the world movement as a whole, a discussion involving strong factional opponents of that tendency, is a matter on which we obviously have opinions that differ strongly with those of the Political Committee of the SWP. But that no "secret faction" or "violations of democratic centralism" are involved in such internal tendency discussions is a matter of organisational principle on which we stand unequivocally, in defense of the fundamental democratic rights of all members of the FI.

The apparent indignation of the SWP PC on both these matters—"secret parallel bodies" and "secret consultations and discussions" within a tendency—would sound more convincing and less hypocritical if the comrades of the IEC Minority faction (with whom the SWP PC is in close solidarity and association, although it is prevented by reactionary legislation from belonging to it) had acted differently from the manner in which they claim the IEC majority tendency to have acted. In that case we would have had a genuine difference on an organisational principle. This could have led to an interesting and constructive international discussion.

But the reality is that the IEC minority faction and with it the SWP leadership has been following precisely the same procedure that the SWP PC reproaches the IEC majority tendency for having followed. In light of this fact, the "accusations" made by the PC of the

SWP can only be interpreted as a claim for special privileges for one side—privileges that are at the same time hotly denied to the other side. Such organisational "principles" are inadmissible and can only disrupt the movement.

The SWP PC statement of July 4, 1974, says: "This (behavior of the IEC majority) contrasts sharply with the methods employed by the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction (LTF). The LTF was openly declared. Its membership, leadership structure, and limits of its discipline, were all openly stated" (IIB, No. 6 in 1974, p. 19).

Were they indeed? The only leadership of the IEC minority faction that has been "openly declared" is the list of members of its Steering Committee, parallel to the "openly declared" Steering Committee of the IEC Majority Tendency. But in addition to that "openly declared" Steering Committee, there are various other bodies functioning, bodies that, according to the logic of the SWP PC, should be branded and condemned as "secret bodies." According to the same logic, the fact that they don't even have formal names (at least, it would seem, formal names used in writing) makes them even more "conspiratorial" and "secret," and thereby more reprehensible and no less real and functional.

Prior, during and after *each and every* meeting of the United Secretariat, IEC minority section members of that body meet and consult each other. Various members of the IEC Minority Faction who are not members of the United Secretariat, and sometimes not even members of the IEC, are involved in these "secret" consultations. What is the nature of this "secret body"? What is its composition? The International has never been informed of this secret body—not the leadership of the International, and not its membership. Is it a "sub-bureau" of the IEC Minority Faction Steering Committee? Is it a "subfaction"? What is its undeclared political platform? What is its function? Is it to work out common lines, proposals, and votes for the meeting of the United Secretariat behind the back of that body? What terrible behavior! Is the IEC Minority Faction a "secret faction" with parallel leadership bodies? We of course never thought of raising such questions because we recognized that there was in the United Secretariat and in the International a minority that could not function without such meetings.

There is definite documentary evidence that the IEC Minority Faction has created a "faction center" to which correspondence is addressed. Never has the existence of this "center," its composition or its various functions been communicated to the leadership or the membership of the FI. According to the logic contained in the SWP PC statement of July 4, 1974, the IEC minority has thereby committed the deadly sin of creating a "secret center."

The IEC minority faction has been engaged in stepped-up international factional activity since the world congress (which is not very "normal" in the framework of democratic centralism, to say the least). This activity involves a great deal of travel and significant expense. We have convincing evidence that the trips are not being done by the members of the "publicly declared Steering Committee" of the IEC minority faction taken as a body. It is done by individuals, some of whom are not among

the members of that "publicly declared Steering Committee." Who selects these individuals? Who decides the allocation of funds? A full meeting of the "openly declared Steering Committee"? Does this body meet every day? Is there an intense correspondence and telephone network working day and night to decide about these grave matters of principle? Or has decision-making power in such matters been delegated to the "secret center," somebody that acts in practice like a day-to-day faction bureau? European supporters of the IEC minority faction have consulted each other on various occasions "behind the back of their respective sections and their normally elected leaderships," as one can easily substantiate from documentary evidence. What is the name of that "secret body" whose existence and composition has never been made known to the leadership of the International? Is it perhaps a "secret European sub-bureau" of the IEC minority faction?

Through the medium of the *Militant*, the members of the United Secretariat, including three associate editors of *Intercontinental Press*, learned accidentally that IP had decided to include Spanish-language material. Never had this measure—perhaps useful, perhaps constructive, perhaps of extreme importance for the building of the FI—been discussed or submitted to any leadership body of the FI. Who took that decision? The PC of the SWP? Since when is *Intercontinental Press* an organ of the SWP? Or is it the organ of the secret "faction center" of the IEC minority? Has IP become a faction organ? In addition to that decision, it was decided to transfer to the staff of IP several leading members of sections or sympathizing organizations of the FI, without any consultation or information to the United Secretariat. What secret body took these decisions, in open violation of article 32 of the statutes?

For four months the FI has been faced with a very grave political problem. One of its sympathizing organizations, the PST of Argentina, whose leaders are among the leading members of the IEC minority faction, is publicly on record as favoring the defense of the institutions of bourgeois democracy, that is, of a specific form of the bourgeois state in alliance with bourgeois parties against the allegedly immediate threat of fascist or right-wing dictatorship. This is a complete reversal of the fundamental programmatic position of revolutionary Marxism, the position that only a workers (or workers and peasants) united front can conduct an effective struggle against fascism and that any sort of confusion between the defense of democratic rights for the workers movement and defense of the institutions of the bourgeois state actually feeds the fascist onslaught.

Nowhere in the "openly declared" political documents of the IEC minority faction is there anything that could be interpreted as acceptance of such a revisionist position. It could therefore have been assumed that the IEC minority members of the United Secretariat would have immediately disassociated themselves from these positions. But they did not. They stalled for month after month, evaded any precise political position, tried to obstruct the United Secretariat from acting in defense of the principles and programmatic integrity of our movement which they are duty bound to uphold, and even went so far as to refuse to make their position on the

substantive matter involved in these discussions known to the leaders of the FI, not to mention the members of the FI. In the meantime, they were involved in frantic "secret" negotiations with the PST leadership, exchanging telephone calls and sending emissaries to and from Argentina, all "behind the back" of the elected leadership bodies of the FI, without giving the members of these bodies an opportunity to participate in these "secret" discussions.

Is this not the operation of a "secret faction" trying to patch up internal differences behind the back of the movement and subordinating the common interests of the Fourth International to the sordid goal of maintaining a common factional facade even on such a grave programmatic and principled issue and even in face of growing differences within the IEC minority faction on this matter?

Who took the decision to follow such a disastrous course? Was it the IEC minority faction's Steering Committee? When did that body's meeting on this issue take place? Why was this meeting and its agenda "hidden" from the normally elected leadership bodies of the FI? And if this decision was not taken by the "openly declared" IEC minority faction Steering Committee, what other person or persons, acting as a "secret faction administrative secretariat" or "political bureau" took it upon themselves to advocate and follow such an unprincipled course "behind the back of the elected leadership" of the FI?

The IEC minority faction's alleged "organizational principle" on matters of "parallel leadership bodies" is contradicted by its own practice. Likewise, the practice of the IEC minority faction in the matter of threatened splits in Trotskyist organizations is in crying contradiction to its alleged commitment to public discussion in the whole international as opposed to "internal faction discussion." There are at least four cases that testify to such behavior:

1. During the summer of 1972 a violent discussion on the question of "Canadian nationalism" erupted in that part of the Canadian section that later came to adhere to the IEC minority faction. As soon as he got wind of what looked like a very wrong political position being adopted by the majority of that grouping, a leading member of the future IEC minority faction took a plane to Canada, entered into closed discussions with the comrades involved, and achieved a reversal of political position leading to a change in leadership. This action led to the formation of the tendency led by Ross Dowson and to a struggle that ended in the split from the Canadian section of one of its acknowledged leaders for more than 20 years and of a substantial part of the section's oldest working-class cadre. Dowson was at the time a member of the IEC.

We can easily grant that the intentions of the IEC minority leadership involved in this operation were honorable. They wanted to defend the programmatic and organizational integrity of the FI in Canada. But the point they make in the case of the IT discussions obviously applies equally to the intervention in the LSA/LSO discussion by a leader of the IEC minority. At no time was the leadership of the FI, of which this comrade was a member, informed or consulted about this operation. At no time was the United Secretariat informed of the grav-

ity of the differences involved. At no time were we informed of the fact—already known to leaders of the IEC minority faction—that the Ross Dowson grouping had decided to vote for the IEC minority and against the IEC majority documents in the pre-world-congress debate (thereby influencing the outcome of the world congress) *while at the same time this grouping had already decided to split from the Canadian section and the FI and to set up a separate organization and a separate newspaper.*

Why did the leaders of the IEC minority faction hide this fact from the United Secretariat, the IEC, and the world congress? Why didn't they act as "responsible leaders" who "would have immediately placed before the elected bodies of the FI" the information they had of the split plans of the Ross Dowson tendency and "sought the aid of the leadership of the FI" in preventing the split? Because they placed the interests of their own faction above the interests of the FI, subordinating everything to the rather childish consideration of preventing IEC majority members from receiving additional ammunition in their attempts to go "dragon hunting in the North?"

2. In the autumn of 1972 a split took place in the GCI, the Mexican sympathizing section of the FI. This split was engineered by a youth tendency that was sympathetic to and later joined the IEC minority tendency (and later the IEC minority faction). There is substantial evidence of close consultation in the months and week preceding the split between the leaders of that youth tendency and leading North and South American associates of the IEC minority faction. At no time was the United Secretariat or any other leadership body of the International informed about these consultations and discussions; we were merely faced with the fait accompli of the split.

It is probable that during these consultations and discussions the North American associates of the IEC minority faction exercised a restraining influence, trying to avoid a split. It is less probable that the South American associates of that faction acted in the same way; indeed there is some evidence that they counseled and favored a split course. But independently of that, we note that the IEC minority leaders did not follow the course they now claim to be the course of "responsible leaders." They did not immediately place their information about the internal debates among IEC minority associates about the possibility of a split in Mexico before the elected bodies of the FI. They did not seek the aid of the GCI leadership and the FI leadership in preventing the split.

3. Barely two months after the Tenth World Congress comrade Tony Roberts, a leading member of the IEC minority faction who was elected to the IEC on the slate of that faction at the Tenth World Congress, decided to split from the IMG, British section of the Fourth International, and join a small grouping called the RCG. This split is all the more irresponsible in that this grouping had in fact opened unity negotiations with the IMG and comrade Roberts is busy poisoning their minds about alleged "violations of internal democracy" in the IMG.

The first thing the United Secretariat heard about the resignation of this member of the IMG was its receipt of his letter of resignation. It is difficult to believe that

the IEC minority faction had no prior information as to the plans of this comrade, especially in that his brother and close political cothinker for years remains a member of the IEC minority tendency inside the IMG. Yet at no time was the leadership of the IMG or the FI informed about the discussions in the IEC minority tendency inside the IMG that had preceded this resignation. (Likewise, neither the IMG nor FI leadership has ever been informed about a mysterious split followed by a no less mysterious reunification between the Roberts brothers and the other IMG supporters of the IEC minority faction some time previously.) At no time did the IEC minority faction apply to itself the rule of conduct that it now sets up as the guide to action of "responsible leaders." At no time did the IEC minority leadership bring its information to the leading bodies of the IMG and the FI and "seek the aid of these bodies" in preventing a split.

4. But the worst instance of all is the one relative to the split inside the SWP itself. There is now evidence that the leadership of the SWP had finally made up its mind to expel the IT at the time of the June 20, 1974, meeting of the SWP National Committee. (The expulsion is based almost exclusively on the evidence of internal IT documents that, according to the Political Committee, were obtained by the Control Commission in the two weeks prior to its July 2, 1974, report.) There is definite testimony that members of the IEC minority faction's Steering Committee living in Europe had been consulted on the advisability of these expulsions prior to the July 4, 1974, meeting of the SWP PC. The leadership of the IEC minority faction, as well as the SWP Political Committee, knew that a United Secretariat meeting was scheduled for July 3-4. Yet on this matter of the greatest importance for the unity of the world Trotskyist movement—the question of the unity of the SWP and the grave possible consequences of the expulsion of the IT—they preferred not to apply their alleged standards of how "responsible leaders" should behave. Their representatives and associates were present at that United Secretariat meeting. They hid the preparation of the intended expulsions from that body, not even putting the question on the agenda of the meeting. In no way did they "place immediately before the normally elected bodies of the FI" these grave threats to the unity of the world movement, nor did they seek the "aid of the leadership of the FI to prevent the split." On the contrary, they acted "secretly," "behind the back" of the leadership, informing only the factional grapevine, thus putting factional discipline above the interests of the elected leadership and the collective interests of the world movement.

In view of all this evidence, it is impossible to resist the conclusion that the leadership of the IEC minority faction wants to impose grave constraints on the right of the IEC majority tendency to function as a tendency, constraints that it does not recognize as applying to the functioning of its own faction. This is in accordance with the fact already denounced before the World Congress that the SWP leadership applies double standards—one for itself and another for the majority of the International. An international organization can never be built on the basis of double standards. This is why we reject outright all the accusations about the alleged "secret faction" operations of the IEC majority made in the

III

The claims of the SWP PC and the SWP Control Commission are summarized in the title given to Internal Information Bulletin No. 6 in 1974: "Materials Related to the Split of the Internationalist Tendency from the Socialist Workers Party." If this title is supposed to indicate what happened in the Socialist Workers Party in May, June, and July 1974, we are certainly dealing with one of the strangest notions in the already over-rich history of organizational disputes and splits in the workers movement and in revolutionary organizations. What the SWP Political Committee purports to call a "split" is a previously unheard of species: a split which had not taken place, until those who made it "discovered" an unknown party.

We are faced with the undeniable fact that the comrades of the IT most strongly deny ever having "split" or having had the intention of splitting from the SWP (see Statement by the IT). Regardless of whether these comrades have or have not committed breaches of discipline, no formalistic or talmudic mental gymnastics can warp the meaning of words to the point that a split (that is, the leaving of an organization) can be imputed to people who have never left the organization and who, in an internal memorandum issued July 1, two months after their alleged split, define their activities explicitly in the framework of the SWP and YSA and the respect of the discipline of these organizations.

In reality, what we are faced with is the *expulsion* of the IT from the SWP on the grounds that the IT set up a secret and tightly organized faction with its own discipline inside the SWP; that this faction has broken public discipline on several occasions; and that it has been systematically subordinating the discipline and interests of party building to the interests of its faction. Even if all these accusations were completely correct and substantiated by unassailable evidence, they would prove the existence of a *secret faction in the SWP and not the existence of a separate organization outside the SWP*. The question would then be one of judging whether the expulsion of that faction would be justified and under what conditions and through what procedures. The preposterous statement that the faction had itself "split" and set up a separate organization outside the SWP would still be out of order.

Furthermore, any Trotskyist leadership respecting the spirit and letter of democratic centralism would have been duty bound to communicate the proposal for expulsion to the members of the secret faction and to explain the charges on which the proposal was based. It would have been duty bound to give them the opportunity to defend themselves against these charges, as is clearly called for in articles 29h and 43 of the statutes of the FI, adopted at the Tenth World Congress. (Although the SWP is forbidden by reactionary legislation from becoming a section of the Fourth International, the definition of democratic centralism contained in these statutes accepted by the SWP at the 10th World Congress can be considered as having universal application to all Trotskyist organizations, irrespective of formal affiliation to the FI.)

