

COPY

COPY

COPY

14 Charles Lane
New York, N.Y. 10014
August 4, 1971

Dear Walter,

This is to acknowledge receipt of the July 26, 1971
letter from the United Secretariat to the Political Committee
of the Socialist Workers Party. We will place it in the
next issue of the International Information Bulletin.

Comradely,
s/Jack Barnes
Organization Secretary

COPY

COPY

COPY

July 26, 1971

Dear Jack,

Enclosed you'll find the answer to the July 7, 1971 letter of the Political Committee of the SWP, which the United Secretariat has instructed me to draw up during its July 24-25 session.

Fraternally yours,
s/Walter

P.S. Obviously both your July 7 letter and our answer will be included in an Internal Bulletin.

COPY

COPY

COPY

July 26, 1971.

To the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party

Dear Comrades,

The United Secretariat has discussed your letter of July 7, 1971 during its session of July 24-25. This letter raises two kinds of questions.

Misunderstandings or possible misinterpretations of previous communications seem to have cropped up. In order to eliminate such misunderstandings, we wish to make the following factual points:

- 1.- The "Comité uruguayo (IV Internacional)" is a group of sympathizers of the IVth International in Uruguay. It is the group which was represented by comrade Ramon at the 9th World Congress (3rd Congress after Reunification) and reported upon the mandates committee of that Congress.
- 2.- The members of the United Secretariat, including comrade Livio, resolutely confirm that in their view what occurred during the Reunification Congress was a genuine unification of two groups of organizations, and not an entry of one group into another one. Comrade Livio precises that the formula he used in his answer to your letter of May 11, 1971, refers to a possible later entry of Healy and Lambert into the already reunified International, after their initial refusal to participate in the Reunification Congress.
- 3.- The members of the United Secretariat, including comrade Livio, when referring during the current debate to "comrades of the majority" and "comrades of the minority", thereby design not tendencies, which are till now non-existent in the International, but comrades holding majority and minority positions on the question of Latin-America (on the Latin-American document voted upon during the last congress).

Conclusions are drawn from such misunderstandings which seem out of proportion compared to the matters raised. In our movement there is of course full freedom to form political tendencies, and we do not want to influence anybody in the sense of not forming such tendencies, if the comrades involved are convinced that the existing political differences make such a step necessary.

We note however that these political differences have in no way increased during the last period, nor has any issue linked to the "Domingo letter" tended to increase them.

We therefore continue to share the opinion expressed in the following paragraphs of your July 7, 1971 letter:

"Up to this point in the international discussion we have followed a policy of opposing the crystallization of international tendencies.

First of all, we were of the view that while some important differences had arisen and been expressed at the last world congress, no general division into two opposing sides had occurred there, whatever may have been the factional posture of some comrades on certain questions. In addition we assumed that the areas of common agreement outweighed the division in view of the virtually unanimous approval of the general political resolution which outlined the main tasks of the Fourth International for the immediate period ahead.

Upon the renewal of discussion in preparation for the coming congress, it appeared to us that a policy of opposing the crystallization of international tendencies would help ensure maximum freedom of debate. It was a policy, we thought, that would be most conducive to bringing out nuances of thought, would best permit the shifts and changes in view called for by the interchange of opinion, the weighing of arguments, and development of more thoroughly grounded judgments. Moreover, such a policy, we felt, would best foster efforts to broaden the areas of common agreement and bring them to the fore."

We believe this to hold true to-day, as it did during and after the last World Congress. We do not see any reason to change that view in the light of organizational incidents like the publication of the "Domingo letter",-- incidents which sometimes occur during heated political discussions, but which the most responsible comrades on both sides generally tend to consciously reduce in importance, in order to help the discussion center around the key political issues.

No part of the "Domingo letter" referring to comrade Moreno raises new issues in the international discussion. All these arguments have already been stated openly and clearly by the comrades who hold these views, either during the last world congress itself or during the last IEC. As a matter of fact, the main thrust of that letter, far from being factionally directed against comrade Moreno, is directed (in great part on the basis of information and considerations now by-passed by events) against the very comrades who, on the Latin-American question, aligned and align with the majority.

For these reasons we do not believe that there is ground for changing a judgment on the internal situation in the International which we had in common till a short time ago.

Fraternally yours,

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International

Vote: On the first part (factual precisions): 7 for, 0 against, 1 abst.
On the second part: 7 for, 1 against, 0 abst.