

POLITICAL COMMITTEE MEETING, No. 3, October 19, 1973

Present: Barnes, Breitman, Britton, J. Hansen, Jenness,  
Jones, Lovell, Seigle, Shaw, Stone, Thomas,  
Waters

Consultative: Dobbs, Kerry, Novack

Visitors: Finkel, Scott

Chair: Jones

AGENDA: 1. World Movement  
2. Farmworkers Boycott Campaign  
3. Propaganda Campaign on Mideast War

1. WORLD MOVEMENT

Waters reported. (See attached reports.) *Canada  
Germany*

Discussion

2. FARMWORKERS BOYCOTT CAMPAIGN

Britton reported.

Discussion

3. PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN ON MIDEAST WAR

Barnes reported.

Meeting adjourned.

# SPLITTERS FROM CANADIAN SECTION JOIN REVOLUTIONARY MARXIST GROUP

## Summary of the Events

On October 4, 1973, the Revolutionary Communist Tendency (RCT) wrote the Political Committee of the League for Socialist Action/Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière (LSA/LSO), Canadian section of the Fourth International, announcing its split from the section. The RCT, which had been supported by less than 15 percent of the LSA/LSO membership, walked out of the Fourth International to join the Revolutionary Marxist Group (RMG), a small organization claiming to be Trotskyist which had been conducting a unity maneuver with the Canadian section.

The Revolutionary Communist Tendency's walkout was the third from the section in the last 15 months, completing the desertion of the forces who constituted themselves in March 1972 as the "Unified Minority Tendency."

The RCT walked out only six months after a convention of the Canadian section, where 85 percent of the delegates rejected its positions. The split occurred while the oral discussion in the branches preparatory to the coming world congress was in progress, and six weeks before the pre-world congress convention of the Canadian section.

The organizers of the carefully-prepared and planned walk-out gave no reason for their action except for a reference to "events in Winnipeg."

What happened in Winnipeg was that the majority leadership of the branch refused to carry out instructions of the LSA/LSO Political Committee to build a public meeting there on September 19 where a member of the Political Committee would speak on the events in Chile. Furthermore, the Winnipeg branch leadership publicly attacked the meeting. The majority of branch members, all members of the RCT, endorsed these actions. At their next meeting they proceeded to suspend the branch members who had carried out the Political Committee's instructions to build the meeting.

Six Winnipeg branch members were given the opportunity to avoid harsh disciplinary action by a trial committee, by agreeing to accept the discipline of the elected bodies of the section and appeal to the coming convention. Instead, they reaffirmed to the trial committee that they rejected the right of the Political Bureau to decide to organize a public meeting of the section in Winnipeg. They were therefore expelled or suspended from the LSA/LSO on October 1 by a trial committee.

Four other branch members, who without giving cause did not appear before the trial committee, were suspended pending their making contact with the trial committee.

On October 4, before the Political Committee could meet to hear a report of the trial committee and review its findings, the RCT resigned from the section. The national convention of the Revolutionary Marxist Group (RMG) took place October 5-8. Leaders of the former RCT attended it and accepted positions on the RMG Central Committee that was elected there. On October 13, the former members of the RCT informed the LSA/LSO that they were "commencing" fusion negotiations with the RMG. Two days later the LSA/LSO received a letter from the "unified political committee" of the RMG

declaring that the fusion had taken place.

### The Line of the Fourth International Was Not an Issue

RCT steering committee members told ISA/LSO Political Committee representatives on October 10 that the real reason for their action was the expulsion of RCT members for "presenting the line of the Fourth International."

There is no basis for this charge. No member of the Canadian section has ever been charged or disciplined for presenting the line of the Fourth International.

The events in Winnipeg concerned quite another issue. The RCT members rejected the authority of the elected political leadership of the ISA/LSO, carried through a public split in the Winnipeg branch, and used their majority in the branch to suspend every single branch member who accepted the authority of the Political Committee.

The one other case in Winnipeg where the Political Committee took disciplinary action arose when another RCT member read excerpts from the internal discussion bulletin of the Fourth International to a public forum -- a breach of discipline that was completely premeditated, as the comrade admitted.

Nothing in the charges against any of the RCT members related to the political line of the Fourth International, or, for that matter, to the political line of the Canadian section or the political line of the RCT.