The whole fanciful "split" of the "Internationalist Tendency party"—a party of which nobody has ever heard, a "party" that lacks a program, statutes, public statements, press organs, or even a name—is merely a convenient device used by the SWP leadership to avoid the burdensome procedure of granting members threatened with wholesale expulsion the elementary right to defend themselves, a right explicitly guaranteed by our statutes. This sets a grave precedent in the history of the Trotskyist movement, the champion of workers democracy and staunch defender of the fundamental difference between *democratic* centralism and *bureaucratic* centralism. One essential aspect of the difference is precisely the right guaranteed under democratic centralism to minorities to defend themselves against the charges and threatened disciplinary action by leaderships. This is a tradition of which we are proud, and we will defend and uphold it as a basic principle of the Trotskyist movement.

The SWP's IIB No. 6 in 1974 presents only two charges that relate to the IT functioning *outside* the SWP: that the IT collaborated with "opponent groups" outside the SWP and that one (we repeat, one) non-member of the SWP and YSA allegedly attended the IT national conference held May 25-27. The latter charge has been extensively refuted in the IT answer to the expulsion. As to the first accusation, it is clear that such collaboration behind the back of the leadership of a section of the FI, or of an organization like the SWP that is prevented by reactionary legislation from affiliating to the FI, would be inadmissible and violate democratic centralism. Since then, the members of these so-called opponent groups (28 people in 3 cities) have sent letters applying for membership in the SWP in which they clearly state their agreement with the program and policies of the FI and their resolution to recognize the leadership and organization of the SWP and abide by its discipline. The IT has stated that what actually happened was that some comrades of the IT came into contact with sympathizers of the FI with the perspective of recruiting them to the SWP. We think that the IT made a mistake in not fully and officially informing the SWP of these contacts until its letter of June 9. There is no doubt in our minds that certain comrades of the IT have behaved wrongly in respect to such contacts outside the SWP (be they extremely limited and marginal in character). However, under advice of the IEC majority tendency they showed their willingness to make a self-criticism on this point and corrected their course. (The SWP's harsh and unfraternal attitude toward them has not helped that process of correction, to say the least.) It appears to us completely unjustified to expel them on this very narrow charge.

It must again be pointed out that the comrades of the IEC minority faction, who take such an uncompromising attitude on the duties of minorities in the SWP, become rather more generous when it comes to evaluating the behavior of the adherents of their own faction in organizations in which they are a minority:

1. In Britain members of the IEC minority faction (including one leading member) took it upon themselves to maintain contacts with the RSL, a group that split from the Fourth International, and even to speak before an aggregate of this organization. Unlike the "opponent

groups" with which the IT is said to have associated, the RSL publicly and constantly attacks the Fourth International and its British section. These contacts occurred without previous consultation with the elected bodies of the FI or of the British section.

2. Leading comrades of the PST (a sympathizing organization of the Fourth International) who are at the same time leading members of the IEC minority faction, have been active for months, if not years, in contacting and working with various Bolivian persons and groupings behind the back of the Bolivian section and the United Secretariat. In fact, we found this out only when we read in *Avanzada Socialista* the brazen public assertion of this intrigue: a "greeting" sent to the congress of the PST by "revolutionary socialist Bolivians" outside the official section of the FI in Bolivia.

3. Comrade Hugo Blanco, a member of the United Secretariat and a leading member of the IEC minority faction, several times visited Portugal on behalf of his faction. There he contacted all sorts of individuals and grouplets, including a Lambertist one, without first asking the advice, opinion, or instruction of the United Secretariat or the leadership of the LCI, sympathizing organization of the FI in Portugal. To top it off, he granted a friendly interview to the weekly paper of the Lambertist organization in France, which is a bitter opponent of the FI and our French section and engages in constant slander against both.

Presumably, according to the standards laid down by the SWP PC, the comrades involved in these practices should now be expelled forthwith from the FI, as the IT has been expelled from the SWP. Or should we rather conclude again that the IEC minority faction claims more rights for its own adherents than it grants to adherents of the IEC minority tendency, and rights that trample on the norms of democratic centralism?

In the SWP's internal information bulletin accusations that, if proven, would constitute real breaches of discipline on the part of the IT are interwoven with allegations of such breaches of discipline that cannot be accepted as real. These fall into two categories:

First, statements and evaluations made during internal discussions of a tendency or faction about the nature and perspectives of the organization within which they function, and statements and evaluations about the nature and perspectives of the tendency or faction are construed as providing grounds for organizational reprisals. We would readily concur with the leadership of the SWP that some of the statements and evaluations in question made by individuals of the IT are of a highly irresponsible nature and could only increase to the utmost the suspicions the SWP leadership might have been harboring about the IT comrades. To speak of one's party as "completely degenerate" and its membership as "politically incapable of either understanding or putting into practice a revolutionary line," is utterly false. We note that the IT comrades have made an appropriate self-criticism in this regard, making it clear that they are prepared to accept the discipline of the SWP not for "tactical" reasons but because they are convinced as we are that today the building of the revolutionary party in the United States means the building of the SWP.

But it is alien to the traditions of Bolshevism and Trotskyism to discipline or expel comrades for opinions

expressed in internal discussion, however harsh and provocative these opinions may be. Indeed, not a single example can be cited from Lenin's party in which expulsions were carried out on such grounds, despite the fact that some of Lenin's factional opponents used language that was quite stronger than that used by the IT comrades (in 1918 for example, during the Brest-Litovsk discussion). To initiate organizational reprisals not for *acts* of indiscipline but for opinions *expressed* is to begin to strangle free internal discussion and debate. It leads logically to methods of internal witch-hunting, trying to discover the "secret" opinions of fork-tongued party members. This is not in conformity with the statutes of the FI nor with the definition of democratic centralism as we understand it and as it is explained in the programmatic and official documents of the FI. It can only poison the atmosphere in an organization and hinder frank and democratic tendency debate.

Second, it is alleged that the IT comrades have endowed themselves with a form of organization, internal financing, and discipline that goes far beyond that of an ideological tendency. In fact they formed a tightly knit faction and should have described themselves as such. They should have called their leading bodies faction organs and not "PC," etc. It is further alleged that the IT comrades have heavily concentrated their commitments in finances and press sales on either faction activities or activities in conformity with their tendency opinions (sales of FI organs like *Old Mole*, *INPRECOR*, and *International*). We would fully agree with any leading comrade who stated that all these attitudes are unhealthy and indicate the existence of a highly explosive factional atmosphere uncondusive to the defense of party unity and of the overall interests of party building. But we cannot accept that they are synonymous with public breaches of discipline. One could say that the responsibility of the SWP leadership—in which the IT was not represented—would have been to give guidance to the tendency in proposing to it meaningful fields of activity which wouldn't lead it into conflict with the interests of party building. And the very least one can say is that such a type of behavior was not *initiated* by the IT comrades. They were merely following the example set previously by comrades of the IEC minority faction, beginning with the British supporters of that faction.

Let us refresh the memory of the members of the SWP PC and the IEC minority faction leadership in this regard. Without asking either the advice or permission of the IMG or the U.SEC, Comrade Adair at the time a member of the U.Sec and of the NC of the IMG, took it upon himself to become a full-time "sales agent" of *Pathfinder Press* in Britain, concentrating on the circulation of *Intercontinental Press*. *Intercontinental Press* is supposed to be an organ of the International. But without any consultation with the International's leading bodies, and without any decision being made by them, funds were made available (by whom?) for setting up a public *Pathfinder Press* center in London (and later in Nottingham as well), premises were hired, up to six additional full- and part-timers were apparently employed. The entire group of supporters of the IEC minority faction in the IMG became organized around these activities, selling only *Intercontinental Press* at public activities of the

IMG and public activities of the International, going so far as to appear wearing recognition badges on which were printed "Intercontinental Press."

At no time had the IMG or the United Secretariat decided that members of the IMG should devote their exclusive public activity for a period of several years to the sale of Intercontinental Press instead of to sales of the official organs of the British section. At no time were the supporters in the IMG of the IEC minority faction granted permission to behave in this way. At no time did they even request such permission. They simply went ahead and did it, neglecting their general financial, party-building, and party-defending activities toward the IMG, at least to the same extent as the IT comrades are accused of having done in the SWP.

Yet when these comrades were mildly challenged by the IMG leadership for this obviously abnormal behavior — not expelled or even suspended, just mildly challenged and, in one case, censured — the entire IEC minority faction (then tendency) was up in arms. How can anyone dare to try to prevent comrade Harris from "making a living" through the sale of Intercontinental Press and Pathfinder literature? How can anyone dare censure (not expel or suspend, just censure) a minority comrade for "breaches of discipline" without due process of law, without first presenting him with written charges, without granting him every right to defend himself? The Political Committee of the SWP even voted a resolution condemning the IMG for such an "abuse of authority." But in the SWP and YSA more than 100 comrades are being expelled for similar, if not much milder, acts of a factional character without any possibility of being confronted with written charges, without any possibility of defending themselves against charges whose nature they learned only after they had already been expelled. Should this not also be considered an "abuse of authority"?

Once again the conclusion is unavoidable: The IEC minority faction claims for itself and its supporters privileges that it refuses to grant to the majority of the members and supporters of the FI. Such an "organizational principle" is inadmissible. No international organization will ever be built in a durable manner on such a weak foundation. We cannot in any way accept such a principle. The same rules must and shall apply to everyone in the world Trotskyist movement.

We repeat: The method of factional selection of public activities and priorities and of financial commitments, first started by the supporters of the IEC minority faction within the IMG and now repeated by other groupings, including the IT in the SWP, is highly irregular and abnormal. We cannot support or condone it as correct behavior. But when such actions occur, they testify to the existence of a tense factional situation that in turn cannot be alleviated by organizational reprisals. Organizational reprisals can only exacerbate the factional situation and increase the risk of a split. That is why we did not approve of the sanctions taken against the supporters of the IEC minority faction in the IMG, even though they had given the leadership grounds for those sanctions. This is why we advised the leadership of the IMG to give supporters of the IEC minority faction meaningful areas of public activity with which they could easily [word or sentences missing; in an earlier draft this

phrase ends with "agree"]. Since the fact finding commission report, the IMG has complied with these recommendations. The SWP, however, has followed a completely different course. The SWP leadership refused to give the IT any representation on the NC. This was protested by comrade Livio Maitan, the representative of the United Secretariat to the August 1973 SWP convention. In addition, the IT has extensively documented in its letters of October 29, 1973, and June 9, 1974, other outstanding factional acts by the leadership of the SWP, such as factional exclusion from assignments and a factional recruitment policy.

Comrade Diego, a vigorous spokesman for the IEC minority faction and a staunch defender of the SWP leadership, had the following to say about the dispute in the IMG that led to the United Secretariat's setting up a fact finding commission:

"The documents of the IMG are full of references to the principles of 'democratic centralism.' This is not some abstract concept that more often than not is saluted in a ritualistic way. It involves a scrupulous regard for the democratic rights of the ranks. The IMG leadership is fond of repeating that it is the right of the majority to rule, and that is certainly true. But to have the right to rule. . . means to have in the eyes of the ranks a moral authority. This in turn reflects a mutual confidence. This does not exist in the IMG. The moral authority of the present leadership is seriously compromised. . . . Take for example, the behavior of the Scottish comrades. A 'smash the tendency' campaign. . . was decided upon in London and several plenipotentiaries ticked off to travel there and do the job. And when the members of the tendency resisted, they were entrapped and chopped."

Remarkable analysis indeed! We only wonder whether comrade Diego is prepared to apply it to the SWP as well. What moral authority could the SWP leadership have had in the eyes of the IT after the "war speeches" delivered at the August 1973 convention, which voted to place "all the resources" of the SWP at the disposal of a fight for the platform of a faction with which the IT comrades strongly disagreed? What moral authority could it have had in the eyes of the IT when the IT was publicly warned that it would be smashed if it did not capitulate? What "scrupulous regard for the democratic rights of the ranks" is manifested in the July 4, 1974 expulsions?

It is high time to remind the comrades of the SWP leadership that our movement originated with the "New Course," when in the Political Bureau of the Soviet CP a motion was presented ordering members of this party to inform the leading bodies and the GPU of secret groups or factions existing in this party. In a letter to the CC and the Central Control Commission, of October 8, 1923, Trotsky opposed this demand for police measures, urging the leading bodies of the party to seek first for the conditions that had brought members of the party not to express openly their views or to organize secret groups for discussion inside the Bolshevik party at that time. Let us read what he wrote at that time on the question:

"The existence of a left communist faction (at the time of the Brest-Litovsk peace debates) represented an extreme danger for the unity of the party. It would not have been

difficult to bring about a split then, and it would not have called for. . . a great effort on behalf of the leadership: It would have been sufficient to issue an order forbidding the left faction to exist. However, the party adopted more complex methods; it preferred to discuss, to explain, to prove by experience, and to resign itself temporarily to this threatening anomaly which was the existence of an organized faction in its midst." (The New Course)

This was Trotsky's opinion at the very origin of our movement. This has also been the line of conduct adopted by the IEC majority tendency and the leadership of the Fourth International ever since the beginning of the current dispute in the FI. It is highly advisable that all leaderships of national sections and sympathizing organizations, like the SWP, including the leadership of the SWP, conduct themselves in the same way. It is for that reason—to defend the unity and integrity of the Fourth International as an organization—that we cannot accept the proposal of the SWP PC to hold a special world congress of the FI. We urge all IEC members and all sections and sympathizing organizations to reject the proposal.

The world congress is the highest body of our movement. Its task is to decide a political line and elect leading bodies for implementing this line. Organizational conflicts of the type raised by the SWP leadership are cleared up by control commissions, which have the power and the means to investigate accusations and grievances of all kinds. Members of our movement all over the continents can through proper debates take political positions with validity on the orientation of the movement as a whole or even in some parts of the world. They have no means to check any and sundry accusations against this or that comrade or groups of comrades. This can be done only by a control commission, in the present case by the control commission elected by the Tenth World Congress, which will report to the IEC and to the next world congress.

Already before the Tenth World Congress we refused to follow the SWP leadership when it tried to replace political debates with organizational disputes and accusations. We avoided this danger of a "free for all" battle on questions which did not deal with the political problems. If we would accept today the SWP leadership's proposal for a special world congress held about the morality or immorality, not the politics, of the majority members of the international leadership, that sort of free for all battle would erupt. The dynamics of such a free for all are obvious: They are the dynamics of a split. The assertion of the SWP PC that a special world congress held on such issues would "avert the dangers to the international arising from the actions of the IMT" is not a serious prediction made by responsible leaders. It is an irresponsible factional maneuver threatening to set in motion a most dangerous chain reaction. Anyone with even a minimum of experience in tendency struggles knows that such a "special congress" could well result in a split in the Fourth International. The congress itself could even be the occasion for a split.

But another, and graver, matter is involved in the call by the SWP leadership for an extraordinary world

congress on such matters. Prior to the Tenth World Congress, the International went through an intense political debate on a world scale. The debate lasted for fifteen months and involved the publication of 150 discussion articles. It led to innumerable membership aggregates and local, regional, and national conferences at which all the issues were debated. This process ended with the world congress, which, after a democratic discussion held on the basis of membership election of delegates and political differentiation in strict proportion to the strength of the contending tendencies, voted on documents and elected a leadership by majority vote. To call for a special world congress on the basis of an organizational dispute only a few months after that congress would mean in effect to attempt to overturn the decisions of the Tenth World Congress, to try to overthrow the normally elected leadership of the International. It is an attempt to utilize organizational grievances and "horror stories" to nullify a political verdict based on a political judgment made by the ranks of the world movement. This verdict can be challenged only after experience allows the correctness or incorrectness of the decisions of the world congress to be judged, that is, after the elected leadership has had time to apply its line in practice. The attempt to nullify the decisions of the Tenth World Congress is a violation of the basic rules of democratic centralism: that after a decision is made by a majority at a democratically convened and organized world congress, the minority must collaborate loyally with the application of the majority line before it wins the right through this loyal behavior to challenge that line and leadership again.

