

New York, New York

July 20, 1974

TO LENINIST-TROTSKYIST FACTION COORDINATORS

Dear Comrades,

Enclosed are copies of several items:

1. A letter from Bill Massey to the SWP Political Committee, protesting the Control Commission investigation, along with a carbon copy of a letter from Massey to the United Secretariat on the same subject. Both letters are dated June 26, 1974, but were received on July 10, 1974.
2. A letter from Polly Connelly, Ed Hoffmans, and Don Smith dated June 28, 1974, announcing their resignation from the Internationalist Tendency effective June 26, 1974. The letter was received on July 5, 1974. Connelly, Hoffmans, and Smith were dropped from the SWP membership rolls on July 5, 1974, along with all the others who were members of the IT party as of the time of the IT's split convention May 25-27, 1974. According to their letter, their resignation from the IT was not based on rejection of the IT split, but took place over "the question of Stalinism."
3. A letter from Debby Leonard of Houston, dated July 5, 1974, opposing the PC decision on the IT party, and announcing her support to the IMT, and a reply to her from Lew Jones, dated July 20, 1974.
4. A letter from Tom Leonard of Houston, dated July 10, 1974, opposing the PC decision on the IT party.
5. A letter dated July 9, 1974, from a group of four members of the Revolutionary Marxist Collective in the Bay Area applying for membership in the SWP. Barry Sheppard has arranged to meet with this group.
6. A letter dated July 16, 1974 from 19 members of the Socialist Union in Southern California, proposing the dissolution of the Socialist Union into the Socialist Workers Party, and a reply from Barry Sheppard, dated July 17, 1974.
7. A letter dated July 12, 1974 from a group of five members of the Baltimore Marxist Group, applying for membership in the SWP, and a reply from Gus Horowitz, dated July 20, 1974.
8. A document of the IT party entitled, "Statement of the Political Committee of the Internationalist Tendency of the Socialist Workers Party and the Young Socialist Alliance, July 5, 1974." The document lists five people as comprising the Political Committee of the IT party. One of these five, John Hutton, was formerly a member of the YSA, but not of the SWP. The IT newsletter report of June 6, 1974 reporting on the IT split convention states that six people were elected to the IT PC.

9. A letter dated July 17, 1974 from Bill Massey of the IT party to the Political Committee of the SWP, written on behalf of a list of IT party members. There are five people who were on the list of IT party members dropped from the SWP on July 5, 1974 whose names do not appear on the list sent in by Massey: Polly Connelly, Ed Hoffmans, and Don Smith from Chicago; Steve Smith from Houston; Sandy Hall from Oakland-Berkeley.

10. A reprint of an article that appeared in the July 19, 1974 issue of Workers Vanguard, newspaper of the Spartacist League. The article, reporting on the IT split from the SWP, is clearly aimed at recruiting the IT party members to the Spartacist League. Note that the article also quotes from two documents that are not available to the SWP: 1. a "circular letter of June 11 to the IMT by IT leader Bill Massey"; 2. a document by Don Smith explaining his June 26, 1974 resignation from the IT.

Comradely,

Ed Shaw

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

Chicago, Illinois
June 26, 1974

[received July 10, 1974]

The Political Committee
Socialist Workers Party
14 Charles Lane
New York, New York 10014

Dear Comrades,

I write this letter in my capacity as the National Coordinator of the Internationalist Tendency of the Socialist Workers Party and as a member of the International Majority Tendency (even though the Socialist Workers Party is prevented by reactionary legislation from membership in the Fourth International.)

At the most recent Plenum of the Socialist Workers Party, the Political Committee put forth a motion to the National Committee to set up a control committee investigation of the May 11 demonstrations in conjunction with the activities of the comrades of the Internationalist Tendency. We were told that materials such as the letters of various Party branch organizers and letters written by Cde. John Barzman, Cde. Cathy Matson and myself had also been given to the N.C. as part of the basis for the Control Committee investigation. This was the entire specifications announced at the Plenum. (The letters of the various organizers have never been sent by us of the I.T.). The N.C. voted for this recommendation without discussion of any type (we presume there must have been some discussion in the two official Leninist-Trotskyist Faction meetings that took place in conjunction with the Plenum or in the majority of closed sessions of the Plenum from which not only were Cde. Barzman and myself excluded but also Cde. Aubin of U.S..

However in discussing with Cde. Horowitz of the Political Committee and now of the Control Committee, I was told that the control committee will investigate anything it feels needs investigation and that the May 11th events are just one item. Cde. Horowitz proceeded to ask me details concerning the life of the International Majority Tendency, the International Tendency, the Puerto Rican Socialist Party, etc.. He also informed me that these were to be considered "official" questions. (This "official" meeting of the Control Commission took place while I was waiting for Cde. Aubin and Cde. Barzman to leave the Plenum room since we were not welcome to stay for the next session dealing with "Opponent organizations", I believe). Only Cde. Horowitz was present. Not only was I shocked by the informality of the control commission, in that it can just walk up to a comrade and start popping "official questions", but by the lack of clarity as to what the specific nature of the investigation is. Does this suggest that any member of the control commission or the body as a whole can just wander up to individual IT comrades anywhere in the country and start a session of the "investigation" on any topic "they" think needs investigation? Then the hodge podge of information is put together to build a case for the disciplining of the I.T. as a whole?