### How it Began -- The Campaign Against the Coup in Chile

The RCT and its predecessors held a majority in the Winnipeg branch of the ISA/LSO, and in the Winnipeg Young Socialists, from August 1972 to October 1973. A minority within both organizations in Winnipeg supported the majority leadership of the ISA/LSO, and the positions of the Leninist-Trotskyist Tendency in the world movement. The internal life of the Winnipeg ISA was not without friction and crises. These were resolved, through the intervention of the Political Committee, without resort to disciplinary actions, for a year following the establishment of the RCT majority in Winnipeg.

The Winnipeg branch split publicly on September 19, 1973. The split did not occur over the right of RCT members to "present the line of the Fourth International." The issue was the right of the Political Committee to organize a public meeting within Winnipeg's city limits.

The Political Bureau, responsible for the implementation of Political Committee decisions, scheduled a meeting in Winnipeg for a spokesperson of the Political Committee on September 19, as part of an emergency country-wide campaign of defense actions and meetings, decided upon by the Political Committee in response to the coup in Chile. The scheduled speaker was Al Cappe, a member of the Political Bureau and executive secretary of the YS/LJS.

The RCT majority leadership in the Winnipeg branch refused to organize the meeting decided by the elected central leadership -- an unprecedented defiance of the authority of the Political Committee. It announced that instead it was going to hold a different meeting on Chile, to be addressed by Brett Smiley, a Toronto

member of the RCT. These plans, it said, made it impossible to organize the meeting scheduled by the Political Bureau.

The Political Bureau contacted the Winnipeg executive a second time to insist that it carry out the decision to organize the September 19 public meeting on Chile with Cappe as speaker. Since the planned meeting with Smiley had been posed by Winnipeg RCT leaders as the barrier to organizing the meeting proposed by the central leadership, the Bureau instructed the Winnipeg branch to cancel the Smiley meeting, or reschedule it in a context which would not interfere with carrying out the decision of the Political Committee. The Winnipeg RCT leadership refused again to hold the Cappe meeting. The meeting was organized by five comrades in the branch who accepted the authority of the Political Bureau whether they agreed with its decision or not.

On September 19 Murray Smith, the Winnipeg branch organizer, spoke at the public meeting organized in accordance with the decision of the Political Committee. He disassociated the majority of the members of the section in Winnipeg from the meeting. It was not a meeting of the Winnipeg ISA, he said, it was organized by a minority faction within the branch. The real meeting of the Winnipeg ISA would take place two days later -- the meeting where Brett Smiley was to speak.

At a meeting of the Winnipeg branch held that evening, the RCT majority voted to adopt an executive report that rejected the authority of the Political Bureau to organize the Cappe meeting. It voted to proceed with the meeting for Brett Smiley. This meeting had now been publicly defined by the branch organizers as being rival to the one organized by the elected central leadership, and as a meeting organized by a rival grouping within the Winnipeg branch.

Three days after the Smiley forum the Winnipeg branch received charges laid against the five comrades in the branch who had built the meeting under Political Committee instructions. They were charged with a breach of branch discipline for carrying out the instructions of the elected central leadership in building the Chile campaign. Without waiting for a hearing or a trial on the charges, the branch majority suspended these five members from membership in the ISA/LSO.

### Is the Political Committee Empowered to Organize a Public Meeting?

Charges relating to these events were laid before the Political Committee against ten members of the Winnipeg branch. The Political Committee sent a subcommittee to Winnipeg to conduct trials on these charges and to take appropriate action.

The Canadian section's leadership made every effort to find a solution to the dispute that would avoid disciplinary measures. Before the trial committee held its hearing in Winnipeg, Art Young, organizational secretary of the ISA/LSO, phoned Comrade Ernest Mandel, one of the two members of the IEC Majority Tendency on the United Secretariat Parity Commission, to inform him of the events in Winnipeg.

Comrade Mandel said this was the first he had heard about this dispute.

Comrade Young urged Comrade Mandel to contact Walter Davis, a member of the ISA/LSO Political Committee who was a leader of

the RCT, with a view to helping overcome the crisis. Comrade Mandel indicated that he would do this.

The PC subcommittee conducting the trial posed questions to the six, to enable them to pull back from their stance of defiance of the authority of the Political Bureau to organize a public meeting in Winnipeg, and thus open the door to a resolution of the crisis without disciplinary action.