To accept the convening of a special world congress under these circumstances would mean in reality to declare null the decisions of the Tenth World Congress, to prepare a new congress not only on nonpolitical matters, but also on a new parity basis. That would mean the transformation of the FI *as an organization* based on democratic centralism into a loose federation of factions, tendencies, and sections that "collaborate" with each other when they agree and refuse to collaborate whenever disagreements appear. This would be a denial of everything Trotsky stood for and fought for after he recognized the final degeneration of the Comintern in 1933. It would be a denial of the very statutes that were adopted unanimously at the Tenth World Congress.

The call for a special world congress just a few months after the Tenth World Congress is all the more ominous in that it comes on the heels of a whole series of actions by the IEC minority faction that seriously place a question mark over its willingness to behave in a disciplined and loyal manner after that congress, despite the fact that it enjoyed and still enjoys full and even exceptional minority rights.

It comes after the refusal of the IEC minority faction to send its main leaders to the United Secretariat and the administrative bureau, to share responsibility for the day-to-day leadership of the International and the application of the world congress decisions, as is its normal duty. This refusal came just twenty-four hours after the conclusion of the congress in flagrant contradiction to the

solemn promises made by the IEC minority faction at the end of the congress. It was based on the flimsiest of pretexts: the fact that the IEC majority tendency, which holds 60% of the posts in the IEC, was granted 66% of the seats on the United Secretariat. The IEC minority faction utilized this pretext, despite the IEC majority's statement that it was perfectly willing to revise that figure on the basis of serious and responsible counterproposals for a more effective functioning of the leading bodies of the International.

It comes after the decision of the IFC minority faction to maintain its faction and continue the faction fight after the World Congress, which is highly abnormal and in contradiction to the spirit, if not the letter, of democratic centralism, and is again in contradiction to the solemn promises made by representatives of the IEC minority faction at the end of the congress.

It comes after the stopping by the sections led by the IEC minority faction of all payments of dues to the international leadership. All sections and sympathizing organizations led by supporters of the IEC minority faction—with the single exception of the New Zealand section—have taken this step.

It comes after a substantial reduction of the overall financial support to the International that can be credited in any objective way to these sections and sympathizing organizations. This reduction is out of all proportion to the fraction of the membership of the international that the minority claims to represent, as reflected in the mandates credited to the IFC minority faction at its own demand during the Tenth World Congress.

When the call for a special world congress and the proposal to overturn or modify the leadership that was democratically elected at the Tenth World Congress after the longest and most democratic discussion period in the history of our movement comes after all these previous acts and is seen in that specific context, it can only demonstrate to the leaders, cadres, and members of the FI that the IEC minority faction wants to shirk its responsibilities after having fully enjoyed all its rights. This again is utterly intolerable. After the Tenth World Congress, sections and sympathizing organizations have to concentrate on public activity and not internal debates. They have to shift resources from internal discussion to party-building activities. They have to collaborate *unanimously*, regardless of political differences on the application of world congress decisions. They have to support the international leadership in that respect and collaborate with it loyally. After a congress, a loyal minority does not clamor for "rights," such as the "right to agitate for a special world congress;" it carries out its duties. That is what democratic centralism means. We shall uphold this principle in order to defend the unity and integrity of the world Trotskyist movement.

Every single step that has been undertaken up to now to escalate the internal dispute in the FI has been undertaken by the IEC minority. It was the IEC minority that first set up a tendency instead of keeping the discussion open and uncrystallized. It was the IEC minority that transformed its tendency into a faction. It was the IEC minority that challenged the representative character of the then upcoming Tenth World Congress and the democratic character of the pre-congress discussion, retreating step by step until it had to acknowledge the validity

of the 10th World Congress at its conclusion. It was the IEC minority that shirked its duty of loyally applying world congress decisions, of loyally collaborating and participating with the democratically elected leadership—using all sorts of pretexts and gimmicks to justify their behavior, the call for a special world congress being only the latest in a long series. And it is the co-thinkers of this IEC minority faction that have now topped this escalation with a wholesale expulsion from the SWP and YSA of around 130 supporters of the IEC majority tendency's political line and platform, thereby creating a grave threat to the unity of the world Trotskyist movement since the current dispute arose.

The IEC minority faction and its cothinkers have made a habit of accusing others of harboring split intentions. This is the axis of the July 4, 1974, statement of the SWP PC, just as it was the axis of numerous interventions before and during the Tenth World Congress. The IEC majority tendency, in part or in toto, was accused of plotting the expulsion of the PST, the expulsion of the LSA/LSO, the expulsion of the IEC minority supporters in the IMG. But the evidence is now crystal clear. *No section or sympathizing organization led by supporters of the IEC minority has been expelled, and no supporters of the IEC minority has been expelled from any section or sympathizing organisation led by supporters of the IEC majority. But one of the main ideological components of the IEC minority has now gone over to wholesale expulsion of its ideological opponents.* This unassailable fact is more eloquent than one hundred and forty-six pages of gossips, unsubstantiated or contestable allegations, and "working hypotheses" about "intentions" that have not been proved and cannot be proved. It places the responsibility for the grave and dangerous increase of tensions within the world Trotskyist movement squarely on the shoulders of the leadership of the minority faction and of the SWP leadership.

The United Secretariat has up to now answered these acts of escalation with restraint and moderation. It will continue to do so. It is convinced that the defense of the unity of the International on the grounds of principle is part and parcel of the defense of our program, of the struggle for the successful building of a new revolutionary leadership of the world proletariat. The record shows that avoiding factional traps and reprisals, maintaining strictly principled attitude and defending organisational rules and regulations that must be commonly applied to all sections and members of the movement helps to strengthen the political views of those who are correct and to expose the errors of those who uphold an incorrect political line. This has been proven on more than one occasion in the past and it will be confirmed in the future.

Only tendencies or factions acting under the pressure of alien class influences could willfully provoke a split in the Fourth International today. A split would be totally unjustified given the existing political differences. We therefore call upon sections, sympathizing organizations, cadres, and members of the FI irrespective of tendency or faction affiliations to unite in a common struggle to take advantage of the constantly growing opportunities for party building in most countries and on an international scale.

We call upon them to reject the maneuver of a "special world congress," which is intended to deviously undo

what was openly, normally, and democratically done at the tenth world congress. We call upon them to oppose that maneuver along the following lines:

— *For the defense of international democratic centralism.* After the tenth world congress the duty of the IEC minority is to loyally apply the world congress decisions and to collaborate with the international leadership in doing so to the best of its ability.

— *For the defense of democratic centralism nationally.* The duty of any minority of a national organization is to loyally apply party discipline and subordinate factional interests and calculations to party building under the leadership of the section or sympathizing organization. The duty of any national leadership is to respect the full rights of any minority.

— *For defense of the unity of the IVth International.* No expulsions or organizational reprisals against members of minorities for expression of opinions inside the movement. All comrades of the IT, after acknowledging

and recognising the discipline of the SWP, should be re-integrated immediately and collectively into the SWP as a faction or tendency with full rights. The International faction fight should be halted until the next pre-world-congress discussion is opened.

The dangerous drift toward an international split, which we tried to reverse at the tenth world congress can be definitively reversed only by applying all these principles *together and simultaneously.* Then all our efforts can be concentrated on what is our number one duty and responsibility under the present conditions of the growing crisis of world capitalism and the bureaucracies in the workers states, of the rising tide of world revolution: *the building of the Fourth International through increased and coordinated intervention in the international class struggle and the revolutionary mass struggle.*

September 7, 1974

The Myth of the 'IT Split'—Purge Politics of the LTF

[The following statement was given to members of the United Secretariat at the meeting of September 7-8. It was signed by "the Internationalist Tendency of the Socialist Workers Party."]

On July 5, 1974, members of the Internationalist Tendency in both the SWP and YSA were given hand-delivered letters from the SWP Political Committee and YSA National Executive Committee respectively. These letters, in virtually identical terms, informed members of the IT that the Tendency was a "rival party" and that because of their adherence to the "Internationalist Tendency Party" they had placed themselves outside of the SWP and YSA. The letters concluded that SWP branches and YSA locals had been instructed to remove "all known members" of the IT from their rolls.

These expulsions had no real precedent in the Trotskyist movement. The comrades of the IT were given no opportunity to defend themselves, to answer accusations, or to correct the falsifications, innuendos, and slanders which permeate the document "Materials Related to the Split of the Internationalist Tendency from the Socialist Workers Party." So hurried were the expulsions that the lists of expelled comrades contained serious inaccuracies. (Comrade Sandy H., for example, was included although she had resigned from the IT; Don S., Ed H., and Polly C., had resigned from both the IT and the IMT in general. Comrades Mike T. and Lauren C., who had received *none* of the IT newsletters or internal bulletins cited in the SWP document and taken part in none of the "disciplinary violations" reported, were nonetheless expelled as well.)

The precipitous nature of the expulsions was implicitly recognized in the Report of the SWP Control Commission, issued on 2 July. The Commission stated, "We decided that this evidence was so overwhelming that it was not necessary to spend a great deal of time to examine many of the specific incidents, allegations, and counter-allegations." (Materials. . ., pp. 5-6.) It was apparently also considered unnecessary to allow the IT to respond to the "incidents, allegations, and counter-allegations" contained in the Control Commission report although Comrade Bill M. was told at the SWP Plenum in June to be prepared to answer questions from the Control Commission "within three weeks," neither he nor any other member of the IT was ever contacted or questioned.

The expulsion of the members of the IT—an expulsion which included a large number of comrades who had been in the SWP and YSA for years and involved two members of the International Executive Committee, three members

of the YSA National Committee, members of branch and local executive committees, all or most of four YSA locals—marks a qualitative change in the history of the SWP and YSA's organizational norms. During the past period, the SWP's internal life has displayed increasing tendencies toward making monolithic agreement a basic party norm; this has been reflected in the conception of inner-party democracy and the rights and responsibilities of minorities. Beginning with the August 1973 Convention of the SWP, a declaration of war was issued by Cde. Jack Barnes, National Secretary of the SWP, against the International Majority Tendency and its supporters in the SWP, the Internationalist Tendency. Cde Barnes enunciated a policy for the Socialist Workers Party (it is important to realize that Barnes meant the Party and not the faction of the Party to which he belonged. In this sense the SWP became the LTF and those who did not belong to the faction did not really belong to the Party) putting it on a war footing and placing all the resources of the Party (including finances) at the disposal of the war needs. Part of the war plans included provisions against fraternization with the enemy—the IT. In another respect the members of the IT were to be treated as prisoners of war whose rights were not to be those of full members of the Party but rather those which coincided with the diplomatic necessities of the International Minority. This atmosphere consciously engendered and militarily carried out by the SWP leadership has been the single most important factor leading towards the expulsion of the IT in July of this year. It is not our purpose here to analyze the causes and extent of this process of impoverishment of inner party life, but merely to point out the step which the expulsion of the IT represents. In the case of previous minorities which were expelled, the party assumed full responsibility for determining the political or organizational incompatibility of these groups with the party. This decision was formalized in expulsion proceedings which allowed the minority to present its point of view to the ranks of the party so that the basis of the decision could be verified by the party as a whole. Thus, when members of the Spartacist League were discovered in the YSA, they were not simply taken off the books on command from the leadership, but were expelled with a trial. Even most recently, in the case of Gerry Clark of the Revolutionary Internationalist Tendency (RIT), who was accused of attending a Spartacist summer school—although he was able to conclusively demonstrate that he was at work at the time—the party felt compelled to hold a formal trial before proceeding with the expulsion. But in the case of the Internationalist Tendency—

whose loyalty to the Fourth International has been questioned by no one—all norms of party democracy have been thrown out. The leadership simply announced that the IT had "split" (despite its denials) and ordered the branches to take the comrades in the IT off the membership rolls! (The YSA promptly followed suit.) Such a procedure is not in the Trotskyist tradition; it is rather a standard procedure followed by the Stalinist parties to expel minorities without allowing the ranks to hear their case. It is commonly known as a PURGE.

These expulsions are not a normal disciplinary action, nor the recognition of a "split" by a mythical "IT Party," but a *purge* of dissidents, of supporters of the IMT inside the SWP and YSA (including several not a part of the IT). The explanation for this purge, its timing, and the manner in which it was carried out, can only be found in the escalation of the LTF's factional war inside the international as the pressures of the class struggle on a worldwide scale impose further disassociations by the LTF from the FI and its sections.

It is necessary we feel to readily admit that the IT considers that it made certain errors in relation to its conduct over this past period. They fall mainly into the following categories:

1. We recognize that we were incorrect in not fully informing the SWP leadership of the attempts of various supporters of the IT to recruit members of the Socialist Union of Los Angeles, the Revolutionary Marxist Collective of Berkeley-San Francisco, and the Baltimore Marxist Group of Baltimore, to the Socialist Workers Party. This error was committed largely on the basis of the fact that contacts of the IT have generally been discriminated against by the SWP and YSA leadership because they are contacts of the IT. Nonetheless we do recognize it as an error on our part not to have given full and complete information of our attempts to convince these supporters of the Fourth International to join the Socialist Workers Party to the Party leadership prior to our letter of June 9, 1974, which did provide such information. It must also be recalled in this regard that we had informed both the SWP leadership and the United Secretariat of our opposition to the factional recruitment policies being exercised by the SWP leadership toward groups such as the Socialist Union in our letter of October 29, 1973, in which we requested an International Control Commission inquiry into this as well as other facets of the factional warfare of the SWP leadership against the IT.

2. We also feel that the self designation of the IT as a Tendency rather than a Faction was confusing at least in light of the reality of things. While the designation of Tendency was correct at its inception, after the declaration of war by Cde Barnes and the formation of the SWP into a faction it was no longer possible nor feasible to remain a tendency inside of a faction if the IT was to survive.

The undemocratic nature of the SWP leadership reflected in their refusal to finance travel by minorities of the Party while at the same time placing all of the Party's resources at the disposal of the LTF is a case in point. This refusal to finance travel costs which in the United States can be quite high due to the size of the

country, included the refusal to subsidize the travel costs of comrades of the IMT who toured the SWP and YSA branches prior to the World Congress giving the political positions of the IMT. This necessitated that the IT be self-financed. The Party leadership was informed of these factors.

The use of the Party and the YSA apparatus for the needs of the LTF was countered by the IT in its use of two full-time cadre to carry out its responsibilities. Likewise, in order to assure a democratic functioning of the Tendency, leadership bodies were elected by the Tendency as a whole. Similarly we felt it necessary to carry out internal discussions in order to better prepare ourselves for the political responsibilities we had as members of the FI, the SWP, and YSA. In retrospect we can say, without giving any credence to the ludicrous charges of "secret factions" that it would have been more appropriate to have designated ourselves as a faction rather than a tendency.

The exercise of the right to hold internal discussions among ourselves would have been more understandable, as well as the circulation of internal bulletins and a regular newsletter. The IT did inform the Party leadership of its financial policy, of the designation of a national coordinator and of the holding of its national conference in May 1974. However, none of these facts were ever a secret to the leadership of the SWP and YSA in that these leaderships employ "special methods" that give them all the internal documents of minority tendencies or factions.