With regard to the only question mentioned in the P.C. motion, May 11th, both comrade Barzman and myself spoke on this matter at the Plenum. We both acknowledged that our Tendency as a Tendency but also as loyal supporters of the Fourth International gave out the statement of the Fourth International on Chile and sold the Old Mole supplement on Chile in addition to carrying out our regular assignments. In many areas we acknowledge that this was done after we had requested the Branches of the Party to carry out their responsibilities in this regard. If it is true to say that the IT had a national policy to hand out the FI statement on Chile and get out the positions of the FI thru the Old Mole Chile statement it is also true to say that the leadership of the Socialist Workers Party had a national policy to not carry out the line of the FI on Chile. This is not a case of tactical implementation but of refusal to carry out the essence of the line of the Fourth International. On this basis the Control Commission is our penalty for carrying out the line of the FI. Further it is meant to intimidate and provoke comrades of the I.T.. Further still it is meant to intimidate other comrades of the Party or the YSA from joining us on the basis of our political ideas, being warned in advance, "that this is what you get if you are loyal to the Fourth International in the United States."

For the reasons of lack of specificity as to why we are being investigated, I as coordinator of the Internationalist Tendency have counseled the membership of the I.T. not to cooperate with this control commission until we have been notified as to the specific and concrete charges or areas of investigation and until the material which forms the basis of the charges or investigation is made available to us.

Secondly, the Internationalist Tendency will ask for an official investigation of the procedures taken by the SWP leadership in this case, that investigation to be made by the International Control Commission or by the United Secretariat. If comrades in political solidarity with the FI can be harassed and punished for giving out the line of the FI on Chile at a Chile demonstration and can be harassed and punished for selling a special supplement of an official group of the Fourth International, on Chile at a Chile demo--and for carrying out the essence of the line of the FI in this regard while the SWP leadership consciously avoids the implementation of that same line--then the idea of a democratic centralist International is a ludicrous joke. This is not the case, however, as we feel will be shown in relation to this "investigation" approved by the SWP National Committee which only allows members of the ITF to sit among it.

We will await your reply before we can give cooperation to this investigation, so we would appreciate an untypically fast reply.

cc: U.Sec
 IMT
 IT membership

Comradely,
 s/Bill Massey, Coordinator
 Internationalist
 Tendency

Chicago, Illinois
June 26, 1974

The United Secretariat
of the Fourth International

Dear Comrades,

Enclosed is a letter sent by me to the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party. I also enclose a copy of three letters sent on behalf of the Internationalist Tendency to the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party (2 of them--one by Barzman and the other by myself) and the leadership of the Young Socialist Alliance (one of them--signed by Cathy Matson, Coordinator of the YSA Internationalist Tendency).

As the above material makes quite clear, our Tendency after attempting to persuade the leadership of the Socialist Workers Party to carry out the line of the Fourth International with regard to the Chile solidarity campaign, took it upon itself to carry out that line in the forms of the distributing of the September 1973 statement of the Fourth International on Chile and the sales of a special supplement of the Old Mole on Chile. I stress the fact that this was done without in any way neglecting or absenting ourselves from carrying out the assigned tasks that the leadership of the SWP Branches gave us. This same situation is the case with the YSA non-SWP comrades.

The fact that the leadership of the SWP charges us with having done what we already admit to having done would seem to obviate the need for a control committee of investigation. What does need investigation is the fact that the SWP leadership adopted a national policy in opposition to the essence of the line recommended by the International. Not only this but the fact that the leadership of the SWP is now embarked on a campaign of which the Control Committee "investigation" is only a part, to intimidate, provoke, harass and punish those comrades on the basis that they handed out statements of the United Secretariat on Chile and sold a special Chile supplement of the RMG, the official sympathizing group of the FI in Canada is an expression of the deepest hostility on the part of this leadership to the democratic centralist concepts of the International and its own Party.

We see this investigation now being used as a general fishing trip to cause an atmosphere of complete intimidation for members of the I.T. in the SWP and YSA. This is reflected in the fact that Cde. Gus Horowitz states that the Control Commission will investigate whatever needs investigating. Everyone who is aware of the "Barzman letter" conspiracy syndrome of the SWP leadership can imagine the atmosphere developing with the constitution of a Control Commission which has the intentions to investigate everything that needs investigation. Secondly this investigation and new reprisals against the I.T. has the flavor of a blackmail attempt against the International Majority--the leadership of the F.I.. The attacks on the French Sections election campaign and the investigation of the I.T.

are used as pawns to attempt to balance the actions of the PST in relation to the agreements of institutionalizations. This is a very cynical maneuver on the part of the IFF but one that is in keeping with past practices on this bloc.

Because of the situation existent under these conditions, I, on behalf of the Internationalist Tendency, formally request that the United Secretariat take this matter up and make a formal decision as to whether:

1. Comrades of the I.T. in the SWP are subject to investigation and disciplinary actions against them for selling the Old Mole Chile supplement and distributing the Statement of the F.I. on Chile at the May 11th Chile demonstrations.

2. Whether members of the Fourth International or supporters of the FI in areas such as the SWP, where reactionary legislation prevents membership, can be forbidden to sell the press of the International. Clarification of this is needed not only in relation to May 11th, but in general. This situation has been brought about by the fact that several SWP branches are now voting regularly on what press can be sold at various events. The only constant in this process is that the International press, such as Inprecor and the Old Mole are not recommended and therefore "not allowed". Members of the I.T. do not accept such a restriction and would like to know as to whether they are correct or not?

3. Can a Control Commission be set up to investigate everything that it feels needs investigation or must it have a specificity about the nature of its investigation? Do those comrades under investigation have a right to see what specific charges are being brought against them?

I feel that prompt attention to these matters is in order since in my judgement this series of actions on the part of the SWP leadership is meant to drive or provoke our Tendency out of the Socialist Workers Party by making life within it as unbearable as possible. While we will not allow this to happen it creates an atmosphere that is very damaging to political collaboration and political discussion within our Party. The fact that the Control Commission was set up at the recommendation of a leadership that denied our Tendency minority representation on the National Committee that approved the PC motion to set up the control commission speaks volumes. The fact that the commission is headed up by a member of that same PC is certainly alarming.

