

August 12, 1974

To the Steering Committee of the Leninist Trotskyist Faction

Dear Comrades,

Enclosed are the following items:

1. A letter to the United Secretariat from the Political Committee of the Canadian section concerning the recent tour of Canada made by Comrade Alain Krivine on behalf of the Revolutionary Marxist Group.
2. A letter to the United Secretariat from Darrel Furlotte for the ISA/ISO Central Office, concerning the dues status of the Canadian section.
3. A letter from Comrade John Riddell to Comrade Dick F., enclosing six items related to negotiations between the ISA/ISO and the RMG on mutual support for each others candidates in the recent federal elections in Canada.
4. A reply from Comrade Walter to Comrade Barry Sheppard's letter of June 28, 1974, concerning the resources of the Socialist Workers Party and the finances of the Fourth International.
5. A translation of an article on the French presidential elections written by three comrades of the Leninist Trotskyist Tendency in the GIM, submitted to the internal discussion bulletin of the German section.

* * *

We have received a notice from the United Secretariat Bureau that the next meeting will take place in September as regularly scheduled.

Comradely,

Mary-Alice Waters

August 12, 1974

To Leninist Trotskyist Faction Coordinators

Dear Comrades,

Enclosed are the following items:

1. A letter to the United Secretariat from the Political Committee of the Canadian section concerning the recent tour of Canada made by Comrade Alain Krivine on behalf of the Revolutionary Marxist Group.
2. A statement adopted by the membership assembly of the Compass Tendency in the GIM concerning the split of the Internationalist Tendency from the SWP, plus a longer contribution by Compass written for the International Internal Discussion Bulletin.
3. A letter from Walter to the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party proposing an "emergency" meeting of the United Secretariat for August 25-26, and a reply.
4. 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; and a letter dated July 29, 1974, from Barry Sheppard to this group, summarizing the discussion that took place at a meeting with them and the SWP's proposals to them to hasten their integration into the SWP.
5. A letter to the United Secretariat from Darrel Furlotte for the ISA/LSO Central Office, concerning the dues status of the Canadian section.
6. A reply from Comrade Walter to Comrade Barry Sheppard's letter of June 28, 1974, concerning the resources of the Socialist Workers Party and the finances of the Fourth International.
7. A letter from Comrade John Riddell to Comrade Dick F., enclosing six items related to negotiations between the ISA/LSO and the RMG on mutual support for each others candidates in the recent federal elections in Canada.
8. A translation of an article on the French presidential elections written by three comrades of the Leninist Trotskyist Tendency in the GIM, submitted to the internal discussion bulletin of the German section.

Comradely,

Ed Shaw

ISA/ISO
334 Queen St. West,
Toronto 2b,
Canada.

July 16th, 1974.

United Secretariat of the Fourth International.

Dear Comrades:

1

Comrade Alain Krivine, one of the best-known leaders of the Fourth International, a member of the International Executive Committee and a leader of the International Majority Tendency, toured Canada during the first week of July on behalf of the Revolutionary Marxist Group. The RMG is a sympathizing organization of the Fourth International, most of whose members are in political agreement with the IMT. Comrade Krivine spoke at election rallies of the RMG in Winnipeg and Toronto, as well as at a RMG public meeting in Vancouver.

The plans for this tour were concealed from the Canadian section, the League for Socialist Action/Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière. We learned of the tour with some astonishment, only on June 27, through wall posters announcing the RMG meetings with Krivine.

We then immediately wrote comrade Krivine and the RMG to propose our collaboration in his tour, either through joint sponsorship of his meetings, or some other mutually agreeable form. As we stated in our letter to comrade Krivine "joint sponsorship of your meetings in Canada by the RMG and the ISA/ISO will make your tour a demonstration of unity by Fourth Internationalists in this country. It will prevent any impression that you are taking a public partisan stand on the division among adherents of the Fourth International in Canada.

"Both the RMG and the ISA/ISO have fielded candidates in the July 8 federal elections. Your Toronto meeting is billed as an election rally in support of the candidates of the RMG. Joint sponsorship of your meetings will prevent any impression that your tour gives political support to the candidates of only one of the two organizations of the Fourth International in Canada."

On July 1, comrade Krivine, along with several RMG representatives, met with two of the leaders of the ISA/ISO. Comrade Krivine frankly informed us that the purpose of his visit was to assist the RMG election campaign and to build the RMG. He said that he had discussed his tour with the leadership of the French Trotskyist organization, the Front Communiste Révolutionnaire, and that his decision represented the views of the FCR leadership. They had foreseen that the ISA/ISO, upon learning of the tour, might request joint sponsorship; they had decided in advance to refuse the request.

We wish to underline the significance of this event and

2.

the implications behind it for our world movement. Krivine's action in accepting the sponsorship of the RMG, a sympathizing organization, while at the same time rejecting the sponsorship of the ISA/ISO will be clearly understood on the left in Canada as an act of public political opposition to the Canadian section, ISA/ISO, by the majority leadership of the Fourth International.