The designation of the IT as a faction would have also clarified the purpose of our leading bodies, i.e. the IT Political Committee and the IT steering committee. These would have been more clearly seen for what they were, faction bodies in opposition to the majority faction of the SWP and not the Party itself. (Since the leadership of the Party constituted the Party itself as being at the disposal of their faction this adds to the confusion in this situation). From hindsight the use of the term "IT Political Committee" was a mistake and should have been replaced by a term such as "IT Coordinating Committee." However we are quite confident that this would have been titled a "secret political committee" by the LTF.

3. We wish to make it quite clear that we recognize a number of political mistakes made in contributions to our internal discussion. These are not simply matters of formulation but of political appreciation and judgment. Statements which implicitly or explicitly characterize the Socialist Workers Party as "degenerated" or as having become a sect are absolutely wrong.

It must be pointed out that these characterizations were made by individuals and never adopted by the Tendency as a whole. In fact the characterization of the SWP as a "sect" was explicitly rejected by the IT conference, including the author of the characterization. We make no excuse for these errors in politics as in other sciences precision is the basic necessity.

The internal discussions of the IT were of value in that operating as we were in the highly undemocratic environs of the SWP/LTF, subjective reactions very often could substitute for political wisdom. Thanks to these discussions and the firm but patient advice of the IMT leadership, the IT was able to overcome the dangers that could have

led to a split mentality and actions which would then flow from such a mentality. This was the real outcome of the May IT conference and not the absurd fantasy created by the SWP leadership to justify its purge of the IT and to further its factional war against the leadership of the International.

The Expulsions in Light of the International Situation

Since the Tenth World Congress, the groups within the Fourth International supporting the Leninist Trotskyist Faction have stepped up their campaign against both the sections and sympathizing organizations of the FI which support the International Majority Tendency, and against the leadership bodies of the Fourth International itself.

This stepped-up attack has taken a number of forms: Joe Hansen's characterization of the FI leadership as "petty-bourgeois"; the refusal by LTF-dominated sections and sympathizing organizations that are not prevented by reactionary legislation from doing so to pay international dues (or to contribute one penny to international campaigns, such as support for the Portuguese LCI); the public attacks on the Front Communiste Revolutionnaire, French section of the Fourth International for supporting Mitterrand on the second ballot of the recent French elections (the culmination being an attack by Art Young of the LSA/LSO before a large audience containing a number of opponents); the attacks on the LCR/ETA(VI), Spanish sympathizing organization of the FI, as non-Marxist (and lately the claim that it is implementing a terrorist line), etc.

The major crisis for the LTF, however, has been the class-collaboration of the Argentine Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores (PST). The support given by Coral and Moreno to the statement of bourgeois parties in defense of the existing bourgeois institutions is the logical end-product of a process which originated in the PST's legalistic electoral fetishism and gathered strength with its call for the restoration of Obregon Cano, bourgeois governor of Cordoba Province. The SWP at first attempted to cover up for the PST (the numerical backbone of the LTF) by stating that it lacked "sufficient information"; when this information became available, the SWP moved to arguing that the PST did not *really* sign the statement and that it had made a "self-criticism." The flimsiness of this excuse became apparent when the text of the "self-criticism" became available with its explicit *defense* of signing such pacts with bourgeois parties in times of crisis. (The PST presently explains that it does not support the Peronist government, but merely the institutions! And this at a time when these same institutions are being used to organize a massive onslaught against the Argentine working class and its organizations.)

The SWP wing of the LTF was faced with a choice: to join with the IMT in condemning this policy and attempting to save the name of the International among the Argentine working class (which would have meant the demise of the factional bloc assembled by the SWP and PST leaderships prior to the 10th World Congress), or to place factional consideration above the needs of the class struggle, above the needs of the International, above the responsibility of educating the cadre of the

world party against such class collaborationist and treacherous activity. Unfortunately, the SWP LTF leadership attempted to cover up the facts, to rationalize these class collaborationist practices, and to divert attention from the situation of the Fourth International in Argentina.

In the short run, the response of the SWP leadership was a clever factional maneuver. If they could not extricate themselves from the PST mess, they could adroitly focus attention elsewhere. The expulsion of the Internationalist Tendency (a component part of the International Majority Tendency) for "forming a rival party" would not only serve as a good pretext for continuing the factional hysteria in the SWP and YSA (and cover up the increased isolation of both organizations in the past period), but it could serve as a focus for a counterattack against the whole leadership of the FI, which had encouraged the lunatic "IT splitters." It was to be 1953 all over again, with Massey and Barzman substituting for Clark and Cochran and Mandel for Pablo. At the very least, such a strategy would serve to divert attention away from the PST and force the IMT to defend itself against a series of attacks from the LTF. It was in this context that the expulsions took place.

The "Split"

The central allegation of the "Materials. . ." document is that at the May Conference the IT "split" from the YSA and SWP. The SWP Political Committee charges in their document that: "Systematically prepared in the period beginning immediately after the last World Congress, the split was consummated at the May 25-27 national convention of the Internationalist Tendency held in Chicago." (p. 18) As a result, the Control Commission argues, the IT "is a separate, rival party to the SWP." (p. 13)

This charge is a lie.

The Control Commission makes much of a document submitted by Carapace, et al. Yet the Report on the IT Conference included in the SWP document makes it clear that this document was never submitted to a vote. Nor was the Rico document, also stressed in the SWP report. They refer to a document entitled "Unless We Believe the SWP to be Reformable. . ." without pointing out that the conference record indicates this document, out of 24 full and 10 consultative delegates, received only two votes. They quote the Rahdnick-Estreugal Amendments at every opportunity; yet the Conference report shows that these amendments were *rejected*.

The actual records of the conference indicate the opposite of the SWP charge. The YSA Report by Inessa, for example, makes it clear that the IT orientation toward the YSA was that of a serious, functioning tendency. The quotations from the Hank Williams document quoted in "Materials. . ." stress the need to be involved in the "day to day work" of the YSA and note that "All sectarian practices toward the cadre of the party and YSA must become a thing of the past." The Conference Report quotes Hank Williams (Bill Massey), IT Coordinator, as making the following, unambiguous statement: "We need a major orientation to the YSA; we must fight to have the IMT push the democratization of the SWP, we *are against any split in the SWP and must fight the LTF on this question.*" (p. 38)

Other material which the SWP Document did not choose to reprint, makes this even more clear. The IT Emergency Newsletter of 6-27-74 dealt with the SWP Control Commission investigation. It stated that the Commission was "first of all a factional act to further intimidate, demoralize, and isolate members of the IT in the Party and YSA. *It is meant to cut across any attempt by us to function as real members of the Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance.* It is also meant to provoke our ranks into such demoralization that they will take actions that would make it easy for the leadership to repress us even more and if they got their wishes, *expel us or better still have us leave the Party and YSA.*" (Emphasis added, see Appendix No. 1) This hardly sounds like a group which has already split, nor does the statement in the same article—made, it should be noted, by the leadership of the IT to the IT ranks in an internal document—that, once the SWP stated concretely the aims and scope of the Control Commission investigation, that "we will be happy to comply—that being in the best interests of the party. . ."

This is further stressed in the "Memorandum on the IMT Tour," proposed by a comrade from the IMT and *unanimously approved* by the IT Political Committee on 7-1-74 (ironically, the day before the expulsions were recommended). The statement is highly critical of the SWP; our views on the SWP were and are hardly a secret, however. The Memorandum stresses that the goal of the IT is "the constitution of a national tendency in the SWP and especially in the YSA"; it cites in this context the task of fighting for the "recognition of the rights of members of the IT to speak and act as disciplined members of the FI. . ." It calls for "an effort to politically recruit to the FI and organizationally recruit to the SWP on the basis of agreement of activists (isolated or in groups) with the program of the Fourth International and its Tenth World Congress, and of their respecting the discipline of the SWP and YSA and of their commitment to behave as active militants." (Emphasis added) The statement concludes that the errors of the SWP leadership are not to be underestimated and are part of a consistent opportunist and sectarian trend, but "the membership of the SWP in the FI—for whatever reasons—is a factor which hinders the fullest expression of these trends to an extent which would necessitate a split." Unless the SWP grants that it is planning a split from the FI, this would seem to be the opposite of a commitment to a split from the SWP and YSA, much less recognition of a split which has *already* occurred.

Thus, the May IT conference did *not* decide upon a split on either organizational or political grounds. On the contrary, the IT oriented itself purposefully toward its functioning as a serious tendency within the SWP and YSA. At a time when the Argentine situation is a living confirmation of the bankruptcy of the LTF line, and at a time when it is increasingly apparent that the SWP's "new radicalization" perspectives in the USA must be replaced, it is clear that one of the major considerations for purging the IT was precisely the fear that the orientation of the IT as a serious tendency in the SWP and YSA would effectively begin to win comrades away from

the LTF.

The SWP Document then goes on to hint that the mere act of *holding* the IT Conference was in itself grounds for expulsion. If so, it is difficult to understand why the point was not made until July; in the intervening period, the IT was not informed that it had "placed itself outside" the SWP and YSA at any time, *even though the SWP leadership had been notified of the holding of the conference and had acknowledged receipt of this notification.*

The question of whether the IT organizational structure itself constitutes an "illegal" counter-party is raised several times in the "Materials. . ." document; it must therefore be examined.

The IT Organizational Structure

The "Materials. . ." document focuses attention upon the organizational structure of the IT. At one point it states that "The IT's description of its own structure and method of functioning clearly indicates that it is already a separate party." It goes on to point out that the IT held a national conference, has a National Steering Committee and a Political Committee, a 10 person YSA Commission, etc. (pp. 6-7) It concludes later that the "IT has its own highly organized and centralized independent party structure functioning on all levels." (p. 13)

It is difficult to know what to make of such a charge, especially in view of the fact that the Control Commission itself acknowledges reluctantly that "a faction has the right to meet privately and determine its own structure. . ." (p. 8) The charge in this section is not that the IT had its own structures, but rather that it did not *inform* the party "as a whole" about these structures; all the rambling about the IT Steering Committee, the YSA Commission, etc., is therefore totally beside the point.

It is necessary to examine for a moment the "secret party" which the IT supposedly constitutes. The SWP is divided into branches, the YSA into locals; "local tendency" organizations are obviously made up of all IT supporters in every local area. These IT comrades have *in every case* functioned openly as members of the Internationalist Tendency.

The IT exists *nationally* within the SWP and YSA, however (as well, of course, as internationally as a fraternal body of the IMT); it therefore found it necessary to hold a national conference and to elect a National Steering Committee. It may have been "alien" to Party and YSA norms not to publish the names of the members of the Steering Committee (or the Political Committee when it was elected); if so, it is odd that this point never came up until July 2, 1974. There was never any request for names of national leaders of the IT from the leaderships of the Party and YSA. (As a matter of fact, there was never a request of any kind from the leaderships of the Party and YSA, which chose instead to ignore the IT, in an attempt to demoralize it.) We did make it clear at the very outset of the IT who our leaders were. It was established from the first that Bill Massey was IT National Coordinator; in the YSA comrades John Holton, Rich Mitten and Cathy Matson all served for a period as YSA-IT coordinator. (Each in turn notified the YSA of his or her appointment as a national leader of the YSA IT).

It is unclear how the SWP and YSA thought these comrades were selected; at any rate, it was never a point in contention either at conventions or in correspondence with the SWP or YSA leaderships until it suddenly became grounds for our expulsion.

To state that the mythical "IT Party" operates "both within the SWP and outside the SWP" is totally false (p. 6). Not only every member of the Political Committee and Steering Committee, but *every member of the IT* is a member of either the SWP, the YSA, or both.

What emerges from a close observation of the internal situation of the SWP (and, of course, the YSA) is the picture of a strongly polarized party, in which the leadership has acted as a divisive, factional body. In reaction to this attitude of the leadership, the IT (which has politically defined itself as a tendency) was nonetheless compelled to organize itself in such a way as to minimize the effects of the factional activity of the leadership (SWP and YSA). The result was a relatively high degree of organization of the tendency, a situation which is definitely not a desirable one, but which was still well within the bounds of minority rights. Both in terms of political perspectives and organizational reality, the IT (except for its open ties to the IMT) functions entirely as an opposition tendency within the SWP and YSA.

It is also interesting to see how the criteria established (rather suddenly and unilaterally) by the SWP Political Committee and YSA National Executive Committee apply to their own factions. The YSA Majority Faction *did* provide a (vague) guideline as a basis for membership and extent of discipline. The YSA MF did not "inform the organization as a whole" of its structure or leadership composition, if "organization as a whole" includes the IT and comrades with third or independent positions. (This, of course, is not surprising in view of a situation in which expulsion proceedings could be planned and put into effect without the three IT comrades on the YSA National Committee being informed of them. Is this within the "norms of our movement"?) Much the same is true of the functioning of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction in the SWP. Members of the IT, one supporter of *Kompass*, and comrades with positions other than complete support to the LTF have been left completely uninformed as to LTF leadership, organizational structures, and so on. As for the statement that "faction discipline must be subordinate to party discipline," it is rendered all but meaningless in a situation where *every* party and YSA officer is a member of the LTF and/or YSA MF; in these situations, *party or YSA discipline is identical with faction discipline*. The actions of the SWP and YSA in expelling the IT without any formal charge or trial, with no opportunity to answer accusations, are a convincing proof of the dissolution of Party and YSA leadership organs into factional agencies.

But we repeat what we have already stated that because of the conditions existent in the SWP and the changes that were forced upon us we would have been far more correct to have designated our tendency as a faction.

The "Secret Internal Discussions"

The "Materials. . ." Document stresses the horrors of the IT internal discussion. The charges focus on two facets of this discussion: (1) The statements made in the discussion, and (2) the fact that such a discussion was held at all without every document being shipped to the SWP and YSA leadership for approval. (This latter charge relates to the lengthy discussion of the use of pseudonyms and false covers for documents in the discussion.)

The "Materials. . ." Document extracts quotes from the Hank Williams Document in which the SWP is described as having a "petty bourgeois methodology" and the "methodology of a right opportunist sect," and as being "deadly sick" (this last statement in the context of SWPers crossing picket lines in a strike). The Control Commission says of these quotes: "The above statements of the IT are not those of a group that is loyal to the Socialist Workers Party, and that sees the SWP as the nucleus of the revolutionary Marxist party that must be built. They are not the statements of a loyal minority that has confidence in the cadre of the party and that seeks to convince the majority through force of argument, and that pitches in to help build the party while retaining dissident views." (p. 13)

Two points must be made in this context. First, the statements from the Hank Williams Document are not qualitatively different from the criticisms made by the IT in both the SWP and YSA internal discussions. In "The Building of a Revolutionary Party in Capitalist America," we stated that the SWP could "continue to drift along the path of the new radicalization, and risk being bypassed by the working class, jeopardizing the future of Trotskyism for years to come and degenerating into a sect. Or it can break out of its stupor and return to the road of Trotskyism and the Transitional Program." (p. 28) Other statements were even stronger; yet these statements were not viewed as being a grounds for expulsion from the SWP and YSA and did not prevent four supporters of the IT from being placed on the YSA National Committee. (In fact, the whole method of judging a tendency's orientation on the basis of selected quotes rather than on its overall political thrust is highly questionable.)