Only six of the charged members attended the trial. They were asked by the trial committee whether they accepted "that the members of the Winnipeg branch, when informed of the (Political Bureau's) decision to build the Chile meeting with Al Cappe as speaker on September 19, were obliged to carry out this decision." All six answered, "no." All six still rejected the authority of the elected central leadership of the ISA/LSO. For this reason, and for this reason alone, five of the accused were expelled from the ISA/LSO, and a sixth, a Central Committee member, was suspended.

Four other accused members failed on two occasions to appear before the trial body, without giving any reason. They were suspended from the ISA/LSO, pending another effort to have them contact the trial body.

RCT members of the Winnipeg branch refused to accept the authority of the Political Bureau to organize a public meeting in Winnipeg. RCT members split the branch over this question. They publicly attacked the meeting organized by the Political Committee, announced plans for a rival meeting, and defied the authority of the elected leadership of the section in proceeding with this meeting. They then suspended from membership and from all political activity those members who accepted the Political Committee's authority. They consummated the split both publicly and internally. At the trial, the accused members reaffirmed their defiance of the authority of the Political Committee. They thus left the leadership no alternative but disciplinary action.

#### Questions of Political Line Were Not at Issue

A great deal of argument took place in the Winnipeg branch around the conflicting political lines on Chile presented by the speech of Cappe and the speech by Smiley. The organizers of both meetings claim to have correctly presented the Fourth International's position on Chile. Both sides stated that their positions rested on the public statements of the Fourth International, interpreted in the light of changes in circumstances.

The trial committee ruled that this dispute was not relevant to the disciplinary charges against Winnipeg RCT members. "The comrades are not charged with presenting the line of the Fourth International," the trial committee report explained. "Nor are they charged with violating the line of the Canadian section. Therefore the question of the political line of the meetings on Chile addressed by Al Cappe and Brett Smiley is not relevant to the issue before us. Whether the accused comrades violated the political line of the Canadian section in advancing what they consider to be the 'line of the Fourth International' is not relevant to this case, and is not a factor in our decision."

#### Charges Relating to Political Line were Dropped

Six weeks earlier, another forum in Winnipeg had led to a disciplinary case. It ultimately led to the expulsion of an RCT member,

Michael Tregobov. But here too, the question of "advancing the political line of the Fourth International" was not a factor in the expulsion.

Michael Tregobov spoke to a public meeting on August 16 on the question of Latin America. He informed the Political Committee before the meeting, and confirmed again after the meeting, that he had decided to present a line contrary to the decisions of the Canadian section's convention, to present a line which he considered to be "the line of the Fourth International." However, instead of presenting the public positions of the Fourth International, he read long excerpts from an internal document of the Fourth International -- "Bolivia, Results and Perspectives" -- submitted by the IEC Majority Tendency to the internal bulletin for the pre-world congress discussion and consideration.

Charges were laid against Tregobov for violation of the discipline of the section and for public presentation of an internal document.

On August 30, fourteen Winnipeg RCT members declared in a written statement submitted to the Political Committee that in planning the Tregobov forum, they had decided "consciously not to present the line of the Canadian section on Latin America, as it is articulated in Labor Challenge and convention resolutions," and thereby "to violate the section's discipline." (Emphasis in original) They were charged with a violation of the discipline of the section.

The Political Committee delayed a decision on these charges for several weeks, hoping that a political solution could be found. In addition to repeated discussions in the Political Committee, the Canadian representative on the United Secretariat discussed this problem in September with Comrade Mandel.

Comrade Mandel was informed of the Canadian leadership's concern over the matter, and of its desire to resolve it without resort to disciplinary action. He was asked to speak to the comrades in Canada and communicate to them any suggestions he might think helpful.

On September 30 the Political Committee dropped the charges against the 14 signers of the August 30 statement of the branch majority, and the charge against Tregobov on the question of violating the line of the section -- let alone being disciplined for presenting the line of the Fourth International.

Yet one charge against Tregobov remained. On his own authority, or in consultation with some others, Tregobov had arrogated the authority to present publicly an internal document of the Fourth International. This action of presenting the dispute inside the Fourth International to persons outside the ranks of our world party, occurred at a public forum where Tregobov was speaking in the name of the ISA/LSO.

The Political Committee felt that it was its responsibility to call a halt to such irresponsible actions which threatened the ability of the entire movement to pursue its internal discussion in a disciplined manner. Authoritative elected bodies of the Fourth International can vote to make internal material public. Individuals cannot take this upon themselves or no discussion can remain internal.