This was all the more serious since the ISA/ISO was also waging an election campaign for its own candidate. (The ISA/ISO also called for a vote for the RMG candidates.) Krivine did not mention the candidacy of the official section even once during his public appearances, let alone indicate his support for its efforts. We expected that Krivine, in addition to his call for support for the RMG's election candidates, would call for a vote for the candidate of the ISA, the official section. The political basis for his failure to support the ISA election candidate was not explained.

The blatant factional manner in which this tour was conceived was brought out even more clearly when, during the course of several interviews he gave on Canadian television, comrade Krivine stated, "I am here (in Canada) to speak at the election rally of the Canadian Trotskyists, the Revolutionary Marxist Group" (CBIT, 11:20 pm, July 7). He thus excluded the concept that there was any Trotskyist campaign other than that of the RMG.

It was in order to reinforce the unity of the world movement in this difficult period that the delegates to the last World Congress adopted the nine-point "Agreement on Measures to Help Maintain the Unity of the Fourth International". Included in that agreement was the ten-point agreement unanimously adopted by the United Secretariat on Sept. 19, 1973. Point 4 of the latter reads as follows:

"That in those countries where two or more groups exist because of splits or other reasons, the united moral authority of the Fourth International be brought to bear for the earliest possible fusion of the groups on a principled basis."

Comrade Krivine's tour did the exact opposite. It set a precedent in the post World Congress period for partisan public intervention by leaders of the International on behalf of contending groups, thus exacerbating existing divisions and promoting splits. The actions of those who organized the Krivine tour violated the decision of the last World Congress. By declaring that they are no longer bound by the nine-point agreement, leaders of the IMT have nullified the agreement.

The manner in which it was organized, and the blatant public display of partisanship involved in the Krivine tour leave the unmistakable impression that a section of the official leadership of the Fourth International has decided to begin a process of de facto recognition of the RMG as the representatives of the "real" International in Canada. This can only have the most serious consequences. It would amount to a decision to adopt a course which will provoke a deepening international split. Once this kind of unprincipled factional

3.

maneuvering is accepted, democratic discussion and collaboration become impossible. Any group which has disagreements with the inner leaders of the IMT will become the target of a secret wrecking operation.

11

We have read the materials relating to the split organized inside the Socialist Workers Party. While the SWP cannot belong to the International because of reactionary U.S. laws, we think there is substantial evidence of the complicity by the International Majority leadership in the preparation of that split by the Internationalist Tendency. We were amazed, for example, to learn of the existence of a "North American Bureau," on which the RMG has representation. When did this secret body come into existence? What is its program? What are its terms of reference? Is there a Latin American bureau, an Asian bureau? Are there other secret regional bodies acting behind the backs of the section leaderships who are not political supporters of the IMT?

What part did the NAB play in the unprincipled split in the Canadian section prior to the last World Congress? What are the real views of the IMT and its components?

Publish the secret resolutions and discussions of the IMT, so that the whole world movement may consider them.

111

There is a clear connection between the two events mentioned above. Comrade Krivine's tour was not a personal initiative. While neither the United Secretariat nor the elected leadership of the Canadian section were informed of the plans for the tour, others were surely consulted on so serious a move.

It is not unreasonable to assume that the tour was the product of a decision of one of the secret bodies of the IMT in consultation with the North American Bureau. If this is the case, it only increases the seriousness of the matter, adding further proof that the IMT leadership has set out on a course of violating the agreements reached by both sides, and endangering the unity of the world movement in the pursuit of their narrow factional ends.

This conduct poses the gravest danger to the International since reunification. It is time to call a halt, to take emergency action to stop the actions of the pro-split wing of the IMT. We urge the United Secretariat to act promptly and affirmatively upon the SWP's call for a special World Congress to resolve this question and ensure the unity of our movement. We urge other sections and groups to take a similar stand.

Comradely,

s/John Riddell,
for the Political Committee
of the ISA/ISO.

COPY

COPY

COPY

KOMPASS
Tendenz in der GIM

Peter Selig, 6 Frankfurt/M
Kl.Friedberger Str.13

to the
United Secretariat of F.I.
ccPolitical Bureau of the GIM

July, 15., 1974

Enclosed find a 'Statement of the Membership Assembly of the KOMPASS Tendency/GIM' concerning the split of the Internationalist Tendency from the Socialist Workers Party, which is adopted unanimously by the membership assembly July 13.

Enclosed find, too, the contribution entitled 'The Danger of a Split in the International', related to the same issue.

The memb.ass. of KOMPASS Tendency decided unanimously to submit this contribution officially to the national and the international discussion.

The KOMPASS Tendency did not vote on this contribution itself, because this contribution includes an estimation of the events and not a point of decision.