With the warmest comradely greetings

Bill Massey, National Coordinator
for the Internationalist Tendency

cc: SWP PC
I.T.
IMT

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

June 28, 1974

[received July 5, 1974]

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

Comrades:

We are writing to inform you that we are no longer retaining our membership in the Internationalist Tendency.

The reason is that we have serious programmatic differences with the International Majority Tendency on the question of Stalinism. Unlike the IMT, we [do not] believe that centrism is still a characteristic feature of Stalinist political formations. We also characterize the Vietnamese Communist Party as Stalinist, and would support political revolution in North Vietnam.

Therefore, we have resigned from the IT/IMT effective June 26, 1974.

Comradely,
s/Polly Connelly
s/Don K. Smith
s/Ed Hoffmans

Chicago branch

cc: Internationalist Tendency

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

Houston, Texas
July 5, 1974

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

Dear Comrades of the Political Committee,

I wish to register my protest at the expulsion of the Internationalist Tendency from the Socialist Workers Party. I do not deny that some of the recent actions by the IT have put into question the loyalty of some of their members to the discipline required of members in the SWP. However, there have been numerous provocations by the LTF which have also been unwarranted and have put the norms of democratic centralism in some jeopardy.

Although I have never joined the IT, I want to reaffirm my substantial agreement with the International Majority Tendency as opposed to the LTF. This agreement has increased since the Tenth World Congress, on the basis, especially, of recent developments in Argentina and Portugal.

Because of this position, I am extremely alarmed by what appears to be a stepped-up drive toward split of the Fourth International on the part of the LTF--beginning with the expulsion of the IT. Obviously I cannot support this perspective and feel my own party membership is jeopardized by it.

I am sending a copy of this statement to the Houston SWP National Committee member/Organizer and requesting it be read at the next branch meeting.

Comradely,
s/Debby Leonard

cc: Nelson Blackstock

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

14 Charles Lane
New York, New York 10014
July 20, 1974

Debby Leonard
Houston

Dear Debby,

This is to acknowledge your letter of July 5, 1974 informing us of your adherence to the International Majority Tendency.

There are no grounds for your stated concern that your "own party membership is jeopardized."

The Political Committee on July 4, 1974, adopted the Control Commission's recommendation, "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." As long as these conditions are lived up to, along with the provisions of the Political Committee letter of July 4, which points out that "Political collaboration with non-members of the Party must be formally authorized by the Party committee having jurisdiction," no comrade's membership will be in jeopardy.

A copy of the July 4 letter, which was read at the Houston branch meeting, is included in Internal Information Bulletin No. 6 documenting the split of the Internationalist Tendency party from the SWP.

Comradely,
s/Lew Jones
SWP National Office

cc: Nelson Blackstock, organizer
Acting organizer

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

Houston, Tex.
July 10, 1974

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

Dear Comrades,

Prior to the last World Congress I voted for only one of the resolutions submitted, namely, "The Building of Revolutionary Parties in Capitalist Europe." In my opinion, events in that sector of the world, including Portugal, confirm the basic analysis of this resolution, particularly as it relates to the crisis of capitalism and resurgent class struggle.

After more than 20 years of modest efforts on my part to help build the Trotskyist movement in the U.S., I found myself in disagreement with the leadership of the SWP on a key political question for the first time. This is the reason I did not join the ITF, although I had previously been a member of the IIT on the question of Argentina.

I now consider the decision of the ITF to expel the IT and call for a World Congress to deal with the organizational question a serious mistake in political judgment.

It is quite clear the IT violated the organizational norms of the SWP and the ITF has a strong case for their expulsion. But you have combined the expulsion with a frontal assault on the IIT, which poses the serious threat of a worldwide split.

This course can only appear to serious revolutionaries as an attempt on the part of the ITF to gain by organizational means what it has not been able to gain by political means and that is the majority of the World Movement.

Unfortunately for the ITF this decision occurs at a time of increasing class polarization and actions, coupled with the resurgence of reactionary and fascist movements which are already taking a toll of Trotskyists and other militants around the world. Both the opportunities and the danger to our movement require redoubled efforts to maintain unity.

If you are convinced that it is impossible to do this in the Trotskyist movement as defined by the 10th World Congress, then I can only conclude that the ITF has adopted a split perspective.

I am therefore submitting this statement in opposition to the motions of the Political Committee on both the expulsion of the IT and the immature call for a special World

2/

Congress since I consider them a synthesis.

As a former member of some years on the National Committee, during which I developed great respect for many members on that party body, I wish to make the special request that this statement not be confined to the P.C., but be sent to the entire N.C.

Comradely,
s/Tom Leonard

July 9, 1974

To: Socialist Workers Party Headquarters, NYC

Comrades:

The undersigned members of the Revolutionary Marxist Collective (Berkeley-San Francisco) would like to apply for membership in the SWP (and YSA) on the following basis:

- a) agreement with the positions of the Fourth International as expressed in its world conference documents;
- b) desire to engage in public political practice in the name of the Fourth International;
- c) willingness to abide by the discipline of the Socialist Workers Party, which but for reactionary legislation would be the section of the Fourth International in the United States.

The following individuals are applying for membership in the following branches of the SWP:

Jim Collins	SWP	Oakland-Berkeley
Barry Biderman	SWP	San Francisco
Bob Glick	SWP	San Francisco
Susan Schulman	SWP and YSA	San Francisco

We have sent letters stating the above to the appropriate branches of the SWP (San Francisco) with a copy to the USFI in Brussels. These letters also include information about where we can be contacted. The following letter is to inform you directly about our application (on learning from the Berkeley SWP that this was correct procedure) in the hopes that we can be admitted into the SWP as soon as possible.