Second — and more important — these statements do not go beyond the bounds of what the SWP and YSA leaderships have said (and continue to say) about the Fourth International and its leadership. Does Tom Kerry's statement that the leaders of the FI are "centrist muddleheads" make him ineligible for membership in the FI? And how are we to characterize Joe Hansen's remarks on the Tenth World Congress? If the IT is to be expelled for referring to "petty bourgeois methodology" by the SWP leadership, how do we handle Hansen's statement that "Enough evidence is accumulating to make it possible. . .to offer a convincing analysis so that the term 'petty bourgeois' will appear as a correct label. . ." (Internal Information Bulletin, April 1974, p. 10) Are these statements of a "loyal minority that has confidence in the cadre" of the FI, that "seeks to convince the majority through force of argument and that pitches in to build" the FI "while retaining dissident views"? The actions of the SWP leader-

ship and the LTF in general would not seem to indicate so.

The Control Commission and Political Committee of the SWP seemed to regard it as more important that documents were published *at all* by the Internationalist Tendency for the purpose of regular coordination and internal discussion. They state: "A faction has the right to circulate drafts of proposed documents among faction members for the purpose of preparing material for presentation to the party as a whole. But an organized faction can circulate its own internal discussion bulletin only on the condition that it receive the prior approval of the party and that its bulletin be made available to the party." (p. 9) They do not state whether this provision would apply as well to a tendency newsletter, which is a guide for the tendency on how to present its views on the party.

These provisions not only weaken the ability of an opposition tendency to operate; in the existing political climate of the SWP and YSA, they would prevent it from operating entirely. We should mention in passing here that the 1965 SWP Organizational Resolution from which they quote does *not* apply to the YSA, making it especially unclear on what basis the IT was expelled from that organization. As the YSA did not bother to issue a bulletin explaining the YSA expulsions, we can only assume that the "Independent" Young Socialist Alliance engaged in nothing more serious than a game of political "follow the leader."

In theory, a tendency is a loose grouping united around several (or even one) programmatic points, to which it attempts to win the majority of the party. The shining example of Hansen's grouping around Eastern European questions in 1950, which the SWP today upholds as the model (and virtually its only example) of a tendency was such a grouping. But when a tendency emerges in the SWP today, it is immediately subject to a vicious assault from the leadership. The fact that the tendency is formed around a relatively narrow range of programmatic points (in many cases) is used to attack the tendency as "unprincipled." ("Where Does Tendency X *Really* Stand On. . .?") The example of the unprincipled politics of Martin Abern is dredged up at every opportunity. Leading members of the SWP and YSA, such as Pearl C., the Chicago Branch Organizer, issue remarks such as Comrade Pearl's charge that every opposition tendency in the entire history of the SWP had been on the wrong side of the class line. Bluntly, the SWP leadership now regards any serious oppositional tendency as disloyal; while on paper it issues rhapsodic descriptions of the rights of mythical opposition tendencies, *real* oppositions are isolated, baited, slandered, and ultimately either expelled or forced to resign.

It was in this environment that the IT was forced to operate. The IT responded, as noted, by organizing itself in such a way as to minimize victimization of its comrades within the SWP and YSA. A major goal of the IT was the democratization of the SWP and YSA; prior to our expulsion, we had made certain limited gains. It was no longer considered grounds for expulsion, for example, to telephone comrades in other branches between preconvention discussion periods. (Although this "right" may seem absurd to comrades in the International, it must be noted that the Proletarian Orientation

Tendency in 1971, for example, had been characterized as an unprincipled clique, threatened with disciplinary measures, and denied representation on the National Committee of the SWP, in large part for doing just that.) Comrades of the SWP who are also in the YSA have also been allowed to operate within the YSA without being bound by Party discipline (i.e., it was possible for IT supporters in the SWP to also be IT supporters in the YSA), in contrast to the practice in previous periods. But so long as IT comrades were continuously attacked as "disloyal", so long as mere support of the IT was viewed as a major political heresy, it was necessary for the Internationalist Tendency to maintain certain minimal precautions to prevent harassment, while seeking simultaneously to correct the undemocratic norms of the party.

It should be noted that another distinction made in the SWP Document seems more than a bit artificial: the SWP and YSA leaderships (theoretically) allow documents to be circulated, as long as the final draft is presented to the entire organization. But how are positions arrived at within tendencies except by a full internal discussion? If any differences, hasty formulations, and first judgments are to be shipped off to the SWP's LTF leadership for approval before they can be ironed out, the entire "unprincipled bloc" attack will be set off again. Under the rules provided by the SWP leadership, the days of any oppositional tendency are indeed numbered.

We also point out again that the leaders of the SWP and YSA have different standards for themselves and minorities. The LTF and YSA MF, after all, are factions; yet surely the "whole organization" includes the IT and supporters of Kompass and various nonaligned comrades; yet none of these sectors of the Party or YSA were ever privy to LTF or YSA MF discussions, communication, and so on.

We can take as an example the declaration of the YSA Majority Faction. It is possible that Comrade Welch simply decided that such a declaration would be a good idea, sat down at her typewriter one day, and dashed it off; that she then showed it to the other signers, who approved it on the spot, with no changes; and that they then immediately ran down to show it to the NEC (which was coincidentally meeting at the time) and had them approve it and sent it out to every YSA local. It seems a rather dubious hypothesis, however; far more likely is the possibility that there were a number of discussions and communications between members of the LTF in the YSA (and even those not in the USA), culminating in the drafting of a statement which reflected the (rather low) political level of the discussion, though not necessarily including every statement, point, or political characterization made during the discussion. None of this prior discussion was ever communicated to members of the IT or to the YSA as a whole; frankly, we never expected it to be. In actuality, it would seem reasonable to suppose the existence of a whole series of international discussions between groups and members of the LTF. We would hope so, anyway, given the well-known differences on a whole series of issues (Popular Frontism, the "progressive role of the colonial bourgeoisie," China, etc) which are found in the LTF. None of these exchanges have ever been made known to the IMT or the IT.

Concretely, we can note that LTF minorities (such as the Tendency in the IMG) in sections of the FI have

internal discussion, conferences, etc., as a matter of course without being accused of "forming a rival party" or violating party organizational norms.

The charges made in regard to the "secret documents" of the IT are actually a rather thin smokescreen for the behavior of the SWP and YSA leaderships. Although the IT was not informed of the existence of the SWP Control Commission until the Party Plenum beginning on June 24, it had apparently been secretly functioning for a considerable period before this date. The YSA, for its part, apparently never even bothered to go through the motions of appointing such an investigative body; it made preparations for expulsions without the knowledge of three IT comrades (and one other IMT supporter) on the National Committee—and thus without the knowledge of the National Committee as a whole—and without any prior warning to the IT or the YSA membership (outside of factional caucuses). In the case of the YSA, comrades of the IT were actually *attending* the National Committee Plenum when, as the second session began, they were denied access. They were thus deprived the right—as elected leaders of the YSA—to participate in the session which formally expelled the IT (and, of course, the three IT NCers) from the YSA. It is behavior of this sort which is thoroughly outside of the norms of the movement.

A few words should also be included regarding the use of pseudonyms and false covers for the IT discussions. The SWP regards both as measures aimed at itself: "There is an IT 'security policy' *vis-a-vis* the SWP. It is designed to hide IT activity from the SWP. This security policy includes the use of pseudonyms that are not party names and deceptive covers attached to the secretly circulated IT discussion bulletins. . ."

The SWP apparently cannot conceive that the IT has security problems except in regard to itself. The fact that the IT has been the subject of a probe by the House Internal Security Committee (which published several of the IT's submissions to the last party discussion bulletins, along with the names of comrades who signed them), that the IT has been attacked as a "terrorist" group by professional red-baiting sheets such as Philip Abbot Luce's *Pink Sheet* and other individuals such as the nationally syndicated columnist Victor Riesel, etc., apparently goes beyond them entirely. The IT internal bulletins were mailed around the country and sent to members of the IMT in other countries; it was entirely natural and correct for the IT to adopt (as have the majority of comrades in the FI) working pseudonyms under such circumstances. As for the Party and YSA, their understanding of such security precautions is apparently all but nonexistent; how else can we interpret their printing of the pseudonyms of Comrades Massey and Barzman and their inclusion of Comrade Massey's address and telephone number? Parts of the SWP Document could serve quite well as briefing reports for the local Red Squad.

As a matter of fact they have already provided a briefing for the national Red Squad. This is evidenced in the contribution by Representative John Ashbrook, a reactionary member of the U.S. Congress, in a contribution he made to the Congressional Record of July 24, 1974, pages E4988-89. In an article entitled "American Trotskyites Split on Terrorism" Ashbrook labels

the IT as terrorist for its support of the views of the IMT. Specially it lists Cdes Barzman and Massey as having attended the 10th World Congress and having voted for every resolution in favor of terrorism and "armed struggle." It goes on to use the Barzman letter, which it states, "The Socialist Workers Party through their surveillance of the 'Internationalist Tendency' secured a secret letter written from France by Barzman to his comrades in the U.S." It goes on to state that "Barzman's secret letter was published in the confidential Socialist Workers Party Discussion Bulletin and was reprinted by the House Committee on Internal Security in its hearing on 'The Theory and Practice of Communism'. Ashbrook's article went on to mention all the comrades who Barzman had ostensibly received "advice and instructions from." The failure of the SWP to use pseudonyms in its bulletins will unfortunately later be realized in the concrete when the bourgeois courts seek to use this material against both comrades of the IMT and LTF. Further the listing of Bill Massey and John Barzman's home address in the SWP document is now responsible for its listing in the Congressional Record. That the U.S. government attains this material by the use of spies in the Socialist Workers Party is an invasion of the democratic rights of the Party. It is a violation that deserves a united condemnation as does the attacks on the IT. This would be made easier if these same methods were not used by the LTF in their obtaining of the internal documents (and private letters) of the IT.

The charge in regard to "deceptive covers" is totally absurd; we remind comrades again that documents were sent over international borders—often by mail, but sometimes by individual comrades. The covers were obviously not meant to fool the SWP or YSA, but rather to survive a cursory examination by other, more powerful, third parties.

"Unauthorized Work Outside the SWP"

Several times in the "Materials. . ." Document emphasis is placed upon the "unauthorized" (read "illegal" or "disloyal") work done by the IT with groups outside the SWP and YSA. Unfortunately these examples dissolve into a pathetic charade; in no case do the facts fit the blaring headlines which precede them.

1. "Unauthorized IT intervention in the national conference of the Attica Brigade, a Maoist opponent group." The facts here include a letter from Jose Perez of the YSA National Committee and a short statement by Dale G. of the Chicago SWP branch.

The facts are these: the National Conference of the Attica Brigade (now the Revolutionary Student Brigade) was held in Iowa City, Iowa. There is a YSA local in Iowa City; a majority of the members of this local adhere to the Internationalist Tendency. Rather naturally, the Iowa City comrades intended to sell the press and attempt to make contacts at this important conference. Comrade Jose states in his report that for security reasons, these arrangements (i.e., the nationally-planned YSA intervention) were made in as discrete a manner as possible directly in collaboration with the organizers of party branches and YSA locals involved." (p. 118) Apparently the plans were *extremely* discrete, because (in spite of queries) the comrades in Iowa City were not informed

of the plans for a national intervention at all. (This was perhaps because of their support for a "disloyal" tendency.) Rather worried that the small Iowa City local would not be able to intervene effectively, the Iowa City comrades asked Mark L. (a personal friend of the former local Organizer) if he could make the 3-4 hour drive from Chicago to help distribute material and sell the press. In this connection, Mark L. (a member of the Chicago SWP branch and YSA local) went to Iowa City, accompanied by Larry N. and Rob B., both members of the Chicago YSA local. When the three Chicago comrades became aware that there was a national SWP-YSA intervention, Comrades Larry and Mark immediately approached Jose, made their presence known, and had several discussions as to what approach the YSA should take in its intervention. At no time did Jose make the charge of "disloyal" activity or instruct Comrades Larry and Mark to leave. The entire Iowa City problem could have been avoided altogether had the YSA leadership not seen fit to treat the Iowa City comrades (like other IT locals and the IT in general) as political pariahs and outcasts.

2. "Unauthorized work with the Puerto Rican Socialist Party." The documents here attempt to show that Comrade Massey lied to the Control Commission when he stated that he never met with Alfredo, a New York leader of the Partido Socialista Puertoriqueno (PSP). This is supposed to demonstrate "unauthorized work" by the IT with the PSP! In actuality, Comrades Massey and Barzman stated that they wished their "discussion" with the Control Commission (in a hallway during the Plenum, a rather informal setting for a session of a party commission) tape-recorded to ensure accuracy; Comrades Gus Horowitz and Barbara Matson of the Control Commission refused, instead launching into a series of questions. One such question had to do with a meeting with Alfredo L.; Comrades Massey and Barzman indicated *generally* that they would not answer such questions under such circumstances, at that time and place, until seeing formal charges. So much for the 'denial' of meeting Alfredo L.

As for the meeting itself, Comrade Massey did indeed have a conversation with Alfredo L., a former member of the Proletarian Orientation Tendency whom Comrade Massey has known for years and considers a friend and a comrade. However, at no time did Comrade Massey discuss internal matters of the SWP and FI, nor did Alfredo L. discuss internal matters of the PSP. The conversation was a political one about the positions of the Fourth International. While it can be assumed that Comrade Roberts' report is grossly exaggerated, we know for a fact that Comrade Ivan's is completely false. We call upon him to document his charge; he cannot, in fact, do so. Taken as a whole, this episode reveals more about the frantic efforts of the SWP leadership to add variety to its charges, than to any "unauthorized work" by the IT.

3. "Unauthorized work in the Emergency Committee to Defend Democracy in Chile in San Jose, California." This matter is dealt with extensively in Comrade Massey's letter "Against the Split Tactics of the LTF", sent to the SWP PC on June 9, 1974 (and reprinted in the "Materials . . ." Document). The facts are that the San Francisco branch of the SWP refused to allow three IT comrades who live and work in the San Jose area (60 miles from San Francisco) to work in the ECDDC in San Jose, or,

in fact, to give them any political assignments at all in the area where they live. The ECDDC is generally under CP hegemony but has a left wing which is hostile to the reformist CP line and is possible to work with. The ECDDC scheduled a meeting for Harald Edelstamm which drew between 400 and 500 persons. (See "Materials. . .", pp. 137-138) The three reports in this section of the document are almost meaningless, especially the tedious report by Comrade Armen who notes breathlessly that three IT comrades spoke with members of the ECDDC "for over 15 minutes." It becomes apparent from reading the document that: 1. one of these three comrades was eventually *assigned* to work with the ECDDC, voiding disciplinary charges there. 2. When, subsequently, because of the sectarianism of the SWP and YSA, the comrades were *ordered* not to work with ECDDC (thus terminating all Chile work in San Jose in any meaningful sense), Comrade H. "agreed not to repeat this breach of discipline." The comrades complied, as the report itself makes clear; no charge is made for any violation of this order by supporters of the IT.

A separate point must be made here. Both the SWP and YSA have a *de facto* policy of not assigning IT comrades (especially in groups) to areas of work which involve contact with independents; in the case of the ECDDC, this policy coincided with the SWP/YSA sectarian attitude toward anti-imperialist minded youth. The basic point here, though, is that when the order to cease work was given, it was complied with.

4. "Unauthorized work with the Revolutionary Marxist Collective in San Francisco and Oakland-Berkeley." What emerges from this section of the SWP document is that a group of militants with differing backgrounds have been evolving toward the Fourth International, that they had in their possession public literature of the RMG, IMG, and USFI, that Comrade Massey talked to one of their members with the approval of the Oakland Organizer (Jeff Powers) and that Comrade Garth was seen coming out of a study group led by the RMC. The only point open to some confusion is Comrade Garth's presence at the meeting. The facts, as related by Comrade Garth, are these: the RMC held a study group in Garth's neighborhood. Garth had met members of the RMC after a local demonstration and learned of their avowed support for the FI. Invited to attend a study session, he went to persuade the members of the RMC to join the SWP (in line with the policy of the IT, as shown from appended documents). This visit in no way constituted sustained work with the RMC, but should be seen as an individual initiative to recruit to the SWP in a comrade's immediate milieu.