This was the issue that had to be resolved in the Tregobov case. It could be solved quite simply, through a statement by Tregobov that he would not repeat in the future such an action. No such statement was ever made. The Political Committee was left with no choice but to expel him.

The Political Committee Asks the RCT To Reconsider Its Course

The RCT split letter of October 4 stated that "we are terminating all financial commitments to the League for Socialist Action," that is, to the Canadian section of the Fourth International. It thus repudiated the conditions of membership in the LSA/LSO as determined by the LSA/LSO constitution, which specifies that regular payment of dues is a condition of membership in the section (Article VII, Section 1).

In its letter the RCT further specified that it "will no longer respect the authority or actions of the Political Committee of the League for Socialist Action." The Political Committee is defined by the LSA/LSO constitution as the central leadership body of the section, acting with the authority of the Central Committee between Central Committee meetings.

The letter made clear that the RCT's members no longer accepted the constitution of the section. They no longer accepted the conditions of membership in the LSA/LSO.

Despite the categorical terms of the RCT's letter of resignation, the Political Committee decided, after weighing its contents, to request discussions with representatives of the RCT. The Political Committee wished to make a final attempt to reach a resolution of the organizational conflicts with the RCT, and to press the RCT once more to change its split course. It also wanted to determine whether the RCT's decision to split was final and irrevocable, and whether the RCT had discussed its decision with the leaders of its international tendency.

Walter Davis, named by the October 4 letter as "coordinator" of the RCT, agreed to meet with representatives of the Political Committee on October 9.

The PC representatives asked Davis whether the RCT letter had been discussed with the international leadership of the IEC Majority Tendency. Davis replied that he had discussed it with Comrade Vergeat. He had not been able to contact Comrade Mandel, he said. It was agreed to have another meeting the following day, to permit the RCT to attempt once more to contact Comrade Mandel, and to permit the RCT Steering Committee to give further consideration to its move.

On October 10, three members of the RCT Steering Committee met with three representatives of the LSA/LSO Political Committee. The RCT representatives repeated the positions taken by Walter Davis the previous day. They had nothing new to add.

The LSA/LSO representatives asked if the RCT could name any specific actions which the LSA/LSO could take which would help resolve the crisis. Davis said that the LSA/LSO should stop using the section's resources for factional purposes, and should readmit the expelled members of the RCT in Winnipeg.

The LSA/LSO representatives said they believed that the RCT's grievance on the question of use of the movement's resources was based on a misunderstanding, since the movement's funds had not been and would not be used for factional purposes. This misunderstanding could easily be resolved. As for Winnipeg, the Political Committee desired now as before to work out a political solution to the crisis there. In this

framework the problems posed by disciplinary actions could be overcome. Davis of the RCT said that he agreed that a solution to the Winnipeg crisis could probably be worked out on paper. But, he said bluntly, the RCT in Winnipeg would prove unable to respect the agreement.

The LSA/LSO Political Committee representatives asked the RCT under what conditions it would consider retaining membership in the LSA/LSO. The RCT said that their condition was the resignation from the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction by the leaders of the Canadian section.

The LSA/LSO asked if the RCT would recognize the authority of a plenum of the LSA/LSO Central Committee, or of an LSA/LSO convention. The RCT representatives said no, not unless the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction supporters resigned from the faction.

The RCT representatives said that the RCT would operate as a "public faction," and that it would not be under the discipline of the LSA/LSO. They said it had not yet been decided under what name they would function publicly.

The LSA/LSO representatives asked if the RCT had any proposals on how to overcome the crisis. Davis replied that there was nothing the RCT could do.

The PC representatives did not know at the time that the persons with whom they were speaking had already joined an opponent organization and been elected to its central committee. They were representatives not of the RCT -- it had ceased to exist -- but of the Revolutionary Marxist Group.

#### The "RCT" -- Faction for a Day

In its October 4 letter announcing the RCT walkout, the RCT also renamed itself the "Revolutionary Communist Faction" (RCF).

This faction lasted only one day. On October 5, the members of the "RCF" joined the Revolutionary Marxist Group (RMG), an opponent of the Canadian section, at the RMG's national convention. The convention elected leaders of the RCT, including Walter Davis, to the RMG Central Committee.