Yours fraternally,

s/Jim Collins (for the four
names above)

Los Angeles
July 16, 1974

City Organizer
Los Angeles Local
Socialist Workers Party

Dear Comrade:

We, whose names appear below, are members of Socialist Union, a local independent Trotskyist organization. We are in essential agreement with the program, policies and organizational principles of the Fourth International, have been circulating its press, and popularizing its policies and its work. We are naturally eager to be associated with the International and to help build a strong section in the U.S.

We have therefore decided to apply for membership in the S.W.P., since it is the sympathizing section in the U.S. (unaffiliated only because of the reactionary Voorheis Act), and to urge other independent supporters of the 4th to do likewise.

We are aware of the division within the F.I. We are in general agreement with the positions of the majority tendency (IMT). Since these differences are obviously permissible within the S.W.P. and the International, this should not present any obstacle to our admission. We are, of course, prepared to abide by the decisions of the party and to accept its discipline.

Our organization grew out of a small study group consisting of independent Trotskyists (formerly members of Liberation Union). Last summer we formed the Socialist Union and began to engage in propaganda and action projects.

We initiated the Farm Workers Support Coalition, which you joined, and which was quite effective, as you know.

Next, we initiated the Lawton-Gardner Defense Committee in connection with the third frame-up trial. This committee is carrying out effective work of publicity, fund-raising and demonstrations. Some of your members have participated in several of these activities.

Our comrades active in La Raza Unida Party were the initiators of the demonstration around the Mexican Consulate on May 18, 1974, protesting the recent arrests and torture of revolutionaries across the border. This was quite successful, (as reported in the Militant), and we were glad to see a contingent from USLA on the picket line.

In addition to these actions which we initiated, we participated in demonstrations organized by others, including the S.W.P. Thus, as you know, we helped to build the May 11th demonstration against the Chilean junta. We intervened with

effective banners and literature, which in addition to demanding freedom for political prisoners, called for support to the resistance and for a Socialist Chile. Our banners also popularized the symbol of the Fourth International.

We also participated actively in the demonstration in the Black community protesting the assault by the police against the community and the brutal murder of the SLA members.

In all public activities we sold and/or distributed literature of the F.I. and some of its sections.

Throughout our brief existence, we have continued our studies uninterruptedly. This has served both to educate our cadres and to win new people to Trotskyist ideas. At present we have a study group in process on the history of revolutions and counterrevolutions in the capitalist era. More than 20 members and contacts participate, including a number of Blacks and Chicano.

Our action projects, combined with our study groups and participation in community organizations, have born fruit. We have gained 12 new members, including 5 who are members of oppressed minorities, and a number of close sympathizers and contacts. Our Chicano comrades have recently begun a new class in the barrio which looks promising.

Of our 19 comrades, 16 reside in the L.A. area, and 3 in Riverside, and 6 are members of oppressed minorities. We have a fraction of 3 in La Raza Unida Party, 6 in the Food Conspiracy, (a radical community organization), and several in unions. About half of our members were formerly associated with the S.W.P. or the Y.S.A. and have been reactivated.

We are certain that our group can make a substantial contribution toward building a strong local of the S.W.P. in Southern California.

We are prepared to meet with representatives of the Los Angeles S.W.P. local at your convenience to expedite the dissolution of the Socialist Union into the Socialist Workers Party.

Comradely,

Alejandro Ahumado
Don Andrews
Susan Bronn
Woody Diaz
Adrienne di Donato
Jeff Higgins
Mickey Haslam
Jeanne Hoftetler
Nadine Kerner

Samirah Laban
Alvaro Maldonado
Jesus Mena
Melody Roberts
Stephan Santini
Evelyn Talmadge
Frank Wolff
Pearl Wolff
Edith Zaslow
Milton Zaslow

cc: USFI

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

July 17, 1974

Socialist Union
c/o Milton Zaslow

Dear Comrades of the Socialist Union,

I have received your letter of July 16, 1974, signed by Alejandro Ahumado and 18 others, requesting a meeting with representatives of the Los Angeles SWP local "to expedite the dissolution of the Socialist Union into the Socialist Workers Party."

Of course, we are pleased that your organization has come to the conclusion that it is in "essential agreement with the program, policies and organizational principles of the Fourth International" and therefore you want to join the SWP.

I propose that your group as a whole meet with myself, as the Los Angeles City Organizer and as representative of the SWP Political Committee, and the two Los Angeles branch organizers to discuss this question. For the next few days, however, I will be in the Bay Area, for a similar discussion with members of the Revolutionary Marxist Collective who have also raised the question of joining the SWP. Following those meetings, I am going on to New York for about a week on national SWP business. When I return, I'll put other things aside so we can hold this proposed meeting as soon as possible. Thus, we could hold the meeting sometime during the week of July 29-August 3, if this is convenient for you.

I will contact Milt Zaslow by telephone upon my return to Los Angeles.

Comradely,
s/Barry Sheppard

cc: Westside L.A. SWP Organizer
Central-East L.A. SWP Organizer
Political Committee

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

12 July 1974

Socialist Workers Party
1345 E St. NW (4th fl)
Wash., DC

Dear Comrades:

We would like to formally apply for membership to the SWP as individuals. Presently, we are members of the Baltimore Marxist Group. We support the positions of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International and agree to abide by the discipline of the SWP.

Fraternally,

Rick E.

Michel S.

Jack S.

Lisa S.

D.M.

cc: SWP NO, New York City
F.I., Brussels

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

14 Charles Lane
New York, New York 10014
July 20, 1974

Rick E.
Michel S.
Jack S.
Lisa S.
D.M.

c/o Michel S.
Baltimore, Md.