The IT position on the RMC is no secret. After becoming aware of its existence, we took the position that the SWP should organize to recruit to its ranks. (This is made clear in Comrade Massey's letter "Against the Split Tactics of the LTF.") As Comrade Massey noted in the letter, there are today at least three formations in the United States—the RMC, the Baltimore Marxist Group, and the Socialist Union in Los Angeles—which define themselves as supporters of the majority of the Fourth International. (As we shall note later, it is scarcely difficult for members of the "Trotskyist" left in the US to become aware of differences in the SWP and FI; in addition, many of these comrades were members of or in con-

tact with other Trotskyist groupings at one time or other, especially the IMG and the ex-Ligue.) These groups approached members of the IT; they were informed that they should join the SWP as active militants. The Los Angeles Socialist Union (with 19 members) has voted to approach the SWP on this basis. (This was reported to Comrade Wendy R. of the Los Angeles SWP branch by Comrade Aubin of the United Secretariat following a meeting he had with the SU in late June.) Members of the BMG and RMC have since approached the SWP on the same basis; it is somewhat ironic that, in the meantime, the IT has been summarily ejected from the SWP itself. We made no secret of our learning about these groups; Comrade Massey's letter contains two pages on this point. That the SWP—which is aware of these and other groups which might be won to the FI—never entertained even a passing thought of approaching these militants, speaks volumes about the sectarianism of the SWP and YSA leaderships.

5. "Unauthorized work with various opponent groups in Minneapolis." This item seems strangely misplaced. It is worthwhile to clarify what occurred. Comrade Hillery attempts to make the case that the RMG aided groups which are opponents of the SWP. The May 2 Meeting she mentioned was co-sponsored by a large number of groups participating in the May 11 Chile coalition, as Comrade Hillery acknowledges, as a build-up for that event. It centered on solidarity with the Chile movement in other countries, especially Canada. Comrade Peter D. of the RMG was invited to speak as a member of the Defense Committee for the eleven militants who were arrested in Toronto while protesting the military coup last September. The SWP was invited to cosponsor the event. To call this, as Comrade Hillery does, "a public insult to the Fourth International," is a grotesque display of sectarian double-think. To include this incident under the heading of "unauthorized work by the IT with various opponent groups in Minneapolis" reflects the haste with which this flimsy documentation was assembled by the Control Commission.

Amidst all the invective directed against the RMG, the *only* charge made in regard to the IT (the supposed subject) is made in a brief parenthetical note at the beginning. The charge here is that Comrade Jeff M. of the SWP (and IT) "acknowledged being part of the Selby-Dale Freedom Brigade's study classes." There is no documentation, no elaboration, and no explanation of this point. It seems unusual hysterical diatribe against the RMG. This says a great deal about the seriousness of the charge—which is nil.

6. "Unauthorized work with various opponent groups in Madison, Wisconsin." The paucity of documentation in this section is not surprising; the LTF and YSAMF have constantly been forced to rein in their overzealous cofactionalists in the Madison YSA. In fact, it is the local LTF leaders who have, on many occasions, deliberately attempted to sabotage decisions of the Madison YSA with which they disagreed. In July, 1973, the YSA voted to hold a forum on Britain, with a comrade of the IMG who happened to be in the area as a speaker. Not only did the local leader, James L., boycott the forum, he was seen by comrades *tearing down* posters for the forum in his neighborhood. This factional hot-head is the only source for Comrade Finkel's accusations. With regard to the two events cited (a CALA May Day Forum on Chile

and the Hortonville Teachers' Strike), the facts are as follows:

Community Action for Latin America (CALA) is in no sense an "opponent organization." It is a committee of independent radicals doing work in a nonsectarian way around Latin American issues. CALA had organized a conference on repression in Chile and Brazil in early April, which drew close to 800 people. The CP was totally isolated at this conference; at the urging of IT supporters, Harald Edelstam (then on a nationwide USLA tour) was invited to speak. The Madison YSA boycotted the conference until Comrade Brian W., the Regional Organizer, arrived and authorized a belated shift in attitude and participation in the conference. Brian W. (and a YSA national leader on tour later in the year) stated that the YSA attitude should be to get closer to CALA people in regard to Chile work. It was in this framework that comrades in the IT spoke with individuals in CALA with suggestions for activities on Chile, including USLA speakers. CALA organized a May Day Forum, with a speaker from the Defense Committee for the Toronto 11. The IT in no way built the CALA Forum as a rival to the YSA forum.

As for the rally on behalf of the Hortonville teachers, Comrade John H. of the YSA IT informed Ted S., the Madison Organizer, at least three times of the need for action on behalf of the strikers in order to pressure the statewide union into broader solidarity efforts, and later, of the fact that such a coalition was forming and that the YSA should participate in it. Ted S. gave no response on any occasion. The rally, when held, had roughly 100 participants; three YSA comrades were already selling *The Militant* and three more the *Young Socialist*, which was the reason for the decision of Comrade Mark K. of the IT to supplement these sales with sales of the *Old Mole*. At no time were *Old Mole* sales counterposed to regular SWP-YSA press sales. Comrade Pat Q. (of the SWP and IT) has been active for years in the Madison trade union movement and is often contacted to speak as a member of his union local of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME). He has reported his AFSCME activities to Frank Lovell, SWP Trade Union Director, and to SWP trade union panels with no objection raised. His participation in the rally was perfectly in line with his AFSCME work to build solidarity among public employees of different unions. (At the time of the rally, both Pat and Martha Q. had requested transfer to at-large status in Madison, but had never received a reply. The letter from Comrade Finkel is, in fact, the first and only notification either comrade ever had of receiving at-large status. Both comrades were forbidden to attend YSA meetings in Madison, although there is no branch of the Party in the area. They thus had no channel of communication with the SWP except the guidelines already mentioned; to classify his trade union work and participation in the rally as "unauthorized" is the height of hypocrisy. The implication that Comrade Pat gave preference to the Spartacists over the YSA is not only totally false—as noted, the YSA was invited three times to participate—it is politically nonsensical. In fact, Pat had arranged for the YSA to have a speaker at the rally and personally asked James L. of the YSA to speak. Comrade James L. refused, thus depriving the YSA of the opportunity of presenting its

views to a broad representation of trade union militants. It is this sort of sectarian behavior which has characterized the Madison YSA/LTF for a considerable period and prevented the YSA from making any gains whatever in Madison.

7. "Unauthorized work with the Baltimore Marxist Group and Chile resistance committees." The documentation here is a letter from Bitsy Meyers, Washington (DC) branch organizer. The majority of her letter is filled with a lengthy account of who is in the BMG, proving only that the BMG has members. The *entire* charge directed against the IT is that they "sat with" members of the BMG at a demonstration and that both sold either Old Mole or Red Weekly. There is no attempt to demonstrate that the IT "worked with" the BMG at all, physical proximity apparently being viewed as synonymous.

The fact that the BMG is led by former members of the SWP and YSA who became aware of the work of Trotskyists in the world (especially with the ex-Ligue) and moved toward the politics of the FI may seem "strange" to comrade Meyers, but this is scarcely a political point. They have no paper of their own, so they sell Old Mole, with which they are in general political agreement. Members of the BMG have since, we understand, applied to join the SWP and YSA.

As we previously stated, we feel that we committed an error in not fully notifying the party of the attempts by IT members in recruiting these comrades to the party and YSA.

"Attendance of a non-SWP or YSA member at the IT conference"

This point, which the SWP leadership chose to stress throughout their document (even giving it an entire page to itself), is not only totally without foundation, it is demonstrably so. The fact that it is made at all reveals a great deal about either the dishonesty or confusion of the SWP leaders. The fact is that the IT had *ten* (not eight) supporters in the SWP and YSA in Washington at the time of the conference, and that *all nine* who came to the conference were members of either the SWP, YSA, or both: They include Tom Q. (in Both), Kirk L., Starr B., John B., Sally C., and Max G. (YSA); and Cathy K., Les B., and Marilyn L. (SWP). Total nine people. Some confusion perhaps comes from the fact that John B. was *subsequently* invited to leave the YSA by the YSA organizer as a part of the general campaign to intimidate and drive out IT supporters. A new comrade, unversed in the Macchiavellian maneuverings of the LTF, John B. complied. Comrade Meyers then found only eight (overlooking still another IT member in the shuffle) and began a series of speculations leading to the idiotic charge.

This explanation renders the intricate chain of pseudologic involving D.M. of the BMG somewhat academic. A few words are perhaps necessary on this point, however, to clear up the situation. The IT conference registration and all witnesses confirm that D.M. did not attend the conference at all; considerable doubt was thus placed on the DC organizer's report. Subsequent verifications show that D.M. never claimed to have attended the conference, but merely answered the question, "Were you in Chicago?" with "Yes, it was a very interesting city." The conversation reported by Comrade Bitsy is thus completely untrue. The whole proceedings indicate the unreliability of attempting to entrap people into giving

the right answer to questions. The whole matter of the "D.M. incident" could have been avoided had the Control Commission asked us for an explanation of the discrepancy instead of trying out its skills as a secret detective agency.

A word must also be said in regard to the charge, made in several contexts, that various persons not in the SWP or YSA were "familiar with the debates in the FI." The implication is always that the IT is handing out internal documents; significantly, the charge is never made in the concrete, but always through inuendo. It is a fact in the United States that the various vampire sects have had a field day with divisions inside the SWP and YSA. It is almost impossible for a person considering himself or herself a Trotskyist not to be aware of them. In the Spartacist press alone, there has been a series of articles such as "Guevarism vs. Social Democracy in the USec," "Renegades from Trotskyism Battle in the USEC," "Split Momentum Mounts in USec," etc. Other sectlets have held their own in this rush to "expose" the "Pabloites": See, for example, The Torch ("Pabloite International Heads Toward Split"). At the time of the YSA convention virtually every grouplet prepared its own analysis of internal events in the SWP and YSA. They derived their information from former members of the SWP and YSA, occasional agents inside the SWP and YSA, and from each other. The SWP and YSA leaderships are as fully aware of this as we are; they prefer, however, to conceal this and hint at further "violations" by the IT.

"Non-participation in the SWP and YSA"

The SWP document does not attempt to refute the specific evidence of refusal to integrate ITers into the SWP and YSA cited by comrade Massey in his letters of June 9, 1974—evidence involving fraction assignments, educational and transfer policies, etc. They simply state that "on the contrary. . .the IT, by its own choosing, does not participate actively in the work of the SWP." (p. 8) They then seek to show that the IT "boycotts" SWP work.

The charge of "non-participation" in SWP and YSA work would seem a line from the theater of the absurd were it not for the tragic situation which it is meant to hide. We will not attempt to challenge the statistics provided by the Control Commission. We have not been so cynical as to begin a statistical study of the SWP and YSA's factional exclusions against the IT; we had hoped that the situation could be solved in a political way. Comrades of the IT need no defense. Many of them have over ten years of activity in the Trotskyist movement, as youth organizers, party candidates, branch organizers, fraction heads, and trade-union activists. We all joined the SWP and YSA dedicated completely to the building of the organizations and many of us have maintained a high level of activity despite the factional attacks against us. However, it is an undeniable fact that a number of comrades have found it increasingly difficult to continue their work under conditions of unbridled hostility, ostracism, constant demeaning attacks, and assignments based on factional considerations rather than the needs of the party. We have called the party leadership's attention to this situation on numerous occasions, asking for discussions. But such discussions were out of the question with a "disloyal" and "antiparty" minority. Comrade Barzman pointed to this dangerous situation when he spoke at the August 1973 SWP convention on the election of the national committee. But his remarks

were not circulated to the membership as had been requested. Instead, the slanders of the nomination commission were reproduced and circulated without an answer. The status of the IT inside the party has been closely tied to the LTF's international factional considerations, and not to the needs of the SWP and YSA, let alone the international as a whole. Thus, prior to the world congress, comrades of the IT were placed on the national committee of the YSA, and some verbal statements were made that the IT could start with a "clean slate—as if comrades of the IT were criminals on probation. But barely had the world congress ended that the same policies resumed. As the LTF's attacks on the Spanish and French organizations unfolded, as the need to cover up the Argentine PST's orientation became more urgent, and especially as the IT's public defense of the positions of the Fourth International became more embarrassing in the face of the LTF's failure to defend them, the IT came under a new volley of attacks with limitations on its right to speak, orders on comrades of the SWP and YSA not to socialize with members of the IT, denial of the right to present counterreports on the business before the branches, exclusion from political assignments, and so on. The activity of a number of comrades in the IT was affected by this. We hold the leadership of the SWP entirely responsible for this situation, and we repeat our offer to participate in a parity commission wherever necessary, to help resolve such problems. On our side, the tendency's commitment to activity in the party and YSA has been clearly expressed and reiterated. The statement "preparing local tendency tasks and perspectives" from the June 6, 1974, IT newsletter (quoted in the Control Commission document) is quite clear on this: "What is needed is to be recognized as political people, with the capacity for judgment and action, and this can only be demonstrated by a steady involvement in the organization alongside those we are seeking to win. We do not refuse 'shitwork' but we demand the right to participate in meaningful political activities. There are a certain number of activities which we can work on wholeheartedly or with relatively minor conflict: Chile work, CLUW, petitioning, Indochina, farm workers support, TU fractions, campus fractions, various facets of election campaign, forums, regional work, educational." (p. 40-41) This, it should be noted, precisely parallels the supposedly fraudulent explanation put forward by comrade Massey in his already-mentioned letter to the SWP political committee. At any rate, alleged underactivity or under support is *not* the same as "boycott" of finances and activities. The tendency has explained in writing to the party that it was recommending to its supporters that their sustainers to the party and YSA be proportional to the contributions to the International as a whole from LTF-dominated groups legally able to affiliate to the FI.

What makes the charges in this area particularly scandalous is the incredible statement found in the SWP "Materials. . ." document on page 19: the SWP Political Committee maintains here that members of the LTF are "maintaining their activities and financial obligations in an exemplary way." It is uncertain who the LTF is trying to fool here; certainly not the members of the Fourth International, who are perfectly aware that LTF groups not prevented by reactionary legislation from affiliating to the FI have made a complete boycott of all financial contributions since the Tenth World Congress. Not only does this include a refusal by these groups to pay any

dues at all to the FI, but also includes a refusal by these groups to pay even a portion of the assessment to help our Portuguese comrades establish a weekly newspaper!

The FI and Democratic Centralism

The Control Commission document pushes into dangerous waters—for the LTF—on at least one point, arguing that the Internationalist Tendency has violated the statutes of the Fourth International. This point is based on the mendacious claim that the IT attempted to substitute itself for the SWP leadership in determining national tactics for the YSA. It further intended to draw attention away from the fact that the SWP has not followed the political *line* of the Fourth International's campaigns in any tactical shape or form.