THE STEERING COMMITTEE
of the Kompass Tendency

s/Arnold

STATEMENT OF THE MEMBERSHIP ASSEMBLY OF
THE COMPASS TENDENCY (GIM)

The Tenth World Congress (Fourth Since Reunification) succeeded, after long discussion and attempts to find an organizational compromise, in agreeing by an overwhelming majority upon a "Nine-Point Agreement on Measures to Help Maintain Unity of the Fourth International," by which the acute danger of a split could be prevented. Now the unity of our movement is confronted with a new and difficult test: A de facto split has occurred in the Socialist Workers Party (which is prevented by reactionary legislation from being the formal section of the International in the USA). The Internationalist Tendency in the SWP, which belongs to the International Majority Tendency (IMT), is accused by the SWP leadership and control commission of having formed its own party-like organization, operating both inside and outside the SWP, and of having violated the organizational discipline and statutes of the SWP in numerous ways. The SWP leadership has already drawn the conclusion that in view of this the IT is a separate organization and has left the SWP. They regard the members of the IT as no longer members of the SWP. The material on this case presented in International Information Bulletin of the SWP No. 6/74, above all the reproduced original documents of the IT, is indeed alarming and severely incriminating to the IT.

Thus there has occurred a new split in a section between followers of the international majority and the international minority. The split is all the more grave in that it takes place in a section that plays a key role in the international faction struggle, and because it takes place after the world congress and the agreements made there and thus places in question or even invalidates the organizational results of the world congress.

Thus the world Trotskyist movement faces an acute danger of a split, a danger even sharper than before the world congress. It is now necessary for all political forces in the Fourth International to live up to their responsibility for the unity of the international and to use all their means to prevent a split, which could throw our movement back years. In this connection it is our view that a special world congress, which could throw our movement back years. In this connection it is our view that a special world congress, which the SWP leadership now calls for, can be a means of working against the danger of a split, and especially a means of avoiding a "cold split." But the call for a special world congress is premature as long as the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International has not met and used its authority and powers to overcome the present crisis.

We call upon the GIM, as the German section of the Fourth International, to play an active role in the effort against a threatening split. We call upon the central committee members of the Compass Tendency to propose to the central committee of the GIM a common initiative in defense of unity, and to energetically support a prompt meeting of the IEC at the earliest possible moment, and further to support the immediate convening of an international commission of inquiry or the international control commission in order to assist the search for an organizational and political solution to the crisis through an impartial examination of the events and facts.

Passed unanimously by the membership assembly of the Compass Tendency, July 13, 1974.

DANGER OF A SPLIT IN THE INTERNATIONAL

A contribution to the International Internal Discussion Bulletin, submitted by the Compass Tendency in the GIM

De-facto Split in the SWP

In its decision of July 4, 1974, the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) has established that the Internationalist Tendency (IT) in the SWP, which belongs to the International Majority Tendency (IMT), has formed its own party-like organization (called the "IT party" by the SWP-PC) within the SWP and thus placed itself outside the SWP. The PC has informed by letter those members of the IT known to it that they are no longer members of the SWP; and it has directed the branches of the SWP to strike all IT members from their membership lists. At the same time the PC has declared that this decision is not directed against membership in the IMT as such; consequently followers of the IMT who are not organized in the IT remain SWP members.

The SWP leadership sees in this event a threat to the unity of the international and a violation of the "Nine-Point Agreement on Measures to Help Maintain Unity of the Fourth International" adopted by the 10th World Congress. It therefore demands the calling of a special world congress.

This incident is documented in the International Information Bulletin of the SWP, No. 6/74 of July 1974: "Materials Related to the Split of the Internationalist Tendency from the Socialist Workers Party." The documentation includes the report of the control commission of the SWP, the above-mentioned decision and letters of the SWP PC, extracts from the internal tendency discussion bulletin of the IT, materials on violations of discipline by IT members, as well as numerous letters, above all the Langston/Langston letter of resignation from the IT and a letter from Bill Massey (for the IT) to the PC of the SWP.

It is clear that this incident, although it does not come as a complete surprise, represents an acute danger of a split for the International. It is now necessary to concentrate on combating this very present danger of a split and to unequivocally support the preservation of the unity of the international.

The SWP's Motivation of Its Action

The material gathered by the SWP control commission, which provides the basis for the decision of the SWP PC, is impressive, but of extremely varied substance.

The political factors evident in the material are of great weight:

--From the internal IT material published in the IIB the conclusion can be drawn that the IT regards its work in the SWP as "entrism" the goal of which is to win as many SWP and YSA comrades as possible to "their" organization. But there are more people to be won outside than inside the SWP; therefore this "entrism" is not for a long period. (One contribution speaks of three to five months.)

2.

--The IT no longer regards the SWP as its own organization, but as one field of work among others. Consequently, the IT undertakes its "own" external work. It is said of this work that it is increasingly "more important than work in the SWP itself." Even the publication of their own newspaper was already being planned.

--The IT has a regular organizational structure, with an organizational office, paid full-timers, "double-layered" leadership (corresponding to a central committee and a political bureau), delegated national conferences, etc. There are minority tendencies within the IT, which, however, defend the majority line of the IT on the "outside," i.e., in the SWP. In other words, they act toward the SWP as toward a separate (not to say competing) organization.

--In its own internal bulletins the IT conducts its own discussions of political fundamentals (not merely of the tactical questions within the purview of a tendency) without bringing these contributions into the general discussion of the SWP or making them known to the SWP.