Dear Comrades,

We were pleased to receive a copy of your letter dated July 12, 1974 applying for membership in the SWP.

We would like to discuss this with you as soon as possible. I suggest that your group meet together with myself, as a representative of the Political Committee of the SWP, and with Bitsy Myers, Washington, D.C. Organizer of the SWP. I plan to be in Washington on Tuesday, July 23, and can be available for a meeting either Tuesday afternoon, or any-time Wednesday. Is this convenient for you? You can reach me through Bitsy Myers at the SWP offices in Washington. The address and phone number are:

SWP
1345 E Street, N.W.
fourth floor
Washington, D.C. 20004
tel: (202) 783-2391

Comradely,
s/Gus Horowitz

cc: Washington, D.C. SWP Organizer

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

STATEMENT OF THE POLITICAL COMMITTEE OF THE INTERNATIONALIST
TENDENCY OF THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY AND THE YOUNG SOCIALIST
ALLIANCE--JULY 5, 1974

On July 5, all supporters of the Internationalist Tendency were informed that they had been expelled from the Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance for "forming a rival party". There was no opportunity for self-defense, no trial, and no provision for appeal. This action sets into motion a dynamic which concretely poses a split in the Fourth International. The Internationalist Tendency is firmly opposed to such a split in the world Trotskyist movement; to forestall such a split, we propose the following:

- (1) We do not recognize our expulsion from the SWP and YSA-- an expulsion which is contrary to the democratic-centralist norms of the Fourth International and the SWP. We appeal to the United Secretariat of the Fourth International to intervene against this expulsion of supporters of the FI from its American co-thinker organization.
- (2) Until a decision by the United Secretariat, the members of the Internationalist Tendency continue to regard themselves as disciplined members of the SWP and YSA. Concretely, this means:
 - (a) We will not publicize the expulsions.
 - (b) We will not discuss internal matters of the SWP and YSA with persons who are outside of the Fourth International.
 - (c) We will not intervene against the SWP or YSA in public forums or meetings.
 - (d) In mass work, we will place ourselves under the discipline of the appropriate SWP or YSA fraction.
- (3) We are preparing statements to the SWP Political Committee and the National Executive Committee of the YSA demanding our reintegration into these organizations along the normal criteria for membership in the Fourth International, the SWP, and the YSA--agreements with the general program of the FI, acceptance of the discipline of the Fourth International and the SWP/YSA, and commitment to work as active militants in these organizations.

We call for the reintegration of all comrades of the Internationalist Tendency who sign these statements. We reject any scheme which would require individual application for "readmission", probationary periods, and selective re-admission. All comrades in the Internationalist Tendency were expelled; all must be reintegrated.

- (4) We are preparing a detailed response to the accusation of "an IT split" made in the SWP Internal Document "Materials Relating to the Split of the Internationalist Tendency from the Socialist Workers Party". We reaffirm that tendencies

within the SWP and YSA have the right to internal discussion about perspectives, tactics, and platform; we also defend the right of tendencies to choose their own leadership bodies, organize conferences, and take votes on their line that will be presented to the party. We absolutely reject the notion that the May IT Conference was a "split convention"; on the contrary, we will show that the decision of the IT was to function as an active tendency within the SWP and YSA and as a part of the International Majority Tendency of the FI.

- (5) We call upon all supporters of the Fourth International in the United States outside of the SWP and YSA to apply for admission into these organizations along the criteria of their political agreement with the general line of the FI, acceptance of FI and SWP/YSA discipline, and commitment to work as active militants of these organizations.

The Fourth International is threatened by a deep crisis; it can only be resolved through a common effort on both sides to reach a principled agreement. We stress our determination to build a strong and unified Trotskyist movement both in the United States and around the world.

This statement was approved by Comrade C., member of the IMT and of the United Secretariat.

Political Committee
of the IT

John Barzman

John Hutton

Bill Massey

Cathy Matson

Pat Quinn

cc: All IT members
United Secretariat
SWP PC
YSA NEC
IMT

Internationalist Tendency of the Socialist Workers Party
c/o Bill Massey, National Coordinator
Chicago, Illinois
July 17, 1974

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

Dear Comrades,

The undersigned members of the Internationalist Tendency of the Socialist Workers Party demand their immediate re-integration into our Party, The Socialist Workers Party. We base this demand on the attached statement that was approved by Comrade C., a member of the United Secretariat and a member of the IMT. (A relatively large number of comrades who were not mentioned in your letter informing us that we were a "rival party", but who have like the entire Internationalist Tendency been defacto expelled while we do not mention those comrades in this letter nonetheless we do include them in our demand for immediate reintegration into the Party.)

At Large
Mike Hoffheimer

Boston
John Montello

Brooklyn
John Singleterry

Chicago
Bill Banta
John Barzman
Ann Marie Capuzzi
Lauren Charous
Mark Lobato
Bill Massey
Cathy Matson
Guy Miller
Debby Pope
Martha Quinn
Pat Quinn
Judi Rossi
Beth Semmer
Ted Stacey

Philadelphia
Robin Block
Harry Brent

Portland
Peter Kirshner

St. Louis
Mark Lause

San Francisco
Garth Chojnowski
Emily Ford

Detroit
Randy Prince

Houston
Jeff Beneke
Bruce Clark
Cheryl Clark
Randy Erb
Peter Gellert
Howard Gerber
Danny Laird
Bill Peterson
Jana Peleusch
David Rossi
Jeanne Shaffer
John Shaffer
Roy Simmons
Russell Welch

L.A.-Central/East
Sunny Foreman
John Van Leuwen
Gene Warren
Sue Warren
Judy Wollacott

L.A.-West
Ed Medard
Ned Moore
Debby Shayne
Judi Shayne
Ron Warren

Twin Cities
Jeff Meisner

Lower Manhattan
Hedda Garza
Frank Manning
Rich Mitten
Charlie Post
Bill Yaffe

Oakland-Berkeley
Tim Kissner
Fran McPoland
Lew Pepper
Mike Tormey

Upper West Side-N.Y.
Joseph Harris
John Chairret
Kari Chairret

Washington D.C.
Les Gulf
Kathy Kersey
Marilyn Lerch
Tom Quinn

cc: United Secretariat, IMT, I.T. membership
Encl.: Statement of the I.T. P.C. of July 5, 1974

Comradely,
s/Bill Massey, for the Internationalist
Tendency of the Socialist Workers Party

End of the "United" Secretariat?