Davis informed the Political Committee that he had no time to meet with its representatives between October 5 and October 8 (when the RMG convention was taking place).

It was not until one week later that the "RCF" formally informed the LSA/LSO that they had joined the RMG. During this week, the leadership of the Canadian section, not knowing they had already joined the RMG, had made every effort to get the "RCF" to reconsider its split declaration.

The RMG, which claims to be Trotskyist, has carried out a unity maneuver with the Canadian section over the past year. During this time, it concentrated its efforts, not towards achieving unity in action with the section in interventions in the class struggle, but towards attacking the section and encouraging splits from its ranks.

Based on its experience with the RMG, the Canadian sec-



tion came to the conclusion that this grouping was clearly operating as an opponent of the section. Any fusion without positive common experience would be an unprincipled adventure.

The RMG's unity maneuver scored its first success during June 1973, when 25 members and supporters of the RCT deserted the Canadian section and its sympathizing youth organization to join the RMG. In a letter to the LSA/LSO, the RMG justified the splitters' action. Their "unity" proposal was thus revealed as a crude raiding operation the aim of which was to chip away members from the Canadian section and recruit them to the RMG. The raid achieved its second victory in October, as the remaining members split from the Canadian section to join the RMG.

### A Ban on Factions?

The RCT leaders had explained that they were not interested in attempting to resolve the real problems facing the Canadian section, such as the crisis of the Winnipeg branch. Even if other demands were met they still insisted that their precondition for functioning loyally within the movement was the resignation of the majority of the leaders of the LSA/LSO from the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction.

The majority of members of the Political Committee support the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction in the Fourth International. They reserve the right to caucus, and discuss questions that fall within the framework of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction program. But this fact hardly justifies a split.

The RCT claims that the adherence of a majority of Political Committee members to the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction, and their private meetings to discuss implementation of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction's program, "objectively dissolved" the PC by converting it into the leadership of a faction.

This is nonsense. When tendencies or factions exist it is necessary and normal that their members in a leadership body meet in private caucus periodically for discussion. Among other things, it facilitates the normal functioning of the leadership body. Both sides were doing this in Canada. Regular PC meetings were held; Davis attended and voted, attesting to their authority. A request for a PC meeting by Davis or any other member of the PC was always honored.

The further charge was made that the LSA/LSO had been converted into a tool of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction (LTF) through the use of resources of the movement for the LTF. There is no basis for such a charge. Funds of the Canadian section have never been used for factional purposes. Every expenditure of funds was authorized and open to the scrutiny or challenge of members of the PC (including Walter Davis) and members of the Control Commission.

If the RCT believed the Political Committee to be misusing the movement's resources for factional purposes, its proper course would have been to press its case with the appropriate leading bodies of the movement.

The Control Commission of the LSA/LSO received a letter

from Walter Davis on September 7, where he said he was submitting disciplinary charges to the Control Commission against the Political Committee majority on a number of questions. But he submitted no charges. Instead of asking the Control Commission to take action -- a body he had voted to elect and which contains a member of the IEC -- he walked out of the section.

The RCT's attacks concerning private caucus meetings and alleged diversion of funds are only a smokescreen, as is the demand that leaders of the LSA/LSO must resign from the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction. The smokescreen was aimed at covering up the preparations for a split and justifying it after the walk-out and adherence to an opponent grouping.

The RCT presented the LSA/LSO with an anti-Leninist ultimatum when it insisted that the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction dissolve: an ultimatum against the constitution of the LSA/LSO; against the statutes of the Fourth International; against the rights of every Trotskyist.

### Three Walkouts

The RCT's resignation is the third walkout in 15 months from the Canadian section by IEC Majority Tendency supporters.

The process began in July 1972, a month after the opening of a preconvention discussion in the Canadian section. Unwilling to wait for the verdict of the membership in convention on their views, the ten adherents of a grouping around Michel Mill in Montreal walked out. Three were members of the section; seven were members of its sympathizing youth organization, the Young Socialists/Ligue des Jeunes Socialistes. Their split has been condemned by the leadership of both the majority and minority tendencies within the International Executive Committee.

The preconvention discussion lasted 11 months. Over 90 written contributions by LSA/LSO members were printed for circulation to the membership. For almost a year, LSA/LSO branch meetings debated the disputed issues. The discussion resulted in a clear majority decision on all the main disputed issues. When the convention assembled in April 1973, the Revolutionary Communist Tendency won the votes of only 15 percent of the members, and received 15 percent of the votes of convention delegates.