--The IT has its own "security policy" with regard to the SWP leadership, with internal tendency pseudonyms, disguised covers of its bulletins; that is, it acts conspiratorially in its own party as it would against the class enemy.

All these things are serious and justify the characterization of the IT as a separate organization. Langston/Langston write in their letter of resignation from the IT that a "separate organization" is the logical consequence of these steps (IIB, pp. 23).

But certainly the most serious point, which is made apparent by a study of the internal IT texts, is that there is not sufficient political agreement of the IT with the SWP for them to work in a common organization. Thus the IT characterizes the SWP as "degenerated" and "deadly sick." Therefore it is to be feared that the points listed above do not represent mistakes correctable by the IT, but rather the reality of two distinct organizations: the LTF-led SWP majority and the IT.

But the matter appears in a somewhat different light when one examines the formal accusations of the SWP leadership, which led to the Control Commission's proceedings against the IT, in the course of which were "discovered" the above-mentioned weighty facts, which unambiguously put the blame for the split on the IT. These accusations for the most part concern matters that in most other sections of the Fourth International would hardly have led to accusations before the Control Commission: attending (public) meetings of other groups without authorization by the party; contacts with education and discussion circles outside the party without party authorization; selling, without party authorization, of the newspapers of other sections and sympathizing groups of the Fourth International in addition to SWP material at Chile demonstrations; and so on. In addition, there is the serious charge of having crossed the boundary between the SWP and its youth organization, the YSA, in tendency work and having brought

IT adherents in the SWP and YSA together within a single IT. Here the SWP leadership poses the problem of "double democratic centralism" in an extreme form: On the one hand the YSA is "guided" politically by the SWP and a representative of the YSA as such sits in the Political Bureau of the SWP. On the other hand, the YSA is supposed to be a completely "independent" organization; that is, SWP members must represent the official line of the SWP within the YSA because the latter is "external." An IT adherent in the YSA who is not a member of the party can thus advocate in full the line of the IT there, but one who is also a member of the SWP cannot do so, and can even be forced to defend the line of the LTF inside the YSA.

This method is in fact suited to discredit the idea of a youth organization (a pet idea of the LTF) in the other sections of the Fourth International. We know from our own rich experience of the relationship between the GIM and RKJ that such a procedure is impractical and politically unacceptable.

Unfortunately it is impossible to separate the grave reasons for a split that have been "discovered" from the -- in our judgment insufficient -- official accusations of the Control Commission. It is obvious that this specific "centralist democracy" of the SWP constitutes an essential reason that the IT established de facto its own organization and evolved out of the party. Apparently the IT had come to the position where it could no longer breathe politically inside this straitjacket of "assignments," restrictions, and prohibitions, in which the difference between party discipline and harassment seemed to disappear. In this connection it is to be noted that the SWP leadership or control commission apparently used "detective" methods against the IT; otherwise it would be unthinkable that such a volume of damaging materials would have come to light.

But even when the problem is viewed from this aspect, the behavior of the IT cannot be defended, because formally the SWP is of course right in all points. The ITers know the SWP and its statutes and accepted them when they joined. They knew that their actions would not be viewed with "European" eyes but would be measured against the statutes and organizational principles of the SWP and that by this measurement their actions were breaches of discipline (breaches, moreover, that were continually repeated at various times and places). And even in the European sections it is the task of the leadership to determine how the line of the Fourth International is to be applied and disseminated; it is not left to the pleasure of tendencies or individuals. In the GIM also, an individual cannot simply produce his own leaflet and distribute it with the argument that it is "his right and his duty to disseminate the line of the Fourth International," even if the content of the leaflet does conform to the line of the Fourth. Otherwise 25 GIM members at a demonstration could distribute 25 different leaflets, all of which "conform to the line of the Fourth International."

The first conclusion that we must draw from the material presented in IIB 6/74 is that the most important task now, as it was earlier, is to intervene to maintain the unity of the Fourth International and to fight against the acute danger of a split, while at the same time we must discuss how this unity can in

general function usefully: not, in any event, in the way the SWP majority and the IT function together.

The Relationship of the IT to the IMT

Central to an evaluation of the real possibilities of a split in the international on the basis of the events in the USA is of course the question of the relationship between the IT and IMT.

The IT, which is very heterogeneous (see appendix), finds its cohesiveness first of all in opposition to the SWP leadership. But naturally it requires a clearer and less diffuse distinguishing characteristic: It tries to find this in membership in the IMT. It is not for nothing that the IT leadership again and again poses greater integration into the IMT as the decisive thing. This is not merely internationalist rhetoric and an opportunist attempt to rely on the bayonets of the international majority for support, but also essential for its very existence because identification with the IMT is at present the only way in which the IT can transform itself from a bloc into a tendency.

However, one can see that opposition to the SWP leadership remains the decisive motive for the IT when the IMT takes up the question of the SWP. On this point the IT, which very much wants to "integrate" itself into the IMT, refuses to obey the IMT.