SWP Stages Mass Purge

The Socialist Workers Party/Young Socialist Alliance this 4th of July resolved three years of mounting internal struggle by the brutal mass expulsion of the supporters of the Internationalist Tendency (IT). Forty-five party members, 45 youth members and 25 dual members were expelled—a total of 115, the largest single split in the SWP in 21 years. This abrupt act in the United States may well lead, even within a matter of weeks, to the definitive rupture in the "United Secretariat of the Fourth International" between the SWP-led Minority ("Leninist-Trotskyist Faction," or LTF) and the International Majority Tendency (IMT) which the U.S. IT supports.

For the past five years the United Secretariat (USec) has been polarizing ever more sharply between the fake orthodoxy of the reformist, legalist Minority and the impressionistic revisionism of the centrist, petty-bourgeois Pabloist Majority. Brain-truster for the Majority (whose main base is the French organization currently calling itself the Front Communiste Révolutionnaire) is the facile, erudite, academic European Ernest Mandel, while the

spokesman for the Minority has been the American SWP's intellectual technician Joseph Hansen.

The SWP expulsions were accomplished by the simple expedient of notifying every IT supporter "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." The peculiarly tortured language in proclaiming, not an expulsion, but the recognition of a new "Internationalist Tendency party" standing outside the SWP is an attempt to put a defensible face on the expulsion in confronting the SWP's international associates, in the light of the "Tenth World Congress" agreement prohibiting new splits and organizational reprisals. In addition the SWP immediately published a massive 146-page *Internal Information Bulletin* (No. 6, July 1974) to its membership attempting to justify the expulsion.

The Statement on the IT expulsion adopted by the SWP Political Committee on 4 July concludes with the ultimatis-

tic demand: "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... 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."

Technique of the Big Lie

To justify its accusation of IMT "splitters" the SWP had to make a fraudulent case against the IT. The core of the case is the Political Committee Statement's assertion that in fact the expulsions are based on the *previous* split of the IT: "the split was consummated at the May 25-27 national convention of the Internationalist Tendency held in Chicago."

There was a national conference of the IT at the place and dates indicated. But the funny thing is, it had a very different outcome than that alleged by the SWP. The IT delegates went into that conference with various draft

resolutions and amendments whose thrust was that they saw little long-term future for themselves in the SWP/YSA. But the Bureau of the IMT made very forceful recommendations to the conference, and the IT adopted the perspective of "building a strong Tendency in the SWP in the long-term sense."

The IT was dead serious about remaining in the bureaucratic stranglehold of the SWP as was made absolutely clear in this same circular letter of 11 June to the IMT by IT leader Bill Massey, who concluded: "In short, we urge the comrades of the IMT, who we recognize as our political leaders, to take strong actions to help us democratize the SWP, so that we can carry out the perspectives of the Bureau. Without your strong actions, we will die trying, but we will die."

Massey's conclusions about dying were straightforward and bore early fruit: on June 26 Don Smith, a founding leader of the IT, and two associates abruptly resigned from the IT expressing in the course of their resignation profound demoralization and disorientation. (They still made the unaltered SWP's expulsion list as ITers, how-

ever.) Smith noted: "The transformation of the Internationalist Tendency from a group seeking to 'build the nucleus of the future section' to one seeking to 'become a strong tendency within the SWP' completely changes our political situation." He recommended that the IT break with the IMT and suggested that it itself break into four constituent tendencies.

Behind the USec Fight

The fundamental driving force behind the escalating polarization of the USec is that the two counterposed wings are responding to different pressures and appetites. The European-based Majority continues to race recklessly along the archetypically Pabloist road of striving for some kind of "revolution" other than the victorious class struggle of the proletariat, without the creation and ascension to real leadership in that struggle of a Leninist vanguard party as a condition for victory. Having abandoned (but never disavowing) universal "entrism" (tailing and hoping to pressure Stalinist, social-democratic or Labourite bureaucracies or big-time colonial nationalists) the USec has in rapid succession put forward various impressionistic short cuts to social revolutionary success without the class-conscious proletariat: a peasant-guerrilla road to power in Bolivia; the "red university" strategy which sees students as the key social layer; "from the periphery to the center" as the means whereby their French student graduates turned bank clerks or school teachers can somehow find the

road to the Stalinist-led industrial proletariat.

The new jargonistic cover for this petty-bourgeois impressionism is the discovery of the New Mass Vanguard, comprised of all the discontented young Europeans who, of course, don't even necessarily know they are supposed to be a vanguard and who embody every kind of manifestly false, mainly anarcho-Maoist, program. Rather than viewing the heterogeneous strata of militant, disaffected young workers and students as potential raw material for a Leninist party, the USec turns them into a New Mass Vanguard, a semi-Leninist semi-party waiting to be found by the Pabloist vanguard-detectors.