The articles of the statutes quoted by comrade Horowitz, et al. refer to the tactical jurisdiction of national sections over the countries in which they operate, to the fact that the IEC cannot change the leadership of a section, and to the fact that the center should not dictate national tactics. Comrade Horowitz attempts to show that the IT devised its own tactical interpretation of the FI line on Chile work, demanded that the SWP accept it because the IT was part of the International majority, and then went ahead and carried it out on its own. This claim is politically ludicrous and factually incorrect. The IT felt that the Fourth International's line for Chile work in the period following the coup, as expressed in the United Secretariat statement, was to campaign for solidarity with the resistance as long as it lasted, and then with the various struggles of the Chilean workers and peasants, on an internationalist and class basis. The IT considered that the SWP's civil libertarian work in USLA had nothing in common with that line, and the IT offered the suggestion of one possible tactical implementation: to create a left pole within the broader Chile movement, based on clear solidarity positions. The IT was in no position to carry out such a line and never was so foolhardy as to see itself as the agent of such a perspective. Rather, when their proposals were rejected, comrades of the IT confined themselves to *circulating* the general *political* positions of the FI on Chile while *carrying out* the SWP and YSA assignments. They did so with the sales of *the special issue* of the Old Mole *on Chile* and the distribution of the United Secretariat statement *on Chile*. It was this public *expression* of the political positions of the Fourth International and not any *alleged* claim of the IT to substitute for the leadership which provoked the ire of the LTF.

It is a grotesque smokescreen to argue, as the SWP and YSA leaderships have done, on various occasions, that the IT felt that as a representative of the majority of the FI it should determine SWP and YSA policy. As the IT pointed out in its reply to the declaration of the YSA Majority Faction (in regard to the FI's campaign of solidarity with the Chilean working class), "The IT never has sought to impose its own interpretation of the solidarity line, but has merely asked that the solidarity line be implemented, which is not the case at the present time." What is more, the YSA and SWP leaderships themselves have recognized that this is the case. Our answer to the YSAMF explained this: "the declaration states that there were two public faces of the YSA on May 11. This can only mean that there was one based on the civil libertarian line of USLA and the other based on the FI

statement. It would seem that if the USLA civil libertarian approach was consistent with the line projected for Chile work in the FI statement, then there would have been not two public faces of the YSA, but one and the same line. If such were the case, there would be no basis for the charge of indiscipline. In fact, by stating that the distribution of FI statements and the selling of Old Moles constituted an act of indiscipline, i.e., the putting forward of a counter line of 'second face,' the YSA is admitting that its own line stands squarely counterposed to that of the FI. . . . It is not the members of the IT who are guilty of indiscipline, but the leadership of the YSA who are indisciplined toward the line of the Fourth International, which the YSA orients to and supports although it cannot be an actual youth organization of the FI because of reactionary legislation."

The simple fact is that the SWP and YSA leaderships totally ignored the FI's approach to and line on Chile work, just as they have ignored international discipline by attacking publicly the FCR for supporting a "popular front" in France, just as they have refused to aid the Portuguese comrades in their campaign to build a weekly newspaper, and just as the entire LTF has boycotted the finances of the FI since the Tenth World Congress.

Comrade Horowitz further attempts to show that the IT had a general policy of carrying out its own interventions, regardless of whether there was a difference between the IMT and the LTF on the issue at hand, and regardless of whether the SWP approved such actions. His case is based on the fact that several IT supporters attended a rally in defense of Soviet political prisoners while they were assigned to "other sales locations." This is an interesting case, because it was the first instance of complete and unabashed exclusion of comrades of the IT from a major political activity of the branch. For the first time, all comrades of the IT were specifically assigned not to go to this demonstration. And several of them were not even told of this prohibition. This factional act is surpassed in maliciousness only by the organizer of the St. Louis SWP branch ordering comrade Mark Lause not to talk politics to anyone outside the party. These situations reflected an unprecedented and new stage of the LTF factional attacks and comrades were at a loss as to how to respond. This explains their individual decisions to attend the demonstration rather than appeal the assignments. The rampant factionalism of the LTF is further evidenced by the objections of comrade Pat Grogan, the LTF convener in Chicago, to the sales of Inprecor, even though it contained a particularly relevant article by comrade Ernest Mandel reviewing Solzhenitsyn's latest book. Rather than an organized IT breach of discipline, we have a case of a massive and unbridled factional attack by the LTF meant to demoralize and drive out the IT. Such factional exclusions, and not sales of Inprecor, are the real departures from the norms of our world movement.

Other Charges

A charge which receives a certain emphasis in the SWP document relates to the trade-union document drafted by the IT. The charge here is that the trade-union document calls for work outside the Socialist Workers party. This is the main item meant to demonstrate that work in the SWP and YSA was entry work, and only one area of work among several.

Of prime interest in this section of the SWP document is the deceptive use of a partial quote. In the quotation utilized (on p. 11), the portion which the SWP leadership omits is underlined: "The fact that we are in the SWP automatically poses the question of what to do with potential recruits that we are able to draw around us. *Although the SWP is not the most congenial organization for working class militants, we should attempt to induce them to join. Should the SWP refuse to admit them for factional reasons (either blatantly or via the imposition of a long waiting period, impossible assignments, etc.)* or if the potential recruit finds joining the SWP an uninviting alternative, then we have the duty to help sustain their interest in the politics of the Fourth International through a variety of means. . . ."

The implications are clear. The first priority of the IT was to win potential trade-union comrades to the SWP. In many cases, however, the factional nature of the SWP recruitment policy and activity makes this impossible. (For information on SWP factionalism in these areas, see both the Massey "Against the Split Tactics of the LTF" letter in the Control Commission document, and his letter to the United Secretariat of October 29, 1973.) In these cases, the IT would attempt to prevent these worker militants from drifting away from the Trotskyist movement by common union activity ("action interventions"), socializing ("tavern raps, dinners, parties, etc."), and encouragement to continue study in Marxism ("study classes, reading programs. . ."). The IT was governed by the policy of the International Majority Tendency, which was concretely codified in the already quoted "memorandum on the IMT tour" agreed to by the IT and the IMT as a whole, and which contained the reaffirmation of the commitment to "politically recruit to the FI and organizationally recruit to the SWP on the basis of activists' agreement. . . with the program of the Fourth International and its Tenth World Congress, of their respecting the discipline of the SWP, and of their commitment to behave as active militants."

What must be pointed out is that the SWP can find *not a single instance* of real or alleged violation of party or YSA discipline by the IT in trade-union work. On the contrary, we can cite case after case of the SWP acting to prevent union activity by members of the IT—actions and instructions which were, of course, protested but were complied with in every case. We can point to the case of comrade Ned M., who was forced to withdraw from a militant trade union caucus and was withdrawn from a speaking engagement (which had already been publicized) at an SWP forum, the case of comrade Polly C., who was forbidden to take a major organizational assignment in the Coalition of Labor Union Women (CLUW), the refusal by the SWP and YSA leaderships (following the CLUW conference) to allow IT women trade unionists to work in or even to join CLUW, the dissolution by the Chicago branch of the rail fraction when the IT obtained a majority in it, and so on. At the CLUW conference, where each IT comrade was provided with a personal LTF chaperone, IT members loyally carried out party and YSA discipline even when it entailed voting to curtail the democratic rights of other left tendencies and supporting an incredible "compromise" on the question of support for the struggle of the United Farm Workers. The charge in the SWP document must be viewed as nothing more than a (poor) smokescreen to cover

up the SWP's lack of involvement in trade-union activity and its factional acts aimed at IT trade unionists.

A thoroughly absurd charge is to be found on pages 9-10 of the SWP document. The SWP Control Commission states that "The secret circulation of private internal discussion bulletins by the IT has apparently been going on for a long time. They then refer to a quote from an IT document which mentions a so-called Jules Verne document on Vietnam, drafted in 1972. The Control Commission notes that the Gregorich-Passen split from the SWP (mentioned in the quote) occurred "long before the formation of the IT" and concludes that: "The SWP has never been informed of a 'Jules Verne document.' Nor had the SWP been informed by Bill Massey of the preparations for the Gregorich split from the SWP."

The basic facts are these: Following the 1971 convention, a section of the former Proletarian Orientation Tendency led by Barbara Gregorich and Phil Passen began to develop apart from the rest of the old POT. This grouping (which was to become the Leninist Faction) developed a position that the National Peace Action Coalition and SMC were "popular fronts." Other members of the former POT (some of whom were later to form the nucleus for the Internationalist Tendency) rejected this analysis and circulated a reply ("Jules Verne") to Gregorich and Passen which rejected the "pop front" charges but argued that the SWP had, in fact, made a serious error in the anti-war movement in not utilizing the slogan "Victory to the NLF!" Discussions around this reply led to the formulation of the January 19, 1973, document produced by Comrade Lauren C. (which the SWP refused to allow to be read in branches).

The kicker here is the reference to "advance knowledge of the Gregorich-Passen split" as is clear from the context of the quote, it deals *not* with the future split of the Gregorich-Passen grouping from the SWP, but to the just-occurred split of the Gregorich-Passen forces from the POT. Following the formation of the separate Gregorich-Passen group, contact between the former POT and what was to become the Leninist Faction was entirely severed. The image conjured up by the Control Commission of Massey, Shaffer, and Smith hiding the knowledge of an impending split from the SWP is revealed as totally false. The authors of this deliberate falsification probably felt confident that the confusion would remain, because the SWP leadership hid from the party as a whole the fact that Gregorich and Passen had broken away from the POT. At the time, the leadership ordered branches not to allow the reading of the declaration of the newly-formed Leninist Faction, thus fostering a climate of suspicion and misunderstanding toward the POT as a whole.

The IT Expulsions - a Violation of Party and YSA Norms

Although the charge of an "IT Party" is idiotic, it does serve a purpose for the SWP and YSA leaderships. It enables them to by-pass the clear provisions in the SWP and YSA constitutions relating to discipline. Even the absurd myth of a "split" which the SWP did not discover for more than a month (and of which the IT was unaware until its "existence as a separate party" was "recognized") was apparently preferable for the SWP and YSA leaderships to the established trial systems in both organizations, in which the IT could have exposed the fraud put forward by the LTF leadership.

The provisions in the SWP and YSA constitutions are scarcely ambiguous. Article VIII of the SWP Constitution states in Section 3 that "Charges against any member shall be made in writing and the accused member shall be furnished with a copy in advance of the trial. Charges shall be filed and heard in the branch to which the member belongs, or in a higher body which may decide to act directly in the case. . ." Section Five adds that "Any member subjected to disciplinary action has the right to appeal to the next higher body, up to and including the National Convention. . ." The YSA Constitution echoes these provisions; Article IX, Section 3, for example, states that "Written charges shall be presented to the accused member in advance of the trial. Charges shall be filed in the local unit where the accused is a member and shall be heard by a committee it sets up for the purpose." Section Six parallels Article VIII, Section 5, of the Party constitution.

In the past, at least the forms of the articles on discipline in the SWP and YSA Constitutions were observed. In 1963, for example, the charges leveled at the Robertson minority (the nucleus of the Spartacists) by the SWP Control Commission roughly paralleled those leveled today at the IT; the SWP Political Committee responded by suspending Robertson, Mage, Harper, White, and Ireland. The Robertsonites appealed; a party trial was held. Arguments can be made as to the nature of the charges, trial procedures, etc. But at the very least, formal charges were made, appeals were allowed and there was a trial at which these accused were allowed to defend themselves.

The expulsion of the IT in 1974 was, as we have seen, entirely different. The IT members of the SWP were simply informed that "the Internationalist Tendency's status as a separate, rival party" placed them "outside the constitutional provisions for membership in the Socialist Workers party." There is no precedent for this formulation (which is precisely paralleled by the statement of the NEC of the YSA; it placed the IT *entirely* outside of the norms provided for in the statutes.)

Actually, even the intricate maneuverings of the SWP and YSA leaderships were inadequate in this regard. The Control Commission report was an *accusation* aimed at the IT; however well rounded the SWP PC and the YSA NEC may have regarded it, assertion and belief do not substitute for proof. However firmly the leaderships may have believed the split nonsense (and, frankly, it is hard to believe that they take it all seriously), their belief does not allow them to discard at will the statutes of the party.

The *de facto* purge of the IT was prepared with the greatest secrecy. Not only were members of the IT not informed of the preparations for the expulsions, those SWP and YSA comrades who had taken third positions or non-aligned stances were, likewise kept in the dark. These comrades have almost unanimously denounced the expulsions as a flagrant violation of party and YSA norms.

There is some evidence that the expulsions were planned *prior* to the formal inauguration of the Control Commission on June 20. At the June SWP plenum, not only two supporters of the IT (present as members of the International Executive Committee), but also comrade C., a member of the United Secretariat, were barred from attending most of the sessions, including a mysterious one devoted to "opponent groups." The justification for this was that only members of the national committee and de-

partment heads could be allowed in. This excuse was totally unacceptable on the face of it, as there is no precedent for statutory justification for exclusion of USec members from such sessions. Further, the excuse was openly fraudulent in that members of the Canadian LSA/LSO and the Mexican Liga Socialista were allowed to attend the session in question. Comrade Dick G., a member of the National Committee of the SWP, was somewhat more frank when he stated that the SWP leadership could "discuss more frankly" in the absence of these comrades and that the decision to purge the IT was made at these closed sessions of the SWP plenum (which in fact were faction meetings and not party meetings—unless we recognize that to the leadership of the SWP their faction is the party and the party is their faction).

As for the Control Commission investigation, it can be viewed as little more than a charade. As noted, the only approach to any member of the IT came during an informal encounter in a hallway during the plenum. No member of the commission ever stated the scope of the investigation, nor the nature of the charges against the IT. As national coordinator of the IT, comrade Massey therefore informed the commission that the IT would answer questions as soon as the nature and scope of the investigation were clarified. No member of the IT was ever approached by the control commission; the charges were never explained; and though comrade Massey had been told that he would be contacted in three weeks, no effort was made to reach him. Instead, on July 4 the SWP PC voted to expel the IT. The YSA NEC obediently followed suit, apparently on the basis of no investigation whatever. Supporters from the IT were removed from the rolls; a membership reregistration process was begun, apparently to catch any ITers who escaped the net the first time. ITers were physically excluded from the second day of the YSA National Committee plenum (at which our expulsion was formally ratified) and all over the country IT supporters were barred from SWP and YSA meetings. Comrade Jeff M. was physically thrown from the premises when he attempted to attend a YSA meeting; two comrades in Philadelphia were dragged out of a branch meeting and down two flights of stairs. Members of other sections of the FI who had transferred into the SWP and YSA were generally treated in the same manner; for example, comrade Adam S., a member of the IMG, was told that he could no longer attend SWP or YSA meetings because "his transfer had not come through yet." (He had been allowed to attend meetings prior to the IT expulsions.) When he asked Pearl C. Chicago branch organizer, how long such a process would take, he was told that the transfer would not be allowed, as he had shown himself to be a supporter of the Internationalist Tendency (in the two weeks he had been in Chicago).

Simultaneously, pressures were placed upon LTF or nonaligned comrades thought to be "shaky"; they were urged not to return phone calls from members of the IT, to meet or speak with them, and so on. An intense propaganda barrage was inaugurated to keep the factional heat at a high level in the Party and YSA, coupled with a massive attack upon other sections of the FI. (In the Plenum reports following the YSA NC, the focus was upon the FCR and the "ultraleft, terrorist, mad bombers" of the LCR/ETA VI. The question of the PST was dismissed as an IMT "witchhunt.")

Opposition in the SWP and YSA

In most of the sections of the Fourth International, differences are regarded as both normal and healthy. Opposition tendencies are allowed to exist freely; they are not only allowed to speak to each branch or cell, they are given financial aid to help them to reach as much of the cadre as possible. Proportional representation on leading bodies is taken for granted; supporters of opposition tendencies are allowed to hold leadership positions, give educationals, speak at public forums, run as candidates, and so on. For the past few years, not one of these has been true of the SWP or YSA.