From the material published in IIB 6/74 it is clear that the various leading organs of the International Majority Tendency unambiguously opposed the split course of the IT. The IMT did not merely express an opinion but also came to completely clear decisions, most importantly that the IT should cancel its national conference.

The IT informed the IMT that it would not recognize these decisions, and it openly violated them. The IT declared "the struggle against the IMT majority position on the SWP" as its most important task. The IT quite clearly proceeded entirely contrary to the decisions of the IMT.

Moreover, if one takes as a basis the firm fact -- of which there are many proofs -- that the IMT within its ranks practices a faction discipline, and if one places the proceedings of the IT within the overall tactics of the IMT, then one is forced to draw the following astonishing conclusion: Before its split with the SWP, the IT "split" de facto from the IMT.

But it would be rash to draw the further conclusion from this that the danger of a split in the international is unreal. The actions of the IT work their own dialectic upon the IMT: Through its violation of IMT discipline in the question of the SWP, the IT has the chance to become the majority in the IMT. With this violation, the IT has created a "fait accompli" that is difficult for the IMT to swallow. To exhort the IT to abandon its split course in the SWP is one thing. To let the IT drop like a hot potato in the international after its de facto expulsion from the SWP is another. The IMT will hardly saw off the branch it is sitting on: the confidence of its followers in the power of the international leadership to protect its followers.

It is therefore very probable that the "fait accompli" will (or already has) change the majority of the IMT anti-splitters, which doubtlessly existed at the time of the decisions against the IT's split course, into a majority that is willing to risk a split. And this change in the majority position of the IMT takes place in a situation in which the leaders of the IMT (and the leaders of the anti-split front in the IMT) no longer have control of events. They must react according to a logic that they did not choose.

But this intricate logic of the relationship between IT and IMT goes still further: The IT drew its confidence to risk a split course in the SWP precisely from its membership and "integration" into the IMT whose discipline the split course violated. Prior to their integration into the IMT, the same comrades, as the Proletarian Orientation Tendency, drew back from this course (in contrast to others, who have in the meanwhile set up their own anti-Pabloist groups in the USA). This expresses itself in the fact that the IT regards itself as the "nucleus of an American section of the Fourth International" (although the SWP has been the American section -- even if not so legally -- ever since the founding of the Fourth); in the fact that the IT equates itself with the Fourth International and treats the SWP as outside the Fourth ("There are very few followers of the Fourth International in the SWP, there are more outside it"); in the fact that the IT designates the supporters of the IMT as the sections of the Fourth International in North America, namely the RMG in Canada and itself in the USA (whereas in reality it is well known that the ISA/LSO and the SWP are the sections, although the SWP cannot be so officially because of reactionary legislation); and in the fact that the IT in its violations of discipline claims to have the right, independently, "to put into practice the decisions of the Tenth World Congress."

How will the relationship IT/IMT take form after the split in the SWP? An important indication will be the treatment accorded by the IMT to those IMT supporters in the SWP who resigned from the IT in opposition to its split course but remain supporters of the IMT. Before the split, the IMT had decided that all its supporters in the USA must be members of the IT. If the IMT were now to recognize Langston, Langston and Co., who resigned from the IT, as members of the IMT, this would be an important step against a split.

The Tactics of the SWP Leadership and the I/T

The SWP leadership has documented and proved the course followed by the IT and its split with that formal perfection for which it is known. The decisive conclusion that it has drawn in regard to the international is: the need for a special world congress. This demand, it should be noted, has many aspects.

For one thing, the call for a special world congress is a formal mistake, and to be sure, a calculated one, since in formal questions the SWP is very good. Before a special world congress there is the International Executive Committee. Only if the SWP receives no satisfaction from the IEC is the call for a special world congress justified. Contrary to its usual practice, the

SWP chooses not to exhaust all the measures, first of all, all the possibilities offered by the statutes.

This is, of course, no accident. The SWP expects nothing from an IEC composed according to the voting relationships at the Tenth World Congress. The primary goal of the LTF with a special world congress is neither a split in the International (as the IMT is sure to impute to it) nor the hindering of a split (as it will say of itself), but to organize the ostracism of the IMT before the entire international.

For a long time the LTF has sought to prove that the IMT is a manipulative secret faction. It has tried for a long time to demonstrate this thesis with revelations concerning the "Domingo affair," the letter (which was not made known to the U.S. and the IEC) from the leaders of the IMT to the PRT of Argentina, and the "Barzman letter." But the LTF was continually unable to score a resounding victory with the followers of the IMT. The IMT leadership always succeeded in taking the wind out of the LTF's sails with some sort of pithy explanation.

Now the LTF has available ammunition of a quite different caliber, and it plans to use this opportunity to open the eyes of the "silent majority" in the international.

Now it has proof that the IMT practices a faction discipline, proof that amounts to a reversal of political relationships: the letter from the Los Angeles group of the IT to the IT leadership stating that they have always been and still are opposed to the Latin American line of the IMT -- in the voting for the world congress, these comrades, out of faction discipline, voted for the Latin American line of the IMT.