Thus the thin, pulsating layers of Pabloists are fated to walk the earth looking for the "easy way." But what happens when they find it? When one of their local formations has locked on and acquired some significance—something tangible to sell out—then the centrist rhetoric of the USec suddenly becomes an impediment to be sloughed off: the Ceylonese LSSP got into a popular-front government; Michel Pablo himself got to be a senior advisor to the Ben Bella government in Algeria; the Argentine PST, along with the representatives of six bourgeois parties and the CP, even got to meet with Pefon. Of course Mandel himself didn't make it, being bounced in 1960 as a top advisor in the Belgian left labor bureaucracy, and had to hit the road for the infinitely less satisfying "student power" (thus the tabling of deep entrism—enter the "red university").

The SWP hit the big time briefly

with the Vietnam peace movement and has been shopping around, mainly unsuccessfully, for a successor. SWP National Secretary Jack Barnes, his personal appetites for greater power and global post notwithstanding, and his SWP are above all seeking to fend off and suppress the USec Majority's appetites for miscellaneous (mainly verbal) extremism which are not only embarrassing but downright dangerous for the SWP's main chance as a radical power-broker to social movements in the United States, hopefully thereby to acquire the basis to become a successful mass new domestic social-democratic party. So for several years the SWP has employed its presumed authority and very considerable material resources to bend the USec to its needs and will.

The IT Is Expendable

The 112 comrades of the IT are essentially but a pawn in the far-flung international calculation and counter-calculation as the two wings of revisionist ex-Trotskyism maneuver to destroy one another's credibility. The USec Majority evidently sees that a break with the SWP and its allies cannot be long postponed (see our account of the "Tenth World Congress" in *WV* No. 42, 12 April). But to avoid the appearance of a major international split which would undermine its own presumed legitimacy as "the Fourth International," the IMT may have hoped to tackle the Minority piecemeal. They temporized, so the story goes, until the exhibition, under the tumultuous condi-

tions in Argentina, of the naked reformist appetite of the PST (see article in this issue) should compel the SWP to acquiesce to the elimination of its major LTF ally. Apparently, Barnes simply struck first, precipitating the crisis of his own choosing at his own time.

Whether by calculation in order to isolate the SWP, or because the shameful conduct of the PST has become an albatross the USec can no longer wear, and whatever the accompanying Machiavellian calculation, this is the logic of thrust and counter-thrust. And so the IT, having accepted the perspective of continued suppression, demoralization and disintegration inside the SWP, suddenly finds itself on the outside while the IMT considers the next move in the gambit.

The prospects in any case for the IT are unenviable, above all because of the "comrades of the IMT, who we recognize as our political leaders," as Comrade Massey put it so clearly. In its desperate thrashing about, the IT has tried to persuade itself that the Pabloism of the United Secretariat is only a shibboleth, an empty political epithet. They are finding out differently. The organizational consequence of the USec's objectivist, tailist line is disinterest and contempt toward the painstaking building of communist cadres. What are 112 ITers in the United States to the Pabloist mind?—after all, the automatic unfolding processes of the New Mass Vanguard or some successor gimmick will certainly bring thousands surely one speech by Ernest Mandel in a suitable mass

meeting could win far more, so why worry about small change like the political death of the IT, which is merely the major part of three years of left oppositional activity in the SWP? Thus it is not subjective evil or ill will that causes the USec tops (the superstars Mandel and Alain Krivine, the more pedestrian Pierre Frank and Livio Maitain) to look upon the IT not as comrades but as pawns; this willful destructiveness is only the necessary corollary of their impressionistic politics.

Evolution of the IT

The comrades of the IT, leaders and ranks alike, are mainly young and inexperienced. They sought, not always steadily or without capitulations, to move left in the degenerated SWP, that school for opportunism with its hypocritical, brutal regime which willfully connives at the destruction of internal critics. The initial oppositional declaration of the left wingers was "For a Proletarian Orientation" introduced for the 1971 SWP Convention, some two years after the fight in the USec had begun. Though narrowly focused and ahistorical, this document was a promising beginning for an SWP left wing. It cast Ernest Mandel as the principal theoretical fount for the SWP's departures: "However in the last several years Comrade Ernest Mandel has developed a theory which challenges these basic Marxist definitions [on the centrality of the industrial working class to socialist revolution]. And the SWP leadership has neither

criticized Mandel's assertions nor analyzed the implications these assertions have for the strategy of the revolutionary party. In fact, our party has been following the logic of Mandel's position without admitting it."

By 1973 in their letter of 19 January again declaring a tendency, signed by Bill Massey, John Shaffer and Don Smith (SWP *Discussion Bulletin* Volume 31 No. 1, 8 April 1973) the oppositionists clearly inclined to the USec Majority while still expressing criticism of its guerrilla war line and reservations about its hailing of Third World Stalinism as a pragmatic revolutionary leadership. By 27 May 1973, in their Declaration as the IT, they had come out for the general line of the IMT, and they ended up voting unconditionally for all IMT positions. Thus a tendency which began by criticizing the SWP for tailing Mandel, architect of the petty-bourgeois "neo-capitalism" line, today condemns the SWP for refusing to embrace this same Mandel.

Bureaucratic Centralism

The SWP leadership has not failed to make considerable demagogic exploitation of the IT's turnabout, while doing its level best to drive the oppositionists down such a destructive road into indiscipline and/or into the arms of the IMT. Accompanying the political degeneration of the SWP, the life of oppositional elements in that party has gotten correspondingly shorter, nastier and more brutish. The SWP Control Commission Report justifying the IT's expulsion, in the current SWP *Internal Information Bulletin*, makes a

new long step in "regulating" out of existence any remnants of factional democracy within the SWP.