This was shown in 1971, for example, in the treatment afforded the Proletarian Orientation Tendency. The POT was a loose tendency formed around a recognition of the need for the SWP to reroot itself in the working class; it took no stand on international issues as a tendency, allowing its supporters to take different stands. For this, the POT was denounced as an "unprincipled clique." The ghost of Martin Abern was dredged up for the tenth or eleventh time to characterize a tendency. As the discussion progressed, the attacks from the party leadership increasingly turned to vicious personal assaults, such as "Where Does Hedda Garza Stand?" by Comrades Lew Jones and Susan LaMont (SWPDB, Vol. 29, no. 30, July 1971, pp. 5-8). The form of the criticisms was adequately summarized by Mark L. of the IT: "On and off the branch floor, we have been accused of being apolitical cliquists and of being fanatical automatons, of being too deeply immersed in abstract theory and of being theoretical illiterates, of being based on organizational gripes and of having too many fundamental differences with the Political Committee to merit consideration as a serious tendency, etc. Perhaps this confession could have been broadened to include more of my crimes if I were but sure of their nature." (Confessions of a Cadre Killer, SWPDB, Vol. 31, No. 31, July 1973, p. 41). The POT was denied representation on the SWP National Committee on the grounds that it did not represent a "clear political tendency."

Worse by far was what followed the Convention. Areas of strength of the POT were systematically attacked by the SWP Political Committee. This was particularly true of the Oakland-Berkeley branch and local, where 40-50 supporters of the majority were shipped in prior to the local Tasks and Perspectives to smash the minority and eliminate it from the leadership in the YSA. Comrade Mark L. in the previously-quoted document—which has never been refuted by the SWP leadership—described his own role in the crusade to crush the Oakland-Berkeley POT. He notes a conversation with the YSA Organizer, who "discussed the tremendous potential of the Bay Area and the real reason for our transfer: *to smash the minority.*" As he puts it, "We arrived in the middle of a meeting. We almost literally walked into the meeting with our hands raised." (p. 41) Across the country, supporters of the POT who did not recant were removed from any positions of leadership; slate votes for local executive committees became a common means of eliminating minority representation.

The repression aimed at the POT could not help but have an effect; one result was the formation of the Gregorich-Passen Leninist Faction. As the IT Document "The Building of the Revolutionary Party in Capitalist America" pointed out (p. 26), "The Class Struggle League-

Vanguard Newsletter is partly the result of a subjective reaction by a group of dissident SWP members to drive them out of the party campaign conducted by the SWP leadership." Some comrades became discouraged and dropped out of politics entirely; a larger number remained inside the SWP to continue the fight. (Identical pressures were at work, of course, inside the YSA. Comrade Peter G., for example, was dumped from the YSA National Committee in 1971 for his support of the POT inside the Party.)

The POT however, had been formed around a relatively narrow circle of differences with the SWP and YSA majority. When the Internationalist Tendency was formed, with a much broader and better-defined set of differences with the Party and YSA majority, the campaign of factional hysteria reached new heights. The charges of "unprincipled combinationism" were dredged up again; the ghost of Martin Abern was once again summoned up. (See "An Unprincipled Grouping Within the SWP," Tom Scharett, SWPDB, Vol. 31, no. 33, July 1973, pp. 35-42). In branch and local preconvention discussions it was solemnly avowed that the supporters of the IT were racists (or, more modestly, were "bowing to racism"), were sexists, that they hated gay people. Members of the IT in Los Angeles who attempted to defend the right of a comrade accused of being a police agent (arguing that a formal trial was necessary before action could be taken) were called "cop-lovers." The IT was accused of capitulating to liberalism, Stalinism, ultraleftism, of all three at once. Comrade Norman Oliver informed us that we made him sick. ("Ultraleftism in the Black Movement and the Internationalist Tendency's Adaptation to it." SWPDB vol. 31, no 31, July 1973, p. 8). At the 1973 YSA convention, one comrade accused us (seriously) of supporting "guerrilla warfare in Carbondale, Illinois." At the same convention, Kris V., a leading comrade, compared us to the Ku Klux Klan.

This campaign reached a peak of sorts at the 1973 SWP Convention. Not only was the number of votes in each branch necessary to elect a delegate moved upward from seven to fifteen, cutting down considerably upon minority representation (in spite of a lack of growth in the Party during the preceding two years), the IT was denied any representation upon the SWP National Committee. The old charge of "unprincipled combinationism" was again dredged up, but to it was added the new accusation that the IT was "disloyal" and an "anti-party group." Reacting to such charges, Comrade Livio, a representative of the USEC FI at the proceedings, was forced to intercede: "We consider the decision to reject any representation of a minority as alien to the traditions and rules of the Fourth International. . . Do you consider the SWP is a special party? Last point: the terminology used by the reporter who spoke in terms of anti-party elements is quite alien to the Trotskyist movement and actually it is in the traditions of the Stalinist bureaucracy." (Appendix to IMT Statement, "Let's Discuss Political Differences, Not Old Wives' Tales," IIDB Vol. X, no. 20, October, 1973, p. 28). His point was ignored.

Prior to the Tenth World Congress, the LTF apparently attempted to improve its image somewhat on the international scene; at the December 1973 YSA Convention the IT was allowed two full and two alternate members on the National Committee. At the 10th World Congress, NC member Rich M. of the IT was allowed to attend as

a member of the YSA leadership delegation. (Such was the miseducation produced by the YSA leadership, that this decision to include four ITers provoked considerable opposition from the LTF ranks, which the leadership (somewhat embarrassedly) had to bludgeon down. Several delegates argued that to include IT members on the YSA National Committee was an "insult" to the party. When ITers asked whether this meant that the IT was no longer considered disloyal, the YSA leadership replied in the negative—the SWP IT was still "disloyal," but, it was added, nothing was known about the YSA IT yet.)

Following the World Congress, it was decided to grant ITers in both the YSA and SWP token seats on branch and local executive committees. That this *was* of a purely token nature is shown by the fact that, where the IT was a considerable minority (as in the Madison, Wisconsin YSA local and the Houston SWP branch and YSA locals) IT representation was still kept to one seat. Further, these EC representatives were inevitably the only members of the EC given no organizational responsibilities at all; their stated purpose was to "give the IT point of view" to the other (real) members of the local execs. The policy of preventing IT members from giving educationals, speaking at forums, etc., was maintained.

Nor was there any real change in the increasingly factional atmosphere in the branches and locals; it is difficult to describe this atmosphere to those who did not have to experience it. Any and all motions from the IT were routinely ruled out of order or "referred to the EC"; extensions of speaking time were denied as a matter of course; "informational reports" described in detail the "disloyal" acts of the IT supporters (i.e., sales of the press of the FI). (In many cases, IT comrades were not allowed to reply to these attacks.) IT supporters in both SWP and YSA were carefully guarded; as pointed out Comrade Mark L. was forbidden by the St. Louis Organizer from speaking to contacts at all. A representative sample of IT protest letters in regard to such actions by local LTF groups is appended.

Following May 11 Chile demonstrations, the factional heat increased sharply. A climax of sorts was provided by the formation of the YSA Majority Faction (YSAMF) on an almost nonexistent programmatic basis in June 1974. The creation of the YSAMF as a disciplined faction (which caused and decided upon actions in advance of meetings) was a *de facto* exclusion of IT and non-LTF comrades from the YSA: IT supporters and independents retained the duties of membership (dues, attendance, work assignments) but were totally excluded from any share whatever in decision-making. The local meetings were reduced to the level of sterile replays of the prior YSAMF meeting, at which ITers and independent comrades were informed of the decisions already made. A reply to the YSAMF declaration was made by four comrades of the IT: Cathy M. (YSA IT Coordinator), Rich M., Mark L., and John G. (members of the YSA National Committee) and sent to the YSA NEC with the demand that it be distributed to the locals of the YSA on the same basis as the YSAMF statement. The National Executive Committee refused to comply with this request, in spite of frequent letters and phone calls; as a result, the vast majority of the YSA was never aware that the IT had even *made* a reply to the slanders contained in the YSAMF statement. (Requests to read the reply in locals where the IT had supporters were denied on th

grounds that the NEC had not authorized such action. In Houston, an IT comrade was able to begin to read the reply, but was ruled out of order before he could finish.) It is entirely possible that the YSA NEC had already decided upon expulsion by this time.

The logical follow-up to the growing factionalism was the expulsion of the IT from both the Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance. The June 9th, 1974 letter from Comrade B. Massey (Against the Split Tactics of the LTF) which warned of such a possibility and called for a parity commission to forestall a split, was not sent out until its inclusion in the "Materials. . ." Document.

Why the IT was Purged

We have answered the specific charges against the IT. We think the record shows very clearly that the IT had maintained a perspective of functioning as a tendency in the SWP and YSA. After an internal discussion in which a variety of views were expressed, and after the fraternal contribution to the discussion from the IMT Enlarged Bureau, the conference of the IT decisively adopted a course of fighting the organizational obstacles erected by the LTF to its participation in the life of the SWP and YSA. Following the conference, with the help of a tour by a representative of the IMT Bureau the IT was in the process of implementing this perspective. It is precisely at this time that the LTF decided to strike and purge the IT.

The high degree of organization of the IT may seem somewhat strange to observers unfamiliar with the internal life of the SWP. However, it is our contention that this level of organization would be necessary for any tendency functioning under the circumstances: the repressive atmosphere inside the SWP, the international factional struggle, and the need to centralize information on the political situation inside the United States, so as to present cogent alternatives to the LTF's orientation. The IT was aware of the dangerous dynamic of such organization and constantly tried to fight the centrifugal inclinations, by asking for our integration in the SWP leadership, by calling for a parity commission, by combatting our own subjective reactions. The LTF's reaction to these efforts was always to ignore them and slander the IT, until it finally decided to purge the IT altogether. In attempting to explain this decision, we must turn to a series of internal and international factors.

The IT was a permanent challenge to the SWP leadership's conception of a monolithic party. By introducing the ranks to the method of organization of other sections of the FI, by legitimizing criticisms, the IT threatened to seriously weaken the authority of the LTF leadership. The IT, even with its modest forces, had been able to win over to the positions of the IMT a growing number of comrades, including a majority in four YSA locals and a substantial minority in Houston. This ability of the IT to pose itself as an alternative to the present policies of the SWP leadership represented a real threat to the LTF as a drastic reorientation of the Party and YSA became more and more urgent. While all recognize that the present political situation in the USA reflects a definite lull, it is becoming increasingly clear that major struggles by the working class are on the agenda, which will definitively transform the nature of the vanguard. But the

present orientation of the SWP and YSA remains fundamentally that of the late 1960's, that of the "Worldwide Radicalization of Youth" document and is increasingly seen as inadequate and bankrupt. In this context, the proposals of the IT on trade union work, Black work, and relations with the vanguard would become all the more relevant. The LTF leadership is eliminating the IT from this forthcoming discussion to prevent a link between American and international questions.

Another problem which the IT created for the LTF was that its very presence permanently exposed the hypocritical relations of the SWP to the International. While arrogantly boasting at the World Congress that the test of the two lines would be made in practice in the coming period—in Latin America, Canada, and Spain—the LTF forcefully maintained that the decisions of the Fourth International had no bearing on the United States. This applied not only to the general methodology of the resolution on the world political situation, to the issues settled by the World Congress, but also to the specific campaigns decided by the International's leading bodies. The mere verbal defense of the positions of the FI by members of the SWP and YSA was considered a provocation. This was the case with the Chile solidarity campaign and it had the potential of expanding to a whole spectrum of issues (Portugal, France, Vietnam, etc.) The LTF leadership feared that widespread knowledge in the USA of the FI's positions would lead to members of the SWP and YSA being constantly asked about the discrepancy between the SWP's and the FI's lines, creating severe internal problems. This explains the virulent opposition to sales of the *Old Mole* and *Inprecor* by members of the IT, or for that matter, by the membership of the SWP and YSA as a whole.

The move against the IT must also be seen as a reaction of despair in the face of the aggravating international dispute and the increased isolation of the LTF. The LTF made it clear that it considers the question of minority violence to be one on which it is forced to disassociate itself politically. This was evidenced by the public attack on the Argentine PRT (at that time a section of the FI) during the Sallustro affair, and following an attempt by the House Internal Security Committee to implicate the SWP because of its fraternal support to the FI. Since that time, *The Militant* has published attacks against the LCR/ETA VI by the Spanish LC. In addition, at a time when the SWP is being cross-examined by the government in relation to its civil liberties suit, the LTF leadership finds it increasingly difficult to defend the IMT against bourgeois slanders that it is terrorist. Thus, when the Internationalist Tendency of the SWP was attacked in the American press as terrorist and violence-prone, the leadership remained silent for an extended period, and ultimately made a damaging statement, arguing that there might be police provocations in the ranks of the Party. This eagerness to completely disassociate from all forms of minority violence is becoming a dangerous ritual which can only pull the SWP further away from the International into the swamp of legalism.

But, more importantly, on the questions of the International's own activity and orientation, the differences of the LTF have been duplicated in country after country, constantly narrowing the areas of collaboration between it and the IMT. The LTF is acting as a booster for all

rightist and adaptationist currents in the FI and sees its role as assembling a coalition of these currents to overthrow the present leadership. It has used its publishing house as a tool for factional rewards and continued to ship in cadres to prop up the sagging LTF group in the IMG. It has openly attacked the French section and the Spanish sympathizing section in its press, while refusing to say a word about the PST's capitulation to the bourgeoisie's ultimatum that it support existing institutions. It has converted *Intercontinental Press* into an international factional organ. The LTF sees the publication of *Inprecor* as a challenge to its monopoly of press in the English speaking world, as it saw the IMG's development as a first breach in this monopoly. It now counter-attacks with the expansion of *Intercontinental Press* into the Spanish language. At the same time, LTF-dominated groups have not made a single financial contribution to the Fourth International since the Tenth World Congress. It is in the context of this covert deployment of LTF forces that the IT was purged at a time when it was passing through a difficult test.

The Purge of the IT is an Attack on the Unity of the FI

The purge of the IT effectively splits one of the major fraternal sections of the International, thereby leaving the International divided in yet another country and threatening to split the FI altogether. The blame for this situation must rest clearly on the shoulders of the LTF which has pursued a reckless factional policy of brinkmanship and blackmail. It is time to call a halt to these split activities.

The unity of the International remains the best frame-

work within which the tendency struggle can contribute to the building of a strong world party. For these reasons, we call on the International to condemn the LTF purge of the IT in the SWP and YSA and to demand the immediate and collective reintegration into the SWP and YSA of *all* those unjustly expelled. The IT maintains its commitment to act as a disciplined tendency of the SWP and YSA and as supporters of the International Majority Tendency. In addition, we appeal to the International Control Commission to examine the charges against the LTF leadership of the SWP, against the IT, and against the IMT leadership. We demand the immediate and collective reintegration of the Internationalist Tendency, so that the purge will not become a *fait accompli*, thereby encouraging further such organizational moves in the Fourth International. For our part, we continue to regard ourselves as disciplined members of the Socialist Workers Party and the Young Socialist Alliance.

We are long standing members of the SWP and YSA. For this reason, we reject any proposed plan which would involve our individual application for "readmission," individual selection of which IT comrades can (or cannot) re-enter, and probationary or candidacy periods. The entire IT was arbitrarily and bureaucratically expelled and we demand that *all* members of the IT be reintegrated into the Party and YSA. All forces who are truly interested in maintaining the unity of the Fourth International will protest this introduction of bureaucratic methods within our movement and refuse to recognize this purge.