Thus the LTF has proof that the authority of the tenth world congress is no longer so simon-pure. With a majority of only 50.5 percent for the line on Argentina, for example, a few cases of faction discipline prevailing over conviction could suffice to change a slim majority into a slim minority.

Now the LTF has the proof that the IMT has its own organizational apparatus parallel to the International, that the IMT, for example, has erected structures that according to the statutes can be erected only by the world congress or the IEC, such as the forming of continental bureaus, the NAB (North American Bureau) in which the IMT makes the decisions for its "sections" for North America.

The LTF is betting that at a special world congress all these facts will open the eyes of the IMT membership to what is going on. But if this proves fruitless and the IMT members shrug their shoulders over this sort of revelation, then it cannot be excluded that the LTF will "write off" the IMT sections and proceed on a split course.

The third aspect of the LTF's demand for a special world congress is that, independently of the motives of the LTF, it can prove to be a means to hinder a split in the Fourth International.

It is obvious that neither side -- IMT or LTF -- has any wish to assume formal responsibility for a split. We have explained the reasons for this often enough. The real greatest danger is obviously that of a "cold split." This could occur in the form that both sides come up with mutually incompatible interpretations of the split in the SWP -- the LTF saying that the IT has split and thus violated the decisions of the Tenth World Congress and placed itself outside the international, and the IMT saying that the SWP leadership expelled the IT and thus violated the decisions of the Tenth World Congress. The two sides would part company over these two incompatible interpretations without either side formally declaring a split. Both sides would justify their position with 2,000 pages of documents and declare themselves to be the "legitimate" Fourth International, and the clientele of both factions would applaud their leaders and be persuaded that they were members of the "real" international.

Such a "cold split" is of course not possible at a world congress. There both sides face the necessity either to find a solution and to accept majority decisions or to walk out and thus take on the formal responsibility for the split.

Our position is therefore the following: According to the statutes, the IEC is the highest body between world congresses. It is the task of the IEC to remove the acute danger of a split that has arisen and to solve the pressing crisis.

We therefore advocate the immediate summoning of the IEC at the earliest technically possible moment. Only when all possibilities in the IEC have been exhausted can the question of a special world congress be posed responsibly. If the IEC confirms the assumption that a special world congress remains the only way of preventing a split, then we will support the calling of a special world congress.

But we will struggle against any maneuver that regards a split as a "fait accompli" because of the IT's split with the SWP and thus attempts to split the Fourth International in a "cold way" behind the backs of its membership.

The Reality of the Split Danger

The reality of the split danger lies in the fact that, contrary to the situation at the Tenth World Congress, the split in the SWP opens no possibility of an organizational solution. Political solutions are unavoidable. From the standpoint of principle, this is an advantage, but practically it creates an unprecedented split danger.

The reason is this: Both before and at the Tenth World Congress we fought bitterly, as is well known, against the "Canadian" solution. This solution meant that alongside the ISA/ISO as the section, a split-off from it (the present RMG) was recognized as a sympathizing organization. This was an unsurpassed affront to the statutes and was forced on the ISA/ISO against its will by the IMT and the majority of the LTF. We fought against this solution neither because of sentimentality nor because of any penchant for Canada, but because of a quite sober consideration:

The Canadian solution is a model for a split. A split model that, to be sure, applies very well in this form to only one other country: the USA. But there this precedent is not applicable without a split in the international (and then it is superfluous), because the SWP will not accept for itself and the USA what the ISA/LSO was forced to accept, and unlike the ISA/LSO, the SWP cannot be outvoted in the ITF. That is, the "Canadian solution" was a split model that in its first and only repetition must lead to the splitting of the international. Now it is necessary to think of something else besides breaking the international statutes.

Before the Tenth World Congress, the international faction struggle was a sort of mad chess game, in which the ITF, thanks to its superior play and scrupulous regard for the rules of play, was able to pile up clear advantages. But at the world congress the game became a poker party in which the bluff of the anti-split front in the IMT won out, supported by the strong nerves of the "solid nucleus" of the ITF. Today both factions are playing "chicken": Two autos rush toward each other, and the first to turn away or brake is the "chicken" and has lost. The stupid thing is only this: if no one brakes, both cars will be destroyed. REMAIN ON GUARD TO DEFEND THE UNITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL!

July 13, 1974

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

July 13, 1974

To the Political Committee of the S.W.P.

Dear Comrades,

We are in possession of your letter of July 4 and of the material to which that letter refers. We have considered your request that the proposal for a special world congress should be placed on the agenda of the next meeting of the United Secretariat. We concur with that request.

Given the gravity of the situation, we think that an emergency meeting of the United Secretariat is required in the month of August, although the last United Secretariat session had decided to hold the next Un. Sec. meeting only in September. The earliest possible date to have a quorum of Un. Sec. members assembled seems to be August 25-26. We therefore tentatively call the Un. Sec. meeting on these dates, but are willing to consider an earlier date if you should request so and make definite proposals in that respect.