The 1965 SWP Organizational Resolution adopted to justify the expulsion of the Revolutionary Tendency (precursor to the Spartacist League) still had a certain elasticity. Our tendency had written on 25 March 1963 in a statement to the SWP National Committee (reprinted in our *Marxist Bulletin* No. 4-1) that "The Minority declares: 1—that it *has and will* strictly abide by the democratic-centralist practices, discipline and responsibilities normal to the Trotskyist movement; 2—that it will not surrender the necessary and essential attributes and functions of an organized and internally democratic tendency; 3—that it recognizes the right of existence as an organized tendency is only justified by the most serious political differences such as all sides acknowledge exist within the party today."

In his reports motivating our exclusion from the party Farrell Dobbs brooded aloud about point 2, but was forced to expel us for "disloyalty." This was reflected in the 1965 resolution, the gist of which can be summarized as: (1) factions are permitted in the SWP, (2) factionalists are disloyal people, (3) disloyal people are expelled.

Barnes' present-day SWP removes the ambiguities left in 1965. Thus the Control Commission Report states: "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 structure: its basis for membership, its struc-

ture, its membership composition, its leadership composition, the powers of its leadership bodies, and the extent of its discipline"; "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"; and "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."

Both the IT and our tendency when in the SWP were denied representation on the SWP National Committee. Such denial of representation for oppositions has been normal SWP practice these last ten years. This adds another dimension to the Control Commission's new restrictions on factional activity. Thus a majority faction, declared or otherwise, always has the automatic secrecy, protected by party discipline, of privacy in higher bodies (including the restricted circulation of minutes) while it thrashes out its own factional platform. Meanwhile caucus or faction participants are to be denied the right to subordinate minor differences to major issues in order to present a common front within the party. For a politically-based faction to demand privacy in its deliberations and put forward a disciplined common front within the party is fully principled and necessary. How many times did Cannon in the CP or the SWP or Trotsky in the Russian CP do this very and utterly necessary thing? Conversely, how many times has anyone seen SWP Majority-

ites break a common front in the last ten years? A rotten bloc is when primary differences are subordinated to secondary ones.

The SWP accuses the IT of acts of indiscipline or hostility. The primary responsibility for the maintenance of discipline and good party practice rests in the first place with a majority, and above all in its own conduct. Only then can it legitimately make corresponding demands on all other elements in the party. The SWP Majority has been concretely and massively disloyal and indisciplined, excluding the IT from its rightful share in the official leadership and depriving ITers of all significant opportunity for responsible party work. This deliberate practice of the Dobbs and later Barnes leadership, which facilitated the capitulation of the IT into the ostensibly protective arms of the IMT, has successfully driven out all oppositional elements from the SWP. All oppositions but one, that is. The Revolutionary Tendency refused to quit, refused to break discipline and refused to capitulate to Healy's "protective" arms. That's why they had to throw us out for our views solely and then cook up the 1965 resolution and its current escalation.

The IT in endless letters and documents of protest has shown itself to be particularly and vehemently sensitive to the suppression of its democratic rights. But it stood by while the Revolutionary Internationalist Tendency, led by Gerald Clark, was suppressed, framed up and expelled, and all appeal not only denied but ignored through the

common action of both the SWP and the IMT. The RIT had analyzed the USec fight and drew conclusions from roughly the same quarter as the SL. As we note in the document "Declaration for the Organizing of an International Trotskyist Tendency" (printed in this issue) one of the aspects of the principled Leninist movement is even-handedness in discipline, not the importation into the allegedly Marxist movement of the common practice of reformist bureaucrats: step on the little ones, smash the troublesome ones and crawl before the powerful ones.

What Next for the IT?

Some of the IT's positions are not bad. It opposes the SWP's sectoralism ("self-determination" and a separate party for everyone) and the line that U.S. blacks are a nation. But for the IT as a tendency, though surely not for many of the individual members, its revolutionary fibre is damaged.

Conceivably, as the result of an unlikely deal, the IT could be forcibly restored for a time to the bosom of the SWP. As Massey implied, down that road lies death. Or if the current USec crisis stops short of a complete international rupture, the IT could for a time become a public "sympathizing group" pledged not to openly criticize the SWP. In the event of a complete international split, as now appears probable, the IT will become the new USec Majority group—all heterogeneous 112 of them, along with the several sympathizing circles scattered

around the country and maybe even the nine IMT supporters still in the SWP.

The IT grouping will find that a USec franchise will not cut a lot of ice as they begin to be squeezed on the right by the tenfold-larger SWP and on the left by the several times larger Spartacist League. The IT will find, when and if it is permitted to set up shop publicly, that it is mistaken in many of its SWP-derived prejudices about the irrelevance or ineffectiveness (as to political origins, prior work and present practice) of the SL of the U.S., now a section of a burgeoning and principled democratic-centralist international tendency. Moreover, the IT's implantation within the labor movement is primitive and its practice opportunist with a kamikaze overlay. Given the current gloomy economic prognosis, the IT will find it difficult to improve its trade-union involvement; should it manage to do so, however, it will find the SL there as an established competitor, not least in the IT's projected target industries.

Unlike the IT, the SWP has a niche to fill—but that niche lies unequivocally outside the authentic Trotskyist movement. The original split in the Fourth International took place in 1952-53. The SWP then, despite its developing weaknesses, fought against the Pabloites on the qualitatively superior political platform. Then, a decade of accelerating degeneration brought it down to the centrist level of Pablo's International Secretariat. The resulting European-centered USec has continued on the

same centrist merry-go-round, powered more recently by some thousands of new youth. But the SWP continued its rightward motion. It, as first grotesquely revealed by Dobbs' condolence telegram to the widow Kennedy, is locked in fundamentally to the American scene and ultimately its activity is at the pleasure of the American bourgeoisie. The preconditions for its reformist participation in American life are fully prepared. It awaits only new and bigger opportunity. ■

Workers Vanguard

July 19, '74