At the close of the convention, RCT spokespersons pledged that the RCT would abide by convention decisions, and accept the authority of the leadership elected by the convention. The convention was accepted by all tendencies as a democratic expression of the decision of the LSA/LSO membership. RCT delegates joined in the unanimous election of the Central Committee.

Six weeks after the convention a second split began. Between June 3 and July 3, 1973, five members of the LSA/LSO and 21 members of the YS/LJS resigned and joined the RMG. The main justification they gave for their split was that they disagreed with the decision of the LSA/LSO convention on the need for a principled basis of unity with the RMG before any fusion should take place.

Their split was unanimously condemned by the United Secretariat, which reasserted the need for minorities to respect majority decisions of the section, and called on those who resigned to reverse their course and rejoin the section on this principled basis.

The October 4 letter of the RCT marks the third and culminating walkout. Twenty-eight members of the section, and one remaining RCT supporter in the youth organization, were listed as adhering to the RCT's split letter.

The decision of the Revolutionary Communist Tendency members to leave the Canadian section and join the RMG has been accompanied by a number of charges. The majority leadership is accused of operating in a factional manner. It is accused of not correctly carrying out the decisions of the Fourth International. It is accused of being wrong in insisting on the necessity for a principled basis of unity with groups like the RMG. It is accused of having made errors with regard to discipline in Winnipeg. No doubt further accusations will be thought up.

All these charges have one feature in common: they do not justify a split.

The Revolutionary Communist Tendency has a right to its opinions on these and other questions. The obligation of its members, as the United Secretariat said in reference to the second of the three walkouts, was "to recognize majority decisions, trying to change them within the normal limits of democratic centralism." The RCT refused to accept the authority of the elected leadership bodies of the Canadian section. It refused to recognize even their authority to organize a public meeting on Chile. It refused to wait for a convention of the section only six weeks away.

Drawing the logical conclusion from its own actions, it deserted the Canadian section of the Fourth International, thereby walking out of the Fourth International.

Political Bureau, ISA/LSO  
October 19, 1973

APPENDIX I

Chronology of Key Events

- April 20-24, 1973: Convention of the LSA/LSO, Canadian section of the Fourth International, and election of Central Committee. Unanimously accepted as authoritative.
- June 3 - July 3: Split of five groups of RCT members and supporters from the Canadian section and its youth organization -- 25 in all.
- August 16: Public presentation of an internal document at a Winnipeg LSA meeting.
- August 30: Statement of 14 Winnipeg LSA members on August 16 forum.
- September 13: Political Committee decides on campaign on Chile.
- September 16: Bureau informs Winnipeg executive of planned Chile meeting in Winnipeg.
- September 19: Public meeting on Chile in Winnipeg organized by the Political Bureau, with Al Cappe of PC as speaker.
- September 19: Winnipeg branch meeting.
- September 21: Rival meeting on Chile, in Winnipeg, with Brett Smiley as speaker.
- September 24: Winnipeg branch suspends five members who built September 19 meeting.
- September 30 -  
October 1: Political Committee trial subcommittee meets in Winnipeg.
- October 4: Letter of the RCT resigning from the LSA/LSO.
- October 5-8: RMG convention. RCT members secretly attend RMG convention. RCT leaders secretly accept posts on RMG Central Committee.
- October 9: Political Committee discussion with RCT steering committee.
- October 13: "RCF" announces "beginning" of fusion negotiations with RMG.
- October 15: RMG announces results of raiding operation.

APPENDIX II

The RCT's Letter of Resignation

October 4, 1973

Dear Comrades of the LSA Political Committee:

Events in Winnipeg have confirmed our suspicions that previous actions of the Political Committee were leading in a direction of serious consequences.

Those events have led us to decide that we have no choice but to dissolve the Revolutionary Communist Tendency and reconstitute ourselves as the Revolutionary Communist Faction.

We will no longer respect the authority or actions of the Political Committee of the League for Socialist Action.

We also wish to inform you that we are terminating all financial commitments to the LSA and will submit future financial commitments directly to the United Secretariat of the Fourth International.

The Political Committee of the LSA has, by the decisions of its former majority, dissolved itself as a cross-section leadership and now functions as a leadership of a faction.