Fraternally yours,
For the United Secretariat/
Bureau
s/Walter

COPY

COPY

COPY

COPY

New York, New York
July 22, 1974

Walter

Brussels

Dear Walter,

On July 18 we received your letter proposing, in response to our letter of July 5, an "emergency" meeting of the United Secretariat on August 25-26. You indicate that this is "the earliest possible date to have a quorum of the United Secretariat assembled."

As this date is less than two weeks before the regularly scheduled United Secretariat meeting of September 7-8, it seems to us that it would be advisable to maintain the dates of the September meeting. All United Secretariat members have been informed of the September dates for several months, thus assuring maximum attendance at this meeting which will take up our proposal for a special world congress.

Comrade Johnson will be leaving Brussels for New York on July 31. If there are any matters you wish him to convey to us you can contact him before he leaves.

Comradely,
s/Jack Barnes
National Secretary
Socialist Workers Party

COPY

COPY

COPY

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)

COPY

COPY

COPY

14 Charles Lane
New York, New York 10014
July 29, 1974

Revolutionary Marxist Collective

Jim Collins
Barry Biderman
Bob Glick
Susan Schulman

Dear Comrades of the Revolutionary Marxist Collective,

The purpose of this letter is to follow up on the July 19 meeting between you four comrades, the SWP Bay Area organizers, and myself. As you know, we made a concrete proposal to you to facilitate the dissolution of the RMC into the SWP. You indicated that you wanted some time to consider our proposal, and would discuss it further with us when I get back on the West Coast.

To aid our discussion, I would like to summarize our proposal. It was as follows:

That the party branches in the Bay Area and yourselves begin immediately a period of close political collaboration, leading toward the fusion of your group in the SWP. Concretely, we propose the following steps to be taken immediately: 1) That your political work be carried out in consultation with the Oakland/Berkeley and San Francisco organizers; to facilitate this, regular meetings would be set up between yourselves and the organizers. 2) That you begin to make regular financial contributions to the party. 3) That you collaborate with the party in helping to prepare and build the September 11 Chile actions being organized by USLA, and dissolve the Chile Solidarity Committee into USLA to strengthen our common work in this area. 4) That you attend forums. 5) That you undertake regular sales of The Militant, working with SWP members on sales teams. 6) That you help in SWP election campaign work.

Jim raised the question of whether you all could receive the internal discussion material of the SWP and the Fourth International in this period of collaboration, and we indicated that we thought this would be a good idea. Bob also raised the question of his work in the AFT; we indicated that this work, as all your political work, should be done in collaboration with the party. If Susan is in a position to work in building CLUW, she should work with our CLUW fraction.

Jim also raised the question of attendance by RMC members at the Oberlin educational conference in August. If you accept our proposal, it would be a good idea for you to come to Oberlin, since you would then have a chance to see the party as a national organization, and participate in discussions about party work in the period ahead.

When I arrive back on the West Coast, I'll get in touch with Jim through the Bay Area organizers.

2. .

Comradely,

s/Barry Sheppard
Organization Secretary
Socialist Workers Party

cc: Oakland/Berkeley SWP Organizer
San Francisco SWP Organizer
Political Committee

COPY

COPY

COPY

ISA/ISO Central Office
334 Queen Street West
Toronto, Ontario, Canada
July 2, 1974

United Secretariat
Bruxelles

Dear Comrades,

With regard to Jen's letter of May 12, 1974 concerning our dues to the United Secretariat, we last sent an accounting of our international dues to Gisela Mandel on January 25, 1974. Perhaps with the reorganization of the center and the moving of files, this letter may not have come to your attention. In any case, I enclose a copy of this letter.

As you can see, due to the unusually heavy expenses incurred in the latter part of 1973, we are paid up in our international dues through to the end of June 1974.

Comrade Crandall of the ISA/ISO is now on the secretariat, so I assume we will continue the previous arrangement of using our international dues to cover his united secretariat travel expenses. We can begin this procedure for comrade Crandall beginning with July, and I can send you our semi-annual accounting at the end of December, as usual.

Within the framework of assessing our overall financial situation, our Political Committee has discussed what we can pay as international dues in the coming period. In assessing our finances the Political Committee noted the negative effect of the two splits in the past year; the split of the Revolutionary Communist Tendency, and the group around Ross Dowson. It also noted that while the League had made good progress in stabilizing its finances, it still had not totally overcome the problems accumulated over the past five years during which the League had committed itself to expenditures beyond its resources. Those commitments beyond our means included our increasing our international dues to \$250 per month.

In order to bring our expenditures in line with our resources, the Political Committee decided to cut back on expenditures, cutting our central office expenditures by \$1,055. The central office staff was reduced from six to three, and the office and travel expenses were also cut by half. In this framework, we decided to reduce our international dues from \$250 to \$125 per month.

This reduction is only for the immediate period ahead. We hope to be able to revise it upwards as our resources grow.

Comradely,

s/Darrel Furlotte, for the
ISA/ISO

July 31, 1974

Dear Comrade Sheppard,

Your letter of June 28 contains in my opinion misunderstanding on three accounts.