We will submit further documentation on this and related matters to the LSA and to the United Secretariat.

Communist greetings,

s/Walter Davis  
Coordinator of the RCF

cc: USFI

APPENDIX III

The RCT "Fuses" With the RMG

October 15, 1973

Comrades:

We wish to inform the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction of the Canadian Section that the Revolutionary Communist Faction and the Revolutionary Marxist Group have fused.

The new formation will continue to be called the Revolutionary Marxist Group.

Communist greetings,  
s/Walter Davis,  
for the Unified Political  
Committee

REPORT ON CENTRAL COMMITTEE MEETING  
OF THE GERMAN SECTION

October 6-7, the German Central Committee met to discuss the issues in dispute in the world movement. Prior to this meeting, three tendencies had been declared in the GIM (IEC Majority Tendency supporters, Leninist-Trotskyist Faction supporters and the Kompass Tendency, which does not completely agree with either of the two international tendencies). After an initial presentation by each tendency, discussion was divided into a section on Latin America and a section on Europe. Most of the time available was spent on the Latin American discussion.

The reporters for the two international tendencies, Ernest Germain and Peter Camejo, and others who spoke supporting either of these positions presented the ideas that are available in the International Internal Discussion Bulletin. What is of interest is the positions presented by the reporter, Karew, and the other leaders of the Kompass Tendency. These positions are not yet available to the world movement in the IIDB. The document "Why We Did Not Sign the International Majority's Tendency Declaration" signed by twelve leaders of the German section (IIDB Vol. X, No. 11) is not a document of this tendency although many leaders of Kompass signed that document.

On Latin America, the Kompass Tendency disagrees with the line adopted at the last world congress. They believe it has led to disaster in Bolivia and Argentina and must be changed. The most important problem in their opinion is not that the error was made but that it is not being corrected. This could lead to a crisis in confidence in the leadership. Further they stated there is no need for a specific orientation to armed struggle because armed struggle flows from the class struggle itself. If a revolutionary party has a correct orientation to the class struggle, it will have a correct orientation to armed struggle. The orientation of the IEC Majority Tendency leads to substitutionism -- substitution of armed struggle for political struggle, for the class struggle.

The Kompass Tendency supporters stated that the dispute in the Fourth International has not arisen because one of the tendencies is for armed struggle and the other is against it. Both tendencies are for armed struggle. If one tendency was against armed struggle, it would not, or should not, be in the International. The question is how. In their opinion, Joe Hansen's document "The Underlying Differences in Method" is correct on the origins of the dispute. This document was referred to several other times during the discussion.

They raised that they thought the party should organize a parallel apparatus, and they did not know whether the international tendencies, especially the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction, agreed with this.

The Kompass Tendency had several criticisms of the perspectives on Europe developed by the IEC Majority Tendency in the European resolution and in some of their articles. First they felt that section 11 entitled "Three Tactics" should be removed from the document. None of the three were tactics. They were either goals or orientations, and this section did not give any advice on tactics, which in any case can vary greatly

country to country.

Second they thought that the concept of the new mass vanguard as it has been developed is incorrect. It is talked about as if it were a structured phenomenon which the party could have a single orientation toward. This is incorrect. It has many components which are not homogeneous. The example used was that it includes student radicals and advanced workers who in many cases cannot even talk to each other. An orientation to the new mass vanguard in Germany, they held, would in reality mean an attempt to win hegemony in the radicalized student movement rather than an orientation toward the working class. They considered the most important task today to make a serious effort to penetrate the working-class movement.

The Kompass Tendency raised some criticisms of Mary-Alice Waters' contribution to the discussion on Europe. While they disagreed with the 4-5 year timetable, they felt her contribution was incorrect when it maintained the document had a catastrophic character.

Of the comrades who spoke the largest number supported the Kompass Tendency. Almost as many supported the IEC Majority Tendency. One person spoke as a supporter of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction. A slightly smaller number of comrades than the number supporting either the Kompass or IEC Majority tendencies indicated they did not clearly support any of the three tendencies.

The Kompass Tendency has prepared several documents for the German discussion and is planning on writing additional documents on its attitude toward the issues under discussion in the world movement. When these are available, comrades will be able to have a more complete presentation of their views.

They stressed that a central aspect of their platform was a stand for unity of the International.

Benny Johnson  
October 11, 1973