In the first place, neither the United Secretariat nor any of its members ever raised the question to disregard the special status of the Socialist Workers Party created by the Voorhis Act. We know perfectly well that you cannot affiliate as a section to the F.I. as a result of the reactionary legislation in effect in the USA, and that, in the framework of that legislation, dues or financial contributions to the F.I. are prohibited. Nobody wants to take any "factional advantage" from that situation or wants to change acknowledging it.

If you received information to the contrary, this can only be interpreted as misunderstandings or mistaken reporting. It would have been wiser to check with those whom your informants claim to have been guilty of such change of attitude, rather than to record without verification an alleged irresponsibility or the fact that "threats" were made against you. Otherwise, the way in which "reports" of oral discussions at United Secretariat meetings are being "transmitted" could put into jeopardy the freedom of discussion at such meetings, which, in the democratic tradition of our movement, is complete and unrestricted, and will remain so, without anybody having the right to warn anybody that "anything you say might be written down and used against you."

Representatives of the IEC minority faction in the United Secretariat have several times insisted upon the same principle. It would be wise if they and you would stick to it.

In the second place, the questions raised in the United Secretariat meeting did not concern the Socialist Workers Party, but the IEC minority faction which is a faction of members of the F.I. who claim full membership and voting rights and therefore have full membership duties. It so happens that, since the 10th World Congress, with the honorable exception of the New Zealand section, not a single section or sympathizing section whose leadership supports in its majority the IEC minority faction has contributed a single penny to the budget of the international center. Far from being a normal and traditional situation, this is a new one. It is true that some of the organizations whose leaderships support in their majority the IEC minority faction had already made such a "turn" before the 10th World Congress. We raised this matter several times before and during the world congress, but didn't want it to cut across the absolute priority of conducting a political debate to clarify political issues.

However after a world congress, this situation changes. The continuation and generalization of what can only be described as a financial boycott raises grave questions as to the application of democratic centralism on behalf of that faction. The strengthening of the international center is explicitly mentioned as a key task of the world Trotskyist movement by the political resolution adopted by a clear majority at the 10th

World Congress. A refusal of the IEC minority faction to take its full part -- to the extent of its membership claims -- in the expenses implied by the strengthening of that center can only be interpreted as a shirking of its statutory duty, if not as an outright refusal to apply world congress decisions.

In the third place, you are absolutely right that it has always been the custom to give credit to those organizations doing so for any genuine expenses of an international character not directly made in the form of contributions to the center. Nobody proposes to change that custom. But your misunderstandings regarding that matter concern:

(a) The nature of these expenses. Only those which have been previously agreed upon can be credited, not any expense arbitrarily decided by one side as being of such a nature. To give two examples: travel expenses in Europe of an IEC minority faction supporter in the United Secretariat, who has never been assigned by the United Secretariat to any activity in Europe whatsoever, cannot be credited as supporting the building of the world Trotskyist movement. They are faction building expenses, and should be supported by the said faction, without any credit being given for this to any organization. Travel expenses incurred in bringing to United Secretariat meetings "translators" without previous agreement (or even proposal made to!) by the United Secretariat to underwrite such expenses cannot be credited either. Likewise, expenses explicitly excluded by United Secretariat decision from the financial efforts for building the world Trotskyist movement and channelled toward special campaigns cannot be credited in any way as international expenses to any Trotskyist organization.

Differences of appreciation on the above mentioned expenses already run into the equivalent of several thousand dollars. This has been brought to the attention of the IEC minority faction many times.

In short, we do not propose to modify anything in regard to mutually agreed upon credits. The IEC minority faction supporters seem to have decided a change in attitude, "crediting" unilaterally what they want. This we cannot accept.

(b) If credits have to be evaluated, they have to be evaluated for all sections and sympathizing organizations, several of which incur the same type of expenditures you mention over and above the dues they pay. In that case, it simply is not true that the credits you mention, in so far as they concern mutually agreed upon expenditures, amount to "several times more than the contributions of the largest sections."

(c) Our key complaint is not this question of "credits," or a change in their evaluation compared to the past prior to the eruption of the present faction fight. It is the question that over and above any genuinely creditable expenditure on international matters, the sections and sympathizing organizations of the F.I. led by IEC minority faction supporters had in the past regularly paid contributions to the running of the international center. Sometimes they were large, sometimes they

3.

were modest, but they were always real. We want to return to that situation, which is the only normal one.

The proposal made by us involves contributions of this sort not covering "a large part" but hardly 20% of the current expenses of the center. They are not ultimatums but proposals. We would be perfectly willing to consider any reasonable counter-proposal.

We understand that, inspite of the reactionary Voorhis Act which prevents you from formally affiliating with the IEC minority faction in the same way, as it prevents you from affiliating with the F.I., you have close relations of sympathy and collaboration with the leadership of that faction. We think it would be wise if you would most strongly advise that leadership to change its behavior in that respect, which is abnormal and intolerable.

In no organization could the rank-and-file -- not to speak of the leadership -- accept that those who claim more than 40% of the membership and more than 40% of votes at congresses pay much less than 20% of the financial contributions for party-building purposes (not counting, we repeat, faction building activities, which cannot be included in these).

Fraternally yours,

s/Walter